

*Table of Contents*

- 2 Editorial
- Articles*
- 3 Faith Shewn by Works: A Sermon on James 2:18.  
*By Samuel Miller, D.D.*
- 11 Samuel Miller, D. D. (1769-1850) An Annotated Bibliography.  
*By Wayne Sparkman, M.A.R., M.Div.*
- 43 Examining the Work of S. W. Carruthers: Justifying a Critical Approach to the Text of the Westminster Standards & Correcting the 18<sup>th</sup> Century Lineage of the Traditional Scottish Text.  
*By Chris Coldwell*
- 65 Jonathan Edwards on Scripture & Salvation.  
*By W. Gary Crampton, Ph.D.*
- 94 The “Ministerial and Declarative” Powers of the Church and *In Thesi* Deliverances.  
*By C. N. Willborn, Ph.D.*
- 102 A Critical Examination of N. T. Wright’s Doctrine of Justification.  
*By J. V. Fesko, Ph.D.*
- 116 Reframing Presbyterian Worship: A Critical Survey of the Worship Views of John M. Frame and R. J. Gore.  
*By Frank J. Smith, Ph.D., D.D. & David C. Lachman, Ph.D.*
- 151 *Reviews & Responses*: Stephen Westerholm, *Perspectives Old And New On Paul: The ‘Lutheran’ Paul And His Critics* (Rowland S. Ward) ■ Leonard J. Coppes, *The Divine Days of Creation* (Benjamin Shaw) with *Response* (Leonard J. Coppes) and *Reply* (Benjamin Shaw) ■ Norman Shepherd: *Law and Gospel in Covenantal Perspective* (Wayne Forkner) ■ Robert Trill: *Justification Vindicated* (Andrew J. Webb) ■ *The Auburn Avenue Theology, Pros and Cons: Debating the Federal Vision* (J. Ligon Duncan III, Ph.D.).
- 164 *Psallo*: Psalm 109:1-10.
- 166 *In Translatione*: Andrew Willet’s Preface to Nicholas Bownd’s *Sabbathum veteris et Novi Testamenti*.
- 168 *Antiquary*: The Traditional Form of The Westminster Standards.
- 176 *Bibliography*
- 184 *The Editor and Contributing Editors*
- In ‘Brief*: Samuel Miller 1769-1849 (9) ■ Miller on Worship (40) ■ Miller on Mature Preparation for the Ministry (41) ■ William Carruthers (64) ■ Two Anecdotes (93) ■ Miller on Arminian & Pelagian Subscribers (175).

*Contributing Editors*: The Revs. Richard E. Bacon, Th.D., W. Gary Crampton, Ph.D., J. Ligon Duncan, Ph.D., John T. Dyck, David W. Hall, Ph.D., Sherman Isbell, Ray B. Lanning, Thomas G. Reid, Frank J. Smith, Ph.D., D.D., Alan Strange, C. N. Willborn, Ph.D. Mr. John R. Muether; Mr. Wayne Sparkman.  
*Editor*: Mr. Chris Coldwell.

*Editorial Address*: *The Confessional Presbyterian*, P O Box 141084, Dallas, TX 75214. Email: editor@cpjournal.com. Subscriptions: Individual USA \$18; Library/Foreign \$25. Retail Price: \$25.

*Article and Review Submissions*: Please mail the Editor regarding submissions for publication, or visit <http://www.cpjournal.com> for more details.

*The Confessional Presbyterian*, Volume 1 (2005).

ISSN 1549-9979

ISBN 0-9704638-1-2

All Material Copyright © 2005 by Reformation Presbyterian Press, a ministry of First Presbyterian Church, Rowlett, Texas.

*Front Cover*: Samuel Miller, D.D. (1769-1850), Presbyterian Minister and Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Church Government at Princeton (1813-1849). Graphite and charcoal on Bristol, Copyright © 2003 by Lori Teibel. *Back Cover*: Westminster Abbey, attributed to John Kay. *Britannia Illustrata* (London, 1707).

## EDITORIAL

In a day when it appears that Presbyterians are drifting further and further from the doctrines of the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms, we hope *The Confessional Presbyterian* journal will provide a forum for inter-denominational discussion among conservative Presbyterians, wishing to defend closer adherence to these old standards of biblical Christianity. To facilitate such an environment we have assembled a fine board of contributing editors from several denominations (see page 184). Our goal, as hopefully reflected in this first issue, is to publish a range of theological, practical and historical material, supportive of the Westminster Standards, while allowing for courteous discussion where disagreements may exist. Our hope is to publish one volume annually.

We are pleased to present some fairly significant *Articles* in this inaugural issue, which begins with what we believe is a first time transcription of material from the Samuel Miller Manuscript Collection (Special Collections, Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries). The transcription presented, a sermon on James 2:18 preached in 1792 while Miller was still a licentiate, was chosen because it is one of the earliest surviving examples, and on a topic of renewed attention and controversy today. The sermon is followed by a new annotated bibliography of Dr. Miller's publications compiled and edited by Wayne Sparkman, which is supplemented with an index of the contents of the Miller manuscript collection just mentioned. As Dr. Miller is of no little importance in the history of Confessional Presbyterianism, we believe this material will be of great interest.

In *Edwards on Scripture and Salvation*, from his study of the writings of Jonathan Edwards, Dr. W. Gary Crampton presents the views of this "Puritan Sage" on such topics as Knowledge, Scripture, Revelation, Inspiration, the Law of God and "the doctrine of justification by grace alone, through faith alone, in Christ alone."

The extent and limit of church power is often a subject of concern to Confessional Presbyterians and Dr. C. N. Willborn of Greenville Presbyterian Theological Seminary, canvases a relevant topic in his article on *In Thesis* Deliverances, which became a subject of controversy in the old southern Presbyterian Church in the United States in the latter part of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. In sum, Dr. Willborn addresses the question of whether the response of the highest court of a church to anything other than a judicial case "can be said to bind the consciences of men or be used by the lower courts to construct judicial cases in the future? In other words, when the

highest court speaks *in thesi*, does it speak with authority; is any one bound by its voice?"

In *Reframing Presbyterian Worship: A Critical Review of the Worship Views of John M. Frame and R. J. Gore*, Drs. Frank J. Smith and David C. Lachman, both long time defenders of what has in the last century become known as the Regulative Principle of Worship, review the writings of these two leading Presbyterian critics and assess their rejection of this important principle of Confessional Presbyterianism.

Dr. J. V. Fesko's article, *N. T. Wright on Justification*, is an excellent critique of the Bishop of Durham's views and a defense of the Westminster formulation. While it covers some material that may be unfamiliar to the general reader, the article is worth a careful study. We found the comments on the "context" of justification—not before the world, but at God's tribunal—to be especially worthy of notice.

The remaining article to mention, a contribution by the editor, while not of any doctrinal consequence, does address the question of how Presbyterians may determine if they hold the best and most accurate form of their historic doctrinal statements. In *Examining the Work of S. W. Carruthers*, an argument is presented for continuing a critical approach to the text of The Westminster Standards, even though manuscripts exist for the Confession of Faith and both the Larger and Shorter Catechisms. From his research and collation of key editions, the author constructs a corrected and improved genealogy of the traditional published text, and some corrections are made to the significant critical work of Dr. Carruthers.

In addition to these *Articles*, several hopefully recurring departments or features are presented:

*In Brief* refers to the several short articles that appear throughout the volume. In this issue, in addition to some biographical material on Samuel Miller, we republish some extracts by the Princeton professor on *The Regulative Principle of Worship*, and on *Mature Preparation for the Gospel Ministry* (from an 1829 lecture delivered at the opening of the Summer Session at Princeton Theological Seminary).

As the title implies, *Reviews & Responses* will feature critical assessments of significant books and other media. When possible, authors receiving particularly negative reviews will be given the opportunity for an appropriate response in the current or in a subsequent issue. Responses to featured *Articles* may also be submitted for consideration for publication (see page 151 for more information). We believe this issue contains some significant reviews, relating to the New Perspectives on Paul, and to what has been labeled as the "Federal Vision."

*Psallo* is intended to give an opportunity to present new musical settings and translations of portions from the Psalms for singing. In this issue, Rev. Todd L. Ruddell, the assistant

*Continued on Page 183.*

## Faith Shewn by Works:

A Sermon on James 2:18:  
*I will shew thee my faith by my works.*

By Samuel Miller, D. D.

We are equally taught by reason and experience that the principles of our minds should govern our practice in life and be kept in correspondence with it in every particular. Accordingly in our converse with men, where we find one who professes sentiments which are not justified, and of which he gives no evidence by his external conduct, we hold him in contempt and stigmatise him as a deceiver, unworthy of confidence or regard. And this criterion of judging has received the complete sanction of our divine Master, since, in recounting the detestable qualities and wicked dispositions of the Scribes and Pharisees, he observed that *they said and did not*.<sup>1</sup>

Perhaps there has been no fault more common among the professors of Christianity in all ages of the world, than that which is now under consideration. Profession is cheap and easy, if it be admitted alone; but to prove its sincerity by uniform practice is a much more difficult and laborious attempt; and an attempt in which none can eventually succeed but those who have in them the root of the matter, [2] and are in reality that which they declare to the world.—Others may imitate this example for a short time and may impose upon men by the regularity of their external observances; but this deception will rarely last long; like the morning cloud and the early dew, it will soon pass away; and exhibit their character in its native colours.

Too much pains cannot be taken, then, to impress on the minds of man the great advantages, and the absolute necessity of proving the sincerity of their religious profession, by maintaining good works, and by adhering to a uniform course of holy obedience. In proportion as this proof is neglected, and men indulge in an opposite course of life, in the same proportion does real religion decline, and the holy cause subjected to the ridicule and reproaches of carnal men.

To establish this truth, and to urge it in a practical

manner, appears to be the grand design of the Apostle in this chapter now before us. On this account indeed, he has been supposed by some, to contradict that fundamental doctrine [3] of the Gospel so frequently delivered in the foregoing epistles, viz. that we are justified by faith, without the deeds of the law. He has been supposed, by those who did not understand his design, to inculcate a dependence on good works for pardon and acceptance with God, if not wholly, yet at least in a kind of conjunction with Faith.—But a careful and impartial attention to those inspired authors will quickly convince us, that their language may be easily reconciled, and that there is in reality, a most beautiful harmony in

---

THE AUTHOR: Samuel Miller (1769-1849). Dr. Miller was Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Church Government at Princeton Seminary (see a short biography on page 9). He delivered this sermon while still a licentiate, just shy of twenty-two years of age. TRANSCRIBED by Chris Coldwell. "Faith Shewn by Works: A Sermon on James II.18." (No. 22). Dover, Oct 1792. Box 9, item 18. Samuel Miller Manuscript Collection, Special Collections, Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries. Samuel Miller was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Lewis meeting in Dover, October 13, 1791. According to a notation on the reverse of the title page, Miller preached this sermon while supply at Dover, October 26, 1792, and again in New York, January 20, 1793, after accepting a call to the United Presbyterian Churches of New York. He was ordained on June 5, 1793 (See *Life of Samuel Miller, D.D.L.L.D.* [Philadelphia, 1869] 1.43-70; 87), and pastored in New York until called to be the second professor at Princeton in 1813. Only four sermons earlier than this date are listed in the MS collection, and the six preached as a licentiate all date to 1792. The last numbered sermon from the period of his New York pastorate is No. 668, dated April 1813. One unnumbered sermon is dated May 1813, and another is simply noted as having been preached "once before 1814."

1. Em dashes ending most paragraphs have been omitted. Interlinear insertions by Miller are noted by <arrow brackets>. Insertions by the editor are in [square brackets]. Deletions in the MS are noted with a dagger (†) or footnoted if still discernable. Words that were underlined have been italicized, and contractions have been expanded without comment. The original pagination of the MS is noted in the text as [1], [2], etc.

their sentiments, amidst the seeming opposition.—St. James appears to have been writing to those, who, relying on faith alone, were disposed to disseminate doctrines tending to licentiousness in practice; in order to confute them, he<sup>†</sup> declares and proves that no other faith will be found of a saving kind, but that which has sent a powerful and extensive influence on the soul, as to produce a sincere obedience to the divine law. This solemnly teaches that a mere assent to goſpel truth, if it be not accompanied with a correſponding temper of life is utterly ineffectual and vain. On the other hand, St. Paul as if to expose the self-righteous, and to obviate the error of such [4] as taught that obedience to the Mosaic<sup>2</sup> law was necessary to salvation; often declares that faith is the only means of uniting with Chriſt and of becoming interested in his great atonement. viz that faith which is the act of a regenerated soul, and which has a permanent influence on the heart and conversation.—In short, the Apoſtle James appears to be ſpeaking of a cold assent to ſpeculative truth; but St. Paul, of a cordial and sincere reliance on the only Saviour. The former seems to intend, by the word *Justification*: the fair and ample evidence which is given to men of sincerity; while the latter means, what is more important, our acceptance in the sight of God.

The grand truth, then, which these two Apoſtles agree rather more than is imagined in teaching, is that a genuine and saving faith, wherever it exists, will always be attended by good works; or, in other words, that there is a necessary and indissoluble connection between such a faith, and holiness of practice.

To illustrate and establish this truth therefore, and to urge it with a few practical remarks, is the design of the present discourse.—And may the great Author [5] and finisher of faith, so apply what may be ſpoken to our souls, that we may be made wise unto salvation.

It is unnecessary to remark that by the obedience which is here maintained to be always the consequence of saving faith, cannot be understood to be an obedience uninterrupted and perfect in its nature. Those who have true faith may not only sometimes fall into a slothful and inattentive state, but they may by the temptation of Satan, or the remaining corruptions of their own hearts, be led aſtray and enticed into grievous transgressions of the divine law.—All that is intended by the Apoſtle, and all that I want to attempt to establish on the present occasion is that every true believer's inclination of mind,

and habits of life are of an holy and obedient nature; and that though<sup>3</sup> from the causes above mentioned, he may sometimes fall into sin, yet this is opposite to the general tenor of his conversation, and is a deviation from which he seldom fails to return with deep repentance.—I want to advance and endeavour to prove that no man can be a real Chriſtian unless his conduct be generally conformed to the moral law; that he cannot be a true disciple [6] of Chriſt, unless he lives in the habitual discharge of the various duties which he owes to God, to his fellow creatures, and to himself.

It appears, then, that there is a necessary and indissoluble connection between faith and good works, because faith is the result of a renewed nature; or, in other words, it can be the act of no other than a regenerated and sanctified heart.—We are expressly informed in the first chapter of St. John's Goſpel, that as many as received Chriſt, were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.—And it is also evident from what is revealed to us in Scripture of the nature of regeneration, that no one is capable of such views of divine things, as will lead him to embrace by faith the salvation of the Goſpel, unless his mind has been graciously enlightened, and his will renewed by the influence of the holy Spirit. Indeed, any hearer's faith may, without much impropriety, be called *a part* of that new nature which is implanted in the soul by the power of the Holy Ghost. That ſpiritual perception of God, of Chriſt and of his own state, which induces a renunciation of self righteousness, and [7] a reliance on the only Saviour, is in fact that <faith> which we are now contemplating; and that this ſpiritual perception is the result of gracious and holy influences on the soul is not less evident to all who attentively study the divine Word.

It may be also worthy of further remark, that the gracious p<r>inciple in the soul of which faith is a fundamental act, is not of a partial nature. It does not <affect><sup>4</sup> one faculty alone, without <extending><sup>5</sup> to any of the rest. It does not enlighten the understanding without renewing and transforming the will; but it pervades and rectifies every faculty, regulates their operations, and directs them to those pursuits and exercises which are agreeable to the divine will. It is a principle, in short, which reaches to all the moral powers of the soul, and maintains an influence over them that is permanent and universal.

If it appear thus, that genuine and saving faith can exist in no heart but that in which these gracious principles and holy dispositions are implanted by the Spirit of God, we are obviously and necessarily led to conclude,

2. The word "divine" has been struck out (deleted).

3. Tho' and thro' are abbreviated throughout the manuscript.

4. Two words have been deleted: "regulate individual"?

5. The word "affecting" has been struck out.

that it must always be accompanied with holiness of practise. For when life is conferred on any being, he must of course perform those exercises which are the natural consequences of this life. Does not an immediate and uniform discharge of all the animal and vital functions constantly ensue on the establishment of animation in any natural body? And do we not always conclude that such a body is in a state of death, when the exercise of these functions is not only suspended, but wholly destroyed? Believe it, my hearers, the connection is as obvious, and quite as necessary, between the spiritual life and those holy actions which form its great evidence and its valuable fruit. It is as absurd and impossible to reconcile the existence of this divine animation in the soul, with the want of holiness in practice, as it is to think of preserving the life of the body, under a total <and continued> absence of all vital operations.

What is it that gives a moral stamp to actions but the disposition of the heart? What is it that characterizes human conduct, but the principles from which it springs, and the state of the will by which it is immediately dictated?—To [9] suppose then, that the tenor of a man's actions may be opposite<sup>6</sup> to the law of God, and that his soul, at the same time, may be possessed and governed by holy principles and gracious affections, involves as great a contradiction to reason and the nature of things, as to imagine that the actions must necessarily be of the same <character><sup>7</sup> with the operations of mind which gave birth to them, they may nonetheless be of one directly opposite; or which is the same thing, that though it be impossible they should be dissimilar, yet still they may bear no kind of similarity.—It is to suppose that the acts of the will are generally pure and holy, while the external conduct, which is nothing more than the acts of the will brought into view, may be of a character entirely the reverse.

But, my hearers, those suppositions are too unreasonable to be admitted by a reflecting mind.—We need no proof to be convinced that men will always pursue that course of conduct which is most agreeable to principles and dispositions of their hearts. They may dissemble for a while;—they may suspend this mode of acting;—they may be led [10] astray by various causes; but their real character will at length predominate, and man may easily discover what manner of spirit they are of.—If they love God, they will keep his commandments.—If their souls be enriched with heavenly grace, it will shine forth in their life and conversation.

My hearers, can they who are dead to sin live any longer therein? Can they whose temper necessarily and uniformly includes a hatred to every wicked and false

way, be still found to delight in pursuing them? (Can he whose heart is filled with love to God, frequently and habitually allow himself to practise those things which he knows are hateful in his sight?) Can they who delight in holiness, and who take pleasure in obeying all the divine commandments, notwithstanding this prefer a course of known and deliberate sin? My hearers, these suppositions are all contradictory and therefore impossible.—They are as inconsistent with truth and the nature of things, as to imagine that <all> the habits and inclinations of any mind may be pure and holy, but that it may notwithstanding this be generally inclined to those things which are wicked and unlawful in their nature. [11]

We are led then, by a very natural and easy process to the desired conclusion.—If faith can exist in no other mind than that which is renewed and sanctified by the Holy Ghost—If every soul that is thus renewed and sanctified, is under the government of gracious principles, and holy dispositions—If it be impossible, as has been proved, for any soul who is under the government of these dispositions, to avoid correspondent acts of the will, or holy actions, then it is evident that there is an infallible and necessary connection between faith and good works.

But farther:— the indissoluble connection between faith and good works appears not only because faith has its foundation in a holy nature, but also because<sup>†</sup> this grace, in its own exercises, tends to produce the same effect.—We have already contemplated the subject in a general view;—we have endeavoured to show, from the existence of a spl. [spiritual] life in the soul, that good works must be the result. Let us now endeavour, for a moment, for the sake of argument, to place out of view the circumstance of faith being founded on a new nature in the soul; let us consider it as a mere act of the mind, without any reference to the [12] principle from which it springs.—Taken in this abstracted light, faith has undoubtedly a direct tendency to influence the heart and life of believers and consequently to regulate their moral conduct.

It is one and no very inconsiderable part of the act of faith <taken in an external[?] view[?]> to receive Christ in his Kingly office: To accept of him not only as a Saviour from punishment, but also as a great Lawgiver and the Ruler of our life and conversation. Thus our Lord himself expresses a soul's receiving him by faith, in this striking language,<sup>8</sup> take my yoke on you, and

6. A phrase has been deleted; probably "to the opposite."

7. The word "kind" has been deleted.

8. The word "of" has been deleted.

learning of him;—This phrase surely means a <cordial> submission to the law of Christ, and a readiness to perform all the duties which it requires. It intends a <pious>† resignation to this His holy will, arising from a deep conviction of his wisdom and goodness, and a firm reliance on these attributes for continual protection and guidance.—Thus we find that the very essence of faith includes a willingness and constant tendency to obedience of life.

But under this consideration the various interesting and delightful views which faith presents to the mind, surely tend to inspire a holy temper and promote a disposition to observe the strictest rectitude of conversation.—Can anyone who sincerely believes in Christ, [13] who trusts in him as his Saviour from sin and de<a>th, and who feels all that gratitude which is the necessary consequence of such a reliance,—can such a soul be disposed to indulge in a life of opposition to this Saviour, and in an habitual neglect of his service?—Can he who realizes that he is under the immediate inspection of the great Jehovah, and who has a deep conviction of the purity and glory of his character, can he dare to allow himself in disobedient and rebellious practice?—Is it possible for him who has his eyes and his attention fixed on the glories that shall be revealed hereafter, to† place his affections on the vain and animal pursuits of this world?

No my hearers:—a strong and lively faith not only supports the soul in difficulties and trials; but urges it on to the discharge of the most painful and laborious duties.—It deters from the commission of sin by presenting to the mind the awful consequences thereof, and the heinous nature of transgressing the divine law. It allows to the cultivation of all the humane and social virtues, by the transforming views which it affords of the sublime pleasures and exalted enjoyments of the world to come.—It qui<c>kens [14] the soul, and stirs up its native power to diligence and zeal, in the pursuit of heavenly objects by the perception which it affords of this high dignity and inconceivable value.

The sacred scriptures treat frequently and fully of the influence of faith on the soul, and consequently <of> its affect on the practice. The 11<sup>th</sup> chapter of the Hebrews presents us with a large discourse on this interesting subject. It represents in striking language, the astonishing influence it had on the minds of many worthies and distinguished favourites of heaven among the peculiar people of God. It declares this divine principle to have been the source of the most glorious magnanimity, and the most heroic exploits that ever were achieved by mortals. In this remarkable chapter we find it men-

tioned as an ample support to the weak, as a most powerful excitement to the purest benevolence and every amiable virtue. Under the impulse of this grace, Moses when he came of age, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, choosing rather to suffer with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season.—Armed with the shield of faith, many saints, whose names [15] are there recorded, were made conquerors and more than conquerors. They subdued kingdoms—wrought righteousness—obtained promises—out of weakness were made strong—waxed valiant in fight—turned to flight the armies of the aliens.

Once more:—the necessary and indissoluble connection between faith and good works is so frequently stated and so fully asserted in the sacred scriptures, that we may derive from hence an undeniable and weighty argument to confirm and establish those which have been already advanced.

Many are the instances which occur in the holy volume of God's rejecting the most fair and splendid profession of love and faith, because this profession was not accompanied and confirmed by a corresponding life and conduct. Many are mentioned in the divine word, who though they pretended to know God, yet in works they denied him; being abominable and disobedient and unto every good work reprobate. If ye love me, says Christ, keep my commandments. For whosoever saith he loveth me and keepeth not my commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not [16] in him.

We are also taught by infinite wisdom that the greatest proof, and indeed the only infallible test of holiness in the heart, or a genuine and saving faith, is a corresponding holiness in the life and conversation. For we are told that the fruits of the Spirit are always, love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, meekness, and temperance. Ye shall know men by their fruits, said our Saviour himself. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit, but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit.—A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit.—Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them. For he that abiddeth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit. And hereby do ye know that ye know God, i.e. that ye believe in him, if ye keep his commandments.

In many of the promises given to men of granting them regenerating grace; and in several of the explanations with which we are furnished of the nature and extent of the Gospel Redemption, a regulation of the life and practice [17] is also included and represented of the highest importance.

—Thus saith the Lord, [in]<sup>9</sup> the prophecy of Ezekiel, I will <put><sup>†</sup> my spirit <within><sup>†</sup> you and I will cause you to walk in my statutes and ye shall keep my judgments and do them.—That grace of God, which bringeth salvation, and which is offered in the Gospel to all who will accept it, is described as teaching men to deny all ungodliness, and every worldly lust, to live soberly, righteously and godly in the present evil world.—And we are also told that the great design of Christ in giving himself for us, was, that he might purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.

The scriptures again declare, to complete their testimony on this subject, that by works is faith made perfect.—That is, it produces its proper effect, and is brought to that exercise which is the chief end and design of its existence;— a<sup>10</sup> tree is perfected, and comes to that upon which is wished, when it brings forth fruit abundantly, fitted for the use of man.—Now if the principal object designed to be obtained by implanting faith in the heart, be holiness of life and conversation; if this be the natural effect, and that which was intended by infinite Wisdom, we are necessarily led to conclude, that wherever this faith exists, it must be accompanied [18] with that which is its proper consequence and which it was chiefly meant to produce in the soul:—<that> wherever it really governs in the heart, it must regulate the external conduct. That it must shine in the various departments of human duty—and invariably adorn the civil—the *social*, and the *domestic* character.

Having thus made an attempt to establish the constant and necessary connection between faith and good works, let us direct our attention to a few practical remarks, which may naturally arise from what has been said.

This passage of scripture then, according to the explanation which has been given, may obviously be applied as a test, to try the sincerity of many who make a splendid profession. There are many, my friends, whose language would lead one to suppose they had all faith, whose lives and tempers are found of an opposite description. There are many, who though they profess the fullest assurance and confidence in the div[ine] promises, who notwithstanding exhibit unsanctified dispositions and highly immoral conduct. Why do we find their hearts instead of being pure, filled with many and grievous abominations? and under the willing government of passions that disgrace and injure them? Why do we find those who say they [19] love God, hating their brethren, indulging in envy and malice, and in all uncharitableness? Why do we see them who pretend to have their hearts fixed on the things that are not seen,

and that are eternal, led away by worldly principles, and enticed by perishing enjoyments from the path of duty? What can be the cause of all these melancholy opposites to the Christian character? Is the prevalence of such actions consistent with grace in the heart? Can men be real Christians and disregard the obligations of morality? No, my friends, the truth is, such have not *faith* and amidst all this high pretension are sadly deceived.—They mistake some paltry and groundless *resemblance* for an important reality. They confide in a broken reed which will speedily fail and pierce them through with many sorrows.

<sup>11</sup>No one indeed can infer here: he is strictly moral in his external conduct, that therefore he is in a gracious state and in the road to <happiness>.<sup>†</sup> The outward deportment may be [unexceptionable?]<sup>12</sup> without a spirit of grace or of real religion. But where real religion is morality will always appear. No further proof is needful that one is in the gall of bitterness and in the bonds of iniquity, than<sup>†</sup> an habitual neglect of obedience to the divine law.

[How absurd & insidious is it for any <one> to pretend that he has a *good heart*, while his life is immoral, & while the tenor of his conduct is of an opposite character! — How vain & presumptuous [to] profess faith in Christ, while his practise is one continued scene[?] of disobedience to his sacred precepts! — Can a man expect to be believed in his declarations of internal piety & hidden exercises of mind, while nothing appears in his external behaviour, but a total inattention to] [20] every divine law? Can he who neglects the humane and social virtues, expect to be received on earth as in heaven as the disciple of that benevolent Saviour who went about doing good?—No surely:—such characters are universally despised by their fellow mortals. But what is of infinitely<sup>†</sup> more importance they will <also> be despised at a higher tribunal and rejected as the disciples of the Father of lies.

In what light is that servant received, who professes to feel the utmost love and veneration for his earthly master, while he neglects his service and refuses to obey him? Is he not discarded, not only as a detestable hypocrite, but as presumptuous and foolish in the extreme? Is he not considered<sup>†</sup> as despicable for his de-

9. There is an ink blotch obscuring most of this word. A paragraph break has been added prior to the dash in this transcription.

10. The word "A" was deleted.

11. At this point a piece of paper with new wording has been placed over the first part of this paragraph; leaving the remaining portion on the following page unchanged. The old wording follows in square brackets.

12. The abbreviation appears to be either "unexcepl" or "unexcept."

ceit; and as worthy of exemplary punishment for his insolent and daring conduct? Believe it, my hearers, he is no less detestable and ridiculous a character who professes to love his Maker, while he tramples on his commandments; who talks of professing faith in Christ, while he practically declares, I will not have this man to reign over me.

Christ came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it. He did not teach men that righteousness was no longer required, [21] or that good works were only necessary under the old dispensation. He taught the contrary of all this, as plainly as words could <convey><sup>13</sup> his meaning.—He declared with awful solemnity, “Not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doth the will of my Father who is in heaven.”—He has taught us in a manner which should alarm every worker of iniquity, that the habitual and allowed practice of any one sin, is as inconsistent with salvation, under the Covenant of grace, as ever it was under the Covenant of works; or rather, to speak in more becoming language, a continuance in sin is now <much> more heinous and aggravated in its nature, because it opposes a brighter and more glorious dispensation.

All therefore, who feel themselves habitually disposed to neglect morality, and disregard obedience to the divine law, may certainly come to this truly awful conclusion, that their hearts are not right with God, but that they are strangers to the Covenant of Promise. They may without hesitation conclude that they are not only destitute of faith, but of every grace which can render them acceptable to God and prepare them for his heavenly kingdom. [22]

This passage of scripture may also be applied as an excitement to *believers* to be more uniform, diligent and zealous in maintaining good works.—Christians! how many who really have faith, bring disgrace on their profession and injure their own souls by a lukewarm and a careless life! How often do they give men occasion to blaspheme that worthy name by which they are called, to think religion a mere cloak for wickedness, and Christ but the minister of sin! By not being sufficiently careful to avoid every appearance of evil, they lead many to view every thing serious with contempt, and to consider godliness as an empty name.

The eyes of the world are set on those who make a profession of religion and many are waiting for their fall.—’Tis true that charity, that heavenly virtue, which so many claim, should teach them another lesson. It

should teach them to *mourn*, rather than to *triumph* over the faults of Christians. It should be cast, as a concealing mantle over the infirmities of the pious, and made to hide a multitude of <their> sins.—But this boasted virtue is rarely to be found: there is much more of that ungenerous, diabolical temper, which rejoiceth in [23] iniquity instead of rejoicing in the truth.—Will you then be slothful in so important and so delicate a cause? Will you be indulging in negligence, suffer the way of truth to be evil spoken of? Will you be the occasion of men despising the religion of Jesus, and becoming avowed enemies of the gospel salvation?

But Remember, I beseech you, <my Christian hearers>, that you are not only bound to avoid bringing religion into reproach; but you are also bound by every tie to honour and adorn it.—In what manner then, can this be so effectually done as by bearing testimony, by every part of your conduct, to the extensive and amiable influence which <Christ><sup>†</sup> possesses over the life and conversation?—By what means can you more fully convince gainsayers, and recommend the religion you profess,<sup>14</sup> than by showing that it makes you better men, and more exemplary in the discharge of every <human> duty?—Believe it my friends, there is not a more beautiful sight upon the earth, nor one which has a more powerful tendency to silence the profane, and strike the vicious with awe, than a consistent, amiable Christian; a Christian who walks uprightly, and [24] who constantly stand in to maintain a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man—This is a character whom all men love—whom angels admire—and on whom the great Jehovah smiles <with approbation> from his throne.

I will detain you with one thought more which methinks is somewhat tender and affecting in its nature.—What labour and pain, my hearers, did our Lord and Master undergo that he might keep this divine law and bring in an everlasting righteousness for our justification? Did he not suffer more than language can describe, that he might mitigate <the distresses> that he might lessen the infirmities, and put away the sins of man? And shall we serve this Redeemer in a cold and negligent manner? Do we profess to love him supremely, and can we engage in his service with so little spirit? Do we own ourselves under such infinite obligation to him, and can we think it hard to submit to his holy law for a few years? Alas, my hearers, if we were not lamentably deficient in love to God, we should certainly serve him with more diligence and care. If we had a suitable sense of his favours to us, we could not content ourselves with a few chief observances or with a partial

13. Word deleted (probably “declare”).

14. The phrase “to all descriptions of men” has been deleted.

obedience, but we should hunger and thirst after righteousness and labour to [25] discharge every known duty. Were our faith more strong and vigorous in its exercise we should show it more plainly, by abounding in every good word and work.

Let us all then as many as profess to believe, be careful to maintain good works, for this is good and profitable unto men. Let us add to our faith virtue, and to virtue knowledge, and to knowledge temperance, and to temperance<sup>15</sup> godliness, and to godliness brotherly kindness, and to brotherly kindness charity—Let these things be so in us and so abound in our hearts, that we may be neither barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour.—By this means, our light may shine before men, and they, seeing our good works, may be led to glorify their Father who is in heaven.■

#### *In Brief: Samuel Miller (1769-1850)*<sup>16</sup>

Samuel Miller, D. D., was the fourth son of the Rev. John Miller, born a few miles from Dover, Del., October 31, 1769, and graduated, with high honor, at the University of Pennsylvania, July 31, 1789. He commenced the study of theology shortly after his graduation, under the direction of his father, but his father being removed before he had completed his theological course, he was licensed by the Presbytery of Lewes, of which his father had long been a leading member, on the 15<sup>th</sup> October, 1791, and immediately after put himself, for the residue of his course, under the instruction of the celebrated Dr. Nisbet, of Dickinson College.

In April, 1792, he received a call to the pastoral charge of the congregation of Dover, then recently vacated by the death of his venerable father, which, however, he ultimately declined. In the Autumn of this year he received a unanimous call from the United Presbyterian churches of New York, to become the colleague of Dr. Rodgers and Dr. McKnight. This call he accepted, and was ordained and installed June 5<sup>th</sup>, 1793. From the commencement of his ministry in New York he enjoyed a high reputation. Besides having the advantage of a remarkably fine person, and most bland and attractive manners, he had, from the beginning, an uncommonly polished style, and there was an air of literary refinement pervading all his performances, that excited general admiration, and well might put criticism at defiance. He was scarcely settled before his services began to be put in requisition on public occasions, and several of these early occasional discourses were pub-

lished, and still remain as a monument of his taste, talents, and piety.

In 1806, Dr. Miller was Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. He took a deep interest in the establishment of the Theological Seminary at Princeton, from the first inception of the enterprise, though without the remotest idea that he was destined to be more intimately connected with it than many others of his brethren. When the Chair of Ecclesiastical History and Church Government was to be filled, the eyes of the Church were directed to Dr. Miller, and in due time the judgment of the Church was pronounced in his being formally elected to that responsible place. The appointment was made in May, 1813, and having accepted it, he was inducted into office on the 29<sup>th</sup> of September following. Here Dr. Miller continued, discharging the duties of his office with great fidelity and ability, and to the entire acceptance of the Church, during a period of more than thirty-six years. In May, 1849, in view of the growing infirmities of age, he tendered his resignation of the office, and the General Assembly, in accepting it, testified, at the same time, in the strongest manner possible, their grateful appreciation of his services and their high respect for his character. His health, which had been waning for a considerable time, failed after this more perceptibly, until at length it became manifest to all that his period of active service was over. He felt himself that his work was done, and he was ready to enter upon his reward. The few friends who were privileged to see him during the period of his decline, especially after he had nearly reached the dark boundary, were not only edified, but surprised at the expressions of humble, grateful, joyful triumph that fell from his lips. He gently passed away to his heavenly rest, January 7, 1850. His funeral drew together a large concourse of clergymen and other distinguished strangers from the neighboring towns and cities, and an appropriate and characteristic sermon was preached by his venerable colleague, Dr. Alexander.

In many respects Dr. Miller was a remarkable man. He was a laborious and successful student, methodical in his plans, and never entered on the performance of any public duty without full and accurate preparation. The great secret of his being able to do so much, and to do it so well, was that he did everything systematically.

15. The phrase "and to temperance" was repeated.

16. The following biography of Dr. Miller is taken from: *Encyclopedia of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America: Including the Northern and Southern Assemblies*. Alfred Nevin, D.D., LL.D., Editor (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Publishing Co., No. 1510 Chestnut Street [1884]), 1185-1186.

He had a time for every duty, and one duty was not suffered to encroach upon another. In his personal habits and dress he was remarkably neat, without anything, however, of undue precision. In his manners he was polished and graceful, and duly attentive to all those proprieties which confer dignity upon social intercourse. Of the “clerical manners” which he recommended in his invaluable work on that subject, he was himself an admirable example.

Dr. Miller’s intellectual and moral character partook of the same beautiful symmetry that characterized his external appearance. He had by nature a kindly, sympathetic and generous spirit. His heart beat quick to the tale of distress, and his hand opened instinctively to administer relief. Whilst he made no display of his charities by giving to particular objects large sums, worthy of being displayed as examples of liberality, it could not be concealed that he refused aid to no object that he considered worthy of public or private beneficence. He used to say that he loved to have a nail in every building intended for the glory of God or the good of man. He had warm social affections, and received, as well as imparted, great pleasure in his intercourse with his friends. His mind was perfectly well balanced in all its faculties, calm and deliberate, but certain in its movements, and worthy of being trusted wherever good taste, sound judgment and high intelligence were demanded. There are few men who have an assemblage of intellectual and moral qualities so well fitted as were his to form a dignified character, or to secure a course of honorable and enduring usefulness.

17. ED. See Dr. Carnahan’s Reminiscences in *The Life of Samuel Miller*, 2,372-374, and in William B. Sprague’s *Annals of the American Pulpit. Presbyterian* (Robert Carter & Bros. 1858) 3,607-610. Dr. Miller first preached in a “vehement and fervid” style while at Dover, but changed to a “deliberate mode of speaking” after leaving for New York. “Says a friend, ‘I have heard the late Judge Fisher, of Dover, speak of the great change in Dr. Miller’s style of preaching, after he left the Presbyterian church of Dover; and deplore his transition from the vehement and fervid, to the deliberate, mode of speaking.’” *Life of Samuel Miller*, 1,70. During his pastorate in New York, Dr. Miller wrote out his sermons and delivered them from memory with only the briefest of outlines as an aid. However, once at Princeton he eventually adopted the practice of simply reading his sermons. “Dr. Miller, when he left New York, was at the acme of his reputation as a preacher. From the date of his removal to Princeton, he gradually, if not at once, abandoned the more laborious method of memoriter preaching, for the easier one of reading his sermons. Moreover, lecturing to students of theology became his grand business as a public speaker; and that tended to confirm him in reading, and also in a plainer style of delivery. He might have resisted the influence of habit in this respect; but perhaps the importance of doing so did not occur to him; at any rate, his preaching, thereafter, fell off in popularity.” *Life of Samuel Miller*, 1,369.

Dr. Miller was eminent as a preacher. His voice was pleasant, his enunciation perfectly distinct, his attitudes in the pulpit were extremely dignified, his gesture was always appropriate, and his utterance was deliberate. He never shot at random, but always had a distinct object in view, and went deliberately and skillfully at work to accomplish it. There was the same symmetry about his sermons as there was about his character, everything was in its right place. He did not deal in dry and doubtful speculations, but confined himself to Bible truth. “For solid gospel truth, presented in a distinct and logical manner, and expressed in chaste and appropriate language,” says Dr. Carnahan, “he was certainly distinguished above most of his brethren.... In leading the devotions of the large congregation, or of the social meeting, he was peculiarly happy. There was a simplicity and reverence in his manner and language, and an appropriateness in the topics which he introduced, which were admirably fitted to awaken devout feeling in the hearts of his auditors.”<sup>17</sup>

As a Professor in the Theological Seminary, Dr. Miller was alike able and faithful. He gave to his work all the energies of his mind and body. His lectures were always highly appropriate and instructive, and while they were evidently the result of much thought and investigation, and were so admirably perspicuous and well arranged that they could easily be remembered, they were written with excellent taste, and sometimes, when description was called for, were marked by great rhetorical beauty. His intercourse with the students was characterized by paternal kindness.

Dr. Miller attained distinction as an author, his graceful and vigorous pen having produced a very large number of valuable volumes and pamphlets, which are too well known to require any specific mention here. But the crowning excellence of his character, after all, was his humble and devoted piety, his attachment to the great truths of the gospel, and his earnest desire to honor his Lord and Saviour, by making known to the perishing the way of life. He was eminently conscientious, disinterested and devout. Condescending in indifferent matters, he always stood firm to his own convictions where anything important was involved. He was meek, humble, patient and forgiving. He moved about in society, exhibiting the graces of nature in attractive combination with the higher graces of the Spirit. He was a living epistle of righteousness, known and read of all men who enjoyed his acquaintance or came within the range of his wide-spread influence. ■

# The Rev. Dr. Samuel Miller

October 31, 1769 - January 7, 1850

## An Annotated Bibliography

Compiled by Wayne Sparkman

The following compilation was gathered primarily from the listings found in the Online Catalog of the Library of Congress (OCLC). This list was then compared with the bibliography prepared by Margaret Miller, the grand-daughter of Samuel Miller. Her compilation was published in the *Princeton Theological Review* in 1909,<sup>1</sup> though it lacked the fuller citations now provided here. Additional sources consulted include *The National Union Catalog, Pre-1956 Imprints*<sup>2</sup> and the bibliographies provided in Sprague's commemorative discourse<sup>3</sup> and Lane B. Curnow's dissertation.<sup>4</sup> Jeremiah Chamberlain's catalog, preserved at the Presbyterian Historical Society, was not consulted. In this compilation a few works by Dr. Miller were located that were not listed in the Miller/PTR bibliography and these are marked with a dagger (†) before the title.

Margaret Miller's compilation does provide reference to a fair number of works not located on OCLC. For those works, effort has been made in this bibliography to complete the citations, adding whatever information can be discovered, such as the publisher's name. In addition, cross-references to passages in *The Life of Samuel Miller* have been added to provide historical background for many of the works. These are indicated toward the end of an entry, in square brackets, with the volume number indicated in lower-case Roman numerals, e.g., [LSM, ii.275]

All materials are entered chronologically, rather than alphabetically, as per the date of publication, where known. Subsequent editions of a given title are then indicated immediately beneath the description of the first edition. Some of the advantages of a chronological listing are the provision of historical context, an uncovering of the progress of thought and interest, and perhaps even a display of periods of productivity and inactivity.

### PUBLICATIONS AND MINISTRY

1793

- 001.0 A Sermon, Preached in New-York, July 4th, 1793. Being the Anniversary of the Independence of America: at the Request of the Tammany Society, or Columbian Order. (New-York: Printed by Thomas Greenleaf, 1793) 38pp.; 23cm. Text: 2 Corinthians 3:17. [cf. LSM i.89-91; printed in the year of Miller's ordination.]
- 001.1 Microform – (Louisville, KY : Lost Cause Press, 1955-56) micro-opaque, 1 card ; 7.5 x 12.5 cm.
- 001.2 Microform – NCR Microcards edition (1970-1977?) 1 microfiche, 11 x 15cm.
- 001.3 Microform – (Louisville, KY : Lost Cause Press, 1981) 2 microfiches, 10 x 15 cm.
- 001.4 Microform – (New York : Readex, 1985) 11 x 15 cm. (EAI. First series ; no. 25823).
- 001.5 Reprinted as "A Sermon on the Anniversary of the Independence of America," in *Political Sermons of the American Founding Era: 1730-1805*, edited by Ellis Sandoz (Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Press, 1990; 2nd ed., 1998) 1149-1167. And online at <http://oll.libertyfund.org/ToC/0018-02.php>.

THE AUTHOR: Wayne Sparkman, M.A.R., M.Div., is Director of the PCA Historical Center, St. Louis, MO. NOTE: 1. The following words have been Abbreviated: Early American Imprints (EAI); Readex Microprint Corp (Readex); University Microfilms International (UMI); Presbyterian Board of Publications (PBP); Sunday School Work (SSW); American Antiquarian Society (AAS). 2. Beginning on page 31, with permission from Special Collections, Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries, a finding aid for the Samuel Miller Manuscript Collection has been appended to this bibliography.

1. Margaret Miller, "A List of the Writings of Samuel Miller, D.D., LL.D., 1769-1850, Second Professor in Princeton Theological Seminary, 1813-1850," *The Princeton Theological Review*, 9.4 (October 1911) 616-636. Hereafter, "Miller/PTR"

2. *The National Union Catalog, Pre-1956 Imprints* (London: Mansell Information/Publishing Ltd., 1975) 394.472-478.

3. "List of Dr. Miller's Publications," in *A Discourse commemorative of the Rev. Samuel Miller, D.D.*, by William B. Sprague (Albany [NY]: Erastus H. Pease & Co., 1850) 49-51.

4. Lane Belden Curnow, *Democracy and the Ruling Eldership: Samuel Miller's Responses to Tensions between Clerical Power and Lay Activity in Early Nineteenth Century America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton Theological Seminary, 1976; Ph.D. dissertation) 408-440.

001.6 Digital image available in the Readex/Newsbank: <http://opac.newsbank.com/select/evans/25823> [see <http://www.newsbank.com/> for further information or to enroll for access.]

## 1795

002.0 *A discourse delivered in the New Presbyterian Church, New-York: before the Grand Lodge of the State of New-York. And the brethren of that fraternity, assembled in general communication, on the festival of St. John the Baptist, June 24th, 1795* (New-York: Printed by F. Childs, 1795) 32pp.; 20cm. [cf. *LSM* i.98-100.]

002.1 Microform – (New York: Readex, 1985) 11 x 15 cm. (EAI. First series; no. 29082).

002.2 Digital images available in the Readex/Newsbank: <http://opac.newsbank.com/select/evans/29081> [see <http://www.newsbank.com/> for further information or to enroll for access.]

003.0 *A sermon delivered in the New Presbyterian Church, New-York, July fourth, 1795: being the nineteenth anniversary of the independence of America; at the request of, and before, the Mechanic, Tammany, and Democratic societies, and the military officers* (New York: Printed by Thomas Greenleaf, 1795) 33pp.; 27cm. Text: Exodus 12:14. [cf. *LSM* i.99-100, 130.]

003.1 Microform – (Woodbridge, CT: Research Publications, 1997) 1 microfiche.

## 1796

004.0 †*Sketch of the early history of the First Presbyterian Church* (Brooklyn, NY: F. Weidner Print. & Pub. Co., 1796; rpt 1937) 46pp.; illus.; 22cm. [Cover title: The early history of the First Presbyterian Church of New York. "A re-print".]

## 1797

005.0 *A discourse, delivered April 12, 1797, at the request of and before the New York society for promoting the manumission of slaves, and protecting such of them as have been or may be liberated* (New York: T. and J. Swords, no. 99 Pearl-street, 1797) 36pp.; 22cm. [cf. *LSM* i.91-94; *Miller/PTR* indicates 33pp.]

005.1 Microform – (New York: New York Public Library. Available from KTO Microform, 1969) 1 microfilm reel, 35 mm. (Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture. Series 2. Section 3, Blacks in the U.S.; reel 16, no. 5).

005.2 Microform – (New York: Readex, 19\_\_?).

005.3 Microform – (New York: New York Public Library, 1976) 1 microfilm reel; 35 mm. (MN \*zz-80-47).

005.4 Microform – (Sanford, NC: Microfilming Corporation of America, 1980) 1 microfiche. (Slavery; AS543).

005.5 Microform – (Woodbridge, CT: Research Publications, 1997) 1 microfiche.

## 1798

006.0 A sermon, delivered May 9, 1798, recommended, by the President of the United States, to be observed as a day of general humiliation, fasting, and prayer (New-York: Printed by T. and J. Swords, 1798) 49pp.; 22cm. Text: 2 Timothy 3:1 [cf. *LSM* i.111-112, 130; *Miller/PTR* and *LSM* indicate 46pp.]

006.1 Microform – (New York: Readex, 19\_\_?).

006.2 Microform – (Woodbridge, CT: Research Publications, 1997) 1 microfiche.

007.0 †“New-York, February 10, 1798: Sir, I have, for some months past, devoted my leisure hours to the collection of materials, with a view to writing an history of New-York...” (New York: s.n., 1798) 1 sheet ([2] p., signed on p. 1 by Samuel Miller).

007.1 Microform – (New York: Readex, 1985) 11 x 15 cm. (EAI. First series; no. 34110).

007.2 Digital image available in the Readex/Newsbank: <http://opac.newsbank.com/select/evans/34110> [see <http://www.newsbank.com/> for further information or to enroll for access.]

007.3 Posted with the American Memory project, sponsored by the Library of Congress, at <http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/>.

## 1799

008.0 *A sermon, delivered February 5, 1799; recommended by the clergy of the city of New-York, to be observed as a day of thanksgiving, humiliation, and prayer, on account of the removal of a malignant and mortal disease, which had prevailed in the city some time before ...* Published by request. (New York: George Forman, 1799) 36pp.; 21cm. Text: Psalm 2:11. [cf. *LSM* i.117-118; concerns an epidemic of yellow fever in New York State in 1798 and includes, on pp. 34-36, statistics of burials in each of the cemeteries in the city, August 1-November 10, 1798.]

008.1 Microform – (New York: Readex, 19\_\_?).

008.2 Microform – (Louisville, KY: Lost Cause Press, 1981) 2 microfiches, 10 x 15 cm.

008.3 Digital images available in the Readex/Newsbank: <http://opac.newsbank.com/select/evans/35821> [see <http://www.newsbank.com/> for further information or to enroll for access.]

## 1800

009.0 *A sermon, delivered December 29, 1799, occasioned by the death of General George Washington, late President of the United States, and Commander in Chief of the American armies* (New York: T. & J. Swords, no. 99, Pearl-Street, 1800) 39pp.; 20cm. Text: 1 Chronicles 29:12. [cf. *LSM* i.122-127.]

009.1 Microform – (Woodbridge, CT: Research Publications, 1997) 1 microfiche.

## 1802

010.0 *A sermon, delivered before the New York Missionary Society, at their annual meeting, April 6th, 1802. To which are added, The Annual Report of the Directors, and other Papers relating to American Missions.* (New York: Printed by T. & J. Swords, 1802) 81pp. Text: Habakkuk 2:3. [cf. *LSM* i.168.]

010.1 Microform – (Worcester, MA: AAS, 1965) 1 microopaque; 23 x 15 cm. (EAI. Second series; no. 2660).

010.2 Microform – NCR Microcards edition (1970-1977?) 2 microfiches, 11 x 15cm.

010.3 Microform – (Woodbridge, CT: Research Publications, 1997) 2 microfiches.

010.4 Microform – (Louisville, KY: Lost Cause Press, 1997) 2 microfiches; 8 x 13 cm. fiche.

## 1803

011.0 Two letters concerning Thomas Jefferson, to Rev. Mr. Gemmil, of New Haven [personal], New York, Dec. 7, [and Dec. x], 1800. Printed without permission, in *The American Mercury*, (Hartford, CT: Barlow and Babcock) Jan. 6, 1803.

011.1 Reprinted in various papers, 1803.

011.2 An extract from one letter, dated 7 Dec. 1800, was reprinted in the January 1803 issue of *The Columbian Centinel* [Boston: Benjamin Russell.]

011.3 This same extract was later reprinted in the *New York Evening Post* on 25 February 1803.

011.4 And again in various other papers later that year.

012.0 Open Letter (in explanation of above personal letters) to

- Mr. Babcock, New York, 5 February 1803. *The American Mercury* (Hartford, CT: Barlow and Babcock) February 1803.
- 012.1 Reprinted in the *New York Evening Post* (New York: M. Burnham) 25 February 1803.
- 012.3 Subsequently reprinted in other papers later in 1803.
- 013.0 *A brief retrospect of the eighteenth century. Part first; in two volumes, containing a sketch of the revolutions and improvements in science, arts, and literature during that period* (New York: T. and J. Swords, no. 160 Pearl-Street, 1803) 2 volumes, 544pp. & 510pp. [cf. *LSM* i.173-181.]
- 013.1 Reprinted, (London: Printed at New York; London: reprinted for J. Johnson, St. Paul's Churchyard, by S. Hamilton, Shoe Lane, Fleet Street, 1805) 3 volumes, 1262pp., with name index; 21cm.
- 013.2 Microform of 1803 edition – (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, Photoduplication Department, 1950).
- 013.3 Microform of 1803 edition – Ann Arbor, MI: UMI, 1962, (American culture series, Reel 206.1).
- 013.4 Microform of 1803 edition – (Worcester, MA: AAS, 1965) 12 microopaques; 23 x 15 cm. (EAI. Second series; no. 4654).
- 013.5 Reprint of 1803 edition, (New York: Burt Franklin, 1970) 2v.; 21cm.
- 013.6 Microform of 1803 edition – (Chicago: Library Resources, 1970) 2 microfiches; 8 x 13 cm. (Library of American civilization; LAC 20910-11).
- 013.7 Microform of 1803 edition – (New Canaan, CT: Readex, 1987-1992) microfiche (EAI. Second series; no. 4654).
- 013.8 Facsimile printing of 1803 edition, (Bristol, England: Thoemmes Press, 2001) 2 volumes, with a new introduction by Roger Fechner of Adrian College, Adrian, Michigan. [see [http://www.thoemmes.com/american/miller\\_intro.htm](http://www.thoemmes.com/american/miller_intro.htm).]
- 1805**
- 014.0 *The guilt, folly, and sources of suicide: two discourses, preached in the city of New York, February, 1805* (New York: Printed by T. and J. Swords, 1805) 72pp.; 23cm. Text: Job 2:9-10. [cf. *LSM* i.186-190.]
- 014.1 Reprinted in *Sermons*, Volume 1 (s.l.: s.n., 1802-1806) as sponsored by the Massachusetts Charitable Fire Society and the Ladies' Society for the Relief of Distressed Women and Children.
- 014.2 Microform – (Worcester, MA: AAS, 1967) 1 microopaque; 23 x 15 cm. (EAI. Second series; no. 8903).
- 014.3 Microform – NCR Microcards Edition (1970-1977?) 2 microfiches, 11 x 15cm.
- 014.4 Microform – (Louisville, KY: Lost Cause Press, 1981) 2 microfiches; 8 x 13cm.
- 014.5 Microform – (New Canaan, CT: Readex, 1987-1992) 11 x 15 cm. (EAI. Second series; no. 8903).
- 014.6 Microform – (Woodbridge, CT: Research Publications, 1991) 1 microfiche. (19th-century legal treatises; no. 62445).
- 014.7 Microform – (Atlanta, GA: Solinet, 1995) 1 microfilm reel, 35mm. (SOLINET/ASERL Cooperative Microfilming Project (NEH PS-20317); SOL MN05257.08 SBM).
- 014.8 Reprinted – (Dallas, TX: Presbyterian Heritage Publications, 1994) 56pp.; 22cm.
- 015.0 *Address of the Presbytery of New York, as to the education of candidates for the ministry* [in conjunction with Mr. Griffin], October 1805. A circular. (New York: Printed by T. & J. Swords, 1805) 16pp.; 22cm. [cf. *LSM* i.190-197.]
- 1807**
- 016.0 *Letters concerning the constitution and order of the Christian ministry as deduced from Scripture and primitive usage: addressed to the members of the United Presbyterian Churches in the city of New-York* (New-York: Printed by Hopkins and Seymour, 1807) 355pp. [cf. *LSM* i.206-227, e\$\$. 216-218; ii.430f.; 439.]
- 016.1 Second edition – *Letters concerning the constitution and order of the Christian ministry: addressed to the members of the Presbyterian churches in the city of New York. To which is prefixed, a letter on the present aspect and bearing of the Episcopal controversy* (Pittsburgh, PA: Towar, J. & D.M. Hogan—Pittsburgh, Hogan & Co.; C. Sherman & Co., Printers, 1830) liii, 485pp.; 22cm. [Revised, with an added Preliminary Letter [v-liii] and both *Letters concerning the Constitution* (1807) and *A Continuation of Letters* (1809).
- 016.2 Abridged and reprinted as *The primitive and apostolical order of the church of Christ vindicated* (Philadelphia, PA: PBP, 1840) 384pp.; 20cm. [cf. *LSM* ii.429-430.]
- 016.3 (Philadelphia, PA: n.d.) 388pp.; 20cm. [Likely 2nd printing, 1840.]
- 016.4 Microform – (Worcester, MA: AAS, 1968) 4 microopaques; 23 x 15 cm. (EAI. Second series; no. 13086).
- 016.5 Microform of 1840 abridged edition – (Ann Arbor, MI: UMI, 1949[?]; 1976) 1 reel; 35mm.
- 1808**
- 017.0 Review of a sermon by Edward D. Griffin, A.M., in *The Panoplist* [Boston: Farrand, Mellory & Co.], February 1808, 408-410. [cf. *LSM* i.231.]
- 018.0 *A sermon, preached March 13th, 1808, for the benefit of the Society instituted in the city of New-York, for the Relief of Poor Widows with Small Children* (New-York: Printed by Hopkins and Seymour, 1808) 21pp. Text: Acts 9:36-41. [cf. *LSM* i.239-240.]
- 018.1 Reprinted as "The Appropriate Duty and Ornament of the Female Sex," in *The Princeton Pulpit* (New York: Charles Scribner, 1852) 9-28.
- 018.2 Microform – (New York, NY: Readex, courtesy of AAS, 1979) 1 microopaque; 23 x 15 cm. (EAI. Second series; no. 15610).
- 019.0 "On Novel Reading," *The Panoplist* [Boston: Farrand, Mellory & Co.], October 1808, pages 204-209. [cf. *LSM* i.231.]
- 1809**
- 020.0 Review of a sermon by Timothy Dwight, D.D., *The Panoplist* [Boston: Farrand, Mellory & Co.], March 1809, pages 457-461. [cf. *LSM* i.274.]
- 021.0 *A continuation of letters concerning the constitution and order of the Christian ministry addressed to the members of the Presbyterian churches in the city of New-York: being an examination of the strictures of the Rev. Drs. Bowden and Kemp, and the Rev. Mr. How, on the former series* (New York: Published by Williams and Whiting, J. Seymour, printer, 1809) viii, [13]-434; 19cm. [cf. *LSM* i.278-280, 210, 225-227.]
- 021.1 Second edition – *Letters concerning the constitution and order of the Christian ministry: addressed to the members of the Presbyterian churches in the city of New York. To which is prefixed, a letter on the present aspect and bearing of the Episcopal controversy* (Pittsburgh, PA: Towar, J. & D.M. Hogan—Pittsburgh, Hogan & Co.; C. Sherman & Co., Printers, 1830) liii, 485pp.; 22cm. [Revised, with an added Preliminary Letter [v-liii], dated Sept. 16th, 1830, and both *Letters concerning the Constitution* (1807) 1-226; and *A Continuation of Letters* (1809) 227-485.

- 021.2 Microform of 1809 edition: (Worcester, MA: AAS, 1970) 5 microopaques; 23 x 15 cm. (EAI. Second series ; no. 18088).
- 021.3 Microform – (Wooster, OH: Micro Photo Division, Bell & Howell Company, 19\_\_?) 1 microfilm reel; 35 mm.
- 021.4 Microform of 1830, 2nd edition – Louisville, KY: Lost Cause Press, 1981) 7 microfiches.
- 021.5 Microform of 1809 edition – (New Canaan, CT: Readex, 1987-1992) microfiche (EAI. Second series ; no. 18088).

## 1810

- 022.0 Report for the Presbytery of New York, respecting the Theological Schools, delivered 23 January 1810.
- 022.1 Reprinted in *LSM*, i.281-283.
- 023.0 A Letter to the Churches, concerning a Theological school [written in conjunction with the Rev. James Richards, dated 30 May 1810, and printed in Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, 1789-1820, 457-459. [cf. *LSM* i.285.]
- 023.1 Reprinted in A Collection of the Acts, Deliverances, and Testimonies of the Supreme Judicatory of the Presbyterian Church...., by S.J. Baird (Philadelphia: PBP, 1856) 408-410.
- 024.0 Report on the subject of establishing a Theological school, [Samuel Miller, chairman], presented 30 May 1810 and recorded in the Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, 1789-1820, 453-455.
- 024.1 Reprinted in A Collection of the Acts, Deliverances, and Testimonies of the Supreme Judicatory of the Presbyterian Church...., by S.J. Baird (Philadelphia: PBP, 1856) 406-408.
- 025.0 A sermon, preached in the Presbyterian Church, in Beekman-Street, New-York, on Wednesday, August 8, 1810, at the ordination and installation of the Rev. Gardiner Spring, as pastor of said church (New-York: Williams and Whiting, at their theological and classical book-store, 1810) 60pp.; 22cm. The charge to the minister is by Samuel Miller; the exhortation to the people by John Brodhead Romeyn [1777-1825]. [cf. *LSM* i.288-291, 297-304.]
- 025.1 Microform – (Worcester, MA: AAS, 1973) 1 microopaque; 23 x 15 cm. (EAI. Second series; no. 20738).
- 025.2 Microform – (New Canaan, CT: Readex, 1987-1992) microfiche, (EAI. Second series; no. 20738).
- 026.0 Letter to the Rev. John Codman, dated 19 November 1810, regarding ministerial exchanges with those who preach another gospel, reprinted in *The Panoplist* [Boston: Farrand, Mellory & Co.], presumably early in 1811. [cf. *LSM* i.291-293; ii.137-138.]
- 026.1 Reprinted in *The Spirit of the Pilgrims* (Boston: Peirce and Williams) Volume 1 (1828) pages 141-145.
- 026.2 Reprinted in *Memoir of John Codman*, by William Allen (Boston: T.R. Marvin and S.K. Whipple & Co., 1853) 100-107.
- 026.3 Digital format available by subscription service at <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb>.]
- 027.0 Annual Report of the New York Bible Society (New York: 1810) 22pp.; [also signed by Alexander McLeod]; bound with the Constitution of the New York Bible Society.

## 1811

- 028.0 *A discourse, designed to commemorate the discovery of New-York by Henry Hudson, delivered before the New-York historical society, September 4th, 1809; being the completion of the second century since that event* (New York, s.n., 1809) 188pp. [cf. *LSM* i.276; Henry Hudson, d. 1611.]
- 028.1 Reprinted in *Collections of the New York Historical Society* (New York: Printed and published by I. Riley, 1811) First series,

1.17-45; 24cm., [bound with *The Constitution of the New-York Historical Society*.]

- 028.2 Reprinted, (New York: AMS Press, 1974) 45pp.; 23cm.
- 029.0 *The divine appointment, the duties, and the qualifications of ruling elders: a sermon preached in the First Presbyterian Church, in the city of New-York, May 28, 1809* (New-York: Samuel Whiting & Co.; J. Seymour, printer, 1811) [4]-47; 24cm. [cf. *LSM* i.274; expanded in 1831 as *An Essay on the Warrant... of the Ruling Elder*.]
- 029.1 Microform – (Worcester, MA: AAS, 1972) 1 microopaque; 23 x 15 cm. (EAI. Second series; no. 23390).

## 1812

- 030.0 *A sermon, delivered January 19, 1812, at the request of a number of young gentlemen of the city of New-York who had assembled to express their condolence with the inhabitants of Richmond, on the late mournful dispensation of Providence in that city* (New York: Whiting and Watson, 1812) 42pp.; 22cm. Text: Lamentations 2:1,13. [cf. *LSM* i.321-322.]
- 030.1 Reprinted, (New-York: Printed by T. and J. Swords, 1812) [3]-50; 21cm.
- 030.2 Miller's sermon bound as an appendix to *A serious inquiry into the nature and effects of the stage and a letter respecting play actors*, by John Witherspoon (New York: Whiting & Watson, 1812 [printed by D. & G. Bruce]).
- 030.3 Microform of T. & J. Swords 1812 edition – (New York, NY: Readex, courtesy of AAS, 1974-75) 3 microopaques; 23 x 15 cm. (EAI. Second series; no. 27590).
- 030.4 Microform of T. & J. Swords 1812 edition – (New York, N.Y.: Readex, courtesy of AAS, 1974) 2 microopaques; 23 x 15 cm. (EAI. Second series; no. 26082).
- 030.5 Microform of Whiting and Watson 1812 edition, (New York: Readex, 1974; New Canaan, CT, 1987-1992) 1 microopaque; 23 x 15 cm. (EAI. Second series; no. 26081).
- 030.6 Microform of Whiting and Watson 1812 edition, (Louisville, KY: Lost Cause Press, 1981) 2 microfiches, in Group 14 of *The literature of theology and church history in the United States and Canada series*.
- 030.7 Miller's sermon only, reprinted as "A serious inquiry into the nature and effects of the stage" in *Naphtali Press: An Anthology of Presbyterian & Reformed Literature* (Dallas, TX: Naphtali Press) 3.3 (Summer 1990) 10-23. Online at the publisher's website, <http://www.naphtali.com/stagefrm.htm>.
- 030.8 Microform of Whiting and Watson 1812 edition, (New York, NY: Columbia University Libraries, to be filmed in 2004) 1 microfilm reel, 35 mm.
- 031.0 *An address, by several ministers in New York, to their Christian fellow-citizens, dissuading them from attending theatrical representations* (NY, Published for the New York Religious Tract Society, and sold at their depository, by Whiting & Watson, June, 1812) 8pp.; 20cm.; tract no. 15, signed (p. 8): Samuel Miller, Philip Milledoler, et al. [This is the introduction to the Witherspoon volume, *A Serious Inquiry...*, bound as a separate volume.]
- 031.1 Microform – (Worcester, MA: AAS, 1973) 1 microopaque; 23 x 15 cm. (EAI. Second series; no. 24532).
- 032.0 *Theatrical exhibitions* (New York: Published by the American Tract Society, date attributed variously as [1826 or 1827] or [between 1827 and 1832] or [between 1832 and 1838]; possibly different printings) 12pp.; 19cm. Tract no. 130. [This title includes a letter, "written by one who was present at the conflagration of the Richmond Theatre, December, 1811." The tract utilizes the Richmond Theater fire of 1811 as "an example of the

- evil which can befall those who attend popular amusements"; attributed to Rev. Miller in *Sketch of the origin and character of the principal series of tracts of the American Tract Society*. (New York: American Tract Society, 1831) Volume 6, no. 11.]
- 032.1 Reprinted, (Glasgow: Glasgow Religious Tract Society, 1800's?) 12pp.; 16cm.
- 032.2 Microform of Glasgow edition – (Atlanta, GA: SOLINET, 2001) 1 microfilm reel, 35 mm.
- 033.0 Report (Resolution) on Temperance, 1 June 1812, [Samuel Miller, Chairman], *Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., 1789-1820, 511-512*. (Philadelphia, PA, 1847) [cf. *LSM* i.315-316.]
- 034.0 Report of the Committee of General Assembly, appointed to draught a plan for discipling baptised children, July 1, 1812 (New York: 1812) 56pp.; 23cm. (See *Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, 1789-1820*) 509. [Report signed by James Richards, Samuel Miller and John B. Romeyn, Committee.]
- 035.0 *The Duty of the Church to take measures for providing an Able and Faithful Ministry: a Sermon, delivered at Princeton, August 12, 1812, at the inauguration of the Rev. Archibald Alexander, as Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology, in the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church, in the United States of America* (New York: Whiting and Watson, 1812) 50pp. Text: 2 Timothy 2:2. [cf. *LSM* i.332-335.]
- 035.1 Also printed with the other portions of the service, in *The sermon delivered at the inauguration of the Rev. Archibald Alexander, as professor of didactic and polemic theology, in the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church, in the United States of America, to which are added, the professor's inaugural address, and the charge to the professor and students*, (NY: Whiting & Watson, 1812) 122pp.; 23cm. Sermon delivered by Samuel Miller; charge to Rev. Alexander delivered by Philip Milledolor [1775-1852]; inaugural address by the Rev. Archibald Alexander.
- 035.2 Rpt. in *Home, the School and the Church* (Philadelphia: [Board of Education of the P.C.U.S.A.], (1852) 2.133-154.
- 035.3 Microform of 035.1 – (NY, NY: Readex, courtesy of AAS, 1976) 2 microopaques; 23 x 15 cm. (EAI. 2nd series; no. 26080).
- 035.4 Text of Miller sermon only (Dallas, TX: Presbyterian Heritage Publications, 1984; 2nd edition, 1994) viii, 28pp.; 21.5cm.; with an introductory essay by Kevin Reed, iii-viii [cover title: *An Able and Faithful Ministry*.]
- 035.5 The 1812 text is online at [www.willisoncenter.com](http://www.willisoncenter.com).
- 1813**
- 036.0 *Memoirs of the Rev. John Rodgers, late pastor of the Wall-Street and Brick Churches in the city of New-York* (New-York: Whiting and Watson; J. Seymour, printer, 1813) 432pp.; portrait; 22cm. Appended to the *Memoir* is the text of *A sermon, preached in the city of New-York, May 12th, 1811, occasioned by the death of the Rev. John Rodgers, 351-395*. [cf. *LSM* i.308-313.]
- 036.1 Abridged edition – (Philadelphia: PBP, 1840) 240pp.; 16vo. [cf. *LSM* i.309; abridged edition omits funeral sermon and provides the *Memoirs* only.]
- 036.2 Microform of 1840 edition – (Wooster, OH: Micro Photo Division, Bell & Howell Company, 19\_\_?) 1 reel, 35 mm.
- 036.3 Microform of 1813 edition – (New York: Readex, 1974-76. 5 microopaques; 23 x 15 cm. (EAI. Second series; no. 29166).
- 036.4 Microform of 1813 edition – (Louisville, KY: LoSt Cause Press, 1981) microfiche, 6 cards.
- 036.5 Microform of 1813 edition – (New Canaan, CT: Readex, 1987-1992) microfiche, (EAI. Second series; no. 29166).
- 036.7 Microform of 1813 edition – (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Historical Society, 1992) microfilm, 1 reel, 35 mm.
- 037.0 *A sermon, preached in the city of New-York, May 12th, 1811: occasioned by the death of the Rev. John Rodgers, D.D., late Senior Pastor of the Wall-street and Brick Churches, New York* (New York, 1813). [cf. *LSM* i.308-313; the sermon is printed in the above *Memoirs of the Rev. John Rodgers, D.D.* on pages 351-395.
- [Note: Dr. Miller was inaugurated as Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Church Government at the Princeton Theological Seminary on 29 September 1813. His inaugural discourse encompassed a "Sketch of the Characters and Opinions of some of the more conspicuous Witnesses for the Truth during the Dark Ages." However, he declined to have the discourse published. See *Life of Samuel Miller*, ii.358-359 for a brief synopsis of the sermon and an account of his decision not to publish. See also Box 19, file 15 of the Samuel Miller Manuscript Collection housed at Special Collections, PTS Libraries (see the PTS finding aid on page 37 below).]
- 1814**
- 038.0 *The Medical Works of Edward Miller, late Professor of the Practice of Physic in the University of New-York, and Resident Physician of the City of New-York*, by Edward Miller [1760-1812] (New-York: Printed and sold by Collins and Co., 1814) cxi (*i.e.*, cix) 392pp.; portrait; 23cm. Collected, and accompanied with a biographical sketch of the author, by Samuel Miller. [cf. *LSM* i.323-331.]
- 038.1 Microform – (New York: Readex, 1975) 6 microopaques; 23 x 15 cm. (EAI. Second series; no. 32130).
- 1816-1821**
- 039.0 Revision of the Form of Government and Discipline and the Directory for Worship of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S. [in conjunction with Drs. Alexander and Romeyn]. As amended by the General Assembly and twice by the Presbyteries. A circular, 1816-1821. [cf. *LSM* ii.24.]
- 1817**
- 040.0 *A Sketch of the Rise, Progress, and Present State of the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church in the United States: To which is subjoined a Copy of the Constitution of the Seminary*. (Elizabethtown, NJ: Published by order of the Board of Directors, 1817) 19pp.; 12vo. [cf. *LSM* ii.28; enlarged editions published in 1837-1838.]
- 041.0 Report concerning the "Pastoral Letter of the Synod of Philadelphia," 24 May 1817, *Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., 1789-1820* (Philadelphia: PBP, 1847) 653. [cf. *LSM* ii.27; presumably Dr. Miller was seated as chairman of the Committee.]
- 042.0 Report to Synod of New York and New Jersey, on the African School. A Circular (1817). [cf. *LSM* ii.25.]
- 1819**
- 043.0 Extract from a sermon at the funeral of Rev. James F. Armstrong, in January, 1816. In *Memoirs of the Rev. Robert Finley, D.D.*, by the Rev. Isaac V. Brown, (New Brunswick, CT, 1819) 200-203.
- 044.0 *Circular letter to Dr. Richards* (Princeton, NJ: s.n., 1819) 3pp.; 34cm. [folio]. In substance a reply to a printed letter signed by Mr. James Richards, which they viewed as "calculated to make an erroneous impression with respect to [their] conduct at a . . .

meeting ... for the purpose of organizing an Education Society?" Signed by Samuel Miller and Archibald Alexander. [James Richards, 1767-1843.]

- 044.1 Microform – (New York: Readex, courtesy of AAS, 1982) 1 microopaque; 23 x 15 cm. (EAI. Second series; no. 48695).  
 045.0 Constitution of the Education Society of the Presbytery of New Brunswick. [In conjunction with Dr. Alexander.] Adopted at Pennington, October 6, 1819. (Trenton, NJ: 1821) 5pp.; 16vo.

### 1820

- 046.0 *The difficulties and temptations which attend the preaching of the gospel in great cities: a sermon, preached in the First Presbyterian Church, in the city of Baltimore, October 19, 1820; at the ordination and installation of the Reverend William Nevins, as pastor of said church* (Baltimore, MD: Printed by J. Robinson, Circulating Library, corner of Market and Belvidere-Streets, 1820) 60pp.; 22cm. Sermon by Samuel Miller, 1-43. Text: Romans 1:15-16. Charges to the pastor and to the people by the Rev. Elias Harrison, of Alexandria, 45-60. [William Nevins, 1797-1835.] [cf. *LSM* ii.58-60.]  
 046.1 Both *Miller/PTR* and *LSM* indicate that Miller's sermon was also published separately, 43pp.; 8vo.  
 046.2 Microform – (New York: New York Public Library, 19\_\_?) 1 microfilm reel, 35 mm.  
 046.3 Microform – (New York: Readex, 19\_\_?).

### 1820-1821

- 047.0 "The Doctrine and Order of the Waldenses," in *The Virginia Evangelical and Literary Magazine* (Richmond, VA) 1820, 259-264; 297-301; 370-374; 514-520 and 1821, 57-63.  
 047.1 Available in digital format, by subscription, at <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb>.

### 1821

- 048.0 "A Letter to the Editor [Jared Sparks] of the *Unitarian Miscellany*, in reply to an Attack, by an Anonymous Writer in that Work, on a late Ordination Sermon delivered in Baltimore" (Baltimore, MD: Published by E.J. Coale; R.J. Matchett, printer, 1821) viii, 34pp.; 22cm. [cf. *LSM* ii.60.]  
 [The initially anonymous attack on Miller's 1820 sermon at the ordination of Rev. William Nevins was written by Jared Sparks, editor of the *Unitarian Miscellany*, and was first published in that periodical in March of 1821. It was then later issued as a pamphlet with the title *A letter to the Rev. Samuel Miller ... on the charge against Unitarians.*]  
 048.1 Second ed., (2nd ed., Baltimore, MD: John D. Toy, 1821).  
 048.2 Anr. "second edition" is noted, (Boston, MA: Samuel T. Armstrong, and Crocker and Brewster, 1821) 24pp.; 17 cm.  
 048.3 Microform of 1st edition – (Louisville, KY: Lost Cause Press, 1981) 2 microfiches.  
 048.4 Microform of 2nd ed., 1821 – (NY, NY: Readex, 19\_\_?).  
 049.0 *Letters on Unitarianism; addressed to the members of the First Presbyterian Church, in the city of Baltimore* (Trenton, NJ: Printed by George Sherman, 1821) vii, [9]-319; 22cm. [cf. *LSM* ii.61-69, 439.]  
 049.1 (Lexington, KY: Thomas T. Skillman, by express permission of the author, 1823) 312pp.; 18cm.  
 049.2 Microform of 1821 Sherman ed. – (New York: Readex, 19\_\_?).  
 049.3 Microform of 1823 Skillman ed. – (New York: Readex, 19\_\_?).  
 050.0 Speech [a quotation from] on Free Masonry, as delivered

before the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., May, 1821. The quoted portion is reproduced in *The Life of Samuel Miller*, ii.56.

### 1822

- 051.0 *A Brief Account of the Rise, Progress, and Present State of the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, at Princeton; Including the Constitution of the said Seminary, a Catalogue of those who have been Members, and a List of the Present Officers and Students* (Phil., PA, 1822) 87pp.; 12vo.  
 052.0 *A sermon, delivered in the Middle Church, New Haven, Conn. Sept. 12, 1822, at the ordination of the Rev. Messrs. William Goodell, William Richards, and Artemas Bishop, as evangelists and missionaries to the heathen, New Haven, September 12, 1822* (Boston: Crocker and Brewster, no. 50, Cornhill, 1822) 48pp.; 24cm. Charge by Rev. Abel Flint, D.D. of Hartford, 39-42; "Right hand of fellowship," by the Rev. Joel Hawes, of Hartford, 43-46; "Brief view of the missions under the direction of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, compiled October, 1822," 47-48; [William Goodell, 1792-1867; William Richards, 1793-1847; Artemas Bishop, 1795-1872.] [cf. *LSM* ii.70.]  
 052.1 *Miller/PTR* indicates Miller's sermon was published separately, 38pp.; 8vo., though no separate publication was located on OCLC.  
 052.2 Extracts published in *The Christian Advocate* [Philadelphia: A. Finley; Ashbel Green, editor], January 1822, 30-33.  
 052.3 Microform – (New York: Readex, 19\_\_?).  
 052.4 Microform – (Louisville, KY: Lost Cause Press, 1981) 2 microfiches. (The literature of theology and church history in the United States and Canada. Group 14).  
 052.5 Microform – (Atlanta, GA: SOLINET, 1994) 1 microfilm reel; 35 mm. (SOLINET/ASERL Cooperative Microfilming Project (NEH PS-20317); SOL MN04928.09 SBM).  
 052.6 Microform – (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Library, 2002) 1 microfilm reel, 35 mm. (History of religions preservation project, MN42443.9).

### 1823

- 053.0 "Thoughts on Lay Preaching," in *The Christian Advocate* [Philadelphia: A. Finley], Volume 1 (1823) pages 12-19.  
 054.0 *The Literary Fountains Healed: A Sermon, preached in the Chapel of the College of New Jersey, March 9th, 1823* (Trenton, NJ: Printed by G. Sherman, 1823) 42pp.; 21cm. Text: 2 Kings 2:21. [*LSM* ii.85.]  
 054.1 Microform – (Woodbridge, CT: Research Publications, 1997) 1 microfiche.  
 054.2 Microform – (New York: Readex, 19\_\_?).  
 055.0 *A Sermon, delivered June seventh, 1823, at the Opening of the New Presbyterian Church, in Arch Street, in the City of Philadelphia, for the Public Worship of God* (Philadelphia, PA: Published by T.T. Ash, 1823) 32pp.; 23cm. Text: 2 Chronicles 6: 41. Cover has title "Dr. Miller's sermon. [cf. *LSM* ii.86-87.]  
 056.0 A Latin Address, being a charge to the Rev. Dr. James Carnahan at his inauguration as President of the College of New Jersey, August, 1823. [unpublished manuscript; see 19:22 below.]  
 057.0 *A Sermon, Preached at New-Ark, October 22d, 1823, before the Synod of New Jersey for the benefit of the African School, under the care of the Synod* (Trenton, NJ: Printed by George Sherman, 1823) 28pp.; 23cm. Text: Isaiah 61:1. [cf. *LSM* ii.87-90; cover title: "Dr. Miller's sermon, for the benefit of the African School!"]  
 057.1 Microform – (Sanford, NC: Microfilming Corporation of America, 1980) 1 microfiche. (Slavery; SC534).

- 057.2 Microform – (New York: New York Public Library, 1989) 1 microfilm reel, 35 mm. (MN \*ZZ-30406).
- 058.0 *Letters on the Eternal Sonship of Christ, addressed to the Rev. Professor Moses Stuart of Andover* (Philadelphia: W.W. Woodward, 1823) 295pp.; 20cm. Miller's work, dated February 20th, 1823, was written in reply to *Letters on the eternal generation of the Son of God, addressed to the Rev. Samuel Miller, D.D. by Moses Stuart* (Andover, MA: Published and for sale by Mark Newman, 1822). [cf. LSM ii.73-82.]

## 1824

- 059.0 *The Utility and Importance of Creeds and Confessions: an Introductory Lecture, delivered at the Opening of the Summer Session of the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church, Princeton, July 2, 1824* (Princeton, N.J. Printed and published by D.A. Borrenstein; and for sale by A. Finley, Philadelphia; Edward J. Coale, Baltimore, MD; John P. Haven, New-York; and by D. Fenton, Trenton, N.J., 1824) 6–84; 23cm. [cf. LSM ii.96-101.]
- 059.1 Revised and enlarged, bound with *Spruce Street lectures, delivered by several clergymen, during the autumn and winter of 1831-32. To which is added, a lecture on the importance of creeds and confessions* (Philadelphia: Russell and Martien, 1833) 299-398 of 398.
- 059.2 Revised and printed as *The Utility and Importance of Creeds and Confessions: addressed particularly to Candidates for the Ministry* (Philadelphia, PA: PBP, 1839) 119pp.; 16cm.
- 059.3 *Spruce Street lectures, ... To which is added, a lecture on the importance of creeds and confessions* (Philadelphia: Russell and Martien, 2nd edition, 1840) 299-398 of 398.
- 059.4 1839 edition reprinted, (Greenville, SC: A Press, 1987) 119pp.; 17cm.
- 059.5 1839 edition reprinted as *Doctrinal integrity: The Utility and Importance of Creeds and Confessions and Adherence to Our Doctrinal Standards* (Dallas, TX: Presbyterian Heritage Publications, 1989) xxii, 137pp.; 23cm. "...based upon *The Utility and Importance of Creeds and Confessions* (1824, 1839) and the Letters VI-VIII of *Letters to Presbyterians on the Present Crisis in the Presbyterian Church in the United States*," (1833) 89-150. With revised grammar. Introductory essay by Kevin Reed. Scripture Index.

## 1825

- 060.0 A discourse, delivered in the chapel of Nassau-Hall, before the Literary and Philosophical Society of New-Jersey at its first annual meeting, September 27, 1825 (Princeton, NJ: Printed for The Society by D.A. Borrenstein, 1825) 39pp.; 23cm. [cf. LSM ii.108.]
- 060.1 Reprinted in *American Journal of Letters, Christianity and Civil Affairs* [Princeton, NJ: T. Callaghan Gibson], Nov. 5, 1825.
- 060.2 Microform of Borrenstein edition – (Woodbridge, CT: Research Publications, 1997) 1 microfiche.
- 061.0 Open Letter in reply to *Catholicus*, on Bible Societies, Princeton, December 24, 1824, as published in *The Christian Journal and Literary Register* [New York], Volume 9 (1825) pages 47-49.
- 061.1 An extract, reprinted in *The Western Luminary* [Lexington, KY: T.T. Skillman], 1.47 (1825) 739-740.
- 061.2 Available through subscription service at <http://proquest-umi.com/pqdweb>.
- 062.0 Open Letter on the observance of Christmas. Signed *Biblicus*. As printed in the *Commercial Advertiser* [New York],

December 29, 1825. Online at [http://www.fpccr.org/blue\\_banner\\_articles/miller1825.htm](http://www.fpccr.org/blue_banner_articles/miller1825.htm).

- 063.0 †*To the Reverend ministers of the Presbyterian Church, about to assemble in Philadelphia, humbly submitted by the author, a wayfaring man ...* (n.p.: printed for the author, 1825) 8pp.; 21cm. [Also titled "Christian theology against retrospective or dreaming theology".]

## 1826

- 064.0 "Why are there at Present so few Ministers of the Gospel Really Eminent in their Profession? Outline of Introductory Lecture at opening of the session of Princeton Theological Seminary, November 1825. Published in *American Magazine of Letters and Christianity* [Princeton, NJ], January 1, 1826. [cf. LSM ii.111-112.]
- 064.1 Reprinted in successive issues of *The Western Luminary* [Lexington, KY: T.T. Skillman], Volume 2 (1826).
- 064.2 Available through subscription service at <http://proquest-umi.com/pqdweb>.
- 065.0 *A Letter to a Gentleman of Baltimore, in reference to the Case of the Rev. Mr. Duncan, January 25, 1826* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton Press; printed by D.A. Borrenstein, 1826) 91pp.; 24cm. [cf. LSM ii.112-114; Subtitle – "Remarks on the rise, use and unlawfulness of creeds"; John Morison Duncan, 1795?-1825.]
- 066.0 "On Sea Kale." A Letter, dated October 13, 1817, Princeton, NJ. Published in *Memoirs of the Philadelphia Society for Promoting Agriculture* (Philadelphia: Johnson & Warner) v. 5 (1826) 27-31.
- 067.0 *Christian Weapons Not Carnal, but Spiritual: a Sermon, delivered in the Second Presbyterian Church, in the City of Baltimore, October 13, 1826, at the Installation of the Reverend John Breckinridge, as Colleague with the Reverend John Glendy, D.D., in the Pastoral Charge of said Church* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton Press, printed by D.A. Borrenstein, 1826) 55pp.; 24cm. [cf. LSM ii.115-116; sermon text: 2 Cor. 10:4.]
- 068.0 *The Evidence and Duty of Being On the Lord's Side*. Sermons VIII and IX, December 1826. Published in *National Preacher* (New York, 1826) Volume 1, number 7, pages 97-112. Text: Exodus 32:26. [cf. LSM ii.115-116.]
- 068.1 Reprinted in *The National Preacher*, Volumes 1-2 (New York: J. Seymour and J.J. Harper) 97-112.
- 068.2 Reprinted in *The National Preacher: Revival Sermons from the Second Great Awakening, June 1826-May 1828*, edited by Austin Dickinson (Birmingham, AL: Solid Ground Christian Books, 2004) 97-112.
- 069.0 "Social Amusements." Two or more articles, published in the *New Jersey Patriot* [Princeton, NJ]: D.A. Borrenstein, printed by A.E. Werden circa 1826. [The *New Jersey Patriot* began with vol. 1, no. 1 (August 10, 1826) and concluded with vol. 2, no. 61 (October 12, 1827); copies are held by the Library of Congress and the Princeton Theological Seminary.]

## 1827

- 070.0 *The importance of the gospel ministry; an introductory lecture, delivered at the opening of the winter session of the theological seminary at Princeton, New Jersey, Nov. 9, 1827* (Princeton, NJ: D.A. Borrenstein, 1827) 56pp.; 21cm. [cf. LSM ii.136-137; published on request of the Seminary's Society of Inquiry on Missions.]
- 071.0 *Letters on clerical manners and habits; addressed to a student in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N.J.* (New York: G. & C. Carvill, 1827) xiv, [13]-423; 20cm. [cf. LSM ii.123-131; Miller/PTR indicates 470pp.]

- 071.1 Second edition: (New York: Published by G. & C. Carvill, 1827) xi, [13]-423; 20 cm.
- 071.2 Third edition, revised: (Princeton, NJ: Moore Baker, 1835) xii, (1) 14-395pp.; 20cm.
- 071.3 Reprinted, edited by W.D. Killen – (Belfast: William M'Comb, 1842) vii, 101pp.; 22cm.
- 071.4 "A new edition, revised" – (Philadelphia: PBP, 1852) viii, 9-384; portrait; 20 cm.
- 071.5 Microform of 1st edition – (Chicago: Library Resources, 1970) 1 microfiche; 8 x 13 cm. (Library of American civilization; LAC 13519).
- 071.6 Microform of 1st edition – (Ann Arbor, MI: UMI, 1976) 1 reel; 35mm., (Religion in America: early books and manuscripts; reel 28, number 11).
- 071.7 Microform of 1852 edition – (Louisville, KY: Lost Cause Press, 1981) 6 microfiches; 10 x 15 cm.
- 071.8 "Conduct in Church Courts," *Naphtali Press: An Anthology of Presbyterian & Reformed Literature* (Dallas, TX: Naphtali Press) 2.4 (Fall 1989) 18-28. Excerpted from *Letters on clerical manners...* (1827); a table of contents for *Letters on clerical manners* is presented in this issue, pages 28-29.
- 071.9 "Conversation," *Naphtali Press: An Anthology of Presbyterian & Reformed Literature* (Dallas, TX: Naphtali Press) 2.1 (Winter 1989) 62-70. Excerpted from *Letters on clerical manners...* (1827). Also online at the publisher's website, at <http://www.naphtali.com/conversation.htm>.
- 071.10 "Pastoral Visitation," *Naphtali Press: An Anthology of Presbyterian & Reformed Literature* (Dallas, TX: Naphtali Press) 2.3 (Summer 1989) 35-42, 34. Excerpted from *Letters on clerical manners...* (1827).
- 071.11 "Religious Conversation," *Naphtali Press: An Anthology of Presbyterian & Reformed Literature* (Dallas, TX: Naphtali Press) 2.2 (Spring 1989) 74-80. Excerpted from *Letters on clerical manners...* (1827). Available online at the publisher's website, [http://www.naphtali.com/religious\\_conversation.htm](http://www.naphtali.com/religious_conversation.htm).
- 071.12 Microform of 2nd ed. 1827 – (Woodbridge, CT: Research Publications, 1990) 5 microfiches. (The literature of theology and church history in the United States and Canada. Unit 23).
- 071.13 Microform of 1842 Belfast edition – (Atlanta, GA: SOLINET, 1998) 1 microfilm reel, 35 mm.
- 071.14 Digital image of 1852 edition via the Making of America series (<http://www.hti.umich.edu/m/oagrp/>).
- 1828**
- 072.0 Recommendatory Letter on behalf of "Jonathan Dickinson's Letters," [signed by Drs. Samuel Miller, Archibald Alexander, and James Carnahan]. Printed on the cover of *American Magazine of Letters and Christianity* [Princeton, NJ], Number 33, circa 1828.
- 1829**
- 073.0 *The importance of mature preparatory study for the ministry: an introductory lecture, delivered at the opening of the summer session of the Theological Seminary at Princeton, New-Jersey, July 3, 1829* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton Press; printed by Bernard Connolly, for the students of the Theological Seminary, 1829) 42pp.; 22cm. [cf. LSM ii.137, 143-145.]
- 073.1 Reprinted, (Andover, MA: Published and for sale by Mark Newman, Flagg & Gould, printers, 1830) 30pp.; 21cm.
- 073.2 Abridged and republished as "The Importance of a Thorough and Adequate Course of Preparatory Study for the Holy Ministry, May 24, 1832" in *Annual of the Board of Education* [Philadelphia, PA], Volume 1 (1832) 55-95.
- 073.4 Microform of 1830 Andover edition – (Woodbridge, CT: Research Publications International, 1989) 1 microfiche. (History of education; fiche # 12,701).
- 074.0 *Holding fast the faithful word: a sermon, delivered in the Second Presbyterian Church, in the city of Albany, August 26, 1829; at the installation of the Reverend William B. Sprague, D.D. as pastor of the said church* (Albany, NY: Printed by Packard and Van Benthuysen, 1829) 49pp.; 22cm. [cf. LSM ii.145-147; William Buell Sprague, 1795-1876.]
- 075.0 Open Letter on Sabbath Schools, September 10, 1828. Published in *The New Jersey Sabbath School Journal*, March 1829.
- 075.1 Extract, reprinted in *The Life of Samuel Miller*, ii.138-139.
- 076.0 Circular and Subscription Paper to secure funds for the erection of a Chapel and an apartment for the Library at the Theological Seminary at Princeton, May, 1829 (Princeton, NJ, September 21, 1829) 1 page, folio. [cf. LSM ii.254.]
- 077.0 Recommendatory Letter in *Memoir of John H. Livingston, D.D.*, by Alexander Gunn (New York, 1829) 511-525.
- 1830**
- 078.0 Review of *An Essay on the Invalidity of Presbyterian Ordination*. By John Esten Cooke...., *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, 2.1 (January 1830) 38-77.
- 079.0 "Remarks on a Certain Extreme in Pursuing the Temperance Cause," *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, 2.2 (April 1830) 242-250. [Signed, "A Friend to Temperance Societies".]
- 080.0 The Rejection of Truth Referable to Moral Depravity. A sermon, in New York, between April and June, 1830. Discourse VI in *Discourses in Murray Street Church* (New York, 1830) 195-239.
- 081.0 Review of *A Letter from a Blacksmith to the Ministers and Elders of the Church of Scotland; in which the Manner of Public Worship ... is considered...*, *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, 2.3 (July 1830) 389-407. [Header title: "On the Use of Liturgies".]
- 082.0 Introductory Address for *Lectures to Young People*, by William B. Sprague (New York, John P. Haven, 1830) xxii, 288pp.; 19cm. Described on OCLC as the second edition, but no earlier edition could be located, and the 1831 edition below is also described as the second edition. Miller's introduction is printed on pages i-xxii.
- 082.1 Reprinted, (New York: John P. Haven, 1831, 2nd ed.) xxi, 310pp.; 19cm.
- 082.2 Reprinted, (New York: Appleton, 1835; 3rd American edition) 359pp.; 19cm. [PHS indicates 288pp.]
- 082.3 Reprinted, (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1836; 4th American edition) 341pp.; 19cm.
- 082.4 Reprint of the Haven 1830 edition, (Harrisonburg, VA: Sprinkle Pub., 1988) xxi, 288pp.; 20cm.
- 1831**
- 083.0 "Suggestions in Vindication of the Temperance Society," *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, 3.1 (January 1831) 44-60.
- 084.0 Review of *Works of John Howe*, *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, 3.2 (April 1831) 177-196. [Authorship is assigned to Samuel Miller by both Margaret Miller, *PTP* 9.4.624, and Peter Walker, *Index to BRPR*, p. 257. However, other evidence cites James W. Alexander as the author: Walker, *Index*, p. 80 and *Life of J.W. Alexander*, i.158n.]

- 085.0 Review of *The People's Right Defended*...., *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, 3.2 (April 1831) 249-263. [regarding access to the Bible by the laity.]
- 086.0 Resolutions on Mr. Barnes, May 30, 1931. ["Much altered against the author's judgment"]. *Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, 1821-1835* (Philadelphia, n.d.) 329.
- 086.1 Reprinted in *A Collection of the Acts, Deliverances, and Testimonies of the Supreme Judicatory of the Presbyterian Church*...., by S.J. Baird (Philadelphia: PBP, 1856) 655-656.
- 087.0 The Duty, the Benefits, and the Proper Method of Religious Fasting. Sermons XCVII and XCIX, in *The American National Preacher* (New York) 5.10 (1831) 146-160. Text: Daniel 9:3. [cf. *LSM* ii.164-167.]
- 087.1 Reprinted as *Fasting* (Dallas, TX: Presbyterian Heritage Publications, 1983, Second Edition, 1994) [with spelling and grammatical revisions.]
- 088.0 *An Essay on the Warrant, Nature, and Duties of the Office of the Ruling Elder, in the Presbyterian Church* (New York: Jonathan Leavitt, 1831) 322pp.; 19cm. [cf. *LSM* i.273-274; based upon the 1809 sermon "The Divine Appointment ..."; prior to his death, Miller was preparing a revised edition.]
- 088.1 Reprinted, (New York: Boston: Jonathan Leavitt ; Crocker & Brewster, 1832, 2nd edition) xi, 322pp.; 19cm.;
- 088.2 Reprinted, (Philadelphia: PBP, 1832) 6, x, [11]-339pp.; 16cm.
- 088.3 Reprinted, (Glasgow, J. Reid & Co., 1835) iii-xxiii, 277; 12mo.; introductory essay by the Rev. William Lindsay.
- 088.4 Reprinted, (Philadelphia: PBP, 1840, 3rd edition) 324pp.; 15cm.
- 088.5 Reprinted, (Edinburgh, Glasgow and London, 1842) 290pp.; 12mo.
- 088.6 Reprinted, (Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Historical Society, 1973; reprint of 1831 ed.) 322pp. on 153 leaves; 22 x 26cm.
- 088.7 Microform of "1832, 3rd edition" - (Louisville, KY: Lost Cause Press, 1973) 5 microfiches, 11 x 15cm.
- 088.9 Extract, Chapter 11, 192-204, 208-215, 244-259, reprinted as *The Ruling Elder* (Dallas, TX: Presbyterian Heritage Publications, 1984) vi, 28pp.; 21cm. [with spelling and grammatical revisions.]
- 088.10 Reprint of 1832 edition, (Dallas, TX: Presbyterian Heritage Publications, 1987) xiii, 338pp.; 22 cm.; includes indexes and a bibliography of Miller's works, on pages 323-326; spine title - *The Ruling Elder*.
- 088.11 (Edmonton, AB Canada: Still Waters Revival Books, 1990s) xiii, 338, 2 p.; 22 cm.
- 088.12 Microform of 1832 edition - (Chicago: University of Chicago Library, 1997) 1 microfilm reel; 35 mm. (MN 05154.3).
- 088.13 (Dallas, TX: Presbyterian Heritage Publications, 1999; reprint of 1844 [?] ed.) 446pp.; 24 cm.; together with *A sermon on the ruling elder preached in Philadelphia, May 22, 1843*. Spine title: *The Ruling Elder*.
- 088.14 Available online at [http://www.bpc.org/reading\\_room/books/miller/ruling\\_elder.html](http://www.bpc.org/reading_room/books/miller/ruling_elder.html) or at [http://www.reformed.org/books/ruling\\_elder/](http://www.reformed.org/books/ruling_elder/).
- 1832**
- 089.0 Letter IV to Rev. William Buell Sprague, D.D., dated March 8, 1832, in *Lectures on Revivals of Religion*, by Rev. William B. Sprague, D.D., (Albany, NY: Webster & Skinner; J.P. Haven, etc., 1832) Appendix, 22-44.
- 089.1 Reprinted, (Glasgow: Printed for William Collins, 1832) Appendix, 306-328.
- 089.2 Reprinted, (Glasgow: Printed for William Collins, 1833, 2d. ed.) Appendix, 380-401.
- 089.3 Reprinted, (New York: D. Appleton, 1833, 2nd ed., with additional letters).
- 089.4 Reprinted, (Glasgow: W. Collins, 1837).
- 089.5 Reprinted, (London, Banner of Truth Trust, 1959) 22-44.
- 089.6 Reprinted, (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1978).
- 089.7 Microform - (Ann Arbor, MI: UMI, 1976) microfilm, 1 reel, 35mm.
- 089.8 Microform - (Woodbridge, CT: Research Publications, 1991) microfiche.
- 090.0 "Memoir of the Rev. Joseph Stibbs Christmas..." [by E. Lord], *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, 4.2 (April 1832) 256-269.
- 091.0 The Importance of Gospel Truth. Sermon No. I, *The Presbyterian Preacher* (Pittsburgh, PA: D. and M. Maclean, 1832) 1.1 (June 1832) 1-16. Text: John 17:17. [cf. *LSM* ii.212-213.]
- 092.0 "The Importance of a Thorough and Adequate Course of Preparatory Study for the Holy Ministry," in *Annual of the Board of Education of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States*, edited by John Breckenridge (Philadelphia, PA: Russell & Martien, 1832) 1.55-95. [cf. *LSM* ii.213.]
- 1833**
- 093.0 "Ecclesiastical Polity," in *Spruce Street lectures, delivered by several clergymen, during the autumn and winter of 1831-32. To which is added, a lecture on the importance of creeds and confessions* (Philadelphia, PA: Russell and Martien, 1833) Lecture 7, 171-212 of 398pp. [cf. *LSM* ii.212; delivered 12 February 1832; key text: 1 Peter 5:1-3.]
- 093.1 Reprinted, (Philadelphia, PA: Russell and Martien, 2nd edition, 1833).
- 093.2 Reprinted, (Philadelphia, PA: PBP, 1840).
- 093.3 Reprinted, (Phil., PA: PBP, 1841) Lecture 6, 182-224.
- 094.0 Introductory Essay [dated 24 June 1833] to *An essay on the spirit and influence of the reformation*, by Charles de Villers, [1765-1815], (Philadelphia: Key & Biddle, 23 Minor Street, 1833) 1-12 of 187. [cf. *LSM* ii.241.]
- 095.0 Review of *An Apology for conforming to the Protestant Episcopal Church* ... by Thomas S. Brittan, *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, 5.3 (July 1833) 333-358. [Header title: "Britain on Episcopacy".]
- 096.0 "The Dead Speaking. A sermon delivered in the oratory of the Theological Seminary at Princeton, New-Jersey, November 18th, 1832, on the occasion of the death of the Rev. Joseph W. Barr, missionary to Africa," in *Memoir of Rev. Joseph W. Barr*, by E.P. Swift (Pittsburgh, PA: Published by R. Patterson; D. and M. MacLean, printers, 1833) 163-193. Text: Heb. 11:4. [cf. *LSM* ii.213; *LSM* ii.213n3 indicates that the sermon was published separately.]
- 097.0 *Letters to Presbyterians, on the present crisis in the Presbyterian Church in the United States*. Sixteen open letters originally published in *The Presbyterian* (Philadelphia, 1833) [cf. *LSM* ii.222-240.]
- 097.0.1 Introductory Remarks. Early Rupture in the Presbyterian Church, January 16.
- 097.0.2 Voluntary Associations, January 30.
- 097.0.3 Voluntary Associations and Ecclesiastical Boards, February 6.
- 097.0.4 The same, continued, February 13.
- 097.0.5 The same, concluded, February 20.
- 097.0.6 Adherence to our Doctrinal Standards, February 27.

- 097.0.7 The same, continued, March 6.
- 097.0.8 The same, concluded, March 13.
- 097.0.9 Revivals of Religion, March 20.
- 097.0.10 The same, concluded, March 27.
- 097.0.11 Adherence to Presbyterian Order, April 3.
- 097.0.12 The same, concluded, April 10.
- 097.0.13 Selecting and Licensing Candidates, April 17.
- 097.0.14 Religious Education of the Children of the Church, April 24, 1833.
- 097.0.15 Doing Good as a Church, May 1
- 097.0.16 Sectarianism: Conclusion, May 8
- 097.1 A portion of the above reprinted as *A letter of the Rev. Samuel Miller, D.D., professor in the theological seminary at Princeton, New Jersey; addressed to the members of the Presbyterian churches in the United States, on the present crisis in their religious and theological concerns* (Hartford, CT: Printed by P.B. Gleason & Co., 1833) 20pp; 18 cm.
- 097.2 All of the letters gathered under the title *Letters to Presbyterians, on the present crisis in the Presbyterian Church in the United States* (Philadelphia, PA: Anthony Finley; John C. Clark, printer, 1833) vi, 314pp; 21cm. ["The following 'Letters' first appeared in 'The Presbyterian;' and are now presented in this form, revised and corrected by the author, at the request of the publisher."]
- 097.3 Microform – (Chicago: Library Resources, 1970) 1 microfiche; 8 x 13 cm. (Library of American civilization (also labeled "The Library of Religion in America, beginnings to 1914"; LAC 11061).
- 097.4 "Revivals of Religion," *Naphtali Press: An Anthology of Presbyterian & Reformed Literature* (Dallas, TX: Naphtali Press) 2.4 (Fall 1989) 7-17. Excerpted from *Letters to Presbyterians ...* (1833). [A typo in this issue, on page 39, incorrectly attributes the excerpt to *Letters on Clerical Manners*]. Online at <http://www.naphtali.com/miller.htm>.
- 097.5 Microform of 1833 Clark edition – (Woodbridge, CT: Research Publications, 1997) 4 microfiches.
- 098.0 Recommendation, Princeton, May 20, 1833, in *Memoirs of Rev. Thomas Halyburton* (Princeton, NJ: Baker & Connoly, 1833). [in conjunction with Dr. Charles Hodge.]
- 099.0 Letter in *Annual Report of the Society for Promoting Manual Labor in Literary Institutions* (New York, 1833) 27.
- 1834**
- 100.0 "Remarks on the Epistles of Ignatius," *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, 6.1 (January 1834) 9-27.
- 101.0 Open Letter in reply to "A Catholic Layman," in *The Protestant Vindicator*, September 12, 1834.
- 102.0 Introductory Essay to *A History of Popery, including its origin, progress, doctrines, practice, institutions, and fruits, to the commencement of the nineteenth century*, by A Watchman [i.e., Ephraim Stinchfield, 1761-1837] (NY: J.B. Haven, 1834) xix-xxiv, [25]-416; 21cm. [cf. LSM ii.507; cites the author as Harvey.]
- 102.1 Microform – (Wooster, OH: Micro Photo Division, Bell & Howell Company, 19\_\_?) 1 reel; 35 mm.
- 103.0 †Introductory Essay [dated July 30, 1833, Princeton] to *A manual on the Christian Sabbath: embracing a consideration of its perpetual obligation, change of day, utility, and duties*, by John Holmes Agnew [1804-1865] (Philadelphia: Key & Biddle, 1834, © 1833) i-xlix of 198; 18cm. With an appendix containing extracts from an 1832 report of a committee of the British House of Commons on the observance of the Sabbath.
- 103.1 Reprinted, (Philadelphia: W.S. Young, 1845) 198; 16cm.
- 103.2 Reprinted, (Philadelphia: PBP, 1852) 198pp; 16cm.
- 104.0 Plea for an Enlarged Ministry. Sermon XXVIII in *The Presbyterian Preacher* (Pittsburgh, PA: s.n., 1834) 16pp; 21cm. ["Preached in the Central Church, Philadelphia, May 18th, 1834 ... before the Board of Education of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church."] Text: Luke 10:2. [cf. LSM ii.248-249.]
- 105.0 *On religious revivals*, by the Rev. Doct. Miller, & Doct. E.D. Griffin; (Bennington [Vt.]: Printed by John C. Haswell, 1834) 15pp; 24 cm. [Consists of an extract of a letter by Miller to the Rev. Ansel D. Eddy, Aug. 6, 1832, pages 3-12 and an extract of a letter by Griffin to a friend, April 2, 1833, pages 13-15.]
- 1835**
- 106.0 *The good man: a sermon in memory of the Rev. George S. Woodhull: delivered in the Presbyterian Church in Princeton, January 18, 1835* (Princeton, N.J.: Printed by R.E. Horner, 1835) 28pp; 23.5cm. [George Spafford Woodhull, 1773-1834.]
- 107.0 "The Present State and Prospects of the Presbyterian Church" *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, 7.1 (January 1835) 56-72. [Authorship is assigned to Samuel Miller by Walker's *BRPR Index*, p. 257 and to Archibald Alexander by Walker, *BRPR Index*, p. 66, by *The Life of Archibald Alexander*, p. 407, by A.A. Hodge's *The Life of Charles Hodge*, p. 304, and by LSM ii.271n.1. Cf. also *BRPR* 6.4 (October 1834).]
- 108.0 "New Ecclesiastical Law," *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, 7.1 (January 1835) 89-97.
- 109.0 †"New Ecclesiastical Law, No. 2," *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, 7.2 (April 1835) 186-197.
- 110.0 Review of *Episcopacy tested by Scripture*, By...Henry U. Onderdonk...." *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, 7.2 (April 1835) 239-272.
- 110.1 Reprinted in *Episcopacy Examined and Re-examined, comprising the tract "Episcopacy tested by Scripture," and the Controversy concerning that publication*, by Henry Ustick Onderdonk [1789-1858] (New York: Protestant Episcopal Tract Society, 1835) 200-227.
- 111.0 Review of *The Annual of the Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church...* Edited by John Breckinridge, *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, 7.2 (April 1835) 272-284. [Header title: "Presbyterian Policy with respect to Learning"]
- 112.0 Open Letter in Refutation of "Pious Frauds," dated Princeton, April 2, 1835, in *The Southern Churchman* (Richmond, VA: William F. Lee) v. 1, no. ?, April 17, 1835. [cf. LSM ii.430-433.]
- 113.0 Open Letter #2 in Refutation of "Pious Frauds," dated Princeton, May 9, 1835, in *The Southern Churchman* (Richmond, VA: William F. Lee) Vol. 1, no. ?, June 5, 1835.
- 114.0 *Christ the model of Gospel ministers: a sermon delivered June 1, 1835, in the city of Pittsburgh, before the Association of the Alumni of the Theological Seminary at Princeton* (Princeton, NJ: Printed by John Bogart, 1835) 32pp; 21cm.
- 114.1 Reprinted in *The Presbyterian Preacher* (Pittsburgh, PA: s.n.) 4.4 (September 1835) 49-64.
- 115.0 Report on a Memorial praying for the redress of certain grievances, June 6, 1835 [Samuel Miller, Committee chairman and presumed author], *Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., 1821-1835* (Philadelphia, PA: PBP, n.d.) 484-487.
- 115.1 Reprinted in *A Collection of the Acts, Deliverances, and Testimonies of the Supreme Judicatory of the Presbyterian Church...*, by S.J. Baird (Philadelphia: PBP, 1856) 681-684.

- 116.0 Report on Slavery, to the General Assembly [projected], 1835. Printed in *The Life of Samuel Miller*, ii.282-295.
- 117.0 Open Letter, in reply to the Rev. George Weller, D.D., dated Princeton, August 13, 1835, in *American Presbyterian* [Nashville, TN: Synod of West Tennessee; printed by Joseph Norvell; edited by John Todd Edgar], September 3, 1835. [cf. *LSM* ii.433-434; *The American Presbyterian* was a 4pp. weekly periodical which ran from 1835-1839 (vols. 1-5).]
- [Note: The bibliographic history for entries 118 and 119 is difficult at best. The two works were frequently bound together, occasionally with other works, and rarely as stand-alone titles. As Margaret Miller noted, "it is impossible to specify all editions and reprints of his books; the Presbyterian Board of Publication having republished a number of them repeatedly;..." ]
- 118.0 *Infant baptism scriptural and reasonable: and baptism by sprinkling or affusion, the most suitable and edifying mode, in four discourses, with additional notes* (Philadelphia, PA: Joseph Whetnam, printed by William S. Martien, ©1834, 1835) 148pp.; 19cm. [Originally delivered in two sermons at the church in Freehold, Monmouth county, New Jersey, 29 September 1834, then revised and enlarged for publication.] [cf. *LSM* ii.255-258.]
- 118.1 Bound with *Presbyterianism the Truly Primitive and Apostolical Constitution of the Church of Christ* (Philadelphia: PBP, 1835) 98 and 122pp.; 20cm.
- 118.2 Reprinted, (Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian Tract and Sunday School Society, 1836) 129pp.; 18cm. ["The substance of the ... discourses was delivered in two sermons ... 1834."; Advertisement; Bibliographical footnotes.]
- 118.3 Reprinted, bound with *Presbyterianism the Truly Apostolical and Primitive ...* (Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian Tract and ... Wm. S. Martien, printer, 1837) 122pp.; 18.5cm.
- 118.4 Reprinted, again published together with *Presbyterianism the Truly Primitive and Apostolical...* (Philadelphia, PA: PBP, 1840, ©1835) 122pp.; 20 cm.
- 118.5 Reprinted in *Presbyterian Tracts*, Volume 1 (Philadelphia, PA: PBP, 1842) Tract VIII, [3]-122.
- 118.6 Reprinted, (Belfast: William M'Comb ... [and 5 others], 1842) 120pp.; 17cm.
- 118.7 Rpt. Philadelphia: PBP & SSW, 1914; bound with 119.0.
- 118.8 Reprinted, with spelling and grammatical updates, in *Baptism and Christian Education* (Dallas, TX: Presbyterian Heritage Publications, 1984) 1-122. [Naegle/Brown portrait.]
- 118.9 Microform of 1840 edition - (Evanston, IL: American Theological Library Association, 1992) 1 microfiche. (ATLA monograph preservation program; ATLA fiche 1990-5014).
- 118.10 Microform of 1842 Belfast edition - (Atlanta, GA: SOLINET, 1998) 1 microfilm reel; 35 mm. (SOL MN07844.07).
- 118.11 Extract of pp. 21-32 of 1834 edition in *Children of the Promise: The Biblical Case for Infant Baptism*, by Robert R. Booth (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 1995) Appendix A, 167-180.
- 118.12 Reprinted as *Infant Baptism* (Wiggins, MS: Crown Rights Books, 1997) 122pp.; 22cm.
- 118.13 Online at <http://www.swrb.com/actualNLS/baptism1.htm>, with text revised to spelling, punctuation and grammar, (Dallas, TX: Presbyterian Heritage Publications, 1997).
- 119.0 *Presbyterianism the Truly Primitive and Apostolical Constitution of the Church of Christ* (Philadelphia: Printed by Wm. S. Martien, no. 9 George street, for the Presbyterian Tract and Sunday School Society, 1835). Bound with *Infant baptism scriptural and reasonable, and baptism by sprinkling or affusion the most suitable and edifying mode*. Title page: (Philadelphia: PBP, 1835) 98 and 122pp.; 20cm. [cf. *LSM* ii.255-258.]
- 119.1 Reprinted, (Philadelphia: Printed by Wm. S. Martien, no. 9 George street, for the Presbyterian Tract and Sunday School Society, 1835) 96pp.; 19cm.
- 119.2 Reprinted, (Philadelphia: PBP, 1835), bound with *Infant Baptism*, 98 and 122pp.; 22cm.
- 119.3 Reprinted in *American Presbyterian* [Nashville, TN: Synod of West Tennessee], in 1835.
- 119.4 Reprinted, (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Tract and Sunday School Society, Wm. S. Martien, printer, 1836) 98pp.; 19cm.
- 119.5 Included as part of *A Series of Tracts on the Doctrines, Order, and Polity of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, embracing Several on Practical Subjects* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Tract and Sunday School Society, Wm. S. Martien, printer, 1836) 1.1-98; 18.5cm. [Spine title: *Presbyterian Tracts*.]
- 119.6 Reprint, (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Tract and Sunday School Society, Wm. S. Martien, printer, 1836), bound with *Infant Baptism*, 98 and 122pp.; 19cm.
- 119.7 Reprinted, (Philadelphia: Printed and for sale by Wm. S. Martien, S.E. corner of Seventh and George streets, for the Presbyterian Tract and Sunday School Society, 1837, 1836) [3]-98; 19 cm.
- 119.8 Reprinted in *Presbyterian Tracts* (Philadelphia: PBP, 1837) 1.1-98.
- 119.9 Reprinted, (Belfast: William M'Comb..., 1840 Rev. from the last American ed.) 100pp.; 18cm.
- 119.10 Reprinted, (Philadelphia: PBP, 1840), bound with *Infant Baptism*, 98 and 122pp.; 20cm.
- 119.11 Reprinted, (Philadelphia: PBP, 1840) 98pp.; Bound with 118.0.
- 119.12 (Belfast: William M'Comb..., 1841, 2nd edition) 100pp.; 18cm.
- 119.13 As Part I of *Manual of Presbytery*, (Edinburgh: John Johnstone, 1842) 288pp.; 18cm. comprising I. Presbyterianism the truly primitive and apostolic constitution of the church of Christ, by Samuel Miller and [Part II. The character and advantages of Presbyterianism ascertained by facts; with an appendix on the testimony of the fathers and reformers to Presbytery, the moral tendency of Calvinism, etc., by John Gordon Lorimer (1804-1868).]
- 119.14 Rpt. in *Presbyterian Tracts* (Phila.: PBP, 1842) [3] - 98.
- 119.15 As Part I of *Manual of Presbytery*, edited by the Rev. John G. Lorimer, (Edinburgh and London: 1842) 16-165.
- 119.16 As Part I of *Manual of Presbytery* (Edinburgh: London: John Johnstone, 1847, 2nd edition, enlarged).
- 119.17 As Part I of *Manual of Presbytery* (Edinburgh: [s.n.], 1848, 2nd edition, enlarged) 17-144.
- 119.18 As Part I of a German edition of the *Manual of Presbytery: Geschichte, Wesen und Vorzüge der Presbyterialverfassung* (Halle: H.W. Schmidt, 1849).
- 119.19 Reprinted, (Philadelphia: PBP, n.d., but not before 1850) 98pp.; 19cm. This edition includes "Extract from Boardman's 'Tribute to the memory of Rev. Dr. Miller.'" [Miller died in 1850.] Pp. [5]-98 also numbered 7-100.
- 119.20 Reprinted, (Belfast: William M'Comb [etc.], 1853, 3d ed., revised from the last American edition) 100pp.; 18cm.
- 119.21 Reprinted in Italian, *Il Presbiterianismo Ossia la Vera costituzione primitiva Apostolica della Chiesa di Cristo* (Genova, 1855) 170pp., 24vo.
- 119.22 Chapters V and VI reprinted as *The Worship of the Presbyterian Church*, in *Presbyterian Tracts* (Philadelphia: PBP, circa 1856) Volume 10, Tract no. 197, pages numbered 1-34.
- 119.23 Rpt. 119.6. Philadelphia: PBP & SSW, 1914.

- 119.24 Microform – Rpt. 119.14.
- 119.25 Microform of 1840 Philadelphia edition, 98pp. American Theological Library Association, 1992.) 1 microfiche. ATLA fiche 1990-5015 ISBN: 0524042241 (microfiche)
- 119.26 Extract from “Presbyterianism” concerning Presbyterian views on the celebration of Christmas, is online ([http://www.fpcr.org/blue\\_banner\\_articles/miller\\_on\\_holy\\_days.htm](http://www.fpcr.org/blue_banner_articles/miller_on_holy_days.htm)).
- 119.27 Undated reprint, (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, n.d.) [7], 7-96pp.; 19 cm.
- 119.28 Undated reprint, (Philadelphia: Printed by Wm. S. Martien, no. 9 George street, for the Presbyterian Tract and Sunday School Society, n.d.) 96pp.; 19 cm.
- 120.0 *The earth filled with the glory of the Lord: a sermon preached at Baltimore, September 9, 1835, before the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, at their twenty-sixth annual meeting* (Boston, MA: Printed by Crocker & Brewster, 1835) 34pp.; 23cm.
- 120.1 Reprinted in *The American National Preacher*, Sermon CCV (New York: J. & J. Harper, 1835) 10.7 (December 1835) 289-304.
- 120.2 Reprinted in *The Missionary Enterprise: a collection of discourses on Christian Missions* (Boston, MA: Gould, Kendall and Lincoln, 1846) 143-163.
- 120.3 Microform – (Atlanta, GA: Solinet, scheduled for filming in 2004) 1 microfilm reel, 35 mm.
- 120.4 Online at <http://www.pcanet.org/history/documents/glorry.html>.
- 121.0 *The Importance of Domestic Happiness*. Sermon CXCVIII in *The American National Preacher* (New York: J. & J. Harper, 1835) 241-248.
- 122.0 *The Means of Domestic Happiness*. Sermon CXCIX, in *The American National Preacher* (NY: J. & J. Harper, 1835) 249-256.
- 123.0 Letter to Dr. Lyman Beecher [personal]. About 1828. Published by Dr. Lyman Beecher or his friends, circa 1835.
- 123.1 Reprinted in Dr. Lyman Beecher’s *Autobiography* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1865) 2.133-135.
- 123.2 Reprinted in *The Life of Samuel Miller*, ii.140-141.
- 1836**
- 124.0 Letter on Temperance, to the Rev. Justin Edwards, D.D., [personal], dated January 1, 1836. Published in *The New York Observer* later in 1836.
- 124.1 Reprinted in *The Life of Samuel Miller*, ii.301-303.
- 125.0 Review of *Christian Union; or an Argument for the abolition of Sects* by Abraham Van Dyck, *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, 8.1 (January 1836) 11-39.
- 125.1 Reprinted in *Essays, Theological and Miscellaneous*, Second Series (New York and London: Wiley and Putnam, 1847) Chapter VIII, 236-258.
- 126.0 “The Most Suitable Name for the Christian Sabbath,” *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, 8.1 (January 1836) 64-73. [Header title: “Title of the Sabbath.”]
- 127.0 Open Letter, in Reply to Dr. Luther Halsey, regarding his “Exceptions to the Confession.” Letter dated March 16, 1836, Princeton, NJ. Published in *The Presbyterian* [Philadelphia], March 24, 1836.
- 127.1 Reprinted in *American Presbyterian* [Nashville, TN: Printed and published by Joseph Norvell], April 14, 1836.
- 128.0 Review of *Toleration: A discourse delivered ... on Thanksgiving Day ...* by Evan M. Johnson, *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, 8.2 (April 1836) 185-201.
- 129.0 Review of *The Practical Church Member....* by John Mitchell, *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, 8.2 (April 1836) 243-268.
- 130.0 Address to the General Assembly, on the transfer of the Western Foreign Missionary Society, May 26, 1836. Published in *The Presbyterian* [Philadelphia], July 9, 1836.
- 131.0 Resolution condemning Mr. Barnes for his “Notes on Romans,” June 7, 1836, *Minutes of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.* (Philadelphia, 1836) 270. [cf. *LSM*, ii.283-288.]
- 131.1 Reprinted in *A Collection of the Acts, Deliverances, and Testimonies of the Supreme Judicatory of the Presbyterian Church....*, by S.J. Baird (Philadelphia: PBP, 1856) 690-691.
- 131.2 Reprinted in *The Life of Samuel Miller*, ii.287n.1.
- 132.0 Address to the General Assembly in the Case of Mr. Barnes, June 1836. Published in *The Presbyterian* [Philadelphia and New York], August 6, 1836.
- 133.0 Protest concerning the Western Foreign Missionary Society, June 9, 1836. Published in *Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.* [Philadelphia], 1836, page 280.
- 133.1 Reprinted in *A Collection of the Acts, Deliverances, and Testimonies of the Supreme Judicatory of the Presbyterian Church....*, by S.J. Baird (Philadelphia: PBP, 1856) 353-353.
- 134.0 *Christ our Righteousness*. Sermons CCXXX and CCXXXI, in *The American National Preacher* (New York: J.S. Taylor, 1836) 11.7 (December 1836) 99-114. [cf. *LSM* ii.311; cover title: The Lord our righteousness; text: Jer. 23:6.]
- 135.0 Exchange between Dr. Thomas Skinner and Dr. Miller over the Assembly’s Board of Foreign Missions. Published in *The New York Observer* (New York: Morse, Hallock & Co., 1836) Volume 14, number 29, Saturday, 16 July 1836.
- 136.0 *The sacred office magnified: a sermon, delivered in the First Presbyterian Church, in the city of Baltimore, September 15, 1836: at the installation of the Rev. John C. Backus, as pastor of the said church* (Baltimore, MD: Published by Armstrong & Berry, no. 134 Market Street, 1836) 46pp.; 23cm. [cf. *LSM* ii.311; cover title: Dr. Miller’s sermon, delivered at the installation of the Rev. John C. Backus, in the city of Baltimore, September 15, 1836; text: Rom. 11:13.]
- 137.0 Review of 1. *Thoughts on Evangelizing the World*, by Thomas H. Skinner.... 2. *Catholic Communion...* by John T. Pressly, *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, 8.4 (October 1836) 500-515.
- 138.0 Letter to Rev. Joseph Sanford, dated December 19, 1823. Published in *Memoir of Rev. Joseph Sanford, A.M.*, by Robert Baird (Philadelphia: H. Perkins, 1836) 121-122 of 268.
- 139.0 Letter containing remarks on Dr. Nevins’ character. Published in *Select Remains of William Nevins, D.D.*, by William Swan Plumer (New York: J.S. Taylor, 1836) 71-77 of 398. [cf. also #s 46 and 48, above.]
- 1837**
- 140.0 Letter to Rev. John McElhenney [personal], dated April 15, 1837. Published in *The Life of Samuel Miller*, ii.228-236.
- 141.0 *Circular Letter to the Churches of Christ*, June 8, 1837. Condensed. Published in *Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.* (Philadelphia, 1837) 502-508. [cf. *LSM*, ii.331.]
- 141.1 Reprinted in *A Collection of the Acts, Deliverances, and Testimonies of the Supreme Judicatory of the Presbyterian Church....*, by S.J. Baird (Philadelphia: PBP, 1856) 747-754.
- 142.0 “A Brief History of the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, at Princeton, New Jersey,” in

- The Presbyterian* (Philadelphia and New York) 19 August 1837. [cf. LSM ii.28.]
- 142.1 Reprinted in *American Quarterly Register* (Boston and Andover: Perkins & Marvin) 10.1 (August 1837) 31-38.
- 142.2 Published "Together with its Constitution, Bye-laws, etc." (Princeton, NJ: John Bogart, 1838) 45pp.; 8vo.
- 142.3 A "hand-corrected copy" is preserved at the New Jersey Historical Society, Manuscript Group 879. See further description online at [www.jerseyhistory.org/findingaid.php?aid=0879](http://www.jerseyhistory.org/findingaid.php?aid=0879).
- 143.0 *Open Letter to the Rev. William S. Plumer*. Published in *The Watchman of the South* [Richmond, VA: B.R. Wren], 1.1 (August 31, 1837).
- 143.1 Reprinted in *The Presbyterian* [Philadelphia and New York], September 16, 1837.
- 143.2 Reprinted as "Dr. Miller on Early Piety," in *The Presbyterian* [Philadelphia and New York], 8.9 (March 3, 1838) 35.
- 144.0 *Open Letter concerning Ignatius*, in reply to the Rev. Septimus Tuſton, Princeton, August 28, 1837 and published in *The Southern Religious Telegraph* [Richmond, VA], September 29, 1837.
- 144.1 Abridged and reprinted in *The Southern Churchman* [Richmond, VA], December 1, 1837.
- 144.2 Abridged version reprinted in *The Churchman* (New York: Protestant Episcopal Church) December 23, 1837.
- 145.0 Review of *Decline of Religion, and its Causes...* by Evan M. Johnson, *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, 9.4 (October 1837) 588-594.
- 146.0 *Open Letter on Voluntary Societies*, signed *Pacificus*. Published in *The New York Observer*, December 1837.
- 147.0 *Christian Assurance*. Sermon, published in *The Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine*, Volume 3 (1837) 433-441.
- 148.0 *Life of Jonathan Edwards, president of the College of New Jersey*, published in *Lives of Jonathan Edwards and David Brainerd* (Boston, MA: Hilliard, Gray, and Co.; London: Richard James Kennett, 1837) 1-256. Bound with *Life of David Brainerd, missionary to the Indians*; by William Bourn Oliver Peabody [1799-1847], 258[?]-373. Volume VIII of *The Library of American Biography*, edited by Jared Sparks. [cf. LSM ii.324.]
- 148.1 Reprinted, (New York: Harper, 1837) 1-256 of 373pp.; 18cm.
- 148.2 Reprinted, (New York: Published by Harper and Brothers., 1840, 1837) x, 373pp.; 16 cm.
- 148.3 Reprinted separately as *Life of Jonathan Edwards* (Boston, MA: s.n., 1836-1848) 256pp.
- 148.4 Reprinted, (New York: Harper, 1847) x, 373pp.; 17cm.
- 148.5 Reprinted, (New York: Harper, 1856) x, 373pp.; 2 leaves of plates; 18cm.
- 148.6 Microform of 1847 Harper edition - (Woodbridge, CT: Research Publications, 1997) 5 microfiches.
- 148.7 Microform of 1840 Harper edition - (Pittsb., PA: Filmed by Preservation Resources for the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh, Preservation Department, 2000) 1 microfilm reel; 35 mm.
- 1839**
- 149.0 "The importance of peculiar attention on the part of Ministers of the Goſpel to the Children of their charge," *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, 10.1 (January 1838) 23-33. [Header title: "Attention to Children?"]
- 150.0 Review of *A Compendium of Christian Antiquities...* by C. S. Henry, *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, 10.2 (April 1838) 154-179. [Co-authored by Joseph A. Alexander.]
- 151.0 *Zion called upon to awake: a sermon preached in the Second Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, May 22, 1838 before the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America* (New York: Printed by Scatcherd & Adams, 1838) 20pp.; 21cm. [cf. LSM ii.337; text, Isaiah 52:1.]
- 152.0 †"Creeds and Confessions,"—a series of open letters to the Rev. Wm. S. Plumer, first published in *The Watchman of the South* (Richmond, VA: B.R. Wren), pagination unconfirmed at the date of this publication.
- 152.1 †Reprinted in *The Presbyterian* (Philadelphia: Wm. S. Martien). Letter I, 8.36 (Sept. 8, 1838) 142-143; II, 8.38 (Sept. 22, 1838) 149; III, 8.39 (Sept. 29, 1838) 154-155; IV, 8.40 (Oct. 6, 1838) 157; V, 8.41 (Oct. 13 1838) 161-162.
- 153.0 *The dangers of education in Roman Catholic seminaries. A sermon, delivered by request, before the Synod of Philadelphia, in the city of Baltimore, October 31, 1837; and afterwards in the city of New York, November 26, 1837* (Baltimore, MD: Printed by Matchett & Neilson, 1838) 15pp.; 21cm. [cf. LSM ii.335.]
- 153.1 Reprinted in *The Protestant Preacher* (London: Francis Baisler, 1838) 369-380.
- 153.2 Second edition - (Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1843) 24pp.; 16 cm.
- 153.3 Reprinted as part of the *Series on Popery* (Philadelphia, 1843) Number 6, 227-250.
- 153.4 Microform - (Ann Arbor, MI: Xerox UMI, 1949[?], 1973, 1976) 35 mm. (American Culture Series, reel 556.4).
- 153.5 Microform - (Sanford, NC: Microfilming Corp. of America, 1982) 1 sheet, 11 x 15 cm., (Pamphlets in American history: Catholicism and anti-Catholicism; CA 511).
- 1839**
- 154.0 *Micæ Ecclesiasticæ* [three open letters, signed "Biblicus"], published in *The Presbyterian* [Philadelphia and New York], February 9, 16, 23, 1839. One of this series was titled "Occasional Communion" [cf. LSM ii.352-353.]
- 155.0 Review of *Bible Class Manual...* by John McDowell, *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, 11.1 (January 1839) 31-37. [cf. LSM ii.353-354.]
- 156.0 Review of *Sermons by the late Edward D. Griffin...* by William B. Sprague, *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, 11.3 (July 1839) 404-415. [cf. LSM ii.354-356.]
- 157.0 Review of I. *The Intermediate State: a Sermon ...* by Reuben Sherwood.... 2. *No Intermediate Place: a Sermon ...* by William Cruikshanks, *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, 11.4 (October 1839) 453-478.
- 158.0 "Letters of a grandfather, to the surviving children of Mrs. Margaret Breckinridge," in *A memoir of Mrs. Margaret Breckinridge. In two parts: Part I. Memoir, and funeral sermon. Part II. Letters to her surviving children* (Philadelphia: William S. Martien, 1839) Part II, 6-103. [cf. LSM ii.351-352; Margaret Breckinridge, 1802-1838.]
- 158.1 Microform - (Washington, D.C.: United States Library of Congress, 19\_\_?) 1 reel. 35 mm.
- 159.0 †"The Presbyterian Church in the United States," in *The Weekly Christian Teacher* (Glasgow: A. Fullarton and Co., 1840) v. 3, n. 106 (December 7, 1839) 28-30. [A footnote states that this article was prepared for an American periodical. It may have been merely submitted, as no evidence of an American edition has been located at this writing.]
- 1840**
- 160.0 †"Appendix," addressed to the Rev. James Wharey [1789-1842] and dated 7 March 1838, concerning the history and doc-

- trine of the Waldensians, in *Sketches of church history. Comprising a regular series of the most important and interesting events in the history of the church, from the birth of Christ to the nineteenth century* (Philadelphia: PBP, 1840) 318-324 of 324; 17cm.
- 160.1 Reprinted, (Philadelphia: PBP-SSW, 1840 New ed., rev. and corrected) 324pp.; 16 cm.
- 160.2 Reprinted, (Philadelphia: PBP, 1850-1859? A new ed., rev. and cor.) xi, 324pp.; 16 cm.
- 160.3 Reprinted, (Philadelphia: PBP-SSW, 1914 New ed., rev. and corrected) 324pp.; 16cm.
- 161.0 *History of the early rise of prelacy* (Philadelphia, PA: PBP, 1840) 46pp.; 19 cm.
- 161.1 Reprinted in *Presbyterian Tracts* (Philadelphia: PBP, n.d. [1844?]) vol. 4, no. 45, pp. 71-116 (also numbered [1] - 46).
- 162.0 Memoir of the Rev. Charles Nisbet, D.D., late president of Dickinson college, Carlisle (New York: R. Carter, 1840) x, [11] - 357pp., portrait; 20cm. [cf. *LSM* ii.356; 425.]
- 162.1 Microform - (Richmond, VA: Eastern Microfilms, 1967) 1 microfilm reel, 35 mm.
- 162.2 Microform - (Louisville, KY: Lost Cause Press, 1981) 5 microfiches; 10 x 15 cm.
- 162.3 Online: <http://deila.dickinson.edu/theirrownwords/title/0070.htm>.
- 163.0 *The Christian Education of Children and Youth in the Presbyterian Church* (Philadelphia, PA: PBP, 1840) iv, 5-28pp.; 16cm. [Report to the General Assembly, on Christian Education, by Rev. Miller; Report to the Synod of New Jersey on the subject of parochial schools, by Rev. Jacob Jones Janeway [1774-1858]. [cf. *LSM* ii.418ff.]
- 163.1 (Philadelphia, PA: PBP, 1840) iv, 40pp.; 16cm.
- 163.2 (Philadelphia, PA: PBP, 1840) 66pp.; 16cm.
- 163.3 (Philadelphia, PA: PBP, 1845, © 1840) 216pp.; 16cm.
- 163.4 Reprinted in *Baptism and Christian Education* (Dallas, TX: Presbyterian Heritage Publications, 1984) 139-155.
- 163.5 Microform of 1st edition, (Woodbridge, CT: Research Publications International, 1993) 1 microfiche. (History of education; fiche # 31,510).
- 163.6 Reprinted as Chapter 9 of *The Church Effeminate* (Unicoi, TN: The Trinity Foundation, 2001) 167-183, using the revised language edition issued by the Presbyterian Heritage Publication in 1984.
- 164.0 Book notice of *Memoranda of Foreign Travel*, by Robert J. Breckinridge, *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, 12.4 (October 1840) 464.
- 1841**
- 165.0 Introductory Essay to *Articles of the Synod of Dort*, translated from the Latin, with notes, by the Rev. Thomas Scott, D.D., (Philadelphia: PBP, 1841) 5-78 of 371; 16cm. [Miller's essay is dated May 1841; Thomas Scott, 1747-1821.]
- 165.1 Reprinted, (Philadelphia, Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1856) 1-78 of 260.
- 165.2 Microform of 1841 edition - (Ann Arbor, MI: UMI, 19\_\_?) 1 reel; 35 mm.
- 165.3 Microform of 1856 edition - (Ann Arbor, MI: UMI, 19\_\_?) 1 reel; 35 mm.
- 165.4 Microform of 1841 edition - (Wooster, OH: Micro Photo Division, Bell & Howell Company, 19\_\_?) 1 reel; 35 mm.
- 165.5 Reprint of 1841 edition - (Harrisonburg, Va.: Sprinkle Publications, 1993).
- 166.0 *Calvin Claimed by Episcopalians*, Princeton, December 13, 1841. [2nd], Calvin and Episcopacy. [3d], A Charge Repelled, Princeton, December 23, 1841. Three open letters, in controversy with *The Banner of the Cross*, signed Samuel Miller, and published in *The Presbyterian* [Philadelphia and NY], December 18 and 25, 1841, and January 1, 1842. [cf. *LSM* ii.435-437.]
- 167.0 Recommendatory letter [dated January 12, 1841] in *The Force of Truth: an authentic narrative*, by Thomas Scott (Philadelphia: PBP, 1841) ix-xx. [Thomas Scott, 1747-1821.]
- 167.1 Reprinted, (Philadelphia, PA: PBP, 2nd ed., 1841) ix-xx.
- 1842**
- 168.0 Open Letter concerning his Recommendatory Letter in *The Force of Truth*, and in reply to "Layman," Princeton, December 29, 1841, as published in *The Episcopal Recorder* [Philadelphia], January 8, 1842. [cf. *LSM* ii.438-439.]
- 168.1 Reprinted in *The Presbyterian* [Philadelphia and New York], January 15, 1842.
- 169.0 *Calvin II*. An open letter in controversy with Bishop Ives, Princeton, December 6, 1841. Published in *The Watchman of the South* [Richmond, VA: B.R. Wren], January 29, 1842.
- 169.1 Reprinted in *The Presbyterian* [Philadelphia and New York], February 12, 1842.
- 170.0 *Calvin Vindicated*. An open letter in controversy with Bishop Ives, Princeton, November 20, 1841. Published in *The Presbyterian* [Philadelphia and New York], February 5, 1942. [cf. *LSM* ii.434-435.]
- 171.0 Review of *The Life and Times of Red-Jacket*, by William L. Stone, *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, 14.2 (April 1842) 183-199. [authorship in some dispute: Page 183 in this article seems to imply that the author of this article (whom Peter Walker, *Index to BRPR*, pg. 257, says is Miller) is the same as that of Art. I. of *BRPR*, Vol. XI. No. I. (January 1839), whom Walker's *Index*, pg. 67, says is Archibald Alexander).
- 172.0 *Licentiate*s. An open letter, signed *Clericus*. Published in *The Presbyterian* [Philadelphia and New York], May 21, 1842.
- 173.0 *Rights of Ruling Elders*. An open letter, signed *Canonicus*. Published in *The Presbyterian* [Philadelphia and New York], May 21, 1842.
- 174.0 *Rights of Ruling Elders*. A series of five open letters, signed *Calvin*. Published in *The Presbyterian* [Philadelphia and New York], November 26, December 3, 10, 17 and 24, 1842.
- 175.0 Open Letter on confirmation, Princeton, November 24, 1842. Published in *The Watchman of the South* [Richmond, VA: B.R. Wren], December 8, 1842.
- 1843**
- 176.0 Open letter in reply to "Justice," Princeton, September 19, 1843. Published in *The South Kentuckian* [Henderson, KY, October 27, 1843].
- 177.0 *Letters from a father to his sons in college* (Philadelphia, PA: Grigg and Elliot, 1843) 344pp., portrait. [cf. *LSM* ii.456-457; no surviving copies of this first edition were found listed in OCLC.]
- 177.1 (Philadelphia, PA: PBP, 1852) 240pp. 19 cm.
- 177.2 Microform of the 1843 edition - (Chicago, IL: Library Resources, 1970) 1 microfiche, 8 x 13 cm. (The library of religion in America, beginnings to 1914; LAC 13518).
- 177.3 Microform of the 1852 edition - (Ann Arbor, MI: UMI, 1965; 1976) microfilm, 1 reel, 35 mm. (American culture series, Reel 288.4).
- 177.4 Microform of the 1852 edition - (Louisville, KY: Lost Cause Press, 1981) 4 microfiches.
- 177.5 Text of the 1852 edition, digitized by the University of

- Michigan and posted as part of the Making of America Project, online at <http://www.hti.umich.edu/m/oaagrp/>.
- 177.6 Also available as part of the American Memory project sponsored by the Library of Congress, at <http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/ndlpcoop/oahtml/ncpmAuthorso9.html>.
- 1844**
- 178.0 Letter, dated August 6, 1831, Princeton, NJ, in a Circular of Maxwell McDowell, concerning the laying on of hands by ruling elders. Published April 26, 1844.
- 179.0 Letter recommending *The Antiquities of the Christian Church*, by Lyman Coleman. Published in *The Presbyterian* [Philadelphia], June 22, 1844.
- 180.0 *The warrant, nature, and duties of the office of the ruling elder in the Presbyterian Church: a sermon preached in Philadelphia, May 22, 1843* (Philadelphia: William S. Martien, 1844) iv, 166pp.; 16 cm. [cf. LSM i.273-274; ii.456; sermon text – 1 Timothy 5:17.]
- 181.0 Letter recommending *The Apostolical and Primitive Church* (Boston, 1844), by Lyman Coleman, 2d edition. In flyleaf advertisement in that volume. Princeton, September 20, 1844.
- 182.0 Introductory Letter, dated September 19, 1844, for the first American edition of *The Memoir and Remains of Rev. Robert Murray McCheyne of St. Peter's Church, Dundee*, by the Rev. Andrew A. Bonar, (Philadelphia: PBP, 1844) vii-xviii.
- 182.1 Online at: <http://web.ukonline.co.uk/d.haslam/mccheyne/miller/INTRODUCTORY%20LETTER.htm>.
- 183.0 Recommndatory Letter, Princeton, November 25, 1844, in *The History of the Popes*, by Archibald Bower (Philadelphia: Griffith & Simon, 1844, 1845) 1.4-5.
- 1845**
- 184.0 Letter to the Rev. D.V. McLean, concerning the formation of the New Jersey Historical Society, Princeton, February 18, 1845 [personal]. Published in *Proceedings of the New Jersey Historical Society* (Newark, NJ: The Society, 1845) 1.5-7.
- 185.0 "Remarks on the Mode of Conducting the Monthly Concert in Prayer," A series of four articles, published in *The Foreign Missionary Chronicle* (New York: Mission House, 1845) v. 12, 265-270; v. 13, 34-37; 65-69; and 129-133. [cf. LSM ii.475.]
- 185.1 Reprinted "in a revised and somewhat different form" as *Letters on the observance of the Monthly concert in prayer: addressed to the members of the Presbyterian Church in the United States* (Philadelphia: PBP, 1845) 104pp.; 16cm.
- 186.0 *History and the Historical Society*. An address before the New Jersey Historical Society, Princeton, September 4, 1845. Published in *Proceedings of the New Jersey Historical Society* (Newark, NJ, 1845) 1.81-96. [cf. LSM ii.474-475.]
- 187.0 Recommendation in *Internal Evidence of the Holy Bible: or, The Bible proved from its own pages to be a divine revelation*, by J.J. Janeway, D.D. (Phila.: PBP, 1845) 3-4 of 287. [cf. LSM ii.476.]
- 1846**
- 188.0 *An address on the dedication of a monument erected to the memory of the Rev. James Caldwell, formerly pastor of the said Church, who fell by the hand of an assassin, November 24th, 1781* (Elizabethtown, NJ: Edward Sanderson, 1846) 24pp.; 22cm. [cf. LSM ii.478-479; re: Rev. James Caldwell, 1734-1781.]
- 188.1 Microform – (Ann Arbor, MI: UMI, 1984) 1 microfiche. (Genealogy and local history; LH2392).
- 188.2 Microform – (Woodbridge, CT: Research Publications, 1997) 1 microfiche.
- 189.0 †Foreword in *Thoughts and Counsels for the Impenitent* by Rev. J. M. Olmstead (NJ: Robert Carter, 1846) [i] 284pp. [Only a few sentences on one page.]
- 1847**
- 190.0 Recommndatory Letter in *History of the ancient Christians inhabiting the valleys of the Alps*, by Jean Paul Perrin and the Rev. Robert Baird (Philadelphia, PA: Griffith and Simon, 1847, © 1846) 1-7 of 475.
- 190.1 Reprinted – (Gallatin, TN: Church History & Archives, 1991).
- 191.0 †"The Rise and Progress of the Theological Seminary at Princeton. A paper read before the New Jersey Historical society, at Newark, May 27, 1847," *Proceedings of the New Jersey Historical Society* (Newark, NJ: The Society) Volume 2 (1847) pages 73ff.
- 1848**
- 192.0 *Remarks on Clericus*. An open letter, signed "S.M." Published in *The Presbyterian* (New York and Philadelphia) February 19, 1848. [cf. LSM ii.501-502; extant copies of the referenced pamphlet could not be located.]
- 1849**
- 193.0 Letter to Joseph H. Jones, dated September 25, 1848 and prepared for the press by Joseph H. Jones. Published in *The Life of Ashbel Green, V.D.M.* (NY: R. Carter, 1849) 523-540 of 628.
- 194.0 Letter to the Rev. H.A. Boardman, D.D. [personal], dated February 28, 1849.
- 194.1 Excerpts reprinted in *The Life of Archibald Alexander* (New York: C. Scribner, 1854) 582-584.
- 194.2 Excerpts reprinted in *The Life of Samuel Miller* (Philadelphia, 1869; Stoke-on-Trent, 2002) 2.512-513.
- 195.0 Testimony on Temperance, Princeton, April 2, 1849. Published in *The Life of Samuel Miller* (Philadelphia, 1869; Stoke-on-Trent, 2002) 2.303.
- 196.0 Letter to the Members of the Cincinnati Society of Religious Inquiry, Princeton, January 24, 1849. Published in *Constitution of the Cincinnati Society of Religious Inquiry* (Cincinnati, OH: John D. Thorpe, 1849) 7-12.
- 197.0 Report of the Committee appointed to frame a directory for the administration of baptism to adults, and admission of persons to the Church on public profession of faith. Overture 39: laid on table. Issued in folio, 4pp. and published in *Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.* (Philadelphia, 1849) 266.
- 198.0 *Thoughts on Public Prayer* (Philadelphia, PBP, 1849) 306pp.; Sartain engraving of portrait by George Linen; 19cm. [cf. LSM ii.503-507; Miller's dedication dated October 31st, 1848.]
- 198.1 Rpt, (Philadel.: PBP, circa 1849) 245pp.; portrait; 20cm.
- 198.2 Reprinted, (Harrisonburg , VA: Sprinkle Publications, 1985) xxxii, 306pp.; illus.; portrait; 20cm. [Includes a "Biographical Sketch on Samuel Miller" by Kevin Reed.]
- 198.3 Microform of 1st edition, (Chicago: University of Chicago Library, 1999) microfilm, 1 reel, 35 mm.
- 198.4 Rpt, (Harrisonburg, VA: Sprinkle Publications, 2002).
- POSTHUMOUSLY PUBLISHED WORKS—**
- 1854**
- 199.0 *Church Attachment and Sectarianism*, in *The Presbyterian Magazine* (Philadelphia: C. Sherman, Printer), 4.1 (January 1854) 1-6.

199.1 Reprinted in *Presbyterian Tracts* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, circa 1855), Volume 9, Tract number 167, 8pp.

## 1856

200.0 *Atoning blood; or The blood of Jesus Christ delivering from the condemnation, power, and pollution of sin.* (NY: American Tract Society; Daniel Fanshaw [1788?-1860], printer, 1837?) 12pp.; 18cm. "Tract no. 361" ["S. Miller, trustee, 1807-1850".]

## UNCONFIRMED MATERIALS—

*The Bishop and the Bible, or, the nail driven home*, by "Old Covenanting and True Presbyterian" and Samuel Miller (Albany [NY]: Munsell & Rowland, 1858), 35pp.; 23cm. Under the pseudonym, some 60 works, published between 1714-1981, can be located; the section attributed to "Samuel Miller" is an outline of a sermon on women's rights, or rather, the rights of women in all ages, stations and nations. Given the date of publication, the work is more likely authored by some other Miller, perhaps his son. Copies of this particular title were located at the Upper Hudson Library System and at the Wisconsin Historical Society.

## MISCELLANY—

Margaret Miller closes her article in the *Princeton Theological Review* [9.4 (October 1911) 616-636] with this note:

"Dr. Miller's frequent articles in periodicals (including *The Princeton Repertory*) cannot all be identified. Also, it is impossible to specify all editions and reprints of his books; the PBP having republished a number of them repeatedly; in some cases even to this day.

Many of his letters are printed in his "Life."

A manuscript Introductory Letter to *A Memoir of Rev. Robert Gibson*, by Robert Baird and John Breckinridge [1835], signed 'Samuel Miller,' apparently never published, is in the possession of the Gibson family.

At the University of Pennsylvania, his *alma mater*, there are several volumes of his manuscript "Notes," upon lectures attended there as a student, in 1788-89.

His collection of letters received is in the Library of Princeton University.

Dr. Miller wrote the epitaphs for the tombs of: Rev. Robert Finley, D.D., Rev. Samuel Stanhope Smith, S.T.D., LL.D., Chief Justice Andrew Kirkpatrick, The Hon. James Sheafe, and Rev. George S. Woodhull. This last was probably not used.

There is a practically complete collection of this writer's works, including manuscripts and a few letters, in the Library of Princeton Theological Seminary."

## CORRESPONDENCE OF

## THE REV. DR. SAMUEL MILLER—

Outside of the various archival collections which contain Miller correspondence, a small group of letters can be viewed online at the American Memory website sponsored by the Library of Congress [<http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/index.html>.]

George Washington Papers at the Library of Congress, 1741-1799: Series 4. General Correspondence. 1697-1799.

Samuel Miller to George Washington, August 4, 1793, Signed, The Author.

George Washington to Samuel Miller, August 29, 1793.

Samuel Miller to George Washington, July 30, 1795.

The Thomas Jefferson Papers Series 1. General Correspondence. 1651-1827.

Thomas Jefferson to Samuel Miller, September 3, 1793.

Thomas Jefferson to Samuel Miller, February 25, 1800.

Samuel Miller to Thomas Jefferson, August 11, 1800.

Samuel Miller to Thomas Jefferson, September 14, 1800, Partly Illegible.

Samuel Miller to Thomas Jefferson, June 22, 1801.

Samuel Miller to Thomas Jefferson, June 10, 1802.

Thomas Jefferson to Samuel Miller, February 29, 1804.

Samuel Miller to Thomas Jefferson, May 8, 1805.

Thomas Jefferson to Samuel Miller, May 13, 1805.

Samuel Miller to Thomas Jefferson, January 18, 1808.

## ARCHIVAL COLLECTIONS:

A. Special Collections, Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries, Princeton, NJ—

1. The Samuel Miller manuscript collection, 35.1 cu. ft. This is the primary archival collection of Dr. Miller's papers. The collection consists of 35.1 linear feet of sermons, course lecture notes, correspondence, articles, bibliography, genealogy, autobiography, and miscellany. Collection processed and finding aid prepared by Douglas F. Denné; revised by Raymond D. Cannata in 1996.

2. The Thomas Ware Cattell [1823-1887] manuscript collection, circa 1844, 1.3 linear feet. Collection includes lecture and sermon notes dated 1844, lecture notes from Archibald Alexander's introductory lecture entitled "Hints for Young Men" and "Remarks," by Samuel Miller. Collection processed and finding aid prepared in 1993 by Douglas F. Denné.

B. Princeton University, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton, NJ—

1. Biblical history, 1819, 1 bound manuscript [92pp.], by Samuel Miller; Henry Ewing Hale [1869-1946], donor. Dr. Miller's handwritten manuscript, titled "Biblical History," consisting of questions and answers about the Old Testament. Presumably used in his teaching at the Princeton Theological Seminary.

2. Papers of Archibald Alexander, William Buell Sprague and Samuel Miller, 1819-1851, 0.20 cubic ft. Collection consists of correspondence, manuscripts, and notes on lectures delivered at Princeton, including notes from lectures given by Samuel Miller. Organized in three series: 1. Outgoing correspondence, 1819-1851; 2. Manuscript articles, 1851 and undated; 3. Lecture notes, 1826, 1840 and undated. [The Presbyterian Historical Society appears to have photocopied duplicates of this collection.]

3. Lectures on the composition and delivery of a sermon, 1820, 1 bound manuscript, by Samuel Miller; John E. Pomfret, donor. Manuscript of handwritten lecture notes, author unknown, from Dr. Miller's lectures at Princeton Theological Seminary, dated 1820.

4. Sketches of sermons: A manuscript composed by Abraham Dewitt, dated November 16, 1828 to April 12, 1840 and consisting of outlines and notes on sermons delivered in Bloomfield, Princeton, and New Jersey towns by ministers such as G.N. Judd, Archibald Alexander, Samuel Miller, and Charles Hodge.

5. Dr. Miller's lectures, 1839-1842; Benjamin Haines Williams [1817-1855], donor; 1 bound ms. [50 leaves]; 20cm. Lecture notes taken by Benjamin Haines Williams of lectures by Samuel Miller on ecclesiastical history, the history of preaching, and the composition of sermons; taken when Williams was a student at

- the Princeton Theological Seminary, and dated November 23, 1839 to May 6, 1842.
- John Miller Papers, [1839-1895], (Co632), Correspondence. Collection includes 13 letters in correspondence with Dr. Samuel Miller, dated October 8 1845 through 20 August 1849.
  - Andrews-Eliot correspondence, 1715-1814, 1 box. A diverse collection of letters, with correspondents including Samuel Miller, among others.
- C. Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, PA—
- Papers, Miller family, 0.20 cubic ft. [Record Group 343] Collection consists of sermons, correspondence, materials on the Synod of New Jersey, and miscellaneous other items. Organized in two series: 1. Samuel Miller, Sr., 1809-1852 [includes biographical notes on Princeton colleagues, 1843; biographical notes on his father, John Miller; Correspondence, 1809-52; and Sermons, 1815, 1816, 1818, 1821-22, 1825]; and Series 2. Samuel Miller, Jr., 1844-1879 [consisting of Correspondence, 1844-55; and items from the New Jersey Synod, 1879.]
  - Diploma, awarded to Samuel Miller by the Philological Society of Manchester, dated June 29, 1804; 1pg.; 33cm.; engraving by Daniel Orme.
  - Zebulon Butler [1803-1860] Collection. The collection includes a typescript "Settlement of the Rev. Z. Butler at Port Gibson in 1827"; photocopies of genealogical information taken from the "family Bible," and copies of a letter of recommendation, 1826, from Samuel Miller of Princeton Theological Seminary.
  - Jeremiah Chamberlain [1794-1851] Collection, 0.5 cu. ft., includes, among many other items, "a Catalog of Books by the Rev'd Samuel Miller."
- D. New Jersey Historical Society Library, Newark, NJ—
- John Johns Notebook, 1 volume, 1817-1818; Manuscript Group 69. Collection consists of one leather-bound notebook, compiled by Princeton Theological Seminary student John Johns [1786-1876]. The notebook covers the years 1817 to 1818 and contains notes and analysis of lectures, as well as reading lists provided by the Princeton professors. C.L. Travis, donor.
- E. Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, MA—
- Andrews-Eliot Correspondence, Archival Material, 1 box. A diverse collection of letters, including some correspondence with Samuel Miller. Collection is housed at the Massachusetts Historical Society.
- F. Duke University, Medical Center Library, Durham, NC—
- Papers of Benjamin Rush, 1766-1845, 252 items; Includes personal and professional correspondence, with correspondents including Samuel Miller, among many others. [Benjamin Rush was a physician residing in Philadelphia and a patriot in the Revolutionary war.]

PORTRAITS, DRAWINGS AND PHOTOGRAPHY  
OF DR. MILLER—

A number of portraits of Dr. Miller have been identified. Examples of their publication are cited without attempt to be exhaustive.

- Portrait by Thomas Sully, 1812, reproduced in *The Princeton University Library Chronicle*, volume 14, p. 55, from a portrait in the possession of the Hon. Breckinridge Long, the last known owner (ca. 1953). Current location is unknown. The portrait can be viewed online at [http://libweb5.princeton.edu/visual\\_materials/pulc/pulc\\_v\\_14\\_n\\_2.pdf](http://libweb5.princeton.edu/visual_materials/pulc/pulc_v_14_n_2.pdf).
- Portrait by George Linen. Engraved for publication by John Sartain and reproduced in *The Primitive and Apostolical Order ... Vindicated* (1840) and *Thoughts on Public Prayer* (1849).
- Portrait by John Sartain; engraving by John Sartain, reproduced in *The Presbyterian Magazine*, 2.2 (November 1852), facing page 481.
- Portrait by John Naegle; engraving by John Sartain [Miller seated, facing left, holding Bible], reproduced in *The Life of Samuel Miller*, volume 1, frontispiece. Reprinted in *The Princeton University Library Chronicle*, volume 14, facing p. 70, and on the cover of the Naphtali Press Anthology of Presbyterian & Reformed Literature, 2.3 (Summer 1989). See online at <http://www.covenanter.org/SMiller/millertheatre.htm> and at [http://libweb5.princeton.edu/visual\\_materials/pulc/pulc\\_v\\_14\\_n\\_2.pdf](http://libweb5.princeton.edu/visual_materials/pulc/pulc_v_14_n_2.pdf).
- Engraving in Alfred Nevin's *Encyclopedia of Presbyterianism*.
- Drawing of the Naegle portrait [#4], rendered by Stephen T. Brown, ©1983, commissioned by Kevin Reed, Dallas, TX., 1983. Reproduced on the cover of the booklet *The Ruling Elder* (Dallas, PHP, 1984).
- Untitled, graphite and charcoal sketch on bristol, after the engraving in Nevin's *Presbyterian Encyclopedia*, © 2003, by Lori Teibel; commissioned by Chris Coldwell; reproduced on the cover of *The Confessional Presbyterian* journal, volume 1 (2005).
- The Presbyterian Historical Society, Montreat archives holds the Samuel B. Hall [1818-1867] collection, 1 folder. The collection consists of photoengravings of several Presbyterian ministers, including Thomas Verner Moore, Francis McFarland, Samuel Miller, W. M. Lowrie, W. L. Breckinridge, J. H. Thornwell, and Walter A. Scott.

PSEUDONYMNS USED BY DR. SAMUEL MILLER—

- A Friend to Temperance Societies. 2. Biblicus. 3. Calvin. 4. Canonicus. 5. Clericus. 6. Pacificus. 7. S.M.

WRITINGS NOT BY THE REV. DR. SAMUEL MILLER

The name "Samuel Miller" is obviously not all that unusual. A number of Samuel Miller's can be located in literary history, and several were writing during the same era as the Rev. Dr. Samuel Miller. The first to distinguish from Dr. Miller is his own son, Samuel Miller, Jr. The next is Samuel Miller of Glasgow. The remaining number should not provide much confusion. Samuel Miller, Jr. [1816-1883], son of Dr. Samuel Miller—

- Report of the Presbyterian Church Case* (Philadelphia: W.S. Martien, 1839) 596pp.; 24cm.
- Prayer for Our Country: Three Sermons* (Philadelphia: H.B. Ashmead, printer, 1862) 46pp.; 21cm.
- A Treatise on Mercersburg Theology, or, Mercersburg and Modern Theology Compared* (Phila.: S.R. Fisher, 1866) 131pp.; 17cm.
- "Historical Review of the Church (Old School Branch) since 1837," Chapter 1 in *Presbyterian Reunion: A Memorial Volume. 1837-1871*. (New York: De Witt C. Lent & Company, 1870) 1-49. Reproduced as Chapter XI, "Historical Sketches After 1837," in *The Presbyterian Church Throughout the World* (New York: De Witt C. Lent & Company, 1874) 149-197.
- Record of marriages: with the laws relating thereto*. A signed, handwritten manuscript of a record book of marriages in New Jersey (1861-1877), maintained by Samuel Miller; 12pp. Preserved at Princeton University.
- The Life of Samuel Miller, D.D., LL.D., Second Professor in the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church, at Princeton, New Jersey* (Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen and Haffelfinger, 1869; Stoke-on-Trent: Tentmaker Publications, 2002) 2v, 381/562pp.
- The Samuel Miller, Jr. manuscript collection. Collection consists

of 7.8 linear feet of exegetical notes, notes on ministers, biographical materials, journals and correspondence. Collection is housed at Special Collections, PTS Libraries.

Samuel Miller, D.D., of Glasgow [1810-1881] – Pastor, Monifieth & Saint Andrew's Churches; member, Dundee Free Church Presbytery.

1. *The blasphemy against the Holy Ghost: a discourse preached in the ordinary course of weekly lecture* (Glasgow: William Collins, 1845) 32pp.; 18cm. [OCLC erroneously attributes this title to Dr. Miller of Princeton.]
2. *Scripture plea for the sustentation fund: the portion of the Levites; or, God's ordinance for the support of the ministry: a discourse* (Glasgow: David Bryce, 1848) 24pp.; 18cm.
3. *Discourse preached by appointment: before the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, on Tuesday, May 29th, 1851, being the day set apart by the Church for solemn humiliation before God on the part of her supreme court* (London: Johnstone and Hunter, 1851) 47pp.; 23cm.
4. *War, though a judgment, may be blessed by God: a sermon, preached in Free St. Matthew's Church, Glasgow, on the day appointed by Her Majesty for humiliation and prayer on account of the present war* (Glasgow: David Bryce, 1854) 24pp.; 22cm.
5. *The true freedom of the church of Christ in the light of Scripture and how it can be secured* (Glasgow: T. Murray, 1869) 68pp.; 21cm.
6. *Memorials of the Rev. Samuel Miller, D.D., minister of St. Matthew's Free Church, Glasgow* (Glasgow: David Bryce, 1883) lxiii, 283pp.; 20cm.

Samuel Miller [M.D.?.]

1. *De dysenteria* (Edinburgi, Apud A. Smellie, 1802) 49pp.; 21cm. In University of Edinburgh *Dissertationes medicae*, 1802, vol. 2.
2. There may be related materials in the Cullen Papers, at the University of Glasgow, with two items which would appear to be by the same author:
  - a. Extract of letter from Samuel Miller to W. Cullen, 1789. Re. various cases of disease. [MS Cullen 231.]
  - b. Extract of letter from Samuel Miller, South Carolina, to W. Cullen 1789. Miller's observations of wide-spread Scarlet Fever in the years 1787/88 tended to confirm Cullen's doctrine in his First lines. [MS Cullen 232.]

Other Samuel Millers to be distinguished:

Samuel Thomas Miller [1789 – 1870.]

Samuel Miller [1799 – 1852] – wrote on British tax; property law.

Col. Samuel Miller [1814-1856?] – of the U.S. Marine Corps.

Samuel Miller [1807-1853], artist.

Samuel Freeman Miller [1816-1890] – wrote extensively on constitutional law.

Samuel Franklin Miller [1827-1892] – wrote on female education.

Samuel Almond Miller [1836-1897] – geology and paleontology.

Samuel Henry Miller [1840-1918] – wrote on Southern election frauds.

Samuel Miller [1842-?] – Author of *The Bible and Nature vs. Copernicus* (New York: Abbey Press, 1903).

Samuel Llewellyn Miller [1844-?]

Anonymous, biographical notice of Rev. Samuel Miller, D.D., in *The Presbyterian Magazine*, 2.2 (November, 1852) 510-517, by “\*S.”

Boardman, Henry A., *A discourse commemorative of the character and life of the late Rev. Samuel Miller, D.D. of Princeton, New Jersey, delivered on Sunday evening, January 27th, 1850, in the Tenth Presbyterian Church* (Philadelphia, PA: W.S. Martien, 1850) 40pp.; 22cm. Note: “Brief biographical notice of Dr. Miller, from the Presbyterian of January 18, 1850, pp. 38-40. [cf. *LSM* ii.395-396.]

De Witt, John, “The intellectual life of Samuel Miller: the opening address of the session of 1905-6 at Princeton Theological Seminary,” in *The Princeton Theological Review*, 4.2 (April 1906) 168-190. Reprinted as a separate item by the Princeton Press. Available online at <http://www.angelfire.com/nh/politicalscience/1906princetonamuellermillerbio.html>.

Faris, Paul Patton, biographical entry for Samuel Miller, in *Dictionary of American Biography* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933) 12.636-637.

[Handy, Isaac W.K.], “Licensure and Ordination of Samuel Miller,” *The Presbyterian Magazine*, 2.4 (April 1852) 179-183.

Henry, Symmes Cleves [1797-1857], *This ministry: a sermon preached at the opening of the Synod of New Jersey in the Second Presbyterian Church of Elizabethtown, October 15th, 1850* [review], (s.l.: s.n., 1851), [text: 2 Cor. 4:1] [One copy located at Princeton University.]

Kennedy, E.W., biographical entry for Samuel Miller, in *Dictionary of the Presbyterian & Reformed Tradition in America*, Darryl G. Hart, General Editor (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1999) 160.

Miller, Samuel, Jr., *The Life of Samuel Miller, D.D., LL.D., Second Professor in the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church, at Princeton, New Jersey* (Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen and Haффelfinger, 1869) 2 volumes, 381pp. and 562pp.

Reprinted – (Stroke-on-Trent, Staffordshire, U.K.: Tentmaker Publications, 2002). [Miller's biography of his father was reviewed in *The New Englander and Yale Review* (New Haven, CT: W.L. Kingsley), 28.108 (July 1869) 620-625 and this review is online at <http://memory.loc.gov/>. Another review appeared on the pages of *The Princeton Review* 42.1 (January 1870) 33-49. It also can be found online, at <http://www.hti.umich.edu/m/moagrpf/>.

Nevin, Alfred, biographical entry in *Encyclopædia of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America: including the Northern and Southern Assemblies* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Encyclopædia Publishing Co., 1884) 1185-1186.

Plumley, G.S., *The Presbyterian Church Throughout the World* (New York: De Witt C. Lent & Company, 1874) 267-272.

Sprague, William Buell, D.D., *A Discourse commemorative of the Rev. Samuel Miller, D.D., Late Professor in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, delivered in the Second Presbyterian Church, Albany, on Sabbath evening, January 27, 1850* (Albany [NY]: Erastus H. Pease & Co., 1850) 51pp.; 23cm. [cf. *LSM* ii.384ff., 508-509, 543-544; “List of Dr. Miller's Publications, pp. 49-51.]

#### RESOURCES ON THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF SAMUEL MILLER

##### BIOGRAPHICAL—

Anonymous, biographical entry in *American National Biography* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999) 15.515-516.

#### ADDITIONAL BIOGRAPHICAL RESOURCES AND RELATED FAMILY ITEMS—

Gravesite of the Rev. Dr. Samuel Miller, The Princeton Cemetery of the Nassau Presbyterian Church [established 1757] For further information, see map and notes online at <http://www.princetonol.com/groups/cemetery/mon.html>.

Biography and genealogical chart for the Rev. John Breckinridge [July 1797 – August 1841] and his wife Margaret Miller, daughter of Dr. Samuel Miller, at <http://www.princeton.lib.nj.us/princeton/family.html>.

John Miller [1819-1895] Papers, preserved at the Manuscripts Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library [See <http://libweb.princeton.edu/libraries/firestone/rbsc/aids/miller-john.html>]. Regarding John Miller, see also:

1. Lectures on church government: Signed, handwritten manuscript of lectures given by John Miller, 1841-1842 concerning church government. Former owner: Samuel Miller Breckinridge [1828-1891.]
2. "If You Love That Lady Don't Marry Her": *The Courtship Letters of Sally McDowell and John Miller, 1854-1856*, Edited with an Introduction by Thomas E. Buckley, S.J., (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 2000) xlvii, 896pp.; 24cm.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY—

Miller, Margaret, "A List of the Writings of Samuel Miller, D.D., LL.D., 1769-1850, Second Professor in Princeton Theological Seminary, 1813-1850," *The Princeton Theological Review*, 9.4 (October 1911) 616-636.

"List of Dr. Miller's Publications, in *A Discourse commemorative of the Rev. Samuel Miller, D.D.*, by William B. Sprague (Albany [NY]: ERASTUS H. PEASE & CO., 1850) 49-51.

Chamberlain, Jeremiah, Papers, (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Historical Society). Collection includes "a Catalog of Books by the Rev'd Samuel Miller D.D." [see the Chamberlain entry under Archival Collections for more information.]

## CONTEMPORARY INTERACTIONS—

Adams, John, Letter to Samuel Miller, dated July 8, 1820. Online at <http://personal.pitnet.net/primarysources/adamsletters.html>.

Bowden, John [1751-1817], *The Apostolic origin of Episcopacy* asserted in a series of letters, addressed to the Rev. Dr. Miller (New-York: Printed and sold by T. & J. Swords, 1808) 2 volumes.

Bowden, John and Samuel Miller, *A series of letters, addressed to the Rev. Dr. Miller in answer to his Continuation of Letters concerning the constitution and order of the Christian ministry* (New-York: Printed and sold by T. & J. Swords, 1811) xi, 414pp.; 18cm.

Microform – (Worcester, MA: AAS, 1971) 5 microopaques; 23 x 15 cm. (EAI. Second series; no. 22444).

Carey, Mathew [1760-1839], *Address to the Public on Religious Intolerance and Persecution by a Catholic layman* (s.l.: s.n., 1834) [17]-28pp.; 24cm. One copy located at the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia. Call number PAM BV741.C37.

*The Christian Examiner* [a Unitarian periodical.]

Anonymous, Review of *An Inquiry into the Comparative Moral Tendencies of Trinitarian and Unitarian Doctrines; in a Series of Letters to the Rev. Dr. Miller, of Princeton*, by Jared Sparks, 1.3 (May-June 1824) 221-224.

Anonymous, Review of *The Utility and Importance of Creeds and Confessions: An Introductory Lecture*, in 2.5 (September-October 1825) 364-377.

Anon., Review of *Letters on Clerical Manners and Habits, addressed to a Student in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N.J.*, in 4.4 (July-August 1827) 324-333.

Anon., Review of *Letters to Presbyterians*, in 17.65 (November 1834; New Series, 12.35) 137-155.

Cooke, John Eſten [1783-1853], *Answer to the review of An essay on the invalidity of Presbyterian ordination: published in the January number of the Biblical repertory & theological review, of Princeton, New Jersey* (Lexington, KY: Printed at the Reporter office, 1830) 136pp.; 23cm. ["Agnew Pamphlets on Methodism"; Written in reply to Miller's article in *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, 2.1 (January 1830) 38-77.]

Cooke, John Eſten, *An Essay on the Invalidity of Presbyterian Ordination* (Lexington [KY]: Printed at the Reporter Office, 1829) [3]-216, with Appendix containing the Martyrdom and the Epistles of St. Ignatius, i-xxiv and Index, xxv-xxviii.

Duncan, John M., *A reply to Dr. Miller's letter to a gentleman of Baltimore, in reference to the case of the Rev. Mr. Duncan* (Baltimore: Published by Cushing & Jewett; John D. Toy, printer, corner of St. Paul & Market ſts., 1826) 143pp.; 20cm. [John M. Duncan was pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Tammany Street, Baltimore.]

Henshall, James, *Immersion, the only baptism, or, A review of Samuel Miller's discourses on the mode of baptism* (Richmond, VA: Ellyson, 1843) 24pp.; 26cm. [Presbyterian Historical Society – PAM BV 811.5 H46 1843 UG24.5 H39.]

How, Thomas Yardley [1776-1855], *Letters addressed to the Rev. Samuel Miller, D.D., in reply to his letters concerning the Constitution and Order of the Christian ministry. In which there is an humble attempt to shew that the charges, against the Episcopal Church, and her advocates, are totally unfounded; and, in which the preliminary reasoning of the reverend author is particularly considered. Being introductory to an examination of the whole work ...* (Utica, NY: Printed by Seward and Williams, ... east of the Coffe House Genesee Street, 1808) 124pp.; 22cm.

How, Thomas Yardley, *A vindication of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in a series of letters addressed to the Rev. Samuel Miller D.D., in reply to his late writings on the Christian ministry, and to the charges contained in his life of the Rev. Dr. Rodgers; with preliminary remarks* (New York: Eastburn, Kirk and T. & J. Swords: P.A. Mesier, 1816) 492pp.; 21cm.

Jefferson, Thomas, Letter to Rev. Samuel Miller, from Washington, January 23, 1808. A digital image of the original letter is online at <http://www.loc.gov/exhibits/jefferson/images/vc113-p1.jpg>, while a transcription of this same text can be found at [http://press-pubs.uchicago.edu/founders/documents/amendI\\_religions60.html](http://press-pubs.uchicago.edu/founders/documents/amendI_religions60.html).

Ravenscroft, John Stark [1772-1830], *An answer to the statements contained in Professor Mitchell's printed letter, of the 12th February last,...* (Raleigh, NC: Printed by J. Gales & Son, state printers, 1825) 23pp.; 23cm.

Ravenscroft, John Stark, and Elisha Mitchell, *The correspondence published by Professor Mitchell with Bishop Ravenscroft's answer to his letter of the 12th of February last* (Raleigh [N.C.]: Printed by J. Gales & Son, 1825) 24 + 23pp.; 22cm.

Sparks, Jared ["A Unitarian of Baltimore"], *Five letters on atonement, in which the opinions of Trinitarians and Unitarians are examined with reference to their moral tendency* (Baltimore, MD: Published by the Baltimore Unitarian Book Society, Sold by F. Lucas, Jr. & N.G. Maxwell, circa 1793-1849) 93pp.; 19cm. [Sparks is identified as the author of these letters in *The Life and Writings of Jared Sparks*, by Herbert B. Adams (Boston and New York, 1893) 2.601-602. [cf. *LSM* ii.90-92.]

Sparks, Jared, *Second and third letters to the Rev. Samuel Miller, D.D., professor of ecclesiastical history and church government in the theological seminary of the Presbyterian church in the United States, at Princeton: on his charges against Unitarians* (Baltimore: John D. Toy, 1821) 36pp.; 19cm.

- Sparks, Jared ["A Unitarian of Baltimore"], *Sixth and seventh letters to the Rev. Samuel Miller, D.D., professor of ecclesiastical history and church government in the theological seminary of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, at Princeton, on his charges against Unitarians* (Baltimore: John D. Toy, printer, 1821) [3], 4-48pp.; 19cm. [The sixth letter was first published in the Unitarian Miscellany, October, 1821, and the seventh letter appeared first in the December issue, 1821, in response to Miller's Letter to the editor of the *Unitarian Miscellany* ... Baltimore, 1821.]
- Sparks, Jared, *Eighth and ninth letters to the Rev. Samuel Miller, D.D., professor of ecclesiastical history and church government in the Theological seminary of the Presbyterian church in the United States, at Princeton [sic]. On his charges against Unitarians. A Unitarian of Baltimore* (Baltimore: J.D. Toy, Printer, 1822) 20pp.; 18cm. [Contains the eighth letter only, and signed: "A Unitarian of Baltimore?"]
- Sparks, Jared, *Letters to the Rev. Samuel Miller, D.D. on the charges against Unitarians ... (Baltimore: Toy, 1821-1822) 5 volumes in one.* [Ten letters in all, with the third & fourth not contained in this collection; signed by "A Unitarian of Baltimore" & reprinted from the *Unitarian Miscellany*. Tenth letter has title, "On the moral tendency of a belief in the Trinity?"]
- Sparks, Jared, *An Inquiry into the Comparative Moral Tendency of Trinitarian and Unitarian Doctrines; in a Series of Letters to the Rev. Dr. Miller, of Princeton* (Boston: Wells and Lilly, Court-Street, 1823) xvi, 418pp.; 25cm. ["The present work contains a series of letters originally published in The Unitarian Miscellany?"]
- Stuart, Moses, *Letters on the eternal generation of the Son of God, addressed to the Rev. Samuel Miller, D.D.* (Andover, MA: Published and for sale by Mark Newman. Flagg and Gould, printers, 1822) 166pp.; 25 cm. [Cover title: Stuart's letters to Samuel Miller, D.D.]
- Weller, George [1790-1841], *A letter to the members of the Protestant Episcopal church in Nashville, containing a reply to a publication of the Rev. Samuel Miller, D.D., in the American Presbyterian of September 3, 1835, and in some other papers* (Nashville, TN: S. Nye, 1836) 63pp.; 18cm.
- Weller, George, *An appeal to the public generally, and to the religious public especially* (Nashville, W.H. Hunt & Co., Prs., 1835) 16pp.; 21cm. [Attributed to Rev. George Weller, presumably by R.B. Croes in a manuscript note on the title page of his copy.]
- Weller, George, [1790-1841] *Two letters in reply to certain publications of the Rev. Dr. Samuel Miller, by George Weller; Samuel Miller* (Nashville, TN: [W. Hasell Hunt & Co., S. Nye & Co., 1836) 56, 63pp.; 18cm. [The first letter, dated 1835, is to the editors of the *Nashville American Presbyterian* and examines Miller's reasons for "Rejecting Episcopacy"; the second, dated 1836, is an open letter to members of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Nashville, in reply to a publication by Miller.
- Willson, James Renwick [1780-1853], *Dr. Watts, an anti-trinitarian: demonstrated in a review of Dr. Miller's letter to the editor of the Unitarian Miscellany* (Phila.: J. Anderson, 1821) 23pp.; 20cm.
- activity in early nineteenth century America* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Theological Seminary, 1976; Ph.D. dissertation) 440pp; 21cm.
- Nelson, John Oliver., *The Rise of the Princeton Theology—A Genetic Study of American Presbyterianism until 1850* (New Haven, CT: Yale University, 1935; Ph.D. dissertation) 377pp.; 21cm.
- Susskind, Jacob Louis, *A critical edition of the scientific sections of Samuel Miller's A brief retrospect of the eighteenth century* (Location?: George Peabody School of Teachers, 1969; Ph.D. dissertation) vi, 680pp.
- White, David A., *Samuel Miller: a study in Princetonian theology* (Deerfield, IL: Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 1988; Ph.D. dissertation) vi, 105pp.; 28cm.

## ARTICLES—

- Carey, Jonathan Sinclair, "For God or Against Him?: Princeton, Orthodoxy and Transcendentalists," *American Presbyterians*, 64.4 (Winter 1986) 243-258. [see esp. pp. 249-250 on Miller's controversy with Jared Sparks.]
- Chinard, Gilbert, "A Landmark in American Intellectual History: Samuel Miller's *A Brief Retrospect of the Eighteenth Century*," in *The Princeton University Library Chronicle*, 14.2 (Winter 1953) 55-71. [Text of this article is available at [http://libweb5.princeton.edu/visual\\_materials/pulc/pulc\\_v\\_14\\_n\\_2.pdf](http://libweb5.princeton.edu/visual_materials/pulc/pulc_v_14_n_2.pdf).]
- Hart, Darryl G. and John R. Muether, "Lessons from Church History: #2 – Samuel Miller: Discipline on the Frontier," in *Ordained Servant*, 6.2 (April 1997) 40-42. Online at <http://www.opc.org/OS/html/V6/2e.html>.
- Jantz, Harold S., "The Samuel Miller Papers at Princeton," *The Princeton University Library Chronicle*, 4.2/3 (February/April 1943) 68-75. [Available online at [http://libweb5.princeton.edu/visual\\_materials/pulc/pulc\\_v\\_4\\_n\\_2-3.pdf](http://libweb5.princeton.edu/visual_materials/pulc/pulc_v_4_n_2-3.pdf).]
- Lane, Belden C., "Presbyterian Republicanism: Miller and the Eldership as an Answer to Lay-Clerical Tensions," *Journal of Presbyterian History*, 56.4 (Winter 1978) 311-324.
- Mattison, Joel, "Samuel Miller: a unique source for students of the eighteenth century," (S.I.: s.n., ca. 1953) 20pp.; 22cm. [One copy located at Princeton Theological Seminary.]
- Reed, Kevin, "Children: the Hope of the Church—The Relationship of the Church to Her Children in the Writings of Samuel Miller," in *Baptism and Christian Education* (Dallas, TX: Presbyterian Heritage Publications, 1984) 123-135.
- Schorsch, Anita, "Samuel Miller, Renaissance Man: His Legacy of 'True Taste'" *American Presbyterians*, 66.2 (Summer 1988) 71-87.
- Stephens, Bruce M., "Watchman on the Walls of Zion: Samuel Miller and the Christian Ministry," *Journal of Presbyterian History*, 56.4 (Winter 1978) 296-309.
- Susskind, Jacob L., "Samuel Miller's Intellectual History of the Eighteenth Century," *Journal of Presbyterian History*, 49.1 (Spring 1971) 15-31.

## BOOKS—

- Calhoun, David B., *Princeton Seminary—Faith and Learning: 1812-1868* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1994), Chapter 4, "Samuel Miller, pp. 61-74. See also pp. 28, 33-34, 86-87, 97-99, 132, 135-136, 472-73n27, 176-181-183, 241, 285-286, 294, 296-298, 301-302, 336-340, 347-349, 461n48.
- Selden, William K., *Princeton Theological Seminary—A Narrative History: 1812-1992* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992) 17-24, 27-30, 35, 42-45, 48-49, 72, 75, 115, 181. ■

**Samuel Miller**  
**Manuscript Collection**  
**A Finding Aid (Index)**

Archivist: William O. Harris. Compiled by: Douglas F. Denné, Spring, 1992. Revised by: Raymond D. Cannata, March, 1996. Special Collections, Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries. Reproduced with Permission.

This collection consists of a variety of personal papers of Dr. Miller gathered from a number of sources. Among the items in this collection are sermons, course lecture notes, correspondence, bibliography, genealogy, articles, autobiography, and miscellany.

These papers were organized into a manuscript collection of the Princeton Seminary Archives in the spring of 1992. The collection was reorganized and additional materials were added in March of 1996. The collection is currently housed in twenty-seven archival boxes (27 linear feet).

**BOX 1**

- 1:1 Catalogue of Dr. Miller's Library (n.d.).
- 1:2 Catalogue (n.d.).
- 1:3 Catalogue as found at his death (n.d.).
- 1:4 Catalogue of his library, pp. 1-25 (n.d.).
- 1:5 Catalogue of his library, pp. 26-50 (n.d.).
- 1:6 Catalogue of his library, pp. 51-75 (n.d.).
- 1:7 Catalogue of his library, pp. 76-116 (n.d.).
- 1:8 Catalogue of his library, pp. 117-150 (n.d.).
- 1:9 Catalogue of his library, pp. 151-185 (n.d.).
- 1:10 Catalogue of his library, pp. 186-219 (n.d.).
- 1:11 Memorandum book, PTS (begun December, 1833).
- 1:12 Bibliography of published works, pp. 1-25 (n.d.).
- 1:13 Bibliography of published works, pp. 26-60 (n.d.).
- 1:14 Bibliography of published works, pp. 61-90 (n.d.).
- 1:15 Bibliography of published works, pp. 91-120 (n.d.).
- 1:16 Bibliography of published works, pp. 121-158 (n.d.).
- 1:17 Bibliography of published works, pp. 159-204 (n.d.).
- 1:18 MSS of Miller's sermons and lectures (n.d.).
- 1:19 List of articles put into the hands of Dr. McGill (n.d.) 1:20  
List of works ... published by the Presbyterian Board of  
Publication (July 23, 1891).
- 1:21 List of my publications up to 1814.
- 1:22 Autobiography (c. 1843).

**BOX 2**

- 2:1 Introductory lecture (n.d.).
- 2:2 Introductory lecture (November 12, 1814 and with additions June 30, 1815).
- 2:3 Introductory lecture (June 27, 1817).
- 2:4 Introductory lecture (November 13, 1818 and with additions November 10, 1820).
- 2:5 Introductory lecture (November 9, 1821).
- 2:6 Introductory lecture (November 8, 1822).
- 2:7 Introductory lecture (November 11, 1831).

- 2:8 Introductory lecture (June 1835).
- 2:9 Third Introductory lecture on Ecclesiastical History (March 2, 1815).
- 2:10 Practical Results from a Course of Ecclesiastical History (n.d.).
- 2:11 Ecclesiastical History, No. I (n.d.).
- 2:12 Ecclesiastical History, 1-2 Centuries (n.d.).
- 2:13 Ecclesiastical History, No. I 1-2 Centuries (n.d.).
- 2:14 Ecclesiastical History, No. II. 2-3 Centuries (n.d.).
- 2:15 Ecclesiastical History, No. III. 4-5 Centuries (n.d.).
- 2:16 Ecclesiastical History, No. IV. 6-8 Centuries (n.d.).
- 2:17 Ecclesiastical History, No. V. 9-12 Centuries (n.d.).
- 2:18 Ecclesiastical History, No. VI. 13-16 Centuries (n.d.).
- 2:19 Ecclesiastical History, No. VII. 16-18 Centuries (n.d.).
- 2:20 Ecclesiastical History, No. VIII. 18 Centuries (n.d.).  
"Rise, Progress, and Present State of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S."

**BOX 3**

- 3:1 History of the Rise and Progress of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S. (n.d.).
- 3:2 Ecclesiastical History, No. IX 18-19 Centuries (n.d.).
- 3:3 Ecclesiastical History, No. X (n.d.).
- 3:4 Church Government, lecture 1 (January 30, 1815).
- 3:5 Church Government, lecture 2 (February 2, 1815).
- 3:6 Church Government, lecture 4, Infant Members (n.d.).
- 3:7 Church Government, lecture 6 & 7 (February 17, 1815).
- 3:8 Church Government, Presbyterianism, Part I (March 17, 1815).
- 3:9 Church Government, Presbyterian Church Government (March 21, 1815).
- 3:10 Church Government, Ruling Elders (March 23, 1815).
- 3:11 Church Government, Synods and General Assembly (April 3, 1815).
- 3:12 Church Government, Appeals, Complaints (April 10, 1815).
- 3:13 Church Government, New Evidence & Licentiates, Moderators, etc. (April 17, 1815).
- 3:14 Church Government, Infant Members (March 4, 1816).
- 3:15 Church Government, Lecture 8: Episcopal Controversy (March 11, 1816).
- 3:16 Church Government, Episcopal Controversy (March 14, 1816).
- 3:17 Church Government, Episcopal Controversy (March 18, 1816).
- 3:18 Church Government, Episcopal Controversy & Incidental Circumstances (Feb. 14, 1817).
- 3:19 Church Government, Process (March 31, 1817).
- 3:20 Church Government, Episcopal Controversies (March 2, 1818).
- 3:21 Church Government, Church Session & Presbytery (March 19, 1819).
- 3:22 Church Government, Miscellaneous Councils (1829).
- 3:23 Church Government, Lecture III: Adult Members (January 13, 1830).
- 3:24 Church Government, No. I (n.d.).
- 3:25 Church Government, No. II (n.d.).
- 3:26 Church Government, No. III (n.d.).
- 3:27 Church Government, No. IV (n.d.).

**BOX 4**

- 4:1 Church Government, No. I (n.d.).

4:2	Church Government, Lecture I: General Principles (n.d.).	5:7	Century II, No. 3 (n.d.).
4:3	Church Government, Lecture II: Origin of the Virgin Church (n.d.).	5:8	Century III, Seculum Novatianum (January 31, 1814).
4:4	Church Government, Head of the Church, Lecture II (n.d.).	5:9	Century III (February 4, 1814).
4:5	Church Government, Infant Members, Lecture IV (n.d.).	5:10	Century III, Part I (n.d.).
4:6	Church Government, Officers, Lecture V (n.d.).	5:11	Century IV, Seculum Arianum (February 18, 1814).
4:7	Church Government, Officers, Lecture VI (n.d.).	5:12	Century IV, No. II (February 21, 1814).
4:8	Church Government, Infant Members, Lecture 8 (n.d.).	5:13	Century V, No. I (March 7, 1814).
4:9	Church Government, Lecture 9: Diocesan Episcopacy (n.d.).	5:14	Century V, No. II (March 11, 1814).
4:10	Church Government, Lecture 10: Episcopal Controversy (n.d.).	5:15	Century VII (March 21, 1814).
4:11	Church Government, Lecture 11: Episcopal Controversy (n.d.).	5:16	Century IX (April 4, 1814).
4:12	Church Government, Lecture 12: Episcopal Controversy (n.d.).	5:17	Century X (April 11, 1814).
4:13	Church Government, Lecture 14: Independency Cont. (n.d.).	5:18	Century XI, Crusades (n.d.).
4:14	Church Government, Popery (n.d.).	5:19	Century XI, No. II (February 17, 1819).
4:15	Church Government, Conduct in Judicatories (n.d.).	5:20	Century XII (n.d.).
4:16	Church Government, Courts of Appeal & Review, Independency Cont. (n.d.).	5:21	Century XII (n.d.).
4:17	Church Government, Controversy with Independents (n.d.).	5:22	Century XIII, Crusades (1818).
4:18	Church Government, Lectures on Independency (n.d.).	5:23	Century XIII, Part II (n.d.).
4:19	Church Government, Synagogue (n.d.).	5:24	Century XIII (n.d.).
4:20	Church Government, Principles vs. Claims of New School Assembly (n.d.).	5:25	Century XIII (n.d.).
4:21	General: Advantages of Presbyterianism, A Lecture (March 26, 1824).	5:26	Century XIII, Fragment (n.d.).
4:22	The Example of Our Fathers (August 8, 1838).	5:27	Century XV (March 15, 1819).
4:23	The True Church (April 11, 1843).	5:28	Century XV, Council of Constance, No. I (n.d.).
4:24	Lecture on the Disruption in 1837 (n.d.).	5:29	Century XV, Council of Constance, No. II (n.d.).
4:25	Licentiates in the Presbyterian Church (n.d.).	5:30	Century XV, No. II (n.d.).
4:26	What is Ordination? (n.d.).	5:31	Century XVI (November 14, 1814).
4:27	Election of Ruling Elders (n.d.); and Ruling Elders (January 1809).	5:32	Century XVI (April 9, 1818).
4:28	Ruling Elders Cont. (n.d.); and Ordination of Ruling Elders (April 27, 1811).	5:33	Century XVI (n.d.).
4:29	Ruling Elders (n.d.); and Ordination of Ruling Elders (May 17, 1812). C.R.: Letters to the Rev. William M. Engles, D.D. (Philadelphia, 1842).	5:34	Century XVI, Lutheranism (n.d.).
4:30	Theological Papers for a Brief Retrospect. Fragments (n.d.).	5:35	Century XVI, Reformed Church (July 15, 1819).
4:31	Theological Papers for a Brief Retrospect. Robert Hall's Sermon (n.d.).		
4:32	Theological Papers for a Brief Retrospect. Section: Biblical Literature & Theological Science (n.d.).		
4:33	Theological Papers for a Brief Retrospect. German translation of the whole Bible (n.d.).		
4:34	Theological Papers for a Brief Retrospect. Fragment: Volume I, Preface (n.d.).		
4:35	Theological Papers for a Brief Retrospect. Fragment (n.d.).		
4:36	Theological Papers for a Brief Retrospect. Fragment (n.d.).		
	<b>BOX 5 – MOSHEIM'S ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY</b>		
5:1	Century I, No. I (July 2, 1831-June 14, 1834).		
5:2	Century I, No. II (n.d.).		
5:3	Century I, Apostolicum (n.d.).		
5:4	Century II, (n.d.).		
5:5	Century II, No. II (n.d.).		
5:6	Century II, No. 3 (n.d.) Gnosticism.		
			<b>BOX 6 – MOSHEIM'S ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY</b>
		6:1	Century XVI, Vol. 4, Anabaptists (July 21, 1819).
		6:2	Century XVII, Romish Church (August 13, 1818).
		6:3	Century XVII, Lutherans (August 20, 1818).
		6:4	Century XVII, Nonconformists (September 2, 1818).
		6:5	Century XVII, Reformed Church – England (n.d.).
		6:6	Century XVII, Learning and Philosophy (n.d.).
		6:7	Century XVII, (n.d.).
		6:8	Century XVII, Romish Church (n.d.).
		6:9	Century XVII, Edict of Nantes (n.d.).
		6:10	Century XVII, Reformed Church (n.d.).
		6:11	Century XVII, Reformed Church (n.d.).
		6:12	Century XVII, Quakers (n.d.).
		6:13	Century XVII, State of Jews (n.d.).
		6:14	Century XVII, Deists (n.d.).
		6:15	Century XVII, Oriental & Greek Churches (n.d.).
		6:16	History of the Secession in Scotland, the Methodists, (January 13, 1815).
		6:18	Several Sects (n.d.).
		6:19	History of the Nonconformists and the Moravians (n.d.).
		6:20	Reformation (March 20, 1817).
		6:21	Melanchthon and Zwingli (April 8, 1818).
		6:22	Luther (n.d.).
		6:23	Luther (n.d.).
		6:24	Zwingli (n.d.).
		6:25	Sketch of the Present State of Christendom (Dec. 20, 1819).
		6:26	Sandemanians (December 11, 1817).
		6:27	The Present State of the Jews (December 26, 1817).
		6:28	Jews Continued (December 29, 1817).
		6:29	Present State of the Jews (n.d.).
		6:30	Distinguishing Characters of the 18th Century (November 30, 1818).

- 6:31 Episcopal Church in the U.S. and Baptists (December 11, 1818).  
 6:32 Catholic Church (December 18, 1818).  
 6:33 Jesuits (April 16, 1818).

**BOX 7**

- 7:1 Council of Trent (n.d.).  
 7:2 Synod of Dort and Arminianism (September 3, 1823).  
 7:3 Greek Church (December 21, 1818).  
 7:4 Mohammedanism (December 28, 1818).  
 7:5 Rise, Progress and Character of the Puritans (July 15, 1818).  
 7:6 Puritans (n.d.).  
 7:7 Puritans Coming to New England in 1620 (n.d.).  
 7:8 Puritans (n.d.).  
 7:9 Puritans in the 16th Century (n.d.).  
 7:10 John Knox (July 22, 1818).  
 7:11 Rise and Progress of the Church of England (July 23, 1818).  
 7:12 Church of England (n.d.).  
 7:13 Rise and Progress of the Church of England (n.d.).  
 7:14 Assembly of Divines at Westminster (n.d.).  
 7:15 Paganism (January 1, 1819).  
 7:16 Rise, Progress, and Calamities of the French Churches (July 14, 1819).  
 7:17 French Churches (n.d.).  
 7:18 The French Church (n.d.).  
 7:19 French Prophets (n.d.).  
 7:20 Early Piety (n.d.).  
 7:21 Vol. (?) Apociatoris and Ecclesiastical Boards (n.d.).  
 7:22 Ludi Gladiatorii (n.d.).  
 7:23 Fragment: Summary View of the Christian God (n.d.).  
 7:24 Shuckford: Sacrifices, Volume 1 (January 1819).  
 7:25 Shuckford: Pyramids, Volume II (n.d.).  
 7:26 Shuckford: Hail, Volume III (March 1819).  
 7:27 Shuckford: Burial of Moses, etc. (March 21, 1818).  
 7:28 Bishop Warburton's Theory (1828).  
 7:29 Extemporaneous Prayer – Liturgies (n.d.).  
 7:30 History of Public Prayer (n.d.).  
 7:31 History of Public Prayer, continued (n.d.).  
 7:32 Slavery (n.d.).  
 7:33 Prideaux: Dial of Ahaz (March 31, 1818).  
 7:34 Prideaux: Present State of Babylon (April 7, 1818).

**BOX 8**

- 8:1 Chronology: Lecture I (n.d.).  
 8:2 Chronology: Lecture II (n.d.).  
 8:3 Chronology: Lecture III (n.d.).  
 8:4 Chronology: Lecture IV (n.d.).  
 8:5 Chronology: Lecture V (n.d.).  
 8:6 Chronology: Lecture VI (n.d.).  
 8:7 Geography (n.d.).  
 8:8 Geography (n.d.).  
 8:9 History and Geography (July 2, 1831).  
 8:10 Exegesis: De Desumu Christi Ad Infernum (n.d.).  
 8:11 History of English Biblical Translation (February 5, 1816).  
 8:12 English Biblical Translations (February 9, 1816).  
 8:13 Biblical History, No. I (n.d.).  
 8:14 Bible Notes (1844).  
 8:15 Bible Notes continued (1844).  
 8:16 Habakkuk, Chapter III Translation (n.d.).  
 8:17 History and Pedagogy (n.d.).

- 8:18 Fragment: 16 Century, Part II, Chapter I (n.d.).  
 8:19 Fragment: Church Government, No. IV (n.d.).  
 8:20 Fragment: "This is not the Esteem..." (n.d.).  
 8:21 Fragment: "You Might Have it Equally..." (n.d.).  
 8:22 Fragment: "Notes and References for Ruling Elders and Deacons" (n.d.).  
 8:23 Fragment: "The Duties of the Elder" (n.d.).  
 8:24 Edward's (n.d.).  
 8:25 Essay on Youth (n.d.).  
 8:26 History of Sermonizing, Lecture I (n.d.).  
 8:27 The History of Preaching Cont., Lecture II (n.d.).  
 8:28 Preparation for Sermonizing, Lecture III (n.d.).  
 8:29 Choice of Texts, Lecture IV (n.d.).  
 8:30 Delivery of Sermons, Lecture VIII (n.d.).  
 8:31 Composition and Delivery of Sermons, Lecture IX (September 8, 1815).  
 8:32 Composition and Delivery of Sermons: Public Prayer and Sacraments, Lecture X (September 15, 1815).

**BOX 9 – COMPOSITION AND DELIVERY OF SERMONS**

- 9:1 Lecture II (July 12, 1819).  
 9:2 Lecture III (July 16, 1819).  
 9:3 Lecture IV (July 19, 1819).  
 9:4 Lecture V (July 23, 1819).  
 9:5 Lecture VI, Parts of a Discourse (July 30, 1819).  
 9:6 Lecture VII (August 6, 1819).  
 9:7 Lecture VIII (August 13, 1819).  
 9:8 Lecture IX (August 19, 1819).  
 9:9 Lecture X (August 26, 1819).  
 9:10 Lecture XIV (September 10, 1819).  
 9:11 Lecture (September 10, 1819).  
 9:12 Lecture (September 8, 1820).  
 9:13 Lecture (August 6, 1824).  
 9:14 Mark 16:15, The Gospel Preached, No. 13 (May 1792).  
 9:15 Matthew 25:10, The Door Shut, No. 15 (June 1792).  
 9:16 Matthew 16:26, The Excellent & Precious Nature of the Human Soul, No. 16 (April 1792).  
 9:17 Luke 27:5, Prayer for the Increase of Faith, No. 20 (July 1792).  
 9:18 James 2:18, Faith Shewn by Works, No. 22 (October 1792).  
 9:19 II Peter 3:2, The Approaching Dissolution of All Things Urged as a Motive to Godliness, No. 28 (December 1792).  
 9:20 Philippians 4:11, Contentment, No. 116 (March 1795).  
 9:21 Proverbs 4:23, The Government of the Heart, No. 124 (August 1795).  
 9:22 Psalm 5:11, Trusting in God, No. 131 (October 1795).  
 9:23 Job 29:12-13, Charity Sermon, No. 141 (December 1795).  
 9:24 Job 14:14, Waiting for our Great Change, No. 151 (June 1796).  
 9:25 II Peter 3:16, The Mysteries of Revelation, No. 155 (August 1796).  
 9:26 Proverbs 1:10, Cautions against the Enticements of Sinners, No. 172 (February 1797).  
 9:27 Acts 9:4, Why Persecutest thou Me?, No. 189 (Aug. 1797).  
 9:28 Matthew 5:43, 44, Saving our Enemies, Explained and Urged, No. 201 (November 1797).  
 9:29 I Samuel 13:14, The Character of David, No. 212 (February 1789).  
 9:30 Prov. 14:34, Sin is a Reproach to any People (Aug. 1798).

**BOX 10**

- 10:1 John 8:34, The Servitude of sin, No. 235 (December 1798)
- 10:2 Matthew 3:7, The Wrath to Come, No. 238 (Jan. 1799).
- 10:3 Proverbs 7:7, The Sin, Folly, and Misery of Unlawful Pleasures, No. 244 (March 1799).
- 10:4 Proverbs 4:18, The Path of the Just Compared to the Shining Light, No. 247 (May 1799).
- 10:5 Luke 22:62, The History and Character of Peter the Apostle, No. 252 (December 1799).
- 10:6 Matthew 27:5, The Confession and of Judas Iscariot, No. 255 (February 1800).
- 10:7 Proverbs 1:2, The Evil and Danger of Bad Company, No. 267 (June 1800).
- 10:8 I John 5:4, He that is Born of God, Overcometh the World, No. 284 (March 1801).
- 10:9 Numbers 23:10, The Character and the Death of the Righteous, No. 294 (January 1802).
- 10:10 Psalm 42:11, Consolation for the Afflicted, No. 299 (March 1802).
- 10:11 Hosea 13:9, Sinners Their own Destroyers, No. 308 (September 1802).
- 10:12 Acts 12:21-23, The Character and End of Herod Agrippa, No. 315 (December 1802).
- 10:13 II Chronicles 32:25, Hezekiah's Ingratitude, No. 317 (December 1802).
- 10:14 Mark 10:13-14 and Matthew 18:10, The Importance of Children, No. 319 (February 1803).
- 10:15 Galatians 6:14, The Cross of Christ, the Christian's Glory, No. 320 (March 1803).
- 10:16 II Timothy 4:10, The Character and Apostasy of Demas, No. 321 (March 1803).
- 10:17 II Timothy 4:10, The Character and Apostasy of Demas, No. 321 (March 1803).
- 10:18 Philippians 3:18, Enmity to the Cross of Christ, No. 330 (July 1803).
- 10:19 Isaiah 52:7, The Excellency and Desirableness of the Ministerial Office, No. 331 (August 1803).
- 10:20 Philippians 2:5, The Example of Christ, No. 337 (December 1803)
- 10:21 Luke 23:42-43, The Penitent Thief, No. 342 (Jan. 1804).
- 10:22 Luke 23:42-43, The Penitent Thief, No. 342 (Jan. 1804).

**BOX 11**

- 11:1 II Peter 1:1, Precious Faith, No. 345 (April 1804).
- 11:2 II Peter 1:1, Precious Faith, No. 345 (April 1804).
- 11:3 Psalms 8:3-4, The Wonderful Condescension of God, No. 349 (May 1804).
- 11:4 Psalms 8:3-4, The Wonderful Condescension of God, No. 349 (May 1804).
- 11:5 James 4:11, Evil Speaking, No. 351 (May 1804).
- 11:6 Exodus 20:8, The Sanctification of the Sabbath, No. 354 (August 1804).
- 11:7 II Corinthians 11:3, Departing from the Simplicity that is in Christ, No. 362 (November 1804).
- 11:8 Acts 16:29-31, The Great Question Answered, No. 363 (November 1804).
- 11:9 Genesis 5:7, The Longevity of the Patriarchs, No. 367 (December 1804).
- 11:10 Isaiah 42:16, God's Dealings with His People, No. 369 (January 1805).
- 11:11 II Kings 5:13, The Healing of Naaman, No. 370 (February 1805).

- 11:12 Genesis 3:24, Adam Expelled from Eden, No. 376 (April 1805).
- 11:13 Genesis 3:24, Adam Expelled from Eden, NO. 376 (April 1805).
- 11:14 Acts 7:55, The Death of Stephen, No. 344 (May 1805).
- 11:15 II Peter 1:11, Admittance into the Kingdom of Christ, No. 378 (July 1805).
- 11:16 Job 1:21, The Submission of Job, No. 379 (November 1805).
- 11:17 Matthew 24:44, Preparation for Death, No. 380 (November 1805).
- 11:18 Matthew 11:30, The Yoke of Christ, No. 381 (November 1805).
- 11:19 I Peter 4:7, The End of All Things Considered and Improved, No. 383 (December 1805).
- 11:20 Luke 13:8, The Importance of a Year, No. 384 (January 1806).
- 11:21 Genesis 13:10-13, The History of Lot, No. ? (January 1806).
- 11:22 Psalm 149:2, The Children of Zion Rejoicing in Their King, No. 389 (February 1806).
- 11:23 II Chronicles 33:12, Manasseh, No. 394 (July 1806).
- 11:24 Genesis 4:4-5, Cain and Abel, No. 395 (August 1806).
- 11:25 Mark 16:19, The Ascension of Christ, No. 396 (September 1806).

**BOX 12**

- 12:1 Psalm 90:10, The Shortness of Life, No. 397 (November 1806).
- 12:2 Revelations 7:9 and Hebrews 12:22, The Blessed Society of Heaven, No. 403 (December 1806).
- 12:3 Luke 16:15, Our Obligations to God, No. 405 (December 1806).
- 12:4 Matthew 6:9, After this Manner Pray Ye, No. 407 (January 1807).
- 12:5 Matthew 6:9, Preface to the Lord's Prayer, No. 408 (February 1807).
- 12:6 Matthew 6:10, Thy Kingdom Come, No. 411 (March 1807).
- 12:7 Matthew 6:11, Give Us This Day Our Daily Bread, NO. 412 (March 1807).
- 12:8 Philippians 3:8, The Excellency of the Knowledge of Christ, No. 415 (May 1807). Note: Preached May 21, 1807 at the opening of the General Assembly.
- 12:9 Psalm 84:12, Trust in God, No. 416 (August 1807).
- 12:10 Hebrews 6:17-18, The Security and Strong Consolation of God's People, No. 417 (September 1807).
- 12:11 Psalm 25:14, The Secret of the Lord with them that Fear Him, No. 419 (September 1807).
- 12:12 James 4:3, Ye Ask and Receive Not, Because Ye Ask Amiss, No. 420 (October 1807).
- 12:13 Acts 2:4, The Day of Pentecost, No. 421 (October 1807).
- 12:14 Acts 2:4, The day of Pentecost, No. 421 (November 1807).
- 12:15 Matthew 18:10, The Importance of Children, No. 422 (November 1807).
- 12:16 Philippians 4:7, The Peace of God which Passeth All Understanding, No. 423 (November 1807).
- 12:17 Matthew 12:49-50, The Brethren and Sisters of our Lord, No. 425 (December 1807).
- 12:18 Luke 10:38-42, Martha and Mary, No. 426 (Dec. 1807).
- 12:19 John 14:2-3, Christ's Valedictory Address to His Disciples, No. 430 (January 1808).

12:20 III John 2, Symptoms of Spiritual Prosperity, No. 432 (July 1808).  
 12:21 Isaiah 43:25, The Pardoning God, No. 434 (February 1808).

**BOX 13**

13:1 Hebrews 13:8, The Unchangeableness of Christ, No. 437 (March 1808).  
 13:2 Matthew 9:2, Son, Be of Good Cheer, Thy Sins are Forgiven Thee, No. 439 (March 1808).  
 13:3 Proverbs 28:14, Hardness of the Heart, No. 440 (April 1808).  
 13:4 Ephesians 5:16 and Colossians 4:5, Redeeming the Time, No. 441 (April 1808).  
 13:5 Job 24:5, Justification, No. 445 (May 1808).  
 13:6 Jeremiah 2:19, The Evil of Sin Considered and Improved, No. 446 (June 1808).  
 13:7 Isaiah 55:8-9 and Romans 11:33, God's Ways Above Ours, No. 452 (August 1808).  
 13:8 Hebrews 7:25, The Intercession of Christ, No. 453 (September 1808).  
 13:9 Fragment form, No. 457 (1808).  
 13:10 Romans 8:33-34, Paul's Confidence, No. 458 (October 1808).  
 13:11 John 20:28, The Confession of Thomas, No. 464 (December 1808).  
 13:12 Colossians 4:5, Redeeming the Time, No. 468 (January 1, 1809).  
 13:13 Luke 11:21-22, The Strong Man Armed, No. 470 (January 1809).  
 13:14 Matthew 13:44, The Treasure Hid in a Field, No. 471 (February 1809).  
 13:15 Luke 24:29, The Presence of Christ with His Disciples, No. 457 (March 1809).  
 13:16 Luke 19:41-42, Christ Weeping over Jerusalem, No. 477 (March 1809).  
 13:17 I Corinthians 6:17, The Reality, Nature, Effects, Etc. of Union to Christ, No. 479 (April 1809).  
 13:18 Proverbs 27:19, The Hearts of All Men Alike, No. 480 (May 1809).  
 13:19 II Corinthians 8:9, The Grace of Jesus, No. 481 (May 1809).  
 13:20 Exodus 12:26, The Nature and Design of the Lord's Supper, No. 485 (June 1809).  
 13:21 Luke 19:9, The Conversion of Zaccheus, No. 487 (June 1809).

**BOX 14**

14:1 Matthew 5:6, Hungering and Thirsting after Righteousness, No. 488 (July 1809).  
 14:2 Hebrews 4:1, Fear Lest We Enter Not into Rest, No. 489 (July 1809).  
 14:3 John 14:18, The Disciples of Christ not left Comfortless, No. 491 (August 1809).  
 14:4 II Corinthians 8:9, Ye Know the Grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ, No. 493 (September 1809).  
 14:5 John 11:35, Jesus Wept, No. 495 (September 1809).  
 14:6 Genesis 47:8, How Old Art Thou? No. 506 (December 1809).  
 14:7 Hebrews 6:19, Hope the Anchor of the Soul (March 1810).  
 14:8 I Kings 18-21, Halting between Two Opinions, No. 457 (September 1810).

14:9 Psalm 140:6, The Christian's Relation to God, No. 528 (May 1810).  
 14:10 I Corinthians 14:15, The Character of Acceptable Prayer, No. 534 (July 1810).  
 14:11 Luke 13:14, The Strait Gate, No. 536 (July 1810).  
 14:12 II Chronicles 32:31, The Character of Hezekiah, No. 538 (July 1810).  
 14:13 Psalm 17:15, Awakening in the Likeness of Christ, No. 539 (August 1810).  
 14:14 Acts 13:36, Serving our Generation, No. 540 (Aug. 1810).  
 14:15 John 19:30, The Death of Christ, No. 544 (September 1810).  
 14:16 Acts 16:33, The Conversion of the Jailor, No. 545 (September 1810).  
 14:17 John 14:2, Our Father's House, No. 546 (September 1810).  
 14:18 Acts 10:1-2, The History and Character of Cornelius, No. 552 (November 1810).  
 14:19 II Corinthians 6:17-18, Coming out from the World, No. 555 (November 1810).  
 14:20 II Corinthians 6:17-18, Coming out and Separating Ourselves from the World, No. 555 (November 1810).  
 14:21 Mark 15:34, Christ Mourning the Hiding of his Father's Face, No. 556 (December 1810).  
 14:22 Matthew 25:28, The Joys of Heaven, No. 557 (December 1810).  
 14:23 Matthew 6:33, Seeking the Kingdom of God and his Righteousness First, No. 558 (December 1810).

**BOX 15**

15:1 James 2:19, Christian Faith Distinguished from the Faith of Devils, No. 559 (December 1810).  
 15:2 I Corinthians 7:29, Time is Short, No. 560 (December 1810).  
 15:3 Luke 13:6-9, The Barren Fig Tree, No. 561 (January 1811).  
 15:4 Luke 13:6-9, The Barren Fig Tree, No. 561 (January 1811).  
 15:5 Luke 12:40, Preparation for Death (1811).  
 15:6 Hebrews 11:24-26, Moses' Choice, No. 574 (March 1811).  
 15:7 Psalm 130:3, If God Mark Iniquities, No Man can Stand, No. 577 (April 1811).  
 15:8 Philippians 2:21, The Nature and excellence of Public Spirit, No. 591 (May 20, 1811). Note: Preached before the General Assembly.  
 15:9 Jeremiah 23:6, The Lord our Righteousness (May 1811).  
 15:10 John 13:7, The Mystery of Providence, No. 589 (July 1811).  
 15:11 Isaiah 53:1, The Gospel Report and Man's Neglect of It (September 1811).  
 15:12 I John 3:16, The Nature and Design of the Death of Christ, No. 594 (September 1811).  
 15:13 Genesis 48:15-16, Jacob Blessing his Grandchildren, No. 598 (September 1811).  
 15:14 John 15:22, The Guilt of Rejecting the Light of the Gospel, No. 600 (October 1811).  
 15:15 Luke 12:40, Readiness for Death, No. 603 (October 1811).  
 15:16 Ecclesiastes 7:16, Be Not Righteous Overmuch, No. 606 (November 1811).  
 15:17 Genesis 5:24, The Character of Enoch, No. 609 (November 1811).  
 15:18 Song of Solomon 2:4, The Banqueting-House, No. 613 (December 1811).  
 15:19 Acts 7:51, Resisting the Holy Ghost, No. 614 (December 1811).  
 15:20 Luke 24:47, Beginning at Jerusalem, No. 632 (July 1812).

- 15:21 Revelation 7:14, The Robes of the Redeemed, No. 645 (September 1812).
- 15:22 Matthew 5:16, Letting our Light Shine before Men, No. 646 (October 1812).
- 15:23 Isaiah 4:5, The Defense and Glory of Zion, No. 647 (October 1812).
- BOX 16**
- 16:1 Genesis 25:31-34, Esau Selling his Birthright, No. 649 (October 1812).
- 16:2 Matthew 13:45-46, The Pearl of Great Price, No. 650 (November 1812).
- 16:3 Psalms 90:16-17, Concern for God's Cause, No. 653 (December 1812).
- 16:4 II Corinthians 13-14, The Apostolical Benediction, No. 655 (January 1813).
- 16:5 Genesis 13, Abraham's Trials and Temper, No. 660 (February 1813).
- 16:6 Jeremiah 6:16, The Good Old Way, No. 662 (Feb. 1813).
- 16:7 Mark 10:21, The Young Man whom Jesus Loved, No. 668 (April 1813).
- 16:8 John 17:24, The Prevailing Intercessor (May 1813).
- 16:9 I Corinthians 15:51-55, Renunciation (Preached once before 1814).
- 16:10 Acts 10:38, Doing Good (August 1815).
- 16:11 Mark 10:15, Receiving the Kingdom of God as a Little Child (July 20, 1817).
- 16:12 Colossians 1:12, Meekness for the Inheritance of the Saints in Light (September 21, 1817).
- 16:13 John 18:11, Christ Consenting to Drink the Cup Given to Him (September 1817).
- 16:14 II Corinthians 7:1, Believers, under the Influence of the Promises (October 1817).
- 16:15 Titus 2:6, Youth Exhorted to be Sober-Minded (February 1818).
- 16:16 Romans 14:7-8, The Duty of Not Living to Ourselves (February 5, 1818).
- 16:17 Philippians 2:21, Public Spirit (February 6, 1818).
- 16:18 Acts 2:37, Men and Brethren, What Shall we Do? (March 22, 1818).
- 16:19 II Timothy 1:12, Christian Assurance (April 12, 1818).
- 16:20 Romans 8:7, The Carnal Mind's Enmity Against God (August 1818).
- 16:21 Acts 11:26, The Import of the Christian Name (December 14, 1818).
- 16:22 Proverbs 14:9, Fools Make a Mock at Sin (June 1819).
- 16:23 Isaiah 45:22, Looking to Christ and Being Saved (November 1819).
- BOX 17**
- 17:1 II Thessalonians 3:1, That the Word of God may have Free Course and be Glorified (December 7, 1819).
- 17:2 John 6:53, Eating the Flesh of Christ and Drinking His Blood (December 20, 1819).
- 17:3 James 2:23, Friendship to God (November 19, 1820).
- 17:4 II Corinthians 4:7, The Gospel Treasure Committed to Earthen Vessels, No. 567 (October 19, 1819) Note: Preached at the opening of the Synod of New York.
- 17:5 Lamentations 3:24, The Lord is my Portion (1823).
- 17:6 Ephesians 2:19, Christians are fellow citizens with the Saints (May 3, 1823).
- 17:7 II Corinthians 12:1-4, Paul's Rapture (December 4, 1823).
- 17:8 Jeremiah 17:9, The Heart is Deceitful above all Things (December 7, 1823).
- 17:9 Psalms 119:18, Wonderful Things in the Bible (January 18, 1824).
- 17:10 Hebrews 12:16-17, Esau Selling his Birthright (February 1, 1824).
- 17:11 Acts 8:18-24, Simon Magus (March 7, 1824).
- 17:12 Zechariah 9:12, Prisoners of Hope Turning to the Stronghold (April 18, 1824).
- 17:13 II Samuel 18:9-18, The Character and Death of Absalom (August 8, 1824).
- 17:14 Isaiah 60:1, Arise, Shine, for thy Light has Come (December 26, 1824).
- 17:15 Jeremiah 50:5, Asking the Way to Zion (January 16, 1825).
- 17:16 Luke 24:32, The disciples going to Emmaus (Apr. 3, 1825).
- 17:17 John 17:17, Sanctification by the Truth (September 18, 1825).
- 17:18 Psalms 36:2, The Vain Self Flatteries of a Sinner (November 27, 1825).
- 17:19 Luke 2:15-20, The Shepherds Going to Bethlehem (December 25, 1825).
- 17:20 Daniel 9:3, The Duty, Advantages and Method of Religious Fasting (December 2, 1825).
- 17:21 Matthew 11:22, Come Unto Me All Ye that Labor, (April 1, 1827) Note: Question of authorship. It appears to be Dr. A. Alexander's penmanship.
- 17:22 Deuteronomy 14:2, God's Peculiar People (November 8, 1827).
- 17:23 Romans 12:5, Christians One Body in Christ (December 23, 1827).
- 17:24 I Kings 3:5-14, The Choice and Prayer of Solomon (March 1, 1829).
- 17:25 Lord's Supper, Preached at the General Assembly (May 23, 1830).
- 17:26 Ecclesiastes 7:2, The House of Mourning and the House of Feasting (August 12, 1832).
- 17:27 Lord's Supper (January 6, 1833).
- 17:28 Daniel 6:10 (March 17, 1833).
- 17:29 Lord's Supper, preached at the General Assembly (March 26, 1833).
- 17:30 Psalms 100:4, Thanksgiving Sermon (December 10, 1833).
- BOX 18**
- 18:1 I Timothy 1:11, The Glory of the Gospel (Oct. 3, 1834).
- 18:2 Ephesians 2:1, It is the Spirit that Quickeneth (January 24, 1836).
- 18:3 Job 1:4-5, Day of Prayer for Colleges (February 22, 1838).
- 18:4 Proverbs 7:6-7, And Beheld Among the Simple Ones (October 28, 1838).
- 18:5 Psalms 77:10, I Will Remember the Years (December 1, 1839).
- 18:6 Zechariah 8, Psalms 90, Visitation of the Princeton Church (November 16, 1841).
- 18:7 John 16:8, The Work of the Holy Spirit (December 1843).
- 18:8 John 14:22, Christ Manifesting Himself to his People (March 3, 1844).
- 18:9 John 18:36-37, The Kingly Office of Christ (April 14, 1844).
- 18:10 Ephesians 2:8, The Reign of Grace (November 15, 1846).
- 18:11 Numbers 12:1-16, And Miriam and Aaron Spoke against Moses (April 18, 1847).
- 18:12 I Peter 2:22, Who Did No Sin (n.d.).

18:13 II Kings 2:13, My Father, My Father! (n.d.).

18:14 John 14:2, In My Father's House Are Many Mansions (nd.).

18:15 Deuteronomy 6:6-7, And These Words, Which I Command Thee This Day (n.d.).

18:16 Ezekiel 20:21, Notwithstanding, the Children Rebelled Against Me (n.d.).

18:17 Matthew 27:3-5, Such was the Miserable End of Judas (n.d.).

18:18 Luke 14:33, and the Lord Said unto the Servant (n.d.).

18:19 I Timothy 3:1, This is a True Saying (n.d.).

18:20 Psalms 44:1, We have heard with our Ears (n.d.).

18:21 Romans 10:14-15, How Shall they Believe in Him (n.d.).

18:22 Matthew 6:24, Man is an Active Being (n.d.).

18:23 I Samuel 16:7, The Lord Seeth Not as Man Seeth (n.d.).

18:24 Philippians 1:21, For Me to Die is Gain (n.d.).

18:25 Luke 23:34, Then Said Jesus Father, Forgive Them (n.d.).

18:26 Acts 14:23, And When they had Ordained Them (n.d.).

18:27 Sermon fragments.

**BOX 19**

19:1 Exhortation to the people, at the installation of the Rev. M. L. Perrine as pastor of the Spring Street Church (October 31, 1811).

19:2 Introductory remarks and charge at the installation of the Rev. Samuel B. How (December 17, 1816), the Rev. Symmes C. Heny (August 9, 1820), and the Rev. Ravaud K. Rodgers (May 5, 1830).

19:3 Charge at the installation of J. W. Woodhull (June 5, 1820).

19:4 Introductory remarks at the ordination of John Maclean (February 5, 1828) and Mr. Hunting (June 10, 1829).

19:5 Charge at the ordination of B. Pinney and Joseph W. Barr (October 12, 1832), Will H. McAuley (March 25, 1840), and Mr. Canfield (October 7, 1840).

19:6 Installation of Dr. Benjamin H. Rice, pastor of Princeton Church (August 15, 1833).

19:7 Ordination exhortation for the Rev. James McOwn in Dr. Cuyler's church (April 24, 1835).

19:8 Charge to Mr. Shenck (1848).

19:9 Letter to R. and D. B. on the impressions of the late Dr. Nevins (n.d.).

19:10 Epitaph of Samuel Stanhope Smith, President of the College of New Jersey (August 21, 1819)

19:11 Letter to Samuel Stanhope Smith's daughter, Mrs. Pintard (May 1, 1820).

19:12 Epitaph of Robert Finley, President of the University of Georgia (1772-1817).

19:13 Epitaph of Andre Kirkpatrick, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of New Jersey (1757-1831).

19:14 Epitaph of James Sheafe, Senator (1755-1829).

19:15 Inaugural Address (1813).

19:16 Lecture 12: Valedictory lecture to the Senior Class (September 22, 1815).

19:17 Lecture 12: Valedictory lecture to the Senior Class (May 15, 1823-May 3, 1844).

19:18 Valedictory lecture to the Senior Class (n.d.).

19:19 Copy of a letter in Latin to the Trustees of the College of New Jersey (1815).

19:20 Copy of Honorary Degree of LL.D. given to Joseph McKean by the College of New Jersey (1818).

19:21 Copy of Honorary Degree of LL.D. given by the College of New Jersey (n.d.).

19:22 The following latin address was delivered, as a charge, to the Rev. Dr. James Carnahan at his inauguration as President of the College of New Jersey (August 1823) 3 copies Vir Plurimum Venerande Specatissime.

19:23 Address on Temperance (1831).

19:24 Address to the Board of Foreign Missions (May 6, 1844).

19:25 Address to the Board of Princeton Theological Seminary (May 12, 1845).

19:26 A calm and respectful address to the friends and advocates of horse-racing (n.d.).

19:27 Address on Dancing published in the New Jersey Patriot (1809).

19:28 Committee plan for conducting Presbyterian meetings (n.d.).

19:29 Committee report for the Synod on Christian Education (n.d.).

19:30 Lists of Letters (August 3, 1798-September 29, 1845).

19:31 Letter from Evan Johns (May 23, 1804).

19:32 Letter to Ashbel Green (May 13, 1805).

19:33 Letter to Ashbel Green (January 16, 1810).

19:34 Letter to Ashbel Green (January 23, 1810).

19:35 Extracts from letters to and from Samuel Miller by Phillip Milledoler, former Vice President of the Board of Directors (1805-1831).

19:36 Letter to either William Phillips or John Phillips appealing for funds to establish Princeton Theological Seminary (1811).

19:37 Six letters concerning contemporary issues (c. 1812).

19:38 Letter from Jones Platt offering S. Miller the Presidency of Hamilton College (July 23, 1812).

19:39 Letter to the Joint Meeting of the Officers of the Wall Street Church (June 24, 1813).

19:40 Letter to the Rev. David Benedict (June 16, 1823).

19:41 Letter to Allen Brown (April 1843).

19:42 Letter to Jonathon Freeman (February 7, 1820).

19:43 Seven letters to Thomas Smythe (1838-1840) [photocopies of transcripts.]

**BOX 20**

20:1 Address to monthly prayer meeting (March 6, 1826).

20:2 Letter and extract concerning Thomas Jefferson (June 10, 1830).

20:3 Resolution proposed at New Haven and rejected (1831).

20:4 Letter to Asahel Nettleton (August 18, 1835).

20:5 Letter to the Rev. Mr. Vermilye (March 31, 1836).

20:6 Letter to Judge Nisbet (April 4, 1838).

20:7 Memoir of Rev. Nisbet (1840).

20:8 Letter to a friend "in need" with a note of explanation (April 1840).

20:9 Letter to a friend "in need" (May 1840).

20:10 Letter to a friend "in need" (April 5, 1841).

20:11 Letters to a student in college (n.d.).

20:12 Letter to the Rev. John McDowell (August 17, 1841).

20:13 Letter to the Rev. William M. Engles, Editor of The Presbyterian (January 1, 1842).

20:14 " " (January 10, 1842).

20:15 " " (January 24, 1842).

20:16 " " (May 7, 1842).

20:17 " " (May 16, 1842).

20:18 " " (March 3, 1847 "Ruling Elders."

20:19 " " (n.d.).

20:20 Letter from George Burder (June 4, 1815).

20:21 Letter from Dr. B.W. Wisner (January 19, 1833).

- 20:22 Letter from John Lorimer (December 13, 1841).  
 20:23 Letter from Samuel Murray (December 24, 1841)  
 20:24 Letter from Samuel Murray (December 24, 1841).  
 20:24 Letter from the Rev. A. Bankin (November 4, 1842).  
 20:25 Letter from Ashbel Green on the “Elder” question (February 4, 1843).  
 20:26 Letter from Hopkins & Jennings on publication of Blair’s sermons (February 21, 1843).  
 20:27 Letter from Thomas Smyth (April 8, 1843).  
 20:28 Letter from Luke Lyons (August 24, 1843).  
 20:29 Letter from the Rev. Dr. Darrack (August 29, 1843).  
 20:30 Letter from William G. Allen (September 2, 1843)  
 20:31 Letter from John D. Watthewy (September 22, 1843).  
 20:32 Letter from George Bourne (March 12, 1844).  
 20:33 Letter from George Bourne (March 28, 1844).  
 20:34 Letter from J. C. Lowrie (May 8, 1844).  
 20:35 Letter from J. J. Janeway (June 12, 1844).  
 20:36 Letter to John Miller (August 22, 1844).  
 20:37 Letter to John Miller (February 2, 1846).  
 20:38 Letter to John Miller (March 8, 1847).  
 20:39 Letter to John Miller (May 24, 1847).  
 20:40 Letter from Griffith & Simon (February 6, 1845).  
 20:41 Letter from D. V. McLean (May 13, 1845).  
 20:42 Letter from William E. DuBois (September 8, 1845).  
 20:43 Letter to William M. Engles, Editor of The Presbyterian (November 30, 1846)  
 20:44 Letter to Angelina Burdett (October 29, 1847).  
 20:45 Letter to the Board of Directors of Princeton Seminary (November 3, 1847).  
 20:46 Letter from J. V. Moore (November 15, 1849).  
 20:47 Letter to Dr. Henry A. Boardman (February 28, 1849).  
 20:48 Letter to Thomas P. Deuereun (July 12, 1849).  
 20:49 Letter on the Care of Children dictated to John Miller (November 20, 1849).  
 20:50 Letter concerning the Literary and Philosophical Society of New Jersey (n.d.).  
 20:51 Letter to the citizens of New York (n.d.).  
 20:52 Fragment of a letter by Miller (n.d.).  
 20:53 Letter from Ms. B. C. Kennedy and Miller’s reply (n.d.).  
 20:54 Ms. Mary Miller, daughter of Dr. Miller, describing his help in founding Princeton Seminary (n.d.).  
 20:55 Letter from Dr. Carnahan to A. T. McGill concerning the life of S. Miller (n.d.).  
 20:56 A tribute to the life of S. Miller by the Rev. John Plotts (n.d.).  
 20:57 Extract from Dr. Sprague’s sermon on the death of S. Miller (n.d.).  
 20:58 Newspaper article: The New York Evening Post (Friday, February 25, 1803) on T. Jefferson and Deism.  
 20:59 Fragment: Cover from the “Familiar Letters” of President Dickinson (January 18, 1826).  
 20:60 Newspaper Article: Commercial Advertiser (Thursday, December 29, 1825) Remarks on Christmas.
- 21:3 American Presbyterian (September 3, 1835) Episcopal Controversy.  
 21:4 American Presbyterian (March 1, 1833) Present Crisis of Presbyterian Church and New York Observer (January 1, 1836) Wine and Drink.  
 21:5 American Presbyterian (April 14, 1836) on Luther Halsey.  
 21:6 The Episcopal Recorder (January 14, 1837) on Christmas.  
 21:7 Southern Religious Telegraph (September 29, 1837) Episcopal Controversy.  
 21:8 Southern Churchman (December 1, 1837) on Dr. Miller’s opinions of Ignatius.  
 21:9 Southern Churchman (December 23, 1837) on Dr. Miller’s opinions of Ignatius.  
 21:10 The Presbyterian (Feb. 9, 1839) Micæ Ecclesiastical, v 1-3.  
 21:11 Southern Churchman (Jan. 17, 1840) on Confirmation.  
 21:12 Southern Churchman (Feb. 14, 1840) on Confirmation.  
 21:13 The Presbyterian (February 14, 1840).  
 21:14 The Lincoln Republican (November 10, 1841) On Calvin, concerning Bishop Ives.  
 21:15 The Banner of the Cross (December 11, 1841) on Calvin, concerning Bishop Ives.  
 21:16 The Presbyterian (December 18, 1841) on Calvin, concerning Bishop Ives.  
 21:17 The Episcopal Recorder (December 24, 1841) on attack concerning Scott’s “Force of Truth.”  
 21:18 The Presbyterian (Dec. 25, 1841) on Calvin & Episcopacy.  
 21:19 The Presbyterian (Jan. 1, 1842) on Calvin & Episcopacy.  
 21:20 The Episcopal Recorder (January 8, 1842) on Scott’s “Force of Truth.”  
 21:21 The Presbyterian (January 15, 1842) on another perversion exposed.  
 21:22 The Presbyterian (February 5, 1842) on Calvin vindicated.  
 21:23 The Presbyterian (February 12, 1842) on Calvin vindicated, No. II.  
 21:24 Watchman of the South (Dec. 8, 1842) on Confirmation.  
 21:25 South Kentuckian (August 25, 1843) on Confirmation.  
 21:26 South Kentuckian (October 27, 1843) on Confirmation.  
 21:27 The New-York Observer (March 18, 1852) My first Sabbath in New York.  
 21:28 Princeton Press (June 1891) Liberia as a Christian mission.

**BOX 22**

**BOX 21 – NEWSPAPER ARTICLES**

- 21:1 The Southern Churchman (April 17, 1835) Episcopal Controversy.  
 21:2 The Southern Churchman (June 5, 1835) Episcopal Controversy.  
 22:1 Controversy between S. Miller and the Rev. Dr. McKnight: Dr. Miller’s survey of papers on the subject.  
 22:2 Controversy between S. Miller and the Rev. Dr. McKnight: My defense before the Board of Referees, on the charges of Dr. McKnight. (n.d.).  
 22:3 Controversy between S. Miller and the Rev. Dr. McKnight: History of Separation of churches in NY (n.d.).  
 22:4 Controversy between S. Miller and the Rev. Dr. McKnight: Letter to the elders, deacons and trustees of the First Presbyterian Church, at a joint meeting, to be held on the 15th (February 14, 1809).  
 22:5 Controversy between S. Miller and the Rev. Dr. McKnight: Letter to the elders, deacons, and trustees of the First Presbyterian Church, at a joint meeting, to be held on the 15th (February 14, 1809).  
 22:6 Controversy between S. Miller and the Rev. Dr. McKnight: Terms of agreement and acquittal of Miller (June 2, 1809).

<p>22:7 Controversy between S. Miller and the Rev. Dr. McKnight: S. Miller's note of appreciation for Dr. Rodgers' assistance in the matter of settlement (November 30, 1847).</p> <p>22:8 S. Miller on Dr. Rodgers (n.d.).</p> <p>22:9 PTS Controversy (1820): Miller-Wilson-Nicholson R. Morgan affair. Names are censored.</p> <p>22:10 Memoranda of foreign travel by Robert J. Breckinridge (1839).</p> <p>22:11 Receipt for \$250. (November 1, 1849) and memoranda forbidding the publication of S. Miller's sermons (n.d.).</p> <p>22:12 Fragment: Dr. Miller's periodicals and 2nd century (n.d.).</p> <p>22:13 Notes on Prideaux's connection by John Finley Crowe (July 5, 1814).</p> <p>22:14 Notes on Biblical history, No. II, by John Finley Crowe (September 16, 1814).</p> <p>22:15 Notes on Biblical history, No. II, by John Finley Crowe (September 16, 1814) Continued.</p> <p>22:16 Notes on chronology by John Finley Crowe (April 6, 1815) Part I. Notes on Ecclesiastical history by John Finley Crowe (June 30, 1815) Part II.</p> <p>22:17 Notes on chronology by John Finley Crowe (April 6, 1815) Part I. Notes on Ecclesiastical history by John Finley Crowe (June 30, 1815) Part II.</p> <p>22:18 Introduction to Ecclesiastical history by Cyrenius Crosby (n.d.).</p> <p>22:19 Analysis of 2-4 lectures by Cyrenius Crosby (n.d.).</p> <p>22:20 Notes on Biblical history by Cyrenius Crosby (1821).</p> <p>22:21 Notes on chronology by Cyrenius Crosby (November 1820).</p> <p>22:22 Notes on the Presbyterian Church in the U.S., the Moravians and the Reformed Dutch Church by Henry A. Boardman (c. 1832).</p> <p>22:23 Notes on the Associate Reformed Church, German Lutheran Church, and the National Churches in Europe by Henry A. Boardman (c. 1832).</p> <p>22:24 Notes on Muhammadanism, Paganism, Jews, and practical results by Henry A. Boardman (c. 1832)</p> <p>22:25 Notes on the Quakers, Methodists, and Swedenborgianism by Henry A. Boardman (c. 1832).</p> <p>22:26 Notes on the Westminster Assembly and the Puritans by Henry A. Boardman (c. 1832).</p> <p>22:27 Notes on Puritans, the Church of Scotland, Arminiansim, and the Quakers by Henry A. Boardman (c. 1832).</p> <p>22:28 Notes on Mosheim by Henry A. Boardman (c. 1832).</p> <p>22:29 No. I: Notes on the composition and delivery of sermons by John C. Hoes (1834).</p> <p>22:30 No. II: Notes on the composition and delivery of sermons by John C. Hoes (1834).</p> <p>22:31 No. I: Notes on Church Government by John C. Hoes (1834-1835).</p> <p>22:32 No. II: Notes on Church Government by John C. Hoes (1834-1835).</p> <p>22:33 No. III: Notes on Church Government by John C. Hoes (1834-1835).</p>	<p>23:3 Notes on the Methodist controversy by Alexander K. Nelson (c. 1832-1835).</p> <p>23:4 Notes on Church history, Sixth Century by Alexander K. Nelson (November 27, 1832).</p> <p>23:5 Notes on the Armenian Church by Alexander K. Nelson (c. 1832-1835).</p> <p>23:6 Notes on Church Government and the composition and delivery of sermons by Joseph A. Rosseel (November 28, 1842).</p> <p>23:7 Notes on the Moravians, Swedenborgians, Shakers, etc. (Author unknown, September 1845).</p> <p>23:8 Notes on Church government by Samuel S. Schmucker (c. 1820).</p> <p>23:9 Notes on compend of church government by Samuel S. Schmucker (c. 1820).</p> <p>23:10 Records (n.d.).</p> <p>23:11 Record of marriages (1793) and record of preaching (1795).</p> <p>23:12 References to readings (begun October 15, 1795).</p> <p>23:13 De Coena Domini, etc. (1795).</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>BOX 24</b></p> <p>24:1 Catalogue of letters written to different persons (begun 1798).</p> <p>24:2 Textbook (begun October 30, 1804).</p> <p>24:3 Record of preaching (begun January 1, 1833).</p> <p>24:4 Lectures on Ecclesiastical history (1842-1843).</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>BOX 25</b></p> <p>25:1 Lectures on Composition and delivery of sermons (1843-1844).</p> <p>25:2 Lectures on church government (1843-1844).</p> <p>25:3 Diary (1845).</p> <p>25:4 Notes on church history and church government by James W. Douglas (1821).</p> <p>25:5 Notes on composition and delivery of sermons by Melancthon W. Jacobus (June 1838).</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>BOX 26</b></p> <p>26:1 Notes on church history and Dr. Hodge's lectures on Presbyterian church history.</p> <p>26:2 Notes on church government and the composition and delivery of sermons by Peter Lesley, Jr. (1842-1843).</p> <p>26:3 Notes on chronology and Ecclesiastical history by John Miller (c. 1842).</p> <p>26:4 Notes on Biblical history and Ecclesiastical history by Stuart Mitchell (c. 1851).</p> <p>26:5 Notes on Ecclesiastical history by Allen Henry Brown (c. 1843).</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>BOX 27 – ADDENDUM (BOX 27:2-7 ADDED TO THE COLLECTION MARCH 1996).</b></p> <p>27:1 Notes on church government, etc. by Allen Henry Brown (September 1843).</p> <p>27:2 Obituary notices of Dr. Miller, 1850.</p> <p>27:3 Compend, in questions and answers, on Ecclesiastical history, notes by D. Monfort on Dr. Miller's lectures (from former "Alumni Alcove" collection).</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**BOX 23**

23:1 Notes on Ecclesiastical history by Alexander K. Nelson (c. 1832-1835).

23:2 Notes on Bible history by Alexander K. Nelson (c.1832-1835).

- 27:4 File of letters (1850-1852) to Mrs. Samuel Miller after the death of her husband: American Whig Society, NJ Historical Society, Robert J. Breckinridge, Francis McFarland, William L. Breckinridge, R. Baird, H.G. Ludlow, William Neil Samuel H.C., New Brunswick Presbytery, NY Historical Society, William B. Sprague, C. Van Rensselaer, William Allen, James [Richard?], Grant Burn, Sarah E. Dickey, Ephraim Marsh, Leonard Woods, 1st Presbyterian Church of Trenton, John Hall) [From File D.]
- 27:5 Letters to Mrs. Miller and to Samuel Miller's biographer (March 1-2, 1853) from William B. Sprague [from File D.]
- 27:6 Eleven letters to William Swan Plumer, 1827-1849 [photocopied from Plumer collection, PTS.]
- 27:7 "Adult descendants of Samuel Miller" (1912).

#### CROSS-REFERENCES:

See also the following manuscript collections:

- Sermon and discourse notes taken by Alexander P. Silliman in his journal (December 1844-April 1846). See the Silliman Manuscript Collection, PTS
- "Introductory Remarks" taken by Thomas Ward Cattell (1844). These remarks are in three points only. See the Cattell Manuscript Collection, PTS
- Letter from Henry A. Boardman to Samuel Miller, Regarding Samuel Miller, Jr. (his son). See the Samuel Miller, Jr. Manuscript Collection, PTS
- Samuel Miller Manuscript Collection at the New York Historical Society.
- Samuel Miller Manuscript Collection at Princeton University. ■

### *In Brief: Samuel Miller On The Regulative Principle of Worship and On 'Holy Days'*

A fundamental principle of the Presbyterian Church [USA], in forming her 'Directory for the Worship of God,' is, that here, as in every thing else, Holy Scripture is the only safe guide. One of the earliest practical errors which gained ground in the Christian community, was the adoption of the principle that the ministers of religion might lawfully add, at their pleasure, to the rites and ceremonies of the Church. In consequence of the admission of this error, Augustine complained, as early as the beginning of the fifth century, that for one appointment of God's, ten of man's had crept into the Church, and formed a burden greater, in some respects, than was the ceremonial economy of the Jews. The fact is, for the sake of drawing both Jews and Pagans into the Church, many rites and ceremonies were adopted from both, that they might feel more at home in the Christian assemblies. This evil increased, until, before the Reformation, it had reached that revolting amount of superstition which now distinguishes the Church of Rome.

It was in reference to this point, that our Fathers, both in Scotland and England, had many conflicts, when their respective Churches, in those countries were organized and settled in the sixteenth century. On the one hand, the Prelates, and other court clergy were in favour of a splendid ritual, and were disposed to retain a large number of the ceremonies which had been so long in use in the Church of Rome. On

the other, the Puritans in England, and the corresponding body in Scotland, contended that the Scriptures being the only infallible rule of faith and practice, no rite or ceremony ought to have a place in the public worship of God, which is not warranted in Scripture, either by direct precept or example, or by good and sufficient inference. In Scotland the advocates of primitive simplicity prevailed, and established in their national Church the same mode of worship which we believe existed in the apostolic age, and which now obtains in the Presbyterian Church in that country, and in the United States." *Presbyterianism the Truly Primitive and Apostolical Constitution of the Church of Christ*, "The Worship of the Presbyterian Church" (Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1835) 64-65. See item 119.0 ABOVE.

As you have, in your paper of yesterday, availed yourself of your editorial privilege, to plead in behalf of the religious observance of Christmas and undertaken, moreover, to "condemn the error" of the Puritans in refusing to observe this festival ... will you allow a subscriber to your paper ... to say a word in their [the Puritans] vindication? No controversy on this subject is intended; and if I know how to pen these few lines in such a manner as to preclude the possibility of any further discussion, I should be glad to do it. I assure you, sir, it makes no part of my present plan to "condemn," or even to find the least fault with, those who think it their duty to observe Christmas, and other holy days. "Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind." I venerate and love many who are of that opinion, though I cannot think with them. But you, surely, will not deny me the privilege of saying a word, the only object of which is to alleviate, if not to advert, the sentence which you have passed against a body of men "of whom the world was not worthy," and whose example I wish many were as willing to follow as to praise.

1. They [the Pilgrims] thought that no warrant for any such observance [of holy days] was to be found in Scripture. They believed that every institution of this nature, pertaining to the Old Testament economy, was abolished at the coming of Christ; that no similar days were appointed in their place; that neither the Saviour nor his inspired Apostles gave the least countenance, either by precept or example, to the sanctification of any other day than the Sabbath.

2. They considered the Bible as the only infallible rule of faith and practice. They denied that the Church, or any member of it had a right to institute new rites or ceremonies. They were persuaded that the Lord Jesus Christ alone was the Supreme Head and King of the Church; and had no doubt that He, and those Apostles whom He inspired by his own Spirit, were as competent judges of what was proper, and for the edification of the Church, as any individual or body of individuals have been since; and, of course, that for uninspired, and therefore fallible men, to undertake to add to the number of Christ's appointments, is a measure, to say the least, of very questionable propriety.

3. They were confident that, for a long time after the death of the Apostles, no stated festival or Fast Days whatever were observed in the Church. Justin Martyr, who wrote a little after the middle of the *second century*, and who gives a particular account of the institutions and habits of the Christians, gives no hint of any day being kept holy, excepting the first day of the week, or the Christian Sabbath. Before the time of Origen, who flourished about the middle of the *third century*, the Christians had introduced several holy-days, partly to gratify

the converts from Paganism; who, on coming into the Church, wished to have some substitute for the Pagan festivals which which [sic] they had abandoned. But even at this time, the observance of Christmas was unknown....

4. The Puritans attached no little importance to another consideration. Supposing, (what they could not admit) that the church possesses the power to institute observances, which Christ and his Apostles never knew: supposing that ["teaching for doctrines the commandments of men," or in other words, adopting "human inventions in the worship of God," could be justified; what limit they asked, could be set to this power? How far may it be carried? When the door to uncommanded observances is once opened, by whom or when will it be effectually closed? You, and a few others, Mr. Editor, might think two or three will-adjusted church festivals, besides fifty-two Sundays in the year quite sufficient. The Protestant Episcopal Church, however, in this country, has appointed about thirty stated festivals, besides a still larger number of Fast-days. The Church of England has a greater number, it is believed, both of fasts and festivals. The Church of Rome, from whom the Church of England selected her list, observes a far greater number than either.... Is it any wonder, then, that the Puritans, perceiving the tendency in all churches to go to extremes in multiplying such observances, whenever they began to be introduced; and knowing that there was no way to prevent this, but by shutting them out altogether: deliberately preferred the latter as the safer course?—and truly, if there be no Bible warrant for festivals;—no solid warrant for them in the practice of the Christian Church for the first 300 years, and, above all, none for Christmas; if the whole business of bringing institutions into the Church for which there is no Divine authority, be unlawful and of dangerous tendency; and if, whenever the practice has been admitted, it has been almost always abused, that is, carried much further than it ought to have been, I cannot help thinking that the Puritans had at least plausible, if not conclusive, reasons for taking the course which they did. "Open Letter on the observance of Christmas," signed *Biblicus*. *Commercial Advertiser* [NY], December 29, 1825. See item 062.0 ABOVE. ■

### *In Brief: Samuel Miller: Mature Preparation for the Gospel Ministry*

Beloved Pupils, The subject to which I have resolved to direct your attention on the present occasion, is the great importance of candidates for the holy ministry, going through a mature and adequate course of professional study, before entering on their public work....

Whatever may be the grade of your talents, my young friends, or the peculiar character of your minds, respectively, the course which I recommend may be said to be equally necessary to you *all*. On the one hand, those whose powers are of a moderate and solid kind, rather than the brilliant,—and this has been the character of some of the most eminently useful men that ever lived—ought to be aware that they need all the excitement, the invigoration, and the culture which the most mature and diligent study can give them. And, on the

other hand, those who are endowed with remarkably lively, vigorous, and even brilliant talents, should recollect that *they* need all that I have been recommending, on some accounts, even *more* than others. For I hold that no class of men are more likely to do harm in the sacred office, than your striking, splendid, popular preachers, who have power to excite strong feelings, but not wisdom, prudence, and knowledge enough to regulate and direct them. A ship that carries much sail, and but little lading, is always in more danger in traversing the Ocean, than the vessel which spreads less canvass to the winds, and at the same time bears an equal, or even a less cargo. An ample lading is, of course, more necessary to the safety of the former than of the latter. Let no candidate for the ministry, then, imagine that the sprightliness and force of his talents can supersede the necessity of mature study. Nay, so far from this, careful study and training are, to *him*, on that very account, the *more indispensable*. The more vigorous, powerful and active his mind, the more he needs the directing, restraining, and sanctifying influence of much study, prayer, retired communion with God, and counsel with age and experience. Without these, he is in far more danger than the man of dull and feeble powers, of falling into the varied evils which are apt to flow from eccentricity, impetuosity, or the pride of talent.

I hope no one will so far misunderstand my main purpose in this Lecture, as to suppose that I would bind *every* theological student to pursue the course which has been recommended; or that I would refuse admission to the sacred office to all, without exception, who have not enjoyed this privilege. The contrary may be inferred from several things which I have said, but I choose to be explicit on this point. The old law maxim, *Summum jus, summa injuria*, may be applied here. To press a general principle too far, is to pervert and abuse it. Some have not *health* enough to sustain them in such a course as has been urged. Others are unavoidably shut out, by the Providence of God, from that measure of *temporal support* which is indispensable to their prosecuting such a plan of preliminary study as they themselves earnestly desire. In such cases, if there be uncommon ardour of piety, joined with uncommon judiciousness, prudence and zeal, they ought to be admitted, after a shorter and more imperfect course of study than is commonly and properly deemed regular. Still, in every such case, the privation of the opportunity of mature study ought to be regarded by the individual himself, and by all his friends—and *will* be regarded by both, if they have good sense—as a *serious disadvantage*; a disadvantage to which nothing short of *necessity* should induce him to submit; and which can scarcely fail to abridge, and, in all probability, very materially, the usefulness as well as the comfort of all his ministrations.

Besides; let it be considered, that, after doing all we can to raise the standard of Ministerial Education and Character, there will still be some, and, indeed, a considerable number, of those whom we attempt to conform to it, who will fall far short of this standard. Just as in a *College*—with the best system of instruction, and the best teachers in the world, there will always be some indifferent and even poor scholars. But, surely, it is desirable to have as *few* of these as possible, and the system of instruction should be so framed and applied, as to lift up as many as possible to the highest grade of excellence. In like manner, too, in a field of *corn*, with the best plan of culture that ever was or can be adopted, there will be

some feeble and small ears of grain. But what then? Because there always *will* be such, in spite of every thing that the best husbandman can do, would it be wise in him to lay his plan in such a manner as should be calculated to make his whole crop to consist of stunted and miserable ears? Common sense says no. The Governors of the College will not utterly reject even the poor scholars; but try to make the best of them. Neither will the wise cultivator of the soil throw away the small and inferior ears; but both will endeavour so to conduct the culture of their respective objects, as to have as few as may be of inferior character. Let the standard be as high as possible, and let the aim be to bring as many up to it as possible, without despising or rejecting those who cannot raise to the desired elevation.

I have no fear that any of those whom I now address, will suspect me of a design to recommend a *cold and heartless erudition* in the Gospel ministry. On this subject, my own opinion, and that of my Colleagues, has been so often and so decisively expressed, as to preclude the possibility of misapprehension. Unfeigned PIETY—deep, ardent, active PIETY is, no doubt, the most essential qualification,—the most precious and glorious ornament of the ministerial character. Though a minister had all the learning in the world, yet if he were a stranger to the converting and sanctifying grace of God, there would be no reason to expect him to prove a blessing to the Church. The men whom we wish to see trained up for the service of the Church, are men of devoted and fervent piety; enlightened and warm friends to revivals of religion; men qualified and disposed to take an active part in forwarding all the laudable Christian Institutions of the present day; and, at the same time, so solidly judicious; so intimately acquainted with the Bible, with the system of grace, with the history of the Church, and with the human heart, as will prepare them at once, with enlightened discrimination and zeal, to promote all that is good; and to discern and resist every thing of a contrary tendency, whether it appear in the form of “an angel of light,” or of darkness. Such is the ecclesiastical training for which I plead. Such is the model which, next to that of the Chief Shepherd, I would hold up to your view, and commend to your sacred emulation. Let your aims be high. Not high, indeed, on the scale of secular ambition; not high to be merely, or chiefly, great scholars, to be admired as profound Divines, to shine as consummate orators, to “have the uppermost rooms at feasts,” or to be “called of men, *Rabbi, Rabbi.*” But let your sanctified emulation be awake and active to be able and faithful workmen; to be skillful as well as courageous “soldiers of Christ;” to be “mighty in the Scriptures;” mighty in the knowledge of “the faith once delivered to the saints;” mighty in the history of the Church; mighty in wisdom, prudence, holy love, and active zeal; in a word, mighty in that noble, comprehensive character given by the pen of inspiration to a minister of old—“He was a good man, and full of the Holy Ghost, and of faith, and much people was added to the Lord.”

What do the pages of ecclesiastical history say on this subject? What description of ministers, in all ages, have been found eminently useful to the Church of Christ? Unquestionably those in whom eminent piety, zeal, talents and learning were remarkably united? Let the history of the Apostle Paul;—let the character and services of Augustine, of Ambrose of Milan, of venerable Bede, of Wickliffe, of Huss, of Luther, of Calvin, of Knox, of Rivet, of Owen, of Baxter, of Doddridge,

and to mention no more, of our own Dickinson and Edwards, be pondered well; and they will convince the most sceptical, that, though men of *mere piety* may, and probably will be, the means of saving good to some souls; and though *mere talents and learning* may answer another very limited purpose; it is only the union of *both*, in an eminent degree, that can give a reasonable pledge of that deep, extensive, and permanent usefulness to the Church of God, to which every man of the right spirit will not fail to aspire.

I wish it were in my power, my young friends, to impart to *your* minds the full impression which *my own* has received of the importance of this subject. Perhaps I ought rather to say, I feel humbled that it is necessary to plead *such a cause* before *such an audience*. And nothing could ever have convinced me that such a necessity exists, but the direful and daily experience which proclaims it;—but the disheartening fact, that so many of your number manifest that you are not yet satisfied of the truth which I have been labouring to establish. How long, my beloved Pupils, shall this humiliating fact continue to stare us in the face? How long shall the concurring voice of youth and of age, of remonstrance and of authority, continue to plead in vain on this subject? How long shall young men of talents worth cultivating, and of piety which ought to secure a conscientious regard to their cultivation, continue to cheat themselves, and cheat the Church of God, by neglecting to prepare for her service; nay by thrusting themselves into that service, while “novices,” and even “babes in Christ,” when they ought to be “strong men?” Whatever you may think of it now, be assured, you will, one day, find that it is no light matter. You will find that it is a subject which regards, not merely the promotion of sound theological learning, but the advancement of the vital interests of the Church of Christ: not merely the honour of our own denomination, which I hope will never be a matter of small moment in your eyes; but the spiritual prosperity of the whole family of the Redeemer on earth.

For my part, so long as I see so many candidates for the holy ministry contenting themselves with superficial and totally inadequate preparation for their exalted and arduous work; and so many actually venturing forth to that work with qualifications which fit them to be only transient meteors, and very humble ones too, rather than bright and steady luminaries in the Church of God;—I cannot suppose that the *Millennium* is very near. I believe that that time will be as much distinguished for mature ministerial preparation, as for ministerial holiness, zeal, fidelity, and activity. If you desire, then, to hasten on that glorious period; if you desire, each one of you, to contribute as much as possible towards preparing the world for its arrival; then give all diligence to imbibe the spirit, and rise to something of the elevation, which that period will assuredly put in requisition. Be not contented with any thing short of such furniture, both intellectual and moral, as will qualify you to act a part in harmony with the high commission which you hope to receive, and to be “workers together with God” in enlightening and blessing the world. (From *The Importance of Mature Preparatory Study for the Ministry: An Introductory Lecture, delivered at the opening of the Summer Session of the Theological Seminary at Princeton, New-Jersey, July 3, 1829* By Samuel Miller, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Church Government in the said Seminary (Andover: Published and for Sale by Mark Newman. Flagg & Gould, printers, 1830) [1], 24–28. See item 273.1 ABOVE. ■

## Examining the Work of S. W. Carruthers:

### *Justifying a Critical Approach to the Text of the Westminster Standards & Correcting the 18<sup>TH</sup> Century Lineage of the Traditional Scottish Text*

By Chris Coldwell

In 1883 the Presbyterian Church of England published a critical text of the Westminster Confession of Faith compiled by renowned botanist William Carruthers, a leader of that church and director of their committee for publications. Of this work, B. B. Warfield noted:<sup>1</sup>

This little pamphlet is the only attempt made in Britain, since the issue of the 'Collections' of the early eighteenth century, to set forth a critically perfected text of the Confession.

William Carruthers published an updated text in 1914, and while he "began a fuller bibliographical investigation" and intended to publish facsimiles "along with a brief account of the various editions," he never completed this work. These tasks were taken up by his son, S. W. Carruthers, M.D., who was also active in the affairs of the Presbyterian Church of England.<sup>2</sup>

In 1937 Dr. Carruthers published his own critical text of the Confession of Faith, which was an improvement and expansion of his father's earlier work (Carruthers, 9). The importance of this publication would be difficult to overstate. John Murray wrote regarding it:<sup>3</sup> "The Church lies under a great debt to Dr. Carruthers for the painstaking and diligent labour that has given us this book"

In the course of preparing a new critical text of the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms, the author has found that some refinement can be made to the work of S. W. Carruthers. A more exact detailing of the descent of the traditional text through the 18<sup>th</sup> century is possible, which allows for correcting and refining the origin of many of the textual corruptions he was the first to identify. In particular, Carruthers' lineage of the traditional text can be more correctly filled in for the period between the publication of Dunlop's 1719 edition and that of Kincaid's in 1773.

Over time printers of the Standards introduced many errors, subsequently repeated down through the various popular editions, which form the lineage of the traditional Scottish text. The Carruthers' work uncovered 242 such errors in the Confession alone, and in the process a list of editions was compiled which S. W. Carruthers believed contained: "... at least an example of every group necessary to elucidate adequately the textual history of the Confession" (Carruthers, 71).

From out of this list, Dr. Carruthers proposed a lineage for the traditional Scottish text of the Westminster Confession of Faith (See Table 1; and see Endnote A for fuller bibliographical details on the editions listed in the table).<sup>4</sup>

---

THE AUTHOR: Chris Coldwell is the editor of *The Confessional Presbyterian*. Over the years via Naphtali Press he has edited and published classic Presbyterian works, and is currently compiling a new critical text of the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms.

1. W. Carruthers, ed. *The Confession of Faith of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster ...* (London: Presbyterian Church of England, [1890]). B. B. Warfield, "Notes Toward A Bibliography of the Westminster Confession: I. Britain," *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, xii (1901) 659. Hereafter Warfield. Carruthers, born in Scotland, studied for the ministry at New College, Edinburgh, but was advised to follow a scientific career. He became Keeper of the Department of Botany in the British Museum in 1871 ["In Memory of William Carruthers (1830-1922), From the *Journal of Botany*, v. 60, September 1922 (London: Taylor and Francis, n.d.)].

2. S. W. Carruthers, M.D., Ph.D., *The Westminster Confession of Faith: Being an account of the Preparation and Printing of its Seven Leading Editions, to which is appended a critical text of the Confession with notes thereon* (Manchester: R. Aikman & Son, [1937]) 9. Hereafter Carruthers.

3. John Murray, "The Westminster Confession of Faith by S. W. Carruthers," *Collected Writings of John Murray* (Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth, 1982) 3, 291. Hereafter Murray.

4. The lineage of the traditional text of the Confession of Faith is also that of the Catechisms and the other traditional Scottish documents at the various points each began to be published in the descending editions. On this topic see *Antiquary* later in this issue.

Table 1: Carruthers' Lineage of the Traditional Text

1. Edition Three (London, 1647)
2. Edition Four (Edinburgh, 1647)
3. Edition Five (Edinburgh, 1647)
4. Edition Six (London, 1648)
5. Rothwell (London, 1658)
6. "Third" (London, 1688)
7. "Fifth" (London, 1717)
8. Dunlop (Edinburgh, 1719-21)
9. Robertson (Glasgow, 1746)
10. Kincaid (Edinburgh, 1773)
11. Kerr (Edinburgh, 1793)
12. Blair A, B (Edinburgh, 1810; 1831)
13. Johnstone A, B, C (Edinburgh, 1851, 55, 67)

Following upon this ground-breaking work on the text of the Confession of Faith, Dr. Carruthers published two more works on Westminster texts. The later of the two, published in 1957, was an update of his father's work on the Shorter Catechism. It not only included a reproduction of the original manuscript presented to the House of Commons, but contained as well a large expansion of his father's bibliography of editions of the Shorter Catechism. The other, published in 1946, was a transcript of a manuscript of the Confession of Faith, which had been recently discovered.<sup>5</sup>

It is unclear how much work on the critical text of

5. S. W. Carruthers, ed. *Tercentenary Edition. The Confession of Faith of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster* (Publishing Office of the Presbyterian Church of England: London, [1946]). Hereafter *Burges*. S. W. Carruthers, *Three Centuries of the Westminster Shorter Catechism* (NB: Published for the Beaverbrook Foundations by the University of New Brunswick, 1957). Hereafter, *Three Centuries*. See also: William Carruthers, *The Shorter Catechism of the Westminster Assembly of Divines*, etc. (London: Publication Office of the Presbyterian Church of England, 1897).

6. *Three Centuries* contains helpful information on the pagination of various editions, which aided the revising of Carruthers' lineage of the traditional text presented in this article. It should also be noted that, while he published nothing further, there may possibly be unpublished research on Westminster texts amongst Dr. Carruthers' private papers, housed at Westminster College, Cambridge. According to Dr. Van Dixhoorn, who brought this collection to the author's attention, these papers have never been critically examined and studied.

7. The Larger Catechism manuscripts are in the Nalson MSS Collection, vol 22, [MS in Hand B], fos. 133r-157v and [MS in Hand A], fos. 158r-176v, Bodleian Library, Oxford. The MSS are in two distinct handwriting styles and will be referred to hereafter as MSb and MSa. While trying to locate a Larger Catechism manuscript in 2002 to aid in creating a new critical text, the author contacted Chad Van Dixhoorn, who was researching the Westminster Assembly manuscripts. He knew of none existing at the time; but later in August he discovered these and kindly notified the author.

8. The suppositions of analytical bibliography first laid out by

the Confession Dr. Carruthers continued to do after publishing this manuscript. Some of the bibliographical information he provides in his 1957 work indicates that he at least had the information that one would expect would have led to an elaboration and correction of a portion of his lineage of the traditional text. But after the publication of the manuscript text of the Confession, Carruthers apparently published nothing further regarding his textual work.<sup>6</sup> With the recent discovery by Dr. Chad Van Dixhoorn of two manuscripts of the Larger Catechism, manuscripts can now be consulted for both Catechisms as well as for the Confession of Faith.<sup>7</sup>

With these manuscripts available, the question naturally arises: Is a critical approach to the text now unnecessary, and is a critical review of Dr. Carruthers' work superfluous? This article will therefore:

- I. Justify continuing a critical approach; before
- II. Reviewing and adjusting Dr. Carruthers' lineage of the traditional Scottish text, and
- III. Correcting the first occurrence of some of the textual variants presented in Carruthers 1937 critical text of the Confession of Faith.

### I. Justifying a Critical Approach

The manuscripts of the Confession and Catechisms are clearly of great interest, importance, and use. However, as far as arriving at the intended text of the three documents, a critical approach is still necessary, taking into account not only the authoritative printed editions, as Dr. Carruthers did for the Confession, but taking into account all the known manuscripts as well. These manuscripts should not simply be presumed to be the Assembly's "final" text, but neither should they be ignored as a source for possible clarification of any long-standing textual errors, which might have escaped detection. The soundness of this approach can be supported by reviewing printing practices of the period along with the information in the Assembly Minutes regarding the manuscripts and the printing of the texts, as well as by noting some characteristics of the manuscripts themselves.

#### SEVENTEENTH CENTURY PRINTING PRACTICES

Bibliographical studies have sought to clarify as much as possible the process by which an author's work would come into print during the period of the hand press (approximately 1500 to 1800).<sup>8</sup> In general, for

a new work, the author would deliver a manuscript text to the printer, often copied out by a professional scribe, and the compositor would mark up the text to prepare it for composition. He “marked the place in the copy where the new type page ended, and added a marginal note giving the number of the next page both in the book and in the sheet” by page and signature number (Gaskell, 40-41, 50; McKerrow, 205-207; 217-221; Simpson, 49-51). After composing the work into type, the printer would then print the “first stage” proof (Gaskell, 110-116). This was generally turned over to the corrector, who with a reader to read aloud the text from the manuscript copy, would correct the proof, making use of the compositor’s marks (Gaskell, 111). The proof with corrections would be returned to the compositor to correct the text, and a revised proof might be printed to verify that the corrections had been made. After this, the “second stage” of proofing would begin, and generally these would serve as the author’s proof, who would review them at the printer’s shop, or on occasion at his own residence. After the author’s corrections were incorporated, a “third stage” proof or “press proof” would be printed as a final check for imposition errors (Gaskell, 115). After passing this last proof stage, the actual print run commenced.

Ideally, the compositor was “strictly to follow his Copy” (Simpson, 53); but given the lack of standards in spelling and punctuation, it was common, even customary practice at this time to make changes to an author’s manuscript text. The printing shop in the early stages of the hand press became responsible for standardizing capitalization, use of italics, spelling, and punctuation – the “incidentals” of the text as opposed to the “substantials” such as the words themselves. Some authors took greater pains to see that their own punctuation and spelling were followed more exactly; but more often than not the printer saw himself as the enforcer of standards in these matters (Gaskell, 110-116; Simpson, 53-54). Also, though an author might be otherwise insistent that his manuscript be followed exactly, that did not necessarily preclude his desire that the punctuation (or “pointing”) and other incidentals be corrected and standardized (Gaskell, 339).

As for the Assembly’s manuscripts in particular, there is little information detailing how they were handled and printed. There are no surviving printer’s proofs known to exist,<sup>9</sup> and the surviving manuscripts of the Confession and Catechisms do not appear to have been used in the printing process, as they lack evidence of having been handled by a compositor.<sup>10</sup> It is necessary then, to try and construct what is likely and make sup-

positions from the general practices just outlined. However, it might be objected that perhaps the Westminster Assembly documents were a special case and not subject to normal printing practices. In answer, though there may be some direct evidence answering this (see Endnote D), it may be helpful to examine briefly an important state paper printed just a year prior to the sitting

McKerrow and updated by Gaskell appear reasonable given what is known about and what exists of the work of the Westminster Assembly. For a discussion of the different and competing approaches of recent time, see the chapter “Textual Criticism” in D. C. Greetham’s *Textual Scholarship: An Introduction* (NY: Garland Publishing Inc, 1994) especially 335ff. In sum, because of the general practice at the time of allowing the printer to standardize the manuscript text as to its incidentals (such as punctuation), the manuscript text, to that extent, is a “consciously unfinished state” of the intended text (Greetham, 336). See also: Philip Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography* (Oak Knoll Press: 1995); Ronald B. McKerrow, *An Introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students* (Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1927; Rpt. Oak Knoll Press, 1994, with introduction by David McKitterick); R. B. McKerrow, edited by Carlo M. Bajetta, “The Relationship of English Printed Books to Authors’ Manuscripts during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (The 1928 Sandars Lectures),” *Studies in Bibliography*, Volume 53 (2003) 1-65; D. F. Mckenzie, “Printers of the Mind: Some Notes on Bibliographical Theories and Printing-House Practices,” *Studies in Bibliography*, Volume 22 (1969) 1-77; and Percy Simpson, *Proof-Reading in the Sixteenth Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1935. Rpt. 1970). *Studies in Bibliography* is online at: <http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/bsuva/sb/>.

9. In addition to the manuscript, several printer’s proofs would have been made. “Traditionally the stages of proof-correction have been at least three: galley (whether page-or slip-), revises, and, as a last resort, stop-press. And let us not forget that the manuscript copy precedes all three. Now it is incontestable that these several stages can be found in increasing frequency as one moves from manuscript (how much of that survives?), to page-proofs (very few of these), to revises (slightly more of these – if some of our surviving ‘proof’ sheets can be so considered), to stop-press (hundreds of these).” Mckenzie, “Printers of the Mind,” 44.

10. While part of the manuscript of the Directory for Public Worship bears some evidence of handling by the printer (see Endnote D), and other manuscript documents still need close scrutiny, the author has examined the copies of the Catechisms for compositor’s marks, and none are discernible. Dr. Van Dixhoorn, who in 2002 located almost all of the Assembly’s original papers and documents, and completed the first unabridged transcription of the Minutes [See Appendix A in “Reforming the Reformation: Theological debate at the Westminster Assembly, 1643-1652,” Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cambridge, 2004. Hereafter Van Dixhoorn], confirmed to the author that the manuscript of the Confession is similarly unmarked. Neither, in all his research, has Dr. Van Dixhoorn discovered any surviving printer’s proofs, or additional manuscripts of the Confession and Catechisms, other than the known examples of the Shorter Catechism and Confession of Faith, and the two of the Larger Catechism. These last two manuscripts are surely the Parliament copies, and according to Dr. Carruthers that of the Shorter is the copy presented to the Commons, Nov. 25, 1647, and he believed that of the Confession was the one prepared by Dr. Burges [Burges, Editorial Note; Alexander F. Mitchell and John Struthers, eds., *Minutes of the Sessions of the Westminster*

of the Westminster Assembly, which exists in manuscript with printer's marks. As an official declaration of Parliament, it may illustrate how the printer may have handled Assembly manuscripts.

### *A Manuscript with Printer's Marks*

The manuscript in question is titled "The Declaration of Both Houses of Parliament of May 19, 1642."<sup>11</sup> Ac-

*Assembly of Divines* (Edinb.: William Blackwood & Sons, 1874) 308. Hereafter *Minutes*.] However, according to Dr. Van Dixhoorn, all handwriting ascriptions need to be studied and reassessed "now that almost the full corpus of the Assembly's papers have been located" (Personal Communication with Dr. Chad Van Dixhoorn, Dec. 7, 2004).

11. *Parliamentary History Part 2: The Braye Manuscripts from the House of Lords Record Office. Braye MSS. Vol. 7. "Declaration of Both Houses. 19 May 1642"* (Adam Matthew Publications, 1995). Reel 3. Item 1. This was one of a number of exchanges between Parliament and the King leading up to the English Civil War.

12. It seems unlikely that documents of such length and longer would have gone through the printing process unmarked (or even without occasional evidences of handling, such as an inky thumb print). There were many reasons the printer would need to make such notations on manuscript copy. At first the compositor would need to know roughly the length of the document to determine format. Subsequently, he would need a more exact idea of length in order to have sufficient paper. Also, the printer would need to know precise pagination if he was setting by forms or was going to spread the work among more than one compositor. Gaskell, 41-42.

13. *The declaration or remonstrance of the Lords and Commons in Parliament assembled: with divers depositions and letters thereunto annexed* (London: Printed for Joseph Hunscoth and John Wright, 1642). *Early English Books 1641-1700, STC II* (Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, [1975?-]). Reel 252:E.148, no. 17 (Wing E1517). The Declaration takes up the first 24 pages. The depositions and letters are not part of this manuscript, which contains just the text of the Declaration; but manuscript copy does exist elsewhere in the Braye MSS collection (Braye MS 3, ff 149-59, 203-12). See Endnote C for a list of the other editions of the Declaration.

14. For instance, on the first page of the Hunscoth/Wright edition, the spelling in the manuscript has been changed from: *bin* to *been* or *beene*, *greate* to *great*, *varietie* to *variety*, *plots* to *Plots*, *Ruynie* to *ruine* and *deitie* to *deity*. As noted, capitalization was changed in two of these instances as well. In addition, *Services* was changed to *services*, and *Counsells* to *counsells*.

15. On the first page alone, there are more than a dozen additional commas that do not appear in the manuscript; and in the first paragraph, which is one long sentence in both texts, the printed text has changed one comma in the manuscript to a semi-colon, and one comma to a colon. There are many other instances of the introduction of harder "stops" throughout the text, some in places where the manuscript has no discernible punctuation.

16. And possibly more carefully proofed. See footnote 22.

17. Baillie may have had an unofficial MS. Carruthers, 14, 19.

18. See also Lightfoot's Journal. "Being set, Dr. Burgess read what we had done and finished of government, to be sent to the Houses: and he and the scribes compared the original and his transcript." *The*

according to a note inside the front cover of the bound manuscript, "This is the original sent to the printer." Compositor's marks as previously described are present in the margin, as might be expected in a document of this length.<sup>12</sup> When the texts of the manuscript and the published version are compared,<sup>13</sup> it becomes clear that even with such important Parliamentary documents, the printer had discretion regarding the incidentals of the text. In this specific example, the manuscript has no indication for use of the italic face (which would have been indicated by underlining text to be italicized), but the printer has throughout used it for names of months, places and individuals. Spelling and capitalization have also been changed in the printed text.<sup>14</sup> As for punctuation, the printed text has supplied it where the manuscript has none discernible, including the addition of many more commas, and where present, the punctuation in the printed text varies often from the manuscript.<sup>15</sup> All this strongly indicates that printing of state papers was handled in accordance with the general practice outlined earlier.<sup>16</sup>

With this brief review of general printing practices and one example of the period in mind, the facts regarding the Westminster Assembly documents can be examined and some suppositions made about the manuscripts and their subsequent printing.

### MANUSCRIPTS OF THE CONFESSION & CATECHISMS

There were probably at least as many as four official manuscript copies of the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms.<sup>17</sup> Two manuscript copies are certain, as a copy of each document approved by the Assembly was formally presented (i.e. "given") to each House of Parliament. This was true, beginning with the partial manuscript containing the first nineteen chapters of the Confession of Faith, and subsequently it was ordered that completed documents were to be presented to both Houses (*Minutes*, 290-291, 303, 308-309, 349, 354, 484-485, 491, 492, 510). This is supported by the existence of the two Larger Catechism manuscripts, which given their provenance are surely the Parliament copies. As it seems very unlikely that either of these would have been returned to the Assembly, they probably retained a third copy. This appears to be the case when several places in the Minutes are compared (*Minutes*, 303, 308, 319; 349).<sup>18</sup> This copy quite possibly would have served as the master copy from which the others were made, and differences in the two Larger Catechism manuscripts may support this. Where the two differ, the printed text sometimes follows one, and

sometimes the other, which may indicate the existence of this Assembly master copy, unmarred by the unique variants in each copy not appearing in print. But this does raise the question, which manuscript copy would have been submitted for printing? Obviously, a 'best practice' would be for an author not to send the only copy of a work abroad to the printer, without retaining a master,<sup>19</sup> and it is certainly reasonable to assume that a fourth copy would have been prepared by the Assembly scribes, specifically for the printer's use. The preparation of these additional copies is supported by the absence of any evidence that the printer handled most of the surviving manuscripts (See Endnote D).

#### THE PRINTING OF THE CONFESSION & CATECHISMS

As for what is actually known about the printing of the Confession and Catechisms, a few facts are recorded in the Minutes of the Assembly and Journals of the House of Commons and House of Lords. The Houses tasked the Westminster Assembly with the responsibility for the first printings of the documents (*Minutes*, 354 n1, 356). The Assembly in turn gave to their scribes, Henry Roborough and Adoniram Byfield, the responsibility for choosing and working with a printer. For instance, in the case of the Directory for the Public Worship of God, the Assembly ordered (*Minutes*, 66): "That the scribes take care of the printing of ... the Directory for worship, and that they do appoint who shall print it." Regarding the printing of the first nineteen chapters of the Confession of Faith, and subsequently the whole of that document, the Assembly ordered that the scribes "take care of the exact printing of the Confession of Faith" (*Minutes*, 296, 310 n1). In the case of the Catechisms, the Assembly ordered that "Mr. Byfield take care of the printing 'of both' the Catechisms" (*Minutes*, 492; n1, n2). And when the Scripture proofs had been added, the Parliament ordered regarding the Shorter Catechism: "It is this day Ordered by the Lords and Commons in Parliament assembled, that the Shorter Catechism be forthwith printed and published; wherein Mr. Henry Roborough and Mr. Adoniram Byfield, scribes of the Assembly of Divines, are required to use all possible care and diligence, that it be from time to time faithfully and exactly done. And for preventing of all abuses therein, it is further Ordered that no person whatsoever do presume to print or reprint the same in any volume, but only such as shall be appointed and authorized thereunto by the said scribes ..." (*Minutes*, 512-513 n1).

The Minutes contain entries showing the Assem-

bly's concern for publications of the time. They had a committee dealing with the printing of Bibles, were interested in particular printing projects, as well as in censorship of books.<sup>20</sup> As to the last, the Assembly was particularly concerned with the number of books promoting blasphemy and heresy (*Minutes*, 218), and apparently brought to Parliament's attention any work that became a concern to them (*Minutes*, 170, 172-173; Lightfoot, 9). Also, the Parliament on its part would on occasion ask the divines to review a book (*Minutes*, 338, 351). The usual agent of such censorship was the Company of Stationers, which had been given power to seize books and make arrests, since the time of Queen Mary,<sup>21</sup> when they were granted a monopoly over all printing. On at least one occasion, the Stationers' wardens attended upon the Assembly to bring to their attention a particular book and individual they had in their custody (*Minutes*, 105). But beyond these various interesting items, other than the orders for printing, and the expressed care for exactness, there are no details describing how the scribes were to work with the printer. Again, it becomes necessary to make reasonable suppositions based upon what is generally known about printing practices of the time.

As noted above, it is clear that the Assembly scribes

---

*Works of the Rev. John Lightfoot, D. D.* "Journal of The Proceedings of The Assembly of Divines (London: Printed by J. F. Dove, 1824) 13.323.

19. Simpson gives an example from the surviving author's manuscript of Richard Hooker's fifth book of the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (1597), where he was asked in a note by the printer to resubmit a missing page, which he was able to do, having kept a copy (Simpson, 76-77). On the other hand, the example of Nicholas Bownd illustrates the pains that it cost an author when he lost all his papers. For the second edition of his book on the Christian Sabbath, Bownd did not complete it "without some good labour to my self." *Sabbatum Veteris et Novi Testamenti: Or, The True Doctrine of the Sabbath* (London, 1606) A3-A4.

20. *Minutes*, 71, 78, 83, 97, 105, 123, 149, 166, 169, 170, 181, 182, 184, 186, 188, 192-193n.

21. W. W. Greg, *Some Aspects and Problems of London Publishing Between 1550 and 1650* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1956) 1-4. The Long Parliament, while curtailing some of the abusive powers granted by the Star Chamber in 1637, retained the Stationers as the enforcers of state censorship (Greg, 13). According to Sheila Lambert, the 1637 grant was at the Stationers' solicitation to protect their monopoly. [Robin Myers and Michael Harris, eds., *Aspects of Printing From 1600*, Sheila Lambert "The Printers and the Government, 1604-1640" (Oxford Polytechnic Press, 1987) 1]. Others take issue with Ms. Lambert's understating of Laudian censorship. [Robin Myers and Michael Harris, eds., "Introduction"; *The Stationers' Company and the Book Trade 1550-1990* (New Castle: Oak Knoll Press, 1997) vii-viii; and Jean Tsushima, "Members of the Stationers' Company who serviced in the Artillery Company before the Civil War: Ralphe Mabbie and his Network," *Ibid.* 74; 83 n17].

were in charge of the printing of the Confession and Catechisms, and it is hard to imagine, as solemnly charged with ‘exactness’ as there were, that they would not have reviewed the “author’s proofs.”<sup>22</sup> As already indicated, the scribes would either have visited the printer’s shop, or the proofs might even have been sent up to the scribes to review in their “chamber” (*Minutes*, 538). The latter, while not as common at the time, might have occurred given the prominence and official nature of the Assembly’s work, as well as the confidential nature of the first printings of the documents, which were only for the use of Parliament and the Assembly of Divines (*Minutes*, 354 n1).

#### DIFFERENCES IN THE MANUSCRIPTS & PRINTED TEXTS

What has been outlined and illustrated as the general

22. There is an indication that the proofing practice for state papers may have been an even more careful and exacting process. The Company of Stationers claimed to be burdened as follows: “The books of God & of the Statute law are to be printed with a greater care & examination than those that are ordinary” (Simpson, 179). And Greg writes: “The Company [of Stationers] sought to maintain at least some technical standard of printing in service books and other important works.” (Greg, 19). This in addition to what is known about general printing practices gives sufficient reason to believe that the proofing process for Assembly documents was a careful one. See Endnote D for comment on marks which indicate that portions of the manuscripts of the Directory for Public Worship may have been handled by the compositor for printing.

23. Most differences concern punctuation. For instance, in the Confession there are very few substantial differences in the text, none of which are of any consequence. Carruthers lists twelve variations in wording (*Burges*, Editorial Note). The one Carruthers lists at 27:3 (“property” for “propriety”) is actually a mistake as the Burges reading is in the early printed editions. And there is a thirteenth not listed by him at 16:3 (“besides” for “beside”).

24. See: Van Dixhoorn, v. 7, *Minutes*, vol. 3, fo. 229v; Nalson 22, MSb fo. 143r, MSa 167r; Chris Coldwell, [Unpublished] Draft Transcription of The Larger Catechism MSS (The Westminster Assembly Project, 2004) MSa, fo. 167r; MSb, fo. 143r; and *The Advice of the Assembly of Divines, Now by Authority of Parliament sitting at Westminster, Concerning A Larger Catechisme* (London: Printed by A. M. [n.d. Thomason date: Oct. 22, 1647]) 26 [sic 27]. The punctuation in Mitchell and Struthers is not original (*Minutes*, 403); there is actually little punctuation in the manuscripts. Dr. Van Dixhoorn notes the following regarding the punctuation: “Part of the difficulty in reading the text is Byfield’s general neglect of word and sentence separation: Byfield often leaves his pen on the page when moving to a new word and rarely privileges the reader with punctuation or capitalization to indicate a new sentence or paragraph. His most common punctuation mark (when one is used), is a descending line attached to the last letter of a word” [Van Dixhoorn, v.2, Introduction to Appendix B, p. xxxiii]. “Punctuating the minutes proves to be challenging since Byfield dispenses punctuation marks jealously. While Byfield does on occasion use a colon, full stop, slash, or a combination of these to indicate a sentence termination,

printing practices of the time, may shed light upon or at least help suggest reasons why the printed versions of the Assembly’s documents differ from the manuscripts.<sup>23</sup> Given the usual proofing process, the scribes would have been able to correct any substantial compositor’s mistakes, as well as any objectionable modifications to the incidentals (such as punctuation). And since it was the practice of the time to depend upon the printing house for standardizing and correcting these incidentals, this may explain why, though tasked with exact printing of the text, the scribes may have allowed changes in punctuation, which make up the majority of the differences. The fact that there are so few “substantial” differences, and none of these of a significant nature, indicates a great deal of care was taken with the words themselves; while at the same time all the changes in punctuation indicate that the order for “exact” printing did not necessarily extend to the incidentals of the text.

#### *Differences in the Larger Catechism Manuscripts*

Additional support for the idea that in some ways the scribes and printers might have had a free hand in the punctuation may be found in the already noted fact that the manuscripts of the Larger Catechism differ. Again, the differences are overwhelmingly in the punctuation of the text, the majority of which are accounted for by the much greater use of the comma in MSb. This at least indicates freedom in the use of the lesser “stops” of punctuation. But while less frequent, they also differ sometimes in choice and placement of the harder stops. Some of these may simply be scribal errors; but there appears to be some attempt at improvement of the punctuation in some cases. The text of the answer to Larger Catechism Question 104 may illustrate this, by comparing the text as it was printed, as it appears in each manuscript, and as it appears in preliminary form in the *Minutes*.<sup>24</sup>

#### *Example: The Variants in the Answer to WLC 104*

The text of the answer to Question 104 of the Larger Catechism as it was first printed for use by the Westminster Assembly and the Houses of Parliament reads (spelling modernized; numbers added):

The duties required in the first commandment,[1] are, the knowing[2] and acknowledging of God[3] to be the only true God, and our God:[4] and[5] to worship and glorify him accordingly:[6] by thinking, meditating,

remembering, highly esteeming, honouring, adoring, choosing, loving, desiring, fearing of him,<sup>[7]</sup> believing him,<sup>[8]</sup> trusting, hoping, delighting, rejoicing in him,<sup>[9]</sup> being zealous for him, calling upon him, giving all praise and thanks, and yielding all obedience and submission to him,<sup>[10]</sup> with the whole man, being careful in all things to please him, and sorrowful when<sup>[11]</sup> in anything he is offended,<sup>[12]</sup> and walking humbly with him.

The variants as marked are as follows:

- [1] “commandment are”: Minutes only.  
 [2] “knowing, and”: MSa & MSb. The Minutes and first printed texts do not have the comma.  
 [3] “God, to”. The Minutes only have a possible comma or a descending line.  
 [4] “our God, and”: MSb. The early printed texts, and MSa have the semicolon. The Minutes have a descending line or comma.  
 [5] “and, to worship”: MSa only has this extra comma.  
 [6] “accordingly; by”: MSb. The Minutes and MSa simply have a comma; while the early printed texts have a colon as indicated.  
 [7] “fearing of him; believing”: MSa. The Minutes, MSb and early printed texts have a comma.  
 [8] “believing him; trusting”: Mitchell and Struthers inserted a semi-colon (*Minutes*, 403). The comma is in both MS and the early printed texts, as well as the MS Minutes.  
 [9] “him; being zealous”: MSa; Mitchell and Struthers. The comma is in MSb as well as the early printed texts and the MS Minutes.  
 [10] “him with the whole”: Mitchell and Struthers only. Both MS and the early printed texts have the comma. The MS Minutes have a descending line or comma.  
 [11] “in anything we offend him,”: Minutes only.  
 [12] “offended; and”: MSa. The early printed texts and MSb have a comma.

In this list of variants there is one “substantial” difference, where the wording has been changed toward the end at #11. This almost certainly was made in committee and submitted back to the Assembly and approved (*cf. Minutes*, 479-484). The variants at #8 and #10 are included to indicate where the Mitchell and Struthers’ Minutes have provided their own punctuation (see footnote 24). The commas present at #2 and #3 and the one lacking at #1, may indicate changes made by either the Assembly (as in the case of #11), or by the scribes as the final copies where drafted. Variants #4, #5, #7 and #9, may simply be scribal errors, if they are not in fact examples of scribal discretion in the punctuation. It does seem likely the two semi-colons used by MSa at

#7 and #9 were an attempt to improve the punctuation of such a long sentence. Similarly, the scribe of MSb took the approach of having commas throughout except for where the listing begins at #6, where the harder stop of a semi-colon was used. Further improvement appears in the printed text, where the scribes prior to or the printer during the proofing process changed the semi-colon to a colon at #6.

The variants at #4, #7, and #12 are interesting in that they demonstrate, as already noted, that neither MSa nor MSb exclusively represent the punctuation of the finalized printed text, which at points retained punctuation or at least settled upon punctuation used in one or the other, as well as using a colon not found in either (at #6). This at the very least indicates the scribes continued to refine the punctuation of the text as they prepared manuscript copies, and supports the contention that other manuscript copies existed at one time. And all these variations in the manuscripts and the printed texts are certainly not inconsistent with the proposition that the punctuation, as incidentals under the purview of the printer, could have been changed and finalized during the proofing process as the texts were composed for printing.

#### THE ASSEMBLY AND DIFFERENCES IN THE TEXTS

As for the Divines themselves, the Minutes give no indication that the Assembly ever discussed these “incidental” differences. But whether they were inclined to do so or not, there certainly were reasonable opportunities to object to any changes in the printed text. This is because when the Assembly went to work on adding

he usually does not. Commas, when present, are roughly equivalent to the modern usage of colons or semi-colons. Round brackets are used but frequently not closed. Michael Hunter argues for brackets around punctuation added by the editor, suggesting that it only slightly interrupts the flow of text. While I adopt that convention in my transcription of Lightfoot’s journal, it is impracticable for this transcript since dozens of punctuation marks are needed on a single page. Thus, I add punctuation silently throughout the minutes and modify some of the existing punctuation: the slash or slash-period I render a simple full stop, and most commas as semi-colons or colons” [Van Dixhoorn, *Ibid.*, p. lvi]. “It is my hunch that similar thinking motivated Mitchell and Struthers to provide punctuation which made sense to them. Remember, too, that they did not use the original. They used Thompson’s transcript (Thompson only has commas, and he too adds some to the text). They would not know what I know, that the scribe omits some commas because he often feels that punctuation is unnecessary at the end of a line. [Personal Communication from Chad Van Dixhoorn, September 14, 2004]. Dr. Van Dixhoorn kindly provided the text as punctuated in the MS Minutes rather than as punctuated in his transcript [Minutes, Westminster Assembly. Dr. Williams’s Library, MS 38.3 fo. 229v.]

the Scripture proof texts, first to the Confession, and presumably with each Catechism,<sup>25</sup> they worked with the printed copies of the texts and not the manuscripts. It is hard to imagine, even if none of the Divines intentionally checked the text, that, given the number of incidental differences, not one recognized some changes as they handled their personal copies during this work. Surely, at the very least, Dr. Burges,<sup>26</sup> who took such an active role in the preparation of the text of the Confession, who had made the first full transcription for the Assembly, and had moved on one occasion for a change to the partial text after it was printed,<sup>27</sup> would have sought to correct anything he found objectionable in the fully printed text (*Minutes*, 285-286, 289, 290-291, 304)? While not conclusive, that there are no such objections recorded in the Minutes, nor any subsequent attempts to correct the printed text, at least does not contradict the theory that the incidentals of the text were alterable without need for Assembly approval.

#### A CRITICAL TEXT APPROACH: CONCLUSION

The conclusion of all the forgoing is that the coupling of what is generally known about the printing practices of the period, with what is known about the Westminster Assembly's manuscripts and their printing, and the suppositions which can be drawn from this, all support taking a critical approach toward the texts. The exist-

ing manuscripts do not necessarily represent the final texts intended by the Assembly, but may be useful in possibly clarifying or correcting any actual incidental or substantial errors that could have survived the proofing process. But even with the few substantial differences, a critical approach is appropriate, since, with no printer's proofs, and so few surviving manuscripts of those likely to have existed, it cannot be verified whether a change was a mistake in printing, a mistake in the surviving manuscript, a correction to an error discovered in the proofing process, or at exactly what point and for what reason the change occurred.

#### II. Examining Carruthers' Work

Having established that continuing a critical approach to the text of the Westminster Standards is still justified, the balance of this article will focus on refining and correcting some of the data presented in S. W. Carruthers' 1937 work. Following a brief review of the early critical texts, some refining will be made to Dr. Carruthers' lineage of the traditional text as it descended in various popular 18<sup>th</sup> century editions. The article will then conclude by correcting the first occurrence of some of the textual variations identified in Carruthers' critical text.

#### THE 18<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY COLLECTIONS

As noted by Warfield, prior to the work of the Carruthers, one must go back to the early 18<sup>th</sup> century "Collections" to find the previous advancements toward a critical text of the Westminster Standards. The two rival collections were:

1. "Dunlop." *A Collection of Confessions of Faith, Catechisms, Directions, Books of Discipline*, etc. (Edinburgh: James Watson, 1719, 1721).

2. "Reformed Presbyterian." *The Confessions of Faith, Catechisms, Directories, Form of government, Discipline*, etc., of publick Authority in the Church of Scotland, etc. (Edinburgh: Thomas Lumisden and John Robertson, 1725).

#### *Dunlop's Collection*

The edition by James Watson of Edinburgh has become known by the name of the primary editor. William Dunlop (c.1692-1720) was Professor of Divinity and Church History at the University of Edinburgh.<sup>28</sup> In the advertisement regarding the text, after bemoan-

25. Detail is lacking in the Minutes as to the process of adding the Scripture proofs to the Catechisms, but it is reasonable to assume the same process was used as with the Confession of Faith (*Minutes*, 505, 508-511), where the Assembly marked the proofs as they were approved in the margin of one of the copies without proofs from the limited printing ordered by the Parliament.

26. Dr. Carruthers believed that Dr. Burges was responsible for the punctuation in the surviving manuscript of the Confession of Faith (*Three Centuries*, 1, 19; *Minutes*, 308. But see footnote 10 above). He noted that it follows a logical rather than a grammatical system, and was of the opinion that the punctuation in the manuscript could be helpful in showing the proper balance of a passage (*Burges*, Editorial Note). On the other hand, while he did not fault Dr. Burges in the 1946 edition of the manuscript, he indirectly did in his 1937 critical text, as some punctuation he criticized in various printed editions, occur in the manuscript as well (see for example error #38, #116, #146, #154, #163, #171, #178, #187, #229, #233; Carruthers, 102, 123, 130-131, 133, 135, 137, 139, 142, 153, 154).

27. On a previous occasion Dr. Burges moved to make a change to WCF 19.6 after the text of the first nineteen chapters had been printed. The phrase "upon the performance of them" was changed to "upon the performance thereof," and this is how the text reads in all editions from the second limited printing forward (*Minutes*, 307).

28. "William Dunlop," *Dictionary of Scottish Church History & Theology*, Nigel M. de S. Cameron, David F. Wright, David C. Lachman, Donald E. Meek, eds. (Downers Grove: IVP, 1993).

ing the defectiveness of previous editions of such an important work, it is stated:<sup>29</sup>

This moved several Gentlemen to bestow their Labours upon this Edition, and to employ all the Methods they could, to purge it from Errors which had crept into former Impressions, to dispose every thing in the most convenient Order, and render it at least tolerably perfect. . . . For this End, the Copy which this Edition was printed from, was compared with the utmost Care with all the authentick Editions published by Authority. . . .

Subsequently, the Dunlop edition of the Confession and Catechisms, acquired the reputation as a highly accurate and critical text; but there “is no doubt that this estimate is largely based on an acceptance of Dunlop’s own statement . . .” (Carruthers, 78). Murray sums up Carruthers’ findings regarding the Dunlop text of the Confession (Murray, 293):

‘Now what are the facts?’, the author asks. Of sixty errors in the text existing before his time Dunlop corrected nine. Among the fifty-one remaining are not a few important ones. He actually introduced fifty-two new errors. Only four of these affect the words, but of these one has radically altered the meaning and two are arbitrary changes without any discoverable excuse. As to punctuation no principle or system is apparent. ‘It is unmistakably evident, moreover’, he concludes, ‘that he had no eye what-ever for the logical balance of propositions in the sections, which, as we shall see, forms a great feature of the carefully considered punctuation<sup>30</sup> of the Assembly’ (pp. 78f.).

Although now esteem for Dunlop may be tarnished, at the time his work was viewed as quite significant.<sup>31</sup> Still, while his text with some modification became the standard, the edition itself was not reprinted. Dunlop’s early death, preventing him from completing the proposed third volume of his Collection, may have contributed to this. Also, strong dissatisfaction with his omission of some documents led to the production of a rival “Collection” (Warfield, 641):

This [the 1725 edition] is the first edition of the rival “Collection” published on account of dissatisfaction with the “Collection” of 1719-1722, edited by Dunlop – because “some things of no small moment belonging to such a Collection, and in use to be printed and bound with former editions of our Westminster Confession” [the *Sum* and Solemn League and Covenant

are particularly meant] “are left out, and others which have no pretense thereto are inserted.”

### *The Reformed Presbyterian Collection*

The edition published in 1725 by the Edinburgh firm of Thomas Lumisden and John Robertson, is attributed by the Carruthers (*The Shorter Catechism*, 48; *Three Centuries*, 59) to the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Scotland (hereafter RP). The editor is unknown, and no intimation is given of the work that must have gone into preparing the text. Dr. Carruthers explains (Carruthers, 80):

But the final result of the collation is a great respect for the accuracy of the editor, and for his modesty. He really did collate the original editions and said nothing about it; Dunlop had said a great deal about it, but had done it very imperfectly.

This rival Collection fared better than the Dunlop edition, and was republished in 1739, 1761, 1764, 1771 and 1785. However, neither did it become popular as a standard text, though these editions remain of some interest because the preparers of the early American texts of the PCUSA and ARP may have consulted them. Of more interest, is that textual variations found in the 1725 RP text were introduced at some point into the traditional text. This is the reason for Carruthers’ interest in the 1746 Robertson/McLean edition (see Table 1), as it contains these variations, and he believed it was possibly the bridge between Dunlop and the 1773 Kincaid. However, the source of these variations is actually the Lumisden and Robertson edition of 1728, and not the 1746 Glasgow John Robertson / Mrs. McLean (hereafter RbMcLean).

29. *A Collection*, etc. (Edinburgh, James Watson, 1719) 1.clvii.

30. Perhaps Dr. Carruthers realized that all the punctuation was not necessarily the Assembly’s, as he acknowledges in *Three Centuries* that the scribes had differing practices. While this article argues that the punctuation in the printed texts was to some degree a collaborative process, Carruthers viewed printer’s changes as taking liberties. As to wording changes, he does offer some brief but unverifiable theories on why there are differences between the Shorter Catechism MS and the printed text (*Three Centuries*, 1, 19).

31. The “Advertisement” to the Reformed Presbyterian edition notes: “And altho’ that Collection [Dunlop], for Neatneff and Correctneff of the Impression be justly commended. . . .” *The Confession of Faith, Catechisms*, etc. (Edinburgh: Thomas Lumisden and John Robertson, 1725) iii-iv.

*Lumisden and Robertson*

The two rival Collections contained a much broader array of documents than simply the Westminster Standards, and to some extent in each case, this may be a reason why neither became widely popular editions of the Westminster Standards. In 1728, Lumisden and Robertson (hereafter L&R), who had printed the first and second RP editions in 1725 and 1739, published their own edition of the Westminster Standards. Learning perhaps from the controversy which had called forth the rival RP collection in the first place,<sup>32</sup> the “proper” set of documents was included. And the publishers also took the pains to print the Scripture proofs in full (which had been only by reference in the RP editions), as in the Dunlop edition in “greatly improved form in two columns” (Warfield, 638). To what extent, or whether these were contributing factors or not, this form of the Westminster Standards became so accepted, that it essentially “set” their traditional appearance and form from that point forward. “This is the first edition in which are included the various documents found in the authorized editions of the Confession” (Warfield, 643).<sup>33</sup> The L&R text, which is based upon Dunlop with some RP variations, became the traditional Scottish text of the Westminster Standards.

The 1728 L&R edition follows a 552 page format with a 24 page index. Except for one addition,<sup>34</sup> and changes in size and format, the contents, including the index, changed little from this point forward. L&R issued one known reprint of this 1728 form in 1736. Warfield on the basis of the work of Lee lists a 1735 edition by Lumisden & Robertson (Warfield, 644), but this is the same as the 1736. Evidently the printing be-

32. While there is no direct connection to the author’s knowledge between Lumisden or Robertson and the Reformed Presbyterians, L&R did published material for the Secession Church. “Lumisden,” *Scottish Book Trade Index* (SBTI), National Library of Scotland. See URL: <http://www.nls.uk/catalogues/re-sources/sbti/index.html>.

33. Warfield is incorrect as far as the general order and selection of documents is concerned, which had a precedent in the 1679 “Covenanter” edition published in Holland. See *Antiquary*.

34. The 1690 Act did not appear in the traditional text until those of Francis Orr and Sons in the 1840s. See *Antiquary*.

35. An examination of this writer’s copy confirms this, and Carruthers comments on this as well (*Three Centuries*, 60). Another correction to the known Lumisden & Robertson editions should be noted. The National Library of Scotland has listed in the past, that in their collection they own both a 1744 and a 1745 edition. However, upon this writer’s communicating with NLS about these two volumes, it was discovered that both were examples of the 1744. There does not appear to be any such Lumisden and Robertson edition for 1745, as the only basis for suggesting one was this erroneous entry in the NLS catalog.

gan with the Catechisms late in 1735, as the separate title pages both bear that date. Those for the Confession and the other documents, as well as the main title page, are dated 1736.<sup>35</sup>

There was one other printing set to the 1728 L&R format. This was in fact the 1746 Glasgow printing of John Robertson and Mrs. McLean, proposed by Dr. Carruthers as the source of the introduction of the RP variations into the traditional text.

## THE 1746 ROBERTSON EDITION

Carruthers explained the reason for his interest in the RbMcLean edition thus (Carruthers, 82):

The Glasgow edition of 1746, which is probably representative of a considerable number of Glasgow editions, is of interest. Presumably the J. Robertson who issued it is the same who was previously in partnership with Thomas Lumisden in Edinburgh. If that be so, it would account for the fact that though the edition is based on Dunlop it has a number of variations traceable to the Reformed Presbyterian edition (e.g., 14, 43, 70, 83, 159, 178, 186). There are also some peculiarities which occur in the “Third Edition” (e.g., 15, 18, 40). This edition is also of importance because it was from a copy of it that Kincaid’s edition was set up. This is shewn by such peculiarities as 15, 18, 70, 83, 109, 124, 128, 159, 178, 186, 231.

*Robertson of Glasgow Equals  
Robertson of Edinburgh?*

Carruther’s statement that the RbMcLean edition was the direct source for Kincaid will be refuted later, but as for his hypothesis regarding Robertson, it can be disputed on two counts. First, the supposition that John Robertson of Glasgow once worked for L&R in Edinburgh can be disproved. According to the Scottish Book Trade Index, the John Robertson of L&R died before 1752, probably prior to 1747 when Lumisden & Robertson became Thomas Lumisden and Company. The SBTI notes regarding a son of Robertson: “John Robertson, son to deceased John Robertson printer, apprenticed to Thomas Lumsden [sic] printer 5 November 1752” (SBTI, “Robertson, John, printer and bookseller, Edinburgh”). The index also makes it clear that the Glasgow Robertson had been residing and working in that city for some time: “John Robertson and Mrs. McLean in the Middle of the Salt Market 1739-53” (SBTI, “Robertson, John printer and bookseller, Glasgow”). Clearly

these Robertsons are two different people. Neither does it appear that the man in Glasgow had any special connection to the man in Edinburgh (Scottish Book Trade Index, *ibid*).

Secondly, the theory is disproved when one examines the text of the RbMcLean edition and those published by L&R in 1728 and 1736. What becomes clear is not only does the 1746 RbMcLean follow the form of the L&R editions; it is set from one of them. From page to page the beginning and ending words are the same, not only in the text, but in the Scripture proofs as well. It is, as much as humanly and technically possible, an “image” of the earlier L&R printings. This is not surprising, as in general the printers set uncritically, unless the undertaking intentionally involved a critical review of the text. And in particular, printers of the Standards in the 18<sup>th</sup> century often set fairly close copies of previous printings, sometimes matching pages and line endings as exactly as possible.<sup>36</sup>

In theory, it may be supposed, while it was set closely to the L&R edition, that RbMcLean introduced some minor changes, and could still be the source of the RP variants. However, this is also disproved by examining the list of variants provided by Carruthers, traceable to the RP text (Tables 2&3).

In Carruthers’ comment regarding the Robertson and McLean edition, the three lists of numbers reference the 242 textual variants he traced in his critical text of the seven leading editions. Carruthers used the first of the three to demonstrate that variations from the Reformed Presbyterian texts, not present in Dunlop, are in the text of the Robertson-McLean Glasgow edition. Table 2 on the next page shows a comparison of these places in the text of the Confession of Faith, as they occur in the RP text of 1725, the L&R editions of 1728 and 1736, and the RbMcLean of 1746. Table 3 shows the three variants traceable to the “third” edition.

Regarding the data in Tables 2 & 3, two errors must first be noted. Carruthers is mistaken when he writes that the RbMcLean text has a colon in variant #14 at WCF 3.2, which he contended was the same punctuation used in the 1739 RP edition.<sup>37</sup> He also mistakenly attributes a semi-colon to the RbMcLean at variant #159 in WCF 22.6. What becomes clear, taking these corrections into account, is that at least with these variants the RbMcLean matches exactly the L&R text, while both vary from the RP of 1725 at #14 and #159. When the three variants that Carruthers traced to Edition Three are examined, it is clear that L&R and RbMcLean match as well. It also appears likely that the RbMcLean text was set from the 1736 L&R and not the earlier 1728

edition (note the readings at #178 in Table 2, and at #124 in Table 4).

#### A MORE COMPLEX PATH

Clearing up the question of the origin of the introduction of the RP variants into the Dunlop text, is only part of the problem in tracing the descent of the traditional text through the middle of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. If Scottish printers had continued copying the 552 page L&R format begun in 1728, tracing the lineage of the text down to the 1773 Kincaid edition may have been a simpler matter. However, L&R itself did not continue long with this format.

In 1744 L&R published a new edition, this time following a 546 page format, with a 22 page index. While most 18<sup>th</sup> century editions of the standards are rare, this edition is particularly so. And while almost all English titles through the year 1700 are available in the Early English Books collection,<sup>38</sup> a similar project to film 18<sup>th</sup> century titles is far from complete.<sup>39</sup> Happily, a copy of the 1744 L&R is owned by the National Library of Scotland, and the Curator of Rare Books, Dr. Anette I. Hagan, kindly arranged for a preservation film, and a copy for the author’s use.<sup>40</sup>

The popularity of the 1744 L&R edition is illustrated perhaps by the fact that surviving copies are so rare, and by the fact its form was subsequently followed many times by other printers. However, in trying to determine if the 1773 Kincaid edition descends from this one by L&R, another twist appears. The Kincaid is indeed set to a 546 page format with a 22 page index. However, it varies enough from the 1744 form so as to be distinct. What becomes apparent in examining these 546 page

36. It was common to set copies in this way, though obviously differences in type and equipment made perfectly exact copies difficult. McKerrow, 181, 186-188.

37. It is possible that Dr. Carruthers consulted an example of RbMcLean that contained a variant, but this author’s copy has the semi-colon, and it appears the source of the colon is the 1744 L&R edition. See footnote 49.

38. *Early English Books 1475-1640*, STC I (Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, [1937?]-1993). *Early English Books 1641-1700*, STC II (Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, [1975?]-).

39. *The Eighteenth Century* (Primary Source Microfilm, an Imprint of the Gale Group). RbMcLean is available in this set. Unit 264, No(s). 1-26. Religion & Philosophy. Box 2208. Reel 9219.

40. Dr. Hagan was very helpful in aiding the research for this paper, and the author was also able eventually to obtain microfilm copies of a number of rare editions that factor in the lineage of the traditional text: the Watson 1708, the E. Robertson of 1756, the 1771 (n.p.), and Kincaid’s 1773.

Table 2: Reformed Presbyterian Variants in RbMcLean and L&R

WCF Variant	RP 1725	RbMcLean	L&R1728/1736
#14 @ 3.2	conditions, yet	conditions; yet	conditions; yet
#43 @ 7.6	Christ the substance was	Christ the substance was	Christ the substance was
#70 @ 10.1	pleased, in his	pleased, in his	pleased, in his
#83 @ 11.4	elect; and Christ	elect; and Christ	elect; and Christ
#159 @ 22.6	duties; or	duties, or	duties, or
#178 @ 25.1	church, which	church, which	church, which (1728 lacks “;”)
#186 @ 26.2	saints, by profession, are	saints, by profession, are	saints, by profession, are

Table 3: “Third” Edition Variants in RbMcLean and L&R

WCF Variant	RP 1725	RbMcLean	L&R1728/1736
#15 @ 3.4	designed, and their	designed; and their	designed; and their
#18 @ 3.7	mankind, God	mankind, God	mankind, God
#40 @ 7.3	saved, and promising	saved; and promising	saved; and promising

Table 4: Tracing Variants from Lumisden & RbMcLean to Kincaid

WCF Variant	L&R1728/1736/1744	RbMcLean	E. Robertson	Kincaid
#15 @ 3.4	designed; and their			
#18 @ 3.7	mankind, God			
#70 @ 10.1	pleased, in his			
#83 @ 11.4	elect; and Christ		elect: and Christ	
#109 @ 17.3	Spirit; come ... comforts; have ... wounded; hurt			
#124 @ 19.6	Rule of life, informing (except 1728: “Rule, of life informing”)			
#128 @ 19.7	cheerfully, which	cheerfully which	cheerfully, which	
#129 @ 19.7	God revealed in the law requireth			
#159 @ 22.6	duties, or			
#178 @ 25.1	church, which (except 1728: “church which” as in Dunlop)			
#186 @ 26.2	saints, by profession, are			
#231 @ 31.3	God, appointed			

editions, is that they generally fall into two forms. Form A follows the 1744 form set by L&R. Form B follows an edition published by E. Robertson in 1756. Table 4 demonstrates that this edition was derived from the 1744 L&R. The differences in the forms are clearly seen in comparing where each begins the texts of the Confession and the Catechisms, as shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Pagination Differences in 546 page Forms A & B

Section	Form A	Form B
WCF	23	21
WLC	161	167
WSC	359	381

In examining the bibliographies compiled by Warfield and S. W. Carruthers, it appears there were at least seventeen editions of the 546 page form which can still be traced, with ten following Form A and seven following Form B.<sup>41</sup>

As for Form A, except for the first by Lumisden & Robertson of Edinburgh in 1744, all the subsequent editions were printed in Glasgow.

Table 6: Nine Editions of Form A (L&R 1744)

1. J. Robertson and Mrs. McLean, 1749
2. William Duncan, 1749
3. James Knox, 1752
4. William Duncan, 1753
5. John Robertson Sr., 1753
6. Bryce & Patterson, 1755
7. John Robertson Sr., 1756
- 8.a Archibald McLean for John Orr, 1757
- 8.b Also: for Alexander Weir, 1757
9. William Duncan, 1762

In addition to the microfilm of the 1744 edition, the author has examples of #5 and #9. These two closely follow the 1744. The Robertson Sr. of 1756, one example of which has some sections dated 1757, varies slightly. Carruthers noted that the Shorter Catechism begins on page 359 instead of 357, but that it nevertheless follows the same printer's 1753 text so closely, that the line endings are almost all the same (*Three Centuries*, 62). The McLean printings (which evidently are the same printing issued with different title pages for the two booksellers) follow the Robertson, Sr. of 1756 in the pagination of the Shorter Catechism, and are evidently set from it. Another variant, apparent from Carruthers' description (*Three Centuries*, 61), is that

the Shorter Catechism in the William Duncan edition of 1749 ends on page 397, while still extending to 546 pages. And the William Duncan of 1753 varies in that it has only 544 pages; however, the Shorter Catechism still runs from pages 359 to 398 (with 398 evidently blank as Carruthers has "357-398 ['397']" – which may also be the case with the 1749 edition).

Form B begins with the Edinburgh edition of E. Robertson (E.Rob).<sup>42</sup> Except for the Kincaid, and possibly the 1771, all the other editions of this form were printed in Glasgow.

Table 7: Six Editions of Form B (E.Rob, 1756).

1. Glasgow (n.p., 1764)
2. For Alexander Weir (Glasgow, 1767-68)
3. Glasgow (n.p., 1768)
4. Robert Duncan (Glasgow, 1768)
5. Edinburgh? (n.p., 1771)
6. Kincaid (Edinburgh, 1773)

Three of these editions do not identify a publisher, and the strange characteristics of #4 are detailed by Warfield (Warfield, 648).<sup>43</sup> The author owns examples of #4 and #6.

### Glasgow vs. Edinburgh

It is interesting that in both cases the form was set by an Edinburgh edition, and all but a couple of the subsequent copies of the forms are Glasgow printings. In fact, in reviewing all the different editions of the Westminster Standards published between 1719 and 1773 where the place is noted (*Three Centuries*, 53-74), it appears that there were only ten or eleven Edinburgh editions, while at least 37 Glasgow printings occurred over that period. Of the Edinburgh editions, six were printed by L&R, while E. Robertson published two.

It is not clear why nearly four times the number of Edinburgh editions would be called forth during the

41. A Glasgow edition (n.p.) of 1763, while it may derive from either Form A or B, varies significantly enough over its 544 page length that it has not been included under either form.

42. The author gratefully acknowledges the help of Rev. Sherman Isbell who carefully checked various readings in the example of the E. Robertson edition owned by the Library of Congress, and examined copies of #1, #2, #3 and #5 at the NLS while in Edinburgh during the summer of 2004.

43. Warfield examined several copies of this edition and the various title pages of the different pieces are dated 1755 as well as 1768. Thus this edition may have been pieced from earlier as well as newer print work; but the pagination nevertheless is that of Form B.

same period in Glasgow. The fact that the printing industry had just really started to get going in Glasgow in the late 1730s, after faltering for a long period,<sup>44</sup> along with the close proximity of a new type foundry and a source for paper (*Glasgow*, 9-10), as well as the presence of an active group of booksellers available to market products (*Glasgow*, 10), may have all contributed toward making Glasgow amenable for new printers to open shop. And if the market really could bear so many editions of the Westminster Standards over that period, perhaps the infrequency of editions from Edinburgh, was an opening for Glasgow businesses to exploit? At least it is hard to imagine printers would have continued to so often reprint the Standards if the books were not finding a market.

*E. Robertson and Thomas Lumisden*

As noted previously, Dr. Carruthers was incorrect in attempting to connect John Robertson of L&R, Edinburgh, with the John Robertson of Robertson/McLean in Glasgow. However, as it turns out, there is still a Robertson connection in the descent of the traditional text; but it involves a different Robertson and different editions. A connection can be made between L&R and E. Robertson. Ebenezer was another son of John Robertson of that firm, and was apprenticed to Thomas Lumisden after his father's death. "Ebenezer Robertson son to John Robertson printer, apprenticed to Thomas Lumisden [sic] printer 11 July 1750" (SBTI, "Robertson, Ebenezer and John printers and booksellers Edinburgh"). Also for a short time the two worked together in partnership in 1757.<sup>45</sup> Thus, in addition to the fact that the first editions of both forms are Edinburgh editions, there is this familial and business link between the two publishers of the two patterns followed by the various Glasgow printers.

44. The Scottish Printing Archival Trust, *A Reputation for Excellence: A History of the Glasgow Printing Industry* (Edinburgh: Merchiston Publishing, 1994) 4, 7. Hereafter, *Glasgow*.

45. James Burgh, *Britain's remembrancer: or, the danger not over* (Edinburgh: T. Lumisden and E. Robertson, 1757). A search of the COPAC union catalog (<http://www.copac.ac.uk>) indicates this may have been the last publication with Lumisden's name involved. An errant entry indicating a later publication should be disregarded, as it mistakes the Roman numeral date of 1743 for 1763.

46. The 1764 edition varies from the other Glasgow printings, in that it has a colon: "consent. Yet ... Lord: and". This indicates later examples of Form B probably do not directly derive from the 1764.

47. Consequently, it became important to double check the variants Carruthers attributed to Kincaid (Carruthers, 85). Dr. Rowland S. Ward, who was traveling from Australia to Edinburgh on the way to Philadelphia to lecture on the Directory for Public Worship at the

*Connecting E. Robertson to Kincaid*

It seems unlikely that Alexander Kincaid, an Edinburgh printer, would have used a Glasgow printing of Form B from which to set his edition. Table 8 demonstrates that the variants introduced by E. Robertson into the Confession of Faith, in setting his text from the 1744 L&R, do not appear in the Glasgow forms copying his edition. But these do appear in Kincaid's 1773 edition. This at first glance, would seem to indicate that Kincaid derives directly from E. Robertson.

Table 8: E.Rob, Kincaid & Glasgow Editions Compared

WCF	E.Rob/Kincaid	Form B Glasgow eds.
9.5	"free to do good"	"free to good"
24.3	"consent: yet/Lord."	"consent. Yet/Lord;" <sup>46</sup>
25.6	"Christ; nor"	"Christ. Nor"
27.4	"Lord: neither"	"Lord; neither"

*The 1771 Intermediate Link to Kincaid*

However, another interesting wrinkle enters into the lineage of the traditional text at this point. Kincaid did not set his 1773 text directly from E. Robertson's 1756, but set his text from the 1771 (n.p.) edition. When Rev. Isbell had examined this edition, it was only for the purpose of classifying it as Form A or B. The initial assumption was that the 1771 was a Glasgow edition, and that it was more likely Kincaid would have set from an Edinburgh printing. Also, to this point no edition in the lineage had been anonymously published. But, it is as likely the 1771 was an Edinburgh printing, and since it is the closest edition of Form B to the 1773, upon reflection, it was obvious it needed to be more carefully examined. It became clear the 1771 was the source for Kincaid,<sup>47</sup> after Dr. Hagan kindly checked a few key places. Except for one difference where it follows the Glasgow texts (which are correct in dropping the added "do" at WCF 9.5), the 1771 edition matches the E. Robertson text in the places just noted.

Table 9: E.Rob, Kincaid and 1771 Editions Compared

WCF	E.Rob/Kincaid	1771 n.p.
9.5	"free to do good"	"free to good"
24.3	"consent: yet/Lord."	the same
25.6	"Christ; nor"	" "
27.4	"Lord: neither"	" "

However, there are some differences in the Kincaid and E. Robertson texts and these differences appear to have been introduced in the 1771 edition.

Table 10: Differences in E. Rob and Kincaid and 1771

WCF	1771/Kincaid	E. Rob.
8.2	“without sin: and”	“without sin, and”
22.6	“creature but to”	“creature, but to”
LC 13	“glory; and,”	“glory, and,”
LC 15	“world, and all”	“world and all”
LC 30	“leave all men”	“leave all mankind”
LC 35	“Baptism, and”	“Baptism and”

While the 1773 is not so closely set to the 1771 that its appearance is the same page for page and line ending for line ending, there are some physical similarities. Both are among the larger format editions of those published in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. According to the data given by Dr. Carruthers (*Three Centuries*, 62-63), the 1771 is 17.1 x 9.7 cm and the Kincaid measures 17.0 x 9.7, and both are the only 4<sup>o</sup> (quarto) editions for the period from 1719 to 1773, aside from the 1756 E. Robertson (which measures 15.6 x 9.3 cm).

#### CORRECTED LINEAGE OF THE TEXT

With this rather large adjustment to the middle portion of the 18<sup>th</sup> century lineage of the traditional text of the Confession of Faith completed, there remain a few minor modifications to note before offering corrections to some of the entry points of textual corruptions given by Dr. Carruthers (Carruthers, 85).

In brief, Watson’s Fourth can be added between “Third” and “Fifth,” as the evidence suggests that Crutenden and Cox set up their edition from it. Also, two later Kincaid editions can be added between Kincaid’s 1773 and Kerr, as many if not most of the variants Carruthers traced to Kerr actually first occur in these.

In addition, there is evidence that rather than setting up their first edition of 1851 from a Blair edition, Johnstone & Hunter apparently followed an edition by Francis Orr & Sons. This is because Orr’s addition of Mark 9:43 to reference ‘o’ at Larger Catechism 29 is reproduced in the first Johnstone & Hunter edition, but this change is not in the Blair editions published between 1803 and 1841.

The corrected lineage of the traditional text of the Standards can now be presented (Table 11. See Endnote B for the fuller bibliographical details of the editions not given in Endnote A).

Table 11: Corrected Lineage of the Traditional Text

1. Edition Three (London, 1647)
2. Edition Four (Edinburgh, 1647)
3. Edition Five (Edinburgh, 1647)
4. Edition Six (London, 1648)
5. Rothwell (London, 1658)
6. “Third” (London, 1688)
7. Fourth (Edinburgh, 1708)
8. “Fifth” (London, 1717)
9. Dunlop (Edinburgh, 1719-21)
10. L&R A, B (Edinburgh, 1728/36)
11. L&R C (Edinburgh, 1744)
12. E. Rob (Edinburgh, 1756)
13. 1771 ([n.p.], 1771)
14. Kincaid A (Edinburgh, 1773)
15. Kincaid B, C (Edinburgh, 1781/88)
16. Kerr (Edinburgh, 1793)
17. Blair (Edinburgh, 1803-41)
18. Orr (Glasgow, 1842)
19. Johnstone A, B, C (Edinburgh, 1851, 55, 67)

#### III. Correcting the First Occurrence of Textual Variants in the Traditional Text

With the lineage corrected, the edition of origin of many of the textual variants Carruthers first traced in the traditional text of the Confession of Faith can be reassigned and corrected.

##### WATSON’S FOURTH

For his critical text, Carruthers did not examine an example of the edition published by James Watson in 1707/08, though he speculated it contributed to the variations in the traditional text (Carruthers, 77). Watson evidently began to print late in 1707 as there are varieties dated 1707 and 1708, with the 1707 styled the “Fifth edition” and the title page of the 1708 reset as the “Fourth edition.” Carruthers in his later work expressed the opinion that they are from the same type, and an examination of each at several points confirms this. Watson may have first used “fifth edition” counting from Sanders’ “Glasgow Fourth” (*Three Centuries*, 58), and then reconsidered the numbering after commencing with the printing. In his earlier work, Carruthers

2004 Westminster Assembly Conference, generously agreed to check these variants in the examples of the E. Robertson and the 1771 edition at the National Library of Scotland.

proposed that the correction to “Fourth” was to represent the “Fourth” edition following the Third of 1688, with the emphasis in the Scripture references in an italic font (Carruthers, 76-77). Whatever the reason, Watson’s 1707-08 edition does appear to descend from the “Third” of 1688, rather than the “Glasgow Fourth” edition of 1675. This is shown by the presence of two variations introduced by “Third” that are in Watson.

Table 12: Watson Descends from “Third”

WCF“	Third”/Watson	Glasgow 4th
#35 (6.3)	“posterity, descending”	no comma
#164 (23.2)	“occasions.”	“occasion.”

Of the three variants Carruthers traced to “Third,” the last (#210) does match up with Glasgow Fourth rather than Watson. Glasgow Fourth and Watson have at WCF 29.2: “Father; nor.” “Third” has: “Father, nor.” But the weight of the uniqueness of the other two variants point toward Watson’s reliance upon “Third” to set his text. As the semi-colon is the correct punctuation, Watson could have simply corrected it from the comma, or independently introduced the correct reading by accident.

When the six variants are examined which Carruthers traced first to Cox’s “Fifth,” it also becomes clear that Watson’s Fourth neatly drops into the lineage of the traditional text between “Fifth” and “Third.” All six appear in Watson, but not in “Third” (or in Glasgow Fourth for that matter). These are: #32, #89, #96, #97, #107, and #125 (see the list given at Endnote E). Of these six, Carruthers appears to have an error regarding #32, which he attributed correctly to “Fifth” in the summary list of variants (Carruthers, 85). However, in

48. The author once again must express his appreciation to both Sherman Isbell who collated the two Watson editions at points of interest, and to Dr. Hagan for checking against the Watson text, the six variants traced by Carruthers to Cox (Carruthers, 85).

49. The author has two copies of the Kincaid text. In addition to the NLS film copy, the author subsequently acquired an example once owned by Westminster College, Cambridge. According to the bookplate inside the front cover, William Carruthers donated this copy to the college in 1907. As with any correction the author has made to S. W. Carruthers’ work, it is certainly possible that the text he examined may have had a different reading than that found in these two examples. In the process of printing, type can drop out and the printer may have subsequently replaced the missing block with the incorrect type. Thus there can and often are variants within a single edition (see McKerrow, 204). However, in this case it appears to be a mistake or conflation of facts on Dr. Carruthers’ part, as the note in question covers several variants, with different histories and introduction points (Carruthers, 114).

his note, it is indicated that the variant “only” occurs in Anderson and Reformed Presbyterian (Carruthers, 100), contrary to the fact it remained in the traditional text from Watson/Cox onward.<sup>48</sup>

#### ROBERTSON AND MCLEAN’S 1746

Of those variants Carruthers traced to the 1746 Rb-McLean edition, numbers #1, #18, #31, #40, #43, #70, #83, #124, #129, #159, #186, and #231 all trace to the L&R text first published in 1728. Variants #14 and #15 appear first in the 1744 L&R text. Variant #178 as noted in Table 4 first occurs in the L&R 1736 edition, as does #109. Also, while #83 first occurs in the L&R text, it has a more complex history not noted by Carruthers. E. Robertson introduced a colon for L&R’s semi-colon which is in the 1771 edition, as well as Kincaid’s 1773. The semi-colon was restored in Kincaid’s 1781.

In addition, several variants are attributed to Rb-McLean in error in the summary list (Carruthers, 85). Variant #34 is not in RbMcLean, but does occur in Kincaid’s 1773. Neither does #48 appear in RbMcLean (Carruthers, 105). Variant #91 is incorrectly listed under RbMcLean and should have been listed under Kerr. It is also incorrect in the note (Carruthers, 115). For #182, Carruthers correctly traced the first occurrences to their proper editions in his note, but inexplicably lists the variant under RbMcLean in the summary list (Carruthers, 85, 141).

#### KINCAID’S 1773

The following attributed to Kincaid’s 1773 edition occur first in L&R’s 1744 edition: #37, #62, #68, #94, #98, #113, #175, #196, #221, #230. Variant #221 is listed under Kincaid in Carruthers’ list (Carruthers, 85); but in the note it assigns the variant to Kerr. It does appear in Kincaid, but as noted, the introduction to the traditional text came in L&R’s 1744 edition. Also, two of several variants Carruthers lists in #65 as introduced by Kincaid, came in earlier, one in the 1744 edition, the other in E. Robertson’s 1756.

Other errors in the list occur. Variant #72 at WCF 10.2 (“man; who”) does not occur in Kincaid. The semi-colon was introduced in Kincaid’s 1788 edition. The comma was restored in Kerr, but the semi-colon was reintroduced in Blair’s 1803. Variant #69 has a more complex history, for which see the note in Endnote E.

There also is an error in assigning Variant #85 at WCF 12.1 (“God: have”) to Kincaid, which reads “God; have.”<sup>49</sup> The text from Rothwell through Cox had “God.

Have.” Dunlop changed this to a colon. L&R introduced a semi-colon, which remained in the traditional text. A comma, present both in the manuscript and early printed texts, is the correct punctuation. Interestingly, the RP text of 1725 has the comma, supporting Carruthers’ esteem for its accuracy over Dunlop.

Variant #140 was introduced by Dunlop, which is indicated in Carruthers’ note (Carruthers, 129), but the entry is duplicated for some reason under Kincaid as well in the summary lists (Carruthers, 85). Variant #159 is similarly listed in duplicate under RbMcLean as well as Kincaid, but is not mentioned in the note (Carruthers, 134). And as already corrected under RbMcLean, #159 actually came into the traditional text with the L&R editions.

Of the remaining variants listed by Carruthers, the following were introduced by the E. Robertson edition: #7, #55, #74, #127, #133, #157, #165, #171, #177, #184, #195, #197, #200, #201, #208, #236, #240, #241. Also, one of two variants listed in #224 assigned to Kincaid, first occurred in E. Robertson’s text, which also happened to restore the correct text in the other, but the second variant was restored by the 1771 (See Endnote E). In addition, the following were introduced by the 1771 edition rather than by Kincaid: #47, #60, #102, #111, #119, #231.

This leaves only three variants of the more than forty Carruthers originally assigned to Kincaid, as actually coming into the text with that edition: #3, #17, and #34.

#### KINCAID AND KERR

The firm of Alexander Kincaid followed up their very nice 1773 octavo edition with two smaller 12mo versions, one in 1781 and the other in 1788. Carruthers did not examine either of these, and many of the variants he traced to Kerr’s 1793 first occur in them. Kerr is also a 12mo edition and appears to be set fairly carefully from the 1788 Kincaid. Of the variants Carruthers attributed to Kerr, the following occur in both the 1781 and 1788 Kincaid editions: #2, #10, #25, #28, #50, #52, #82, #100, #105, #106, #115, #116, #128, #148, #150, #158, #192, #199, #211, #221, #226. The following two were introduced in the 1788 edition: #80, #104. Carruthers listed #10 under both Kincaid and Kerr, and only listed Kincaid in the note on page 93. However, Kincaid’s 1773 text has the correct reading and it is Kerr that has the variant. In addition, the variant was actually introduced in Kincaid’s 1781. The portion of variant #115 assigned by Carruthers to Kerr, first occurs in Kincaid’s 1781 as

well (the other portion was changed in L&R’s 1744). This leaves #91 in Carruthers’ list, as the only variant introduced by Kerr (Carruthers, 85).

#### BLAIR & BRUCE

The Edinburgh printing firm of Sir D. Hunter Blair and Bruce produced seven similar editions of the Standards over forty years (one each in 1803, 1810, 1815, 1827, 1831, 1836 and 1841). In looking at these editions, one would think they were printed from the same stereotype plates, they so closely follow each other. But they are actually each carefully set by hand. Carruthers only examined the 1810 and 1831 editions. The five variants he traced to the 1810 edition (Carruthers, 85), all appear first in the 1803. Of the six attributed to the 1831 printing only #4 first appeared in that edition. Variants #95 and #181 first appear in the 1815 edition, and #33, #39, and #117 in the 1827 edition.

#### JOHNSTONE & HUNTER

The Johnstone & Hunter editions were dominant from 1851 through the end of the century. There are three distinct types. Carruthers’ Johnstone “A” was stereotyped and published in 1851, and was very likely set from an edition of Francis Orr and Sons, because of the addition of Mark 9:43 as a Scripture proof text at WLC 29. Johnstone “B” is the 1855 large format edition with the reintroduction of the italics in the Scripture proofs, which had first been introduced by Rothwell in 1658. Johnstone “C” is a small compact edition first published in 1860, and reprinted many times through the end of the century. Graham and Heslip in Belfast published a photo-reprint of this type in 1933. Copies of this edition were purchased by the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and there are also Free Church editions with additional matter issued as the *Subordinate Standards and Other Authoritative Documents of the Free Church of Scotland*. One of the two variants which Carruthers assigned to Johnstone “B”, is apparently incorrect (Carruthers, 85, 133). Variant #155 should rather be assigned to Johnstone “C” (See Endnote E).

#### CONCLUSION

A review of what is known about the printing practices at the time of the Westminster Assembly, supports continuing a critical approach to the texts of the Confession and Catechisms. Such a review demonstrates that the record of how the manuscript texts passed into their

final printed form is far from complete. There would have been a careful printing process, with manuscripts marked up by the compositor, as well as printed proof copies, which would have passed back and forth between the printer and the scribes of the Assembly. Lacking the full record of this process, it is now difficult to determine for certain whether even the few “substantial” differences in wording between a single surviving manuscript and the printed text reflect an unauthorized change. Certainly, the case made for discretion with the “incidentals” of the text by the scribes and printer, raises the probability that the Assembly did not regard these as unalterable in the printing process. All this suggests that a critical approach to the text is prudent, making use of the first published editions as well as the manuscripts.

Having justified a critical approach to the text of the Confession and Catechisms, the balance of this article sought to correct the work of Dr. S. W. Carruthers. A fuller lineage was presented of the traditional text of the Westminster Standards than originally proposed by him in 1937, showing a more complex descent through the end of the eighteenth century. From this corrected lineage, adjustments and refinements were made to the entry points of the textual corruptions first identified by Dr. Carruthers in his ground breaking critical work with the text of the Westminster Confession of Faith.

#### ENDNOTES

A. The following are the fuller bibliographical details for the volumes listed in Table 1. (1) Edition Three: *The humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines, now by Authority of Parliament sitting at Westminster, Concerning a Confession of Faith, with the Quotations and Texts of Scripture annexed ...* (London: Printed for the Company of Stationers [May, 1647]). (2) Edition Four: *The Humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines ... concerning a Confession of Faith*, etc. [With an order of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland that three hundred copies, and no more, be printed] (Printed at London and reprinted at Edinburgh by Evan Tyler, 1647). (3) Edition Five: *The Humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines, Now by Authority of Parliament sitting at Westminster, Concerning A Confession of Faith: With the Quotations and Texts of Scripture annexed* (Printed at London; and Re-printed at Edinburgh by Evan Tyler, Printer to the Kings most Excellent Majesty, 1647). (4) Edition Six: *The Humble Advice*, etc. (London: For Robert Boſtock, 1648). (5) Rothwell: *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (London: Printed for the Company of Stationers and are to

be sold by J. Rothwel, 1658). (6) “Third”: *The Confession of Faith: together with the Larger and Lesser catechisms. The third edition* (London: Printed for the Company of Stationers, and are to be sold by Tho. Parkhurst and Dorman Newman, 1688). (7) “Fifth”: *The Confession of Faith*, etc. The Fifth Edition (London: S. Crutenden and T. Cox, 1717). (8) Dunlop: “The Confession of Faith, Larger and Shorter Catechisms,” *A Collection of Confessions of Faith, Catechisms, Directories, Books of Discipline*, etc. (Edinburgh: Printed by James Watson, 1719-21) vol. 1. (9) Robertson: *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Glasgow: John Robertson and Mrs. McLean, 1746). (10) Kincaid: *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Edinburgh: Printed for Alex. Kincaid, His Majesty’s Printer, 1773). (11) Kerr: *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Edinburgh: Printed for Mark and Charles Kerr, His Majesty’s Printers, 1793). (12) Blair: *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Edinburgh: Sir D. Hunter Blair and J. Bruce: 1810 [Blair A]; and 1831 [Blair B]). (13) Johnstone: *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Edinburgh: Johnstone and Hunter, 1851 [Johnstone A]; 1855 [Johnstone B]; and 1860 [Johnstone C]).

B. The following are the fuller bibliographical details for the volumes listed in Table 11 not already given in Endnote A. (7) “Fourth”: *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Edinburgh: James Watson, 1707/08). (10). *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Edinburgh: Lumisden & Robertson, 1728) and *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Edinburgh: Lumisden & Robertson, 1736). (11). *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Edinburgh: Lumisden & Robertson, 1744). (12). *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Edinburgh: E. Robertson, 1756). (13). *The Confession of Faith*, etc. ([Edinburgh?]: n.p, 1771). (15) *The Confession*, etc. (Edinburgh: Assigns of Alexander Kincaid, His Majesty’s Printer, 1781); and *The Confession*, etc. (Edinburgh: Assigns of Alexander Kincaid, His Majesty’s Printer, 1788). (17) Blair: *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Edinburgh: Sir D. H. Blair and J. Bruce, 1803); *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Edinburgh: Sir D. Hunter Blair and J. Bruce, 1815); *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Edinburgh: Sir D. Hunter Blair and M.S. Bruce, 1827); *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Edinburgh: Sir D. Hunter Blair and M. T. Bruce, 1836); and *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Edinburgh: Sir D. Hunter Blair and M.S. Tyndall Bruce, 1841). (18) *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Glasgow: Francis Orr and Sons, 1842; 1845; 1848; 1849). Carruthers notes at least regarding the 1848 and 1849 that they appear to be the same type as the 1842 with altered title pages for the publication date. But evidently these were not stereotype editions, as he states that the Johnstone & Hunter

of 1851 appeared to be the first edition stereotyped in Britain. (*Three Centuries*, 67-68).

C. See Footnote 13. The author examined eight editions of this document printed in 1642. One of items 1, 6, or 8 probably served as the copy from which the other two were set, as they have made similar choices in the incidentals of the text. All the editions by or for F.C. appear to be the same text or set very closely to each other (2, 3, and 4).

1. *A remonstrance of the state of the Kingdome agreed on by the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament the 19. of May, 1642* (London: Printed for Iohn Bartlet, 1642). EEB, Reel 1441:21. Wing E2222. 22 pp. Wing also lists a variant by Bartlet with the “divers depositions and letters.” Wing E2222A.

2. *A remonstrance of the state of the kingdome: agreed on by the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament the 19 of May 1642* (Printed at London: For F.C., 1642). EEB 1651:14. Wing E2223. (2) 33 pp.

3. *A remonstrance of the state of the kingdome: agreed on by the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament the 19 of May 1642: with Divers depositions and letters annexed* (Printed at London for F.C., 1642). EEB 1651: 15. Wing E2223, Variant. (2) 33, (1), 1, 24-50 (i.e. 46) pp. The first 33 pages containing the Remonstrance is the same as 2 above. There are variants of this title: E2223AA, E2223BA.

4. *A Remonstrance or Declaration of the State of the Kingdome, etc.* (London: Printed by R. O. and G. D. for F.C, 1642). EEB 1430:02. Wing R1023. Except for the title page this appears to be the same as 2 & 3 above.

5. *The declaration or remonstrance of the Lords and Commons in Parliament assembled: with divers depositions and letters thereunto annexed* (London: Printed for Joseph Hunscoott and John Wright, 1642). EEB 252: E.148, no. 17. Wing E1517. (2), 59 (i.e. 51) pp. The author has not found a variant edition with only the text of the Declaration by Hunscoott and Wright.

6. *A declaration or remonstrance of the state of the kingdome: agreed on by the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament the 19 of May, 1642, and published by order of both Houses: with divers depositions and letters thereunto annexed ...: also the votes of both Houses of Parliament, the twentieth of May, 1642: with the humble petition of the Lords and Commons in Parliament assembled, to the Kings Most Excellent Majesty at Yorke* (Printed for T.P. in Queenshead-Alley, 1642). EEB 1001:26 (Wing D782) and EEB 1382:20 (Wing E1518). [2], 48 [i.e. 46] pp.

7. *A Remonstrance of the State of the Kingdome, etc.*

(London: Printed for T. Paybody, 1642). This is probably a variant of 6 above. Wing 2223A. [2] 48 pp. A copy with this imprint is noted in the collection at University of Durham, Palace Green Library, Routh.

8. *A Remonstrance of the State of the Kingdome, agreed on by the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament May 19. 1642 (Divers depositions and letters appertaining to the Remonstrance.)* (London: Printed for Thomas Bates, 1642). EEB 2498:17 Wing E2223B. pp. 50.

The Remonstrance also appears in: John Rush-worth, *Historical collections of private passages of state, weighty matters in law, remarkable proceedings in five Parliaments*, vol. 3 (Printed for R. Chiswell and T. Cockerill, 1692) 691-703. EEB 40:1. Wing R2317-R2319. The Remonstrance and the additions also appear in: *An Exact Collection of all Remonstrances, Declarations, Ordinances and other passages between the King's Majesty and his Parliament* (London: Printed for Edward Husbands, et al, 1643). EEB 266:E.241. Wing E1533. 955 pp.

Note: The names John Bartlett, Thomas Bates, Joseph Hunscoott, and Edward Husbands, are listed in: W. Craig Ferguson, *Occasional Papers of the Bibliographical Society Number 4: The Loan Book of The Stationers' Company: With a List of Transactions 1592-1692* (London: The Bibliographical Society, 1989).

D. As will be noted in the published form of his Lecture on the Directory for Public Worship delivered at the 2004 Westminster Assembly Conference, Dr. Rowland Ward has discovered two apparent signature notations in the Assembly's manuscript copy that may have been made by the printer. He kindly provided copies of the manuscripts to the author to confirm this and to determine if there were additional markings. In examining these, it is obvious that given their quality and the slight way in which many of these marks may be made, the originals will need to be examined to make a final determination as to what extent the manuscripts are actually marked up. That said, it is at least clear from the copies that a portion of the manuscripts contain a number of compositor's notations, relating to signatures F though I in the first edition (*Directory for the Publique Worship of God* [London: for E. Tyler, A. Fifield, R. Smith and J. Field, 1644 {1645}]. Wing D1544. See 33-57.).

The presence of these marks is interesting, for as noted in this paper, normally the printer would not have handled the Assembly's copy. It may be that the manuscript provided to the printer was spoiled or defective in these places, and the Assembly's text was required at some point. Or perhaps pages were lost similar to what happened in the printing of Hooker's fifth book of the

*Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*. As they are of some interest, the author may prepare a separate article describing these marks for future publication; but for now, it is sufficient to simply note that their presence confirms that the copies provided the printer would have been marked up with compositor's notations according to the general practice of the time and as exhibited in the Parliamentary paper described earlier. And, since the printers would have needed a more fully marked copy than just the section in the Assembly's surviving manuscripts, it indicates that the scribes would have prepared full copies specifically for their use.

See: Rowland S. Ward, "The Directory for Public Worship," a lecture delivered November 25, 2004, at *Westminster Assembly 2004: A Conference on the Westminster Standards*, Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia PA. For descriptions and location of the Assembly's manuscripts of the Directory for Public Worship, see "Chronological bibliography of the manuscript and published papers of the Westminster Assembly" in Van Dixhoorn, 1.369-372.

E. The following are the nearly one hundred textual variants discussed in this article as numbered and described by Dr. Carruthers (Carruthers, 85; 89-157).

An asterisk (\*) indicates an error by Carruthers. Either the text is not contained in the edition Carruthers cited, or it is unclear why in his Tables the variants are listed under a particular edition (Carruthers, 85). For more information on these, see comments at section III within the body of this article. The format of the following information is: Carruthers' #; WCF location, variant reading (correct reading); first edition this was introduced into the traditional text (Carruthers previous assignment for first occurrence); Note: (if any).

#1 (1.1) "inexcusable" (unexcusable). L&R (RbMclean).

#2 (1.1) "yet **they are**" (yet **are they**). Kncd1781 (Kerr).

#3 (1.1) "unto salvation: therefore" (new sentence). Kncd1773 (Kncd1773).

#4 (1.2) "Old and New Testaments" (Testament). Blair1831.

#7 (1.5) "Scripture, and" (new sentence). E.Rob (Kncd1773).

#10 (2.1) "judgments; hating" (comma). Kncd1781 (Kerr\*/ Kncd1773).

#11 (2.2) "not deriving" (nor deriving). Blair1803 (Blair1810).

#14 (3.2) "conditions: yet" (comma). L&R1744 (RbMclean).

#15 (3.4) "designed; and their" (comma). L&R1744 (RbMclean).

#17 (3.6) "elected being fallen" (elected, being fallen). Kncd1773 (Kncd1773).

#18 (3.7) "mankind, God" (comma unnecessary). L&R (RbMclean).

#25 (5.2) "fall out according" (fall out, according). Kncd1781 (Kerr).

#28 (5.4) "God; who," (comma). Kncd1781 (Kerr).

#31 (5.6) "former sins, doth" (comma undesirable). L&R (RbMclean)

#32 (5.6) "occasion of sin" (occasions). Watson's Fourth (Fifth). Note: Most errors have been in the summary list, but here Carruthers' comment that this variant occurred only in Anderson and the Reformed Presbyterian texts (Carruthers, 100), is incorrect, as this variant has remained uncorrected in the traditional text. Contrary to the note, in the summary list Carruthers attributes the first occurrence of the variant to "Fifth" (Carruthers, 85).

#33 (5.6) Reference letter "x" used for "w" and subsequent letters shifted. Blair1827 (Blair1831).

#34 (6.2) "righteousness, and communion" (no comma). Kncd1773 (RbMclean)

#37 (6.5) "be through Christ pardoned" (be, through Christ, pardoned). L&R1744 (Kncd1773)

#39 (7.3) "whereby He freely" (**wherein**). Blair1827 (Blair1831)

#40 (7.3) "saved; and promising" (comma). L&R (RbMclean)

#43 (7.6) "Christ the substance was" (Christ, the substance, was). L&R (RbMclean)

#47 (8.1) "things; and judge" (comma). 1771 (Kncd1773).

#48 (8.1) "world. Unto whom" (colon). Bostock (Bostock/ RbMclean\*). Note: RbMclean has the colon, and Carruthers incorrectly lists #48 under that edition in his summary list (Carruthers, 85).

#50 (8.2) "very God and very" (very God, and very). Kncd1781 (Kerr).

#52 (8.3) "Father; who" (comma). Kncd1781 (Kerr).

#55 (8.4) "death, yet saw" (semi-colon). E.Rob (Kncd1773).

#60 (8.6) "thereof, were" (undesirable comma). 1771 (Kncd1773).

#62 (8.6) "head, and" (semi-colon). L&R1744 (Kncd1773).

#65 (8.8) 1. "same; making" (comma in early editions) L&R1744 (Kncd1773); 2. "them; and" (comma in the early editions). E.Rob (Kncd1773).

- #68 (9.4) “sin, and by” (semi-colon). L&R1744 (Kncd1773).
- #69 (9.5) “free to **do** good” (free to good). E.Rob/Kncd1773 /Blair1803 (Kncd1773). Note: This has a complex history. In his critical text Carruthers states this variant first appeared in Sanders’ 1675 edition (Carruthers, 110). It appears in Watson’s 1707-08 text, Cox’s “Fifth”, and in Dunlop, but not in the RP and L&R texts. It was re-introduced by E. Robertson’s edition of 1756, but it was not reproduced in the Glasgow editions, or in the 1771 edition. Kncd1773 returned to it, but it was dropped in the later editions of 1781 and 1788. Blair’s 1803 reintroduced it once more into the traditional text.
- #70 (10.1) “pleased, in his” (no comma). L&R (RbMclean).
- #72 (10.2) “man; who” (comma). Kncd1788/Blair1803 (Kncd-1773\*/Blair1810).
- #74 (10.3) “incapable” (uncapable). E.Rob (Kncd1773).
- #76 (10.4) “ever so diligent” (**never**). Blair1803 (Blair1810).
- #80 (11.1) “themselves; it is” (comma). Kncd1788 (Kerr).
- #82 (11.3) “them, their” (semi-colon). Kncd1781 (Kerr).
- #83 (11.4) “elect; and Christ” (comma). L&R/Kncd1781 (RbMclean). E.Rob and 1771 have a colon, as does Kncd1773. Semi-colon restored in Kncd1781.
- #85 (12.1) “God: have” (comma). Dunlop (Kncd1773\*).
- #89 (13.1) “mortified, and” (semi-colon). Fourth (Fifth)
- #91 (13.2) “man, yet” (semi-colon). Kerr (RbMclean\*).
- #94 (13.3) “prevail, yet” (semi-colon). L&R1744 (Kncd1773).
- #95 (14.1) “hearts, and is” (semi-colon). Blair1815 (Blair1831).
- #96 (15.5). “sins particularly” (sins, particularly). Fourth (Fifth).
- #97 (15.6). “confession and sorrow” (confession, and sorrow). Fourth (Fifth).
- #98 (15.6) “offended; who” (comma). L&R1744 (Kncd1773).
- #100 (16.3) “Holy Spirit to work” (Holy Spirit, to work). Kncd1781 (Kerr).
- #102 (16.5) “life, at the hand” (no comma). 1771 (Kncd1773).
- #104 (16.5) “profit nor” (profit, nor). Kncd1788 (Kerr).
- #105 (16.6) “in him; not” (comma). Kncd1781 (Kerr).
- #106 (16.7) GEN 4:5 with HEB 11:4, 6 (GEN 4:5 with HEB 11:4. HEB 11:6). Kncd1781 (Kerr).
- #107 (17.1) “called and” (called, and). Watson’s Fourth (Fifth).
- #109 (17.3) “comforts; have” (comma). L&R1736 (RbMclean\*). Note: Possibly an incorrect entry, as Carruthers does not mention RbMclean in his note, but does list this under Robertson (Carruthers, 85).
- #111 (18.1) Hypocrites, and other unregenerate men, may” (no commas). 1771 (Kncd1773).
- #113 (18.1) God; which hope (comma). L&R1744 (Kncd1773).
- #115 (18.4) “of it; by ... temptation; by” (commas). Kncd1781 (Kerr).
- #116 (19.2) “righteousness; and” (comma). Kncd1781 (Kerr).
- #117 (19.2) “the **first four**” (**four first**). Blair1827 (Blair1831).
- #119 (19.3) Besides (Beside). 1771 (Kncd1773).
- #121 (19.5) “God, the creator” (no comma). Blair1803 (Blair1810).
- #124 (19.6) “life, informing” (no comma). L&R (RbMclean).
- #125 (19.6) “thereof, although” (semi-colon). Watson’s Fourth (Fifth). Note: This is one of the few recorded places of an official change made in the text as published in Edition I of the first nineteen chapters of the WCF from that in Warfield II containing all thirty-three chapters. The phrase “performance of them” was changed to “performance thereof” (*Minutes*, 307).
- #127 (19.6) “works: so as” (new sentence). E.Rob (Kncd1773).
- #128 (19.7) “to do that freely and cheerfully which” (to do that, freely and cheerfully, which). Kncd1781 (Kerr).
- #129 (19.7) “God revealed in the law requireth” (God, revealed ...law, requireth). L&R (RbMclean).
- #133 (20.1) “subjected, and in” (semi-colon). E.Rob (Kncd1773).
- #140 (21.1) “over all; is ... unto all; and” (commas). Dunlop (Dunlop/Kncd1773\*).
- #148 (21.6) “in spirit and in truth” (and truth). Kncd1781 (Kerr).
- #150 (21.8) “rest all the day from” (rest, all the day, from). Kncd1781 (Kerr).
- #155 (22.3) “taketh on oath” (taketh an oath) J&Hc (J&Hb). Note: Carruthers assigns this to Johnstone & Hunter’s 1855 edition (Carruthers’ Johnstone ‘B’), but the example of ‘B’ in the author’s hands has the correct

text. However, the error is in Johnstone 'C', first published in 1860.

#157 (22.4) "hurt; nor" (new sentence). E.Rob (Kncd1773).

#158 (22.6) "creature but" (creature, but). Kncd1781 (Kerr).

#159 (22.6) "duties, or" (semi-colon). L&R (RbMclean/ Kncd1773\*).

#165 (23.3) "entire, that ... suppressed, all ... reformed, and" (semi-colons). E.Rob (Kncd1773).

#171 (24.3) "consent: yet ... Lord. And" (consent. Yet ... Lord: and). E.Rob (Kncd1773).

#175 (24.5) "divorce, and" (colon). L&R1744 (Kncd1773).

#177 (24.6) "observed, and" (semi-colon). E.Rob (Kncd1773).

#178 (25.1) "church, which" (no comma). L&R1736 (RbMclean).

#181 (25.5) "earth to" (earth, to). Blair1815 (Blair1831).

#182 (25.6) "Rome in any sense be" (Rome, in any sense, be). (IV and RothwellB). Note: Carruthers inexplicably lists #182 under RbMclean in his summary list (Carruthers, 85, 141).

#184 (26.1) "glory. And" (glory: and). E.Rob (Kncd1773).

#186 (26.2) "saints, by profession, are" (no commas). L&R (RbMclean).

#192 (27.1) "benefits, and" (semi-colon). Kncd1781 (Kerr).

#195 (27.3) "sacraments, rightly" (no comma). E.Rob (Kncd1773).

#196 (27.3) "administer it, but" (colon). L&R1744 (Kncd1773).

#197 (27.3) "institution; which" (comma). E.Rob (Kncd1773).

#199 (27.4) "Lord; neither" (colon). Kncd1781 (Kerr).

#200 (28.1) "church, but" (semi-colon). E.Rob (Kncd1773).

#201 (28.1) "life: which" (new sentence). E.Rob (Kncd1773).

#208 (29.1) "unto Him, and" (semi-colon). E.Rob (Kncd1773).

#211 (29.2) "once for all, and" (colon). Kncd1781 (Kerr).

#221 (29.8) "table, and cannot" (semi-colon). L&R1744/ Kncd1781 (Kncd1773\*/Kerr).

#224 (30.2) 1. "committed, by virtue" (colon). Dunlop (Dunlop). 2. "sins, to shut" (semi-colon). E.Rob (Kncd1773). Note: The colon was early re-

duced to a semi-colon, which Dunlop turned into a comma. E.Rob reintroduced the colon, but 1771 returned to the comma. E.Rob changed the semi-colon into a comma.

#226 (30.3) "brethren; for ... offences; for ... lump; for ... gospel; and" (commas). Kncd1781 (Kerr).

#230 (31.3) "submission, not" (semi-colon). L&R1744 (Kncd1773)

#231 (31.3) "God, appointed" (no comma). L&R/ 1771 (RbMclean). Note: E.Rob dropped the comma, but 1771 reinserted it.

#236 (32.1) "bodies; and" (new sentence). E.Rob (Kncd1773). E.Rob introduced a semi-colon, which 1771 turned into a colon. Kincaid returned to the semi-colon.

#240 (33.1) "deeds, and" (semi-colon). E.Rob (Kncd1773).

#241 (33.2) "mercy in ... elect, and ... justice in" (mercy, in ... elect; and ... justice, in). E.Rob (Kncd1773). ■

#### *In Brief: William Carruthers:* (1830-1922)

William Carruthers was born at Moffat, Dumfriesshire, where his father was a merchant, on May 29, 1830, and his education began at the Academy of that place. At the age of fifteen he went to Edinburgh University, where save for two periods during which he was engaged in teaching, he remained until 1854. In the latter half of that year he went to New College, Edinburgh, with the view of entering the ministry of the Presbyterian Church; but, on the advice of Dr. John Fleming, under whom he studied natural science, he resolved to abandon an ecclesiastical for a scientific career. The early bent of his mind, however, and the influence of his college training, found full expression in his later life. When he came to London he took a leading part in the affairs of the Presbyterian Church: from 1880 to 1910 he was first secretary and then chairman of its committee on publications, and from 1876 until the year before his death was editor of its magazine, the *Messenger for Children*; indeed, there was not one of the standing committees of the Church of which he had not at some time in his life been an active member. He was keenly interested in ecclesiastical history, particularly that of the Commonwealth period, and had a large and valuable collection of publications relating thereto...

[After his retirement] by degrees his religious and literary interests absorbed such attention as he could devote to them; and in the quiet pursuit of these in his home at Norwood, in the company of his wife and son, the remainder of his days was passed. "In Memory of William Carruthers (1830-1922), From the *Journal of Botany*, v. 60, September 1922 (London: Taylor and Francis, n.d.) [249], 256. ■

# Jonathan Edwards: On Scripture & Salvation

By W. Gary Crampton, Ph.D.

## I. Edwards on Scripture<sup>1</sup>

Jonathan Edwards was a Bibliциst. That is, Scripture was foundational to his entire world and life view. As a Bibliциst, Edwards maintained that one should never attempt to erect a system of thought by combining secular and Christian notions.<sup>2</sup> He held to the principle of *sola Scriptura*. The Bible alone is the Word of God, and it has a systematic monopoly on truth. All studies, regardless of the subject matter, are to be judged by Scripture alone.<sup>3</sup> Nothing stands in judgment over the Word of God. Scripture is sufficient, not only to lead one to a sound and saving knowledge of God, through Jesus Christ, but also to justify all knowledge and to interpret every area of life. As one student of the Puritans put it: Edwards always operated within a “cage” – a biblical cage.<sup>4</sup> For him, there was an absolute primacy and authority to the Word of God. According to David Brand:<sup>5</sup>

The Edwardsian legacy represents a call to re-establish theology as the queen of the sciences, not in terms of a rigidity that stifles scholarship or scientific inquiry, but rather in the form of a lucid and forceful assertion of the Holy Scriptures as the fountainhead of all human academic endeavor.

The *sola Scriptura* view of the Puritan Sage was no different than that of the Apostle Paul and the Westminster Assembly. In the words of the apostle: “All Scripture is inspired by God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, thoroughly equipped for every good work” (2 Timothy 3:16). And in the *Westminster Confession of Faith* (1:6),<sup>6</sup> to which Jonathan Edwards adhered,<sup>7</sup> we read: “The whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary

for His own glory, man’s salvation, faith and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture: unto which nothing at any time is to be added.”

Notice the universal terms in these two statements: “all,” “complete,” “thoroughly,” “every,” “whole,” “all,” “nothing,” “at any time.” The Bible, infallibly, and the

---

THE AUTHOR: Dr. W. Gary Crampton is the author of many books and articles and is a contributing editor to *The Confessional Presbyterian*.

1. Portions of this article come from the author’s book, *Meet Jonathan Edwards* (Morgan, Pennsylvania: Soli Deo Gloria, 2004). Hereafter *Meet Jonathan Edwards*.

2. Allen Guelzo commented that Jonathan Edwards was “the most consistently unsecular thinker in American history”; cited in Michael J. McClymond, *Encounters with God: An Approach to the Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (NY: Oxford U.P., 1998) 112.

3. Jonathan Edwards would not in any sense deny that persons without the Bible hold to certain truths. But what he would assert is that what makes these truths “true” is that they conform to the teaching of Scripture.

4. This statement was made by Peter Gay, as cited in John H. Gerstner, *The Rational Biblical Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (Powhatan, Virginia: Berea Publications; Orlando, Florida: Ligonier Ministries, 1991-1993) 1.102. Hereafter Gerstner. Gay made this statement as a criticism, but it reveals how much he believed that Edwards held tenaciously to the teachings of Scripture.

5. David C. Brand, *Profile of the Last Puritan* (Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1991) 146.

6. Quotations from the Scriptures are from the New King James Version. Citations from the Westminster Standards are from the version published by the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland (1994), and the author has modernized the spelling and usage.

7. Jonathan Edwards, *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, revised and corrected by Edward Hickman (Carlisle, Pennsylvania: Banner of Truth Trust, 1834, 1974) 1.cxxi. Hereafter Hickman. Edwards wrote: “As to my subscribing to the substance of the *Westminster Confession*, there would be no difficulty.” According to John Gerstner, the *Westminster Confession* was his “favorite creed” (Gerstner, 1.160). In this article we will see how much Edwards’ thought is in agreement with the Westminster Standards.

*Westminster Confession*, in compliance with the Bible, both teach the all-sufficiency of Scripture. According to the Reformed principle of *sola Scriptura*, there is no “two-source” theory of knowledge taught in the Word of God. The Bible is sufficient for all the truth we need and the all the knowledge we can have.

#### EDWARDS ON KNOWLEDGE

In the “Preface” of his greatest work, *The Freedom of the Will*, Edwards wrote:<sup>8</sup>

Of all kinds of knowledge that we can ever obtain, the knowledge of God, and the knowledge of ourselves, are the most important. As religion is the great business for which we are created, and on which our happiness depends; and as religion consists in an intercourse between ourselves and our Maker; and so has its foundation in God’s nature and ours, and in the relation that God and we stand in to each other; therefore, a true knowledge of both must be necessary, in order to true religion.

Without a knowledge of one’s self, there is no knowledge of God. But to know one’s self, God’s image bearer, there must first be a knowledge of God. The more man “knows of God,” preached Edwards, “the more he will know of himself. . . . Indeed, he who does not have the true knowledge of God has no true knowledge of anything.”<sup>9</sup> God, then, must be the first object of knowledge. And as William Scheick explained, according to Jonathan Edwards, the only way for one to come to this knowledge of God and self is by “the exploration of the heart, in light of Scripture.” This is what “provides the saint with the best intimation of divine reality.”<sup>10</sup> Like the Westminster divines before him, Jonathan Edwards

began his theological and philosophical enterprise with epistemology (the theory of knowledge).

As noted, the New England divine was a devotee of the principle of *sola Scriptura*. He believed that the indemonstrable axiom of biblical theism is that the Bible is the Word of God, and that it has a monopoly on truth. “Where is [there] any Word of God,” he asked rhetorically, “if it be not the Bible?”<sup>11</sup> “God has given us His Word to this very end that it might be our rule. . . . And strictly speaking, this is our only rule.”<sup>12</sup>

Moreover, he believed that the “the Scriptures themselves are an evidence of their own divine authority.”<sup>13</sup> In the words of Michael McClymond, “in accordance with the Reformed tradition and such earlier figures as Calvin, Edwards saw the Bible as self-authenticating and asserted that its teachings and very words strike the mind as God-given” (McClymond, 97).

It is important to note here that according to Edwards, and the *Westminster Confession of Faith* (1:6, as cited above), the truth of Scripture is not restricted to the explicit statements of the Bible. Those things which can be logically deduced “by good and necessary consequence” are also God’s truth. As Edwards wrote in Miscellany 426 (*Works*, 13):

And if what the Scripture says, together with what is plain to reason, leads [us] to believe any doctrine, we are to look upon ourselves as taught this doctrine from Scripture. God may reveal things in Scripture, which way He pleases; if by what He there reveals the thing in any way clearly discovered to the understanding or eye of the mind, it is our duty to receive it as His revelation.

This is precisely why Brand’s comment is so very apropos. For Jonathan Edwards, “Holy Scriptures [are] the fountainhead of all human endeavor.” He took orders from the Bible alone.

At first glance, one may think that there are inconsistencies in Edwards’s thought here. (We will see that they are only apparent.) First, there is his empiricism. Broadly defined, empiricism is the belief that the source of all knowledge is to be found in sensation or experience. And indeed Edwards did hold to a form of empiricism, agreeing to some degree that there is nothing in the mind which is not first in the senses. But he did not believe that sensation produces any knowledge. Rather, taught the Puritan theologian, it is God who “immediately”<sup>14</sup> produces knowledge in the mind of all who receive knowledge. In Miscellany 64 (*Works*, 13), he wrote: “Thus the matter is as to the Holy Spirit’s gracious

8. Jonathan Edwards, *The Freedom of the Will* (Morgan, Pennsylvania: Soli Deo Gloria Publications, 1996) xi. Hereafter *Freedom of the Will*.

9. Jonathan Edwards, Sermon on Isaiah 6:5, *The Puritan Pulpit*, compiled and edited by Don Kistler (Morgan, Pennsylvania: Soli Deo Gloria, 2004) 131-146.

10. William J. Scheick, *The Writings of Jonathan Edwards* (College Station, Texas: Texas A & M University Press, 1975) 132.

11. Jonathan Edwards, *Selections From the Unpublished Writings of Jonathan Edwards*, edited by Alexander Grosart (Morgan, Pennsylvania: Soli Deo Gloria, 1992) 192.

12. Jonathan Edwards, *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, Volume 12, edited by David D. Hall, *Ecclesiastical Writings* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1994) 319. Hereafter, *Works*.

13. *Works*, 13, edited by Thomas A. Schafer, *The “Miscellanies” a-500*, (1994) Miscellany 333.

14. When Edwards uses the word “immediately” in this sense,

operations on the mind. We have shown in philosophy that all natural operations are done immediately by God only in harmony and proportion.” And as he explained in his sermon on Matthew 16:17, when it comes to the grace of salvific knowledge there is “a divine and supernatural light, immediately imparted to the soul by the Spirit of God” (Hickman, 1.12). Further, as William Scheick and Gerald McDermott have pointed out, with spiritual maturation Edwards progressively placed less emphasis on reason, putting more and more emphasis on Scripture alone.<sup>15</sup> Scripture was the rule by which all experience was to be judged. “Scripture,” wrote Edwards, “is the highest rule.” It “is a more sure guide ... than experience.”<sup>16</sup>

It is also noteworthy that Jonathan Edwards denied what empiricists usually maintain, that the mind of man is a *tabula rasa* (a “blank tablet”) at birth or conception. It was his belief that God created man as a rational creature, with innate propositional ideas from conception. The principles of logic are things that “the soul is born with.”<sup>17</sup>

Second, there is also the apparent inconsistency of Edwards’ use of the theistic proofs. For example, in *The Freedom of the Will* he wrote (p. 50):

[T]he way that mankind comes to the knowledge of God is that which the apostle speaks of, Romans 1:20: “The invisible things of Him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen; being understood by the things that are made; even His eternal power and Godhead.” We first ascend, and prove *à posteriori*; or from effects, that there must be an eternal Cause; and then secondly, prove by argumentation, not intuition, that this Being must be necessarily existent; and then thirdly, from the proved necessity of His existence, we may descend, and prove many of His perfections *à priori*.

Statements like this one convinced John Gerstner that Jonathan Edwards was an evidentialist, i.e., that he held to a form of natural theology, attempting to prove the existence of God and His Word from a series of theistic proofs. At the same time, however, Dr. Gerstner fully recognized that “there was this strain in Edwards that seemed to be utterly antithetical to natural theology” (Gerstner, 1.119; 2.347). For example, in (unpublished) Miscellany 1337 (Gerstner, 1.94), the Puritan divine claimed that “the light of nature is in no sense whatsoever sufficient to discover the Christian religion.” In another place he said that apart from special revelation, “the very notion of such a Being [God] is all mystery, involving nothing but incomprehensible paradoxes, and

seeming inconsistencies.” The same thought is expressed in his statement that “were it not for divine [special] revelation, I am persuaded, that there is not one doctrine of that which we call natural religion, which, notwithstanding all philosophy and learning, would not be forever involved in darkness, doubts, endless disputes, and dreadful confusion” (Hickman, 2.483, 462).

Norman Fiering, recognizing that many of Edwards’ writings showed this kind of antipathy to natural theology, asserted that the New England Puritan always made Holy Scripture the rule of judging all matters of the Christian faith, and not philosophical arguments. Edwards, said Fiering, is always setting forth his arguments from within the system of biblical Christianity, “within a dogmatic tradition.” This being so, the Puritan Sage used his “philosophical arguments” in an *ad hominem* (“to the man”) fashion, to show the logical consistency of biblical theism, and the logical inconsistency of non-Christian thought.<sup>18</sup>

This is the kind of “philosophic argument” that Edwards employed in his statement from *The Freedom of the Will* quoted above, where he cited Romans 1:20 just prior to his statement about an *à posteriori* “proof.” He is making his claim from within the “dogmatic tradition” of biblical theism, pointing out that an effect necessarily needs a cause. And he bases his argument on Scripture (Romans 1:20), where he rests his case. Said Edwards, in (unpublished) Miscellany 1297 (*Meet Jonathan Edwards*, 46): If men “are not led by [special] revelation and direct teaching into a right way of using their reason, in arguing from effects to causes, etc., they would forever remain in the most woeful doubt, and uncertainty concerning the nature and the very being of God.”

With these things in mind, we see that the apparent inconsistencies in Edwards’s *sola Scriptura* principle are simply that – they are merely apparent. The fact is that Edwards operated out of a “biblical cage,” and took orders from the Word of God alone. He argued from the Word of God, not to it. “For the New England divine,”

he is not referring to time, but to the fact that God does this without a mediator.

15. Scheick, 32; Gerald R. McDermott, *Jonathan Edwards Confronts the Gods* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000) 60.

16. *Works*, 21, edited by Sang Hyun Lee, *Writings on the Trinity, Grace, and Faith* (2003) 505.

17. *Works*, 6, edited by Wallace E Anderson, *Scientific and Philosophical Writings* (1980) 370. See also Anderson’s comments regarding this on pages 105–125.

18. Norman Fiering, *Jonathan Edwards’s Moral Thought in Its British Context* (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1981) 49ff.

commented Stephen Stein, “the authority of the Bible was absolute.”<sup>19</sup> He was a firm believer, wrote Gerald McDermott that “there is no true knowledge of God apart from Scripture” (McDermott, 57n.). This is quite evident from one of Edwards more extensive comments on how we know God and His works:<sup>20</sup>

Now there is nothing else that informs us what this scheme and design of God in His works is but only the Holy Scriptures. Nothing else pretends to set in view the whole series of God’s works of providence from beginning to end, and to show how all things were from God at first, and what end they are for, and how they are ordered from the beginning, and how they will proceed to the end of the world, and what they will come to at last, and how all things shall be to God. Nothing else but the Scriptures has any pretense for showing any manner of regular scheme or drift in those revolutions which God orders from age to age. Nothing else pretends to show what God would by the things that He has done and is doing and will do, what He seeks and intends by them. Nothing else pretends to show with any distinctness or certainty how the world began at first, or to tell us the original of things. Nothing but the Scriptures sets forth how God has governed the world from the beginning of the generations of men on the earth in an orderly history, and nothing else sets before us how He will govern it to the end by an orderly prophecy of future events, agreeable to the challenge that God makes to the gods and prophets and teachers of the heathen in Isaiah 41: 22-23: “Let them bring forth, and show us what shall happen; let them show the former things, what they be, that we may consider them, and know the latter end of them; or declare us things to come. Show the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know that you are gods.”

The present author agrees with J. I. Packer, who summarized the matter as follows:<sup>21</sup>

It is clear from his [Edwards’s] private notes and memoranda that metaphysical speculation fascinated him and was, indeed, his hobby, but he never let philosophy teach him his faith, or lead him away from the Bible. He

philosophized from faith, not to it; he did not regard speculation as necessary to salvation, and no hint of his philosophical interests intrudes into his sermons. He took his convictions and concerns from the Bible, and it is as a Scriptural theologian that his true stature is to be measured.

Then too, as a Christian idealist, Jonathan Edwards believed that the sum total of all truth exists in the mind of God. Nothing exists outside of God’s mind. Accordingly, if man is going to know the truth, he must come to know the eternal propositions in the mind of the triune God. Some of these eternal propositions are implanted in man from conception or birth by God. The mind of man, as it were, is enveloped by the mind of God, who enlightens man to understand the eternal propositions which are in His mind. So it is God alone who reveals truth to His image bearer, man. Further, taught Edwards, God has created human beings with rational minds that use the same laws of thought as His own. The principles of reason (logic) and knowledge are innately given by God to mankind. Thus, whenever human beings know truth, they know that which exists in God’s mind. Wrote Edwards: Since “all truth is in the mind, and only there,” and since “God is truth itself,” then if we are going to know the truth there must be a “consistency and agreement of our ideas with the ideas of God.”<sup>22</sup>

As we have already noted, this does not mean that Jonathan Edwards believed that reason is the source of truth. Scripture is the source of truth. But there is a perfect harmony between reason and biblical revelation. There “is the most sweet harmony between Christianity and reason.”<sup>23</sup> In the Scriptures, God has given us a rational revelation. Christian man, then, is to reason from Scripture, not to it. “Revelation,” claimed Edwards in (unpublished) Miscellany 1340 (Gerstner, 1.215), “is given as a rule to reason.”

#### EDWARDS ON GENERAL AND SPECIAL REVELATION

According to Jonathan Edwards, the God of the Bible is no *Deus absconditus*, i.e., no “hidden God” (Fiering, 343). The triune God has revealed Himself to man in both general and special revelation, which are in harmony. The former is general in audience (all mankind) and limited in content; whereas the latter, which is now found in Scripture alone, is more restricted in audience (those who read the Bible), and much more detailed in content. Due to its limited nature, general revelation must always be studied in light of special revelation.

19. Works, 15, edited by Stephen J. Stein, *Notes on Scripture* (Yale University Press, 1998) 33.

20. Works, 9, edited by John F. Wilson, *A History of the Work of Redemption* (1989) 520-521.

21. J. I. Packer, *A Quest For Godliness* (Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway Books, 1990) 315.

22. Works, 6.202-207, 332-393. The quotes are from 340-342.

23. Works, 8, ed. Paul Ramsey, *Ethical Writings* (1989) 286-287.

“The book of Scripture,” wrote Edwards, “is the interpreter of the book of nature.”<sup>24</sup>

Edwards taught that God has implanted an innate knowledge of Himself in all men (*Works*, 13, Miscellany 268). This knowledge, which includes the moral law of God, is propositional and ineradicable. It is this innate knowledge that enables man to see the rich revelation of God in creation. When man interacts with God’s creation, which demonstrates the attributes of God, man is, in some sense, forced “to think God.” “I am not ashamed,” wrote Edwards, “to own that I believe that the whole universe, heaven and earth, air and seas ... be full of images of divine things, as full as a language is of words” (*Works*, 11.152).

The visible creation, however, does not mediate knowledge to man, for the visible creation does not set forth any propositions (and knowledge can only be attained through propositions). Rather, by way of “exciting ideas” (or recollection), it stimulates the mind of man, who as a rational being is already in possession of *à priori*, propositional information about God and His creation. This *à priori* information is immediately impressed upon man’s consciousness. And it is God who does the impressing. God alone reveals truth to man.<sup>25</sup>

All men, therefore, have a knowledge of God, which leaves them without excuse. But due to the noetic effects of sin, fallen man continually suppresses the knowledge of God which he has and knows to be true. General revelation reveals God as Creator, but it does not reveal Him as Savior. This being so, the propositional special revelation of Scripture is necessary for man to come to a sound and saving knowledge of God. “The light of nature [the innate moral law of God] teaches that religion which is necessary to continue in the favor of God that made us,” wrote Edwards, “but it cannot teach us that religion which is necessary to our being restored to the favor of God, after we have forfeited it” (Hickman, 2.51-57, 491).

The *Westminster Confession of Faith* (1:1) explains it this way:

Although the light of nature and the works of creation and providence do so far manifest the goodness, wisdom, and power of God, as to leave men inexcusable; yet are they not sufficient to give that knowledge of God and of His will, which is necessary unto salvation. Therefore it pleased the Lord, at sundry times, and in divers manners, to reveal Himself, and to declare that His will unto His church; and afterwards, for the better preserving and propagating of the truth, and for

the more sure establishment and comfort of the church against the corruption of the flesh, and the malice of Satan and of the world, to commit the same wholly unto writing: which makes the Holy Scriptures to be most necessary; those former ways of God’s revealing His will unto His people being now ceased.

Jonathan Edwards, along with the Westminster Assembly, concluded that due to the inadequacy of general revelation, the “necessity” of divine, or special, revelation “plainly appears.” (Hickman, 2.253).

As seen, according to the New England divine, the Scriptures are self-authenticating and self-evident. The Word of God, he wrote, does not “go about begging for its evidence, so much as some think; it has its highest and most proper evidence in itself” (Hickman, 2.293). “The Scriptures themselves are an evidence of their own divine authority” (*Works*, 13, Miscellany 333).

Jonathan Edwards did not deny that there are a number of evidences that the Bible is the Word of God: “There are signatures of divine majesty to be seen in the Word, and signatures of divine wisdom and of divine holiness, and the evident marks of divine grace, that make it evident that the Word of God did proceed from a divine majesty and wisdom and holiness and grace” (Hickman, 1.189). Nor did Edwards deny that the evidences are useful in the area of apologetics. Even though Scripture is self-authenticating and self-evident, still “great use may be made of external arguments, [and] they are not to be neglected, but highly prized and valued; for they may be greatly serviceable to awaken unbelievers, and bring them to serious consideration, and to confirm the faith of true saints” (Hickman, 1.293). As stated by Stephen Nichols, for Edwards, “the fact that the Bible is self-authenticating does not mean that there are no external evidences that support its claims. Scriptures’ self-authentication and evidences are not mutually exclusive.”<sup>26</sup>

Nevertheless, said the New England Puritan, apart from the inner testimony of the Holy Spirit, these evidences are vain. They “cannot be sufficient.... It is impossible that men ... should come at the force of arguments for the truth of Christianity” (Hickman, 1.292). The evidences, as “highly prized and valued” as they may be in refuting the arguments of non-believers and strengthening the faith of the saints, do not

24. *Works*, 11, eds. Wallace E. Anderson, Mason I. Lowance, Jr., and David Watters, *Typological Writings* (1993) 106.

25. *Works*, 6.346, 361-370; Miscellanies 199-200, *Works*, 13.267.

26. Stephen J. Nichols, *An Absolute Sort of Certainty* (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: P&R Publishing, 2003) 134.

prove the Bible to be the Word of God. Again, if men, commented Edwards, “are not led by [special] revelation and direct teaching into a right way of using their reason . . . they would forever remain in the most woe-ful doubt, and uncertainty concerning the nature and the very being of God” (Unpublished Miscellany 1297, *Meet Jonathan Edwards*, 46) Edwards doctrine is that of the *Westminster Confession of Faith* (1:4-5):

The authority of Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, depends not upon the testimony of any man or church, but wholly upon God (who is truth itself) the author thereof; and therefore it is to be received, because it is the Word of God. . . . We may be moved and induced by the testimony of the church to a high and reverend esteem of the Holy Scripture; and the heavenliness of the matter, the efficacy of the doctrine, the majesty of the style, the consent of all the parts, the scope of the whole (which is to give all glory to God), the full discovery it makes of the only way of man’s salvation, the many other incomparable excellencies, and the entire perfection thereof, are arguments whereby it does abundantly evidence itself to be the Word of God; yet notwithstanding, our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority thereof is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit bearing witness by and with the Word in our hearts.

#### EDWARDS ON SCRIPTURE

From his early years, Jonathan Edwards devoted his life to the study of Scripture. Early on he resolved “to study the Scriptures so steadily, constantly, and frequently, as that I may find, and plainly perceive, myself to grow in the knowledge of the same” (Hickman, 1.xxi). Even while young he began to study with his pen in his hand. He studied prayerfully, developing thoughts which he wanted to preserve in writing. As witnessed by his literary productivity, he continued this kind of study for the rest of his life. Later, as a minister of the gospel, he wrote (Hickman, 1.clxxiv):

My method of study . . . has been very much by writing; applying myself, in this way, to improve every important hint; pursuing the clue to my utmost, when anything in reading, meditation, or conversation, has

been suggested to my mind, that seemed to promise light in any weighty point; thus penning what appeared to me my best thoughts, on innumerable subjects, for my own benefit.

But all of Edwards’ “best thoughts, on innumerable subjects, for my own benefit,” even from his early years, were governed by his zeal to reconcile “all of life and learning to the dictates of God’s law as contained in Scripture.” Even with his “inquiring mind that knew no boundaries, scientific or literary,” the main goal of Jonathan Edwards was to be an “instrument in the cause of his Christ.”<sup>27</sup>

Too, we have seen that he was an advocate of *sola Scriptura*, believing, as taught in the *Confession* (1:6), that “the whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for His own glory, man’s salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture.” For Edwards, not only is Scripture necessary for man to come to a sound and saving knowledge of God, but it is the sole source of truth, and the authority by which man is to interpret all of life. The Bible is the standard by which all things are to be judged. The numerous writings of the Puritan Sage fully attest to this fact. In Miscellany 350 (*Works*, 13), for instance, he wrote: “[Special] revelation is that light in the world from whence has beamed forth not only the knowledge of religion, but all valuable truth.” In the words of John Gerstner, “Jonathan Edwards’ life . . . centered around the Bible.” It was “the *sine qua non* of his rational biblical theology” (1.140).

#### PROGRESSIVE REVELATION

Jonathan Edwards, in the tradition of Reformed theologians throughout the centuries, held that biblical revelation was progressive in nature. In his *A History of the Work of Redemption*, which was originally set forth in a series of some thirty sermon-lectures, he taught that there was a continuous enlarging body of special revelation from the time of Adam in the Garden of Eden to the time of the apostles. In Eden, God revealed Himself to Adam in propositional revelation, and He continued to do so until the close of the canon of Scripture. And throughout the entirety of the progress of revelation, the revelation is infallible and inerrant at every stage.

Jonathan Edwards, as a covenant theologian, taught that one of the predominant ways that the progress of special revelation is recognizable in the Bible is in the various covenants that God has established with His

27. John E. Smith, Harry S. Stout, and Kenneth P. Minkema, editors, *A Jonathan Edwards Reader* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1995) vii-x. Hereafter *Jonathan Edwards Reader*.

church, both in the Old and New Testaments.<sup>28</sup> There is a unity that exists between the Old and the New Testaments, a unity which is founded upon the covenant of grace. It is “the unity of [redemptive] history,” wherein we also see the unity of the Word of God (unpublished Miscellany 1353, as cited in *Meet Jonathan Edwards*, 49). As explained in the *Westminster Confession of Faith* (7:6): “There are not therefore two covenants of grace, differing in substance, but one and the same under various dispensations.”

Jonathan Edwards maintained that when God created man (Adam), He entered into a “covenant of works” with him. As the *Confession* (7:2) says: “The first covenant made with man was a covenant of works, wherein life was promised to Adam, and in him [as the federal head or representative of the entire human race] to his posterity, upon perfect and personal obedience.” Or in Edwards’ own words, “perfect obedience is the condition of the first covenant [of works].”<sup>29</sup> If Adam had been obedient to God for a stipulated period of time, positive righteousness would have been imputed to him, and he would have been granted eternal life, along with his posterity: “If Adam our first surety had fulfilled the covenant [of works] made with him ... then [Adam and] his posterity ... would all have had the title to eternal life by virtue of the promises made to Adam their surety.”<sup>30</sup> Adam, however, broke covenant with God; thus, he and his posterity fell from the state of original righteousness.

Immediately subsequent to the Fall, God entered into a new covenant with His elect: the covenant of grace. In this covenant, as stated in the *Confession* (7:3): God “freely offers unto sinners life and salvation by Jesus Christ, requiring of them faith in Him, that they might be saved; and promising to give unto all those that are ordained unto life His Holy Spirit, to make them willing and able to believe.” In the words of Edwards (Hickman, 2.599):

The first covenant [of works] failed of bringing men to the glory of God, through man’s instability, whereby he failed of perseverance. Man’s changeableness was the thing wherein it was weak through the flesh. But God had made a second covenant [of grace] in mercy to fallen man, that in the way of this covenant he might be brought to the glory of God, which he failed of under the other.... Therefore God introduces another better covenant, committed not to his [Adam’s] strength, but to the strength of one who was mighty and stable [Christ], and therefore is a sure and everlasting covenant.... The first was only to make way for the second.

The covenant of grace, taught Edwards, was made with Christ, and with all of the elect in Him: “God makes the covenant [of grace] with Christ, the second Adam, for Himself and all His posterity” (*Works*, 18, Miscellany 825). This covenant was initially revealed in Genesis 3:15, with the first Messianic or gospel promise; that is, that God would send His Christ to redeem fallen, elect sinners: “Presently upon this the gospel was first revealed on earth in ... Genesis 3:15.... But these words of God in the fifteenth verse of the third chapter of Genesis were the first dawning of the light of the gospel after this darkness” (*Works*, 9.32-133).

Moreover, said Edwards, this covenant promise is that from which all of the other biblical covenants flow: Adamic, Noahic, Abrahamic, Mosaic, Davidic, and New Covenant. With each covenant the body of redemptive, special revelation grew (“that gospel light which dawned immediately after the fall of man gradually increases”), until consummated in the supreme and final revelation of God to man in the person and work of Jesus Christ.<sup>31</sup>

Yet prior to the unfolding of the covenant of grace there was another supra-temporal covenant. This covenant, which Edwards (and Reformed theology in general) refers to as the covenant of redemption, was an intra-Trinitarian covenant. This covenant, in a supralapsarian fashion, purposed the salvation of elect sinners by the person and work of Jesus Christ, their covenant representative. Herein there is an “agreement which the persons of the Trinity came into from eternity as it were by mutual consultation and covenant” (*Works*, 20, Miscellany 993). The covenant of redemption is the foundation of the covenant of grace; and the covenant of grace is the working out of the covenant of redemption (*Works*, 9.117-119).

Special revelation in both the Old and New Testaments, then, is progressive and redemptive. And the New is superior to the Old, not so much in content or substance, as in administration and degree. The “state of things” under the Old Testament “was a typical state of things, and that not only the ceremonies of the law were typical, but that their [the Israelites] history and constitution of the nation and their state and circum-

28. See Carl W. Bogue, *Jonathan Edwards and the Covenant of Grace* (Cherry Hill, New Jersey: Mack Publishing Company, 1975) 141-163.

29. *Works*, 18, edited by Ava Chamberlain, *The “Miscellanies”* 501-832, (2000) Miscellany 786.

30. *Works*, 20, edited by Amy Plantinga Pauw, *The “Miscellanies”* 833-1152 (2002) Miscellany 1091.

31. *Works*, 9.127-386. The quote is from page 172.

stances were typical. It was, as it were, a typical world" (*Works*, 11.146).

Under the New Testament administration, this has changed. Here again Edwards is in agreement with the *Confession* (7:6), which maintains that whereas the covenant under the Old Testament was administered by "promises, prophecies, sacrifices . . . and other types and ordinances delivered to the people of the Jews, all fore-signifying Christ to come," under the New Testament administration, "Christ, the substance" has come; and the covenant is now "held forth in more fullness, evidence, and spiritual efficacy, to all nations, both Jews and Gentiles."

According to Jonathan Edwards, the unity of special revelation in both the Old and New Testaments is evident in a number of ways. In a sermon on Matthew 5:44, Edwards preached that "Christ did not give to the world any new moral precepts that were not either expressed or implied in the precepts of the Old Testament and in the Ten Commandments. He did not, as some have supposed, make by His rule some things duty which before were not duty but only revealed some things more fully" (Gerstner, 1.155).

Moreover, said Edwards, both Testaments have "the same salvation," the "same Mediator" (Jesus Christ), the same method of justification by faith alone in Christ alone, and the same application of Christ's redemptive cross work by means of the Holy Spirit with the Word of God. The two covenants "differ only in manner and circumstances" (unpublished Miscellany 1353). "The whole book, both Old Testament and New, is filled up with the gospel, only with this difference, that the Old Testament contains the gospel under a veil, but the New contains it unveiled, so that we may see the glory of the Lord with open face" (*Works*, 9.290). "For though the covenant of grace was in force before His [Christ's] death," said Edwards, "yet it was of force no other wise than by His death." This covenant of grace is "Christ's last will and testament" (Gerstner, 2.103-104).

#### CANONIZATION OF SCRIPTURE

According to Reformed theology, as taught in the *Westminster Confession of Faith* (1:1-2, 6), the doctrine of progressive revelation maintains that the miraculous or charismatic word-gifts (e.g., tongues, prophecy) ceased at the end of the apostolic age, and the canon of Scripture was closed at that time. That is, because "those

former ways of God's revealing His will unto His people [has] now ceased," special revelation is now found in the 66 books of the Old and New Testaments alone; "unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit, or traditions of men."

Jonathan Edwards agreed with this assessment. As noted by John Gerstner, even though this Puritan theologian nowhere "lists the sixty-six books of the Protestant canon, there can be no doubt that he had the very list in mind which was enumerated by his favorite creed, the *Westminster Confession*" (Gerstner, 1.160). In (unpublished) Miscellany 1358 (Gerstner, 1.146), Edwards wrote:

God took this care with respect to the books of the Old Testament, that no books should be received by the Jewish church and delivered down in the canon of the Old Testament but what was His Word owned by Christ. We may therefore conclude that He would still take the same care of His church with respect to the New Testament.

According to Edwards, the cessation of the charismatic gifts is explicitly taught in 1 Corinthians 13:8-13. These gifts functioned as "childish things," and "they were adapted to the childish state of the church." They were a partial means of special revelation. And they are now supplanted by the perfect, complete Word of God, wherein we have "a perfect rule of faith and practice."<sup>32</sup> In a sermon on this text, he preached: "The extraordinary influences of the Spirit of God imparting immediate revelations to men were designed only for a temporary continuance while the church was in its minority and never were intended to be stately upheld in the Christian church" (Gerstner, 1.160).

#### INSPIRATION

In a sermon on 2 Timothy 3:16 (and elsewhere), Jonathan Edwards posited that the entirety of the Bible is fully inspired by God and that it has been "kept [pure] all along" through the ages; "it has not been changed." It is "the verbally inspired and inerrant Word." "The Scripture is the Word of God," given to man in propositional statements (Grosart, 191-196). Man, taught the New England divine, was created in God's image, as a rational being, and God has given man a rational revelation in the Bible. Jonathan Edwards, then, held to the Reformed doctrine of verbal, plenary inspiration. It is not merely the doctrine and/or content of biblical revelation that is inspired; it is the Scripture itself. In

32. Jonathan Edwards, *Charity and Its Fruits* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1986) 304-322.

the words of John Smith: “Edwards accepted totally the tradition established by the Reformers with respect to the absolute primacy and authority of the Bible, and he could approach the biblical writings with the conviction of their inerrancy and literal truth.”<sup>33</sup>

Scripture, said Edwards, was written through God’s prophets and apostles, who were moved along by the Holy Spirit so that they wrote nothing other than the infallible, inerrant Word of God: there was “an immediate inspiration that the prophets had when they were immediately inspired by the Spirit of God” (*Works*, 13, Miscellany 20). Commenting on 2 Peter 1:20, Edwards wrote that in the Scriptures, “it is not men’s speaking their own sense of things or interpreting their own minds but the mind of God” (Gerstner, 1.142). It is God alone who speaks creatively in Scripture. The words of Scripture are the very words of God the Holy Spirit. Therefore, what Scripture says, God says.

Jonathan Edwards did not hold to a mechanical and/or dictation theory of inspiration, wherein the human authors are to be seen as little more than stenographers.<sup>34</sup> Rather, he maintained that God the Holy Spirit acted upon the human authors in an “organic” way, in accordance with their own personalities, characters, temperaments, gifts, and talents. Each author wrote in his own style, and all the while it was the Holy Spirit moving him along to write infallible truth. The human authors were the “penmen” who wrote “by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit” (*Works*, 15.518-520). For example, in Miscellany 303 (*Works*, 20), Edwards spoke of Solomon, as the author of the Song of Songs as follows:

I imagine that Solomon when he wrote this song, being a very philosophical, musing man and pious man, and of a very loving temper, set himself in his own musings to imagine and to point forth to himself a pure, virtuous, pious, and entire love, and represented the musings and feelings of his mind that in a philosophical and religious frame was carried away in a sort of transport, and in that his musings and the train of his imaginations were guided and led on by the Spirit of God. Solomon in his wisdom and great experience had learned the vanity of all other love than of such a sort of one. God’s Spirit made us of his loving inclination, joined with his musing philosophical disposition, and so directed and conducted it in this train of imagination as to represent the love that there is between Christ and His spouse.

Then too, speaking of Moses as an author of Scripture in Miscellany 352 (*Works of Jonathan Edwards*, 13), Edwards wrote:

Moses was so intimately conversant with God and so continually under the divine conduct, it cannot be thought that when he wrote the history of the creation and fall of man, and the history of the church from the creation, that he should not be under the divine direction in such an affair. Doubtless he wrote by God’s direction, as we are informed that he wrote the law and the history of the Israelitish church.

Further (as noted), because the Bible is the infallible, inerrant Word of God, it is a rational revelation. In the words of the *Confession* (1:5), there is a “consent of all the parts.” Scripture is logically consistent throughout. The “alleged” discrepancies in the Bible are just that: they are “alleged,” and nothing more (Hickman, 1.89, 676ff.). Moreover, there are no contradictions or logical paradoxes in the Bible. There is no biblical assertion which is self-contradictory (or at least appears to be so), where one way or the other the assertion cannot possibly be reconciled before the bar of human reason. In Miscellany 139 (*Works*, 13), he suggested “that there are many things in [the Christian] religion and the Scriptures that are made difficult on purpose to try men, and to exercise their faith and scrutiny, and to hinder the proud and self-sufficient.” But ultimately the Bible shows itself to be completely rational, without contradictions or logical paradoxes. “Men are reasonable,” said Edwards, “and the Bible does not ask [them] to believe things against reason” (Gerstner, 1.113). It is the non-Christian theories, he claimed, which are composed of “a whole heap of inconsistencies” (Hickman, 1.30).

Jonathan Edwards also agreed with the *Westminster Confession of Faith* (1:8), that although only the original writings (“the Old Testament in Hebrew” and “the New Testament in Greek”) were “immediately inspired by God,” nevertheless, He has “by His singular care and providence” kept these texts “pure in all ages [so that they] are therefore authentic.” Therefore, what we have

33. John E. Smith, *Review of Metaphysics* (December 1976), as cited in R. C. Sproul, John H. Gerstner, and Arthur Lindsley, *Classical Apologetics* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1984) 243.

34. Jonathan Edwards does use the word “dictate” (and its cognates) in his writings on this subject. But this usage speaks to the result (i.e., the end product), not the mode, of inspiration. For Edwards, the words of Scripture could be no more the words of God the Holy Spirit than if they were literally dictated (see Gerstner, 1.141-142).

in our Bible today is the very Word of God (*Works*, 13, Miscellany 358).<sup>35</sup>

#### THE AUTHORITY AND SUFFICIENCY OF SCRIPTURE

We have already seen, that according to Jonathan Edwards, the full authority and all-sufficiency of Scripture is due to its unique origin. The Bible is the Word of God and has a monopoly on truth. It is to be recognized as “a transcript of the divine perfections” (*Works*, 13, Miscellany 94). This is the Reformed principle of *sola Scriptura*. There is no other source of divine, special revelation. The 66 books of the Old and New Testaments are all-sufficient, not only for man to come to a sound and saving knowledge of God, through Jesus Christ, but also to justify all knowledge and to interpret every area of life. Scripture is the sole authority by which all is to be judged. Nothing stands in judgment over the Word of God. Not even the revered creeds and confessions of the church, as valuable as they may be, are to be placed on a par with Holy Scripture: “I believe that the Christians, soon after the apostles’ times, depended as entirely upon the holy Scripture, with relation to the doctrines they ought to believe, as we at this distance. I think that God never intended that we should ever have any other sure rule of faith but the holy Scriptures, and has left everything else uncertain, that we might prize and improve them” (*Works*, 13, Miscellany 72). Edwards, in accord with the prophet Isaiah (8:20), affirmed that our only rule in life is “the law and testimony.”<sup>36</sup>

According to the New England theologian, “it is God’s design, when He gave the church the Scriptures, so to make and dispose them, and to put so much into them, and in such a manner, that they should be completely sufficient of themselves, that they should hold forth to us things sufficient for us to know, and they should be sufficiently there exhibited, and that in all important matters, whether in doctrine or practice, the Scriptures should sufficiently explain themselves” (*Works*, 18, Miscellany 535).

In good Calvinistic fashion, Jonathan Edwards taught that the inner testimony of the Holy Spirit is necessary to corroborate the authority of God’s Word to fallen man. “From the Fall of man, to our day,” he commented,

35. In Miscellany 358 Edwards clearly shows that he adopted the Received Text or Majority Text theory of New Testament textual criticism, and that he would have opposed the Critical Text theory. According to John Smith, “Edwards used the King James Version throughout.” See *Works*, 2, edited by John E. Smith, *Religious Affections* (1959) 82.

36. *Works*, 16, edited by George S. Claghorn, *Letters and Personal Writings* (1998) 102.

“the work of redemption in its effect has mainly been carried on by remarkable communications of the Spirit of God” (Hickman, 1.539). It is essential for man to have a knowledge of Scripture to be converted, but many men may have a sound knowledge of Scripture without being converted. Many non-believers have an understanding of the Scriptures, but without “the divine and supernatural light, immediately imparted to the soul by the Spirit of God,” they never attain a spiritual understanding of the message of Scripture. All natural and unregenerate men are destitute of this spiritual understanding of divine things. Only the Spirit is able to make them see the truth of God’s Word and embrace it as “truth.” In this process, however, the Spirit does not reveal any new information which causes the reader to believe. “This spiritual light is not the suggesting of any new truths or propositions not contained in the Word of God.” Rather, the Spirit produces belief in the mind of the elect sinner so that he can and does believe (Hickman, 1.12-17). According to John Gerstner (1.187):

Edwards’ theory of religious knowledge may be represented by the photographic developing process. When the picture is first taken on the emulsion nothing appears or can be seen. When the film is developed the picture is seen. The developer adds nothing to the picture that is not already present, but it makes the picture visible. Natural men [non-believers] have a religious picture on their mind; they may have many such pictures; they may have many more than regenerate persons and, indeed, much better pictures. But not one of these fine pictures is ever developed. The divine and supernatural light [the Holy Spirit] is the developer God uses to make the beauty and sweetness of divine truth apparent to the regenerate.

At the same time, said Edwards, the Holy Spirit is that member of the Godhead who further illuminates the teaching of Scripture for the believer. But again, in this process, the Spirit does not reveal any new information. Rather, the same Spirit progressively gives the Christian a greater understanding of the Scriptures. He sheds more light on the biblical texts so that the believer can more fully grasp the teaching of the Word of God (Hickman, 1.12-17).

#### SCRIPTURE AS A MEANS OF GRACE

These things being so, Jonathan Edwards stressed the importance of Bible study to his congregation. One cannot undergo spiritual growth without a knowledge of

the Word of God. The most acceptable way of showing respect to Christ, he taught, is by giving serious attention to His Word. In a sermon on Hebrews 5:12, Edwards preached:<sup>37</sup>

Every Christian should make a business of endeavoring to grow in knowledge of divinity [theology].... Divinity comprehends all that is taught in the Scriptures, and so all that we need to know, or is to be known, concerning God and Jesus Christ, concerning our duty to God, our happiness in God.... There is no other way by which any means of grace whatsoever can be of any benefit, but by knowledge.... Christians ought not to content themselves with such degrees of knowledge in divinity as they have already obtained. It should not satisfy them that they know as much as is absolutely necessary to salvation, but should seek to make progress.... However diligently we apply ourselves there is room enough to increase our knowledge of divinity, without coming to an end.

In this sense, Scripture, along with the sacraments and prayer, functions as a “means of grace” (*Works*, 18, Miscellany 539). As explained by the *Westminster Shorter Catechism* (Q. 88), the means of grace are: “The outward and ordinary means whereby Christ communicates to us the benefits of redemption, [and they] are His ordinances, especially the Word, sacraments, and prayer; all of which are made effectual to the elect for salvation.” With this explanation, Jonathan Edwards was in agreement, teaching that these means are indispensable to the sanctification of the Christian. “God’s Spirit,” he wrote, “always attends His ordinances” (Hickman, 1.539). “All the stated means of grace,” he maintained, were established “in the apostolic age . . . and are to remain unaltered to the day of judgment.” God’s kingdom advances on earth (individually and corporately) not by extraordinary means, but “by the preaching of the gospel, and the use of the ordinary means of grace” (*Works*, 9.370, 459). The Holy Spirit conveys knowledge to the elect through the Word of God preached, and through the sacraments as explained and understood by the Word. (This is the reason Edwards advocated a weekly administration of the Lord’s supper [*Works*, 16.366].)

Edwards being the Puritan that he was, stressed the importance of preaching, for “in preaching” there is “the impressing divine things on the heart and affections of the hearers.”<sup>38</sup> As stated by Irvonwy Morgan:<sup>39</sup>

The essential thing in understanding the Puritans was that they were preachers before they were anything else

... what bound them together, under girded their striving, and gave them the dynamic to persist was their consciousness that they were called to preach the gospel.

Here, once again, Jonathan Edwards was exemplary. Not only was he a master theologian and philosopher, “but for virtually his entire adult life Edwards was first and foremost a preacher.”<sup>40</sup> And he was a preacher *par excellence*. John Gerstner wrote (Gerstner, 1.480):

Jonathan Edwards was, in my opinion, the greatest preacher, from the standpoint of content of his messages, who has appeared in history since apostolic times.... From the standpoint of deep and solid exegesis, clear and profound articulation of doctrine, searching, thorough, and fervent evangelistic application, I have never found Edwards’ equal.... This [was] a preacher extraordinary of the Word of God.

Along this line of thought, Sereno Dwight, who wrote the *Memoirs of Jonathan Edwards*, once asked a man who had heard this Puritan Sage preach, whether or not Edwards was an eloquent speaker. The man responded (Hickman, 1.cxc):

He [Edwards] had no studied varieties of the voice, and no strong emphasis. He scarcely gestured, or even moved, and he made no attempt by the elegance of his style, or the beauty of his pictures, to gratify the taste, and fascinate the imagination. But, if you mean by eloquence, the power of presenting an important truth before an audience, with overwhelming weight of argument, and with such intenseness of feeling, that the whole soul of the speaker is thrown into every part of the conception and delivery; so that the solemn attention of the whole audience is riveted, from the beginning to the close, and impressions are left that cannot be effaced; Mr. Edwards was the most eloquent man I ever heard speak.

As far as the style of preaching of Jonathan Edwards is concerned, it is a common notion that he laboriously read every word of his sermons. This, however, is not the case. It is true that the majority of the extant manuscripts of Edwards’ sermons are those which are writ-

37. Jonathan Edwards, *To All the Saints of God* (Morgan, Pennsylvania: Soli Deo Gloria, 2003) 212-241.

38. *Works*, 2.115.

39. Irvonwy Morgan, *The Godly Preachers of the Elizabethan Church* (London: Epworth Press, 1965) 11.

40. *Jonathan Edwards Reader*, xvi.

ten out in full. But there are numerous sermons which are in outline form. Likely, Samuel Hopkins correctly averred that even with the sermons which were written out in full, there was a freedom from dependence on the manuscript. Hence, Edwards “read most that he wrote: still he was not confined to them [the written sermons]; and if some thoughts were suggested to him while he was preaching, which did not occur to him when writing, and appeared pertinent, he would deliver them with as great propriety and fluency, and often with greater pathos, and attended with a more sensibly good effect on his hearers, than what he had written.” And with the sermons which were presented in outline form, he would have necessarily spoken from those outlines, using them as somewhat of a springboard for further elucidation of his thoughts.<sup>41</sup>

And the message preached, said Edwards, must be the truth of God’s Word, delivered with intensity. In a sermon on John 5:35, he preached (*To All the Saints of God*, 1-28):

It is the excellency of a minister of the gospel to be both a burning and shining light.... If a minister has light without heat, and entertains his auditory with learned discourses, without a savor of the power of godliness, or an appearance of fervency, of spirit, and zeal for God and the good of souls, he may gratify itching ears, and fill the heads of his people with empty notions; but it will not be very likely to reach their hearts, or save their souls. And if, on the other hand, he be driven on with a fierce and intemperate zeal, and vehement heat, without light, he will be likely to kindle the like unhallowed flame in his people, and to fire their corrupt passions and affections; but will make them never the better, nor lead them a step toward heaven, but drive them apace the other way.... But if he approves himself in his ministry, as both a burning and shining light, this will be the way to promote true Christianity amongst his people, and to make them both wise and good, and cause religion to flourish among them in the purity and beauty of it.

41. Cited in Ian H. Murray, *Jonathan Edwards: A New Bibliography* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1987) 190.

42. John Piper, *The Supremacy of God in Preaching* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1990) 103.

43. Packer, 310, 314.

44. The following quotes are from various sermons that Edwards preached during his pastoral ministry. The texts of these sermons are 1 Corinthians 2:11-13, John 13:15-16, Deuteronomy 32:35, John 3:36, Matthew 2:10, Luke 14:26, Matthew 13:23, Matthew 15:26, Matthew 16:17, and Romans 9:18. See *Meet Jonathan Edwards*, 65-66.

John Piper correctly stated: “Edwards could no more imagine speaking in a cold or casual or indifferent or flippant manner about the great things of God than he could imagine a father discussing coolly the collapse of a flaming house upon his children.”<sup>42</sup>

Commenting on the pastoral ministry of the New England divine, J. I. Packer wrote: “All his life he labored, fearlessly and tirelessly, to understand and apply the Bible.... All his life he fed his soul on the Bible; and all his life he fed his flock on the Bible.... As a Bible-lover, a Calvinist, a teacher of heart-religion,” Jonathan Edwards, being a “pure Puritan, indeed one of the purest and greatest of all the Puritans, [was] a gospel preacher of unction and power.”<sup>43</sup>

When it came to preaching the Word of God, Jonathan Edwards, like the apostle Paul before him, “was innocent of the blood of all men,” for he did not shun “to declare” to his hearers “the whole counsel of God” (Acts 20:26-27). “Ministers are not to preach those things which their own wisdom or reason suggests,” exhorted Edwards, “but the things that are already dictated to them by the superior wisdom and knowledge of God.”<sup>44</sup> Further, ministers of the gospel must not “reject any doctrine that is taught by divine revelation.” God “holds them [accountable] to go and preach the Word.” According to Edwards, “it is the duty of ministers of the gospel, in the work of their ministry, to follow the example of their great Lord and Master [Jesus Christ].”

This Puritan theologian, as an evangelist, did not hesitate to warn his hearers, that apart from Christ, they were “sinners in the hands of an angry God.” “He that does not believe on the Lord Jesus Christ,” preached Edwards, “the wrath of God abides on him.” But “when those that have been earnestly seeking Christ come to find Him they have reason to rejoice with exceeding great joy.” There are, however, warned this evangelist, those “that have seeming come to Christ that do not love Christ above their dearest earthly enjoyments; they are not Christ’s disciples.” “That which distinguishes the profitable hearers of God’s Word from all others is that they [spiritually] understand it and bring forth the fruit of it.” Indeed, “there is a great difference between converted and unconverted men.” Those who come to savingly believe in Christ, however, must never think that it is of their own doing. Rather, the grace of salvation is the work of God alone: It is “a divine and supernatural light immediately implanted to the soul by the Spirit of God.” It is God who “exercises His sovereignty in the eternal salvation of men.” “God’s Word always comes as conqueror,” commented Edwards; “those that are not

conquered by conversion shall be conquered by destruction and the execution of its threatenings.”<sup>45</sup>

In 1750 Edwards was dismissed by his Northampton congregation for attempting to return to the Reformed view of the Lord’s supper, as taught in the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, the *Savoy Declaration*, and the *Cambridge Platform*, which maintains that the Lord’s supper is to be restricted to the Lord’s people. In his farewell sermon, which is one of the most “moving” sermons Edwards ever preached, we see the New England divine at his best. He reminded his congregation that he had faithfully served them for a period of twenty-three years. He addressed the various groups within the congregation at the time: “Those who are professors of godliness,” those “in a Christ-less state,” “those who are under some awakenings,” “the young people of the congregation,” and “the children of the congregation.” Appropriate words were spoken to each group. Edwards told them: “I have spent the prime of my life and strength in labors for your eternal welfare.... [I] have given myself to the work of the ministry, laboring in it night and day, rising early, and applying myself to this great business to which Christ has appointed me.” And he exhorted and warned them: “You and I are now parting one from another as to this world; let us labor that we may not be parted after our meeting at the last day.... This is a sorrowful parting, but that would be more sorrowful.” Then he reminded them that “God is the fountain of all blessing and prosperity, and He will be sought to for His blessing.” Finally, Edwards concluded (Hickman, 1.cc-ccvii):

Having briefly mentioned these important articles of advice, nothing remains, but that I now take my leave of you, and bid you all farewell; wishing and praying for your best prosperity. I would now commend your immortal souls to Him, who formerly committed them to me, expecting the day when I must meet you again before Him, who is the Judge of quick and dead. I desire that I may never forget this people, who have been so long my special charge, and that I may never cease fervently to pray for your posterity. May God bless you with a faithful pastor, one that is well acquainted with His mind and will, thoroughly warning sinners, wisely and skillfully searching professors [of Christ], and conducting you in the way to eternal blessedness. May you have truly a burning and shining light set up in this candlestick; and may you not only for a season, but during his whole life, that a long life, be willing to rejoice in his light. And let me be remembered in the prayers of all God’s people that are of a calm spirit, and

are peaceable and faithful in Israel, of whatever opinion they may be with respect to terms of church communion. And let us remember, and never forget our future solemn meeting on that great day of the Lord; the day of infallible decision, and of the everlasting and unalterable sentence.

#### THE LAW OF GOD

Reformed theology, as taught in the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, does not separate the law and the gospel, though each is carefully distinguished from the other. Jonathan Edwards was of the same mind (*Works*, 13, Miscellany 343). Law without gospel is merely a dead letter. But there is no gospel without the law which reveals one’s sinful nature and his need for the grace of God in the person and work of Jesus Christ. Here the law is “exhibited to be as a school master to lead to Christ, not only for the use of that nation [Israel] in the ages of the Old Testament, but for the use of God’s church throughout all ages to the end of the world.” The law, then, serves “as an instrument that the great Redeemer [Christ] makes use of to convince men of their sin and misery and helplessness and God’s awful and tremendous majesty and justice as a lawgiver, and so to make men sensible of the necessity of Christ as a Savior” (*Works*, 9.180).

The moral law also functions as a pattern of life for the regenerate. It admonishes the Christian to seek God and obey His commandments. Here the law is not to be seen “as a covenant of works, but as a rule of life, so it is made use [of] by the Redeemer from that time [the giving of the law at Sinai] to the end of the world as a directory to His people, to show them the way in which they must walk, as they would go to heaven. For a way of sincere and universal obedience to this law is the narrow way that leads to life” (*Works*, 9.181).

Jonathan Edwards distinguished the three traditional categories of the law of God: moral, judicial (civil), and ceremonial. He agreed with the teaching of chapter 19 of the *Westminster Confession*, that the moral law, which comprises the Ten Commandments and the “general equity” of the judicial law which God gave to Israel as a nation, is continually binding on men and nations. He was of the opinion, for example, that the civil magistrate is obliged to uphold God’s law in its function as God’s minister. New England was under a covenant relationship with God. Therefore, as George Marsden correctly

45. *Works*, 5, edited by Stephen J. Stein, *Apocalyptic Writings* (1977) 105.

states, Jonathan Edwards (as with New England Calvinists in general) believed and taught that “nations and individuals were still blessed or punished according to that standard [God’s law]. Civil law accordingly should reflect God’s commands.”<sup>46</sup>

Edwards taught that “magistrates,” as well as “ministers” of the gospel, and “every living soul, [are] now obliged to arise and acknowledge God in His work” of promoting His kingdom (Hickman, 1.389). God has given us His “written law,” which is a “universal law by which mankind are to be governed.” And in this law, the “sanctions,” i.e., “the rewards and the punishments” are also made known” (*Works*, 13, Miscellany 266). The same argument is found in his message series on 1 Corinthians 13, where Edwards contended that “it will dispose magistrates to act as the fathers of the commonwealth with that care and concern for the public good which the father of a family has for his household” (*Charity and Its Fruits*, 170). This includes the magistrate’s responsibility to execute murderers, in accordance with God’s law: “God established it as a rule, henceforth to be observed, that murder shall be revenged in a course of public justice” (*Works*, 15.328-329).

It is also evident from Miscellany 14 (*Works*, 13), that Edwards was in agreement with the teaching of the *Westminster Confession of Faith* (23:3), that even though the civil magistrate is not to involve himself in matters of ecclesiastical concern, “yet he has authority, and it is his duty, to take order, that unity and peace be preserved in the church, that the truth of God be kept pure and entire; [and] that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed.”

Jonathan Edwards, as with Calvin before him, considered the work of the civil magistrate to be of great importance. In a sermon on Ezekiel 19:12, he preached that civil rulers are “strong rods” within a community. God tells us that there is a “need of government in societies.” God has ordained that good rulers are “vehicles of good to mankind.” Scripture even refers to these leaders as “gods.” The magistracy is a “great and important business.” And men serving in this capacity, should do so as God commands in His law (“as they ought to be”) (Hickman, 2.36-40). Magistrates are “heads, princes or governors, to whom honor, subjection and obedience should be paid” (*Works*, 13, Miscellany 336).<sup>47</sup>

46. George M. Marsden, *Jonathan Edwards: A Life* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 2003) 29.

47. According to Gerald R. McDermott, Edwards believed that the Bible taught a Republican form of government; see McDermott, *One Holy and Happy Society* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992) 137, 155, 157, 176.

As far as the ceremonial law is concerned, it was given to Israel as a “typical law.” These laws “prescribed the ceremonies and circumstances of the Jewish worship and their ecclesiastical state.” They are no longer binding (*Works*, 9.181). These “things of the Old Testament,” wrote Edwards in (unpublished) Miscellany 1439 (Gerstner, 1.146), “are types of things appertaining to the Messiah, His kingdom, His salvation made manifest from the Old Testament itself.” “When Christ died, then there was an end to those types and shadows, because they were then all fulfilled” (*Works*, 15.325). Edwards, then, was in agreement with the *Westminster Confession of Faith* (19:3), which states:

God was pleased to give to the people of Israel, as a church under age, ceremonial laws, containing several typical ordinances, partly of worship, prefiguring Christ, His graces, actions, sufferings, and benefits; and partly holding forth divers instructions of moral duties. All which ceremonial laws are now abrogated, under the New Testament.

This being so, we are to recognize that the elect of the Old Testament economy, which constituted the church “being in its minority” (*Works*, 13, Miscellany 138a), were saved in precisely the same way as those in the New. The elect realized that the ceremonial law pointed beyond itself to the coming Messiah: “All the people of Israel, if they exercised consideration, must suppose and understand that these things pertaining to the ceremonial law were appointed and used as representations and symbols of something spiritual, and not for the sake of any innate goodness in them or any value God had for them” (*Works*, 11.307). “The Messiah and the redemption which He was to work out by His obedience unto death, was the foundation of the salvation of all the posterity of fallen man, that ever were saved.... The saints of old trusted in the promises of a future redemption to be wrought out and completed by the Messiah, and built their comfort upon it” (*Freedom of the Will*, 164-165).

Summarizing Jonathan Edwards’ doctrine of Scripture, John Gerstner wrote (Gerstner, 1.190):

What shall we say? For him [Edwards] it [the Bible] was nothing other than the verbally inspired and inerrant Word, and he always, as Isaiah advised, “trembled” at His Word. It had free course in him as he studied it day and night and preached it throughout his ministry. It was certified internally and confirmed by external credentials as well. It was an “awful” [“awe-inspiring”]

book” with its dread warnings to the wicked and wondrous promises to the humble penitent. So Edwards, “boxed in” as he was by its authority, preached it in season and out of season, laboring to make its unique and saving message plain and powerful while fully aware that no sinner in Northampton or anywhere would ever see and receive it as God’s very Word until God Himself cast His divine and supernatural light upon its pages and its proclamation.

#### CONCLUSION

Jonathan Edwards began his theological and philosophical study with epistemology. His starting point was divine, special revelation. Throughout his writings, he posited the infallible, inerrant Scriptures as foundational to all else. He strongly adhered to the principle of *sola Scriptura*, believing, as taught in the *Westminster Confession* (1:6), that “the whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for His own glory, man’s salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture: unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit, or traditions of men.” The Puritan Sage operated out of a “biblical cage.” In the words of John Gerstner: “Jonathan Edwards’s life ... centered around the Bible.” It was “the *sine qua non* of his rational biblical theology” (Gerstner, 1.140).

#### II. Edwards on Salvation

The doctrine of justification by grace alone, through faith alone, in Christ alone (*sola fide*) was the central doctrine of the Reformation. Martin Luther considered it to be the article by which the church stands or falls. John Calvin declared it to be “the main hinge on which religion turns” and “the sum of all piety.”<sup>48</sup> Jonathan Edwards, as a staunch defender of this doctrine, agreed. As Carl Bogue stated: “Jonathan Edwards reflects the essence of the Scriptures when he attributes salvation to the absolute sovereign grace of God. The Reformation cry of *sola gratia* [by grace alone] and *sola fide* [by faith alone] reverberates through his writings.”<sup>49</sup> In this article, we will look at this Puritan Sage’s teaching on *sola fide*, within the context of his overall doctrine of soteriology.

According to the *Westminster Confession of Faith* (3:3, 5-6; 11:1-2; 14:1-2):

By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life.... Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to His eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of His will, hath chosen, in Christ, unto everlasting glory, out of His mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions, or causes moving Him thereunto: and all to the praise of His glorious grace.... As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath He, by the eternal and most free purpose of His will, foreordained all the means thereunto. Wherefore they who are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ, are effectually called unto faith in Christ by His Spirit working in due season, are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by His power through faith unto salvation.

Those whom God effectually calls, He also freely justifies: not by infusing righteousness into them, but by pardoning their sins, and by accounting and accepting their persons as righteous, not for anything wrought in them, or done by them, but for Christ’s sake alone; nor by imputing faith itself, the act of believing, or any other evangelical obedience to them, as their righteousness, but by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them, they receiving and resting on Him and His righteousness by faith; which faith they have not of themselves, it is the gift of God.... Faith, thus receiving and resting on Christ and His righteousness, is the alone instrument of justification; yet it is not alone in the person justified, but is ever accompanied with all other saving graces, and is no dead faith, but works by love.

The grace of faith, whereby the elect are enabled to believe to the saving of their souls, is the work of the Spirit of Christ in their hearts; and is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the Word: by which also, and by the administration of the sacraments, and prayer, it is increased and strengthened.... By this faith, a Christian believes to be true whatsoever is revealed in the Word, for the authority of God Himself speaking therein; and acts differently upon that which each particular passage thereof contains; yielding obedience to the com-

48. Cited in Robert L. Reymond, *The Reformation’s Conflict with Rome* (Ross-shire, Great Britain: Christian Focus Publications, 2001) 18-19.

49. Bogue, 209.

mands, trembling at the threatenings, and embracing the promises of God for this life, and that which is to come. But the principal acts of saving faith are accepting, receiving, and resting upon Christ alone for justification, sanctification, and eternal life, by virtue of the covenant of grace.

Herein we have perhaps the best synopsis of the doctrine of justification by faith alone that is available in creedal form. It is not only the view taught by the Reformers, but it also is the view espoused by Jonathan Edwards. The New England theologian endorsed this doctrine as taught by the Westminster divines, not only because it was taught in his “favorite creed,”<sup>50</sup> but also because he was convinced that it was the teaching of the inspired, infallible, inerrant Word of God.

Like the Westminster Assembly before him, Edwards believed that the eternal destiny of every man, woman, and child is determined by the eternal decree of Almighty God. In a sermon on Romans 9:18, he preached that God’s attribute of sovereignty necessitates “His absolute, independent right of disposing of all creatures according to His own pleasure.” God decrees, and even delights in, the election of some and the damnation of others. And He does so for His own glory.<sup>51</sup> Moreover, divine election and reprobation are not determined by God’s foreknowledge of the thoughts and choices of man: “God’s loving some and not others [is] antecedent to any manner of difference in them.”<sup>52</sup>

For His own free and sovereign good pleasure, God shows mercy to some in election, and He hardens others through reprobation. “Absolute sovereignty,” claimed Edwards, “is what I love to ascribe to God” (Hickman, 1.xiii).

But like the *Westminster Confession* (3:6; 14:2), Edwards also maintained that even though God “has appointed the elect unto glory” in His eternal decree, He has also “foreordained all the means thereunto.” There-

fore, those who are “fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ, are effectually called unto faith in Christ by His Spirit working in due season, [and] are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by His power through faith unto salvation ... by virtue of the covenant of grace.”

Jonathan Edwards taught that when God created Adam, He entered into a covenant of works with him, wherein Adam acted as the federal head or representative of the entire human race. In this covenant, God promised eternal life to Adam, and his posterity, upon condition of Adam’s perfect, personal obedience to God’s commands. Adam, however, disobeyed God. And when he fell, by virtue of the “constituted oneness or identity of Adam and his posterity in this affair,”<sup>53</sup> all mankind (with the exception of Christ, the second Adam) fell with him: “The beginning of the posterity of our first parents was after the Fall, for all his [Adam’s] posterity by ordinary generation are partakers of the Fall and the corruption of nature that followed from it.”<sup>54</sup>

All men are judicially guilty in this first sin. Man is now in an ethical state of total depravity, unable to do anything that pleases God. “The nature of man,” taught Edwards, “is so corrupt that he is become a very evil and hurtful creature” (John Gerstner, *The Rational Biblical Theology of Jonathan Edwards*, 2.272). He “stands in absolute need of a Redeemer.”<sup>55</sup> Men are “polluted with sin; every step they take is attended with sin, so all the works that they do are polluted. They can perform no service, no business, but they contract their guilt and defilement, that they need the renewed washing of the blood of Christ.”<sup>56</sup> Here again the New England Puritan theologian is in agreement with the *Westminster Confession* (9:3): “Man, by his fall into a state of sin, has wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation: so as, a natural man, being altogether averse from that good, and dead in sin, is not able, by his own strength, to convert himself, or to prepare himself thereunto.”

Immediately subsequent to the Fall, however, God entered into another covenant with elect man: the covenant of grace (which covenant itself is founded upon the supra-temporal intra-Trinitarian covenant of redemption<sup>57</sup>). In the covenant of grace, as stated in the *Confession* (7:3): “God freely offers unto sinners life and salvation by Jesus Christ, requiring of them faith in Him, that they might be saved; and promising to give unto all those that are ordained unto life His Holy Spirit, to make them willing and able to believe.” In the words of Edwards (Hickman, 2.599):

50. Jonathan Edwards said that he had “no difficulty” subscribing to the “substance of the *Westminster Confession*”; see Hickman, 1.cxxi. Edwardsian scholar Dr. John Gerstner is the one who said that the *Westminster Confession of Faith* was Edwards’ “favorite creed”; see Gerstner, *The Rational Biblical Theology of Jonathan Edwards*, 1.160.

51. *To All the Saints of God*, 68-95.

52. *Works*, 13, Miscellany 273.

53. Hickman, 1.220.

54. *Works*, 9.116.

55. *Works*, 18, Miscellany 814.

56. *Works*, 11.124.

57. In the view of Jonathan Edwards, as with Reformed theology in general, the covenant of redemption is the foundation of the covenant of grace; and the covenant of grace is the working out of the covenant of redemption.

The first covenant [of works] failed of bringing men to the glory of God, through man's instability, whereby he failed of perseverance. Man's changeableness was the thing wherein it was weak through the flesh. But God had made a second covenant [of grace] in mercy to fallen man, that in the way of this covenant he might be brought to the glory of God, which he failed of under the other.... Therefore God introduces another better covenant, committed not to his [Adam's] strength, but to the strength of one that was mighty and stable [Christ], and therefore is a sure and everlasting covenant.

The covenant of grace, taught Edwards, was made with Christ, and with all of the elect in Him: "God makes the covenant [of grace] with Christ, the second Adam, for Himself and all His posterity" (*Works*, 13, Miscellany 825). This covenant was initially revealed in Genesis 3:15, with the first Messianic or gospel promise; that is, that God would send His Christ to redeem fallen elect sinners: "Presently upon this gospel was first revealed on earth in ... Genesis 3:15.... But these words of God in the fifteenth verse of the third chapter of Genesis were the first dawning of the light of the gospel after this darkness" (*Works*, 9.132-133). Herein, Christ, as the federal head of God's elect, fulfilled the covenant of works in their behalf, and merited their salvation (*Works*, 9.117-119). So great is the grace of God manifested in the covenant of grace, that He has "become bound to us [the elect] by covenant" (Sermon on Romans 9:18).

Furthermore, Edwards said, there is one covenant of grace for all ages, and salvation is the same for those under the Old Testament administration as it is under the New. Both testaments have "the same salvation," "the same Mediator" (Jesus Christ), and the same method of justification by grace alone, in Christ alone, through faith alone. The two covenants "differ only in manner and circumstances."<sup>58</sup> Old Testament believers were saved, said Edwards, by believing in Christ (even though under the name the "Angel of the Lord," or the "Messenger of the covenant"), just as are their New Testament counterparts.<sup>59</sup> They are all aware that "the Messiah was the Son of God" (*Works*, 11.228). "The whole book, both Old Testament and New," he contended, "is filled up with the gospel, only with this difference, that the Old Testament contains the gospel under a veil, but the New contains it unveiled, so that we may see the glory of the Lord with open face." Jesus Christ is the Savior of the saints in all ages from the beginning of the world. Thus, concluded the Puritan theologian, "the religion of the church of Israel was essentially the same religion

with that of the Christian church," both being "built on the holy Scriptures" (*Works*, 9.290, 443).

There can be little question that Jonathan Edwards was a Christian exclusivist. He maintained that Jesus Christ is the only Savior, and that it is essential for one to believe in Him in order to be saved. Even under the shadows of the Old Testament, it was always "the second person of the Trinity" who appeared to His people, and those who were saved put their trust in Him (*Works*, 18, Miscellany 663). Of course, this does not mean that the Old Testament saints knew as much about Christ as do those in the New Testament era, but they knew Christ. Even those in foreign lands who were saved, were saved by believing in the Christ they had heard of through the special revelation brought to them by the people of God.<sup>60</sup>

According to the New England divine, then, the salvation of the elect ultimately begins in God's eternal plan. God, for His own glory and according to His own good purpose, eternally decrees the election of some and the reprobation of others: God fully exercises His sovereignty in the affairs of men's eternal salvation. Salvation, from beginning to end, is based on God's divine initiative.

This does not, however, deny the fact that God uses means in His sovereignty in salvation. He is sovereign over the means as well as He is in His decree. Preached Edwards: "The things which God does for the salvation and blessedness of the saints are like an inviolable chain"; "God is the sole author of salvation of those that are saved even from the very first beginning of it in the eternal covenant of redemption even to the end and consummation of it in the glory of the saints."<sup>61</sup> And even "though means are made use of in conferring grace on men's souls, yet it is of God that we have these means of grace, and it is He that makes them effectual" (Hickman, 2.4).

#### THE ORDER OF SALVATION

Soteriology is the study of the work of redemption accomplished by Jesus Christ, as it is applied to the elect. Although all three members of the Trinity are involved in the salvation of the elect, taught Edwards, it is the Holy Spirit who applies this grace. The Father elects;

58. Jonathan Edwards, Unpublished Miscellany 1353.

59. Cited in Gerald R. McDermott, *Jonathan Edwards Confronts the Gods*, 159.

60. *Works*, 15.369-372, 535-537.

61. Sermon on Romans 8:29 (Gerstner, 3.151), and Hosea 13:9 (Gerstner, 3.366).

the Son redeems those whom the Father elects; and the Spirit applies Christ's redemptive work to the elect (Hickman, 2.288). Moreover, not only is the Spirit the member of the Godhead who applies the work of redemption, preached Edwards in a sermon on Galatians 3:13-14, He "is the sum of the blessings that Christ purchased for us in the work of our redemption." He effectually unites the elect to Christ through faith (Bogue, 224-225).

The salvation of the elect (both Old and New Testaments), then, has to do with their relationship with Christ. He is the federal head of His elect people; He is their representative, and they are in union with Him. According to Jonathan Edwards, this union with Christ is foundational to the entirety of the order of salvation. In Miscellany 1091 he stated: "God the Father makes no covenant and enters into no treaty with fallen man distinctly by themselves. He will transact with them in such a friendly way no other way than by and in [union with] Christ Jesus as members and as it were parts of Him."<sup>62</sup>

In another Miscellany he wrote (Gerstner, 3.222-23):

By virtue of the believer's union with Christ, he does really possess all things.... I'll tell you what I mean by possessing all things. I mean that God, three in one, all that He is, and all that He has, and that He does, all that He has made or done, the whole universe, bodies and spirits, light, heaven, angels, men and devils, sun, moon, stars, land, sea, fish, fowls, all the silver and gold, kings and potentates, as well as mere men, are as much the Christian's as the money in his pocket, the clothes he wears, or the house he dwells in, as the victuals he eats; yea, more properly his, more advantageously, more his than if he commands all those things mentioned to be just in all respects as he pleased, at any time, by virtue of the union with Christ, because Christ who certainly

does thus possess all things is entirely his, so that he possesses it all ... only he has not the trouble of managing of it but Christ to whom it is no trouble, manages it for him, a thousand times as much as to his advantage as he could himself, if he had the managing of all.... And who would desire to possess all things more than to have all things managed just according to his will.

And in his famous sermon on Romans 4:5, "Justification by Faith Alone," which (incidentally) triggered the first great awakening, Edwards preached that "this relation or union to Christ, whereby Christians are said to be in Christ ... is the ground of their right to His benefits."<sup>63</sup>

As noted, the Puritan sage taught that salvation is not to be viewed as a one step event. One is not converted and immediately glorified. There is a process involved. As cited in the *Confession* (3:6), "they who are elected ... are redeemed by Christ; are effectually called unto faith in Christ by His Spirit working in due season; are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by His power through faith unto salvation." But even as we study the process, we must keep in mind that some of the parts may be synchronous, and the parts can in no way be separated. They are, said Edwards, like "strings in concert, if one is struck others sound with it" (*Works*, 13, Miscellany 315).

Jonathan Edwards nowhere wrote out in systematic form an *ordo salutis* (order of salvation), but from a study of his various writings it is evident that he would basically agree with the *Westminster Confession of Faith*,<sup>64</sup> that the logical order in which redemption is applied to the elect sinner is as follows:

#### *Universal Call*

Jonathan Edwards believed that men enter into this world in a fallen condition; they are "sinners in the hands of an angry God." And if they are going to come to know God savingly, through Jesus Christ, they must hear the gospel preached. When the gospel is proclaimed, there is a "universal call" which goes out to all men who come under the hearing of the Word of God (*Works*, 13, Miscellany 216). This general call, said Edwards, is "to sinners universally," inviting them to come to Christ for their salvation. It is a genuine and universal call, and all who hear the message are called on to respond to it. "When we have heard the Word of God we ought to give earnest heed that we don't lose what we have heard."<sup>65</sup> Many who hear this message, however, reject it to their everlasting destruction.

62. *Works*, 20, Miscellany 1091.

63. Jonathan Edwards, *Justification by Faith Alone* (Morgan, Pennsylvania: Soli Deo Gloria, 2000). "Justification by Faith Alone," based on Romans 4:5, was preached as a series of sermons in 1734. Interestingly, in this series Edwards argues against an 18<sup>th</sup> century version of the "New Perspective on Paul," which averred that the apostle Paul's polemic against the Judaizers' view of the "works of the law" had to do, not so much with grace versus works, but with the Jewish "works" of the ceremonial law of Israel. Edwards sets forth a number of irrefutable arguments against such a notion, showing how it is not possible that when Paul refers to the "works of the law" that he is referring simply to the ceremonial law. The first century Jews may not have been Pelagian, but they were surely (at best) semi-Pelagian.

64. The *ordo salutis* is set forth in WCF 10-18, 32-33.

65. Cited in John H. Gerstner, *Jonathan Edwards: Evangelist* (Morgan, Pennsylvania: Soli Deo Gloria, 1995) 18-23.

### Effectual Calling

The universal call is not efficacious. According to the New England divine, it is not possible for a person to come to a saving knowledge of God without sound doctrine, but sound doctrine is not enough. It is only when the Holy Spirit applies the Word to the heart of the elect sinner that the call becomes “effectual.” In a sermon on John 16:8, Edwards preached: “Whatever in the work of redemption is done immediately or upon men’s souls is the work of the Spirit.” And “the work of the Holy Ghost [is] to make men understand the way of sinners’ reconciliation and acceptance with God through Christ.” He is the one who gives “divine light” “into the heart of converts” (Bogue, 221).

It is important to understand that there is no new revelation given in this work of the Spirit; there are no new propositions revealed to the elect sinner. The Spirit merely opens his heart to understand “spiritually” the teachings of Scripture. In Miscellany 397, Edwards wrote (*Works*, 13): “The first act of the Spirit of God is in spiritual understanding or in the sense of the mind, its perception of glory and excellency, etc. – in the ideas it has of divine things.”

### Regeneration

Although effectual calling and regeneration stand in the closest possible relationship, there is a difference in the two. Regeneration is the work of the Holy Spirit as a result of the effectual call, wherein He prepares the heart of the elect sinner to respond to the call of God. Citing the words of Christ to Nicodemus, Edwards told his hearers: “Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God.” The work of the Holy Spirit in the new birth is internal and supernatural. This is true of both the Old and New Testament eras. “It is no wonder that Christ said that we must be born again” (*Jonathan Edwards: Evangelist*, 126). This work of divine assistance is always efficacious. It is “irresistible grace” (*Works*, 13, Miscellany 15).

### Conversion

Although Jonathan Edwards sometimes used the terms “effectual calling,” “conversion,” “repentance,” and “regeneration” as approximate synonyms, he also did distinguish them. Regeneration ushers in conversion, in which the elect sinner is brought into a filial and intimate relationship with God through Christ: “There is such a thing as conversion.” And this “work of conver-

sion is a great affect of God’s power and grace in the heart” (*Jonathan Edwards: Evangelist*, 128-130).

The Puritan divine believed and taught that conversion is the work of God the Spirit whereby He graciously acts upon the regenerate individual, causing him to respond to the effectual call in faith and repentance. Faith and repentance, although separate acts, are so closely related that they cannot be temporally separated: “So saving repentance and faith are implied in one another. They are both one conversion of the soul from sin to God through Christ.”<sup>66</sup> Or said another way: “Repentance is often spoken of as the special condition of remission of sins,” and “remission of sins is by faith in Jesus Christ,” so “that faith and repentance are not to be looked upon as properly two distinct things”; rather, we should recognize “that evangelical repentance is a certain exercise of faith in Jesus Christ.” “Repentance is implied in faith” (*Works*, 20, Miscellany 943; 18, Miscellany 504).

Edwards properly maintained that whereas in effectual calling and regeneration, the elect sinner is passive, in the case of conversion he is active. Conversion is the believer’s response to the regenerating work of the Holy Spirit. Herein the Spirit infuses grace into the soul of the elect sinner, enabling him to turn away from sin in repentance, and to turn to God, in Christ, in faith (Hickman, 2.12-17).

Repentance (*metanoia*),<sup>67</sup> wrote Edwards, “signifies a change of mind.” The repentant sinner changes his attitude toward sin, and turns from it with a holy hatred to serve God. There is “a change or turning from sin to God.... The change of mind in repentance is that in which saving faith is attained” (Hickman, 1.213). The New England theologian agreed with the *Shorter Catechism* (Q. 87) that biblical repentance “is a saving grace, whereby a sinner, out of a true sense of his sin, and apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ, does with grief and hatred of sin, turn from it unto God, with full purpose of, and endeavor after, new obedience.”

Edwards also agreed with the *Shorter Catechism* (Q. 86) definition of saving faith: “Faith in Jesus Christ is a saving grace, whereby we receive and rest upon Him alone for salvation, as He is offered to us in the gospel.” He wrote (Hickman, 2.590):

The definition [of saving faith] might have been expressed in these words: faith is the soul’s entirely adhering and acquiescing in the revelation of Jesus Christ

66. *Works*, 8.331.

67. The Greek word *metanoia* means “a change of mind.”

as our Savior – Or thus: faith is the soul’s embracing that truth of God, that reveals Jesus Christ as our Savior – Or thus: faith is the soul’s entirely acquiescing in, and depending upon, the truth of God, revealing Christ as our Savior.

In his sermon on Matthew 13:5, on “the Parable of the Sower,” Edwards explained that there are several kinds of non-justifying faith spoken of in the Bible. Only one kind of faith justifies. The kind of spurious faith, i.e., belief, which “rises only from superficial impressions is wont to whither away for want of root when it comes to be tried by the difficulties of religion” (Hickman, 2.585). In Miscellany 218, he wrote (*Works*, 13): “Though unregenerate man may in some measure believe the gospel, yet they don’t believe it so that they dare to trust to it; they are not willing to perform its prescriptions, trusting to its offers, which is true believing in Christ.”

Saving faith is “essentially” different from these various kinds of non-justifying faith. Genuine faith involves knowledge, assent, and trust. It is not enough to know the truth about Jesus Christ as presented in the gospel; nor is it sufficient to understand the message and merely assent to it in verbal agreement, as essential as these are. Saving faith “is the whole soul’s active agreeing, according, and symphonizing with this truth.” It is an “adhering to the truth, and acquiescing in it” (Hickman, 2.580). Here again, Edwards is in agreement with the Westminster Standards. In *Larger Catechism* (Q. 72), we read that “justifying faith” is a faith that “not only assents to the truth of the promise of the gospel, but receives and rests upon Christ and His righteousness, therein held forth for pardon of sin, and for the accepting and accounting of his person righteous in the sight of God for salvation.”

Faith involves union with Christ, not a mere recognition of His existence. In his well known sermon on Matthew 16:17 (“A Divine and Supernatural Light Immediately Imparted to the Soul by the Spirit of God”), Edwards preached: “There is a difference between having a rational judgment that honey is sweet, and having a sense [taste] of its sweetness.” The same is true with regard to saving faith: There is “a true sense of the divine and superlative excellency of the things of religion; a real sense of the excellency of God and Jesus Christ, and of the work of redemption, and the ways and works of God.” There is “a true sense of the divine excellency of things of God’s Word [which] does more directly and immediately convince us of their truth.” When one has

this “sense,” he acquiesces to the “light of the glorious gospel of Christ” (Hickman, 2.12-17).

Moreover, as noted above, at his conversion the elect child of God has new desires, new habits, infused into him by the Spirit: “But man when he is changed from a sinner to a saint has new principles of perception and action; principles which are entirely diverse and not arising merely from [a] new disposition of the old or contracted habits as those changes that are wrought by education do. They are principles that are vastly superior to those he had before” (*Jonathan Edwards: Evangelist*, 129-130). These principles are divinely infused by the Spirit of God, and they affect the whole man. The Spirit “unites Himself with the mind of the saint . . . as a new supernatural principle in life and action” (Sermon on Matthew 16:17, *Meet Jonathan Edwards*, 113). In fact, there is a sense in which we may even say that the Holy Spirit is the new principle Himself: “The Holy Spirit or the third person of the Trinity in His operations and fruits is the sum of the blessings that Christ purchased for us in the work of our redemption” (Sermon on Galatians 3:13-14, *Meet Jonathan Edwards*, 113). Herein is true virtue. God now becomes the very best portion of the Christian; he prefers God above all else (*Works*, 18, Miscellany 567):

If a man has any true love to God, he must have a spirit to love God above all, because, without seeing something of the divine glory, there can be no true love to God; but if a man sees anything of divine glory, he will see that He is more glorious than any other; for where-insoever God is divine, therein He is above all others. If men are sensible only of some excellency in God that is common with Him to others, they are not sensible of anything of His divine glory. But so far as any man is sensible of excellency in God above all others, so far must he love Him above all others.

Further, Edwards contended, a genuine love for God must be a love, not primarily for what one receives from God, but for God Himself. “We are obliged,” he wrote, “not only to love Him with a love of gratitude for benefits received; but true love for God primarily consists in a supreme regard to Him for what He is in Himself. . . . If we love not God because He is what He is, but only because He is profitable to us, in truth we love Him not at all.”<sup>68</sup> And again: “The first objective ground of gracious affections, is the transcendently excellent and amiable nature of divine things, as they are in themselves, and not any conceived relation they bear to self, or self-interest” (Hickman, 1.317). This does not mean

68. *Works*, 3, ed. Clyde A. Holbrook, *Original Sin* (1970) 144.

that there is not a proper type of self-love. Because a biblically based self-love will see God as the highest good for the self, and will rejoice in and embrace God as the greatest good (*Works*, 18, Miscellany 530).

### Justification

Justification, taught Edwards, immediately follows conversion. He averred with the Larger Catechism (Q. 70) that “justification is an act of God’s free grace unto sinners, in which He pardons all their sins, accepts and accounts their persons righteous in His sight; not for any thing wrought in them, or done by them, but only for the perfect obedience and full satisfaction of Christ, by God imputed to them, and received by faith alone.” Justification is a legal act, wherein God pardons the elect sinner and accepts him as righteous “for the perfect obedience and full satisfaction of Christ” which is imputed to him. Theologians refer to this as the doctrine of “double imputation.” That is, not only were the sins of the elect imputed to Christ (in His atoning cross work), but His righteousness was also imputed to them. In defense of the Edwardsian doctrine of justification, Robert Jenson correctly stated:<sup>69</sup>

Edwards knows that the language of “justification” is juridical language in Paul’s use and in the use of the Reformation, and he adheres to the rules of the metaphor. So also the justice given by God’s justification is strictly “imputed” justice, in the purest style of ... Calvinistic teaching: God chooses to reckon Christ’s righteousness to the sinner, and so the sinner is judged righteous.

To be justified is to be approved of God as a proper subject of pardon, with a right to eternal life. In Miscellany 812 Edwards wrote (*Works*, 18):

Justification is not only pardon of sin ... but in an act or sentence approving of him as innocent and positively righteous, and so having a right to freedom from punishment, and to the reward of positive righteousness.... But the pardon we have in Christ is a freeing persons from the punishment of sin, as an act of justice, and because they are looked upon and accepted as having that which is equivalent to innocence, viz. satisfaction.... Justification consists of imputing righteousness. To pardon sin is to cease to be angry for sin. But imputing righteousness and ceasing to be angry for sin are two things; one is the foundation of the other. God ceases to be angry with the sinner for his sin because righteousness is imputed to him.

As stated above, the doctrine of justification by grace alone, through faith alone, in Christ alone, was the central doctrine of the Reformation. And Edwards was a staunch defender of it. In his sermon on Romans 4:5 he preached: “We are justified only by faith in Christ, and not by any manner of goodness of our own.... God, in justification, has no regard to any godliness of ours” (*Meet Jonathan Edwards*, 115).

When Edwards taught that justification is by faith alone, he did not mean that one’s faith is in any sense meritorious. Neither faith nor repentance justify “as a work, for the nature of the one [repentance] is to renounce works, and the nature of the other [faith] is to depend on the work of another [Christ]” (*Works*, 18, Miscellany 620). “God does not give those that believe a union with or an interest in the Savior as a reward for faith, but only because faith is the soul’s active uniting with Christ” (Sermon on Rom. 4:5). “We must believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and accept of Him as offered in the gospel for a Savior. But, as we cannot do this of ourselves, Christ has purchased this, also, for all the elect. He has purchased, that they shall have faith given them; whereby they shall be united to Christ, and have a title to His benefits.”<sup>70</sup> In fact, “there is no good work before conversion” (*Works*, 18, Misc. 797).

Faith means trusting in Christ alone, who justifies. The ground of justification is Christ’s vicarious righteousness and sacrifice, i.e., His works. Ultimately, therefore, said Edwards, salvation is by works, but it is by Christ’s works, not the believer’s. “If it is inquired what we must be saved for or on account of the answer is it must be for works, but not our works; nor any works that we have done or can do but works that Christ has done for us.”<sup>71</sup> As stated by Conrad Cherry, according to Jonathan Edwards, “both the salvation of the saints (their objective good) and their title to salvation (faith as an inherent good) are gifts freely given by God in Christ” (Cherry, 95).

Jonathan Edwards did teach, along with a number of other Reformed theologians, including the Westminster divines and John Calvin,<sup>72</sup> that faith and other graces (such as obedience and perseverance) are ‘conditions’

69. Robert W. Jenson, *America’s Theologian* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988) 58.

70. Cited in Conrad Cherry, *The Theology of Jonathan Edwards: A Reappraisal* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990) 95.

71. Jonathan Edwards, Sermon on Genesis 6:22, *Pressing Into the Kingdom*, compiled and edited by Don Kistler (Morgantown, Pennsylvania: Soli Deo Gloria, 1998) 218-247.

72. See the *Westminster Confession of Faith* (7:3) and the *Larger Catechism* (Q. 32). See also John Calvin, *Sermons on Deuteronomy* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1987) 322; John Calvin *Com-*

of salvation. But they are non-meritorious ‘conditions,’ because they all come as a gift of God. And they are only ‘conditions’ in the sense that “without which it shall not be, and that with which it shall be” (Miscellany 315).<sup>73</sup>

In an (unpublished) sermon on Romans 4:16, he preached: “In one sense of the word Christ alone performs the condition of our salvation.... And in another sense of the word there are other graces besides faith that are conditions of justification.” But then he went on to say that “faith is that in them which God has respect to upon the account of which God judges it meet that they should be looked upon as Christ’s righteousness belonging to them.” And in his sermon on Romans 4:5 (Hickman, 1.641), he stated that even faith itself is a gift of God, as is the saint’s perseverance in a way of holiness unto glory. It is only by the power of the indwelling Holy Spirit of God that the saints are enabled to persevere, and perseverance is so “contained in the first act of faith” that it cannot possibly fail. By God’s grace, saving faith ushers in a certain “natural fitness” or “suitableness” whereby the elect sinner is granted the grace to persevere to the end and be saved.<sup>74</sup> As necessary as these graces are in order to salvation (and they are absolutely necessary), they are nevertheless gracious gifts from almighty God, and therefore non-meritorious, non-causal, and non-justifying; they are in no sense instrumental in justification. According to Jonathan Edwards, “that which makes our obedience the matter of our justification ... [is] contrary to the gospel doctrine of justification” (*Works*, 13, Miscellany 474). The good works, then, are works of necessity, not of merit; the works will “necessarily” follow saving faith.

Jonathan Edwards’ view here on the relationship between faith and good works is the same as that taught by

---

*mentaries*, Volumes I-XXII (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1981) Commentary on Micah 2:10.

73. Editor’s Note: In this context, the term *obligations* is perhaps less subject to misunderstanding than is the term *conditions*.

74. Space does not permit us to develop Edwards’ teaching on “natural fitness,” but basically, he distinguishes between “natural fitness” and “moral fitness.” A person is morally fit when his own holiness or excellency would commend him to salvation. In this sense, only Christ is morally fit. Natural fitness, on the other hand, is that fitness that exists when a person is united to Christ through faith. In the eyes of God it is “fitting” that these two things, i.e., salvation and union with Christ through faith, belong together. In fact, the concept of “fitness” and “harmony” pervade Edwards’ thought. All of God’s providential dealings in His created universe “fit” together, in perfect “harmony.” And Jesus Christ is central to all. See Edwards’ sermon on Romans 4:5; Cherry, 94ff; and Samuel T. Logan, Jr., “The Doctrine of Justification in the Theology of Jonathan Edwards,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 46 (1984) 48-52.

the *Westminster Confession of Faith* (16:2; 14:2): “These good works, done in obedience to God’s commandments, are the fruits and evidences of a true and lively faith.” A converted person is one who, not only “believes to be true whatsoever is revealed in the Word [of God],” but he is also one who is found “yielding obedience to the commands, trembling at the threatenings, and embracing the promises of God for this life, and that which is to come.” God calls us, said the New England divine, to a “universal obedience,” i.e., an obedience that seeks to keep God’s commandments in every area of the Christian life, not just some parts (*Works*, 18, Miscellany 790). Such obedience “is the proper evidence of our acceptable state” with God. Those who are unwilling “to live universally in obedience to God’s commands, it is not best that they should ... treat themselves as if they were godly” (*Works*, 13, Miscellany 462).

As taught in the Epistle of James, said Edwards, good works are a “sign” of “manifestative justification,” rather than “causal justification.” And the reason God accepts them as “good works” is that they are works done “in Christ.” In fact, he goes so far as to say that every act of godliness is to be considered as a “new act” of justifying faith. These acts are continual “acts” of saving faith, of the reception of Christ, in which faith is working through love. Thus, the works do not by themselves contribute anything to salvation: “All evangelical works are works of that faith that works by love; and every such act of obedience, wherein it is inward and the act of the soul, is only a new, effective act of reception of Christ” (Sermon on Rom. 4:5). “Evangelical obedience ... is an expression of [saving] faith” (*Works*, 18, Misc. 670). It is clear, then, wrote Samuel Logan, that whereas “evangelical obedience is thus fully a condition of justification,” in the teaching of Jonathan Edwards, it is clearly “not a cause of justification” (Logan, “The Doctrine of Justification in the theology of Jonathan Edwards,” 39).

On the other hand, the Puritan Sage denounced the Arminian concept of “conditions,” wherein such conditions are in some degree meritorious. Arminianism, he taught, is a form of neonomianism, wherein faith is a kind of good work, and the gospel is a new kind of law. Hence, he strongly opposed “the Arminian scheme of justification by our own virtue” (*Works*, 18.13). This view is “fatal.... [It is] another gospel” (Sermon on Romans 4:5). In a sermon on 1 Corinthians 1:29-31, Edwards preached: “Whatever scheme [i.e., Arminianism] is inconsistent with our entire dependence on God for all, and of having all of Him, through Him, and in Him, is repugnant to the design and tenor of the gospel and robs it of that which God accounts its luster and glory”

(Hickman, 2.3-7). According to C. C. Goen (cited in Bogue, 88):

Convinced that the doctrine of human ability which underlay the gradual shift to Arminian principles was a dangerous heresy, he [Edwards] preached a series of five sermons on justification by faith alone. These messages were broadsides of pure and uncompromising Reformed doctrine that all men justly deserve instant and total damnation, that none has a claim upon God's mercy, that salvation is a gracious gift of God through Jesus Christ who dies to save sinners, that it is appropriated through faith which itself is a gift of God – all these points were hammered home with a relentless force that scarcely can be appreciated by the reader today.

### Adoption

Like justification, adoption is a judicial act of God, wherein He brings the justified sinner, as “partaking with Christ,” into a filial relationship with Himself. All persons are not children of God, said Edwards. He would have nothing to do with the false teaching of the brotherhood of all men, and the universal fatherhood of God. It is only those who savingly receive Christ that are God's children. They are the ones who have intimacy of fellowship with the Father as His children.<sup>75</sup>

### Sanctification

John Gerstner claimed that “of the twelve hundred plus sermons which Edwards wrote, I estimate that sanctification was the central and most emphasized theme” (3.224). In fact, so thorough and penetrating is the New England divine's exposition and analysis of this aspect of soteriology, that some scholars, such as Thomas Schafer, have suggested that Edwards confuses and conflates justification and sanctification.<sup>76</sup> But such is not the case. As Conrad Cherry points out, “it is indeed true that Edwards makes faith and justification by faith dependent on a type of sanctification,” but the “sanctification upon which the act of faith (through which one is justified) is dependent, is the gift of God's Spirit which resides within man as the principle of his act” (Cherry, 41). In actuality, the Puritan Sage is saying nothing different than Calvin, who averred that “Christ justifies no one whom He does not sanctify at the same time”;<sup>77</sup> and A. A. Hodge, who wrote “you cannot take Christ for justification unless you take Him for sanctification.” These two, “justification and sanctification; they go together, and they constitute one life. If there was ever one who

attempted to receive Christ with justification and not with sanctification.... He was no more justified than he was sanctified.”<sup>78</sup>

Jonathan Edwards, in contradistinction to the antinomianism of his day, boldly stood for the biblical doctrine of the inseparable relationship between justification and sanctification, both of which are dependent upon the grace of God, in Christ. Whereas in justification, Christ's righteousness is imputed, in sanctification grace is infused. As taught in the *Westminster Larger Catechism* (Q. 77), “although sanctification be inseparably joined with justification, yet they differ, in that God in justification imputes the righteousness of Christ; in sanctification, He infuses grace, and enables to the exercise thereof.” In Edwards own words:<sup>79</sup>

There is a two-fold righteousness that the saints have: an imputed righteousness, and it is this only that avails anything to justification; and an inherent righteousness, that is, that holiness and grace which is in the hearts and lives of the saints. This is Christ's righteousness as well as imputed righteousness: imputed righteousness is Christ's righteousness accepted for them, inherent holiness is Christ's righteousness communicated to them.

We have seen that the New England divine taught that there are several non-meritorious, non-causal, non-justifying conditions of salvation. What he meant by this is that even though salvation is by faith alone, that faith is never alone. Genuine faith is always accompanied by good works, in the process of sanctification. Sanctification is a necessary corollary to justification. Even though Edwards chose to use different verbiage, his view is in basic agreement with the *Westminster Confession of Faith* (16:2), which states: “Faith, thus receiving and resting on Christ and His righteousness, is the alone instrument of justification; yet it is not alone in the person

75. Jonathan Edwards, Sermon on Romans 2:10, *The True Believer*, edited by Don Kistler (Soli Deo Gloria, 2001) 230-315.

76. Thomas Schafer, “Jonathan Edwards and Justification by Faith,” *Church History*, XX (December 1951) 55-67.

77. John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, John T. McNeill, editor, translated by Ford Lewis Battles (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Westminster Press, 1960) 3.16:1.

78. A. A. Hodge, *Evangelical Theology* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1976) 310-311.

79. *Works*, 14, ed. Kenneth P. Minkema, *Sermons and Discourses: 1723-1729* (1997) 340-341. Calvin also taught that in sanctification the saint has an infused or inherent righteousness from God: “We are never reconciled to God without being at the same time presented with inherent righteousness.” See John Calvin, *Selected Works of John Calvin: Tracts and Letters*, edited by Henry Beveridge and Jules Bonnet (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1983) 3.244.

justified, but is ever accompanied with all other saving graces, and is no dead faith, but works by love.”<sup>80</sup>

In a sermon on Galatians 5:6, Edwards preached (Gerstner, 3.225-226):

There is no room left for anyone to say that they have faith which justifies and that they need take no care about works and so to give themselves the liberty in sinning because they are not under the law but under grace; for though it is only faith that justifies yet there is no faith that justifies but a working faith; so that it is impossible for any person should be saved without works as if they were justified upon the account of their works. It is as impossible that men should be saved without an evangelical, universal, and sincere obedience under the second covenant [of grace] as it was that they should be saved without a perfect obedience under the first covenant [of works] [albeit, not for the same reason].

Or said another way: “Men cannot be saved for any works of theirs, and yet they are not saved without works” (Sermon on Genesis 6:22).<sup>81</sup> In complete agreement with the Westminster divines, he taught that “a true trust in Christ is never infused without other graces with it” (Gerstner, 3.228). A genuine, justifying faith will necessarily produce good works. Because this kind of faith is a “sense of the heart”; it “reaches the bot-

80. Edwards was more comfortable with calling faith a “condition” of justification than he was with calling it the “instrument” of justification. In his sermon on Romans 4:5, regarding this matter he preached: “But yet it must be owned, that this is an obscure way of speaking [calling faith the “instrument” of justification], and there must certainly be some impropriety in calling faith an instrument, wherewith we receive or accept justification; for the very person that thus explains the matter, speaks of faith as being the reception or acceptance itself; and if so, how can it be the instrument of reception or acceptance?...If faith be an instrument, it is more properly the instrument by which we receive Christ, than the instrument by which we receive justification.” But as John Gerstner commented: “There seems to be no great difference here between Edwards and the Reformed tradition” (*Jonathan Edwards: Evangelist*, 142).

81. Sermon on Genesis 6:22, *Pressing Into the Kingdom*, 225. John Calvin made a very similar statement in his Commentary on Ezekiel 18:14-17: “But although works tend in no way to the cause of justification, yet when the elect sons of God were justified freely by faith, at the same time their works are esteemed righteous by the same gratuitous liberality. Thus, it still remains true, that faith without works justifies, although this needs prudence and a sound interpretation; for this proposition, that faith without works justifies, is true and yet false, according to the different senses it bears. The proposition that faith without works justifies by itself, is false, because faith without works is void.”

82. Jonathan Edwards, *Religious Affections* (Portland, Oregon: Multnomah Press, 1984) 157ff.

tom of the heart”; it “gains the heart.” And “when the heart [is] gained,” then the “will is gained,” and “when the will is gained the practice is gained,” and good works will follow (*Works*, 20, Miscellany 868). It is not enough to know the truth; one must practice the truth.

Further, as noted, the good works of the justified saint must be “universal” if true conversion is involved, because a genuine conversion affects every area of the Christian’s life. In the words of the *Shorter Catechism* (Q. 35), “sanctification is a work of God’s free grace, whereby we are renewed in the *whole man* after the image of God, and enabled more to die unto sin, and live unto righteousness.” And although all of the believer’s good works are tainted with sin, they are “universal” in scope; there is a “beautiful symmetry and proportion” of “holy affections,” wherein the practice of godliness is the whole “business” of one’s life. All is consciously done for the glory of God. Godly men have a spirit to be perfectly holy.<sup>82</sup>

The process of sanctification, said Edwards, involves a constant warfare. There is a “mutual opposition and strife” that exists “between grace and corruption in the hearts of the saints during their continuance in this world.” The struggle in the life of the believer is likened to the struggle that went on in the womb of Rebecca between Jacob and Esau. This process involves the chastisement of God, who uses sickness and affliction to cause His saints to confess and forsake sin in their lives, that they may draw closer to Him (*Jonathan Edwards: Evangelist*, 156-159).

Here the New England divine is distinguishing between one’s initial “conversion” and later “conversions.” There is only one “conversion” in the life of any Christian, which occurs when he responds in faith and repentance to the call of the gospel. At the same time, there must be numerous “conversions” in a believer’s life, which occur when he progressively confesses and forsakes the remaining sin in his life. “Those who have true grace in their hearts [i.e., Christians], may yet stand in great need of being converted” (Gerstner, 3.231). One of the “signs of godliness,” said Edwards, is that of “humility, a broken and contrite heart, a being poor in spirit, sensibleness of our own vileness and unworthiness, self-abasement, disclaiming all worthiness and glory, mourning for sin” (*Works*, 18.169n.).

This is why, stressed Edwards, men must continue to “seek” subsequent to their conversion. Now, however, they are not seeking for conversion, but for their continual growth in the Lord. In a sermon on Philippians 3:17, he used “the Apostle Paul [as] an example” in this regard (*To All the Saints of God*, 155-211):

The apostle did not only thus earnestly seek salvation before his conversion and hope, but afterwards [as well]. What he says in the third [chapter] of Philippians of his suffering the loss of all things, that he might be found in Christ, and its being the one thing that he did to seek salvation; and also what he says of his so running as not uncertainly, but as resolving to win the prize of salvation, and keeping under his body that he might not be a castaway; was long after his conversion and after he had received hope of his own good estate.

If being already converted excuses a man from seeking salvation any more, or makes it reasonable that he should leave off his earnest care and labor for it, certainly the apostle might have been excused, when he had not only already attained true grace, but such eminent degrees of it. To see one of the most eminent saints that ever lived, if not the most eminent of all, so exceedingly engaged in seeking his own salvation – it ought for ever to put to shame those that are a thousand degrees below him, and are but mere infants to him, if they have any grace at all; that yet excuse themselves from using any violence after the kingdom of heaven now, because they have attained already, easing themselves of the burden of going on earnestly to seek salvation with this, that they have got through the work, they have got a hope.

The apostle, as eminent as he was, did not say within himself, “I am converted, and so am sure of salvation. Christ has promised it to me; what need I care any further about obtaining salvation? Yea, I am not only converted, but I have obtained great degrees of grace.”

The apostle knew that though he was converted, yet there remained a great work that he must do, in order to his [final] salvation. There was a narrow way to eternal glory, that he must pass through and never could come to the crown of glory any other way. He knew that it was absolutely necessary for him earnestly to seek salvation still; he knew that there was no going to heaven in a lazy way.

According to Robert Jenson, Jonathan Edwards would have us know that “the whole life of sanctification” can be synopsized “by two principles.” The first is a “holiness of heart,” which will “keep men from errors in judgment about religion.” The reason being, “that the sanctified mind is let into the spiritual world,” where it “perceives what ideas are harmonious” with the things of God, and which are not. The second is the realization

that “the motives to believers to perform the commands of God, are not because salvation is [upon] the condition of doing them..., but the amiableness of God..., the loveliness of virtue, and its natural tendency to happiness” (*America’s Theologian*, 87).

Holiness, taught Edwards, is both the desire and the goal of the saint. He delights in holiness out of a love for God, who is the ultimate producer of holiness: “Holiness is ... the highest beauty and amiableness.... It makes the soul a little sweet and delightful image of the blessed *Jehovah*.... What a sweet calmness, what calm ecstasies, does it bring to the soul.... It makes the soul like ... a garden planted by God ... where the sun is Jesus Christ, the blessed beams and calm breeze, the Holy Spirit” (*Works*, 13, Miscellany a).

Jonathan Edwards firmly believed that the process of sanctification must of necessity involve the use of the means of grace: Scripture, the sacraments, and prayer (*Works*, 18, Miscellany 539). It is not possible for a Christian to grow spiritually apart from a knowledge of the Word of God. Therefore, he preached in a sermon on Hebrews 5:12, “every Christian should make a business of endeavoring to grow in knowledge of divinity.... There is no other way by which any means of grace whatsoever can be of any benefit but by knowledge.... Christians ought not to content themselves with such degrees of knowledge in divinity as they have already obtained. It should not satisfy them that they know as much as is absolutely necessary to salvation, but should seek to make progress.... However diligently we apply ourselves, there is room enough to increase our knowledge of divinity, without coming to an end” (*To All the Saints of God*, 212-241). Christians must grow in knowledge. And, as he pointed out in Miscellany 539, all knowledge is conveyed by the Spirit of God to the elect of God, by means of the Word and sacraments (as they are explained and understood in accordance with the Word). “God’s Spirit,” said Edwards, “always attends His ordinances” (Hickman, 1.539).<sup>83</sup>

Then too, taught Edwards, prayer is essential to the process of sanctification. In His Word, God speaks to His people; in prayer, they speak to Him. Herein is the communion between God and the elect (unpublished Miscellany 1338). Prayer, of course, is the duty of all men, but only the elect can truly pray. Genuine prayer

83. Edwards taught that the means of grace, by themselves, “have no influence to produce grace.” Rather, they supply the mind of man “with matter for grace to act upon when God [the Holy Spirit] shall be pleased to infuse it.” It is “the Spirit of God” alone who “causes acts of grace in the soul; and that grace [comes] immediately from Him” (*Works*, 18, Miscellany 539).

is God's children talking to their heavenly Father. Therefore, for God's people, there is "the great duty of secret prayer" (*To All the Saints of God*, 46-67). "The true spirit of prayer is no other than God's own Spirit dwelling in the hearts of the saints. That being a Spirit that comes from God, does naturally tend to God in holy breathings [and] pantings.... True prayer is nothing else but faith expressed.... True prayer is the faith and reliance of the soul breathed forth in words" (*The True Believer*, 50-79). And for prayer to be proper, it must be prayer in accordance with the teaching of Scripture (*Works*, 13, Miscellany 492).

Finally, even though there will be no more sin to wage war against in the final state, said Edwards, the process of sanctification (increasing in holiness) will continue forever (Hickman, 1.101):

There are many reasons to think that what God has in view, in an increasing communication of Himself in eternity, is an increasing knowledge of God, love to Him, and joy in Him. And it is to be considered that the more those divine communications increase in the creature, the more it becomes one with God; for so much the more it is united to God in love, the heart is drawn nearer and nearer to God, and union with Him becomes more firm and close, and at the same time the creature becomes more and more conformed to God. The image is more and more perfect, and so the good that is in the creature comes for ever nearer and nearer to an identity to that which is in God. In the view therefore of God, who has a comprehensive prospect of the increasing union and conformity through eternity, it must be an infinitely strict and perfect nearness, conformity, and oneness. For it will for ever come nearer and nearer to that strictness and perfection of union which there is between the Father and the Son.

#### Perseverance

According to the New England divine, the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints is not one and the same thing with the assurance of salvation. Whereas perseverance teaches that no Christian will finally fall away from the state of salvation to which God has brought him, assurance has to do with the individual Christian's confidence of his own state. A justified man may doubt

84. *Works*, 16.330.

85. *Works*, 6.346.

86. See Nichols, *An Absolute Sort of Certainty*.

his salvation, but this does not deny the doctrine of perseverance.

Jonathan Edwards contended that perseverance is a condition of salvation: "Perseverance in holiness is absolutely necessary to salvation," because a genuine saving faith is a persevering faith. "Persevering in the way of duty is ... a necessary concomitant and evidence of a title of salvation, but also it is a necessary prerequisite to the actual possession of eternal life." Perseverance "is the only way to heaven, [it is] the narrow way which leads to life" (*Jonathan Edwards: Evangelist*, 165).

And yet, it is certain that a genuine Christian will persevere. The reason being that "God, in the act of justification, which is passed on a sinner's first believing, has respect to perseverance, as being virtually contained in that first act of faith" (Sermon on Romans 4:5, Hickman, 1.641). God's "promise of acceptance is made only to a persevering sort of faith." The believer is in union with Jesus Christ, and he cannot ever permanently fall away from the faith. A true Christian may indeed fall into sin, but God will keep him from continuing in it. "That the saints shall surely persevere, will necessarily follow this," that "the righteousness by which they have justification unto life," has "already been performed for them [by Christ] and imputed to them" in Christ (Hickman, 2.596-597).

#### Assurance

As stated by John Gerstner: "It may be clear enough that, according to Edwards, if you have it [salvation] you cannot lose it, but the great question still remains, How do you know if you have it?" (*Jonathan Edwards: Evangelist*, 166). The answer to this question is that this Puritan Sage believed that there were certain marks of a work of the Spirit of God that reveal a genuine work of conversion. Herein "true grace [is] distinguished from the experience of devils" (*The True Believer*, 16-49).

Even though assurance is not necessary for salvation,<sup>84</sup> there is, said Edwards, "an absolute sort of certainty" that one can have.<sup>85</sup> It consists in an immediate witness of assurance given to the elect by the Holy Spirit. There is a new sense, an inner sense, of divine things. And it is most clearly recognized by the practice of holiness in the Christian life. Assurance is mostly to be obtained by action, not self-examination.<sup>86</sup> "Christian practice then is the evidence above all other evidence that confirms and crowns a proof of godliness" (*Religious Affections*, 183). Good works "are as much the proper evidence of the act of the soul in receiving Christ, as the act of the soul in receiving Christ is the

proper evidence of the principle of faith" (*Works*, 20, Miscellany 859).

On the other hand, maintained Edwards, if one is relying on his good works for his assurance of salvation, rather than looking to Christ, who is the Author and Finisher of the faith, then he is practicing a form of self-reliance which is the antithesis of saving faith (*Religious Affections*, 67ff.). Edwards preached a series of sermons on "The Parable of the Ten Virgins" on this very subject. In this series he showed, from the Word of God, both wherein true and false Christians agree, and wherein they differ. And the difference is literally a difference between heaven and hell (Gerstner, 3.337).

*Religious Affections* is undoubtedly Edwards' fullest treatment of this subject. And, said Erroll Hulse, it is "probably the most penetrating analysis of Christian inward experience ever written."<sup>87</sup> As John Piper wrote:<sup>88</sup>

This book [*Religious Affections*] is the mature, seasoned reflection of Edwards, and the most profound analysis of the difference between true and false Christian experience that emerged from the season of the Great Awakening. In fact, it is probably one of the most penetrating and heart-searching biblical treatments ever written of the way God works in saving and sanctifying the human heart.

A reading of *Religious Affections*, along with his other teaching on the subject of assurance, reveals that Jonathan Edwards was in agreement with the *Westminster Larger Catechism* (Q. 80-81), which states that:

Such as truly believe in Christ, and endeavor to walk in all good conscience before Him, may, without extraordinary revelation, by faith grounded upon the truth of God's promises, and by the Spirit enabling them to discern in themselves those graces to which the promises of life are made, and bearing witness with their spirits that they are the children of God, be infallibly assured that they are in the estate of grace, and shall persevere therein unto salvation.... Assurance of grace and salvation, not being the essence of faith, true believers may wait long before they obtain it; and after the enjoyment thereof, may have it weakened and intermitted, through manifold distempers, sins, temptations, and desertions; yet are they never left without such a presence and support of the Spirit of God as keeps them from sinking into utter despair.

### Glorification

In a sermon on Revelation 5:5-6 ("The Excellency of Christ"), Edwards preached that "Christ has brought it to pass, that those whom the Father has given to Him should be brought into the household of God; that He and His Father, and His people, should be as one society, one family, that the church should be as it were admitted into the society of the blessed Trinity" (Hickman, 1.680-689).

Glorification is the final phase of the *ordo salutis*, which according to Jonathan Edwards, comes in two stages. The first stage begins at the death of the individual Christian, when he enters into the disembodied, intermediate state. Stage two occurs at the time of the resurrection of the dead (Hickman, 2.888-905).

Stage one begins at the death of the saint, when he is ushered into the presence of God, in Christ (Hickman, 2.891):

Death is not only no death for them, but is a translation to a more glorious life, and is turned into a kind of resurrection from the dead. Death is a happy change to them, and a change that is by far more like a resurrection than a death. It is a change from a state of much sin, and sorrow, and darkness, to a state of perfect light, and holiness, and joy. When a saint dies, he awakes, as it were, out of sleep. This life is a dull, lifeless state; there is but a little spiritual life, and a great deal of deadness; there is but a little light, and a great deal of darkness; there is but a little sense, and a great deal of stupidity and senselessness. But when a godly man dies, all this deadness, and darkness, and stupidity, and senselessness are gone forever, and he enters immediately into a state of perfect life, and perfect light, and activity, and joyfulness.

According to Edwards, there is nothing on earth that will fully suffice to represent the glory of heaven. In the heavenly state, the saints will fully realize the blessings of the communion of the saints; they will recognize one another, and enjoy fellowship throughout eternity. But the *summum bonum* of glorification is that "the saints in heaven will see God. They shall not only see that glorious city [the heavenly Jerusalem], and the saints there, and the holy angels, and the glorified Christ; but they shall see God Himself ... with the eye of the soul"

87. Erroll Hulse, *Who Are the Puritans? And What Do They Teach?* (Darlington, England: Evangelical Press, 2000) 143.

88. John Piper, *God's Passion For His Glory* (Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway Books, 1998) 59.

(Hickman, 2.892ff, 900). “If God and Christ were not in heaven, however beautiful the place, and whatever excellent creatures are there, yet heaven would be but an empty and lonely place.”<sup>89</sup> In heaven the people of God will see Him face to face. This is the “beatific vision,” which surpasses all other blessings that the saints will have in their heavenly state.

Moreover, preached Edwards, in a sermon on Revelation 18:20, the saints in heaven will not grieve over the lost; rather, it will be just the opposite: “When the saints in glory see the wrath of God executed on ungodly men, it will be no occasion of grief to them, but of rejoicing.”<sup>90</sup> Even Christian parents will delight in the punishment of their incorrigible children. The reason being, that the saints will rejoice that God’s justice is being perfectly carried out, and His majesty revealed. They will rejoice over the fact that God is righting all wrongs, and making His power known. The saints will love God as He is worthy to be loved, and honor Him as He is deserving to be honored; and they will do so with sinless hearts and sinless love.

The second stage of glorification begins at the time of the final resurrection (Hickman, 2.893-894):

As the wicked have not their full punishment until after the resurrection, so neither have the saints their complete happiness. Though they have attained to such exceeding glory, yet they are not yet arrived at its highest degrees, for that is reserved for their final state. The reward which the saints receive after the resurrection, is often spoken of as their chief reward.... So the happiness, that they shall be given at Christ’s second coming, is spoken of as the principal happiness.

It is natural for us to want to be embodied, taught Edwards. The non-corporeal state, in this sense, is unnatural: “Redemption is not complete till the resurrection.... So long as the separation between soul and body remains, one of those evils remains that is a part of the penalty of the law.... To be without the body is in itself an evil, because it is a want of that which the soul of man naturally inclines to and desires” (*Works*, 18, Miscellany 644).

89. Jonathan Edwards, Sermon on Psalm 73:25, *The Puritan Pulpit*, 176-191.

90. Cited in John H. Gerstner, *Heaven & Hell: Jonathan Edwards on the Afterlife* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1980; Ligonier Ministries edition, 1991) 33ff.

91. In Miscellanies 806 and 809 (*Works*, 18), Edwards, in agreement with the *Westminster Confession of Faith* (32:2) taught that the bodies of Christians in the final state will be the same bodies which they had prior to their death, only now glorified.

The bodies of Christians will be raised both “in an exceeding strength” and “in a wonderful beauty,” “for we are told that their bodies shall be like to Christ’s glorious body” (Hickman, 2.894-895).<sup>91</sup> These same resurrected and glorified saints “shall sit on thrones with Christ, to judge wicked men and angels.” And “Christ shall pronounce the blessed sentence upon them [the elect]: ‘Come you blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world’” (Hickman, 2.895-896). In this glorified state, the saints will see that “the eternal heaven surrounds Christ not merely as an house surrounds an inhabitant..., but rather as plants and flowers are before the sun, that have their life and beauty and being from the luminary” (*Works*, 20, Miscellany 1122).

There are degrees of blessedness in heaven, preached Edwards, in a sermon on John 14:2. There are “many mansions” in God’s heavenly kingdom. All of the saints are like vessels that are filled to the brim with joy; yet the vessels are of different sizes (*Heaven & Hell*, 19-20). And “the happiness of the saints shall never have interruption.” And the degree of blessedness of the saints “will be according to the degree of their holiness and good works” (*Works*, 18, Miscellany 671).

Then too, there will be continual growth in purity, with “no sin or corruption” to interfere in any way. “It is certain,” wrote Edwards, “that the inhabitants of heaven do increase in their knowledge” (*Works*, 18, Miscellany 701). And “there shall never be any end to their [the saints] glory and blessedness. Therefore it is so often called eternal life, and everlasting life.... The pleasures which are at God’s right hand, are said to be for ever more (Psalm 16:11).” “As God is eternal, so their happiness is eternal; as long as the fountain lasts, they need not fear but they shall be supplied” (Hickman, 2.902). God’s “saints will be progressive in knowledge and happiness to all eternity” (*Works of Jonathan Edwards*, 13, Miscellany 435).

At this time, when the body of Christ’s church is “perfect and complete,” then “will be the marriage supper of the Lamb.” This day will be glorious, not only for the church, but for Christ as well: “It will be the day of the gladness of Christ’s heart; [and] the feast, and pomp, and holy mirth, and joy in this marriage day, will be continued to all eternity.” The bride will then be presented by Christ to God the Father, “and the glory of His Son shall be displayed in heaven in a more abundant manner than ever before” (Hickman, 2.896). This, taught Edwards, is the end for which God created the world, i.e., that He be glorified. And “if God’s chief end is the manifestation of His glory,” as Edwards maintained,

wrote John Gerstner, “where is that fully realized as well as in heaven” (*Heaven & Hell*, 41).

#### CONCLUSION

In our study we have surveyed Jonathan Edwards’ teaching on the cardinal doctrine of the Reformation, “Justification by Faith Alone,” in the context of his overall view of soteriology. We have seen that the New England divine’s doctrine is in agreement with that of the Westminster Standards (his favorite creed). The salvation of the elect is rooted in the eternal purpose of God. But even though God has elected some men to glory in His eternal decree, He has also appointed all of the means whereby those persons will be saved and glorified. All of the elect, who are fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ through the covenant of grace, and the salvation merited by Christ in their behalf is applied to them by the Holy Spirit.

We have also seen that Jonathan Edwards believed that there is a logical order in which the eternal purpose of God is carried out in redemptive history. This logical order, which is known as the *ordo salutis*, begins in election and concludes in glorification. And at the very heart of the *ordo salutis* is the doctrine of justification by grace alone, through faith alone, in Christ alone: *sola fide*. Man is justified by grace, through faith – a faith which will necessarily produce good works. According to the New England divine, “it is manifest that the Scripture supposes that if ever men are turned from sin, God must undertake it and He must be the doer of it, and that His doing must determine the matter (Works, 21.294). Nevertheless, a saving faith is an active faith. “In efficacious grace we are not merely passive, nor yet does God do all, and we do the rest. But God does all, and we do all. God produces all, and we act all. For that is what He produces, *viz.* our own acts. God is the only proper author and fountain; we only are the proper actors. We are, in different respects, wholly passive and wholly active” (Hickman, 2.557). There is a perfect harmony involved, because God is “the supreme Harmony of all” (Works, 13, Miscellany 182).

Soli Deo Gloria. ■

#### *In Brief: Two Good Anecdotes*

The value of an anecdote depends upon three things—the truth illustrated, the person who is concerned in it, and the aptness of the expression used, or the method employed. An anecdote may be good which involves only one of these conditions; it will be the best when it unites them all. It is for this purpose that we venture to use the names of two of our most venerable ministers, one of whom lately entered into his rest, and the other of whom is waiting for the salvation of God at the verge of four-score years.

1. Every Princeton student remembers with affection the venerable Samuel Miller. One of them, before leaving the Seminary to enter upon the work of the ministry, lingered behind a day to receive the parting word of instruction and blessing. He went to the dwelling of his revered instructor, then emaciated with disease and almost in the act of laying down his tabernacle, and he was received with that benignant and sympathizing courtesy which graced that noble specimen of a Christian man. After a brief interval of edifying conversation, the patriarch offered up a fervent prayer for the young student; and then, taking him by the hand, said to him with the solemnity and sweetness so characteristic: “Brother Paxton,<sup>†</sup> *live near to the throne of grace*, that you may be filled with the love of Christ; and *take care of the lambs of the flock*, the hope of the Church.”

2. A venerable Elder, formerly connected with the Pine Street church, Philadelphia, had not seen his former pastor for several years. During the last summer, Providence enabled him to visit Princeton; and the two servants of Christ had a most refreshing interview. They talked over those good old times, when the two used to visit the neighbouring churches to dispense the word of life, as well as go from house to house in their own congregations. And it was remarked by a person present how the former pastor seemed to remember men, women and children, with the freshness and interest of yesterday, as they two traveled around old scenes and discoursed of the wonderful works of God. Finally the Elder must needs depart; and as he shook by the hand the venerable pastor of his early days, whom he scarcely expected to see again in the flesh, said, “Well, Dr. Alexander, we shall have plenty of opportunity in heaven to talk over these things.” “Yes,” replied the Doctor, with his pleasant, Matthew-Henry, vivacity, “Yes, brother Nassau, and plenty of *time* too!”

<sup>†</sup>The Rev. William M. Paxton, recently [circa 1851] called to the First Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh.

[Excerpted from *The Presbyterian Magazine*, 1.3 (March 1851) 103. ■

# The “Ministerial and Declarative” Powers of the Church and *In Thesi* Deliverances

By C. N. Willborn, Ph.D.

American Presbyterianism has a number of ecclesiological issues which have garnered perennial attention. These include the minister/elder and his adoption of the doctrinal standards of the church, the relationship of ruling and teaching elders within the polity of the church, the power of the courts, and, intimately related to the latter issue, the authority of *in thesi* deliverances of the highest judicatory of the church. The subject of this essay is that of *in thesi* deliverances and their authority to bind the consciences of men in the lower courts of the Presbyterian Church and their utility in shaping judicial cases in a lower court. Another way of posing the topic is this: Are *in thesi* deliverances of the General Assembly only “didactic, advisory, and monitory”?

Before entering into our discussion, we should first explain what the term *in thesi* means as used above and throughout this paper. It is a phrase used to refer to an answer given to a particular inquiry although the par-

ticular inquiry may concern that which is abstract or general in nature. So, a presbytery or session<sup>1</sup> brings a matter before the General Assembly desiring the highest judicatory of the church to render an opinion concerning their query; the General Assembly responds with an *in thesi* declaration. They have not rendered a judicial decision for there was no judicial case before them. The General Assembly has simply given a good faith response to the request of a lower court, believing themselves to have correctly represented the teaching or intent of their constitution and, by inference, the only rule of faith and practice for a Presbyterian church, the Holy Bible.

The question most certainly follows as to whether the highest court’s response to a *non-judicial case* can be said to bind the consciences of men or be used by the lower courts to construct judicial cases in the future? In other words, when the highest court speaks *in thesi*, does it speak with authority; is any one bound by its voice? From American Presbyterian history we wish to explore this question.

### *Presbyterian Church in the United States (PCUS)*

Francis Mullally, one time co-pastor with James Thornwell, had this to say of the church’s power:<sup>2</sup>

But if the church is the organ of Christ, it should always speak with divine authority and expect to be heard with reverence and submission, not only for the agreement of its utterances with the word, “but also for the power whereby they are made as being an ordinance of God, appointed thereunto in his word.” The voice of the church should always be the voice of God, and this is never so emphatic and solemn as when it comes through it. It is idle to say that the church may declare

---

THE AUTHOR: C. N. Willborn is Associate Professor of Church History at Greenville Presbyterian Theological Seminary and a minister in the Presbyterian Church in America. His Ph.D. dissertation is the first to explore one of the great Southern Presbyterian Theologians: “John L. Girardeau: Pastor to Slaves and Theologian of Causes” (Westminster Theological Seminary [Philadelphia], 2003). His publications include the biographical introduction to R. L. Dabney’s *The Sensualistic Philosophy* (Naphtali Press, 2003), essays on the Diaconate and Southern Presbyterianism in *Confessing Our Hope: Essays on Celebrating the Life and Ministry of Morton H. Smith* (Southern Presbyterian Press, 2004), which he co-edited with Joseph A. Pipa, and the doctrine of Adoption in *Sanctification: Growing in Grace* (Southern Presbyterian Press, 2001).

1. While the session of a local church would normally bring an overture through the presbytery to gain presbytery support and then the overture would be sent to the General Assembly by the presbytery, there are occasions when the presbytery does not endorse a sessions overture and the session, feeling strongly about the issue, submits the overture directly to the General Assembly for consideration.

2. Francis Mullally, “The Church’s Power to Make Declarations,” *The Presbyterian Quarterly*, 9.1.571-583 (October, 1895) 581.

what it pleases so long as it does not claim to bind the conscience. It always binds the conscience, except when it can be shown that it transgressed its divine rule.

Of particular note is his emphatic declaration that when the church speaks “it always binds the conscience.” Mullally believed that the church should only speak as “the voice of God,” which meant that the church should only speak consistently with the word of God or else be quiet. So, for Mullally, when overtures came before the highest court of the church, the church should speak according to and consistent with its constitution and the Bible. Thus, she speaks as the voice of God and, according to Mullally, she should “expect to be heard with reverence and submission.”

There appears to be in Mullally’s view more than a “didactic, advisory, and monitory” opinion of General Assembly pronouncements. It would seem that he draws no distinction between the judicial decisions of the General Assembly and the *in thesi* deliverances of the church’s highest court. Why? Because the church should only always speak consistently with God’s word. Thus, whether the response is to judicial case or lower court overture, the word of God has been spoken in response. God’s word is binding, therefore both judicial decisions and *in thesi* deliverances are binding.

Prior to Mullally’s 1895 article, the *in thesi* topic had a considerable history in the PCUS. Not everyone agreed with Mullally’s view; indeed, the General Assembly seems to have had a different opinion altogether when it spoke directly to the issue in 1879. The 1879 decision was precipitated by a series of *in thesi* deliverances against “worldly amusements” in 1865, 1869, and 1877.

In 1869 the General Assembly of the nascent and beleaguered church called all sessions and presbyteries to ply the “discipline provided in our Constitution against offences” and there was no “offence” more directly in the spotlight than that of “worldly amusements.” The same *in thesi* deliverance focused on one of those worldly amusements, specifically, dancing.<sup>3</sup> In 1871, the *North Carolina Presbyterian* wrote: “No question perhaps at the present time agitates the public mind more than that of the right and wrong of various amusements, so popular in this progressive age. The amusement oftenest discussed is dancing.”<sup>4</sup> R. L. Dabney, Stuart Robinson, and Benjamin M. Palmer were among the leading and respected churchmen who had publicly spoken out against the vices of the world.<sup>5</sup>

In 1878, a lower court took seriously the 1869 *in thesi* deliverance of the General Assembly, which not

only urged the lower courts to exercise discipline, but declared that *all* modern dance should be disciplined. Deacon F. E. Block was disciplined by the session of Central Presbyterian Church in Atlanta for holding a social dance in his home. Block promptly appealed the session’s decision to the Presbytery of Atlanta on the grounds that the social dance in his home was not the “lascivious dance” forbidden and condemned in the Westminster Larger Catechism 139. The Presbytery upheld the session’s previous decision on the basis of the 1869 *in thesi* deliverance against unspecified dance, or dance in general. As can be seen, the Atlanta Presbytery believed *in thesi* deliverances were authoritative in nature. However, when a minority of presbytery appealed the decision to the Synod of Georgia, the Synod overturned the decision of the lower courts and restored Deacon Block to church membership by a vote of thirty-seven to fifteen.<sup>6</sup> The Synod’s decision was not appealed to the 1879 General Assembly but it did come before the Assembly through the committee on review of records. The Synod was upheld in its ruling.

The same Assembly received an overture from the Presbytery of Atlanta requesting that the Assembly clarify a number of issues related to worldly amusements and the authority of *in thesi* deliverances. The overture was answered by the Bill and Overtures Committee, through its able chairman, Thomas E. Peck of Union (VA) Seminary. *In thesi* deliverances of prior Assemblies, the Committee answered, are not offered “in a strictly judicial capacity; but were all deliverances *in thesi*, and, therefore, can be considered as only didactic, advisory, and monitory.”<sup>7</sup> The Committee’s answer, which the Assembly adopted overwhelmingly, was in substance the personal position of Thomas Peck.

Peck argued that *in thesi* deliverances “did *not* oblige

3. *Minutes of the General Assembly PCUS, 1869*, 391.

4. *North Carolina Presbyterian*, September 6, 1871.

5. For an example of the rhetoric of the day see the thought provoking article by R. L. Dabney, “The Dancing Question,” *Southern Presbyterian Review* (hereafter *SPR*) 30, no. 2 (April 1879) 302-37.

6. *Minutes of the Synod of Georgia, 1878*, 7-31. For more on this case see E.T. Thompson, *Presbyterians in the South* (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1973) 2:396-97.

7. *Minutes of the General Assembly PCUS, 1869*, 391; R. L. Dabney, “The Dancing Question,” *SPR* 30, no. 2 (April 1879) 302-37; John B. Adger, “The General Assembly at Louisville,” *SPR* 30, no. 3 (July 1879) 586-87; Thomas Peck, “The Action of the General Assembly of 1879 on Worldly Amusements,” *SPR* 31, no. 2 (April 1880) 218-43. The latter article was also published as Thomas Peck, “The Powers of Our Several Church Courts,” *Miscellanies of Rev. Thomas E. Peck* (Richmond: The Presbyterian Committee of Publication, 1896) 331-60. Hereafter Peck. All citations from Peck’s article will be taken from the latter.

the lower courts.” Certainly he would have cautioned the lower courts to take seriously the “deliverance” of the higher court and consider the didactic value of the court’s rendering. Peck, however, did not wish to forfeit the check and balance of power, which he believed Presbyterianism offered. The power of the church, Peck reasoned, is in “every part” of the church. That is, session, presbytery, and general assembly—considered severally—are constitutionally endowed with “the power of the whole church.” The authority of all church courts is the same. Each court of the church, therefore, has the power to judge within the bounds of its jurisdiction and may not be interfered with unless and except through legal, constitutional process, or judicial process, their judgments are overruled and set aside by a higher court. Unless and until a constitutionally shaped case is processed and adjudicated by the higher court, “the power of judgment in the courts of original jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, remains intact” (Peck, 335).

Ultimately and basically, the principle for which Peck argued was this: the church’s constitution provides the higher court power over the power of the lower court. The higher court does not have “power *directly* over the part, but over the *power* of the part” (Peck, 335). Simply put, the General Assembly of the Church can *truly* effect change in a Presbytery *only* through judicial decisions which overrule and set aside the judgments of the lower court. When such as this happens, the *power* of the lower court has been altered. The transplanted South Carolinian<sup>8</sup> believed this principle to be of watershed significance. Indeed, he contended, “it lies at the root of all the struggles between the advocates of a constitutional government and the advocates of an ‘absolutism’” (Peck, 335-336).

The 1879 Assembly had sided, argued Peck, with the

8. Thomas Ephraim Peck was born in Columbia, South Carolina on January 29, 1822. Learning Westminsterian doctrine first at the feet of his beloved mother, at a young age he came under the mentorship of James Thornwell. At age thirty-nine, after serving as pastor in Baltimore, Maryland, Peck was named as professor of church history at Union Seminary (VA) where he served beside R. L. Dabney. He later succeeded Dabney as professor of systematic theology at Union. He died in 1893.

9. *Minutes of the General Assembly, PCUS, 1879, 23.*

10. John Lafayette Girardeau (1825-98) was born on James Island, near Charleston, South Carolina. Of Huguenot descent, Girardeau was a product of the Scottish Presbyterianism prevalent in the Carolina lowcountry. After twenty years of pastoral labor among the slaves and freedmen of Charleston, he replaced William Swan Plumer as Professor of Didactic and Polemic (Systematic) Theology in 1876. Like Peck, Girardeau was greatly indebted to James Thornwell’s person and labors; he was the true successor to Thornwell’s chair of systematics at Columbia.

“advocates of a constitutional government.” The question before them had been, “Whether the Assembly has the power ‘to make law for the church in the matter of ‘offences,’ or to give to its deliverances *in thesi* the force of judicial decisions’” (Peck, 334). The Assembly ruled: “that the courts of original jurisdiction cannot be directly interfered with by the General Assembly in their power of judgment as to law or fact.” Of further significance, the Assembly declared, “The occasion, the mode, the degree, and the kind of discipline, must be left to the courts of original jurisdiction, under the checks and restraints of the constitution.”<sup>9</sup>

Peck’s great concern was to preserve the integrity of “grassroots” Presbyterianism. The *power* of the lower courts—session and presbytery—was essential to Peck’s thinking. *In thesi* deliverances of the General Assembly did not guarantee *process* and thus should not be used in a manner that would imperil the *power* of the lower courts or the rights of any session or individual. The general deliverances of the church could serve a fine purpose to advise or instruct, but that was all. Otherwise, a deliverance of the higher court could effectively eliminate the ability of a sessional or presbyterial case to be appealed to a higher court. In other words, Peck wished to save the church from virtual elimination of the adjudication process, or authoritative checks and balances. To the question of whether the General Assembly has the power to give to *in thesi* deliverances the force of judicial decisions, Peck answered emphatically, No!

Once the Peck position on *in thesi* declarations had been adopted by the General Assembly, the Columbia Seminary professor of theology, John Girardeau,<sup>10</sup> rallied the Synod of South Carolina to overture the 1880 General Assembly. He was gravely concerned that renderings of higher courts that did not effect a change in the constitutional documents had been devalued and rendered mute. More than this, he believed the view that *in thesi* deliverances were nothing more than “didactic, advisory, and monitory” reduced the General Assembly (or any court) to the status of a congregational association that could *only* advise. In other words, Girardeau believed that the 1879 Assembly action was an unintentional strike at the Presbyterian form of governance.

Girardeau’s answer to the question of the authority of *in thesi* deliverances was obviously not “No!” as Peck had concluded, but rather, “Maybe.” He regarded *in thesi* deliverances as *interpretations* of the constitution—interpretations reached by good and necessary consequence. As the product of good and necessary consequences derived from the constitution or the Holy

Scriptures, “they are of equal authority with the Word and the Constitution.” He concluded that *in thesi* declarations are not merely suggestions or advice. If the Assembly’s interpretation (deduced by good and necessary consequence) of the Constitution or word of God is not authoritative, then interpretations would become the prerogative of individuals or sessions or presbyteries, without regard to the larger body of the church. Without a view to the whole, the connected whole, the church was not being Presbyterian but congregational in its view of authority.<sup>11</sup>

The Synod adopted Girardeau’s concerns, and when the 1880 General Assembly gathered in Girardeau’s backyard of Charleston, the Bills and Overtures Committee was once again dealing with the matter of *in thesi* deliverances. The Synod, through Girardeau’s overture, requested a repeal or substantive modification of the 1879 verdict that *in thesi* statements of Assembly are only “didactic, advisory, or monitory.”<sup>12</sup> The Assembly’s Committee proposed that the body of presbyters answer the overture in the negative. The stage was now set for a significant debate.

“Dr. Girardeau opened this grand debate,” wrote John B. Adger, “with a very grand speech, occupying over two hours.” (These were the days of a truly deliberative General Assembly.) The speech was further described as eloquent and forceful and, in a term applied in earlier days to Thornwell, as “logic set on fire.” As he had argued before the Synod of South Carolina, Girardeau pleaded with the Assembly to recognize that the question before them was “one of great importance, as involving some of the fundamental principles of Presbyterian polity.” One of the “fundamental principles” to which he referred was connectionalism and the church’s ability to speak with one voice. “Uniformity of opinion and action in regard to offences,” argued Girardeau, “can only be effectually secured by authoritative *in thesi* deliverances of the superior courts, especially of the General Assembly as sustaining a broad and catholic relation to the interests of the whole church.”<sup>13</sup> He perceived the fragmentizing danger of private interpretation (whether by individuals, sessions, or presbyteries) and the virtue of a confessional and connectional church for the maintenance of peace and purity. A variety of opinions and actions in regard to exact offences could only result in a discordant church and a less than unified witness before the world. Girardeau was alert to the broadening tendencies of the church; the “leveling spirit” that he had identified in Reconstruction was, as he had feared, affecting Presbyterianism.

James Woodrow, a colleague of Girardeau in the

Columbia Seminary, replied to Girardeau’s logical eloquence.<sup>14</sup> Woodrow contended that *in thesi* deliverances could not be made the basis for judicial prosecutions. Offenders must be shown to violate the constitution of the church, not an interpretation of the constitution. Nevertheless, he approached Girardeau’s position on more than one occasion. For example, he confessed that the church acts “in accordance with the ‘genius of Presbyterianism’ when we learn the exact meaning of our fundamental law and act accordingly.”<sup>15</sup> Clearly, the “fundamental law” is the constitution and the “exact meaning” is the interpretation of the courts. Furthermore, Woodrow admitted that a “didactic utterance is one primarily intended to teach Christ’s truth” and that it “may, indeed, incidentally aid in reaching a right judicial decision” (Adger, 562). To the ears of those sitting in the assembly of the divines on that Charleston afternoon, Woodrow must have sounded like he was differing little from Girardeau. How, they would have asked themselves, can one “teach Christ’s truth” and then say it does not bind the conscience and cannot be used to inform some future judicial process? Woodrow left the question unanswered.

Girardeau ascended the podium once again to respond to his colleague and fellow presbyter. After an

11. The Overture and abstracts of speeches by Girardeau, James Woodrow, and H. M. Smith were published in John B. Adger, “Deliverances of Church Courts,” *S’PR* 31, no. 3 (July 1880) 535-603. Hereafter Adger. Girardeau’s appeal to the authority of truth deduced by good and necessary consequences is based upon the Westminster Confession of Faith 1:6.

12. Adger, 537-538. Like Peck, Girardeau was not asking the Assembly to address “worldly amusements.” He, like Peck, had strong views on matters such as dance, theatre, and the likes. He was opposed to all forms of dance—here he agreed with Dr Dabney. There is also an interesting letter on a related topic, that of “public” activities of young women. A lady’s duties, he wrote, “do not require them to appear before the public.” Their training, therefore, should not include her being “manipulated on a stage before a crowd.” Consistent with this position, he “refused to let [Sally] appear upon the platform [at the Female College], or read a composition before an audience.” Sally was his seventh child and wife of Robert A. Webb until her untimely death in 1881. See John Lafayette Girardeau Collection, John L. Girardeau to Rev. James McDowell, January 27, 1883, Microfilm #160, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina (SCL).

13. Adger, 555. Girardeau’s two speeches before the Charleston General Assembly are preserved only in abstract form by Adger.

14. It should be noted that this predates the famous Evolution Controversy which plagued the Seminary and the Southern Church from 1882-1888. In fact, the two had stood together on a seminary matter which culminated in the resignations of Joseph Ruggles Wilson (Woodrow Wilson’s father) and John B. Adger in 1874.

15. Adger, 563. H. M. Smith of New Orleans also spoke against Girardeau’s views. His basic concern was the extra-constitutional nature of *in thesi* deliverances. Adger recorded his address also.

swering many of Woodrow's arguments, Girardeau conceded that there was a danger in his own view, the danger of making declarations against practices "which cannot be proved to be offences by the Scriptures." He would have opposed this, but knew the human heart and its propensities to generalize and misapply. Nevertheless, he believed a greater danger existed—worldliness in the church—and so he was willing to live with the dangers (Adger, 597):

Worldliness is rapidly increasing in the Church. How shall it be checked? If a church member, who has been warned by a faithful Session that he will be disciplined for persistence in an offence, can find refuge in a neighboring Presbyterian church which pronounces him guilty of no offence, discipline is practically at an end. We need harmony of views and of practice among all our churches, and that can only be attained by the firm and decided declarations of our law as to offences, by our church-courts, especially by the General Assembly.

In the end, Girardeau wanted the language of the 1879 Assembly *tempered* so the General Assembly's interpretations of the constitutional documents were not rendered impotent. Similarly, he was concerned that the authoritative role of courts be protected so that discipline could be preserved and administered as needed. He regarded all of this as important because he saw the church on every side suffering from the pervasive influence of the world.

John B. Adger was one of those assembled divines, listening to the debates for two days. He was an adherent to Thornwell's high Presbyterianism and had taught ecclesiology at the seminary in Columbia in the past. His ear was acutely attuned to all the arguments and by the end of Girardeau's second speech in response to Woodrow, he was convinced the differences between

the men were minimal. Girardeau's differences with the 1879 Assembly's deliverance on deliverances, Adger suspected, "arose chiefly out of its discriminating so widely and so absolutely between the judicial and the *in thesi* deliverance" (Adger, 603). On the other hand, Woodrow had lamented the previous assembly's exaltation of the "judicial deliverance" as to undermine the Word of God. In other words, Woodrow was of the mind that the courts high estimate of judicial rulings based upon the Church's constitution threatened his belief "that nothing is law but the Word."<sup>16</sup>

By the time Girardeau concluded his final address and descended the platform, Adger had drafted a substitute to the motion before the Assembly:<sup>17</sup>

1. Nothing is law to be enforced by judicial prosecution but that which is contained in the Word as interpreted in our standards
2. The judicial decisions of our courts differ from their *in thesi* deliverances in that the former *determine*, and, when proceeding from our highest court, *conclude* a particular case. But both these kinds of decisions are alike interpretations of the Word by a church court, and both not only deserve high consideration, but both must be submitted to, unless contrary to the Constitution and the Word; of which there is a right of private judgment belonging to every church court, and also every individual church member.

Girardeau read it three times and reserved pronouncement until Woodrow expressed his view of the paper. Woodrow's acceptance of the paper, according to Adger, "was immediate and unhesitating." Upon hearing Woodrow's acceptance of the substance of the Adger paper, Girardeau embraced it completely.<sup>18</sup> From the willing acceptance of the *via media* position by both parties, it would seem that partisanship was minimal.

Woodrow ascended the rostrum and announced that he had no further response to his colleague's statements and that he would introduce a motion he believed satisfactory to all parties. With the original motion withdrawn from consideration, Adger's substitute was placed in consideration. Upon Woodrow's motion and reading of the brief paper, "it was immediately seconded by Dr. Girardeau and adopted by the Assembly." Adger's motion satisfied Girardeau's desire for more moderate language from the previous Assembly and the recognition by the Church that "some *in thesi* deliverances of church courts are authoritative" (Adger, 584). It rightly differentiated between judicial decisions that *determine*

16. Adger, 603. In the end it must be said that Woodrow held something akin to a *nuda scriptura* view rather than a *sola scriptura*. This became even more evident during the evolution controversy when he repeatedly withstood the interpretation of the church courts.

17. Adger, 602. The final deliverance of the 1880 Assembly may also be found in *A Digest of the Acts and Proceedings of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, 1861-1965* (Atlanta, GA: Office of the General Assembly, 1966) 71.

18. Adger, 602-03. At this date, there certainly appeared to have been no antagonism between these two men. This seems to prove that there was no personal animosity between Woodrow and Girardeau that carried over from this controversy into the evolution controversy, as some Woodrow scholars have tried to argue. See Robert Gustafson, *James Woodrow (1828-1907): Scientist, Theologian, Intellectual Leader* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1995) 129-30.

and *conclude* cases and *in thesi* declarations which instruct lower courts, and thus *inform* future discipline of cases. Both judicial and *in thesi* declarations “are alike interpretations of the Word by a church court” and both “must be submitted to, unless contrary to the Constitution and the Word.”<sup>19</sup> Some asserted that this was a compromise of positions. Woodrow and Girardeau saw it as no compromise. Adger’s handiwork was, according to Girardeau, the “axis” that brought both “poles” into union (Adger, 584).

The *Central Presbyterian* reported “the explicit declaration of the Assembly of 1880, which is to the following effect, namely, that the deliverances of the General Assembly have the authority of a decision of the Supreme Court of the Church—whose function it is to expound and declare what is the law.”<sup>20</sup> Girardeau and Woodrow agreed on this summary.

### *Historical Perspective*

The Westminster Confession of Faith addresses the ministerial and declarative power of synods and councils.<sup>21</sup>

It belongeth to synods and councils, ministerially to determine controversies of faith, and cases of conscience; to set down rules and directions for the better ordering of the public worship of God, and government of His Church; to receive complaints in cases of maladministration, and authoritatively to determine the same: which decrees and determinations, if consonant to the Word of God, are to be received with reverence and submission; not only for their agreement with the Word, but also for the power whereby they are made, as being an ordinance of God appointed thereunto in His Word.

The Confession apparently recognizes three categories to which ecclesiastical office bearers speak ministerially: first, doctrinal and ethical controversies; second, the establishment and ordering of public worship and the government of the Church; and, third, appellate cases brought before a higher court.

William Cunningham, the outstanding Scottish theologian and churchman, sheds light on the meaning of the Confession, which serves to assist our view of court deliverances.<sup>22</sup>

Now this statement of the powers and functions of Church courts includes the whole subject of discipline

and censures, though it comprehends also a great deal more, and the principles which directly or by plain implication it lays down in regard to *all* the judgments and decisions of ecclesiastical office-bearers are these: First, That unless they are consonant with the word of God, they are of no force or validity whatever ... and are entitled to no reverence or submission whatever from men; ... secondly, That such judgments and decisions, when professedly regulated by the word of God, and pronounced by competent parties,—that is, by ecclesiastical office-bearers,—are entitled to a careful and respectful examination; and, thirdly, That when accordant with the word of God, men, in dealing with and submitting to them, and in their whole views and feelings with respect to them, ought to be influenced not only by a regard to their actual accordance with the word ... but also, in addition, by a recognition of God’s arrangement in establishing the ordinance of church government, and of its right and efficient working as a divine ordinance in the particular cases under consideration.

Here it appears that Cunningham gives the General Assembly power to speak authoritatively not only to “discipline and censures” but “a great deal more,” which he further iterates when he says the power of the court includes “the principles which directly or by plain implication it lays down in regard to *all* the judgments and

19. Adger, 584. When Girardeau returned to Columbia after the 1880 Assembly, he became concerned that some might construe a portion of the Assembly’s pronouncement on *in thesi* declarations as denying the authority of good and necessary consequences. Thus, the Synod of South Carolina overtured the 1881 Assembly, meeting in Staunton, Virginia, as to the authority of good and necessary consequences drawn from the law of the church. The Assembly affirmed Girardeau’s position (argued before the 1880 Charleston Assembly) “That all just and necessary consequences from the law of the church are a part of the same, in the logical sense of being implicitly contained therein.... The consequences deduced from it cannot, therefore, be equal in authority with the law itself, unless they be necessarily contained in it as shown by their agreement also with the Divine word.” In other words, as long as inferences from the constitution of the church are in agreement with the Holy Scriptures, they are of equal authority with the constitution, according to the 1881 Assembly. Girardeau was satisfied. For the latter discussion see *Minutes of the Synod of South Carolina, 1881*, 19.

20. *Central Presbyterian*, July 14, 1880; Thompson, *Presbyterians in the South*, 2:399; Webb, “The Presbyter,” *The Life Work of John L. Girardeau, D.D., LL.D.*, 223-29.

21. Westminster Confession of Faith 31.3. The edition used is that adopted by the Presbyterian Church in America and the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. In the section of chapter 31 no difference is found with the original Confession as adopted by the Church of Scotland in 1647.

22. William Cunningham, *Discussions on Church Principles* (1863; reprint, Edmonton, Canada: Still Waters Revival Books, 1991) 246.

decisions of ecclesiastical office-bearers.” The principles to which he refers are laid out above as: faithfulness to God’s word, declared by church officers, and the recognition on the receptor’s part of the authority of God’s ordinance of church government.

Cunningham’s position is consistent with that of Robert Shaw in his commentary on the Confession. He explains that Confession 31.3 “is evidently intended as a decision upon another important principle in the controversy with Independents.” The Independents admitted that a congregation might consult with a synod of ministers and find great advantage for themselves. However, Independents denied to these synods authority over the congregation. The position of the Confession of Faith then, according to Shaw, was that Christ alone is the lawgiver of the church and the church “is only to apply and enforce the laws which he [Christ] has enacted.” So, the power and function of the officers of the church is ministerial and declarative. Shaw points out that the declarations of the ecclesiastical office bearer “are to be considered, not as merely consultative [as the Independents avow], but authoritative.” Furthermore, so far as the declarations of courts agree with the Holy Scriptures, “they must be binding upon the conscience.”<sup>23</sup>

In the end, Cunningham, Shaw, and the 1880 PCUS are clear in saying that judicial renderings and *in these* deliverances of the General Assembly “not only deserve high consideration, but both must be submitted to, unless contrary to the Constitution and the Word.” Therefore, the difference between the two is not found in the authoritative *nature* since both declarations of the church are ministerial and declarative; declarative of the law of the church, the Holy Scriptures. The church should speak to every matter before it according to Scripture or it should remain silent.

The Presbyterian Church in America (PCA), as the ecclesiastical successor to the PCUS, has engaged this question on several occasions. The PCA has experienced the same problem which Girardeau addressed—the lower courts’ failure to take seriously Assembly deliverances. In an effort to address the problem, the PCA added the following paragraph to her Constitution:<sup>24</sup>

Actions of the General Assembly pursuant to the pro-

23. Robert Shaw, *The Reformed Faith: An Exposition of the Confession of Faith of the Westminster Assembly* ... (1845; reprint, Inverness, Scotland: Christian Focus Publications, 1973) 312.

24. Presbyterian Church in America, *Book of Church Order* (Lawrenceville, GA: The Committee for Christian Education and Publications, sixth edition, 2003) 14-7.

vision of BCO 14-6 such as deliverances, resolutions, overtures, and judicial decisions are to be given due and serious consideration by the Church and its lower courts when deliberating matters related to such action. Judicial decisions shall be binding and conclusive on the parties who are directly involved in the matter being adjudicated, and may be appealed to in subsequent similar cases as to any principle which may have been decided. (See BCO 3-5 and 6, and WCF 31:3.)

According to this constitutional provision, all sorts of deliverances are “to be given due and serious consideration by the Church and its lower courts when deliberating matters related to such action.” While deliverances are not to be taken lightly and are to be considered by lower courts when considering similar cases, there is no authoritative or binding nature attributed to them. Judicial decisions, on the other hand, are “binding and conclusive on the parties ... directly involved ... and may be appealed to in subsequent similar cases.” Thus, the PCA makes the general response of the General Assembly to overtures of *some* authority, enough that they demand “due and serious consideration.” To judicial decisions, the PCA makes the specific application of Church law to a specific case of *absolute* authority, so that they are “binding and conclusive.”

### Conclusion

The concern John Girardeau and others had in the nineteenth century for the Presbyterian Church to act like Presbyterians is still a concern. As the nascent PCA has felt its way through issues like the extraordinary gifts of the apostles, the novelty of paedocommunion, and confessional subscription, she has often left the impression that her unity hinges upon diversity and that she cannot speak definitively and univocally. Some have wondered just how many confessions of faith actually exist within the church. Yet, we declare to and publish for the world *one* Confession of Faith. Which is it—The Confession as approved by the General Assembly or the one approved by *this* presbytery or *that* presbytery? May paedocommunionists preach, teach, and practice their novel, contra-confessional views in her churches? What of extraordinary gifts in the church? Is a pastoral letter, issued *in these* by a General Assembly authoritative and binding so as to permit multiple, and often contradictory views, to exist in a denomination? What does that say about a church’s view of Scripture and its perspicacity and authority?

Similarly, the Assembly annually meets for business and deliberates matters of significance to a variety of presbyteries as they come by way of overtures. The Assembly declares itself on the various issues and what happens? Presbyteries walk away thinking the particular deliverance was for someone else, but does not bind them to do anything differently than before.

From all we have seen above, there is no basis historically or constitutionally for *in thesi* deliverances to be taken lightly. They should have an effect on the way every presbytery thinks about and goes about her business. From the 1880 decision of the PCUS General Assembly, to William Cunningham and Robert Shaw, we have heard the wise words of the Fathers—"Listen carefully to the collective wisdom of the church." If Presbyterianism means anything, it means that no church is an island; we are a part of the whole. One contemporary PCA churchman explains the relevance of *in thesi* deliverances in the following manner:<sup>25</sup>

In actuality, the GA makes such statements to advise its members and churches of the mind of the larger church at that moment. While such action does not have the authority of law to bind conscience or future Assemblies, brothers in Christ are obligated to weigh with great deference this "pious advice" since they have vowed to seek the peace and purity of the church, and this cannot be done through simply ignoring the properly approved advice of brothers and fathers.

As one can see from this statement, there is great reason for an *in thesi* deliverance of the General Assembly to obligate every presbyter and presbytery to consider and apply the "pious advice" of the gathered Assembly of divines. Why should *in thesi* deliverances not be considered "pious" and be taken seriously? After all, the ecclesiastical office-bearers of the church have issued a deliverance they believe to be consistent with their constitutional documents.

Nevertheless, we do admit there is a difference between the constitutional law of the church, the judicial decisions of the supreme judicatory, and *in thesi* deliverances.

The difference between judicial renderings and *in thesi* deliverances, it would seem, have to do with the manner in which each stand to the church. *In thesi* deliverances stand as a provisional response to a general concern of the church (albeit the concern may be as specific as what a confessional phrase means, e.g., "the space of six days"). They are a provisional response, yet consistent with our constitution according to human

wisdom. In contrast to the Assembly's issuance of an *in thesi* deliverance, a judicial decision stands as a final redress of a specific matter. In other words, when an overture comes before the General Assembly and the Assembly responds, she does not respond in her relation to the lower courts as the "last resort." It is only when the Assembly decides a specific case—as the case has been brought to her through proper process—as she settles the constitutional right or wrong of a specific case, that she speaks as the court of "last resort." When the General Assembly speaks as the court of "last resort," she speaks with her ultimate authoritative voice. In the context of the "last resort," the church is saying "thus saith the Lord." Appeal can be taken no higher.

The question remains, however, are *in thesi* deliverances of the General Assembly authoritative? Yes, because the court is presumed to have spoken consistent with her constitution. Are they the final word on a given subject? No, because they are not specific to a case. Should they simply be dismissed as "non-binding" and, thus, superfluous? No, because they reflect the wisdom of the church. Should they be allowed simply to collect archival dust? No, because ideas have consequences. If they are important and profitable, they should receive further church-wide consideration and perhaps further explanation, and expounding so as to become the proposition of the church formally. If they are dangerous to the long-term health of the church, they should be exposed, and consequently expunged from the records of the church so as to remove the likelihood of confusion and future conflict.

When a court of the church hands down a "didactic, advisory, and monitory" deliverance, it behooves elders to act as churchmen for the good of the whole, not Independents concerned only with their local church. Men need to begin to think presbytery-wide, and assembly-wide; thinking for the good of the whole, not just the part. The latter really is the only way to offset the all-too-present lackadaisical approach to *in thesi* deliverances and the "Independent tendency" in American Presbyterianism. ■

25. Bryan Chapell, President of Covenant Seminary, made these comments in response to the Presbyterian and Reformed Joint Commission on Chaplains and Military Personnel. They appear in Note 1 of "PRJC Letter Regarding Women in Combat" available through the PCA Office of Administration.

# A Critical Examination of N. T. Wright's Doctrine of Justification

By J. V. Fesko, Ph.D.

## INTRODUCTION

With the rise of the new perspective on Paul (NPP) there have been many modifications offered to the traditional protestant view on many teachings within the Scriptures. With Stendahl's ground breaking essay, followed by the work of Sanders and Dunn, the NPP has challenged the typical reading of the gospels and Paul based upon a need to read the New Testament (NT) within its first century context, not in the context of the debates over justification, whether in fifth century north Africa or sixteenth century Europe.<sup>1</sup> In this re-contextualized evaluation of the teaching of the NT, scholars of the NPP claim that works-righteousness and legalism were not at the heart of Paul's teaching but rather the inclusion of the Gentiles into the covenant people of God. Central to Paul's message, NPP proponents claim, is the proper understanding of the phrase, the works of the law. This phrase refers not to crass legalism but to the covenant badges, circumcision, food laws, and Sabbath observance. In other words, could Gentiles be admitted to the covenant apart from the covenant badges? It is

within this matrix that one finds the traditional protestant doctrine of justification by faith alone set on an entirely different trajectory.

N. T. Wright, one of the most popular and prolific proponents of the NPP, contends that the doctrine of justification:<sup>2</sup>

in the first century was not about how someone might establish a relationship with God. It was about God's eschatological definition, both future and present, of who was, in fact, a member of his people. In Sanders' terms, it was not so much about 'getting in,' or indeed about 'staying in,' as about 'how you could tell who was in.' In standard Christian theological language, it wasn't so much about soteriology as about ecclesiology; not so much about salvation as about the church.

Central to Wright's claim is that justification is about ecclesiology, not soteriology. If Wright's claim about justification is true, then, needless to say the NPP represents something of a Copernican revolution in the Church's understanding of the Scriptures. This essay will argue that the NPP, specifically Wright's doctrine of justification, represents an incorrect reading of the NT. The traditional protestant reading, more specifically as it comes from reformed confessionalism, as it comes through the Westminster Standards, is still correct.<sup>3</sup> To demonstrate Wright's errors we will first examine his doctrine of justification as he has presented it in his popular and academic works. Second, the essay will critique his views on justification demonstrating that reformed confessionalism still represents the teaching of the Scriptures. The essay will then conclude with some observations.

---

THE AUTHOR: Dr. J. V. Fesko is pastor of Geneva Orthodox Presbyterian Church in Marietta, Georgia, and an adjunct professor of theology at Reformed Theological Seminary—Atlanta. He holds a Ph.D. in Theology from the University of Aberdeen in Scotland. NOTE ON BIBLE VERSIONS: N. T. Wright uses the NIV, and for the purposes of this article the author makes use of the ESV.

1. Krister Stendahl, "The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West," in *Paul Among the Jews and Gentiles* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976) 78-96; E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1977) 1-29; James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus, Paul and the Law* (Louisville: Westminster / John Knox, 1990) 183-241.

2. N. T. Wright, *What Saint Paul Really Said: Was Paul of Tarsus the Real Founder of Christianity?* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1997) 119.

3. *Westminster Confession of Faith* (1646; Glasgow: Free Presbyterian Publications, 1976).

## WRIGHT ON JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH

Central to Wright's understanding of justification are two key tenets: (1) a proper understanding of the term *righteousness*, and (2) what a first century Jew would have understood by the term *justification*. One should also examine Wright's specific evidence in support of his views, namely his exegesis of Romans 4:1-8. How, then, does Wright define the term *righteousness*?

*Righteousness*

It is important, Wright argues, to understand properly the concept of righteousness. Righteousness is not something that is imputed to the Christian by faith, as argued in traditional reformed explanations of justification but rather is a demonstration of God's faithfulness to his covenant promises. Common exegesis of Paul has involved the imposition of doctrinal categories from the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, categories that are foreign to Paul's first century Jewish worldview.<sup>4</sup> The first century Jew was not concerned about how one might have a saving relationship with God. Rather, the first century Jew was already a member of the covenant and possessed a relationship with his covenant Lord. What was perplexing for the first century Jew was, how could the chosen people of God be under the Roman occupation? Had not God promised in his covenant to Abraham that Israel would rule over the nations? Yet, Israel was under the thumb of Rome. Though Israel was in the promised land, they were essentially in exile. It is with these questions that God's righteousness, or covenant faithfulness, enters the picture.

Wright argues that *righteousness* refers to God's covenant faithfulness: "The question of the righteousness of god, as expressed by Jews in this period, can be stated as follows: when and how would Israel's god act to fulfill his covenant promises?"<sup>5</sup> In other words, when would God bring the Israelites out of exile, out from under Roman rule? Wright argues that God's covenant faithfulness, or righteousness, is the major theme of Paul's epistle to Rome and is the primary focus of Romans 3:21-4:25: "God's righteousness—that is, God's faithfulness to the covenant with Abraham—has been unveiled in the gospel events concerning Jesus."<sup>6</sup> Wright states that God's covenantal faithfulness, or righteousness, was manifest through Christ's ministry—Christ had dealt with the covenant curses due Israel, began to lead her out of exile, and inaugurate the eschaton, the

age to come: "Israel's god had at last acted decisively, to demonstrate his covenant faithfulness, to deliver his people from their sins, and to usher in the inaugurated new covenant" (Wright, *People of God*, 458). The righteousness of God, then, is primarily a demonstration of his covenantal faithfulness. Texts such as Romans 1:17, then, should be read as: "For in [the gospel] the righteousness [covenantal faithfulness] of God is revealed."<sup>7</sup> This primary significance of the term *righteousness*, of course has implications for Wright's views on justification.

Wright argues that the divine righteousness, or covenant faithfulness, is not the same thing as the righteousness that humans possess when they are declared members of the covenant. Wright states that:<sup>8</sup>

in the Hebrew law court the judge does not give, bestow, impute, or impart *his own 'righteousness'* to the defendant. That would imply that the *defendant* was deemed to have conducted the case impartially, in accordance with the law, to have punished sin and upheld the defenseless innocent ones. 'Justification,' of course, means nothing like that. 'Righteousness' is not a quality or substance that can thus be passed or transferred from the judge to the defendant. The righteousness of the judge is the judge's own character, status, and activity, demonstrated in doing these various things. The 'righteousness' of the defendants is the status they possess when the court has found in their favor. Nothing more, nothing less. When we translate these forensic categories back into their theological context, that of the covenant, the point remains fundamental: the divine covenant faithful is not the same as human covenant membership.

This statement is an important element of Wright's view on justification. God's righteousness remains his own. God does not impute his righteousness to the member of the covenant. Wright stipulates though the

4. N. T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991) 17, 122.

5. N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God*, Christian Origins and the Question of God, vol. 1 (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992) 271.

6. Wright, *People of God*, 458; also idem, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, Christian Origins and the Question of God, vol. 3 (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003) 246.

7. On Rom 1:17 see Wright, *Saint Paul*, 100-03; also idem, *Romans*, NIB (Nashville: Abingdon, 2002) 425-428.

8. N. T. Wright, "Romans and the Theology of Paul," in *Pauline Theology*, vol. 3, eds. David M. Hay and E. Elizabeth Johnson (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995) 38-39.

same word, righteousness, is used for both God's covenant faithfulness and the human's status within the covenant, it demonstrates only their close reciprocal relationship, not their identity (Wright, "Romans," 39). Wright argues that when the term *righteousness* is used in connection with human beings that it is a term that means, "membership within the covenant" (Wright, *Covenant*, 148; idem, *Romans*, 465, 491). In other words, the righteous God, one who is faithful to his covenant, declares those, who place their faith in Christ, to be righteous, members of the covenant, or recipients of God's covenantal faithfulness. This understanding of righteousness, both human and divine, informs Wright's understanding of justification.

### Justification

Wright argues that there are three foundational presuppositions that one must understand before he can properly understand the doctrine of justification. First, Scripture speaks of justification in terms of covenant. One must not read justification in terms of the covenant theology of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries but in terms of second-temple Judaism and the covenant promises that God made to his people. Second, justification is spoken of in terms of law-court language. When God made his covenant promise to Abraham, patriarch of the people of God, it was God's way of correcting the sin of Adam and putting the world to rights. In the law-court the people of God will be vindicated before the world and shown to be "in the right." Third, Scripture speaks of justification in terms of eschatology. Justification is not part of some abstract system of doctrine by which people are saved but is rooted in the decisive action of God in Jesus Christ whereby he rescues the cosmos from sin through the Holy Spirit, bringing all things under the authority of Jesus (Wright, *Saint Paul*, 117-118). From these three premises, one can begin to see the nature of Wright's view of justification emerge.

Justification is not about the imputation of a communicable attribute of God to the one who professes faith in Christ. Rather, justification is the vindication of the covenant people of God before the world. Justification is about demonstrating that the people of God are "in the right" before the unbelieving world, those who refused to place their faith in Jesus Christ and oppressed

the people of God. The people of God had placed their faith in the one true God who, through the covenant, would put the world to rights. Yet, what was difficult for the Israelites is that it appeared as though God was doing nothing to fulfill his unbreakable covenant—the Israelites were in exile under Roman rule. When and how would God vindicate, or justify, the people of God?<sup>9</sup> Wright summarizes the overall context in which one finds the Scripture's message of justification (Wright, *People of God*, 335):

- a The creator god calls Israel to be his people;
- b Israel, currently in 'exile,' is to be redeemed, precisely because she is the covenant people of this god;
- c Present loyalty to the covenant is the sign of future redemption;
- d Loyalty to this covenant is being tested at this moment of crisis;
- e At this moment, what counts as loyalty, and hence what marks out those who will be saved / vindicated / raised to life, is ...

Though Wright ends his last summary point with an ellipsis, he eventually fills in the blank with, faith in Jesus Christ. It is Jesus Christ who was the ultimate fulfillment of the covenant promise that God made to Abraham. Loyalty to the covenant was no longer to be demonstrated by a commitment to Torah and its attendant badges of covenant membership, circumcision, food laws, and Sabbath observance but by the new sign of covenant membership, faith in Christ. No longer were the covenant members to see the Torah as the rallying point of the covenant but Jesus himself (Wright, *Victory of God*, 201). Moreover, if Torah no longer defined the covenant people of God but faith in Christ was its defining membership badge, then this means that Gentiles could now be a part of the covenant people apart from the traditional Jewish identity badges. It is the issue of how one defines the people of God that is the central issue of justification, argues Wright. Are the people of God, those who receive God's righteousness, his covenant faithfulness, marked by the badges of membership—circumcision, food laws, and Sabbath—or by faith in Jesus Christ? This was the nature of the debate at Galatia and the substance of Paul's epistle to the Romans, not crass works-righteousness or legalism (Wright, *People of God*, 241). There is a twofold division of justification that Wright stresses: (1) present justification—namely the vindication that people possess presently, which is marked out by their faith in Christ and indicates who will be vindicated in

9. N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996) 203.

the end; and (2) final or future justification—the actual declaration of being “in the right” before the world. The idea of justification as vindication, then, is the primary thrust of Wright’s understanding of the doctrine. What specific evidence does Wright marshal in support of his view of justification?

*Wright on Romans 4:1-8*

Though not comprehensive in nature, examining Wright’s understanding of Romans 4:1-8 will help the investigator see how he arrives at his conclusions regarding justification. Wright begins his analysis of Romans 4 by explaining that this chapter is about Abraham’s family, not the traditional reformed view of justification by faith. He contends that the chapter hinges on the question of whether Jews and Gentiles can point to Abraham as their father (Wright, *Romans*, 489). Wright then goes on to analyze 4:2: “For if Abraham was justified by works, he has something to boast about, but not before God.” Wright states that Paul is not dealing with self-help legalism but that Paul is saying that Abraham was not justified, vindicated or reckoned within the covenant, by the works of the Torah, circumcision, food laws, and Sabbath. The works of Torah were the identity markers of Jews, not Gentiles. In this verse, according to Wright, Paul is saying that Abraham is not reckoned as a member of the covenant, by the Jewish identity markers. Paul’s point is to deny the Jews a point of boasting because of their Jewish identity and possession of Torah (Rom 2:17-20; 3:27-30; Wright, *Romans*, 490). Wright goes on to explain the following verse.

Paul writes: “For what does the Scripture say? ‘Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him as righteousness’” (4:3). Here Wright explains that the phrase “it was counted to him” (ἐλογίσθη) is a bookkeeping metaphor, though the phrase is rare. He argues that the meaning of the phrase must therefore be sought in the Genesis account and the rest of Romans 4; the idea is also restated in Psalm 106:31 and *Misqat Ma’ase Ha Torah* (MMT) C. Wright enters first upon the meaning of the phrase within its original context in Genesis 15. Genesis 15 opens with Abraham’s puzzlement because God has made great promises to him, but has yet to see them fulfilled. God promised him children, yet Abraham has none. Wright identifies the promise as, that Abraham would have a family as numerous as the stars in heaven. Because Abraham believed this promise, God reckoned his belief in the promise, argues Wright, as righteousness. Righteousness, one must remember, is

not a moral quality but covenant membership. Wright paraphrases the quotation from Genesis 15 as, “God counted Abraham’s faith as constituting covenant membership,” or “Abraham’s believing the promise was seen by God as the sign that Abraham was ‘in the right’” (Wright, *Romans*, 490-491).

Wright then explains that Paul briefly uses a book-keeping metaphor in vv. 4-5 to explain the significance of v. 3: “Now to the one who works, his wages are not counted as a gift but as his due. <sup>5</sup>And to the one who does not work but trusts him who justifies the ungodly, his faith is counted as righteousness.” Wright argues that Paul uses v. 4 to suggest the hypothetical situation that had Abraham obtained his status by works, then his place within the covenant would not have been by God’s grace. Wright stipulates that this is the only time that Paul “uses this metaphorical field in all his discussion of justification, and we should not allow this unique and brief sidelight to become the dominant note, as it has in much post-Reformation discussion” (Wright, *Romans*, 491). The main point is that (492):

one who believes in this God, therefore, will discover that this ‘faith’ will be regarded, not as a meritorious spiritual act (how could that be, for the ‘ungodly’?), but as the badge of covenant membership given by God in sheer grace. And already the answer to the opening question of v. 1 is starting to emerge: We (Jewish and Gentile Christians alike) have not found Abraham to be our father according to the flesh, but according to God’s promise.

In support of this conclusion, Wright explains that Paul calls upon a second witness beyond Abraham, king David.

In v. 6 Paul explains that “David also speaks of the blessing of the one to whom God counts righteousness apart from works.” He then goes on to quote Psalm 32: 2 (31:2 LXX): “Blessed are those whose lawless deeds are forgiven, and whose sins are covered; <sup>8</sup>blessed is the man against whom the Lord will not count his sin” (vv. 7-8). Here Wright argues that Paul uses this quotation to show what it means to be counted as righteous, or as a member of the covenant. To be counted as righteous means to be forgiven of sin, not that one has moral perfection. This means, then, that according to Wright Romans 4:1-8 explains how Abraham’s family can have both Jew and Gentile, that the sign of covenant membership is faith, not the works of Torah, and that those who are righteous, covenant members, receive the forgiveness of sins. This is what it means,

according to Wright's understanding of Paul, to be justified by faith, or vindicated and reckoned as a member of the covenant. Before we proceed to a critical analysis of Wright's understanding of justification, it will be helpful to summarize his views.

### SUMMARY

To understand Wright's views on justification one must recognize that justification is rooted in redemptive history, the outworking of the covenant promise of God. Justification is a manifestation of the covenant faithfulness of God, his righteousness, in sending Jesus to put the world to rights. Those who place their faith in Christ, the new sign of the covenant, are vindicated in the present, present justification, and identified as those who will be vindicated in the future, final justification. Justification is covenantal, because Jesus is the one who brings about the vindication of the people of God, the fulfillment of God's covenant promises. Justification is a law-court metaphor, which manifests itself in the declaration of vindication for those who place their faith in Jesus. And, justification is eschatological, in that it is the in-breaking of the age to come in the middle of history—the in-breaking of the lordship of Jesus, the one who will vindicate his people and put the world to rights. Wright's overview statement of Romans 3:21-4:25 does well to summarize his beliefs concerning justification (Wright, *Romans*, 468):

Faith then becomes the badge that identifies, in the present time, the members of the people of God. This is the meaning of Paul's doctrine of 'justification by faith.' The

verdict of the last day has been brought forward into the present in Jesus the Messiah; in raising him from the dead, God declared that in him had been constituted the true, forgiven worldwide family. Justification, in Paul, is not the process or event whereby someone becomes, or grows as, a Christian; it is the declaration that someone is, in the present, a member of the people of God. This is inevitably controversial, but is I believe borne out by careful study of the relevant texts. We may remind ourselves of the triple layer of meaning in Paul's 'righteousness' language: The covenantal declaration, seen through the metaphorical and vital lens of the law-court, is put into operation eschatologically. The verdict to be announced in the future has been brought forward into the present. Those who believe the gospel are declared to be 'in the right.'

With this summary of Wright's teaching on justification, we may now move forward to a critical examination of his doctrine.

### A Critical Examination of N. T. Wright's Doctrine of Justification

While there is much that must be examined within Wright's explanation of justification, such as questions surrounding the nature of the righteousness of God or the interpretation of the phrase, the works of the law, the investigation will focus on two primary questions: (1) does the term *righteousness* mean "a member of the covenant"; and (2) does Scripture speak of justification in terms of vindication or being "in the right"?<sup>10</sup> Is the declaration of righteousness for one who enters the covenant a declaration of membership, as Wright contends, or is it that God "accepts us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us," as the Westminster shorter catechism states (q. 33)? Also, is Wright's explanation of Romans 4:1-8 accurate? We may turn to the first issue, namely, Is the term *righteousness* best understood as "covenant membership?"

#### RIGHTEOUSNESS

As we saw above, a key element to Wright's understanding of justification is that when the Scriptures speak of a person's righteousness, it is a reference to his status of covenant membership. We will examine several passages of Scripture to demonstrate that Wright's definition is wanting. There are places in Scripture where Wright's proposed understanding might be a possibility; how-

10. On the question of the nature of the righteousness of God, see Wright, *Saint Paul*, 97-111; idem, *People of God*, 271, 336-337, 458; cf. C. E. B. Cranfield, *Romans*, ICC, vol. 1 (1975; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2001) 91-106; Mark A. Seifrid, "Righteousness Language in the Hebrew Scriptures and Early Judaism," in *Justification and Variegated Nomism*, vol. 1, *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*, eds. D. A. Carson, et al. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001) 415-42. On the question of, the works of the law, Wright relies upon the previous work of Dunn, see James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus, Paul, and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians* (Louisville: Westminster / John Knox, 1990) 183-241; cf. Simon J. Gathercole, *Where is Boasting?: Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul's Response in Romans 1-5* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002) 37-111; Andrew T. Lincoln, "Ephesians 2.8-10: A Summary of Paul's Gospel," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 45/4 (1983) 628-629; idem, *Ephesians*, WBC, vol. 42 (Dallas: Word, 1990) 112-13; idem, "The Theology of Ephesians," in *The Theology of the Later Pauline Letters*, eds. Andrew T. Lincoln and Al J. M. Wedderburn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993) 135-136; A. Andrew Das, *Paul, the Law, and the Covenant* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2001) 188-191.

ever, upon closer scrutiny there are other passages that simply do not fit Wright's definition. One such passage is Job 29:11-17. In Job's speech he defends his life and character from the accusations of Eliphaz:

For you have exacted pledges of your brothers for nothing and stripped the naked of their clothing.<sup>7</sup> You have given no water to the weary to drink, and you have withheld bread from the hungry.<sup>8</sup> The man with power possessed the land, and the favored man lived in it.<sup>9</sup> You have sent widows away empty, and the arms of the fatherless were crushed (Job 22:6-9).

Note that Eliphaz's accusations describe Job as morally deficient. Job responds to these accusations:

I put on righteousness, and it clothed me; my justice was like a robe and a turban.<sup>15</sup> I was eyes to the blind and feet to the lame.<sup>16</sup> I was a father to the needy, and I searched out the cause of him whom I did not know.<sup>17</sup> I broke the fangs of the unrighteous and made him drop his prey from his teeth" (Job 29:14-17).

One must note that Job clothed himself in righteousness (צְדָקָה), and righteousness clothed him, what the second half of the synonymous parallelism in v. 14b explains as Job's justice (צֶדֶק) (cf. Psa 132:9; Isa 6:5, 59:17, 61:10). Job's righteousness is not characterized as covenant membership, as Wright contends, but as justice: vv. 15-17 describe Job as assisting the blind, poor, and opposing the unrighteous.<sup>11</sup> These verses, then, represent "a strong claim to both right behavior and right status, the assertion of which is the whole point of Job's closing speech."<sup>12</sup> There are other passages of Scripture that confirm that righteousness is not covenant membership but both right behavior and the status of innocent of wrongdoing.

For example, in Psalm 7 David asks whether he has repaid a friend with evil or plundered an enemy without cause (v. 4). To the possibility of being guilty of this wrongdoing, David responds, "Judge me, O LORD, according to my righteousness and according to the integrity that is in me" (v. 8).<sup>13</sup> David's plea to have God judge him according to his righteousness is not the claim of moral self-qualification, or self-righteousness, but the request that God declare him innocent of wrongdoing, to render a "guilty" or "not guilty" verdict.<sup>14</sup> Again, covenant membership is not in view but status, namely David's innocence. This understanding of righteousness as innocent status comes forth in Psalm 18:20: "The LORD dealt with me according to my right-

eousness; according to the cleanness of my hands he rewarded me." This verse is a declaration of status, or innocence, clearly evident again by the second half of the synonymous parallelism (Briggs, *Psalms*, 146). In Psalm 18:20 righteousness is equivalent to having clean hands, or possessing the status of innocence. But, in the following verses, the status of innocence is indexed by obedience to the Torah—the declaration of loyalty on the part of the one who worships: "For I have kept the ways of the LORD, and have not wickedly departed from my God."<sup>22</sup> For all his rules were before me, and his statutes I did not put away from me" (Psa 18:21-22; cf. Deut 8:6, 10:12, 11:22, 19:9, 26:17, 28:9, 30:16; Josh 22:5; Kraus, *Psalms 1-59*, 262; Briggs, *Psalms*, 146). One finds this same connection between righteousness and obedience to the Torah in the gate liturgy psalms.

With the pre-exilic temple those who sought admission would stand in the forecourt at what the psalmist calls the gates of righteousness (Psa 118:19ff) and were met with the question: "Who shall ascend the hill of the LORD? And who shall stand in his holy place" (Psa 24:3)? To this question the cultic officials would answer from within the inner court: "He who has clean hands and a pure heart, who does not lift up his soul to what is false and does not swear deceitfully" (Psa 24:4). Von Rad explains the significance of this question and answer between the people and the cultic officials:<sup>15</sup>

This means that a selection of Jahweh's commandments was put before those who entered. Admittedly, we do not have to conclude from this that in ancient Israel the fulfilling of the commandments was in principle antecedent to the reception of salvation in the cult, since those seeking admission were certainly not coming before Jahweh for the first time—they had been members of the community of Jahweh from the beginning. But this much becomes clear: those who came to worship were asked for something like a declaration of loyalty to Jahweh's will for justice. These commandments were

11. John E. Hartley, *The Book of Job*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988) 391.

12. David J. Reimer, "צְדָקָה", in *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*, vol. 3, ed. Willem A Van-Gemeren (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997) 760; Norman C. Habel, *The Book of Job*, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1985) 410.

13. Derek Kidner, *Psalms 1-72*, TOTC (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1973) 64; Charles A. Briggs, *Psalms*, vol. 1, ICC (1909; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1969) 55.

14. Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalms 1-59*, trans. Hilton C. Oswald (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993) 172-173.

15. Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, vol. 1 (1962; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001) 377-378.

regarded as perfectly capable of being fulfilled, and indeed was easy to fulfill. The question whether those who sought entrance avowed themselves to be loyal to them now, and had been so in the past, was therefore nothing but the question of their צַדִּיקִים. Hence, 'the gates of righteousness' are שְׂפוּכָה, through which only 'righteous people' enter.

Once again, Wright's definition of righteousness as covenant membership does not fit the context of this gate liturgy psalm. As von Rad points out, those who approach the gates were already members of the covenant. The covenant members are asked whether they are righteous, or innocent of wrong doing.<sup>16</sup> Can their behavior be categorized as loyal to the covenant, to the commandments of God?

16. Peter C. Craigie, *Psalms 1-50*, Word Biblical Commentary (Dallas: Word, 1983) 213.

17. There is no lexical evidence in either the OT or NT to support the claim that righteousness means "covenant membership." See Francis Brown, et al., *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, trans. Edward Robinson (1907; Oxford: Clarendon, 1976) 841-842; R. Laird Harris, et al., *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* (Chicago: Moody, 1980) 751-755; G. Johannes Botterweck, et al., *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, vol. 12, trans. Douglas W. Scott (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003) 239-264; Walter Bauer, et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979) 196-197; H. G. Liddell and Robert Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, rev. ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996) 429; Gerhard Kittel, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 2, trans. Geoffrey Bromiley (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1964) 192-210.

18. So Harris, *Wordbook of the OT*, 753. Cf. Botterwick, *Dictionary of the OT*, 250; Kittel, *Dictionary of the NT*, 190-91, 198-199; Mark A. Seifrid, *Christ, our Righteousness: Paul's theology of justification* (Downers Grove: Inter Varsity, 2000) 41.

19. Daniel I. Block, *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 25-48*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) 252.

20. Though, one should stipulate that Wright identifies the formal nature of the promise, i.e., many offspring. He does not identify the substance of the promise, i.e., that it refers to Christ (Gal 3:16; cf. John 8:56). Wright states: "We might suggest that the singularity of the 'seed' in v. 16 is not the singularity of an individual person contrasted with the plurality of many human beings, but the singularity of one family contrasted with the plurality of families which would result if the Torah were to be regarded the way Paul's opponents apparently regard it" (*Covenant*, 163; see also 164-165).

21. O. Palmer Robertson, "Genesis 15:6: New Covenant Expositions of an Old Covenant Text," *Westminster Theological Journal* 42 (1980) 264. Also see Victor P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1-17*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990) 423-427, 439; Brevard S. Childs, *Old Testament Theology in its Canonical Context* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985) 219-220; Nahum M. Sarna, *Genesis*, JPSTC (New York: JPS, 1989) 113; Gordon J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15* (Dallas: Word, 1987) 330. Cranfield notes "that to Rabbinic Judaism Gen 15:6 was no proof at all that Abraham was not justified on the ground of works is absolutely clear." For citations from rab-

Throughout the OT, righteousness is not a term that means covenant membership, contra Wright.<sup>17</sup> Rather, righteousness, when spoken of people, is usually the status of innocence demonstrated by loyalty to Torah.<sup>18</sup> Those who are righteous, innocent of wrong doing and demonstrate their loyalty to the covenant by obedience to the Torah, will live; the unrighteous, those who are not innocent and disobey Torah, die: "When the righteous turns from his righteousness and does injustice, he shall die for it."<sup>19</sup> And when the wicked turns from his wickedness and does what is just and right, he shall live by them" (Ezek 33:18-19; cf. Dan 4:27; Matt 6:1; 1 John 3:7, 10, 12).<sup>19</sup> With this definition of righteousness we may move forward and examine Wright's exegesis of Romans 4:1-8.

#### ROMANS 4:1-8

Romans 4:1-8 centers upon an important statement, one upon which a proper understanding of justification hinges. Paul quotes Genesis 15:6: "Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him as righteousness" (Rom 4:3). Wright is correct to explain that "it was counted to him" is a bookkeeping metaphor. He is also correct that the meaning of this phrase must be sought in the original context and the rest of Romans 4. Yes, Genesis 15 opens with Abraham's puzzlement because God has made promises to him, but he has yet to see the fulfillment of these promises. God promised Abraham children, yet he has none. Wright is correct to identify the promise as having offspring as numerous as the stars of heaven.<sup>20</sup> Yet, Wright is incorrect to say that God counted Abraham's belief in the promise as covenant membership. Rather, given the OT's use of righteousness as innocence and obedience to Torah, one must read Genesis 15:6 as, "Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him as innocence and covenant loyalty, or obedience." What Genesis 15:6 states, therefore, is that Abraham believed God's promise, and God counted that belief, or faith, in the stead of righteousness, or obedience.<sup>21</sup> Paul then goes on to clarify why he quotes Genesis 15:6 in the following verse.

Wright is correct to state that verses 4-5 are epexegetically related to v. 3: "Now to the one who works, his wages are not counted as a gift but as his due." Contra Wright, these verses do not contain the only place where Paul juxtaposes faith against works. A real problem within first century Judaism was the idea that one could obey Torah. This attitude is certainly present in the rich young ruler who told Christ that he had obeyed

the Torah (Matt 19:16-22).<sup>22</sup> While there were certainly exceptions to the rule, second temple Judaism had misread the OT, particularly the means by which a person obtained righteousness. Many thought that they could obtain their righteousness, the innocent status, through obedience to the Torah. This is why Paul contrasts works and faith, or human effort with trust in Christ. This is why Paul uses the metaphor of wages earned. One does not obtain righteousness by human effort but by faith, trusting in the covenant promise of God: "And to the one who does not work but trusts him who justifies the ungodly, his faith is counted as righteousness" (Rom 4: 5).<sup>23</sup> What about a person's sin? How does sin figure into the question of justification?

Verses 6-8 answer the question of what God does with the sin of those whom he justifies: "Just as David also speaks of the blessing of the one to whom God counts righteousness apart from works: <sup>7</sup>Blessed are those whose lawless deeds are forgiven, and whose sins are covered; <sup>8</sup>blessed is the man against whom the Lord will not count his sin." Wright contends that being counted as righteous, or a covenant member, means that one's sins are forgiven. True enough, those whom God justifies certainly receive the forgiveness of sins, but one must not equate the forgiveness of sins with the status of being righteous, or innocent and obedient to the Torah. The forgiveness of sin is only one half of the justification equation. The one who is justified looks to Christ in faith, his faith is counted as innocence and obedience to the Torah, and his sins are also not counted against him. Who is the source of righteousness, or obedience to Torah? Paul explains that it is Christ (Rom 5:12-19). There are hence two parts of justification: the communication of righteousness through faith and the forgiveness of sins. This interpretation is confirmed when we examine Psalm 106:31 and MMT C, the two places where Wright states that the matters Paul deals with in Romans 4:1-8 are restated.

#### PSALM 106:31

Psalm 106:31 comments upon the events of Numbers 25:1-3, when the Israelites "began to whore with the daughters of Moab," and the people yoked themselves to Baal Peor. Phinehas, a priest and grandson of Aaron, made a swift intervention against the Israelite idolatry and sin by spearing an Israelite and Moabite woman while in the middle of an act of fornication. Why did Phinehas slay this couple? Phinehas offered a sacrifice to stop God's judgment from destroying the Israelites;

this was his function as a Levite: "To make atonement for the people of Israel, that there may be no plague among the people of Israel when the people of Israel come near the sanctuary" (Num 8:19). Sacrifices could stop a plague dead in its tracks.<sup>24</sup> This interpretation thus far is confirmed by Psalm 106:30: "They provoked the LORD to anger with their deeds, and a plague broke out among them. <sup>30</sup> Then Phinehas stood up and intervened, and the plague was stayed." Hence, Phinehas made atonement and stood between the living and dead (Num 25:13).<sup>25</sup> When Israel was heading towards idolatry Phinehas acted faithfully and zealously for God's covenant and especially the Torah. Phinehas is therefore declared righteous: "And that was counted to him as righteousness from generation to generation forever" (Psa 106:31).

At first glance, this event appears to contradict Paul's stated principle, namely that a person is reckoned righteous by faith alone.<sup>26</sup> In Psalm 106:31 it appears that Phinehas is counted as righteous because of his action, not his faith. Yet, one must recognize the overall picture and all of the constituent elements at work: (1) the motivating source of Phinehas' action, (2) the contrast between the faithful and faithless, (3) what reward Phinehas receives, and (4) the typological connection to Christ. First, what motivates Phinehas' action is faith in his covenant Lord. What, for example, was the difference between those Israelites who wanted to enter the land of promise and those who did not? The author of Hebrews states that it was the presence or absence of faith: "For good news came to us just as to them, but the message they heard did not benefit them, because they were not united by faith with those who listened" (Heb 4:2). Hence faith in God motivates Phinehas' actions.<sup>27</sup>

Second, the Israelites were acting unfaithfully, dis-

binic literature that saw Abraham meriting his righteous status see Cranfield, *Romans*, 229.

22. Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to Matthew*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992) 489-491; W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *The Gospel According to Matthew*, vol. 3, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997) 45.

23. Cranfield, *Romans*, p. 231; Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996) 265.

24. Jacob Milgrom, *Numbers*, JPSTC (Philadelphia, PA: JPS, 1990) 478-479.

25. Derek Kidner, *Psalms 73-150*, TOTC (Downers Grove: Inter Varsity, 1973) 381; Gordon J. Wenham, *Numbers*, TOTC (Downers Grove: Inter Varsity Press, 1981) 188.

26. So John Calvin, *Psalms 93-150*, CTS, trans. James Anderson (rpt; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979) 232-233.

27. Franz Delitzsch, *Biblical Commentary on the Psalms*, volume 2, translated by Francis Bolton (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1901) 156.

obediently; they were unrighteous, whereas Phinehas was acting righteously, demonstrating obedience and loyalty to the Torah. Third, one must not miss what reward Phinehas receives. He receives a perpetual priesthood, not justification: “Behold, I give to him my covenant of peace,<sup>13</sup> and it shall be to him and to his descendants after him the covenant of a perpetual priesthood” (Num 25:12-13).<sup>28</sup> Last, and fourth, the typological connection to Christ is one where the priest acts righteously and his act of obedience is imputed to his offspring. This, of course, points to Christ, whose obedience is imputed to his offspring, the Church. Ultimately, therefore, Phinehas’ faith motivates his action, or obedience or righteousness, which secures a perpetual priesthood. So, while Wright is correct to say that Psalm 106:30-31 restates the problem of Romans 4:1-3, it actually works against his overall case. Psalm 106:30-31 is an instance where righteousness is imputed to others. One should note, however, that Paul does not appeal to Psalm 106:30-31 but to Genesis 15:6. The reason for his appeal to Genesis 15:6 will be evident in our examination of MMT C.

### MMT C

Wright draws attention to the connection between Paul’s arguments in Romans 4:1-8 and the literature of second temple Judaism. MMT C, as in Romans 4:1-8, discusses the reckoning of righteousness, and like Paul, also uses king David as an example: “Remember David, that he was a man of piety, and that he was also saved from many troubles and pardoned.”<sup>29</sup> Wright argues beyond this parallel that Paul and Qumran have parallel understandings concerning eschatology (Wright, “Paul and Qumran,” 18):

MMT expounds Deuteronomy 30 and 31 as a prophetic text envisaging future blessings and curses, culminating in the curse of exile, after which Israel will turn to God, and God will restore her ‘at the end of the days.’ This, says the writer of MMT, is now coming to pass, and the

works of the law are the sign of the people to whom ‘it will be reckoned as righteousness’ in the future. In other words, the works of the law function within an inaugurated eschatology—an understanding that the end time has already begun—to mark out those who will be restored, who will be the true Israel. At this point MMT’s theology runs parallel to Paul’s. He too has an inaugurated eschatology—in which the true Israel is marked out by faith.

Wright is correct that there are some parallels between Paul and Qumran. Yet, there are some significant differences.

The most significant difference comes in MMT’s explanation of how a person is reckoned as righteous: “And it will be reckoned for you as righteousness when you perform what is right and good before Him, for your own good and for that of Israel.”<sup>30</sup> This statement stands in stark contrast to what Paul writes in Romans 4:1-8. MMT C states that a person has righteousness reckoned to him for performing what is right and good, whereas Paul states that Abraham believed God and his faith was reckoned as righteousness. In MMT C the person is counted righteous because of his right and good deeds whereas Abraham is counted righteous because of his faith. Wright maintains that this statement, however, is not contradictory to Paul and that though similar, MMT speaks of different types of requirements, or works, than Paul refutes in Romans and Galatians, namely the works of the law, or circumcision, food-laws, and Sabbath observance.

Wright argues that one must understand the difference between the Jewish works of the law, circumcision, food-laws, and Sabbath observance, and the requirements of the Qumran community. Qumran, according to Wright, was a sect within first century Judaism and defined themselves in relationship to the temple. Wright gives several reasons as to why MMT is not in Paul’s crosshairs (Wright, “Paul and Qumran,” 18):

- 1) The laws that MMT commands are designed to mark out the scroll community against other groups within the wider Jewish world. The works that Paul opposes define all Jews and proselytes over against the gentile, pagan world.
- 2) MMT insists on post-biblical laws whereas Paul battles those who insist upon biblical laws. Qumran is concerned about codes regarding animal fetuses, banning the blind and lame from the temple, observing certain purity laws relating to streams of liquid,

28. Wenham, *Numbers*, p. 188; A. F. Kirkpatrick, *The Book of Psalms* (Cambridge: CUP, 1902) 631; A. A. Anderson, *The Book of Psalms*, vol. 2 (London: Marshall, Morgan, and Scott, 1972) 745; cf. Calvin, *Psalms 93-150*, 232.

29. Wright sees other parallels between MMT and Paul, for example, in his instructions concerning children in a mixed marriage (see N. T. Wright, “Paul and Qumran,” *Bible Review* 14/5 [1998], 18).

30. Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (1962; NY: Penguin Books, 1998), 4Q398 14-17 ii with 4Q399, 228.

where as Paul deals with the Jewish identity markers, circumcision, food laws, and Sabbath.

3) Qumran was concerned with the purity of the temple, whereas Paul mentions nothing regarding the temple.

It is on the basis of these differences that Wright rejects the idea that Paul has MMT in mind when he opposes those who seek righteousness on the basis of the works of the law. What is problematic with Wright's position is that he focuses attention upon several particulars that appear to support his position without taking note of the general scope of MMT. In other words, Wright misses the forest for the trees. There are several reasons why Wright's dismissal of the Paul-MMT connection is wanting.

First, one must take into account the title of MMT. Wright translates the title, *misqat ma'ase ha-torah*, as "selection of the works of the law" (Wright, "Paul and Qumran," 18). By translating the word as a "selection," one must not think that it is a random sampling but rather those laws that are important to the author. Abegg notes that the title should therefore be translated as "some important" or "pertinent" laws.<sup>31</sup> Second, *ma'ase ha-torah* should be translated as "the works of the law," as Wright correctly does. Abegg points out, however, that a few minutes with a concordance of the Septuagint leaves little doubt that the Greek equivalent of *ma'ase ha-torah* is likely *ergon nomou*. It is this Greek phrase, of course, that Paul argues against (Rom 3:20, 28; Gal 2:16; 3:2, 5, 10). What is more interesting is that the phrase only appears in Paul and in MMT; it does not at all appear in rabbinic literature in the first or second century (Abegg, "Paul," 53).

Third, while Wright is correct to state that MMT is concerned with temple purity, one must remember that Qumran was a conservative reaction against lax views towards the law. In other words, it is not that Qumran only observed the minor aspects of the law but rather the law in its entirety, including what many first century Jews might consider minor aspects of the law. That Qumran observed the whole of Torah is evident from the Community Rule: "This is the rule for the men of the community who have freely pledged themselves to be converted from all evil and to cling to all his commandments according to his will" (1QS5). The members of the community had to "undertake by a binding oath to return with all his heart and soul to every commandment of the Law of Moses in accordance with all that has been revealed" (1QS5.10).

Fourth, one must consider again the statement, "And it will be reckoned for you as righteousness when you perform what is right and good before Him, for your own good and for that of Israel."<sup>32</sup> Abegg notes that this statement contradicts what Paul states in Romans 4:3.<sup>33</sup> He speculates as to the source of the contradiction and supposes that the author of MMT could have read Genesis 22:16, but believes that the more likely scenario is that the author relies upon Psalm 106:30-31.<sup>34</sup> Abegg writes that,<sup>35</sup>

Upon examination of the Hebrew text of MMT, it becomes clear that MMT echoes this passage from Psalm 106. The same passive verb—"it was reckoned" in Psalm 106 and "you shall be reckoned" in MMT—is one clear reflection of this dependence. The only difference is that the past tense of the verb in Psalm 106 is changed to the future tense in MMT to convert it into a promise for the addressee.

There are other considerations in addition to the verbal parallels, namely the concern for holiness and the connection to the priesthood. Psalm 106 celebrates what Phinehas did, zealously pursuing the law. In this connection the Qumran community called themselves "sons of Zadok," who was the high priest during the reigns of David and Solomon, the direct descendant of Phinehas. It is a likely possibility that the author of MMT reads Psalm 106:30-31 and draws the incorrect conclusion that the people of God are reckoned righteous because of their performance of the law, failing to see that Phinehas did not receive justification but only a perpetual priesthood. In this regard, it is telling that Paul appeals to Genesis 15:6 and not Psalm 106:30-31.

Fifth, Wright correctly states that MMT expounds Deuteronomy 30-31. Yet, what is the subject under consideration in these two chapters? Deuteronomy 30-31 explain the curses and blessings of the covenant. To receive the blessings Israel must "return to the LORD your God, you and your children, and obey his voice in all

31. Martin Abegg, "Paul, 'Works of the Law' and MMT," *Biblical Archaeology Review* 20/6 (1994) 52; idem, "4QMMT, Paul, and 'Works of the Law,'" in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation*, ed. Peter W. Flint (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001) 205.

32. Geza Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 4Q398 14-17 ii with 4Q399, 228.

33. Robert Eisenman and Michael Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* (New York: Penguin, 1992) 183-184.

34. So Carolyn J. Sharp, "Phinehas Zeal and Rhetorical Strategy in 4QMMT," *Revue de Qumran* 18/2 (1997) 210.

35. Abegg, "Paul," 55; idem, "4QMMT," 208; Eisenman and Wise, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 184, 198.

that I command you today, with all your heart and with all your soul" (Deut 30:2). For example, MMT C states: "We have written to you that you should understand the Book of Moses and the Books of the Prophets and David and all the events of every age."<sup>36</sup> Here reference is made to the importance of the entirety of the OT, not just some portions of it. Qumran had a strictness towards the entirety of the law.<sup>37</sup> Indeed, Israel was to return to the commandments of Torah. The Qumran community certainly observed the Torah, as is evident from their entrance requirements—namely their pledge of loyalty to all the commandments. MMT, however, wrongly understood the purpose of the law—it was not to usher in the eschatological age but to bring death (Rom 7:5; 1 Cor 15:56).<sup>38</sup> The law was supposed to cause Israel to seek Christ, the source of righteousness (Gal 3:24-26).

For these five reasons, therefore, while one cannot be absolutely certain, Paul possibly included the work-wages metaphor to counter MMT C, and it is MMT C that lies behind statements such as, "For the promise to Abraham and his offspring that he would be heir of the world did not come through the law but through the righteousness of faith" (Rom 4:13), and, "Not having a righteousness of my own that comes from the law, but that which comes through faith in Christ, the righteousness from God that depends on faith" (Phil 3:9). The evidence examined thus far is not consonant with Wright's explanation of Romans 4:1-8. Verses 5-6 are not a one-time occurrence of the work-wages metaphor but a specific refutation of a common misconception, namely that one could be righteous by obedience to the Torah. Instead, Paul states that one is righteous, innocent and obedient to the Torah, by faith in Christ, not by human effort. With this data, we may move forward to a critical engagement of Wright's understanding of justification.

36. Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 227; also Eisenman and Wise, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 199.

37. Sharp, "Phinehan Zeal," 215; also Gary A. Anderson, "Intentional and Unintentional Sin in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Migrom*, eds., David P. Wright, et al. (Winona: Eisenbrauns, 1995) 49-64.

38. See E. E. Ellis, *Gospel of Luke*, NCB (London: Thomas Nelson, 1966) 215-216.

39. J. Gresham Machen, *The Origin of Paul's Religion* (1925; Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2002) 180.

40. There has been criticism against the monolithic picture of first century Judaism that Wright portrays. See Richard B. Hays, "Adam, Israel, Christ: The Question of Covenant in the Theology of Romans: A Response to Leander E. Keck and N. T. Wright," in *Pauline Theology*, vol. 3, ed. David M. Hay and E. Elizabeth Johnson (Minneapolis:

## JUSTIFICATION

Wright is correct about his three presuppositions regarding justification: it is covenantal, law-court language, and eschatological. Though he correctly identifies these three key presuppositions, his use of these categories require some redirection. First, Wright is correct, justification is covenantal. Though, he argues that one must not understand *covenantal* to mean the covenant theology of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. The problem with this claim is that Wright does not explain how or in what way classic covenant reformed theology is at odds with Scripture. He cites no evidence to support his claim. The assertion of error is something that requires reexamination and the presentation of specific evidence on Wright's part. Though, he moves on to say that what one must understand by *covenantal* is that worldview and understanding of the OT embodied in second-temple Judaism. Wright claims that God made a covenant with Abraham, calling Israel to be his people, and that it is this covenant to which the Israelites look for their vindication, or justification, before the Gentile world. The Jews living in the first century under Roman rule were looking to be vindicated against their Roman oppressors.

Wright is correct in that one must be sensitive to the surrounding cultural and historical context of the NT, however, he gives second-temple Judaism too great a role in defining the covenantal nature of justification. At various points Wright invokes the literature of second-temple Judaism to explain what lies behind Paul's thought. What is problematic about this methodology is that Paul never directly cites the literature of the second-temple. In contradistinction to Wright, Machen explains, "It is significant that when, after the conversion, Paul seeks testimonies to the universal sinfulness of man, he looks not to contemporary Judaism, but to the Old Testament. At this point, as elsewhere, Paulinism is based not upon later developments but upon the religion of the Prophets and the Psalms."<sup>39</sup> Wright assumes that second-temple Judaism has authoritatively interpreted the OT and that Paul builds upon this understanding. Machen notes, for example, the great divergence on a number of subjects concerning the doctrine of the messiah as it is presented in the OT and in the literature of the second temple (Machen, *Paul's Religion*, 182-200). While Wright may be correct in his sketch of the worldview of second-temple Judaism, though there is some doubt as to the accuracy of his explanation, he has not demonstrated that it is consonant with the view of the OT.<sup>40</sup> Is justification in Paul covenantal in the sense of

the vindication of the people of God over against their oppressors, as Wright maintains, informed by second-temple Judaism? Or, is justification covenantal in the sense that God has provided deliverance from sin and death through his covenant dealings with his people in Adam, Noah, Abraham, and Israel?

The answer lies in Paul's explanation of justification in Romans 4. If Wright is correct, what is noticeably absent is any direct connection to the literature of second-temple Judaism and any of the themes Wright claims are connected to justification. In this regard Wright contends that "in the NT Israel's expectation is radically redefined." Wright states that in Christ's "welcome for outcasts and sinners, Jesus enacts God's vindication of (apparently) the wrong group in Israel—the poor, the humble. 'This man [the tax collector], rather than the other [the Pharisee], went home justified before God' (Luke 18:14)."<sup>41</sup> Wright, however, cannot posit a radical redefinition of Israel's expectation for two reasons. If the NT redefined Israel's expectation, then first century Judaism has correctly interpreted the OT, but Christ and the apostles have redefined it. In other words, Christ and the apostles correct the view of the OT. Or, first century Judaism has misinterpreted the OT and it was first century opinion that required correction. If it is the latter, then there has been no redefinition of Israel's hope. Instead, as Machen argues, Paul appeals to the OT, to Abraham, not to the erroneous positions of first century Judaism. And, as classic reformed covenant theology has argued, the Abrahamic covenant, which Paul calls the gospel (Gal 3:8), is built ultimately upon the protoevangelium, not the hopes of first century Jews of being delivered from their Roman overlords. The protoevangelium, of course, was the promise to deliver Adam and Eve out from under the dominion of sin, death, and to conquer the serpent and his seed (Gen 3:15). Justification, then, is covenantal in the sense that God has provided deliverance from sin and death through his covenant dealings with his people in Adam, Noah, Abraham, Israel, the ultimate fulfillment of these covenant dealings comes through the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. What about the law-court aspect of justification?

Wright maintains, and correctly so, that justification is law-court language. Wright explains that:<sup>42</sup>

the covenant was there to deal with the sin, and bring about the salvation, of the world. It was therefore utterly appropriate, as I said earlier, that this great event should be described in terms drawn from the setting in which evil was regularly dealt with, namely that of the law

court.... God himself was seen as the judge; evildoers (i.e. the Gentiles, and renegade Jews) would finally be judged and punished; God's faithful people (i.e., Israel, or at least the true Israelites) would be vindicated.

Wright correctly states that justification is explained in terms of a law-court metaphor but what is problematic is the orientation of the court. According to Wright the people of God look for vindication before the world. Yet, once again, while this may be the view of second-temple Judaism, it is not how Paul explains justification. In the context surrounding Romans 4, Paul's great concern is seeking justification before the tribunal of God, not the world: "For by works of the law no human being will be justified in his sight, since through the law comes knowledge of sin" (Rom 3:20). According to Paul the one who has been justified has peace with God: "Therefore, since we have been justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom 5:1). Paul shows no concern for what the enemies of the people of God might or might not think; Paul shows concern only for what God will say concerning the one who stands before his throne. Justification, therefore, is not about the vindication of the people of God before the world as Wright maintains. Rather it is about the verdict that God passes upon the person who stands in his presence, the verdict of guilty or innocent. This theme of standing before the tribunal of God is found in the OT: "Keep far from a false charge, and do not kill the innocent and righteous, for I will not acquit the wicked" (Exo 23:7; Deut 25:1; Pro 17:15).<sup>43</sup> God will not acquit the wicked, which is why Paul explains that Abraham receives his righteousness, or innocent status, by faith. Moreover, God imputes the obedience, or righteousness, of Christ to Abraham. This interpretation is also confirmed by Christ's use of the term, justification.

Christ explains in the parable of the Pharisee and the tax collector the nature of justification and how it relates to righteousness:

---

Fortress, 1995) 79; Alister E. McGrath, "Reality, Symbol and History: Theological Reflections on N. T. Wright's Portrayal of Jesus," in *Jesus and the Restoration of Israel: A Critical Reassessment of N. T. Wright's Jesus and the Victory of God*, ed. Carey C. Newman (Downers Grove: Inter Varsity Press, 1999) 170; Seifrid, *Christ*, 21-25.

41. N. T. Wright, "Justification," in *New Dictionary of Theology*, eds. Sinclair B. Ferguson, David F. Wright, and J. I. Packer (Downers Grove: Inter Varsity Press, 1988) 359.

42. Wright, *Saint Paul*, 118; idem, "Justification," 359.

43. Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, vol. 1, trans. George Musgrave Giger, ed. James T. Dennison (Phillipsburg: P&R, 1994), 16.1.4, 633.

He also told this parable to some who trusted in themselves that they were righteous, and treated others with contempt: <sup>10</sup>“Two men went up into the temple to pray, one a Pharisee and the other a tax collector. <sup>11</sup>The Pharisee, standing by himself, prayed thus: ‘God, I thank you that I am not like other men, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even like this tax collector. <sup>12</sup>I fast twice a week; I give tithes of all that I get.’ <sup>13</sup>But the tax collector, standing far off, would not even lift up his eyes to heaven, but beat his breast, saying, ‘God, be merciful to me, a sinner!’ <sup>14</sup>I tell you, this man went down to his house justified, rather than the other (Luke 18:9-14).

Notice that Christ uses the parable against those who trusted in themselves, who thought they were righteous, or innocent before God and loyal to the Torah.<sup>44</sup> In this parable Christ describes the Pharisee, not in Wright’s terms of loyalty to the covenant badges, circumcision, food laws, and Sabbath observance, but in the general commands of Torah: thievery, injustice, adultery, fasting, and tithing (Green, *Luke*, 647-648). It is in these terms of Torah observance that some of the Jews thought they were righteous, or innocent. Fitzmyer observes that this parable shows that Christ<sup>45</sup>

recognized that righteousness in God’s sight was not to be achieved by boasting or even by self-confident activity (either the avoidance of evil or the striving for good in the observance of Mosaic and Pharisaic regulations). This saying about justification is important for it may reveal that the NT teaching about the matter is somehow rooted in Jesus’ own attitude and teaching: One achieves uprightness before God not by one’s own activity but by a contrite recognition of one’s own sinfulness before him. Hence, ‘the Pauline doctrine of justification has its roots in the teaching of Jesus.’

And, for these reasons Paul makes statements like, “a person is not justified by works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ” (Gal 2:16), to counter the idea that a person is righteous, innocent before God, by being obedient to the Torah. By contrast, the tax collector who sought the mercy of God and the forgive-

ness of sins, was justified, or declared innocent before the tribunal of God. Hence, justification is a law-court metaphor, but the court is oriented in a God-ward not world-ward direction.

What about the last of the presuppositions, namely that justification is eschatological?

Again, Wright is correct in explaining that justification is eschatological. Wright argues that the justification, or vindication, of the people of God is a long-awaited hope. Hence, according to Wright, the fulfillment of this long-expected hope is eschatological. Wright explains that:<sup>46</sup>

‘Justification’ in the first century was not about how someone might establish a relationship with God. It was about God’s eschatological definition, both future and present, of who was, in fact, a member of his people. In Sanders’ terms, it was not so much about ‘getting in.’ In standard Christian theological language, it wasn’t so much about soteriology as about ecclesiology; not so much about salvation as about the church.

So, then, according to Wright justification is eschatological in that it is the long-awaited fulfillment of the covenant promises as well as the final and ultimate definition of who belongs to the people of God (Wright, “Justification,” 359). While Wright is correct to say that justification is eschatological, he is incorrect to divorce justification from soteriology. As Gaffin notes, “All soteric experience derives from solidarity in Christ’s resurrection and involves existence in the new creation age, inaugurated by his resurrection.”<sup>47</sup> In other words, all soteriology, including justification, is eschatological because of its connection to the resurrection of Christ, the in-breaking of the eschaton.

One finds the connection between justification, eschatology, and soteriology, prominently in Romans 4:25 where Paul states that Christ was “delivered up for our trespasses and raised for our justification.” Paul makes explicit connection between the resurrection of Christ and the justification of the people of God. Now, Wright correctly argues that the resurrection is an eschatological event (Wright, *Saint Paul*, 36). He also correctly explains that the resurrection of Jesus was his vindication, though it is preferable to say that it was his justification, the Father’s declaration of his Son’s innocence and loyalty to the Torah (Wright, “Justification,” 359):

Christ was innocent of the charges for which he was crucified. But Wright goes on to explain that (Wright, *Romans*, 504), Thus, if faithful Jesus is demonstrated to

44. So Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997) 646.

45. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke: 10-24*, AB, vol. 28a (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985) 1184-1185; Ellis, *Luke*, 215-216.

46. Wright, *Saint Paul*, 119; idem, *Victory of God*, 203, 288, 513.

47. Richard B. Gaffin, *Resurrection and Redemption: A Study in Paul’s Soteriology* (1978; Phillipsburg: P & R, 1987) 138.

be Messiah by the resurrection, the resurrection also declares in principle that all those who belong to Jesus, all those who respond in faith to God's faithfulness revealed in him, are themselves part of the true covenant family promised to Abraham. In other words, the resurrection of Jesus can at this level be seen as the declaration of justification.

Paul, however, does not draw the connection between the resurrection and ecclesiology as Wright contends, when Wright describes the resurrection as a declaration of those who belong to Jesus.

Rather, Paul connects the resurrection to soteriology: "If Christ has not been raised, your faith is futile and you are still in your sins" (1 Cor 15:17).<sup>48</sup> Paul ties the resurrection to the conquest of sin and death: "To Paul's way of thinking, as long as Christ remains dead, Satan and sin are triumphant, or more broadly, the dominion of the old aeon remains unbroken" (Gaffin, *Resurrection*, 116). If there is no resurrection, then the protoevangelium and the covenant promises to the patriarchs, Israel, and the people of God are empty. If there is no resurrection, then looking to Christ in faith cannot be counted as righteousness, or innocent before the tribunal of God. There is no deliverance from their sins; they can no longer say, "And such were some of you" (1 Cor 6:11).<sup>49</sup> If there is no resurrection, then there has been no sacrifice to redeem the people of God from the curse of the law (Gal 3:13). In this regard Vos notes that:<sup>50</sup>

resurrection thus comes out of justification, and justification comes, after a manner most carefully to be defined, out of the resurrection; not, be it noted, out of the spiritual resurrection of the believer himself, but out of the resurrection of Christ. On the basis of merit this is so. Christ's resurrection was the *de facto* declaration of God in regard to his being just. His quickening bears in itself the testimony of his justification. God, through suspending the forces of death operating on Him, declared that the ultimate, the supreme consequence of sin had reached its termination. In other words, resurrection had annulled the sentence of condemnation.

So, yes, justification is eschatological, but not in the way that Wright explains. It is not an eschatological definition of the people of God but the in-breaking of the eschatological age, the out-pouring of the power of the age to come, the Holy Spirit, manifest in the resurrection of Christ, bringing about the victory over sin and death, ensuring the justification of the people of God.

Christ has been raised and therefore his people are no longer in their sin because God the Father has accepted the sacrifice on their behalf. Like Phinehas, Christ has stood between the living and the dead and his obedience, his righteousness, has been credited to those who place their faith in him and his work. Hence, Wright is correct to say that justification is covenantal, law-court language, and eschatological. Though, these categories require reorientation because Paul does not discuss justification in the terms that Wright does. Wright bases these categories in the worldview of second-temple Judaism and the longing for deliverance from Rome. Paul, on the other hand, bases these categories in the protoevangelium, the longing for deliverance from sin and death. We may now move forward to some concluding observations.

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In this essay we have examined key aspects of Wright's understanding of justification and found it wanting. While there are broad aspects with which one can agree, there is much in the specific details that is problematic. Wright argues that justification is about the vindication of the people of God before her enemies. Justification, according to Wright, is a declaration that a person is "in the right" and righteous, a member of the covenant. Justification is about the fulfillment of God's covenant promises to give Abraham a family that includes both Jews and Gentiles and the ultimate eschatological fulfillment of that long-awaited hope. While all of Wright's claims may be true, Paul presents an entirely different picture. For Paul justification is not vindication before the world but a declaration of innocence before the tribunal of God. It is the long-awaited fulfillment of the covenantal promises of God, first promised to Adam and Eve, then Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and then Israel, to deliver the people of God out from under the dominion of sin and death. Justification is an eschatological reality, in that the new creation has burst forth in the middle of this present evil age, and through the resurrection of Christ has declared the victory of Christ over sin and death, which means that his people are

*Continued on Page 183.*

48. A. C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000) 1219-1220.

49. Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987) 743-744.

50. Geerhardus Vos, *The Pauline Eschatology* (1930; Phillipsburg: P & R, 1994) 151.

# Reframing Presbyterian Worship: A Critical Survey of the Worship Views of John M. Frame and R. J. Gore

By Frank J. Smith, Ph.D., D. D. and David C. Lachman, Ph.D.

## EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

One of the key reformational doctrines<sup>1</sup> determinate of the health if not the being of a "Presbyterian" Church is the aptly named Regulative Principle of Worship.<sup>2</sup> This principle which was clearly championed from the beginning of the Scottish Reformation, and central to English Puritanism,<sup>3</sup> was refined and

---

1. "I know how difficult it is to persuade the world that God disapproves of all modes of worship not expressly sanctioned by his word." (John Calvin, "On the Necessity of Reforming the Church," *Selected Works of John Calvin: Tracts and Letters*, edited by Henry Beveridge and Jules Bonnet. Edited and translated by Henry Beveridge [Edinburgh: 1844; Rpt. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1983] 1.128-129). "All wirschipping, honoring, or service inventit by the braine of man in the religioun of God, without his own express commandment, is Idolatrie." (John Knox, "A Vindication of the Doctrine that the Sacrifice of the Mass is Idolatry," *The Works of John Knox*, ed. David Laing [Edinburgh: Printed for the Bannatyne Club, 1854; Rpt NY: AMS Press, 1966] 3.34).

2. While it may have been used earlier, the term Regulative Principle of Worship apparently was coined from or at least popularized by usage in the 1946 report of the OPC, "Report of the Committee on Song in Worship Presented to the Thirteenth General Assembly, on the Teaching of Our Standards Respecting the Songs That May Be Sung in the Public Worship of God," specifically section 'A' by John Murray (*Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Minutes of the General Assembly* [1946] 101-107). Research by Sherman Isbell supports Murray authorship. See Endnote A.

3. The regulative principle of worship was the established doctrine of Scottish Presbyterianism, and of the English Puritans. See Endnote B.

4. *Presbyterianism the Truly Primitive and Apostolical Constitution of the Church of Christ*, "The Worship of the Presbyterian Church" (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1835) 64-65.

5. Samuel Rutherford, *The Divine Right of Church Government and Excommunication* (London, 1646) 96.

6. John B. Adger, "A Denial of Divine Right for Organs in Public Worship," *Southern Presbyterian Review*, 20.1 (January 1869) 85.

7. George Gillespie, *A Dispute Against the English Popish Ceremonies*, ed. Christopher Coldwell (Dallas: Naphtali Press, 1993)

classically presented in the Westminster Standards, from whence it has been an integral doctrine of Presbyterianism ever since.

The Westminster Assembly determined: "But the acceptable way of worshipping the true God is instituted by Himself, and so limited by His own revealed will, that He may not be worshipped according to the imaginations and devices of men, or the suggestions of Satan, under any visible representation, or any other way not prescribed in the holy Scripture." (*Confession of Faith*, 21.1). The Princeton professor, Dr. Samuel Miller, gives a succinct statement of the principle when he writes that since the Scriptures are the "only infallible rule of faith and practice, no rite or ceremony ought to have a place in the public worship of God, which is not warranted in Scripture, either by direct precept or example, or by good and sufficient inference."<sup>4</sup> A briefer statement still which sums up the Presbyterian principle of worship, is that in the worship of God, "Not to Command is to Forbid,"<sup>5</sup> or "Whatever is not commanded is forbidden."<sup>6</sup>

As this brief definition can lead to misunderstanding, a necessarily corollary to this principle states that there are some circumstances "concerning the worship of God, and government of the Church, common to human actions and societies which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the word, which are always to be observed." (*Confession of Faith*, 1.6). Defining these "circumstances," is part and parcel with the discussion of what authority the church has in ordering the worship of God. As for the church's power in this regard, George Gillespie gives three conditions:<sup>7</sup>

I direct my course straight to the dissecting of the true limits, within which the church's power of enacting laws about things pertaining to the worship of God

is bounded and confined, and which it may not overleap nor transgress. Three conditions I find necessarily requisite in such a thing as the church has power to prescribe by her laws: 1<sup>st</sup> It must be only a circumstance of divine worship; no substantial part of it; no sacred significant and efficacious ceremony. For the order and decency left to the definition of the church, as concerning the particulars of it, comprehends no more but mere circumstances.... 2<sup>nd</sup> That which the church may lawfully prescribe by her laws and ordinances, as a thing left to her determination, must be one of such things as were not determinable by Scripture because *individua* are *infinita*.... 3<sup>rd</sup> If the church prescribe anything lawfully, so that she prescribe no more than she has power given her to prescribe, her ordinances must be accompanied with some good reason and warrant given for the satisfaction of tender consciences.”

Also, in his letter to “All in the Reformed Churches,” Gillespie defined circumstances this way: “...there is nothing which any way pertains to the worship of God left to the determination of human laws, beside the mere circumstances, which neither have any holiness in them, forasmuch as they have no other use and praise in sacred than they have in civil things, nor yet were particularly determinable in Scripture, because they are infinite.” (*EPC*, xli). James Henley Thornwell gives a more detailed definition:<sup>8</sup>

Circumstances are those concomitants of an action without which it either cannot be done at all, or cannot be done with decency and decorum. Public worship, for example, requires public assemblies, and in public assemblies people must appear in some costume and assume some posture.... Public assemblies, moreover, cannot be held without fixing the time and place of meeting: these are circumstances which the church is at liberty to regulate.... We must distinguish between those circumstances which attend actions as actions—that is, without which the actions cannot be—and those circumstances which, though not essential, are added as appendages. These last do not fall within the jurisdiction of the church. She has no right to appoint them. They are circumstances in the sense that they do not belong to the substance of the act. They are not circumstances in the sense that they so surround it that they cannot be separated from it. A liturgy is a circumstance of this kind.... In public worship, indeed in all commanded external actions, there are two elements—a fixed and a variable. The fixed

element, involving the essence of the thing, is beyond the discretion of the church. The variable, involving only the circumstances of the action, its separable accidents, may be changed, modified or altered, according to the exigencies of the case.

Gillespie’s third condition raises another principle which relates to the church’s power regarding worship, which is the doctrine of Christian Liberty or Liberty of Conscience. The Westminster divines state at Confession of Faith 20.2: “God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men, which are in any thing contrary to His Word; or beside it, if matters of faith or worship.”<sup>9</sup>

The language of the Confession at these several points is reminiscent of both the writings of Gillespie, and of his Westminster colleague, Samuel Rutherford. In one of Rutherford’s works circulating in the Assembly during the early part of the discussion on Christian Liberty, and cited at the same time during debate on the subject of Excommunication, he writes (Rutherford, 109):<sup>10</sup>

281-284. Hereafter *EPC*. “This large volume is the most elaborate defense of the classic Puritan-Scottish Presbyterian view of the regulative principle, recently reprinted. Gillespie was an influential member of the Westminster Assembly.” John M. Frame, *Worship in Spirit and Truth* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 1996) 157. Hereafter, *Spirit and Truth*.

8. Cited from John L. Girardeau, D.D. LL.D., “The Discretionary Power of the Church,” *Sermons*, ed. by Rev. George A. Blackburn (Columbia, SC: The State Company, 1907. Rpt. in *Life Work and Sermons of John L. Girardeau*, Sprinkle Publications, nd) 400-401. See also, “Church Boards and Presbyterianism,” *The Collected Writings of James Henley Thornwell* (Rpt. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1974) 246-247. On the nature of circumstances, see also: *The Works of John Owen*, v. 15, “Discourse Concerning Liturgies,” ed. William H. Goold (Rpt. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1966).

9. Regarding the long incorrect text, “contrary to His Word, or beside it, in matters of faith or worship,” Dr. S. W. Carruthers notes: This double error is the most important in the whole Confession. It has obscured a distinction of great significance ... The divines’ argument is this: men are free in all things directly contrary to God’s word; but, in addition, if the question is one of faith or worship, they are free in matters not stated in the word. The distinction between matters civil and religious, and the great doctrine concerning things indifferent in the ecclesiastical world, are completely obscured by the change of a single letter and an alteration of punctuation.” S. W. Carruthers, *The Westminster Confession of Faith: Being an account of the Preparation and Printing of its Seven Leading Editions, to which is appended a critical text of the Confession with notes thereon* (Manchester: R. Aikman & Son, [1937]) 127-128.

10. See the Minutes of the Assembly, 196-197. Alexander F. Mitchell and John Struthers, eds. *Minutes of the Sessions of the*

In actions or Religious means of Worship, and actions Morall, whatever is beside the Word of God, is against the Word of God; I say in Religious means, for there be means of Worship, or Circumstances Physicall, not Morall, not Religious, as whether the Pulpit be of stone or of timber, the Bell of this or this Mettall, the house of Worship stand thus or thus in Situation.

Our *Formalists* will have it in the power of rulers to Command in the matter of Worship, that which is beside the Word of God, and so is negatively Lawfull, though it be not Positively conform to Gods Word, nor Commanded or warranted by practice; which I grant is a witty way of *Romes* devising, to make entry for Religious humane Ceremonies.

Gillespie wrote the following a decade before the Assembly, which not only contains similar thoughts as the Confessional statements, but relates as well to the common usage, popularized later by men such as James Bannerman and William Cunningham, respecting the power of the civil magistrate *circa sacra* [about religion] as opposed to *in sacris* [in religion] (*EPC*, 288, 314, 316, 318):<sup>11</sup>

The church is forbidden to add anything to the commandments of God which he has given unto us, concerning his worship and service (Deut. 4:2; 12:32; Prov. 30:6); therefore she may not lawfully prescribe anything in the works of divine worship, if it be not a mere circumstance belonging to that kind of things which were not determinable by Scripture.... These *praecognita* [*things foreseen*] being now made good, come we to speak more particularly of the power of princes to make laws and ordinances about things which concern the worship of God.... But in all the Scripture princes have neither a commendable example, nor any other warrant, for the making of any innovation in religion, or for the prescribing of sacred significant ceremonies of men's devising.... Now as

touching the other sort of things which we consider in the worship of God, namely, things merely circumstantial, and such as have the very same use and respect in civil which they have in sacred actions, we hold that whensoever it happens to be the duty and part of a prince to institute and enjoin any order or policy in these circumstances of God's worship, then he may only enjoin such an order as may stand with the observing and following of the rules of the word, whereunto we are tied in the use and practice of things which are in their general nature indifferent.

These lengthy citations and definitions are given because the regulative principle of worship is often misunderstood or mischaracterized when they are ignored. For instance when the doctrine regarding circumstances is ignored, one may see questions in reaction to the regulative principle such as, "If you believe in this regulative principle then why do you use pews in public worship, since they are not mentioned in Scripture?" As William Cunningham writes, just before alluding to Confession of Faith 1.6, "Those who dislike this principle, from whatever reason, usually try to run us into difficulties by putting a very stringent construction upon it, and thereby giving it an appearance of absurdity..."<sup>12</sup> Also, without any reference to historical theology, or to the theological milieu in which the language of the Westminster Standards were drafted, the meaning of the divines may be recast and the traditional/historical meaning divorced from their foundational statements by some postmodern deconstruction of their words. This leads to statements like, "I hold to the regulative principle of the Westminster Confession of Faith, but not to the Puritan understanding of that principle."

Whether they fully understand them or not, it is true that many do reject Presbyterian views of worship. Dr. Cunningham writes of those "latitudinarians" who simply find such a principle repugnant: "Of the views generally held by the Reformers on the subject of the organization of the Church, there are two which have been always very offensive to men of a loose and latitudinarian tendency—viz. the alleged unlawfulness of introducing into the worship and government of the Church anything which is not positively warranted by Scripture, and the permanent binding obligation of a particular form of Church government..." (*Reformers and the Regulative Principle*, 38). There is also an understandable rejection of Presbyterian principles by those of an Anglican, Lutheran or similar persuasion, who profess faith in a different rule of worship, "that

*Westminster Assembly of Divines*. (Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1874).

11. James Bannerman, *The Church of Christ* (Edinburgh : T&T Clark, 1868. Rpt. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1960; and 1974) 154-155. William Cunningham, "Church Power," *Discussions on Church Principles* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1863) 230.

12. William Cunningham, "The Reformers and the Regulative Principle," in *The Reformation of the Church: A collection of Reformed and Puritan documents on Church issues* (Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1965; Rpt. 1987) 38-39. This is an extract from Cunningham's *The Reformers and the Theology of the Reformation* (The Banner of Truth Trust, 1979 Rpt) 31-46.

the Church might warrantably introduce innovations into its government and worship, which might seem fitted to be useful, provided it could not be shown that there was anything in Scripture which expressly prohibited or discountenanced them....” (*Reformers and the Regulative Principle*, 38). However, unhappily for Presbyterianism, criticism and opposition to her rule of worship has not been limited to those who subscribe to different confessions of faith, and this important doctrine has often come under fire from within her own walls. Such is the case in this day.

In particular, over the last several decades, two Presbyterian office holders have taken up the pen against the regulative principle of worship and their writings have received some currency and prominence amongst those looking for champions to overthrow this old cornerstone of Presbyterian orthodoxy. These are Professor John M. Frame, and Dean R. J. Gore. Though he claims to hold to “the basic idea of the regulative principle,” the former rejects the actual principle by redefining it away from what he believes are “the complicated Puritan amplifications of it,” while the latter challenges it directly and would “like to simply drop the regulative principle from Presbyterian theology.” (*Spirit and Truth*, 157). Since this doctrine is crucial to a healthy Presbyterianism, and as the works of these disputants are actually quite deficient to form any sufficient basis for questioning it, the following article surveys their writings and notes the key problems in their contentions with the regulative principle of worship.

In the first section dealing with the writings of John M. Frame, Dr. Frank J. Smith commences the survey by noting some of the professor’s early comments on worship from some seminary class notes from the 1970s. He then moves on to the professor’s published views on worship, observing some key problems with these, as well as noting and memorializing some of the criticisms made by others at the time of their publication. The second section begins with a rigorous critique of R. J. Gore’s doctoral dissertation, “The Pursuit of Plainness: Rethinking the Regulative Principle of Worship,” written by Dr. David C. Lachman, Dr. Smith’s co-editor of *Worship in the Presence of God*. Dr. Lachman exposes serious deficiencies in this paper, and concludes that it “completely fails to make a credible case against the Regulative Principle of Worship.” The survey concludes with a review of Dean Gore’s published work, *Covenantal Worship*, which, as the author, Dr. Smith, notes, retains many of the faults of the dissertation from which it sprang.

## The Writings of John M. Frame Against The Regulative Principle of Worship

By Frank J. Smith, Ph.D., D.D.

History undoubtedly will record that the most influential opponent of Presbyterian worship within conservative Presbyterianism in the twentieth century was John McElphatrick Frame.

Born in 1939 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, John Frame graduated from Princeton University, received his Bachelor of Divinity degree from Westminster Theological Seminary (Philadelphia) in 1964, and pursued doctoral studies at Yale University. He never completed the dissertation at Yale, however, as in 1968 he was hired to teach at Westminster Seminary. In 1980, Professor Frame moved to California to help start Westminster’s branch campus in Escondido. After two decades in California, he was called in 2000 to be a professor at Reformed Theological Seminary in Orlando, Florida. He was recently awarded the Doctor of Divinity degree by Belhaven College.

Because of his stature as a seminary theology professor, he has been able to develop and inculcate views that are far out of the mainstream of classical Reformed thought. Among the most distinctive of his views is the notion that “theology is application”—that is, even the very formulation of theological rubrics (categories) is somewhat arbitrary, and represents a human endeavor, rather than, ideally, reflecting the mind of God as revealed in Scripture.

Theology, of course, must be applied, or the result is dead orthodoxy. But theology has always been regarded as the queen of the sciences, and, as such, as objective in nature. But the professor’s reframing of the theological enterprise recasts it in a subjectivistic direction.

The implications of such are profound for theology as a whole, and it is evident that his views have profoundly affected the way in which he does theology. Indeed, Dr. Frame has promulgated his peculiar

---

THE AUTHOR: Frank J. Smith is pastor of the Covenant Reformed Presbyterian Church of Sheboygan, Wisconsin, and a contributing editor to *The Confessional Presbyterian*. Dr. Smith and Dr. Lachman co-edited the book *Worship in the Presence of God: A Collection of essays on the nature, elements, and historic views and practice of worship* (Greenville, SC: Greenville Presbyterian Theological Seminary Press, 1992).

beliefs on a wide variety of topics. But in no field of theology has this warping effect been more noticeable than the area of worship. The result is that his views regarding worship are among the most novel within putatively conservative Presbyterian circles.

#### WESTMINSTER SEMINARY: DOCTRINE OF THE CHRISTIAN LIFE CLASS NOTES

In the 1990s, Professor Frame would publish books and articles on the doctrine of worship (see below). However, at least some of his peculiar views were formulated decades before then, as witnessed in his class lectures at Westminster Seminary.

In his “Doctrine of the Christian Life” course, Mr. Frame dealt with the Ten Commandments. In conjunction with the Second Commandment, he quoted from the Westminster Confession of Faith, 21.1, regarding the regulative principle of worship, and also quoted from 20.2 (liberty of conscience in relation to faith and worship) and 1.6 (“good and necessary consequence” being equally binding as express statements of Scripture; and circumstances regarding worship and church government). Commenting upon the notion of “good and necessary consequence”, he wrote: “Worship is not limited to ‘express’ teachings of Scripture, but is based also on legitimate inferences from Scripture. That is, applications. The Confession makes no sharp distinction between the meaning of Scripture and its application, and no distinction at all between these as to their authority.”<sup>13</sup>

Before proceeding further, we would note that Professor Frame appears to have equivocated regarding his terminology. There is a profound difference between “good and necessary consequence” or “legitimate inferences” on the one hand, and “applications” on the other—particularly the way in which Mr. Frame defines “applications.” We shall see a lot more of this notion of “applications” and the blurring of terminology relative to the regulative principle in his later writings.

Commenting on the notion of circumstances of worship, the professor stated: “Whenever a question arises as to whether or not a practice is justified by the regulative principle, we must ask whether or not that practice is an ‘element’ of worship or a mere ‘circum-

stance.’ Such questions are often difficult to answer. Yet the Confession sees rightly that to apply Scripture to a situation always involves some Christian prudence, some knowledge of the situation, some extra-Scriptural premises. That cannot be avoided in worship or in life in general” (“Christian Life,” 148).

Professor Frame summarized as follows (“Christian Life,” 149):

(A) Elements of worship must be prescribed by Scripture. ‘Whatever is not commanded is forbidden.’ In Lutheranism a different principle prevails, ‘Whatsoever is not forbidden is permitted.’ Roman Catholicism is even further from the Reformed principle, claiming the right to command what Scripture neither commands nor forbids. Modernism is even worse, permitting and at times commanding what Scripture forbids.

(B) The regulative principle does not require that everything we do in worship be the response to a specific divine command. Acts performed in response to inferences from Scripture or as circumstances of worship are permitted.

Again, what we see here is a blurring of the categories. What the Westminster Seminary professor giveth in point (A), he taketh away in point (B). If the regulative principle has any meaning—and is meaningfully distinct from, say, a Lutheran formulation—the elements of worship constitute the particular acts of worship; but in this professor’s framework, particular acts may themselves be “circumstances” of worship (and therefore, by definition, not requiring a divine command).

Professor Frame went on to question the wisdom of the Westminster Confession of Faith in drawing a sharp distinction between life in general and worship in particular. After a long discussion, he finally concluded: “There are distinctions . . . between faith-worship and other human activities, but those differences are subtle, not as sharp as they are sometimes made out to be. There is a basic unity of structure among all of life’s activities in their relation to God’s law.” Again, we shall see the consequences of the professor’s thinking along these lines in his later writings on worship, and the results are not subtle.

Mr. Frame also discussed the issues of exclusive psalmody and musical instrumentation. Regarding the content of worship song, he framed the debate this way: “The logical status of song: What is song? Is it an ‘element’ of worship. . . ? A ‘circumstance?’ An aspect of

13. John M. Frame, ST 323 Doctrine of the Christian Life, Lecture Outline, Part III, §spring 1979, 148. Hereafter “Christian Life.” In this and in all subsequent citations, emphasis is in the original unless otherwise noted.

some other element?" Having set up the terms of debate according to his preferences, he argued: "We must not simply assume that it is an independent element, as, e.g., John Murray does in his minority report to the OPC General Assembly. Some argument is needed."<sup>14</sup> His position is as follows: "I maintain that song is not an independent 'element' of worship, but a form by which other elements are carried on. It is a form of prayer, praise, teaching (Col. 3:16), etc." He also argued: "If song is really a form of prayer, teaching, etc., then when we apply the regulative principle, we must ask, not what Scripture commands us to sing, but rather what Scripture commands us to pray, teach, etc. But all Christians agree that extra-Scriptural words may be used in prayer, praise, and teaching" ("Christian Life," 155-156).

Here, we can see more clearly the problem in Professor Frame's position. The regulative principle means that the particular elements or parts of worship are prescribed; but in his view, it is merely aspects (prayer, praise, teaching, exhortation, etc.) which are Biblically mandated—aspects which can come to expression in a variety of ways. Accordingly, even the reading of Scripture would not necessarily be a prescribed element of worship, since all Christians agree that extra-Scriptural words may be used in teaching. As a matter of fact, neither the reading of the Word nor the preaching of the Word could be considered to be mandated under Professor Frame's system. If it is true that whatever you may preach you may also sing, then there is nothing to prohibit someone from singing a sermon rather than preaching it.

Further confusion regarding the regulative principle is manifest in Professor Frame's consideration of the question of instrumental music. On the one hand, he appealed to various Scripture passages which mention musical instruments, in an effort to justify using them in public worship today; on the other hand, he wrote that instruments are a "circumstance" which can "provide the important function of coordinating pitch and rhythm in the singing" ("Christian Life," 157). But, a circumstance of worship is something which, by definition, is outside of Scripture; to appeal to Scripture to justify a particular practice and simultaneously to assert that that practice is a matter of circumstance, is contradictory. As will become obvious, the professor's lack of clarity regarding "circumstances" has not improved over the years.

Professor Frame concluded his discussion of musical instrumentation thusly ("Christian Life," 157):

The last point [viz., that instruments have an important role as a "circumstance"], plus the earlier Scriptural references, suggests that instrumental music is basically a form of song, just as song is a form of speech.... Instruments are an extension of the human voice. By them we praise, rejoice, etc. If this analysis is correct, then the use of instruments does not require any independent Scriptural justification. To find out what Scripture allows us to play, we ask what Scripture allows us to sing, and ultimately to speak. From this perspective, the prohibition of instruments begins to look like prohibition of microphones, hearing aids, etc. The idea that we can blow air across our vocal cords, or into electronic devices, but not through a mouthpiece, seems highly arbitrary.

Not only does Professor Frame exhibit confusion regarding the nature of a circumstance, but he also demonstrates that he does not really adhere to the regulative principle. To view the playing of an instrument, or singing and speaking, as being on a continuum (to the extent that no meaningful distinction can be drawn among them), implies that there are no particular "parts" or "elements" of worship, which in turn constitutes a denial of the regulative principle.

#### SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT THE REGULATIVE PRINCIPLE

In a 1992 article in the *Westminster Theological Journal*, Professor John Frame posed "questions" regarding the regulative principle of worship;<sup>15</sup> and in so doing, helped to demonstrate his continued misunderstanding of the principle. T. David Gordon, in a response, characterizes this article's general deficiencies:<sup>16</sup>

14. Editor's Note: See *Minority Report of the Committee on Song in the Public Worship of God Submitted to the Fourteenth General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church* (1947). The text is in the *Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Minutes of the General Assembly* (1947), 51-56. A corrected version of both the majority and minority reports, including addition of a missing line of text, is available at the OPC website at <http://www.opc.org/GA/song.html>. According to William Young, the co-signer of the minority report, it was entirely written by John Murray.

15. John M. Frame, "Some Questions about the Regulative Principle," *Westminster Theological Journal* 54 (Fall 1992) 357-366. Hereafter "Some Questions."

16. T. David Gordon, "Some Answers About the Regulative Principle," *WTJ* 55 (Fall 1993) 321-329. Hereafter "Some Answers." The author thanks Dr. Gordon for his permission to quote extensively from his reviews of the writings on worship of both Mr. Frame and Dr. Gore.

Professor John Frame very accurately entitled a recent article, “Some Questions about the Regulative Principle,” since questions, rather than solutions, dominated the article. This is not necessarily a bad thing. Often the road to cogent answers is first charted by raising cogent questions. Unfortunately, neither the questions raised nor the answers proposed were especially precise or cogent. It was never clear to this reader, for instance, *whose* regulative principle Frame was evaluating, or *whose* understanding of the “circumstances” of worship were problematic, or *why* a new category, “mode,”<sup>17</sup> was deemed necessary, since the three existing categories of Reformed worship (elements, circumstances, and forms) would appear adequate to his concerns....

Regarding whose view of the regulative principle of Worship Frame may have been addressing, Dr. Gordon complained:

It is not clear with whom Frame is debating.... The lack of specificity makes it unclear to the reader whether Frame’s difference is with historic, clearly defined understandings of the principle, or with some of the particular individuals he may have met in his lifetime, who may not represent any other individuals than themselves.... Is Frame debating the regulative principle as articulated by the Westminster Assembly, by George Gillespie, by John Owen, by James Bannerman, or by the Southern Presbyterians (Dabney, Girardeau, Thomas E. Peck)? It is not clear that his debate is with any of these, and if it is, he has misunderstood them all.

17. Regarding Gordon’s criticism of his category here, Frame writes: “As for ‘mode’ (p. 326), I do not care much about it. Take everything I said about ‘mode’ and put it under ‘circumstances,’ if that makes it clearer. My new paper does not use the ‘mode’ category. It’s a question of how you cut the pie and, of course, whether you like it *à la mode*.” John M. Frame, “Reply to T. David Gordon,” *WTJ* 56 (Spring 1994) 183. Hereafter “Reply to Gordon.” See the footnote below regarding this “new paper.”

18. Gordon remarks in a footnote: “So Bannerman, *The Church of Christ* 2.349: ‘And so, likewise, there are matters not *in* the public worship of God, but *about* the public worship of God, in regard to which the law of nature comes in. The *ceremonies* and *institutions* of Church worship are properly and distinctively matters *in sacris*; the *circumstances* of Church worship, or those that belong to it in common with the ordinary proceedings or peculiar solemnities of men, are properly and distinctively matters *circa sacra*’ (emphases his).” James Bannerman, *The Church of Christ* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1868. Rpt. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1960; and 1974).

### *Circumstances in Worship*

Frame begins his article by noting the distinction between the Calvinistic understanding of the regulative principle (“whatever is not commanded is forbidden”), and the Lutheran-Catholic counterpart (“whatever is not forbidden is permitted”). He calls the Reformed principle “RP1” and the Lutheran-Catholic principle “RP2” (“Some Questions,” 357-358). However, it is painfully apparent that he has failed to grasp the distinctiveness of Reformed worship, particularly with regard to the crucial matter of “circumstances” of worship. T. David Gordon explains (“Some Answers,” 323-324):

Frame’s understanding of “circumstances,” and how they are governed, is not (apparently) influenced by the very passage of the *Westminster Confession* he quotes.... Frame indicates an awareness of the category of “circumstances”; however, he does not define them by any common definition, but rather gives examples (“time and place of worship, use of a building, use of pews, etc.”). These are accurate *examples* of circumstances, but the lack of a precise definition leads to an incorrect understanding of how they are determined. A “circumstance” is not determined by “something like RP2.” [“Some Questions,” 359.] It is determined (in the *WCF* 1.6) clearly enough.... In Gillespie, Owen, and Bannerman the distinction is between those things that are *circa sacra* and *in sacris*.<sup>18</sup> There are things which are religious in themselves (prayer, singing praise to God), while there are things surrounding religious events (*circa*) which are not religious themselves (speaking, instructing, singing). These things are to be governed by “the light of nature, and Christian prudence,” not by “something more like RP2.”

Dr. Gordon then comments on Professor Frame’s allegation that the Westminster Assembly’s “recognition of circumstances ‘loosens the apparent force of the original principle somewhat.’” (“Some Questions,” 359; “Some Answers,” 324-325):

It is not evident to this reader, however, how the Assembly’s recognition of circumstances “loosens the apparent force of the original principle somewhat.” It does not loosen, but clarify. Those things which surround a religious service, which have no religious nature in themselves, are not to be excluded on that score. Thus, amplifying the human voice is not a reli-

gious matter; it is a matter of prudence, done in both religious and nonreligious assemblies (as is providing illumination, etc.). The Assembly did not “loosen” the regulative principle by this clarification; to the contrary, it protected against the very kind of over-restrictive proof-texting regarding every detail which Frame himself seems to wish to avoid.

One of Professor Frame’s concerns with the teaching of the Westminster Standards regarding “circumstances,” is that it may be difficult to determine the elemental from the circumstantial parts of worship. T. David Gordon pointedly notes that the regulative principle of worship is not the only doctrine that may have areas of difficulty (“Some Answers,” 325):

The doctrine of the two natures of Christ is not without difficulty, but Professor Frame is not prepared to dispense with the doctrine for that reason. Professor Van Til’s apologetic is, one might say, controversial, but this has not prevented Professor Frame from teaching such apologetics with a view toward settling the controversy. In point of fact, the practical controversy, which has threatened the peace of church life from the sixteenth century to our own, is caused by those who refuse to restrict the public worship of God to biblically revealed elements.

#### *Liberty of Conscience and Church Power*

Referring to the Westminster Confession of Faith’s position on liberty of conscience and worship, Professor Frame states (“Some Questions,” 358): “In effect, the confession tells us to follow something like RP2 in most of life’s decisions, but to follow RP1 in matters of faith and worship.” However, he has been led to “conclude that all human life is under RP1, and RP2 plays no role in biblical ethics.” (“Some Questions,” 362). As he himself puts it, not only is the Confession of Faith in error, but the Confession contradicts itself (“Some Questions,” 363):

So, both in worship and in the rest of life, we should adopt RP1: “Whatever is not commanded is forbidden.” Whenever we are not carrying out (rightly applying) a biblical command, we are committing sin (cf. Rom 14:23).

To say this is to say that the “eloquent semicolon” of WCF 20.2 is misplaced.<sup>19</sup> I say this, not because I believe that the passage is too strict in its view of wor-

ship, but because I believe it not strict enough in its conception of how the commandments bear upon everyday life. Of course, elsewhere in the Westminster standards, particularly WCF 1.6, which we have quoted, there is a very strong view of the sufficiency of Scripture for all of life.

Does 1.6, then, contradict 20.2? I think it does, because the writers of 20.2 did not, evidently, think through the concept of application as I have tried to set it forth above. Paragraph 20.2 tells us that we are free (in everyday life) from commandments of men that run contrary to Scripture, and that in addition we are free (in the areas of faith and worship) from any commandments beside Scripture. But in one sense, we are always free from commandments beside Scripture, not only in ‘faith and worship.’ Scripture alone is our ultimate rule, in all areas of life. Of course, Scripture itself calls us to be subject to lesser authorities (both, incidentally, in worship and elsewhere); but when those lesser authorities command contrary to the will of God, we may and must disobey them. And when they command something ‘beside’ Scripture, then we may not accept that as something ultimately authoritative. If someone claims to give commands equal to Scripture in force and authority, we must deny those claims. We are ‘free’ of them—in worship or life in general.

I can certainly endorse what 20.2 actually says, namely, that we are free from commands contrary to Scripture in any area of life and free from commands beside Scripture in worship. But I would go further than the confession does here in asserting our liberty from extrabiblical revelation (following the lead of the confession’s own teaching at 1.6). So, though rejecting the semicolon and the thought behind it, I do not believe I am contravening the system of doctrine taught in the confession.

For someone who is given over to tri-perspectivalism, Professor Frame’s allegation that the Westminster Confession contradicts itself at chapters 1.6 and 20.2 is perhaps no difficulty. However, for those who hold to basic rules of logic (such as the law of non-contradiction), this allegation would create problems with regard to one’s theological system and doctrinal subscription.

19. Editor’s note: The original punctuation here is indeed a semicolon. See the Editor’s introduction.

The professor speculates “the writers of 20.2 did not, evidently, think through the concept of application as I have tried to set it forth above.” Evidently!?! Or perhaps it is because Frame rejects and/or fails to understand the theological categories of the Assembly, which at least two of their members (Gillespie and Rutherford), were quite articulate in defending (see the editor’s introduction to this article).<sup>20</sup>

In the discussion between the two sparring professors, T. David Gordon comments on Frame’s understanding of WCF 20.2 and his ignoring the whole backdrop of the nature of church power in the historic statement of the regulative principle (“Some Answers,” 323, 327-328):

It appears that Frame is unfamiliar with the relevant writings of the authors mentioned above, for if he were, he could hardly have missed the point so significant to them all: the issue that gave birth to the regulative principle was the nature and limits of church power. The issue was not, for them, “worship” versus “the rest of life,” but “those aspects of life governed by the church officers” versus those aspects of life not governed by the church officers. Bannerman, for instance, says this about WCF 1.6 [Bannerman, 1.337]: “The direct object of the Confession in this passage is no doubt to assert the right and extent of liberty of conscience; but along with that, it very distinctly enunciates the doctrine, that neither in regard to faith nor in regard to worship has the Church any authority beside or beyond what is laid down in the Bible; and that it has no right to decree and enforce new observances or institutions in the department of Scriptural worship, any more than to teach and inculcate new truths in the department of Scriptural faith....”

Frame attempts to establish a hermeneutic free from the (mis)perceived “difficulty” of the regulative principle, whereby he would subject all of life to a common hermeneutic, requiring positive warrant from

God’s Word. Note, however, the equivocation that occurs when he attempts to establish such an alternative. Frame changes the Assembly’s “free from any commandments which are *beside* scripture,” if in faith or worship, into any command which assumes *ultimate authority*; [“Some Questions,” 363] but these are not the same things. The civil magistrate, for instance, would not necessarily assume ultimate authority in requiring a speed limit of fifty-miles mph. Are we free from this command? For the Assembly, the answer is “no,” because while it is “beside” Scripture, in the sense that Scripture does not address the speed-limit question, it is not a matter of faith or worship. But for Frame, it is not clear what his answer would be, and it may demonstrate the impossibility (or meaninglessness) of his RP1 over all of life theory; everything would get swallowed up in giving glory to God, but nothing more specific could be said. The Assembly said nothing about the degree of “ultimacy” given to the law; for them, the only issue was whether it was “beside” the Scripture, regardless of ultimacy, in areas of faith or worship....

Frame’s divorcing of this doctrine from its matrix in the doctrine of the nature and extent of church power leads to the not surprising conclusion of affirming RP1 “while denying that this principle for worship is any different from the principle by which God governs other areas of human life.” [“Some Questions,” 366]. One can only imagine the consequences of this: the church can require of anybody anything not prohibited in Scripture, a position with which the Anglicans would have been most happy and the Westminster Assembly most hapless. That question so crucial to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (the limits of church power as regards liberty of conscience) would completely evaporate. If any individual could argue that some act in some way brought glory to God, then, by Frame’s reasoning, the church could require this to be done as an act of corporate worship. Yet, it takes only a few steps of argument *ad absurdum* to demonstrate the fallacy. Presumably, for instance, the man who is “fully convinced in his own mind” (Rom 14:5) is free to observe a day as religiously distinct. Yet, for Paul (but not for Frame) this individual is not free to do *anything* (put it in a bulletin) which might induce another to observe such a day contrary to his own conscience. As another (admittedly absurd) example, giving my children a bath before bedtime is a matter which I believe gives glory to God (and a much-deserved rest to their mother!). It promotes their health,

20. Editor’s note: The Assembly assigned the topic of “Christian Liberty” to the first committee on November 18, 1645, and the subject received about thirty days of debate within the full Assembly, including thirteen days over the first quarter of 1645/46 and twelve days in October. Debate was concluded and the chapter approved on October 30, 1646. See: B. B. Warfield, “The Westminster Assembly and its Work,” *Works* vol. 6 (Rpt. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1981) 112. The first committee contained around thirty-five divines, counting the Scottish Commissioners, and as initially set up included such men as Palmer, Bridge, Goodwin, Ley, Gouge, Sedgwick, Nye, Tuckney, and Dr. Burges. Many of these members wrote extensively and were noted theologians. *Minutes*, lxxxv.

it calms them down for bedtime, and is “good, clean fun.” However, as an officer in the church, I cannot bring a bathtub into our service of worship, place the girls in it, and give them a bath “to the glory of God,” *requiring others* to observe the rite. In fact, Frame’s own example makes a pretty good *ad absurdum* argument. He says: “Buying cabbages, like all human actions, is a matter of concern to God,” and he goes on to indicate that cabbage-buying is an activity addressed by the Word of God, citing 1 Cor 10:31. [“Some Questions,” 362]. Since that is so, and since he wishes to have no different hermeneutic governing the worship of God than that which governs other aspects of life, would Professor Frame suggest that cabbage-buying is a lawful element of Christian worship? Can it possibly be that a professor of Christian theology finds biblical mandate for cabbage-buying as an act of Christian worship, but does not find biblical mandate for preaching in Christian worship? [“Some Questions,” 366 n10].

#### *The Regulative Principle versus All of Life*

Professor Frame claims to “reaffirm the regulative principle in the form RP1, while denying that this principle for worship is any different from the principle by which God governs other areas of human life.” (“Some Questions,” 366). He states that his perspective “serves as a warning against applying RP1 in a wooden manner, such as by demanding specific proof texts to justify worship practices. That sort of wooden approach does have some precedent in Scripture; it is not wrong to find something like this approach in connection with the tabernacle/temple/sacrificial worship. But it is not a rule for worship in general any more than for the rest of life.” (“Some Questions,” 366)

But although he professes not to have betrayed the system of doctrine contained in the Westminster Standards, that is precisely what he has done. Without a sharp distinction between life in general and worship in particular, there is no regulative principle as historically understood and maintained by the Puritan forefathers. T. David Gordon rightly concludes (“Some Answers,” 329):

That there may be many questions properly raised about the *contemporary* misunderstanding of the regulative principle does not imply that the *traditional* understanding (Frame’s stated concern) needs adjustment. If there is to be intelligent, ultimately fruitful discussion of the Reformed understanding of

worship, such discussion must have sufficient respect for the Reformed tradition to engage the significant, published expressions of that tradition. If Frame had engaged such literature, he could hardly have failed to put the question differently than he did. The regulative principle of worship does not address worship as distinguished from the rest of life. It addresses what an individual may do, obliging no one else, as distinguished from what the church officers may require of the assembled saints. It is not clear in his article that Frame has familiarized himself with “traditional ways of understanding the principle.” Therefore his comments do not contribute significantly to a discussion of the Reformed *tradition’s* understanding of worship.

#### *Professor Frame’s Reply to Professor Gordon*

John Frame replied briefly to T. David Gordon’s Answers to his Questions (“Reply to T. David Gordon”). In this reply he first defers, in response to the question of cogency, to an unpublished paper “on the regulative principle which is longer, and I think more cogent, than ‘Some Questions.’ It poses some additional questions and provides, I think, a few answers as well.” He invited *WTJ* readers to write and obtain a copy. This was a paper the professor submitted to the PCA’s Mission to North America, entitled “The Lordship of Christ and the Regulative Principle of Worship,” which, along with another paper, he would later expand into the book *Worship in Spirit and Truth*, to be noticed next in this survey (*Spirit and Truth*, xvi-xvii).<sup>21</sup>

#### *Whose Regulative Principle?*

In response to Dr. Gordon’s question as to which and to whose view of the regulative principle he was responding, Professor Frame replied that he was responding to then current discussions of the topic but would not name names, and left it to the reader to determine with whom he was dealing (“Reply to Gordon,” 181-182).

Gordon first asks me to identify my opponents more precisely. I respectfully decline. I will say in general that my article was directed toward current discussions within the churches rather than toward the

21. John Frame, “The Lordship of Christ and the Regulative Principle of Worship,” written for the Worship Task Force of the Committee on Mission to North America, PCA. Unpublished.

deliberations and writings of the Westminster Divines themselves. Gordon knows whom I am talking about, for he identified one of the individuals in private correspondence, and he admits in his article that I am “not entirely tilting at windmills” (p. 329). I suspect, therefore, that readers interested in these matters can also identify my targets. Beyond that, I will not “name names.” There is too much of that in the Christian community. If the shoe fits, anyone may wear it. If it fits nobody, then feel free to discard my article.

If I were writing a historical paper or a critique of the specific views of an individual, I would have supplied names and quotes. But in “Some Questions,” my purpose was rather to raise questions and tentatively to put forth a thesis. Academic niceties aside, I did not feel that for this purpose it was necessary for me to interact with anybody. As to whether I have been attacking straw men, I will leave it to the reader to decide.

Gordon says that this matter must be discussed “only within a history-of-doctrine framework” (p. 329). I disagree. I invite him and others to do historical studies, which doubtless will have their value. But mere historical studies do not tell us where the truth lies. For the Reformed scholar, the truth is to be found only through study of Scripture. That point is an application of the very regulative principle we are discussing. In fact, I think that recent theology in orthodox Reformed circles has been *too* “historical” in its approach, to the point where the regulative principle has been lost sight of....

I will then set aside Gordon’s comments to the effect that the Divines themselves were not subject to my criticisms. I did not intend my paper to be a critique of the Divines. Evidently Gordon thinks that any reference to “traditional views” must be a reference to the Divines (p. 329). I do not use the phrase that way. In my vocabulary, the “Reformed tradition” is the whole history of Reformed thinking on the subject, from the sixteenth century to the present. It includes both the seminal views of the Divines and the (to my mind debatable) views of current Reformed churchmen. For the record, let me say that I am not “unfamiliar” (p. 323) with the writings of the Westminster Divines.

Regardless of whether “Some Questions” is less cogent than it could have been, what should be obvious is that Professor Frame’s failure to clearly define his terms (e.g., “traditional view”) and to identify what ‘contem-

porary’ view he was engaging, simply leaves matters in a state of confusion. Which is it? Is the professor rejecting some modern misunderstanding of the principle, as he sees it? Or is he in reality actually rejecting the ‘seminal’ view of the Westminster Assembly itself? Frame would later write, “... I believe that the basic idea of the regulative principle, apart from the complicated Puritan amplifications of it, is scriptural” (*Spirit and Truth*, 157). But the Westminster Assembly was a gathering of Puritan theologians! Apparently, not only does the professor wish to let others do historical studies, he will *ignore* the historical-theological context of the Assembly’s determinations as well.

In addition, Mr. Frame declares that he was not responding or interacting with the views of the Westminster divines, nor criticizing them. But what are the allegations that the Westminster Confession of Faith is contradictory, and that the Westminster Assembly did not ‘think through the concept of application like I have done,’ if not criticism? The professor’s response that he was not unfamiliar “with the writings of the Westminster Divines,” would appear to be a tacit admission that he was indeed unfamiliar with the writings on the subject by Owen, Bannerman, Dabney, Girardeau, and Peck (“Some Answers,” 323; “Reply to Gordon,” 183).

The balance of Professor Frame’s reply is devoted to Professor Gordon’s point regarding the centrality of church power to the issue of the regulative principle and to the doctrine of liberty of conscience. He writes:

Well, I did not use the quoted phrase, but it should not be too difficult for readers of my article to see the implications of my position for liberty of conscience. Since I believe that all of life is under the regulative principle, I believe that liberty of conscience also exists equally within all aspects of human life. In all of life, we follow *sola Scriptura* and therefore recognize no human authority on the same level as Scripture. All of life is therefore governed by divine commands, though the specific applications are to be made by “the light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the Word, which are always to be observed” (*Westminster Confession of Faith* 1.6). Thus the distinction between “elements” and “circumstances” is the same in other areas of life as it is in worship. Indeed, I believe that 1.6 of the *Confession* itself applies this principle to all of life.

Of course this view does not imply that there are no

differences among spheres as to God's specific directives. Government and church are both under the same regulative principle, but there are differences in what God has commanded for each. God has, for example, given to government the power of the sword, which he has not given to the church. Indeed, nothing in my argument would rule out the possibility of specific divine directives concerning worship, as distinguished from other human activities. Therefore I am not forced to say, as Gordon thinks, that the church could require us to bathe children at a worship service (p. 328).

### WORSHIP IN SPIRIT AND TRUTH

Four years after the article in the *Westminster Theological Journal*, Professor Frame encapsulated his ideas in a book entitled, *Worship in Spirit and Truth: A Refreshing Study of the Principles and Practice of Biblical Worship*. Several reviews appeared at the time which noted the many problems in the author's handling of the regulative principle.

#### *General Problems in Frame's Work*

Rev. Brian Schwertley, a prolific author on matters regarding Presbyterian worship, commends and then condemns Frame's book thus:<sup>22</sup>

John Frame ... has written a book that both defends and sets forth the worship paradigm of most [of] modern "conservative" Presbyterianism. Before analyzing many of the fundamental assertions of Frame's book, this author would like to commend Frame for a number of things. First, the book, *Worship in Spirit and in Truth*, is well written and organized. Second, Frame has tackled a subject that is very important and hardly addressed in this century. Third, Frame is strongly committed to biblical inerrancy and the absolute authority of the Bible. Although Frame's book has some commendable aspects, it must be condemned over-all as a serious departure from the standard, historical understanding of Reformed worship. What is particularly disturbing regarding Frame's book is that he abandons the Westminster Standards, yet presents himself as a champion of the regulative principle.

Dr. Joseph A. Pipa, Jr. assesses the general problems in this way:<sup>23</sup>

There are numerous methodological problems with this book. Prof. Frame tells us that he will give an exegetical reinterpretation of the regulative principle. He leaves for another time a discussion of earlier exegesis of the principle. But when one departs so radically from accepted exegesis he needs to interact with that exegesis. Furthermore, the great majority of the few historical references Mr. Frame makes are not accurate. For example, he asserts that the Puritan approach to worship was minimalistic and went far beyond the statement of the doctrine in the Westminster standards. He says, "very little of the Puritan theology of worship" is found in the Westminster standards (xii). An assertion does not make something true. If Prof. Frame is going to make such a suggestion, he needs to validate. Chapters 1, 20, 21 of the Confession; L.C. Q. 107-110, 154-196; and S.C. Q. 49-52, 89-107 are a very thorough statement of the Puritan and Reformed theology of worship and the Directory of Worship only applies the principles found in the standards. Most modern proponents of the principle are content to limit themselves to its expressions in the standards. Furthermore, Mr. Frame tends to isolate the Puritans as if they were more narrow in their understanding of the regulative principle than Calvin or the Dutch reformed. This is a false dichotomy (e.g., Heidelberg Catechism 96, "What does God require in the second commandment? We are not to make an image of God in any way, nor to worship Him in any other manner than He has commanded in His word"; cf. Belgic Confession, Article 32; and Calvin, *The Necessity of Reforming the Church*).

On the other hand, Mr. Frame's exegetical basis for his views is at best scanty. This problem is most telling in his failure to discuss the relation of the regulative principle to the Second Commandment, which is the basis on which all Reformed exegetes from Calvin through the Puritans developed the principle. Likewise, he fails

22. Brian Schwertley, "The Neo-Presbyterian Challenge to Confessional Presbyterian Orthodoxy: A Biblical Analysis of John Frame's *Worship in Spirit and in Truth*." <http://www.reformed.com/pub/frame.htm>. We note here, that since Professor Frame's book factors greatly in the ongoing discussion of worship within Presbyterianism, the lack of a subject/author index is regrettable.

23. Dr. Joseph Pipa, Review: "Worship in Spirit and Truth," *Presbyterian & Reformed News* v. 2, #4 [Fall 1996] 10-11. Used with permission of Presbyterian International News Service. At the time of his review, Dr. Pipa was a colleague of Professor Frame at Westminster Theological Seminary in California. He is now president at Greenville Presbyterian Theological Seminary, where he is also professor of historical and systematic theology.

to discuss the relation of key NT passages such as John 4:20-24 and Col. 2:23.

### *Frame's Statement of The Regulative Principle*

Professor Frame begins his book by asking the question, "What is worship?", and the answer given is: "Worship is *the work of acknowledging the greatness of our covenant Lord*" (*Spirit and Truth*, 1). The professor writes that "true worship is saturated with reminders of God's covenant lordship. We worship to honor his mighty acts, to hear his authoritative word, and to fellowship with him personally as the one who has made us his people. When we are distracted from our covenant Lord and preoccupied with our own comforts and pleasures, something has gone seriously wrong. As my former pastor, Dick Kaufmann, says, when we leave worship, we should first ask, not 'What did I get out of it?' But 'How did I do in my work of honoring the Lord?'" (*Spirit and Truth*, 5).

After treating worship in Old and New Testaments, Professor Frame turns to "The Rules for Worship," and a discussion of the regulative principle of worship. The professor notes that, in contrast to Roman Catholics, Episcopalians, and Lutherans, "Presbyterian and Reformed churches ... have employed a stronger principle: whatever Scripture does not command is forbidden. Here, Scripture has more than veto power; its function is essentially positive. On this view, Scripture must positively require a practice, if that practice is to be suitable for the worship of God" (*Spirit and Truth*, 38).

After quoting from the Westminster Confession of Faith, chapter 21.1, Mr. Frame writes: "The operative word is 'prescribed.' Eventually this restriction of worship to what God prescribes became known as the 'regulative principle' of Reformed and Presbyterian worship" (*Spirit and Truth*, 39).

### *Definitional Changes*

However, having enunciated the Confessional principle, Professor Frame promptly, and subtly, begins to render it meaningless. He does so, as we have seen before, by making the "regulative principle" apply to all of life ("worship in the broad sense", to use his nomenclature); and by carving out the novel category of "application" which allows for human innovation.

24. Kevin Reed, "Presbyterian Worship: Old and New: A Review and Commentary upon *Worship in Spirit and Truth*." <http://www.all-of-grace.org/pub/others/regulativeprinciple.html>.

### *Under the Circumstances*

In presenting his category of "application," the professor again tangles with the concept of "circumstances of worship," in order to reject the term in favor of his new concept, and does not display any apparent benefit from his exchange with T. David Gordon, or from the number of works listed in his bibliography. He writes (*Spirit and Truth*, 40-41):

What are these 'circumstances'? The confession does not define the term, except to say that they are 'common to human actions and societies.' Some of the Puritans and Scottish Presbyterians, trying to further explain this idea, taught that circumstances were secular matters, of no actual religious significance. But surely, in God's world, nothing is purely secular; nothing is entirely devoid of religious significance. That follows from the fact that in one sense worship is all of life. The time and place of a meeting, for instance, are not religiously neutral. Decisions about such matters must be made to the glory of God. The elders of a church would not be exercising godly rule if they tried to force all the members to worship at 3:00 AM! ... Although it is 'common to human actions and societies' to make decisions about meeting times and places, the decision nevertheless has religious significance in the context of the church. The divines understood this, and so they insisted that all these decisions be made 'according to the general rules of the Word.'

In response to this we first refer the reader back to the definitions and citations presented in the editor's introduction to this article. The publisher and writer Kevin Reed, in his review of Frame's book, provides a succinct rebuttal to Frame's comments on "circumstances of worship":<sup>24</sup>

He then moves to a section of applications, asking, "Is there, then, no role for human thought, planning, or decisions, in the worship of God?" (p. 40). He provides a negative assessment of some (unnamed) Puritans and Scottish Presbyterians who supposedly drew a sharp distinction between secular and sacred matters. Yet, the Puritans or Scots did not claim that decisions on circumstances were purely secular; rather, circumstances may be considered indifferent matters considered abstractly, but they obtain a sacred significance when implemented in some way for the service of God.

Mr. Frame continued on the subject of circumstances of worship (*Spirit and Truth*, 41-43):

I agree with the confession that there is room for human judgment in matters that are “common to human actions and societies.” But I do not believe that that is the only legitimate sphere of human judgment. In my view, the term best suited to describe the sphere of human judgment is not *circumstance*, but *application*. Typically, Scripture tells us what we should do in general and then leaves us to determine the specific by our own sanctified wisdom, according to the general rules of the Word. Determining the specifics is what I call “application.”

Unlike the term *circumstance*, the term *application* naturally covers both types of examples I have mentioned. Applications include such matters as the time and place of worship: Scripture tells us to meet, but not when and where—so we must use our own judgment. Similarly, Scripture tells us to pray, but does not dictate to us all the specific words we should use—so we need to decide. As you can see, the sphere of application includes some matters that are “common to human actions and societies” and some matters that are not....

In everyday life, I am never free from God’s commands. When I am obeying the Lord, everything I do is done in obedience to divine commands. Some commands, of course, are more general; others are more specific. “Do it all for the glory of God (1 Cor. 10:31) is general; “do this in remembrance of me: (1 Cor. 11:24), referring to the Lord’s Supper, is relatively specific. By the process of application, I make the general commands specific and the specific commands more so.

Thus understood, the regulative principle for worship is no different from the principles by which God regulates all of our life. That is to be expected, because, as we have seen, worship is in an important sense, all of life. In both cases, “whatever is not commanded is forbidden”—everything we do must be done in obedience to God’s commands. In both cases, application determines the specifics in accordance with the general principles of the word....

I am aware that traditional Presbyterian statements of the regulative principle typically draw a much sharper distinction than I have drawn between worship services and the rest of life. The Westminster Confession,

for example, states that in all of life we are free from any ‘doctrines and commandments of men’ that are ‘contrary to’ God’s word, but that in ‘matters of faith or worship,’ we are also free from doctrines and commandments that are ‘beside’ the word (20.2).

My own formulation does not contradict the confession, but goes beyond it. In my view, we are free from anything ‘beside’ the word, not only in ‘matters of faith, or worship,’ but in all other areas of life as well. In all areas of life, we are subject to biblical commands. Scripture alone is ‘given by inspiration of God to be the rule of faith and life,’ as the confession indicates (1.2). Human wisdom may never presume to *add* to its commands. The only job of human wisdom is to *apply* those commands to specific situations.”

Dr. Pipa writes on these new unconfessional views:

In defending his new definition he confuses both circumstances and forms of worship with elements. The Westminster Confession does not define circumstances as applications of “elements,” but as things that help perform the elements of worship. “Forms” are the precise content of an element—for example, which song to be sung or whether to use common prayer in addition to free prayer. Dr. T. David Gordon has helpfully written of the contrast: “Similarly, if we agree that prayers are to be offered (as elements), it is a ‘circumstantial’ consideration as to how many prayers we will have, and a ‘formal’ consideration as to which particular prayers to include (for instance, whether to pray ‘The Lord’s Prayer,’ or not is a ‘formal’ consideration).”

Further, Frame fails to distinguish between the broad and narrow sense of worship in his application of the principle. “Thus understood, the regulative principle for worship is no different from the principles by which God regulates all of our life” (42). He concludes, since in broad worship Scripture allows us to apply the specific commands to our circumstances, then we may do the same in narrow worship. As he freely admits, this goes beyond the distinction made in WCF 20:2 (“God alone is lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in any thing contrary to his word, or beside it, in matters of faith or worship”). He claims not to contradict the Confession but to go beyond. But the Confession defines the regulative principle purely in matters of corporate worship and government and not

broad worship. His new interpretation clearly contradicts the standards.

We agree with Dr. Pipa, as we have indicated previously on this score, that by going beyond the Confession of Faith, Professor Frame has indeed modified the meaning of the regulative principle. Clearly, the Confessional Standards, with regard to both the doctrines of worship and liberty of conscience, *do* make a sharp delineation between life in general and worship in particular. The regulative principle means that the actual elements or practices of worship, not bare principles of worship, are prescribed. But if the application of Christian liberty in matters of worship and doctrine is equated with the application of Christian liberty to life in general, then there is no basis for specific “elements” of worship (since, in life in general, the application of Biblical principles will lead to varying expressions of obedience).

Professor Frame concludes the chapter on “The Rules for Worship” by stating that: (*Spirit and Truth*, 45-46).

... the regulative principle limits what we may do in worship, but it also allows different sorts of applications, and therefore a significant area of liberty. Different churches legitimately apply God’s commands in different ways. God commands us to sing; some churches may apply that command by singing three hymns in their services, others four. Some may sing primarily traditional hymns, others contemporary songs. God commands us to pray. Some churches may have one prayer, led by the minister, or many, led by members of the congregation. As we shall see more clearly in subsequent chapters, there is quite a large role in worship for human judgment, for human creativity, operating within the limits of God’s word.

Certainly, the regulative principle should not be used, as some have used it, to enforce traditionalism in worship. Both in Scripture and in church history, the regulative principle has been a powerful weapon *against* the imposition of human traditions in the worship of God. Consider again the protests of Isaiah (Isa. 29:13) and Jesus (Matt. 15:8-9) against those who placed human traditions on the same level as Scripture. Also consider again the protests of the Puritans against those who claimed the right to impose ceremonies without scriptural warrant.

Certainly, the regulative principle is a charter of free-

dom, not a burdensome bondage. The regulative principle sets us free from human traditions, to worship God his way. It limits our choices in the way a fish is limited to its watery habitat. When we break out of those limits, we discover death awaiting us, not freedom. To deny the regulative principle is to rebel against our loving Creator and then, paradoxically, to find ourselves in miserable bondage to human dogmatism.

In the remainder of this book, therefore, I will not urge anyone to conform to the Puritan style of worship or to any other style. In that respect, this book will be rather unusual, compared to most other worship books! Rather, I shall present the regulative principle as one that sets us free, within limits, to worship God in the language of our own time, to seek those applications of God’s commandments which most edify worshipers in our contemporary cultures. We must be both more conservative and more liberal than most students of Christian worship: conservative in holding exclusively to God’s commands in Scripture as our rule of worship, and liberal in defending the liberty of those who apply those commandments in legitimate, though nontraditional, ways.

In his review, Dr. Pipa comments on Frame’s inconsistent terminology:

Moreover, when he applies the new principle, he says that the regulative principle may not be used “to enforce traditionalism in worship” (45). Again Mr. Frame fails to define his terms. He uses the term “traditionalism” here as worship that is invented by men, while throughout the book he uses the term for the approach that carefully applies the regulative principle to all the elements of worship. Thus, he gives the impression that those whom he opposes are worshipping by man-made traditions.

#### *Frame’s Rejection of Elements of Worship*

Having repudiated the foundation of the regulative principle, Professor Frame, in his chapter “What to Do in Worship,” proceeds to gut the principle in its entirety. With regard to the Puritan (and Westminster Confessional) notion of “parts” or “elements” of worship, he writes that “there are serious problems with this approach. The most serious problem is that there is no scriptural warrant for it! Scripture nowhere divides worship up into a series of independent

‘elements,’ each requiring independent scriptural justification. Scripture nowhere tells us that the regulative principle demands that particular level of specificity, rather than some other” (*Spirit and Truth*, 53).

The professor contends that the New Testament (*Spirit and Truth*, 54):

... gives us no systematic or exhaustive list of the events that were authorized for such services [of public worship]. Certainly it gives us no list of elements in the technical sense of Puritan theology—actions requiring specific scriptural authorization, as opposed to circumstances or applications that do not.

Another problem with the concept of elements of worship is that the things we do in worship are not always clearly distinguishable from one another. Singing and teaching, for example, are not distinct from one another. When we sing hymns with biblical content, we teach one another (Col. 3:16). And many hymns are also prayers and creeds. Prayers with biblical content contain teaching. The entire service is prayer, since it is uttered in the present of God, to his praise. Perhaps it would be better to speak of “aspects” of worship, rather than “elements” or “parts.”

However, if there are no particular “elements” of worship, but merely “aspects” which may be expressed in a variety of ways, then what, pray tell, is left of the regulative principle? How does Mr. Frame’s position differ substantially from the Lutheran or Anglican view?

Further confirming the confusion exhibited, Professor Frame claims that the “New Testament does not give us an exhaustive list of what was and was not done at early Christian meetings. However, as in the case of the Old Testament synagogue, we may, by appeal to broad theological principles, gain assurance as to what God wants us to do when we gather in his name” (*Spirit and Truth*, 55).

Regarding the cursory way in which Frame handles the concept of elements of worship, Dr. Pipa writes:

But the Westminster Confession of Faith is quite clear on elements (21:3-5). Bannerman says: “The scriptures are the only rule for worship, as truly as they are the only rule for the Church in any other department of her duties. And the Scriptures are sufficient for that purpose; for they contain a directory for worship, either expressly inculcated, or justly to be inferred from its statements sufficient for the guidance of the Church

in every necessary part of worship” (*The Church of Christ*, I, 368).

Not only does Frame differ from the standards, but he also neglects to interact with the exegetical principles that Calvin and the Puritans used to determine the elements—principles that are summarized in the Westminster Confession I, 6: “The whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man’s salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from scripture.” Bannerman offers three guidelines for determining elements: explicit commands (Eph. 5:19; 2 Tim. 4:2); NT examples (Acts 2:42); and general principles (theological inference) drawn from scripture (use of benediction or placing Baptism in corporate worship) (I, 368).

In rejecting “elements” of worship, Kevin Reed makes clear that Mr. Frame has rejected portions of WCF 21 as well as the earlier Reformation creeds:

It is important to realize that, in rejecting the idea of elements (or parts) of worship, Frame has undermined sections 3-6 of chapter 21 of the Westminster Confession. The Confession specifically uses the term “part” or “parts” three times within these sections, in its description of worship. Therefore, to reject the concept of parts to worship, is to reject the teaching of the Confession.

Moreover, as we have seen, the concept of *parts* of worship is much older than the Puritans. It is interwoven within numerous Reformed creeds and advocated by writers from the outset of the Reformation. Thus, Mr. Frame has not only dismissed the Puritans, and the Confession; in his self-proclaimed wisdom, he has also cast off the teachings of the Reformers.

#### *Mr. Frame’s “Things to do in Worship”*

Professor Frame proceeds to develop a “list of things to do in worship.” His list includes Greetings and Benedictions, Reading of Scripture, Preaching and Teaching, Charismatic Prophecy and Speaking in Tongues,<sup>25</sup> Prayer, Song, Vows, Confession of Faith, Sacraments, Church Discipline, Collections/Offerings,

25. Professor Frame does note that Charismatic Prophecy and Speaking in Tongues, although part of New Testament worship, “were special gifts of God for the founding of the church and should not be expected in our time.”

and Expressions of Fellowship (*Spirit and Truth*, 55-60). However, these categories do not fit with standard definitions.

For example, not only does he equate “preaching” and “teaching,” but he further confuses matters when he attempts to justify “drama” as a form of “preaching” (*Spirit and Truth*, 93):

When God gives us a general command (in this case the command to preach the word), and is silent on some aspect of its specific application, we may properly make those applications ourselves, within the general rules of Scripture. The questions before us, then, are whether drama is legitimately a form of preaching or teaching, and whether there are any scriptural teachings that would rule it out as a means of communicating the word. I would answer yes to the first question, and no to the second....

God often teaches his people through drama. The book of Job, the Old Testament sacrifices and feasts, and the New Testament sacraments are reenactments of God’s great works of redemption. As we have seen, the traditional liturgy has continued this process of reenactment for many centuries, so drama in worship is nothing new.

If we grant that the word can be preached or taught by more than one speaker, that teaching can take place through dialogue, and that teaching inevitably has dramatic elements, then we cannot object to drama as a form of teaching.

Dr. Pipa observes the following regarding Professor Frame’s views of Preaching and Drama in worship services:

I also disagree with blurring the distinction between corporate worship and other occasions on which teaching or fellowship occur. Moreover, he fails to see the unique role of preaching (*kerusso*) as verbal, public proclamation by one commissioned to that task by Christ and thus defines all kinds of instruction and verbal communication as preaching. More seriously, he includes drama as a kind of preaching. In doing so, he blurs distinctions and equivocates. He fails to note the difference between the dramatic element in speaking, and drama. He confuses illustrations or Jesus quoting people in a parable with drama. He fails to distinguish between prophetic revelatory actions and drama.

Regarding Vows, the professor claims that they not only are involved in the sacraments, becoming church members, ordination, and marriage, but that they are involved “indeed, more broadly, [in] the consecration of our lives to God’s purposes. All public worship includes the congregation’s vow to serve Christ as Lord” (*Spirit and Truth*, 57). But, if vowing includes everything in life, then how is it a distinct act of worship?

We could note other ambiguities and outright errors in Professor Frame’s “list.” However, we will at this point simply concentrate on the final item, viz., “Expressions of Fellowship.” Here, he sets forth his belief that “worship has both vertical and horizontal aspects—that in worship we should be concerned above all for God’s glory, but also for our fellow worshipers as our brothers and sisters in Christ.” In his opinion, fellowship meals, holy kisses, and announcements can be appropriate for worship. Beyond that, he writes: “It is not wrong in worship to honor human beings, as long as that honor does not compromise the supreme honor due to the Lord. Nor is it wrong for the congregation to express that honor with a song, applause, hand holding, or hugs” (*Spirit and Truth*, 59-60).

At this point, one hardly knows what to say. It is, to say the least, breathtaking to think that a Reformed theologian would suggest that, in worship, honor ought to be offered to mere mortals. However, we are certain that the Lord of the universe has some definite—and very condemnatory—thoughts about the offering of praise to men during a time that is to be reserved for the worship of God.

Professor Frame’s peculiar perspective also has led him to countenance female leadership in worship, and, apparently, leaves the door wide open for the religious observance of Christmas and other holy days (*Spirit and Truth*, 64-66; 75 n4). He also contends that liturgical dancing is kosher: “God is pleased when we dance before him in worship, but he does not expect us to do it every time we meet in his name.... [I]t is not a ‘necessary element’ of worship, but something that provides enrichment of worship from time to time.” Encouraging the clapping of hands and lifting up of hands in public worship, Professor Frame claims that these also constitute “‘music of the body.’ God wants body as well as spirit to be engaged in his worship.” He writes (*Spirit and Truth*, 131-132):

If people want to stand up and move rhythmically to the songs of praise, they should be encouraged to do so. Dance in worship is first of all the simple, natural, physical dimension of the reverent joy we share

in Christ. Most of us, even those who are not very demonstrative in our worship, find it natural to sway, however slightly, to the rhythm of the songs we sing. That movement itself is a simple form of dance. If that is justifiable, who is to draw the line to show precisely how much movement is permitted? And if such simple movements are justifiable, why not greater movement, especially in light of the biblical references to dance?

Dr. Pipa, commenting on this commendation of dance in worship, concludes:

One other serious problem is his defense of liturgical dance. He admits that God does not prescribe dance. He dismisses the application of the regulative principle as a means of preserving the status quo and concludes that even though God does not prescribe dance, he “is pleased when we dance before him in worship” (131). In reaching this conclusion he violates his own principle expressed in chapter three that since all Old Testament worship is fulfilled in Christ, it is very difficult to derive principles of worship in the New Testament.

With respect to his advocacy of drama and dance one begins to see the true nature of Prof. Frame’s regulative principle. He is not refining the position that the Westminster standards teach as the scriptural position, but rather is moving toward the Lutheran view.

Luther taught that one may do whatever is not forbidden in Scripture. Calvin insisted that we may do in worship only what the Bible commands by explicit word or good and necessary consequence. Mr. Frame’s redefinition: “Typically, Scripture tells us what we should do in general and then leaves us to determine the specifics by our own sanctified wisdom, according to the general rules of the Word” (41). As he discusses the “elements” of worship he says, “Where specifics are lacking [he never shows which specifics are lacking—JP], we must apply the generalities by means of our sanctified wisdom, within the general principles of the word” (54, 55). In discussing drama, he says “I do believe that Scripture gives us the freedom to use drama;...” (94). With respect to dance he says, “It is true, of course, that God does not prescribe dance specifically for the regular worship of the synagogue, tabernacle, or temple” (131).

Herein lies the book’s most serious problem. Mr.

Frame departs from the Reformed exegetical understanding of the regulative principle. Of course this does not make his position wrong. Its rightness or wrongness must be determined by Scripture. But is it appropriate for Mr. Frame to offer this book as a clarification of the Confession’s position (xiii)? It would be much more helpful to admit that this book is a reformulation of the principles of reformed worship and to discuss it on that basis. Of course, then Mr. Frame will have to put his exegesis on the table. I am saddened that he published this as a study book for the church at large. The discussion would have been more helpful if he had written the technical book first and interacted exegetically with his critics.

#### CONCLUSIONS ON FRAME’S VIEWS OF WORSHIP

What are we to make of Professor Frame’s views? Despite his protestations to the contrary, his position denies the regulative principle of worship, even while he professes allegiance to it. Moreover, his views have led him to all kinds of unorthodox conclusions, including the endorsement of liturgical dance and drama, and the honoring of men during worship.

Is this merely an academic or scholarly debate, wherein Mr. Frame is simply hypothesizing from the ivory tower of the seminary? Not according to the professor, who is concerned with the clear discrepancies between the current practices of the church and the rule of her worship as it has been historically understood. We agree, and this raises the real context in which this discussion should have been handled, that of confessional Presbyterianism. Pastor Schwertley rather bluntly brings this to the foreground:

Frame’s book should be seen for what it is. It is first and foremost a defense of the departure and declension in most Presbyterian denominations in the area of worship that has occurred over the past two hundred years. Frame openly admits ... that there is a “discrepancy” between what modern Presbyterians profess and what they actually practice. This discrepancy causes some Presbyterian ministers to feel guilty.

So what apparently is needed, according to Frame, is simply a revamped and more flexible rule of worship. After all it is much easier to read a new definition back into the Westminster Standards, rather than making “an honest disavowal (with appropriate

changes).” Thus practices can be maintained or introduced, “with little regard to what those statements really mean...” (Schwertley).

One would think that a conservative Presbyterian would wish to avoid behaving like a theological liberal, but what is rejecting the regulative principle by redefinition but doing just that? A liberal would be perfectly content to say, “I hold to the confessional doctrine of the virgin birth, but I reject the Puritan conception of it.” If Presbyterian conservatives continue to behave like liberals regarding their ordination vows in the area of worship, there is every possibility that such behavior will soon erode other doctrines—maybe even such a central doctrine as that of justification by faith alone.

In addition to the question of confessional integrity, the result of Professor Frame’s view is little different than that of R. J. Gore, who rejects the regulative principle of worship outright. Whom do we find writing the introduction to Gore’s recent book (to be noticed in the following half of this survey), but John Frame himself. In this preface, the professor candidly makes the following statements bringing their views to one: a rejection of the regulative principle of worship:

When I heard, in the early 1990s, that R. J. Gore had written a dissertation at Westminster Theological Seminary opposing the regulative principle of worship, I had to see it for myself. To criticize the Puritan view of worship in that citadel of Presbyterian orthodoxy seemed a bold move, even perhaps a bit foolhardy. But Gore satisfied his examiners at Westminster, and he impressed me with the high quality of his research and thinking.

Research and thinking are not always balanced in our circles. I tend to regard the proponents of the Puritan regulative principle as stronger in the former than in the latter area. My own writings on worship have sometimes been criticized as having the reverse imbalance, and I won’t contest that. But Gore has done a marvelous job, not only of mastering the historical sources, but also of analyzing them carefully and using that analysis to make balanced recommendations for our worship today.

I differ with him on a few points, mostly terminological. He defines “regulative principle” as including all

the elements and distinctions made by the Puritans, and in that sense he rejects the regulative principle. I define it more generally as the principle that worship must be according to Scripture, and in that sense I affirm it. But as I read Gore, there is no substantive disagreement between us. We both want to say that Scripture must direct our worship, but that Scripture must be read according to sound hermeneutics....

If in the second paragraph, by “thinking,” the professor means unfounded speculation, then we certainly agree. Of course that is not what he means. The problem is not that some defenders of the statements of the Westminster Confession are not clear thinkers, nor that there has not been very clear and precise theological thinking on the worship principles of Presbyterianism (witness Bannerman and many others mentioned in this article which the professor dismisses as historical studies), but that Mr. Frame disagrees with these principles and has set his mind to reinterpret them. As for being impressed with Gore’s “research and thinking” in his dissertation, we shall have quite a bit to say in the appropriate place below.

The confusion evident in Mr. Frame regarding worship is emblematic of the deeper problem in his theological system, viz., tri-perspectivalism. His academic work has been predicated upon an advocacy of three “perspectives”—the normative, the situational, and the existential—which are equally ultimate. This means that the normative—presumably, that of Scripture—is simply one perspective that informs us in a given situation. The result, of necessity, is that the entire theological enterprise becomes subject to subjectivism, rather than having a solid, objective, Biblical anchor. It is therefore no wonder that Professor Frame’s views on worship have gone so far astray from the genuine regulative principle of worship.<sup>26</sup>

### The Writings of R. J. Gore Against The Regulative Principle of Worship

R. J. Gore, Jr., represents one of several scholars who desire to move from “simple” and “prescribed” worship, to a type of worship that is ecumenical in scope. Born in Durham, North Carolina, in 1955, Ralph Jackson Gore, Jr., graduated from Bob Jones University (B.A., 1976; M.A., 1979), Faith Theological Seminary (M.A., 1981; M.Div. and S.T.M., 1983),

26. Mr. Frame himself acknowledges the connection between his “perspectivalism” and his views on worship: *Spirit and Truth*, 62 n3; 76 n12.

and Westminster Theological Seminary (Ph.D., 1988). Dr. Gore served pastorates in the Bible Presbyterian Church and the Presbyterian Church in America, and as an U.S. Army chaplain, both at home and overseas. In 1996, he was hired to teach systematic theology at Erskine Theological Seminary, the denominational school of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, located in Due West, South Carolina; and is now the Dean at that institution.

DISSERTATION AT WESTMINSTER  
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Dean Gore's 1988 doctoral dissertation, "The Pursuit of Plainness: Rethinking the Regulative Principle of Worship," was a critique of the Puritan understanding of worship. Since his recent book is a "fairly significant revision" of this paper (though a comparison of the dissertation and the book reveals negligible differences in regard to the material considered below), and since the earlier paper received high praise from some quarters, we present this critical evaluation of it before surveying *Covenantal Worship*.

A CRITICAL REVIEW OF R. J. GORE'S  
"PURSUIT OF PLAINNESS"<sup>27</sup>

By David C. Lachman, Ph.D.

We must pass over most of the early portion of "Pursuit of Plainness" for want of space. Suffice it to say, much of Gore's first hundred pages is a pedestrian rendition of the history of the church in the 16th century, neither worth including in a dissertation (beyond perhaps a page or two) nor worthy of a critique, though he does not really appear to be overly familiar with the subject. His section on the frequency of the Lord's Supper largely represents Calvin correctly and the Puritan practice as well, but he seems to have no understanding of the reasons why the Puritans did not implement the goals of the early Reformers, nor of the Westminster Assembly's desire that it be celebrated frequently. His treatment of the Westminster Assembly is poor and demonstrates a basic unfamiliarity with both the period and the divines, as well as their writings.

*Calvin and the Regulative Principle*

This brings us to Gore's handling of Calvin and the regulative principle which deserves some detailed criticism. Without offering any contemporary evidence, Gore assumes that "the Puritans understood themselves to be faithful conveyors of the great reformer's thought..." ("Pursuit," 138) and, in that context, seeks to determine the faithfulness of the Puritan regulative principle to John Calvin's formulation of the doctrine. After some pages of extraneous material, he begins by correctly characterizing Calvin as saying that "we would be unable to worship God purely unless God told us how we should properly worship and serve him;" God, Calvin says, despises our own intention in worship and "considers it detestable." Further, "God is pleased with our obedience to his commands" and again, quoting Calvin: "we are to follow in all simplicity what he has ordained by his Word, without adding anything to it at all." Worship acceptable to God can not be the product of human invention ("Pursuit," 149-150).

When, after another twenty pages, Gore returns to the point at issue, citing the *Institutes* (IV, x, 22), he claims that, when Calvin says that no ceremony is acceptable if it is imposed as if it were a law of God, "This does not mean that the Church is unable to speak to the circumstances of the day. Indeed [Gore says Calvin says] it is permissible to prescribe certain activity as long as three conditions are met: (1) it must be framed according to love (for the sake of the weak) (2) it must not be viewed as an addition to God's law, and (3) it must be intended for a particular need at a particular

---

THE AUTHOR: David C. Lachman, Houghton College (B.A.), the University of Pennsylvania (M.A.), Westminster Theological Seminary (B.D. and Th.M.), and the University of St. Andrews [Scotland] (Ph.D.). Dr. Lachman is an antiquarian theological bookseller and has lectured in church history at Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia. He served as one of the general editors of *A Dictionary of Scottish Church History & Theology* (T&T Clark and IVP, 1993), to which he also contributed many articles. Amongst other work, he has contributed articles to the *New Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004) and introductions to George Gillespie's *Aaron's Rod Blossoming* (Sprinkle, 1985), James Durham's *Commentary on Revelation* (Old Paths, 2000), and Durham's *Treatise Concerning Scandal* (Naphtali Press, 1990). As already noted, he co-edited with Frank J. Smith, *Worship in the Presence of God* (GPTS, 1992). Dr. Lachman's Ph.D. dissertation, *The Marrow Controversy 1718 - 1723 An Historical and Theological Analysis*, is considered the definitive work on that subject (Rutherford House and Paternoster, 1988).

27. R. J. Gore, "The Pursuit of Plainness: Rethinking the Regulative Principle of Worship." Ph.D. Dissertation, Westminster Theological Seminary, 1988. Hereafter "Pursuit."

time in the life of the Church” (“Pursuit,” 170-171). But in this section of the *Institutes* Calvin says no such thing. Rather he is saying that out of love no offence should be given to weak brethren, illustrating this by saying that such practices as eating meat on Friday and laboring on ‘holy days,’ indifferent in themselves, should be avoided until the weak grow stronger in the faith. Calvin neither says nor implies that the church has authority to prescribe any activity whatever.

### *Calvin Misrepresented*

Worse, Gore goes on to summarize Calvin’s point by saying: “Where these conditions are met, it is possible to introduce a practice, a rite, or a ceremony, or to abstain from one of these as long as there is no imposition or coercion of the conscience” (“Pursuit,” 171). Calvin not only does not say this in IV, x, 22, but rather just the opposite! He argues that in matters indifferent, “superstition aside”, the strong should not offend the consciences of the weak unnecessarily. But against the Romanists he specifies that this is “no contrived addition to God’s law but a genuine and simple accommodation to the times and customs for which it was intended.” Gore completely misrepresents Calvin in this, inventing out of whole cloth a characterization of Calvin by which he can then assert that the Puritans have departed from Calvin’s teaching on the matter.

Again, Gore asserts that Calvin says in IV, x, 30 that “God has not given an exact, detailed prescription of every aspect of worship” and that the church must therefore “rely on ‘general rules’ or broader precepts from which specific applications must be made” (“Pursuit,” 173). Calvin, however, says exactly the opposite: “...the Lord has in his sacred oracles faithfully embraced and clearly expressed both the whole sum of true righteousness, and all aspects of the worship of his majesty, and whatever was necessary to salvation; therefore, in these the Master alone is to be heard.” What Calvin does say (and what Gore confuses with “aspects of worship”) is that “because he [God] did not will in outward discipline and ceremonies to prescribe in detail what we ought to do (because he foresaw that this depended upon the state of the times, and he did not deem one form suitable for all ages), here we must take refuge in those general rules which he has given, that whatever the necessity of the church will require for order and decorum should be tested against these.” The example he gives is that of “kneeling when solemn prayers are being said”; he is not speaking of “aspects” of worship, whether of divine command (prayer) or

of human invention (liturgical dance), but only of the outward details of the aspects. In regard to “aspects”, he clearly asserts that only those of divine command are permissible; those of human invention are offensive to God.

Thus when Gore says that “sensitivity [for Calvin] must be exercised in the development of new practices or the abolition of old practices,” Gore implies Calvin is speaking of aspects of worship when Calvin is only speaking of outward detail. He concludes by claiming that Calvin (in IV, x, 32) gives “three general rules for the observance of ceremonies: (1) the rules and observance should be kept to a minimum, (2) there should be no superstition where ceremonies are observed, and no contention where they are not, and (3) rites and ceremonies should always be contextualized, to the time, place, and needs of the Church.” But he fails to notice that in the preceding section (31) Calvin makes it plain that the ‘ceremonies’ he has in mind are such matters as “a woman [who] needs such haste to help a neighbor that she cannot stop to cover her head” and that “it is better to bury a dead man in due time than, where a shroud is lacking, or where there are no pallbearers to carry him, to wait until the unburied corpse decays.” So when he concludes that “some of the *adiaphora* that Calvin would admit into the Church are not simply circumstances of worship, but at times are indeed substantial parts or elements of worship,” it is based on nothing at all in Calvin; it is entirely Gore’s own opinion foisted on Calvin.

### *The Puritan Regulative Principle*

In his chapter entitled “Critical Analysis of the Puritan Regulative Principle,” Gore acknowledges that “the Puritans considered themselves to be biblical in their theology and in their exegesis,” but asserts that though their “errors were relatively minor” they were handicapped by “certain peculiarities and limitations of the period” and, also, were pressured into “increasingly radical positions” by the Established Church. This, Gore claims, resulted in an extremism which involves an “absence of balance” in respect to the form they gave the *regulative principle* (“Pursuit,” 215-216).

The first section of his ‘Analysis’ begins by asserting that the Puritans had a “tendency towards rationalism,” a position which “argues for the necessary primacy of reason and intellect in the pursuit of truth.” This he attempts to prove by a variety of quotations from modern, secondary literature, most by authors neither sympathetic to or familiar with Puritan thought,

and none to the exact point in question. Having done this, he cites George Gillespie to the effect that “human ceremonies derogate from the true inward and spiritual worship” (“Pursuit,” 219) and John Flavel and John Owen to similar effect (“Pursuit,” 220). How their assertions that the church should confine itself to worship commanded in Scripture demonstrate rationalism, he does not explain.

He concludes by saying that “it is only reasonable to see the Puritans borrowing from these systems [stoic philosophy and neo-Platonism] congenial with their own ascetic leanings.” This he does not bother to demonstrate either from modern studies of Puritan thought or from the Puritans themselves. He does not even stop to consider that neo-Platonism developed as a philosophical movement in the context of Cambridge University in the 1650s and that it is therefore impossible to think it a context for the development of the Puritan regulative principle, which had been fully expounded and stated by the 1640s. He simply makes these unfounded assertions in order to denigrate Puritan thinking (“Pursuit,” 221).

He proceeds to the specifics of his analysis of Puritan Biblical interpretation under the heading: “Errors in Hermeneutics”. He begins by accusing the Puritans of “crass literalism”, quoting J. I. Packer’s listing of “some extreme examples, not representative of Puritans in general.” But Gore, though acknowledging that these examples are not representative, nevertheless uses them as the only basis for his charge of crass literalism (asserting that contra the Puritans “the Bible teaches by implication as well as by direct statement” and that “a preoccupation with a strict, literal basis for worship is not a principle of interpretation consistent with the Bible itself”); he does not bother to refer to any ‘representative Puritans’ to prove his point (“Pursuit,” 222-223).

His further enumeration of errors includes:—1. The possibility of isolating texts in a way that “may fail to synthesize accurately the overall message of the Scriptures” – he gives one example of this, but does not bother to show that the two passages he refers to actually demonstrate his point (“Pursuit,” 223-224).

— 2. The giving of too much weight to “necessary consequences” – he recognizes that “the use of logic and necessary consequence ... is commonly used by all theologians,” but claims that the Puritans read their doctrine into the text; again he does not bother to discuss the two references he makes to the Scottish Presbyterian George Gillespie (“Pursuit,” 224-225).

— 3. The failure “to take into account organic bib-

lical developments” – he faults Puritans for failing to understand the cultural setting of the text and the progressive unfolding of redemption, but with no reference to or consideration of anything they wrote (“Pursuit,” 226).

— 4. A preoccupation with New Testament worship, as opposed to a Biblical basis for worship which includes the Old Testament as well – he faults Owen for placing the OT on a “lower level” than the NT, but does not attempt to correlate his charge that the Puritans failed to understand organic biblical development with his charge that they believed the NT to have superseded the old and, in fact, makes no real attempt to understand the coherence of the Puritan position (“Pursuit,” 227-228).

In concluding this section Gore says “that not all Puritans were guilty of committing all these errors.” But there is no evidence that he has read more than a few pages of those few Puritans he cites and certainly no evidence that he has the familiarity with Puritan literature as a whole which would enable him to draw any conclusions whatever as to the truth of his allegations. A scholarly work on the subject would necessarily illustrate each of the above points with a multiplicity of relevant references to a variety of Puritans, early through late; Gore contents himself with a few references, the relevance of which is not obvious, but which he does not bother to demonstrate.

#### *Worship Practices of the Lord*

His second section, “Dominical Practices and the Regulative Principle”, addresses the question: “... what light do the practices of the Lord shed on the issue of the proper interpretation of the *regulative principle*?” After a quotation from John Murray, asserting that “any tradition which is not based upon and derived from divine prescription is of human origin and sanction and incurs the condemnation so patent in our Lord’s teaching on this subject” of worship, he seeks to find “another interpretation ... of the texts at hand” (“Pursuit,” 231).

#### *The Synagogue*

To do this, he first broaches the question of synagogue worship, accusing the proponents of the *regulative principle* of casually skirting the issue (“Pursuit,” 231-232). Gore asserts that synagogue worship falls “into the category the traditional view would describe as ‘will-worship.’” That “the origin of the synagogue is

that of human contrivance and not of divine command” is the basis of this assertion and he demonstrates that this is the modern consensus opinion. He acknowledges that “Rabbinical tradition locates the [synagogue’s] origin during the time of Moses” and recognizes that James Jordan concurs, finding the origin of the synagogue in Leviticus 23:3. But Gore dismisses this on the basis of what he terms the overwhelming evidence that the synagogue was exilic or post-exilic in origin (“Pursuit,” 233). He then references George Gillespie, saying that he addressed the question, being “familiar with all the previous arguments and writing with the express intent of removing this obstacle to the Puritan view.”<sup>28</sup> But, though

28. What Gore means by “previous arguments” is unclear: he certainly cannot mean the late 20<sup>th</sup> century works he cites and it is unlikely that he has 16<sup>th</sup> or 17<sup>th</sup> century works in mind, as they generally take the position that synagogues were prevalent throughout the land of Israel prior to the exile. See, for example, David Dickson on Psalm 74—could it be that Gore’s failure to reference such works stems from a complete want of familiarity with them?

29. Editor’s note: A case for the early founding of the synagogue as a commanded institution of worship, is presented in: Richard E. Bacon, *A Pattern in the Heavens, Part One: Ecclesiology* (Blue Banner Ebooks, 2001) 83–93. See free ebooks at [www.fpctr.org](http://www.fpctr.org). “So then, in conclusion, we maintain that while it is difficult to trace the synagogue through every book and time of the Mosaic institutions, there is a train that extends from Leviticus through Nehemiah, which is to say from Moses’ generation through the generation in which the Old Testament canon came to a close. There was a *miqra’-qodesh* in the days of Moses, in the days of Elisha, in the days of Ezekiel, and in the days of Christ. That synagogue was an institution of God ...” (*Pattern*, 92–93).

30. Editor’s note: This is the argument against prescribed worship used by Richard Hooker in his *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, which Gore notes in his book where he repeats this same argument from the synagogue. R. J. Gore, Jr., *Covenantal Worship: Reconsidering the Puritan Regulative Principle* (Phillipsburg, N.J.: P&R Publishing, 2002). T. David Gordon commends Dr. Gore for raising the issue, and his answer is that the “synagogue was not worship but study” (T. David Gordon, “Review Article: The Westminster Assembly’s Unworkable and Unscriptural View of Worship,” *WTJ* 65 [2003] 346–347. Hereafter “Review of Gore.”). While he only mentions it in passing, Gillespie on the other hand clearly believed it was an institution for public worship. It may be that this issue is one that holders of the regulative principle may need to treat more thoroughly, particularly since we fear Dr. Gordon’s answer to this objection may raise more problems than it actually solves.

31. The criticism here is that Gore’s critique of Gillespie is based on modern “scholarship” and is correspondingly completely uninformed as to 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> century views on the subject. He has taken a brief digression by Gillespie and, without looking at any other Reformed or Puritan work on the subject, has critiqued it as if it were the definitive statement and defense of the position. That he has failed to do any real research is an indication that it is he who is begging the question, not Gillespie. Mr. Gore is supposedly doing a dissertation on the Puritan view of worship, but could not be bothered to look into what the Puritans (a broad sample as opposed to

Gillespie does assert that synagogues were built after the tribes first settled in the land and that this was done by the warrant of the authority of the prophets,<sup>29</sup> Gillespie is not arguing this point here, as Gore implies, but just mentions it in passing, devoting only ten lines of text to it (Gillespie, *English-Popish Ceremonies*, 3.5.10, 253). If Gore had seriously wanted to understand and critique the Puritan position on the subject, he might have bothered at least to look at a few Puritan commentaries on Psalm 74 or at the controversy William Ames had with Bishop Thomas Morton. As he has not done this, his effort here to demonstrate the Puritan *regulative principle* erroneous on the basis of the participation of Jesus in the worship of the synagogue, a worship purely of human institution,<sup>30</sup> is itself a casual skirting of Puritan treatments of the subject and is therefore worthless.<sup>31</sup>

#### *Voluntary Jewish Feasts*

Gore passes on to a discussion of Jesus’s observance of the Voluntary Jewish Feasts, proving to his satisfaction from the witness of a variety of modern commentators that when Jesus was in Jerusalem at the time of the Feast of the Dedication (John 10:22) it implies that he was there in order to participate in its observance. He interprets John 5:1 (“After these things there was a feast of the Jews, and Jesus went out to Jerusalem”) in similar fashion. But he does not bother to consider that the presence of Jesus in Jerusalem at such times might have been timed in order to enable him to speak to the much larger numbers of people then present there. Certainly there is nothing inherent in either passage which implies his participation in either feast. That it is quite possible to interpret these passages as merely alluding to the time of year Jesus was in Jerusalem does not come under Gore’s consideration. This is a serious flaw in that if he had bothered to look into Puritan commentaries on the passages in question he would have found that this is what they argued is the correct interpretation. It is particularly reprehensible that he does not even refer to George Gillespie’s discussion of the subject in his *English Popish Ceremonies* (EPC, 3.6.8–11, 264–270): admittedly this is not an easy work to read, but granted the subject matter of Gore’s dissertation it should not be too much to expect a familiarity with the whole of the work and an interaction with it when it impinges on the points he is trying to make. Generally, a responsible scholarly discussion of the matter would at least take into account Puritan exegesis of the passages in question. Lacking

even the rudiments of this, Gore's treatment of the matter is wholly without merit.<sup>32</sup>

*Gore's Handling of the 'Proof' Texts for  
the Regulative Principle*

His third section examines selective texts "offered by the proponents of the Puritan *regulative principle*." After introducing the adage, "Interpretation is one, application is many," he considers six texts of Scripture, in order "to determine the exact exegetical meaning of ... [each] passage" ("Pursuit," 247). What follows, however, is anything but an attempt to discuss the "exact exegetical meaning" of the passages in question. First, in regard to Exodus 20:4-5, Gore asserts that "the one obvious exegetical fact is that the use of any idol, or image, of Jehovah or any creature for any purpose of worship is forbidden." He adduces no argument that this is the only clear teaching of the text and cites no commentators, ancient or modern, to this effect. Nor does he refer to any Puritan commentary, pro or con (the two Puritan works to which he refers are very brief: the Owen is a little book on worship and the Flavel is an exposition of the Westminster Assembly's Shorter Catechism, though Gore nowhere in his dissertation gives the title of either; he supplies this want in his published book). He simply asserts that this is the only possible meaning of the text and therefore concludes that it is not possible to interpret the text as requiring that "nothing is acceptable in worship which has not been explicitly commanded" ("Pursuit," 248-249).

Second, in his consideration of Exodus 25:40 ("And see that you make them after the pattern for them, which was shown to you on the mountain." NASB) he asserts that "the advocates of the Puritan regulative principle of worship" expand "this text ... to cover all of worship." But he does not bother to refer to any Puritans, either as to how they actually exegete the passage or as to how they apply it. Gore has space here for an attempt to show that Calvin "left significant room for matters of indifference," but though this chapter of his dissertation is ostensibly on the Puritans, he exhibits no interest in looking into so much as a single Puritan exposition of the passage ("Pursuit," 250-253).

Third, Gore asserts in regard to Leviticus 10:1-3 (Nadab and Abihu) that this is a passage which "frequently occurs in Puritan citations." He also claims that Puritans "usually" will apply "this passage to prohibit doing anything not specifically commanded." As evidence of this he again adduces (the same) refer-

ences from Owen and Flavel. How he can be sure that they are typical Puritans and that he can so generalize from what he reads in them to Puritanism as a whole is not something he considers. Nor does he consider that there might be arguments in more extensive Puritan works which would justify their so using the passage. Gore finds it easier simply to beg the question by asserting that "what is clearly taught here is that the specific commands of God must not be transgressed," not to condemn as illegitimate every act of worship not specifically commanded (*Pursuit*, 253-256).

Fourth, Gore characterizes Deuteronomy 12:30-32 (concluding with "Whatever I command you, you shall be careful to do it; you shall not add to nor take away from it." NASB) as a summary of "Israel's covenant obligations to Jehovah." Without any reference to Puritan expositions of the passage, and after acknowledging that S.R. Driver essentially interprets the passage in a way which confirms what Gore characterizes as the Puritan interpretation, he cites more recent commentators, one of whom characterizes the passage as one which deals with a covenant formula and sanctions and with the substance of the law and not the letter. Although he admits that the passage is relevant to the regulation of worship (quoting Ridderbos), Gore (not Ridderbos) concludes from this that voluntary worship, not specifically required by the covenant, is not totally prohibited. This is hardly honest dealing either with the Puritans or with the exegesis of the passage itself ("Pursuit," 256-259).

Fifth, regarding Matthew 15:3-9 ("... in vain do they worship me, teaching as doctrines the precepts of men." NASB), Gore asserts that "the advocates of the Puritan regulative principle interpret this text in the most rigorous sense possible, so that divine commands are absolutely necessary for every essential part of worship." As proof of this he refers to the same pages in Owen, Flavel and Ames he has previously used, though again without bothering to quote their actual words. Thus he is able to decry their strictness without actually interacting with either the Biblical text itself or what any Puritan has to say about it — and in this case, as what these particular Puritans have

---

the very few works he did bother himself to consult) actually had to say?

32. We note here that Dean Gore made some significant changes to this section dealing with voluntary Jewish feasts in *Covenantal Worship*, including adding references to Gillespie's arguments, one dealing with John 10:22 and the other with Purim. We refer the reader to the following section in this survey dealing with that work.

to say about this passage is minimal and as he has no other Puritans to hand, Gore is perhaps constrained to pass on rather quickly (“Pursuit,” 259-262).

Sixth, the final passage he mentions is Colossians 2: 23. Gore again uses the NASB, which substitutes “self-made religion” for “will-worship”. This notwithstanding, he acknowledges that it is “fair and accurate” to say that “the passage teaches that any human innovation in worship that is contrary to the clear teaching of Scripture, either by forbidding that which is allowed or requiring that which is not commanded, is unacceptable. Further, we are warned against adding to the commands of God as though they were somehow deficient.” But he thinks that this does not require “the narrow prohibitions of the Puritan *regulative principle*” and this, for him, is adequate to dispense with the Puritan use of the passage (“Pursuit,” 262-264).

Gore concludes from all this that since “Jesus participated in worship that was outside the clearly mandated prescriptions of Mosaic worship ... a broader application of the exegetical teachings of the relevant texts and a reformulation of the Puritan *regulative principle* of worship” is demanded. The Puritans’ “virtual denial of *adiaphora* renders necessary a positive warrant, or airtight logic, for every facet of Scripture.” And as Gore thinks this does not do justice to the “total teaching of Scripture”, the Puritan formulation is to be rejected (“Pursuit,” 265).

The whole of this section, crucial to demonstrating the validity of his rejection of Puritan teaching on the regulative principle, is completely inadequate. At a minimum, particularly in a purportedly scholarly work, a representative selection of Puritan authors should be taken under consideration and their collective opinion (if it is found to be essentially uniform) should be carefully stated (or, alternatively, any divergence of opinion should be equally carefully stated) and held up for examination. It is disgraceful that Gore’s acquaintance with the Puritans appears to be limited to a few passages in three authors (William Ames, John Owen and John Flavel: Gore does not even bother to specify to what individual works by Owen and Flavel he refers, simply giving the volume and page number of the collected works),<sup>33</sup> with additional reference to a few passages in the works of one Scottish Presbyterian (George Gillespie). If Gore has any knowledge of any other Puritan authors (or if

he knows it is possible to have access to books printed in the seventeenth century, as opposed to modern reprint editions) it is impossible to discern it from anything he has written in this dissertation which Westminster Theological Seminary accepted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

#### *Adiaphora and the Reformed Confessions*

After a question-begging treatment of the teaching of the New Testament in regard to *adiaphora*, Gore first asserts and then attempts to demonstrate that “the consensus of the Reformation was that such a category was absolutely necessary to understand the role of the Church in worship” (“Pursuit,” 299). He begins by demonstrating the obvious, that the Lutheran *Formula of Concord* teaches that what is not forbidden is permitted as long as the church judges it useful and for edification (“Pursuit,” 300).

But then he proceeds to try to show that the Reformed Confessions took a similar position. He introduces a quotation from the *Belgic Confession* which states: “... we believe, though it is useful and beneficial, that those who are rulers of the Church institute and establish certain ordinances among themselves for maintaining the body of the Church; yet they ought studiously to take care that they do not depart from those things which Christ, our only master, hath instituted. And, therefore, we reject all human inventions, and all laws which man would introduce into the worship of God, thereby to bind and compel the conscience in any manner whatever.” This Gore says “makes a clear assertion that care must be observed in the institution of indifferent matters, allowing only those which further the well-being of the Church.” But this is to mistake “certain ordinances” as intending the introduction of “indifferent matters” into worship; rather the intention in this confession is to allow arrangements which make human meetings possible while guarding against the introduction of “all human inventions” into worship. The intention here is, practically speaking, the opposite of what Gore supposes (“Pursuit,” 301-302).

Likewise in referring to the Scots Confession of 1560 he mistakenly claims that “the confession gives witness to the temporal character of the ceremonies and the necessity of changing those ceremonies from time to time, as the church deems it necessary.” This Gore confuses with the substance of worship when what is plainly in view here is only those matters “men have devised”. This is made more clear in the ninth

33. The full titles are given in *Covenantal Worship*, but this simply indicates how substandard the dissertation is, as a scholarly work, that in a book one would add the precise bibliographical detail which was lacking in the dissertation.

head of the First Book of Discipline (“Concerning the Policie of the Kirk”), where it becomes evident that what is in view are such matters as when baptism is to be administered and what days in the week the kirk should assemble (“Pursuit,” 302).

Again, in regard to the Second Helvetic Confession Gore asserts that “there is yet admission of an area of freedom in matters of worship,” but the Confession asserts that “the true unity of the Church” consists “in the true and uniform preaching of the Gospel, and in such rites as the Lord himself has expressly set down.” Gore does not bother to explain how the Confession’s assertion allows his “area of freedom” (“Pursuit,” 303).

In the context of his discussion of *adiaphora*, Gore even claims that “in an indirect fashion” the Westminster Confession of Faith teaches that “there are matters of indifference, matters which on a voluntary basis could be used in the worship of God.” This interpretation of WCF 20.2 (Of Christian Liberty, and Liberty of Conscience) infers almost exactly the opposite of the meaning of the text (and, also, of what Gore recognizes as the forbidding of such voluntary acts of worship in WCF 21, immediately following). It is an evidence of his basic ignorance of Reformed thinking on the matter that Gore does not recognize that the thrust of the assertion in chapter 20 (“God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men, which are in any thing contrary to his Word; or beside it, if matters of faith or worship”) is to state in unequivocal terms the individual’s freedom from the imposition of human inventions, whether in respect to doctrine or the worship of the church. That it is an infringement of Christian liberty to impose on the worship of the church a dance troupe or an orchestra is something which does not seem to have occurred to him. But this is the intention of both chapters 20 and 21 of the WCF. Liberty in Christ is not freedom to do as we please, but rather the freedom from sin which enables us to do as God pleases (“Pursuit,” 305).

### Conclusion

It should be said plainly that the caliber of Gore’s scholarship in “Pursuit of Plainness” does not rise above that ordinarily expected in a simple ‘term’ paper; consequently it completely fails to make a credible case against the Regulative Principle of Worship. It is indeed almost incredible that this paper was found acceptable for any degree whatever, and we must agree

with the conclusion of one, familiar with both it and the later book based upon it, that the Westminster Seminary “committee should never have approved the dissertation, because the methodology was so seriously flawed.”<sup>34</sup> But yet more seriously, it should never have been accepted because of the inadequacy of Gore’s research, both in his misrepresentations of Calvin and others and in his almost complete failure so much as to look into what the Puritans actually had to say on the subject.

### R. J. GORE’S COVENANTAL WORSHIP

By Frank J. Smith, Ph.D., D.D.

Throughout the 1990s, Professor Gore continued to develop his anti-Confessional ideas,<sup>35</sup> and then summed up his thoughts in 2002 with his book, *Covenantal Worship: Reconsidering the Puritan Regulative Principle*.<sup>36</sup>

As already noted, this book is a distillation and reworking of Gore’s doctoral dissertation just surveyed. The problems with the book remain the same as those in the older paper. As T. David Gordon notes in his review of the book, “the majority of the work (and of the dissertation) is devoted to the unproven and unprovable thesis that the Puritans embraced a different principle of worship than did Calvin.” Among the things which Gordon finds commendable about the work, are the clear noting of “both the differences between the worship practices of the English Puritans and those of Calvin, and the historical occasions of these differences...”; placing the discussion of the synagogue front and center; and Gore’s candor in rejecting the regulative principle as stated in the Westminster Standards. We could not agree more that such candor

34. Personal Correspondence, Dr. T. David Gordon, Professor of Religion and Greek, Grove City College, to Frank J. Smith, Ph.D., D.D., February 28, 2005. See also, “Review of Gore,” 346.

35. For example, see his review of Frank J. Smith and David C. Lachman, eds., *Worship in the Presence of God: A collection of essays on the nature, elements, and historic views and practice of worship*, *WTJ* 56 (1994) 443-47; “Reviewing the Puritan Regulative Principle of Worship,” *Presbyterian* 20.1 (1994) 41-50; and “Reviewing the Regulative Principle. Part II,” *Presbyterian* 21.1 (1995) 29-47. *Presbyterian* is the official scholarly journal of Covenant Theological Seminary in St. Louis.

36. R. J. Gore, Jr., *Covenantal Worship: Reconsidering the Puritan Regulative Principle* (Phillipsburg, N.J.: P&R Publishing, 2002). Hereafter Gore.

is more refreshing than “the prevaricating dodges one occasionally encounters among less-candid Presbyterians, who have no more regard for the regulative principle than Gore does, but who profess to agree with it” (Review of Gore, 346).

Unhappily, most of the serious defects in Gore’s dissertation are repeated in *Covenantal Worship*, and Professor Gordon, who took up the pen again as noted in favor of the regulative principle in a review of Gore’s book, ably underscores them. “Gore’s discussion omits important Reformed terminology for discussing worship (and re-defines one of the two terms retained), leading to substantial misunderstandings of Calvin’s relation to the Puritans; some of the methodological deficiencies of the dissertation are repeated here in Gore’s comparison between Calvin and the Puritans, notably the omission of Calvin’s own statements about his views on the matter; Gore’s objections to the regulative principle as ‘unworkable’ are both overstated and, in large measure, self-created; and Gore’s description of the Reformed understanding of Liberty of Conscience is almost the mirror opposite of what the Reformed confessions have actually taught” (“Review of Gore,” 346).

#### *Misrepresenting Calvin Revisited*

Professor Gordon makes very clear what has been previously seen in Gore’s dissertation, that the latter seriously mishandles and thus misunderstands Calvin. “The gravest methodological weakness (both in the dissertation and here) is Gore’s inferring Calvin’s principles regarding worship from Calvin’s practice. Such an inference is unwarranted, for many reasons.... But this methodology is all the more problematic when dealing with an individual whose principles are *stated*. In many places, Calvin states what his views of worship are, and those statements, reiterated in so many places, are identical to those of the Puritans who followed him. Gore does not cite Calvin’s sermons on the Second Commandment, his statements in *The Necessity of Reforming the Church*, or even his comments from the relevant passages of the *Institutes*, all which would indicate that the church in its public assemblies should only worship God as he has commanded.” Gordon then cites several passages out of Calvin’s writings

37. The author thanks Dr. David C. Lachman for his contribution of this section.

38. Calvin on John 10:22. *A harmonie vpon the three euangelists, Matthew, Mark and Luke ... whereunto is also added a commentarie vpon the euangelist S. Iohn.* (Londini: Geo. Bishop, 1584).

before concluding: “The failure to cite such passages as these (which could be multiplied many times) is simply irresponsible” (“Review of Gore,” 351-52).

#### *Gore’s Mishandling of both John Calvin and George Gillespie*<sup>37</sup>

But Professor Gore mangles not only the meaning of Calvin, but also of George Gillespie. Regarding the appearance of Christ at the Feast in John 10, Gore writes:

Gillespie, recognizing the importance of this event, argues the following points: (1) that there was no legal basis for the Feast of Dedication, (2) that Christ did not approve of the feast, and (3) that his presence was entirely for the benefit of the multitude, not due to any regard he may have had for the festival.

However, George Gillespie is not “recognizing the importance of this event,” but rather is responding to the arguments of the Bishop whose book he is confuting, a work with which R.J. Gore seems to be entirely unacquainted. Gore continues in this vein:

Consider the facts, however. At what other time in the ministry of Jesus did he accommodate himself to the religious errors of the Jews, for whatever reason? The desperation in Gillespie’s efforts to reconcile this event with the Puritan regulative principle of worship should be obvious.

This ignores Gillespie’s argument, which is that the Gospel account does no more than fix the time of year when Jesus was in Jerusalem and in no way implies an approval of the Feast of Dedication or an accommodation to religious error. Gore then misuses Calvin once again for his purposes:

Significantly, the commentators disagree with Gillespie’s speculation. There is virtually unanimity among the commentators that Jesus was there *to worship*. Calvin, for example, notes “Christ appeared *in the temple* at that time, according to custom.”

What Calvin actually says is this: “Christ appeared then according to his custom in the Temple, that his preaching might bring forth greater store of fruit in a great assemblie of men.”<sup>38</sup> Moreover, on John 5: 1 he says: “Jesus came unto the feast day unto Jerusalem, partly because there was greater opportunitie to

spread abroad doctrine, then, by reason of the course of people: partly because he must be obedient to the law, that he might deliver all men from the bondage of the law..." (Calvin in loc.). Note that in respect to both passages Calvin mentions the great number of people. Gore omits this part of Calvin's sentence, perhaps because he has just denigrated Gillespie for making this very point. Further, Calvin gives no other reason than the great assembly of people for Christ's presence in the temple at the feast of dedication, though he also speaks of the fulfillment of the (Mosaic) law in respect to his appearance in John 5:1. It would seem, therefore, that Calvin is in agreement with Gillespie and not with Gore.

In other words, it is in respect to the feast of dedication that Calvin makes no reference to worship (though he could have readily), but in respect of a feast commanded by Moses he does add the second reason for Jesus' presence. It is plain therefore that Calvin does not say, contra Gore, that Jesus was there to worship at a feast clearly not ordained by God. All he actually says is that Jesus was there in order to preach to a great number in a context where it would have been easy for him, as he did in John 5:1, to say that Jesus was there to observe the feast.

As for his use of commentators in general on this point, other than the reference to Calvin, when Gore speaks of virtual "unanimity among the commentators," he evidently has in view only the modern, mostly liberal, commentators he cites. Again, consulting a variety of 16th and 17th century Reformed commentators, who largely agree with Gillespie, does not seem to have occurred to him as a possibility.

Not done with disparaging Gillespie, Gore also cites him in comments on Purim in an endnote, and writes that the Scottish theologian:

argues against Purim as well. His arguments include: (1) Purim was civil only, and not religious (pp. 121-22);<sup>39</sup> if it were religious, Mordecai would be a prophet, so there would be a special warrant for the observation of Purim (p. 123); (3) it was unlawfully instituted, period (pp. 123-24). As may be noted, these objections include arguments based on silence, historical inaccuracies, and simple begging of the question. Similar arguments from "implication" or "good and necessary consequence" were expressed during the Westminster Assembly, session 649. The resolution states that "the fathers at first had a command from God ... yet nothing is left recorded to show His will and appointment of the things instanced in, but

the example and the practice of the apostles and the churches in their time." Mitchell etc. See also the essay by Jack Delivuk ... "Some Hermeneutical Methods in the Westminster Standards."

Gore does not seem to know how either to quote or to summarize accurately arguments with which he disagrees and apparently has trouble giving cogent reasons why he disagrees. He neither presents Gillespie's arguments nor gives any *reasons* why they are inadequate. Is the reader to take it on faith that Gillespie based his arguments on "silence, historical inaccuracies, and simple begging of the question"?

We observe the following on Gore's summation of Gillespie: (1) Gillespie's lengthiest argument which he begins by arguing from the text of Esther itself is that these days of Purim as first instituted appeared to be "only appointed to be days of civil mirth and gladness, such as are in use with us, when we set out bonfires, and other tokens of civil joy, from some memorable benefit which the kingdom or commonwealth has received." He then spends around 1,200 words answering Bishop Lancelot Andrews' arguments that these days were religious holy days rather than "days of civil joy and solemnity only" (*EPC*, 3.6.8.264). (2) After this Gillespie simply makes the point that whatever the nature of these days were, whether civil or religious days, they had a "more than ordinary warrant for them because Mordecai, by whose advice and direction they were appointed to be kept, was a prophet by the instinct and revelation of the Spirit (Esth. 4:13)."<sup>40</sup> He then cites the Swiss theologian Rudolph Hoßpianin,

39. Editor's note: Dr. Gore's citations from Gillespie are from The Presbyterian's Armoury edition of his *Works* (Edinburgh: Robert Ogle and Oliver and Boyd, 1846). See *EPC*, 3.6.8.264 in the Naph-tali Press edition.

40. Editor's note: Thomas McCrie, no friend of "holidays of human appointment," disagrees that Purim was merely civil in nature, saying, "though it should be granted that the description contains nothing but expressions of secular joy, we would scarcely be warranted to maintain that this feast had no religious character. It is of the nature of this Book not to bring forward religion expressly, for reasons that we formerly assigned." On the other hand, McCrie agrees that Mordecai did not act on his own authority, "There can be no doubt that he was raised up in an extraordinary manner as a saviour to Israel; and in the course of this Lecture we have seen grounds for believing that, in addition to his other honours, he was employed as the penman of this portion of inspired scripture. From all these considerations, it is reasonable to conclude that the feast of Purim was not instituted without divine counsel and approbation. Add to this, that the decree of Esther confirming it, is expressly said, in the close of this chapter, to have been engrossed in this book, by whomsoever it was written." Thomas McCrie, *Lectures on the Book of Esther* (Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons, 1838) 280-283.

who wrote: “Perhaps we will not have gone far astray if we say that this was done by Mordecai and Esther from a particular inspiration of the Holy Spirit” (*EPC*, 3.6.10.267).<sup>41</sup> (3) In the citation Gore gives, Gillespie is referring to “the Feast of the dedication of the Altar by Judas Maccabeus” and quotes Cartwright to the effect that “this Feast was unduly instituted.” Gillespie is not there speaking of Purim at all!

#### *Church Power and ‘All of Life as Worship’*

With that brief aside, we return to T. David Gordon’s observations. The professor sums up admirably the whole difficulty with both Gore and Frame regarding the context of discussing ‘worship.’ He writes (“Review of Gore,” 352-353):

The issue that separated the Puritans from the Anglicans was the authority of the church to call saints to certain assemblies, and then to determine what would be done in those assemblies.... I consistently find that those like Gore (and John Frame) who resist the traditional Westminster understanding of regulated worship, discuss “worship” aside from the question of the nature and limits of church-power, whereas those who study the principle within that arena tend to agree with it. Similarly, the same individuals also tend to speak of “all of life as worship,” indicating again an unwillingness to discuss the historic principle within the arena in which it was historically developed. The issues that separated the Anglicans and Puritans had nothing to do with “all of life,” nor anything to do with any aspect of life other than one *particular* aspect of life: the calling of the saints to assemble together to meet and renew covenant with God.

Next in one paragraph Gordon exposes the flaw of the idea that “all of life is worship” (“Review of Gore,” 353):

Such obtuseness regarding the historical setting of the doctrine necessarily will lead to unanswerable theological and practical problems: If all of life is

“worship,” may individuals celebrate the Lord’s Supper privately, in families, without the presence of an ordained minister? If all of life is “worship,” may the sacraments be administered anywhere, any time? If all of life is “worship,” why does Paul give *different* directions for eating in the Christian assembly than he does for eating “at home” (1 Cor 11:20, 33, 34)? If all of life is “worship,” why does Paul require *silence* of the women “in all the churches,” while expressly permitting them to *speak* “at home” (1 Cor 14:33-35)? Does not Paul in these passages expressly distinguish behavior that is permissible “in the church” from behavior that is permissible “at home”? And was not this distinction between how life “in assembly” is governed *differently* than life in other places precisely the point of Calvin and the Puritans?

#### *Christian Liberty and the Reformed Confessions*

Gordon’s review of Gore’s treatment of the subject of Christian Liberty exposes the same fundamental misunderstanding of the Reformed Confessions as noted previously in surveying his dissertation (“Review of Gore,” 354):

It should not be surprising that Gore’s understanding of Christian liberty is almost entirely opposite from what it has historically meant. If one does not distinguish what is permissible in the Christian assemblies on the first day of the week from what is permissible elsewhere, one will not be able to understand the nature and limits of church power, or, consequently, the nature of Christian liberty from the abuse of the same.... Gore understands Calvin and the subsequent Reformed confessions as saying virtually the opposite of what they actually said. Indeed, his misunderstanding is so profoundly total that on first reading I thought the editors had inadvertently omitted (or added) a negative....

What Calvin and the Reformed standards declare that believers are free *from*, Gore declares them to be free *to*. In those places where Calvin and the Reformed creeds declare that we are free “*from* the doctrines or commandments of men,” Gore asserts that we are free *to* obey the doctrines or commandments of men. Gore believes that Christian liberty is the liberty *to do* what is not prohibited; Calvin and the Reformed creeds perceive it as liberty *from* doing what is not commanded. Failing to make the fundamental Pauline distinction between “in assembly” and outside the assembly, Gore

41. Editor’s note: Rudolph Hošpinian (1547-1626), *Festa Christianorum: hoc est, De origine progressu, ceremoniis et riti bus festorum dierum Christianorum* (Zurich, 1587) chp 2. *ad finem*. The translation is given in the Naphtali Press edition of *English Popish Ceremonies*. Hošpinian undertook extensive studies in church history and wrote several books that delved into the origin of the rites and ceremonies of Roman Catholicism. This work dealt with ‘holy days.’ The Zurich preacher also wrote on the rites and ceremonies of the Jews, Turks, Romans, Greeks and Indians.

reads biblical texts as having precisely the *opposite* import that Calvin and the Reformed creeds thought they had.

#### *Gore's Understanding of the Regulative Principle*

As to Gore's persistent claim that the regulative principle is unworkable, Gordon summarizes in reply ("Review of Gore," 355):

...Gore has manifestly misunderstood the doctrine in significant ways. He does not indicate any awareness of its relation to the doctrine of church-power; he does not understand "circumstances" as the Reformed tradition does; and he does not recognize the categories of "form" and "rubric" in his articulation of the Puritan principle. The primary reasons for Gore's finding the doctrine "unworkable" are self-created: he does not yet understand the doctrine as it has been historically articulated. That is, what is "unworkable" for him is not the regulative principle itself, as articulated by Calvin or the Westminster Assembly, but it is his mishandling of that principle that divorces it from the doctrine of the nature and limits of church-power, that confuses "worship as all of life" with "worship" as the first-day gatherings of God's visible covenant people, that redefines what a "circumstance" of worship is, and that fails to appreciate the importance of "forms" and "rubrics" for discussing worship intelligibly.

#### *Motivations and other Problems*

After this summation of the problems in Gore's work what more could be said? However, before closing this survey, we do wish to address some other issues in *Covenantal Worship* and note some apparent motivating factors in Gore's abandonment of Presbyterian principles.

#### *Personal Pilgrimage from Presbyterian Worship*

It is interesting to read from Dr. Gore what the motivating factors were that lead to his rejection of the regulative principle of worship. He begins his treatise by sketching an autobiographical pilgrimage, from a position of enthusiastically adopting the Puritan perspective, to one of questioning it. One key factor in that journey was his increasing inability to understand the difference between using "a visible, physical, and tangible symbol" such as a wooden cross, and the Bible's literary use of that symbol. Another factor was

his having been highly uplifted by means of a highly liturgical worship service at a presbytery meeting, and his not knowing how to reconcile that experience with what he "professed to believe." A third key factor was his becoming a U.S. Army National Guard chaplain in 1986; as a result of his chaplaincy, he found himself having to justify his unwillingness to participate in a generic Protestant service—complete with altar set-up consisting of a brass cross and candlesticks—stipulated by the Army. As he read numerous books which defended the Puritan principle, he found a disturbing pattern. Many of the writings borrowed heavily from other sources favorable to the Puritan regulative principle of worship and provided little interaction with current developments in worship. There was much indicting of 'will-worshippers,' but little effort was made to articulate a positive exposition of the regulative principle in light of cultural challenges. Indeed, a great deal of the literature was little more than sloganeering. Furthermore, the exegesis of the key texts upon which the principle was based often appeared overstated and unconvincing. He then confesses that as he tried to apply the regulative principle, he was led "to conclusions that challenged much of what I had previously believed about Reformed worship" (Gore, 4-7).

Dr. Gore also mentions a final factor in his theological transformation, viz., the sobering fact "that so few Christians embraced the Puritan regulative principle of worship." Of the 2.1 billion Christians in the world, only a tiny percentage would be evangelical Presbyterian (those in the United States representing about 0.019 percent of all Christians worldwide), and "an even smaller subset would profess to follow the Puritan regulative principle of worship." While conceding that "the lack of adherents, in and of itself, does not negate the Puritan regulative principle of worship," he also suggests not only an approach of humility by Presbyterians, but also a willingness to "learn from the church catholic" (Gore, 7).

#### *Enemies of Presbyterianism as Sources*

Given his presuppositions, it is understandable why Dr. Gore opposes this Presbyterian doctrine. One of the ways in which he does so is by trying to drive a wedge between Presbyterian and Puritan worship. He writes: "In true pendulum-like fashion, the corrective efforts of the Westminster Assembly were at times excessive. James F. White observes that 'when the Reformers did rebel against prevailing practice, justifiable anger at contemporary abuses often led to

the elimination of things of genuine value that had become distorted in the course of time.” (Gore, 23-24).

Professor Gore also had previously made reference to James White, “a leading expert on worship,” who “places Puritan worship, a seventeenth-century development and major influence on Presbyterian faith and practice, midway between Reformed and Anabaptist traditions of worship. According to White’s analysis, Presbyterians must trace their liturgical lineage back not only to the practices of Zwingli, Calvin, and Knox, but also to the practices of the English Puritans.”

From the footnotes, one can glean that the resources for this perspective are from liberal sources: John Knox Westminster Press, and *Christian Century* magazine. Moreover, who exactly is this “leading expert on worship”? James F. White is the long-time professor of liturgical studies at the University of Notre Dame, and a champion of an ecumenical approach to church life.<sup>42</sup>

It is one thing to utilize scholarly works in order to gain insight into various historical phenomena with regard to the practice of worship. But it is quite another thing altogether to quote favorably from enemies of historic Presbyterianism in order to denigrate the position of one’s spiritual forefathers. This is a pattern which one finds throughout Professor Gore’s work. He quotes favorably from Robert Webber, an erstwhile Reformed Presbyterian<sup>43</sup> who at one time taught at Covenant College but has now joined himself to High Church Anglicanism (the “smells and bells” crowd); and from Thomas Howard, raised as a fundamentalist but one who subsequently converted to Roman Catholicism. Dr. Gore writes: “Howard ... challenged evangelicals to restore the Lord’s Table to a place of importance, as ‘the center of the liturgy.’ Through these writings, Webber and Howard addressed the evangelical community at large with questions—and proposed answers that demand a hearing” (Gore, 14-15).<sup>44</sup>

### *Covenantal Life is Worship*

In a chapter on “Your Reasonable Service,” R. J. Gore

argues that covenantal life is worship. The professor does correctly note that the concessions by Norman Shepherd and John H. White, who profess adherence to the regulative principle of worship but believe that “the regulation of worship is but a specific application of the regulation of life,” work to “undermine the nature of the Puritan regulative principle of worship” (Gore, 112-114). In his eyes, the regulation of worship and of life are essentially the same: “Worship is regulated, even as life is regulated, based on the clear, sufficient teaching of Scripture, which sets boundaries and limits actions, but provided liberty and freedom of response within those parameters. Francis Schaeffer has pointed out that both form and freedom are grounded in creation and both must be asserted—in balance” (Gore, 120). Furthermore, the author’s approach calls for a “covenantal consciousness,” for worship and life, leading to the following conclusion (Gore, 119-124):

Worship was never intended to consist in simple conformity to a comprehensive set of guidelines. Even in the Mosaic economy, filled with ceremonial and typical elements, basic to true worship was the exercise of dominion as faithful obedient creatures. Now, in the cultural diversity of the New Testament church, the occasion for exercising such stewardship has vastly increased.

In the same chapter, Professor Gore rings the changes on the notion of *adiaphora*, or things indifferent. He attempts to make his case Biblically from four passages: Acts 16 (Timothy’s circumcision); Acts 21 (Paul’s participation in a Jewish purification rite); Romans 14 (“strong” and “weak” Christians); and 1 Corinthians 8 (eating meat sacrificed to idols).

### *The Covenantal Principle of Worship*

At this point we present Dr. Gore’s view in his own words of a “covenantal principle of worship,” the term he has coined to describe his peculiar views (Gore, 138ff). The “most significant” aspect is that (Gore, 140):

the covenantal principle of worship includes the freedom to worship in any manner warranted by the Scriptures. That is, the covenantal principle of worship says that whatever is consistent with the Scriptures is acceptable in worship. Here is where the major difference with the Puritan formula appears. For the Puritan, all worship was either commanded or unlawful.

42. “James F. White ... has devoted his professional life to teaching liturgy and equipping others for this ministry. He has been involved in liturgical reform and is the author of sixteen other books on liturgy” (<http://www.stgabriel.com/pages/LP61564.html>).

43. That is, of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, Evangelical Synod (RPCES) variety.

44. Buried in an endnote is the fact that Thomas Howard did later convert to Roman Catholicism (Gore, 168, n12).

If commanded, it was either directly commanded (or logically necessary; thus essential) or indirectly commanded, by general principle and Christian prudence (and therefore circumstantial).

For the Puritan, the circumstantial alone may be viewed as *adiaphora*; but the circumstantial was so unduly restricted as to rule out, in effect, the concept of indifferent things. Here, in the covenantal principle of worship, there are still two categories: commanded, by direct precept or example (and therefore necessary), and indirectly commanded, or governed by general principle and Christian prudence (and therefore circumstantial *and indifferent*). But the covenantal principle of worship insists that the second category must be given its due to include the broad range of *adiaphora*, things neither commanded nor forbidden, but governed by the light of covenant faithfulness.

We would congratulate anybody who can make sense of those last two paragraphs. However, Dean Gore tries, in the next paragraph, to help us understand what he was saying (Gore, 141):

In other words, the concept of *adiaphora* expands our understanding of circumstances while leaving the concept of elements intact. Without the concept of *adiaphora*, the Presbyterian churches have found themselves engaged in endless disputes about words. By refusing to acknowledge the breadth of circumstances, Presbyterians have continued to fight over definitions, arguing about such issues as whether the use of musical instruments is an element or a circumstance, or whether it is appropriate to have an Easter or Christmas service. Indeed, these things are circumstances of worship. For example, an Easter service is nothing more than the worship of God's people on Easter Sunday, with the usual elements of worship contextualized or conditioned by the *circumstances* of that particular Sunday.

Here, at last, we can begin to see what may be driving Dr. Gore—it is his desire to employ instrumental music in public worship, and his love for Easter and Christmas. But we can also see manifest the fundamental misunderstandings on his part.

#### *Various Principles Governing Worship*

Dr. Gore goes on to speak of various principles which he believes should govern worship. They are

simplicity, orderliness, freedom, glorification and edification, catholicity, cultural sensitivity, balance, and Christ-centeredness.

Regarding worship that is “simple,” he notes that the progressiveness of redemptive history means that certain typological aspects of the Old Testament have been fulfilled by Christ, “so that the pageantry of Old Testament worship is now passé. Thus, New Testament worship, relative to Old Testament worship, is simple.” Simple worship, he writes, is also worship of the Spirit—that is, not as opposed to materiality, but as energized by the Holy Spirit. Thirdly, “simple worship is that which has direction and inner coherence. It is worship that ‘is in the first instance the opposite not of complexity but rather of diffuseness.’ Again, this does not mean a bare-boned minimalism either in rite or ceremony. Rather, this ‘condition of true worship is a respect for the structure controlling the relations between the various parts of the cult, in an arrangement which shows that the cult progresses toward its culminating point, and that, having reached it, it is strengthened by it for the purpose of afterwards witnessing in the world’” (Gore, 143-144). Dr. Gore goes on to explain (Gore, 144-145):

There is little likelihood that a consensus will be achieved on the exact limits of simplicity. Societies where nonverbal means of communication have been highly developed will appreciate a greater role for sign and symbol. Cultures where artistic achievement has developed significantly will have an aesthetic emphasis that differs significantly from those where such development has been hindered. Church communities where an openness to Pneumatic phenomena has been the tradition will be more open to whole-person worship than will those whose tradition lies more along the lines of didactic, teaching-oriented worship. These variables will affect the circumstances of worship. Nevertheless, every ecclesial community must take simplicity seriously, even if there is not complete agreement on its significance and application.

What this passage seems to imply (and we say “seems,” since it is difficult to fathom precisely the man’s mind), is that there is legitimacy to various expressions of nonverbal, aesthetic, and charismatic worship. Indeed, the wording Dr. Gore has selected seems to imply that Pentecostals, being open to “whole-person worship,” have much to teach those in the Reformed faith, who are interested more with “teaching-oriented worship.”

Regarding worship that is “orderly,” Professor Gore claims that such worship “is anything but uniform, for diversity is grounded in the concept of order.... Thus, from creation, God has provided for creativity, individuality, and spontaneity within the bounds of created order. Worship that is orderly may exist in styles as diverse as charismatic worship or High Church liturgy. What is essential is that orderliness be uniformly pursued, even as its practice remains diversely applied” (Gore, 146).

But, the Westminster Assembly was called in order to effect uniformity in religion, including in worship, among the kingdoms of Great Britain. While it is true that there is diversity on circumstantial matters, that is not the same thing as saying that “diversity is grounded in the very concept of order.”

Regarding worship that is “free,” the professor argues for freedom of individual conscience, and for “ecclesial freedom” as well—that is, for the notion “that each congregation, within the bounds of the covenantal principle of worship, has the right to determine its own particular style or emphasis in worship” (Gore, 146-147).

Regarding worship that “glorifies and edifies,” Dr. Gore says that there are “two closely related lines of movement in worship, the vertical and the horizontal.” He rejects the idea that the legitimate worship must be “only enjoyable,” and maintains that worship must edify others (Gore, 148-50; emphasis in the original).

Regarding worship that is “catholic,” he calls upon Reformed believers to be both “open” to others in the Body of Christ, and humble. He goes beyond urging Pentecostals and High Church Episcopalians learning from each other, and claims that “Protestants in general should be able to learn from the traditions of the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox churches. After all, does not the sacramental focus of the Roman Catholic Church have something to say to Presbyterians whose worship, sadly enough, all too frequently has been desacramentalized? And does not the Orthodox tradition of mystery have something to contribute to the churches of the Reformation and their tendency toward intellectualized, overly didactic worship? Worship that is catholic requires the willingness to hear the truth contained in other traditions, even when that truth has been obscured by nonbiblical accretions” (Gore, 151-152).

In answer to the two rhetorical questions in the preceding paragraph, we would most definitely answer, “No!” Our Presbyterian doctrine already includes a proper understanding of the sacraments, and

already properly celebrates the mystery of worship. (Is Dr. Gore simply not aware of the literature in the Reformed heritage?)

More than that, at this point, we see even more clearly where Dr. Gore’s spiritual pilgrimage is taking him. It appears that he is not only embarrassed by the small numbers of conservative Presbyterians, but also by the relative smallness of the Protestant church vis-à-vis Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy.

Regarding worship that is “culturally sensitive,” he writes that “change in worship has been part of God’s ongoing plan of redemption. Even Scripture itself is filled with changes in worship from the patriarchal stage to the Mosaic, from the Mosaic to the Davidic, and from the Davidic to the New Covenant. The biblical imperative for the church in relation to culture, then, is adaptation and transformation, redeeming that which is ‘noble and wholesome.’” He adds: “The genius of Reformed liturgy is revealed every time cultural adaptation of the liturgy is achieved” (Gore, 153-154).

Really? We thought that the genius of Reformed worship is revealed every time the church conforms to the regulative principle of worship. But what is more shocking is the assumption that change in worship within Scripture, gives warrant for extra-Biblical change to the practice of worship. A final observation with regard to this topic has to do with his assertion that the church must redeem in culture “that which is ‘noble and wholesome.’” The reference to “noble and wholesome” comes from a book published by Paulist Press, and written by Anscar Chupungco, a Roman Catholic from the Philippines (Gore, 192, n41).

Regarding worship that is “balanced,” Professor Gore wants to balance Word and symbol and Word and sacraments (Gore, 154ff). He writes (Gore, 156):

Truth, then, can be communicated in worship not only through verbal explanations, but also through movement, posture, music, drama, art, and the wise use of sacred space and sacred time. While there should be no compulsion in the matter, many in the church have experienced humility and submission through the act of kneeling in prayer. Others have rejoiced and exulted in the Lord by lifting up their hands to heaven, acting out what is transpiring at a deeper level. The bright, flowing banners used in some churches emphasize important aspects of God’s redemption, or highlight special seasons in the Christian year.

He also quotes from Robert Webber “on the impor-

tance of the symbolic, particularly the return of aesthetics to worship: ... 'Why, then, shouldn't we accept appropriate art forms as visible means through which a spiritual reality becomes present or through which we offer praise?'" (Gore, 156).

However, the quote from Professor Webber, cited approvingly by R. J. Gore, underscores the problem with their position. In light of clear Scriptural teaching (Exodus 20:4-6; Leviticus 10:1-3; Colossians 2:23; etc.), the question of worship is not, "Why not?"; the question of worship is, "Why?" That is, What positive warrant is there to employ this or that practice in worship? To open up worship practice by means of asking, "Why not?," is to embrace a rationalistic, and skeptical, perspective. The end result of this un-Biblical approach is evident, in that nothing, in principle, could be lawfully excluded from worship—drama, dance, art, or anything else in created reality.

Regarding worship that is "Christ-centered," Professor Gore asserts that "the church must ever be open to the lordship of Jesus Christ, working through men and women gifted by his Spirit, to lead the church into new and greater understanding of his will" (Gore, 161).

While he does not actually state that women are to lead in worship, it is easy to see how someone might infer that he would be open to that suggestion. Indeed, since anything that is not an element of worship automatically falls under the category of *adiaphora*, according to Professor Gore, then why not have women lead in worship?

#### *Conclusions on Gore's Writings on Worship*

We must say that, on one level, it is refreshing that someone who denies the regulative principle of worship would be candid enough to admit it. But since the Rev. Dr. Gore admits that he is out of accord with the Westminster Standards on such a major matter as the doctrine of worship,<sup>45</sup> then why does he continue to enjoy status as a Presbyterian teaching elder? (Would it not be the honorable course of action for him to relinquish his ministerial credentials?) Indeed, why did a purportedly conservative denomination (the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church) employ him as a faculty member at (and now Dean of) their official seminary? The answer, sadly, is because the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, the Presbyterian Church in America (the denomination to which Professor Frame belongs), and other churches that have such men in office, honor these men who reject the Presbyterian faith with respect to worship.

#### FRAME AND GORE: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Over the past several decades, there are numerous factors, from both within and without Presbyterianism, that have worked to reframe Presbyterian worship. Within the putatively Presbyterian churches, foremost among the figures who have done the most damage are John M. Frame and R.J. Gore, Jr.

Each of the men represents a different approach to the rejection of Presbyterian worship. Professor Frame pretends to adhere to the regulative principle of worship, while Dr. Gore is candid enough to admit that he does not. However, the net result is the same: a repudiation of Presbyterian doctrine on this crucial matter, by men who have taken Presbyterian ordination vows and occupy places of influence and authority.

Another commonality between these two teaching elders is their affiliation with Westminster Theological Seminary. The establishment of this Philadelphia institution (in 1929), similarly as the founding of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church and the Presbyterian Church in America later in the century, also manifested a reawakened Calvinism. However, like these two denominations, the seminary, too, was divided theologically: the Scotsman John Murray maintained the views of the Westminster Assembly, while most of his colleagues did not. And, also like these two denominations, the seminary chose not to follow the path of historic Presbyterianism: there eventually arose a new generation that knew not Murray.

The founder of Westminster Seminary, J. Gresham Machen, lamented in a 1923 sermon the lack of honesty among churchmen who say one thing and mean something else. The good professor asserted that he did not know when the revival in religion would come, but he was certain that when it did, it would come only after there was a restoration of basic integrity.

If we agree with Machen's point, then we would have to conclude that R.J. Gore's anti-Presbyterian perspective, which is at least refreshing in its candor, may be a harbinger of better days ahead. But the

45. Not to belabor the point, but, in case there is any question as to Professor Gore's hostility to the Presbyterian position, here is a sampling of his own words: "... the Puritan regulative principle of worship was imbalanced in a number of ways"; "Jesus, in his practice, violated the Puritan formulation of the regulative principle of worship"; "The forced exegesis and arguments from silence demonstrated the inadequacy of the Puritan formula"; "... the regulative principle, as formulated by the Puritans, adopted by the Westminster Assembly, and embraced by the various Presbyterian churches, is flawed and unworkable"; "... the Puritan regulative principle of worship [is] flawed" (Gore, 92, 106, 110, 111, 139).

blessing of God's Holy Spirit will not be apparent until there is repentance by Presbyterian office bearers who take solemn vows with crossed fingers.

#### ENDNOTES.

A. See footnote 2. Sherman Isbell's research supports attribution to John Murray of Section A of the "Report of the Committee on Song in Worship Presented to the Thirteenth General Assembly, on the Teaching of Our Standards Respecting the Songs That May Be Sung in the Public Worship of God," He writes, "The thirteenth General Assembly (1946) was presented with 'a partial report' from the study committee. Murray was responsible for the opening section 'A,' which provides the fundamental statement of the regulative principle. Murray's authorship is evident from the draft text and draft cover letter, both in Murray's handwriting, which are preserved among his papers in the archives of the Montgomery Library at Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia. In his letter to the committee members, Murray says, "This paper is being sent to you in the hope that study of it beforehand will be of some assistance in furthering and perhaps expediting our work at the next meeting of the Committee on March 10<sup>th</sup>. . . . I thought it necessary to enter into some detail in view of questions raised at our last meeting." This statement of the Reformed regulative principle deserves recognition in the corpus of Murray's writings. William Young observes: 'Section A of the 1946 report is clearly the work of John Murray. . . . Section C is evidently based on parts of my report on the scripture proof of the regulative principle, except for the addition to C in the 1947 report, in which I did not concur.' Thus the bulk of the committee's incomplete report in 1946 was composed by the two men who dissented from the committee's majority report the following year. The 1947 General Assembly received from the committee a majority report and a minority report, each seeking to complete what the "partial report" had begun the year before. The contributions by Murray and William Young to the 1946 report were viewed by the committee as a preamble to the 1947 reports. The majority report of 1947 argued that song need not be restricted to the words of Scripture, and that this position is compatible with the regulative principle set forth in the previous year's "partial report." However, the minority report, signed by the men who provided the committee's defining statement of the regulative principle, concluded that 'there is no warrant in Scripture for the use of uninspired human compositions in the singing of God's praise in public worship.' William

Young has noted that the minority report, though signed by Murray and Young, 'was written entirely by Prof. Murray.'" See Mr. Isbell's introduction to his transcript of this material at <http://members.aol.com/RSICHURCH/song1.html>.

B. See footnote 3. The regulative principle was the doctrine of Scottish Presbyterianism, and English Puritanism. — of the Scottish Church as exhibited in *Pardovan's Collections*: "By the 15<sup>th</sup> act of Assembly 1707, they declare that there are some innovations set up of late by prelatists in their public Assemblies, which are dangerous to this church, and manifestly contrary to the constant practice and known principle thereof, which is, that nothing is to be admitted in the worship of God, but what is prescribed in the Holy Scriptures. . . ." (Walter Steuart of Pardovan, *Collections and Observations Concerning the Worship, Discipline, and Government of the Church of Scotland* [Edinburgh: 1709, cited from Edinburgh: W. Gray and R. Inglis, 1770] 2.1.1). — Of the Puritans as exhibited by among many which could be mentioned — William Ames: "1. Instituted worship is the means ordained by the will of God to exercise and increase natural worship. 2. The means ordained by God are wholly set forth in the second commandment, which forbids all contrary means of worship devised by men under the words, *graven image* and *likeness*. Since these were once the chief inventions of men for corrupting the worship of God, they are rightly used for all devices of man's wit pertaining to worship (by a synecdoche constantly used in the decalogue)." (William Ames, "Instituted Worship," *The Marrow of Theology*, Translated from the third Latin edition, 1629, and edited by John D. Eusden [Pilgrim Press, 1968. Rpt. Durham, NC: The Labyrinth Press, 1983] Bk II. Ch. 13, 278). — And William Perkins: "The second point, is the rule of worship, and that is, that nothing may go under the name of the worship of God, which he hath not ordained in his own Word, and commanded to us as his own worship. For we are forbidden under pain of the curse of God, either to add, or to take away anything from the precepts of God in which he prescribes his own worship. . . ." (William Perkins, *Workes* [Cambridge: John Legate, 1608-09] 1.661. Cited from William Young, *The Puritan Principle of Worship Part IV*. <http://members.aol.com/RSIGRACE/puritan4.html>). ■

## REVIEWS & RESPONSES

REVIEW: Stephen Westerholm, *Perspectives Old And New On Paul: The 'Lutheran' Paul And His Critics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004) lge. pbk., xix & 448 pp. \$35.00 Reviewed by Dr. Rowland S. Ward, Pastor of Knox Presbyterian Church, Melbourne, Australia.

Another contribution to Pauline studies from the associate professor of biblical studies at McMaster University is to be welcomed. In this case it is the revision and expansion of his *Israel's Law and the Church's Faith*, published in 1988. It has all the hallmarks of Westerholm's work: wide-reading, clarity, humour and informed orthodoxy. It deserves a wide readership.

As the quotation marks around 'Lutheran' in the book's title suggest, Westerholm is not arguing that Paul was a Lutheran, but he does make the case for the essential correctness of Luther's reading of Paul. At the same time he recognises the importance of a good understanding of Judaism in the first century.

In the first part (pages 3-97) Westerholm offers four portraits of Christian leaders who held an essentially Lutheran understanding of Paul – Augustine, Luther, Calvin and Wesley. While each is only about twenty pages, they sufficiently illustrate that people of different temperament and in different situations concurred in the meaning of justification in Paul. Westerholm closes with a review of Paul's teaching, and lays down seven helpful points in his summary of it.

After this fitting introduction, we have a lengthy second part of about 160 pages in which the views of twenty-six twentieth century scholars are surveyed, grouped according to basic emphasis. Westerholm does not critique their views at this point but seeks to encapsulate them in a succinct and fair manner. In beginning with William Wrede's *Paul*, issued in 1908, Westerholm provides an important reminder that views of Paul's theology in which justification by faith is a secondary issue are not new. According to Wrede, Paul believed that Christ has accomplished redemption from hostile powers effective for all and appropriated by faith. Justification by faith was a side issue, an effective polemic against those who insisted Gentiles should adopt Jewish ritual practices and/or observe the commandments in order to salvation, but not the heart of his teaching.

Westerholm steadily progresses through Schweitzer, Montefiore, Schoeps, Sanders, Kümmel, Stendahl, Bultmann,

Wilkens, Drane, Hübner, Räisänen, Wright, Dunn and Donaldson until he comes to the 'Lutheran' responses of Cranfield, Shreiner and Das, Thielman and Seifrid. He closes looking at Laato's consideration of Paul's anthropology, Thurén and Aletti's emphasis on rhetoric, Martyn's study of Paul's apocalyptic world view and Jürgen Becker's understanding of Paul's theology of the cross. These scholars find coherence of thought in a 'Lutheran' reading of Paul taken along with the other aspects they have studied. A selection of quotable quotes from the anti- 'Lutheran' perspectives concludes the part.

The survey provided of a century of scholarship is of value for its own sake. Readers of this review may be particularly interested in Westerholm's summary of N.T. Wright, since he is the most conservative of writers on the new perspective, and the one most likely to impact Reformed circles. In fact, four pages are sufficient to summarise Wright's position in which justification is regarded as God's vindication of his people at the end of history, anticipated in the present, and determined not on the basis of 'works of the law', considered as boundary markers, such as circumcision, Sabbath and the food laws, but on faith in the gospel. Paul was not opposing the notion of earning one's salvation by good deeds, but a nationalism that insisted on the observance by Gentiles of the boundary markers that set apart Jews from Gentiles. Justification is about identifying who belongs to God's people not about declaring a person righteous. Thus N.T. Wright.

The third part (pages 261-445) is of great importance for here Westerholm deals with the key issues. He first takes up the *dikaio* word group (righteous, righteousness, justify, justification etc.) and distinguishes an ordinary meaning in which, in contrast with sin, righteousness is what one *ought* to do: the one who does righteousness is righteous, and the justified are those declared to be innocent of wrongdoing. It is not the hearers of the law but the doers of the law who are justified in God's sight (Rom 2:13). 'Paul insists that the good spelled out in the law is the responsibility of Jews and non-Jews alike, and that all will be judged by whether or not they have *done* this good.' (p. 273)

But there is also an extraordinary usage for the acquittal of those heretofore sinful, by which sinners are made righteous through the obedience of Christ (Rom 5:19). Westerholm puts it well (p. 275): 'No one has better grasped the absurdity of "receiving righteousness" than N.T. Wright: "Righteousness

---

RESPONSES critical of articles and reviews may be submitted for consideration for publication by sending drafts to the editorial address. Please contact the editor beforehand to obtain submission requirements and preferences. When possible, the subject of a negative or possibly controversial review will be contacted beforehand for any appropriate response for publication along with the review, and the reviewer will be given an opportunity for a response. If required, responses and replies may continue in subsequent issues.

is not an object, a substance or a gas which can be passed across the courtroom" (*Founder*, 98). But the absurdity of it all in no way alters the fact that Paul speaks of "receiving the abundant overflow of grace and of the gift of righteousness" (Rom 5:17); and both 1 Cor 1:30 and Phil 3:9 speak explicitly of a righteousness "from God." Further, God's righteousness is referred to in a manner which shows God maintains the moral order at the same time as he declares sinners righteous (Rom 3:25-26).

When writers on the new perspective claim that righteousness refers to membership of the covenant community they fly in the face of the evidence. Ordinary righteousness is what sinners as sinners lack and need, whether Jew or Gentile. Extraordinary righteousness granted to sinners is what Jew and Gentile lack and need, whether or not they have an outward covenant relationship with God. God's righteousness could refer to God's faithfulness to his promises, but in fact righteousness itself does not mean covenant faithfulness. Indeed, Paul never explicitly links righteousness and covenant, but does stress that God's righteousness reverses human unrighteousness so that all who have faith are 'righteous.' For Paul, though not for Judaism, all men were fundamentally lost in sin and became members of God's covenant by the extraordinary act of grace which declared them righteous.

Westerholm then takes up the definition of law. He shows that while Paul sometimes uses the term *nomos* to refer to part or all of the Old Testament scriptures, his more common use is to refer to the body of law given to Israel by the hand of Moses at Mt Sinai. The broad and narrow uses need to be clearly distinguished. "The law that can be kept, done, fulfilled or transgressed is clearly "the legal parts" of the Pentateuch. The law given 430 years after the Abrahamic promise (Gal 3:17, 19) was not the Pentateuch as a whole but the Sinaitic legislation..." (p. 299). As far as Paul is concerned the essence of law in this sense is that it requires works, and justification by faith is the antithesis of this.

If justification by faith was simply a useful polemic against those Jews whose nationalism made them insist that Gentiles observe certain Jewish boundary markers, then it is not something Jews need, or, if they do, it arises from their racism. But Paul insists all people – Jews, whether or not racists, and Gentiles – are under sin and all need to be declared righteous through faith. Nor is it legalistic works done out of self-righteousness that Paul rejects as the path to righteousness, but all works.

Westerholm turns briefly to the definition of grace (pages 341-351). While it is indeed wrong to view Judaism as typically preoccupied with gaining enough merit to pass the Divine scrutiny in the judgment, rabbinic Judaism is not unequivocal in its rejection of merit and works. Judaism did not see grace and works as opposed to each other as Paul

did. Judaism thought of God's choice of Israel as according to grace, but that grace had a reason in, for instance, the merit of the patriarchs or Israel's willingness to submit to the law before God would grant it to them. Judaism was really very much in a Pelagian mould, and thus in some way thought one could contribute to salvation, whereas Paul's understanding of grace excludes any and all of our works absolutely.

A survey of justification by faith in Paul's thought (pages 352-407) and a discussion of the law summarised in nine theses (408-439) complete this stimulating volume. The new perspective's presentation tends to say the difference between Jews and Christian was not on grace but only on who was the Messiah. But Paul does not say that Gentiles should become like Jews (except for Jewish boundary markers) to enjoy God's blessings. Rather, he insists that Jews and Gentiles alike are sinners and need to stop pursuing righteousness by law but receive righteousness through faith in Jesus.

The volume is quite demanding but repays careful study. It is probably the best introduction to the issue for theological students currently available. Some issues remain, for further consideration, including how one may best state the nature of the Mosaic covenant, the proper interpretation of Romans 7, and aspects of imputation. The effect of Westerholm's study is to give a substantial rebuttal of the distinguishing marks of the new perspective, of which only the general lines have been indicated in this review, and so set us to the heart of the Gospel of Christ. ■

REVIEW: Leonard J. Coppes, *The Divine Days of Creation* (Thornton: Providence Presbyterian Press, 2004). 240 pp. Pb. \$5.00. Reviewed by Dr. Benjamin Shaw, Assistant Professor, Hebrew & Old Testament, Greenville Presbyterian Theological Seminary.

Since the publication of *The Genesis Flood* by Whitcomb and Morris in 1961, there has been almost literally a flood of publications by conservative Christians dealing with some aspect or another of the early chapters of Genesis. This work by Dr. Coppes is one of the most recent contributions to the literature. In nine chapters and five appendices, spread over some 240 pages, he deals with a variety of issues related to the "days" of Genesis 1. His first chapter is a discussion of hermeneutical issues which clearly sets his work in the context of a traditional Reformed approach to the understanding of the Scriptures. The second chapter is an analysis of the issue of whether or not Genesis 1 is to be considered history. The third chapter discusses the relationship of the other Ancient Near Eastern materials to the Genesis creation account. Chapters 4 through 7 treat the meaning of a number of Hebrew terms and phrases: "day," "a thousand years as a day," "evening and

morning” and “day and night.” The final two chapters deal with the issue of death before the fall and the length of the days in Genesis 1.

The appendices deal with a variety of issues related to the discussion of the Genesis 1 creation account. The first deals with the Hebrew term *raqia`* which is traditionally translated “firmament,” arguing that it should instead be rendered “expanse,” as it is in many of the more recent translations, such as the NIV, the NASB (Update), and the ESV. The second appendix deals with the fiat—the divine pronouncements—of the creation account. The third appendix deals with Herman Bavinck’s treatment of the days of creation in the first part of his systematic theological work, now available in English as *In the Beginning*. The fourth appendix deals with John Collins’s “analogical” view of the days of creation. The final appendix deals with the “6 plus 1” formula as it is found in the Ancient Near Eastern mythological material.

As the above survey shows, the book intends to deal exclusively with the issues of Genesis 1 and the interpretation of those issues in the context of the modern conservative Reformed debate about them. It is at this point that one of the major weaknesses of the work is revealed. Aside from the work of Collins, Dr. Coppes shows almost no familiarity with the modern discussion of the issues with which he deals. He relies very heavily on the forty year old work of E. J. Young, *Studies in Genesis One*. As fine as that work is, the discussion has moved considerably beyond it at many points, and Coppes shows no awareness of that movement. His treatment of the Ancient Near Eastern materials is also dated, reflecting none of the massive amount of literature that has grown up around that material in the last generation. He deals only briefly, and in this reviewer’s opinion unsatisfactorily, with the work of Meredith Kline, whose labor in defense of the so-called “framework hypothesis” has to a certain extent set the agenda for this debate as it moves now into the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

The second major weakness of the work is apparent in Coppes’s “word study” approach to exegesis. He sets this out as one of his major hermeneutical principles in the statement, “Word studies should be undertaken in the light of the accepted procedures in Hebrew lexicography.” (p. 17) While this statement is, in itself, unobjectionable, his further discussion on pages 17-18 demonstrates that he is unfamiliar with the incisive critique of the approach offered a generation ago by James Barr in his *The Semantics of Biblical Language*. It is necessary when undertaking word studies to pay careful attention to the context of the material under consideration, and the possibility of the same words being used in different senses by different authors. In addition, it is necessary to separate idiomatic usages of words from more normal usages. For example, in English, no one who is a native speaker of English would consider using the clause “it was raining cats

and dogs” to come to any conclusion about the meanings of the words “cat” and “dog.” Yet when Dr. Coppes undertakes to examine the various meanings of the Hebrew word *yom* (day), he includes the idiomatic expression *b’yom* (a Hebrew idiom that simply means “when”) in his examination. Incidentally, this is a mistake also made by Kline in his arguments in defense of the framework hypothesis. This same sort of mistake is found in Coppes’s discussion of the meaning of the pairs “evening-morning” and “day-night.” He consistently fails to take into account the context of each usage, as if the meaning were separable from the larger context.

There are, in addition to these two major shortcomings of the work, a number of other deficits that might fall under the category of “annoyances.” The organization of the chapters appears to be haphazard, and the outline of each chapter is unclear. Though most of the chapters include definite conclusions, these are unhelpfully not set apart typographically. There is also no bibliography provided for the work. In short, while there is useful material here, the book cannot be recommended due to its systemic weaknesses.

RESPONSE: *Theology by Word Study and Wrong Method of Word Study.*

I very much appreciate the opportunity to respond to Dr. Shaw’s review of my book, *The Divine Days of Creation*. In answer to some of the criticism, I will simply say that it was written to help the debate within the Presbyterian churches rather than as a scholarly paper.

As to the balance of the review, I do wish that Dr. Shaw had interacted with the arguments presented in the book. It was my intention to defend the proposition that we cannot determine from the Biblical text the length of the days of creation as well as to point out the weaknesses of other approaches popular in our churches (the ordinary day view, the framework hypothesis, the day age view, and the analogical view).

We can conclude exegetically that these were real “days” in the Hebrew sense of that word, and that they were continuous, contiguous, and sequential. It is important to note that this was the position of Dr. Edward J. Young who spent a lifetime writing, lecturing, and debating this issue. Indeed, his major work in the field spent much time showing the complete inadequacy of Dr. Meredith Kline’s work (Young’s argument is summarized and extended on pages 35-56). Even though his work was done many years ago, as was the work of Calvin and others, it has stood the test of time and, like his commentaries on Isaiah and Daniel, is an example of some of the best of reformed exegetical thinking. It is of note that Young, Kline and their peers were quite aware of Dr. James Barr’s work.

I spent several years in post-graduate studies in Hebrew

and Akkadian. This is not the place to enter into a presentation and evaluation of lexicographical and philological work and the diverse approaches employed in Hebrew and related language studies. At that time, there were several approaches to language study (one of them being Barr's work). For various reasons, that work is seriously flawed methodologically. So, although I agree with some of Barr's conclusions, I do not feel that his sweeping rejection of almost all that was done exegetically (lexicographically and philologically) in reformed history stands. Hence, my argument about word studies, a major building block of proper exegesis, is intended to follow along the old paths with whatever insights from Barr and others that may be useful. So, although such diachronic and inductive argumentation is not explicitly displayed in the book, it was used in the process of deriving the conclusions. The point made in the book is that *yom* always refers to a period of time and has a much wider semantic distribution than "an ordinary day," and that a proper understanding of a given occurrence depends upon more than a word study that sets the bounds of the semantic possibilities, and one's preconceived theological necessity—it depends upon an evaluation of the requirements of the context. (Incidentally, a study of *b'yom* will unearth several places where the phrase cannot mean "when," cf., Ps. 18:1).

I am glad to see that Dr. Shaw does not seek to suggest arguments against any of the pillars supporting the book's thesis, so the thesis stands untarnished. Some of those pillars are:

1 The Hebrew word *yom* always represents a period of time and this may be as short as a moment and as long as an age. The creation account itself uses Heb. *yom* in several connotations.

2 The first day opened with darkness and closed with a period of darkness. Young correctly argues exegetically that Gen. 1:1-3 is a unit. Hence, the first day was longer than an ordinary day, or it was a day of ordinary length but extraordinary composition consisting of two nighttime and a daytime. This means that we cannot determine the length of the creation "days" from the phrase "there was an evening and there was a morning, a first day."

3 The Bible, outside of Gen. 1, never uses the evening-morning couplet to mean an ordinary day. The only other use of the couplet to signify a day appears in Dan. 8:14-26 where it signifies a day of indeterminable length.

4 The couplet used at every period and genre of Biblical literature for an ordinary day is day-night. So, the fact that this couplet is not used in the coda of days one and four also argues that an ordinary day is not in view in the coda.

5 The coda closing the days of creation is unique in days six and seven. In the first five codas ordinary Hebrew grammar is set aside and the ordinal appears without the definite article, but in codas of the last two days the article is inserted.

Hence, these two days are especially marked as concluding respectively the creating week and the entire week with its day of rest.

DR. LEONARD J. COPPES

REPLY BY DR. BENJAMIN SHAW.

I appreciate Dr. Coppes taking time to comment on my review of his book. It was helpful to have him summarize his own arguments, and I would like to respond to those summaries.

First, no one disputes something that Dr. Coppes goes to great lengths to demonstrate—that *yom* is used in a variety of senses in the Hebrew Bible. He alleges at the beginning of Chapter 4 that "there has been so much debate on the range of meaning (semantic distribution) of this Hebrew word [*yom*]." In fact, there has been very little debate on that issue. A quick look at any of the standard Hebrew lexica would satisfy anyone of the fact, that it has long been recognized that *yom* is used in a variety of senses in the Old Testament. The issue that has been debated is what *yom* means in Genesis 1, which is a different question entirely. Coppes states in his response, "The creation account itself uses Heb. *yom* in several connotations." This is technically true, since "several" means more than two but less than many. But it tends to mislead the reader. The Hebrew *yom* is used fourteen times in the creation account (Gen 1:1-2:3). Nine times it is used in the phrase "the nth day." What it means in this phrase is really at the heart of Dr. Coppes's discussion. Four times it is used in the sense of "the daylight hours" (Gen 1:5, 14, 16, 18). Once it is used in the phrase "for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years" (Gen 1:14) where it probably has the meaning "specific, or set, days."

Second, Coppes says "The Bible, outside of Genesis 1, never uses the evening-morning couplet to mean an ordinary day." This assertion, as stated, is simply not true. I suspect that what Dr. Coppes means is that the couplet, outside of Genesis 1, never refers to the totality of an ordinary day. Instead every single case where the morning and evening occur in the same verse, they refer to a part of an ordinary day. Many of the uses refer to the morning and evening sacrifices, which took place at stated times on *ordinary* days. There is not a single verse where evening and morning are used in the same verse that refers to anything other than an ordinary day. Second, there is no place in the Bible where the precise clause "and there was evening and there was morning" occurs, outside of Genesis 1. Hence, given the fact that every verse where "morning" and "evening" occur in the same verse they refer to parts of an ordinary day, it is reasonable to conclude that the sequence "and there was evening, and there was morning" refers to the course, or the totality, of an ordinary day,

contrary to Dr. Coppes's conclusion. (It should be noted that there are some minor errors in Dr. Coppes's listing of verses on p. 109. 1 Chron 23:28 should be 1 Chron 23:30. Neither morning nor evening is used in 2 Chron 13:4. Job 4:19 should be Job 4:20.)

Third, when Dr. Coppes argues that the couplet "day-night" is necessary to conclude that an ordinary day is in view, he is arguing far beyond what the evidence will allow. As just demonstrated, the morning-evening couplet clearly refers to ordinary days, and we should not think Moses must have been constrained to the use of day-night if he wanted to refer to ordinary days. The fact the day-night does not appear in Genesis 1 simply does not give the exegete room to argue from silence that Moses must therefore have had something other than ordinary days in mind.

Fourth, due to what I perceived as serious flaws in Dr. Coppes's argument, I decided not to deal in detail with those arguments, but rather with underlying methodological issues. But since Dr. Coppes has seen fit to see in my silence an implicit approval of his conclusions, I will say the following. I agree with Dr. Coppes (Chapter 2) that the account in Genesis 1 is intended to be historical. I agree with Dr. Coppes (Chapter 3) that the Hebrew word *yom* can have a variety of specific connotations. I disagree with Dr. Coppes (Chapter 4) that Psalm 90:4 has anything of relevance to say for understanding the length of the day in Genesis 1. I disagree with Dr. Coppes (Chapters 6 and 7) that the couplets "evening-morning" and "day-night" have the significance relative to Genesis 1 that he gives them, and I further would ask the reader to evaluate those usages for himself to see whether the interpretation Dr. Coppes gives them hold up under the light of unbiased examination.

Finally, I was seriously disappointed with both the quality and the tone of Dr. Coppes's response. If he really intended to help the debate within the Presbyterian churches, he had the responsibility to determine whether Dr. Young's forty-year-old work still stood up in the light of work done since then. My own conclusion is that it was an exegetically weak argument forty years ago, and that it has not aged well. (Just as a note: in my review I state that the Hebrew phrase *beyom* simply means "when." Dr. Coppes offers Psalm 18:1 as a counter-example. It is not, as the reader can easily tell. In addition, the phrase *beyom* when it does not occur in construct with another noun, has the meaning "when," and is regularly so translated in a variety of reliable translations, including the KJV, RSV, NIV, NASB, etc.) In addition, he dismisses the work of Barr with the statement "that work is seriously flawed methodologically." While it may be that Barr sometimes paints with too broad a brush, one of the things against which Barr warns is the ignoring of context in the determination of the connotation of a word. In my opinion, Dr. Coppes regularly ignores

this structure, and hence comes to conclusions that really are exegetically untenable.

DR. BENJAMIN SHAW ■

REVIEW: Norman Shepherd, *Law and Gospel in Covenantal Perspective*. A Lecture Presented at Trust and Obedience: A Symposium of Law & Gospel, March 11, 2004, Warrenville, IL. Sponsored by Reformation and Revival Ministries (Audio Recording). Norman Shepherd. *Law and Gospel in Covenantal Perspective* (Holland: Norman Shepherd, 2004).<sup>1</sup> Reviewed by Wayne Forkner, Pastor of Covenant Presbyterian Church, Berkeley, CA (OPC).

"Covenant Theology" of Norman Shepherd versus Covenant Theology of the Westminster Standards

At a meeting called "Trust and Obedience: A Symposium of Law & Gospel" a number of speakers from various churches spoke on the distinction between law and gospel. Most of the speakers argued that the law/gospel distinction, as it is understood in Reformational churches, is not a biblical distinction.<sup>2</sup> One of the chief speakers was Rev. Norman Shepherd, who also affirmed that this commonly understood distinction between law and gospel is a false construct.

As his teachings have been at the center of much debate among Reformed churches in recent years, a little background on Rev. Shepherd and his views here follows. Norman Shepherd was a professor of systematic theology at Westminster Seminary, Philadelphia, beginning in 1963. While at Westminster, Mr. Shepherd's view of the doctrine of justification sparked seven years of controversy at the Seminary.<sup>3</sup> After a professorship of 20 years, Mr. Shepherd took a pastoral position at a Christian Reformed Church. Then in 1999, after his retirement from the pastorate, Shepherd again expounded his views, evoking renewed debate in the Reformed community as to the means of justification. Some of the discussion concerning his views has been heated, bringing accusations from both sides.

The main point of this review is to show that Mr. Shepherd's formulation of covenant theology is not in accord with the Westminster Standards. This is important because there ap-

1. The text of this lecture may be obtained from the author by sending a stamped (37 cents), self-addressed business size envelope to: Norman Shepherd, 436 Wave Court, Holland, MI 49424. Mr. Shepherd has been offered space for a response in the next issue.

2. One notable exception was Dr. Nelson D. Kloosterman of Mid America Reformed Seminary, who called for a return to the reformed confessions, which he said, teach, explain and apply the "Law/Gospel" distinction.

3. A historical overview of the discussion at Westminster is provided by O Palmer Robertson in *The Current Justification Controversy* (Unicoi: The Trinity Foundation, 2003).

pear to be ministers and elders in Presbyterian churches who agree with his views of covenant theology. Were they to teach these views, they would be denying the very standards they have vowed to uphold. My hope and prayer is that Presbyterian elders and pastors would rethink their allegiance to Rev. Shepherd's formulation, understand how it diverges from the historically Reformed view, and embrace the Westminster Assembly's biblically accurate theology of the covenant, appreciating its fullness as God's glorious truth and provision for His Church.

Mr. Shepherd's lecture given at the aforementioned meeting is entitled *Law and Gospel in Covenantal Perspective*. It is divided into three sections: "Law and Gospel in the Adamic Covenant," "Law and Gospel in the Mosaic Covenant," and "Law and Gospel in the New Covenant." In this review, I will deal mainly with the first section, the understanding of the Adamic covenant, for it is here that Rev. Shepherd first denies the covenant of works/covenant of grace system that finds its clearest Reformed expression in the Westminster Standards. I will then briefly show how this fundamental rejection of a covenant of works in the Adamic agreement also alters his understanding of the nature of faith and the work of Christ in the new covenant and how they do not agree with the Reformed view of the Confession.

Mr. Shepherd gives a summary of the theology of the Adamic covenant as expressed in the Westminster Standards (*Law & Gospel*, 2):

Reformed theology as it developed from the late sixteenth century onward commonly spoke of a covenant of works made with Adam and his posterity. God created Adam righteous, without sin, and promised to him and his posterity confirmation in righteousness and eternal life "upon condition of perfect and personal obedience." That is to say, Adam would earn or achieve whatever eschatological blessing and privilege was held out to him on the ground of perfect law-keeping.

Thus, Norman Shepherd correctly acknowledges that the Westminster view of covenant theology maintains that Adam was to "work" for his confirmation in righteousness. The Standards themselves define this righteousness-confirming work of Adam's as "perfect, perpetual, and personal obedience" (WCF 7.1; WSC 12; WLC 20).

#### A NEW VIEW OF THE ADAMIC COVENANT

After giving the Confession's expression of the Reformed view, however, Rev. Shepherd then introduces, "a different way of

looking at the Adamic covenant" (*Law & Gospel*, 3). He begins by stating that the operating principle in the Adamic covenant was not "works," but rather "faith".

Consider the fact that Adam was created holy and righteous, without sin. He was the original just man. He would live and live forever not by the merit of his works but by faith. He would exhibit the principle stated in Habakkuk 2:4 and reiterated by Paul in Romans 1: 17, "The righteous will live by faith." Whatever blessing was in store for him was not a reward to be earned by performance but a gift to be received by faith. (Ibid.).

Mr. Shepherd here explicitly denies that a covenant of works was ever part of God's terms of agreement with Adam. He reiterates this belief in his description of the Mosaic covenant: "The Law of Moses is not a republication of a covenant of works made with Adam because there was no covenant of works to republish" (*Law & Gospel*, 6). He further elaborates his belief that works were never a part of God's covenantal requirement by stating it more emphatically: "The Lord God did not and never does deal with His image bearers in terms of a principle of works and merit, but ever and always in terms of a principle of faith and grace." (*Law & Gospel*, 4).

As already stated, the Westminster Standards *do* affirm a covenant theology of works in the Adamic covenant; they also affirm a difference between God's dealings with pre-fall and post-fall man. God enters into a covenant of works with pre-fallen, righteous man, and a covenant of grace with post-fallen sinful man. The operative principle of the pre-fall covenant was "works" and the operative principle in the post fall-covenant is "grace."<sup>4</sup> In the post-fall covenant, the instrument that connects someone to the grace of God in Christ is faith.

#### THE METHOD OF JUSTIFICATION

Norman Shepherd's view of covenant theology affects his view of justification. In discussing justification, he says, "The method of justification for Adam before the fall is exactly what it is for Paul after the fall: 'The righteous will live by faith' (Romans 1:17)" (*Law & Gospel*, 4). He says that the method of justification for Adam was "faith." But, notice that in making this statement, Mr. Shepherd does not deal with the text of Genesis (you will not find the word "faith" anywhere in Genesis 2). Instead he quotes, without any exegesis, Habakkuk 2:4 and Romans 1:17, "*the righteous will live by faith*," and then applies an abstract "principle" of faith to Adam. In context, Paul is speaking of faith in Jesus. Habakkuk is speaking of faith in the LORD, and what He will do. In Reformed understanding, what the LORD promised to do in Habakkuk He accomplished through Jesus Christ. In both of these pre-

4. In Reformed theology the Covenant of Grace is part of the Covenant of Redemption (*Pactum Salutis*). The Son of God performs the "work" in the Covenant of Redemption which secures God's "grace" to those in the Covenant of Grace.

fall texts, the object of faith is the same: a resting on the Lord Jesus Christ and His meritorious work.

Mr. Shepherd has not only redefined the method of justification for Adam but also for believers under the covenant of grace (*Law & Gospel*, 11):

This is the promise side of the new covenant – justification, sanctification, and eternal life through union with Jesus Christ. And this new covenant, like all the covenants that preceded it in redemptive history has an obligation side as well. The obligation side of the covenant is no different from what it has always been, namely, faith, repentance, and obedience.

Here he says that what is required of those in the covenant of grace is “faith, repentance, and obedience.” So on the one hand, what was required of Adam was “faith” and on the other hand, what is required of post fall man is “faith, repentance, and obedience.” The Westminster Standards are very clear that what was required of Adam before the fall was obedience and what is required of man after the fall is faith. We must be careful not to misrepresent Mr. Shepherd’s view. He is not saying that there are two different methods of justification. Even in the above quote he says, “The obligation side of the covenant is no different from what it has always been....” So how can we understand the apparent contradiction? What we need to see is that Rev. Shepherd is blurring the distinctions between faith and obedience. That brings us to our next point.

#### NORMAN SHEPHERD’S UNDERSTANDING OF FAITH

Mr. Shepherd’s denial of the covenant of works affects his understanding of faith. In his book *The Call of Grace* he writes, “All of this [fulfillment of Abrahamic promises] is made possible through the covenantal righteousness of Jesus Christ. His was a living, active, and obedient faith that took him all the way to the cross. This faith was credited to him as righteousness.”<sup>5</sup> Here Rev. Shepherd uses one of his favorite concepts “obedient faith.” This may simply mean a “living faith” that will produce obedience as fruit. However, it is hard to believe that this is what he means. This can be seen in the Scripture text used in the above quote.

Mr. Shepherd is alluding to a statement about Abraham in Gen 15:6 and applies it to our sinless Lord. At best, this statement is confusing. When the Bible speaks of someone’s faith being “credited” to him as righteousness, it is speaking of an alien righteousness. Jesus did not have to be credited with an alien righteousness as Abraham did. One wants to ask Rev. Shepherd, “Who was the object of Jesus’ faith?” Abraham’s faith rested in the Mediator of the covenant of grace: “Such a high priest meets our need – one who is holy, blameless, pure, set apart from sinners, exalted above the heavens” (Heb. 7:26). According to the Standards, this “faith” of Abraham was but

the instrument that connected him to the actual righteousness of Christ. While Jesus had to trust His Father, He had no need for “credited” (alien) righteousness.

The confusion about faith continues. A couple of paragraphs later Mr. Shepherd says, “But just as Jesus was faithful in order to guarantee the blessing, so his followers must be faithful in order to inherit the blessing” (*Call of Grace*, 19). Notice that where Jesus had an “obedient faith,” His follower must be “faithful” in order to inherit the promises. Now we see a clear indication that Rev. Shepherd has blurred “faith” with “faithfulness” or “obedience.” The Standards see a clear distinction between “faith” and “obedience”:

WLC 73. Faith justifies a sinner in the sight of God, not because of those other graces which do always accompany it, or of good works that are the fruits of it, nor as if the grace of faith, or any act thereof, were imputed to him for his justification; but only as it is an instrument by which he receives and applies Christ and his righteousness.

According to the Larger Catechism, justifying faith “receives and rests upon Christ and His righteousness” (WLC Q. 72). What does Mr. Shepherd mean by “faithful”? Does he mean that Jesus’ followers need to be obedient to inherit the blessings? If this is what he means, then here again he is at odds with the Westminster Standards. They clearly maintain that a justified person will be obedient, but they also clearly maintain that this obedience is in no way the basis for justification. It is only the merit of Christ that justifies a sinner.

Reformed theology has not ignored an aspect of faith for pre-fallen Adam. Louis Berkhof in his *Systematic Theology* says:<sup>6</sup>

In the covenant of works the keeping of the law is the way of life; in the covenant of grace, it is faith in Jesus Christ. Whatever faith was required in the covenant of works was a part of the righteousness of the law; in the covenant of grace, however, it is merely the organ by which we take possession of the grace of God in Jesus Christ.

Mr. Shepherd is able to confuse “faith” and “faithfulness” in his covenant theology because he has jettisoned merit as a Biblical concept. This is our next point.

#### DENIAL OF MERIT AND ACTIVE OBEDIENCE OF CHRIST

Mr. Shepherd’s denial of the Covenant of Works has affected his view of the work of Christ. In order to affirm that a sinner needs to be “obedient” and yet not be charged with

5. Norman Shepherd, *The Call of Grace* (P&R, 2000) 19.

6. Louis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Wm B Eerdmans Publishing, 2000) 272.

“works righteousness,” he has categorically denied that man can “merit” anything from God. That is how he can say, “His [Jesus’] was a living, active, and obedient faith ... this faith was credited to him as righteousness” (*Call of Grace*, 19). For Rev. Shepherd to be consistent, even Jesus cannot not merit anything from God. It is here that we can clearly see the danger of his “faith and grace” principle as opposed to Westminster’s “works and merit” principle. The Standards present and preserve a “works and merit” principle for the two covenant heads: Adam and Christ. They are the only two who can “merit” anything while in covenant with God. With his denial of the “merit” principle, Mr. Shepherd ends up saying that God was gracious to Jesus because of Jesus’ faith.

Thus, the denial of the Covenant of Works also leads Norman Shepherd to deny the imputation of the active obedience of Christ. He has explicitly denied the imputation of the active obedience of Christ at a conference in 2003, in his address entitled, *Justification by Faith in Pauline Theology*. The address was published as a chapter in a recently released book: *The Backbone of the Bible: Covenant in Contemporary Perspective*, P. Andrew Sandlin, ed. (Nacogdoches: Covenant Media Press, 2004).

The Westminster Standards affirm both active obedience and merit in WLC 55 (bold emphasis added):

*How does Christ make intercession?* Christ makes intercession, by his appearing in our nature continually before the Father in heaven, in the merit of his obedience and sacrifice on earth, declaring his will to have it applied to all believers; Answering all accusations against them, and procuring for them quiet of conscience, notwithstanding daily failings, access with boldness to the throne of grace, and acceptance of their persons and services.

In summary we see that Norman Shepherd’s denial of the covenant of works with Adam has an effect on the entire structure of his theology. It produces a system of doctrine that is clearly different than the system found in the Westminster Standards. The words of the 18<sup>th</sup> century Dutch theologian Wilhelmus à Brakel seem prophetic:<sup>7</sup>

Acquaintance with this covenant [of works] is of the greatest importance, for whoever errs here or denies the existence of the covenant of works will not understand the covenant of grace, and will readily err concerning the mediatorship of the Lord Jesus. Such a person will very readily deny that Christ by His active obedience has merited a right to eternal life for

the elect. This is to be observed with several parties who, because they err concerning the covenant of grace, also deny the covenant of works. Conversely, whoever denies the covenant of works, must rightly be suspected to be in error concerning the covenant of grace as well.

I would urge officers in Reformed churches to be very careful when a new and untested theology comes along. Certainly, because Rev. Shepherd’s theology is new and there has been no systematic expression of it, there may be some misunderstandings of it, and I for one welcome any correction from him if I have misconstrued any of his statements. But one thing is perfectly clear: Mr. Shepherd’s covenant theology is different from the covenant theology of the Westminster Standards. ■

REVIEW: Robert Traill, *Justification Vindicated* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 2002) xii, 77pp. Puritan Paperback Series. Reviewed by Andrew J. Webb, Pastor of Providence Presbyterian Church (PCA).

It would be understandable if a reader of *Justification Vindicated* were to conclude that this book had been written only quite recently, for in it Scottish Presbyterian Pastor Robert Traill was responding to the rise of alarming new views on justification within the Presbyterian and Reformed community that seemed to run contrary to what he rightly described as “the good old Protestant doctrine” of justification by faith alone. These “new” views will be eerily familiar to observers of some contemporary movements in Presbyterian and Reformed thought with their repudiation of the active obedience of Christ as a vital component in the biblical doctrine of justification, their emphasis on the necessity of the holiness and obedience of the believer in order to be justified, and their criticism of those who hold to the older view of justification by faith alone as “antinomians.”

Traill (1642-1716) however, was not writing for today’s readers. His book, which originally appeared in 1692, was written to outline and respond to an alarming decline in the beliefs of English Presbyterians regarding the doctrine of justification in his own time. Its enduring value to modern readers lies not only in the fact that Traill’s defense of the Biblical doctrine of justification by faith alone is as edifying and instructive as it was when it was written over 300 years ago, but also in the fact that many of the issues in contention regarding justification in his day have resurfaced in contemporary debates. For instance, the neonomian view of justification espoused by Traill’s contemporary, Richard Baxter, has many similarities with the views of modern neonomians<sup>1</sup> such as Norman Shepherd. Therefore, it is not going too far to say that if a reader is well acquainted with the justification controversy

7. Wilhelmus à Brakel, *The Christian’s Reasonable Service* (Morgan: Soli Deo Gloria Books, 1992) 1.355.

1. Neonomians deny that justification depends upon the imputation of Christ’s perfect obedience to the law and instead

as it existed in Traill's day, he will be better equipped to understand and deal with the errors of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

At only seventy-seven pages in length in the Banner of Truth paperback edition, it is difficult to think of a book length examination of the doctrine of justification that is as succinct and easy to follow as *Justification Vindicated*. Buchanan's magisterial work, *The Doctrine of Justification*, may be more comprehensive, and indeed readers whose appetites are whetted to learn more about justification by faith alone would be well advised to tackle that work as well; but those wishing an introduction to the doctrine and the ways in which it can be and often is misunderstood would be well advised to start with *Justification Vindicated*.

Why is maintaining and defending the biblical doctrine of justification so important? Traill answers that question by pointing out that justification is the keystone in the arch of all Christian doctrine (Traill, 67):

All the great fundamentals of Christian truth centre in this of justification. The Trinity of persons in the Godhead; the incarnation of the only begotten of the Father; the satisfaction paid to the law and justice of God, for the sins of the world, by his obedience and sacrifice of himself in that flesh he assumed; and the divine authority of the scriptures, which reveal all this, are all straight lines of truth that centre in this doctrine of the justification of a sinner by the imputation and application of that satisfaction. There can be no justification without a righteousness; no righteousness can be but what answers fully and perfectly the holy law of God; no such righteousness can be performed but by a divine person; no benefit can accrue to a sinner by it unless it be some way his, and applied to him; no application can be made of this but by faith in Jesus Christ. And as the connection with, and dependence of this truth upon the other great mysteries of divine truth is evident in the plain proposal of it, so the same has been sadly manifest in this, that the forsaking of the doctrine of justification by faith in Christ's righteousness, has been the first step of apostasy in many, who have not stopped till they revolted from Christianity itself.

Traill was by no means alone in his convictions regarding the centrality of justification by faith alone to true Christianity. One of his contemporaries on the continent, the Dutch Puritan Wilhelmus à Brakel (1635-1711) wrote:<sup>2</sup>

[Justification] is the soul of Christianity and the fountainhead of all true comfort and sanctification. He who errs in this doctrine errs to his eternal destruction. The devil is therefore continually engaged in denying, perverting, and obscuring the truth expressed in this chapter and, if he does not accomplish this, to prevent exercise concerning this truth. When

new errors appear on the horizon, even when they initially do not pertain to justification at all, they in time will eventually culminate in affecting this doctrine. One must therefore be all the more earnest to properly understand, defend, and meditate upon this doctrine.

Traill was also quite prescient in his conclusion that if the English Presbyterians persisted in their denial of the necessity of Christ's righteousness to justification, they would inevitably become Arminian and from there it was but an easy step to Socinianism,<sup>3</sup> a development which sadly occurred as the majority of English Presbyterians ended up becoming Unitarian in their theology.

In *Justification Vindicated*, therefore, Traill sets out from the very beginning not only to defend the true doctrine of justification from the unjust charge of Antinomianism, but also to defend the absolute necessity of the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the believer for justification. As a "guiding principle," Traill gives us the following definition of justification (Traill, 9):

That a law-condemned sinner is freely justified by God's grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ; that he is justified only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to him by God of his free grace, and received by faith alone as an instrument; which faith is the gift of the same grace.

Traill goes on to state that those who were most zealous to defend the concept that justification is entirely founded on the imputation of the righteousness of Christ and does not depend in any sense the works of the believer, nevertheless also maintained that those who are truly justified will inevitably manifest holiness and good works. By doing so, Traill shows that the link between justification and sanctification is inseparable, but is never to be confounded. The good works of the believer are the "fruits" of justification, and as such they are an evidence of a lively faith, but are never in any sense the grounds of a believer's salvation.

Indeed, Traill is zealous to point out the differences between the evangelical doctrine of justification and the new scheme regarding the place of the works of believers. He denies, for instance, the mixing of faith with the obedience of believers, holding fast to the idea that faith is the "hand or

---

assert that it is the covenant obedience of the justified believer that is necessary. This evangelical obedience does not need to be perfect but it must be *sincere*. Thus for neonomians faith is often indistinguishable from the believer's faithfulness.

2. Wilhelmus à Brakel, *The Christian's Reasonable Service, Volume 2* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 1993, 1999) 341.

3. Socinians were followers of Socinus. They rejected both the Trinity and the Divinity of Christ, and became the precursors of modern Unitarians.

instrument, receiving the righteousness of Christ, for which only we are justified” rather than the belief held by many in his day of “faith’s justifying as it is the spring of sincere obedience” (Traill, 15, 57).

This idea of the mixing of faith and evangelical obedience as the grounds of salvation, was not only a problem for the “new schemers” of Traill’s day; many modern theologians who hold to some form of what is often called “Covenant Nomism” have posited the necessity of the believer’s obedience for salvation or final justification. One such clear example of this tendency to confuse faith with obedience can be found in the twenty-third thesis of Norman Shepherd’s *34 Theses on Justification*:<sup>4</sup>

23. Because faith which is not obedient faith is dead faith, and because repentance is necessary for the pardon of sin included in justification, and because abiding in Christ by keeping his commandments (John 15:5; 10; 1 John 3:13; 24) are all necessary for continuing in the state of justification, good works, works done from true faith, according to the law of God, and for his glory, being the new obedience wrought by the Holy Spirit in the life of the believer united to Christ, though not the ground of his justification, are nevertheless necessary for salvation from eternal condemnation and therefore for justification (Rom. 6:16, 22; Gal. 6:7-9).

Shepherd is not the only contemporary advocate of a *new scheme* of justification who includes “sincere obedience” as a vital part of the faith that justifies. This tendency is also seen throughout the works of those who advocate a “New Perspective on Paul” (NPP) and the biblical doctrine of justification. N.T. Wright for instance has written:<sup>5</sup>

Faith and obedience are not antithetical. They belong exactly together. Indeed, very often the word “faith” itself could properly be translated as “faithfulness,” which makes the point just as well.

Traill, no doubt would have seen the above definitions of faith as very similar to the defective definitions in vogue amongst late 17<sup>th</sup> century Presbyterians of which he said (Traill, 12):

Instead of justification by perfect obedience,<sup>6</sup> we are now to

4. Norman Shepherd, *Thirty-four Theses on Justification in Relation to Faith, Repentance, and Good Works*, Presented to the Presbytery of Philadelphia of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church November 18, 1978, Thesis #23.

5. N.T. Wright, *What Saint Paul Really Said* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997) 160.

6. By which he refers to the active obedience of Christ imputed to believers and received by faith alone.

be justified by our own evangelical righteousness, made up of faith, repentance, and sincere obedience.

One of Traill’s central purposes in writing *Justification Vindicated* was to prove that any patchwork of our own righteousness and Christ’s, whether it be proposed as part of the popular Neonomianism of Traill’s age or the Covenant Nomism of our own, could never justify or save any man. Traill firmly believed that the very antithesis that N.T. Wright denies in the above quote lay at the heart of the biblical gospel. Simply put, justification and therefore salvation is either all of Christ or it is no justification at all. As Traill put it so very eloquently (Traill, 69-70):

It is also true that whatever variety and differences there are in men’s notions and opinions (and there is a great deal) about justification, they are all certainly reducible to two; one of which is every man’s opinion. And they are, that the justification of a sinner before God, is either on the account of a righteousness in and of ourselves, or on the account of a righteousness in another, even Jesus Christ, who is “Jehovah our righteousness.” Law and gospel, faith and works, Christ’s righteousness and our own, grace and debt, do equally divide all in this matter. Crafty men may endeavour to blend and mix these things together in justification, but it is a vain attempt. It is not only most expressly rejected in the gospel, which peremptorily determines the contrariety, inconsistency, and incompatibility between these two; but the nature of the things in themselves, and the sense and conscience of every serious person, witness to the same thing, that our own righteousness, and Christ’s righteousness, do comprehend all the pleas of men to justification – one or other of them every man in the world stands upon – and that they are inconsistent with, and destructive one of another, in justification.

If a man trusts to his own righteousness, he rejects Christ’s; if he trusts to Christ’s righteousness, he rejects his own. If he will not reject his own righteousness, as too good to be renounced, if he will not venture on Christ’s righteousness, as not sufficient alone to bear him out, and bring him safe off at God’s bar, he is in both a convicted unbeliever. And if he endeavour to patch up a righteousness before God, made up of both, he is still under the law, and a despiser of gospel-grace (Gal. 2:21). That righteousness that justifies a sinner, consists in *aliquo indivisibili*, and this every man finds when the case is his own, and he serious about it.

Let us hope that in our own time, theologians in the mold of Traill will arise once again to strive for and vindicate the “Good Old Protestant doctrine” of justification from its enemies, for certainly the warning Traill sounded regarding

the controversy over justification is just as true of the current situation (Traill, 50):

Lastly, We complain, that the scheme of the gospel contended for by our opposers, is clouded, veiled, and darkened by school terms; new, uncouth, and unscriptural phrases; whereby as they think to guard themselves against opposition, so they do increase the jealousies of their brethren, and keep their principles from the knowledge of ordinary people, who are as much concerned in those points as any scholar or divine.

This controversy looks like a very bad omen. We thought we might have healed our old breaches, in smaller things; and, behold, a new one is threatened in the greatest matters. We did hope, that the good old Protestant doctrine had been rooted and riveted in the hearts of all the ministers on our side; but now we find the contrary, and that the sour leaven of Arminianism works strongly. Their advocates do not yet own the name; but the younger sort are more bold and free: and with them no books or authors are in esteem and use, but such as are for the new rational method of divinity....

It is undoubted that the devil designs the obstructing of the course of the gospel; and in this he has often had the service of the tongues and pens of good men, as well as of bad. Yet we are not without hope, that the Lord, in his wisdom and mercy, will defeat him; and that these contentions may yet have good fruit and a good issue. ■

Review: *The Auburn Avenue Theology, Pros and Cons: Debating the Federal Vision. The Knox Theological Seminary Colloquium on the Federal Vision.* Edited by E. Calvin Beisner. Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Knox Theological Seminary, 2004. 331 pp. \$16.00. Reviewed by J. Ligon Duncan III, Ph.D., Senior Minister, First Presbyterian Church, Jackson, MS (PCA), and Adjunct Professor, Reformed Theological Seminary. Dr. Duncan is also presently Moderator of the Presbyterian Church in America, and President of the Alliance of Confessing Evangelicals.

Before offering a brief review of this volume, it will perhaps be helpful to the reader to know some of the background as to the need for its existence. Especially since the content of this book is itself the result of a significant event in a developing ecclesiastical debate.

For some years now there has been a handful of voices within the reformed community advocating for theological revision. Concerned that the reformed churches have been too influenced by revivalism and rationalism, and believing the traditional reformed doctrine itself has not escaped the

blindspots of its contexts, these men have articulated a need for reformed pastors and churches to undertake some serious theological reassessment. A small sub-culture has grown up around these voices, and their message has been spread via the internet, weblogs, newsletters, self-published books, conferences, tapes/CDs/MP3 downloads and various other media. This diverse group of conversation partners has more recently embraced the designation “Federal Vision” as a description of its collective aspirations. Among other things, they believe that classical Covenant Theology is in need of a biblical makeover and a fresh deployment in the reformed churches and in the lives of reformed Christians. Their proposals have not been widely embraced, but they have sparked controversy in the American reformed community.

Several things in combination have put this issue on the front-burner. In the year 2000, P&R published Professor Norman Shepherd’s little book, *The Call of Grace*. Mr. Shepherd left Westminster Seminary under a cloud in the early 1980s, after a long-running controversy around his doctrine of justification. He had not had a high profile in the reformed-evangelical community since that time, but the publication of his book drew new attention to him, and set the stage for a more positive assessment of his views by some affiliated with the Federal Vision. His own criticisms of “regenerational evangelism” in favor of a “covenantal approach to evangelism” clearly resonated with many in that sub-culture. In 2002, the Auburn Avenue Presbyterian Church (PCA) of Monroe, Louisiana held a Pastor’s Conference in which key aspects of the Federal Vision were articulated. Douglas Wilson, Steve Wilkins, Steve Schlissel, and John Barach all spoke. As word of their messages filtered out into the American reformed community, there was an immediate reaction of surprise and suspicion. Indeed, in July of that same year, one smaller reformed denomination, the Reformed Presbyterian Church in the United States produced resolutions condemning the teaching propounded by these four men at the Monroe conference. Soon thereafter it became common to refer to the new views of covenant, election and sacraments as “the Auburn Avenue Theology.”

The various churches of all four of these pastors responded with strenuous denials of the label “heresy” regarding their pastors’ views, and in September of 2002, the session of the Auburn Avenue Presbyterian Church issued a statement attempting to clarify its views on covenant, baptism and salvation, and to demonstrate that these views are consistent with subscription to the Westminster Standards. Late in 2002, Douglas Wilson elaborated on his own views, in his self-published “*Reformed*” is Not Enough: *Recovering the Objectivity of the Covenant*. This book, far from clarifying the issues and settling the growing concerns of the larger reformed community, succeeded in merely heightening the controversy.

Meanwhile, in 2002-2003, the Orthodox Presbyterian Church was conducting a trial of an elder whose teachings resembled those of Norman Shepherd and intersected at points with the teachings of some Federal Vision advocates. When his previous conviction was overturned on appeal at the OPC General Assembly, there was widespread concern about the influence of Shepherd's views in the OPC, and a fear that the OPC was weak in its embrace of the traditional reformed doctrine of "justification by grace alone through faith alone in Christ alone."

In 2003, the Auburn Avenue Presbyterian Church, again hosted a Pastor's Conference with Douglas Wilson, Steve Wilkins, Steve Schlissel, and John Barach speaking. This time, however, a group of reformed stalwarts were called in to serve as respondents, among them Joseph Pipa, Morton Smith, Carl Robbins, and R.C. Sproul Jr. These men had longstanding friendships with a number of the Federal Vision proponents, and so it was hoped that forthright presentation and debate would clear misunderstandings and remove suspicions of "heresy." Once again, rather than quelling fears, this conference resulted in even more widespread awareness and concerns relating to the Federal Vision. *Christian Renewal* magazine ran interviews with the Auburn Avenue Conference's proponents and opponents of the Federal Vision.

That same year, 2003, saw a vigorous online discussion (via PCANews.com) of the New Perspectives on Paul, in which men affiliated with the Federal Vision criticized RTS professor Douglas F. Kelly's negative assessment of the New Perspectives on Paul and plead for a more positive evaluation of the work of N.T. Wright by the reformed community. The debate publicly revealed the diversity of opinion and intensity of feeling within the PCA on matters relating to the Federal Vision and the New Perspectives.

In August of 2003, Dr. E. Calvin Beisner, a personal friend of many of the key players in the 2003 Auburn Avenue Conference, brought them together, along with other prominent proponents and opponents of the Federal Vision, in Florida, in hopes that further face-to-face discussions in a non-threatening environment would dispel concerns, clarify misunderstandings and lead to unity in the truth. Once again, the best hopes were disappointed, and opponents of the Federal Vision were more concerned than ever about its content and consequences. The content of the book that is the subject of this review was first presented at this meeting.

In 2004, the Reformed Church in the United States adopted a statement condemning the teachings of Norman Shepherd on justification, and three books relating to the Federal Vision controversy were produced. (1) *The Federal Vision*, edited by Steve Wilkins, and published under the auspices of the Auburn Avenue Presbyterian Church, provides chapters by Douglas Wilson, Steve Wilkins, Steve Schlissel, and John

Barach, but also has articles from James Jordan, Peter Leithart, Rich Lusk, and Mark Horne. (2) *The Auburn Avenue Theology, Pros and Cons: Debating the Federal Vision*, resulting from the aforementioned symposium sponsored by Knox Theological Seminary, and moderated by Cal Beisner. And (3) *Backbone of the Bible: Covenant in Contemporary Perspective*, edited by Andrew Sandlin, appeared, with a foreword by John Frame. This book featured chapters by Norman Shepherd, Randy Booth, Roger Wagner, and others, and contains the incredibly unhelpful assertion regarding the relation of the Bible to Christian doctrine: "The Bible is unchanged and unchanging (1 Pet. 1:23-25); but doctrine, which is flawed human reflection on the Bible, is dynamic and developing." No Arian could ever hope for a better formulation of that issue!

All the while that discussion and debate has been proceeding on the Federal Vision via books, blogs and conferences, there have been denominational investigations moving ahead as well in both the PCA and OPC. Nevertheless, the January 2005 rendition of the Auburn Avenue Pastors Conference featured Church of England Bishop N.T. Wright, the most effective and prominent proponent of the so-called New Perspectives on Paul, with a rejoinder from Professor Richard Gaffin of Westminster Seminary.

This historical background to the content of this book, perhaps suggests why the volume is important. First, this book provides the reader firsthand accounts of the views of key proponents and critics of the Federal Vision in their own words. Second, it is the record of a significant attempt to meet face-to-face in hopes of promoting the peace of the church by attempting to clear up misunderstandings, alleviate misplaced concerns and create consensus on disputed matters. Both of these points are significant because of the regular assertion of Federal Vision proponents that their critics are misreading them, falsely accusing them, uncharitably dealing with them and failing to meet with them and hear them out. This is clearly not the case with regard to the interactions in this book—which are the result of critics of the Federal Vision going out of their way to understand precisely what the proponents are saying, to deal fairly and Christianly with them, and yet also to express sincere concerns about the theological assertions and formulations of the Federal Vision.

Third, the Federal Vision proponents who are contributors to this volume are ministers in various reformed denominations. This is significant for at least two reasons. The first is that this indicates that the Federal Vision is having at least some influence amongst the ministry of various reformed and evangelical churches in North America. Yet it has been propounded without the affirmation of any major reformed denomination. That is, though its advocates assert it to be both consistent with and an improvement upon historic reformed confessional formulations, no reformed denomination of

standing has recognized it as such, and yet ministers within those communions are openly and publicly promoting it, among clergy and laity alike. This seems to be a very individualistic way to promote a view that claims to have a higher view of the church than that of the prevailing evangelical culture. Secondly, this is significant because one of the interesting features of the promotion of the Federal Vision, especially in the world of the internet, has been the factor of those who lack theological and ecclesiastical credentials advocating the doctrinal reformation of the churches. It is nice to have ministers, at least in this volume, taking up that task, because some of the occupants of the blogosphere advocating for the Federal Vision (1) are possessed of no formal theological education, and (2) have not been recognized as having the qualifications for the teaching office, even by a local church—that is, not only are they not ordained as ministers, they have not even been recognized as elders in a local church.

The book is divided into four parts, and twenty-three chapters. Cal Beisner's introduction helpfully invites the reader into the debate with a healthy dose of context. It is an introduction not to be skipped. The first section of the book is an overview of some of the concerns of the proponents of the Federal Vision, as well as of concerns about the Federal Vision by its critics. It will give the reader a good feel for the issues in play in this debate.

Douglas Wilson speaks for the Federal Vision side. Wilson assures the reader of the Federal Vision's commitment to divine sovereignty and election and argues that this discussion should be treated as intramural—that is, he wants to stress that both Federal Vision proponents and opponents are legitimate members of the reformed, orthodox, Christian, community, and thus that all discussion about the Federal Vision proposals should acknowledge that and reflect it in tone. His several emphases include: highlighting (1) the Federal Vision's desire to articulate and practice a more consistent view of the place of children in the covenant community and in relation to the promises of God; (2) the Federal Vision's concern to use language more biblically than has been the case, in their opinion, in traditional reformed dogmatics, as well as its desire to subject traditional, confessional systematic theology to a rigorous scriptural re-think; (3) the Federal Vision's concern to coordinate the doctrine of union with Christ, with the doctrine of the Church, so as to correct what it sees as an errant distinction between (or at least an unhelpful deployment of the idea of) the visible and invisible church in traditional reformed ecclesiology; asserting (4) that the Federal Vision is squarely in the center of the Reformed tradition, but desirous to recover something that the original reformers had discovered but which the reformed church of late seems to have misplaced; and that (5) the Federal Vision wants to use what it thinks is more scriptural language and

categories relating to faith and obedience. The Federal Vision does not think that the New Testament entertains the kind of opposition between faith and obedience that is often articulated in evangelical explanations of the relation between law and gospel, between faith and work.

Dr. Joseph Pipa of Greenville Seminary provides the rejoinder to Wilson and, after expressing appreciation for some of the Federal Vision's diagnosis of modern evangelicalism, proceeds to indicate a string of problems: (1) a faulty hermeneutic and exegesis, including a naive and sometimes irrational version of biblicism; (2) a faulty view of systematic theology; (3) confusion in theological definition; (4) an imbalanced, pastorally problematic covenant theology; (5) an incipient sacramentalism; and (6) deviant views of covenant and justification.

Section two of the book commences with Steve Schlissel's meandering essay "A New Way of Seeing" in which he attempts to position the Federal Vision proponents as those who see the big cultural and theological picture, while their detractors are small-minded nitpickers arguing about tassel-length on vestments while Lenin rides a boxcar into Russia. He sees the culprit behind this narrow-mindedness as the Babylonian captivity of the church to Hellenistic philosophy, and posits a propositional-personal dichotomy that is reminiscent of the one many readers will have heard from their Barthian professors in halls of divinity thirty years ago. Chris Hutchinson's reply is humble in tone and devastating in content.

Peter Leithart's essay in chapter five is the most impressive piece in the whole volume from the pro-Federal Vision side. Leithart's intellect and theological training come through in his outline for a trinitarian recasting of reformed theology. Those familiar with the work of T.F. Torrance will already be acquainted with a number of Leithart's themes. Leithart's signature tags regarding "reification" and "abstraction" appear here, and nicely complement Schlissel's diatribe.

Rick Phillips' essay "Covenant and Salvation or What is a 'Christian?'" begins the third and longest section of the book, and is the first of two sturdy pieces he contributes. We may note in passing that though all of the contributions of the critics of Federal Vision theology are solid and competent, Phillips, Hutchinson's and Robbins' chapters stand out. Rich Lusk's chapter ten response to Morton Smith's essay will quickly introduce the reader to themes Lusk often develops in his writings (if you have not read him on the internet before), as will John Barach's chapter eleven contribution on "Covenant and Election" to his standard fare. The sources Lusk cites, by the way, on the history of the covenant of works do not reflect a grasp of the state of the art on that historical theological issue. Carl Robbins' piece on regeneration in chapter thirteen is a treasure trove.

*Continued on Page 183.*

## PSALLO

### Psalm 109:1-10

A new translation of any Psalm to be sung presents not a few challenges, the two foremost being its faithfulness to the Hebrew text, and placing the translation in a metrical form that lends itself to singing in English. In this new translation, I have attempted to preserve the meaning and sense of the original, although perhaps taking some license with the Hebrew meter itself to render it able to be sung according to English conventions of rhyme more typical of our singing.

As for the translation itself, a few notes are in order. First, where many translations render the first line, “Hold not thy peace” (KJV) or “Do not be silent” (NASB), I have rendered the Hebrew verb שָׁרַח, *charash*, *to be deaf*, as “be not deaf” and then the implied “*to me*” in italics, because this better renders the sense of the Hebrew. When in his straits the Psalmist cries out to God, he desires a hearing, rather than, as we say in English, that the Lord would turn a deaf ear to him. The Psalmist understands that if God will not hear, He will not respond or rescue him out of his trial.

Another point worthy of mention is the use of the proper name “Satan” in verse six. This translation is maintained by the KJV, and is supported by the personal use of this same Hebrew name in 1 Chronicles 21.1, and Zechariah 3.1. This translation is also preferred by Keil and Delitzsch in their commentary on the Psalms, who see in this passage a courtroom scene, with the accuser, Satan himself, standing at the persecutor’s right hand.

As for the tune, while tunes are not inspired, and thus not preserved for us in the Divine record, still, Christian prudence (WCF 1.6) would have us order the tune in a way consonant with the matter of the Psalm itself. So, a Psalm with a triumphant theme, such as Psalm 46, ought to be sung to a triumphant tune. So here, with such a plea for help in trouble, and solemn imprecations as these, we ought to have a tune that is somber, plaintive, and has some expression of the gravity of leveling such curses.

This brings us to the content of Psalm 109. My suspicion is that this Psalm, along with other Psalms of imprecation, are often avoided by Churches for inclusion in their worship repertoire. I believe this stems from a lack of understanding of what these Psalms are to teach, and what this understanding ought to engender in us. In Psalm 109, we have imprecations,

strong cursings, leveled at the enemy of the Lord’s anointed. At the time of writing, this was David, and the opposer, probably Ahithophel, during the time of Absalom’s rebellion. And we learn in the New Testament (Acts 1), that these imprecations are leveled, by the Spirit of prophecy, at Judas, the betrayer of the Lord. The imprecations are not the vindictive cursings of one who has been misused. The Apostle Paul wrote, “All scripture *is* given by inspiration of God, and *is* profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness...” (2Tim. 3.16 KJV). The words of the Psalter ought to be understood then, not as the expressions of an angry author, or fulminations of a firebrand, but as the sentiments of God Himself, the thoughts of the Psalmist being raised by that powerful Spirit of prophecy, above mere human vendetta and cursing. The expressions of the Psalmist against sinners are *God’s* expressions. They are the thoughts of *His* heart. The expressed hatred of the wicked, upon those who obey not God, ravage His people, terrorize His little ones, pursue and kill His Anointed, set so eloquently, solemnly, and awesomely in the Psalter, is the expression of *God’s* hatred of the wicked, the exposition of His great heart, who is unyielding in His pursuit of evil doers, and equally unyielding in the defense of His people, who are their prey.

Also, rather than primitive Old Testament expressions, we see that the New as well contains not only a vindication of these very Psalms, citing them as prophetic and indicative of events in the New Testament era, but also imprecations of its own. The imprecations of the Lord Jesus Christ are withering in the twenty third chapter of Matthew’s Gospel, against the “Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!” John the Baptist himself spoke against them as a “brood of vipers.” The Apostle Paul inveighed against Alexander the coppersmith (2Tim. 2.14), Hymenaeus and Alexander (1Tim. 1.20 cp. Psa 109.6), all those who would pervert the Gospel of Christ (Galatians 1.8-9; 5.12), and against those who love not the Lord Jesus Christ (1Cor. 16.22). And the Apostle John also expressed the same sort of cursing and imprecation for God’s enemies in the Revelation, his inspired exposition of the final triumph of God’s decree of redemption, which is replete with imprecations against the wicked, and the rejoicing of heaven and the redeemed upon earth at their demise. Chapters 14-20 announce that the awesome judgments of God upon the wicked are not something at which we ought to mourn, but rejoice! God’s enemies and ours are crushed—and their demise is our salvation! We bless God with the rest of the saints on earth, and with the Church triumphant in heaven, and with the Holy Angels, at their demise. We, with the rest of the saints, pray for their end, *and in the words of the inspired Psalter we make these same prayers in song.*

TODD L. RUDELL ■

## Psalm 109:1-10

To the chief Musician, A Psalm of David

Malediction

Todd L. Ruddell

<sup>1</sup>O my God, O my praise, be not deaf to me  
<sup>3</sup>Fierce - ly they, cast their words, words of hate - ful spite  
<sup>4</sup>For my love, they've be - come en - e - mies to me!  
<sup>6</sup>Up - on him, vis - it thou, with a wick - ed one  
<sup>8</sup>Few his days, let them be, and an - oth - er take,  
<sup>10</sup>Wan - der - ing, in - di - gents, be his child - ren so!

<sup>2</sup>for wick - ed and de - ceit - ful mouths are o - pened a - gainst me,  
 their words en - comp - ass me a - bout and they a - gainst me fight,  
 But I *de - vote* my - self to prayer<sup>5</sup>still e - vil for good they,  
 let Sa - tan stand at his right hand,<sup>7</sup>con - demned let him be shunned  
 his of - fice—<sup>9</sup>let his child - ren sigh from them their fa - ther take,  
 Far from their des - o - late es - tates let them a - beg - ging go,

to me with ly - ing tongues they speak.  
 ar - rayed a - gainst me with - out right.  
 hate for my love re - turn to me.  
 his pray - er let it sin be - come.  
 and of his wife a wid - ow make.  
 seek - ing while wan - d'ring to and fro'.

## IN TRANSLATIÖNE

Andrew Willet's *To the Pious Reader*

From Book One of Nicholas Bownd's

SABBATHVM VETERIS ET NOVI TESTAMENTI<sup>1</sup>

It has been well established over the last 150 years, from the writings of James Gilfillan to James T. Dennison,<sup>2</sup> that Puritan Sabbatarianism did not simply "appear" in the late 16<sup>th</sup> century with the writings of men such as William Perkins, Richard Greenham, and Nicholas Bownd, whose large work, while not the earliest, sparked the first Sabbath controversy in English literature.<sup>3</sup> The Puritan view, in practice if not in the underlying theory, had roots in strict ideals of observing the Lord's Day that existed at least in law even under the medieval church (Dennison, 1-32). After the Reformation, most of the statements on the fourth commandment were ambiguous as far as linking them theologically to a strictly Puritan view, but there were some initially strong statements at the beginning of Edward the Sixth's reign by John Hooper (1548) and Hugh Latimer (1552).<sup>4</sup> Dennison fixes the period

---

ANDREW WILLET, D.D. (1562-1621). Dr. Willet was Rector of Barley from 1599 until his death. *To the Pious Reader*: TRANSLATED BY N. E. Barry Hofstetter, Th.M.

1. Nicholas Bownd, *SABBATHVM VETERIS ET NOVI TESTAMENTI: The True Doctrine of the Sabbath...* (1606) [A6-A7].

2. James Gilfillan, *The Sabbath Viewed in the Light of Reason, Revelation, and History...* (NY: American Tract Society & New York Sabbath Committee, c. 1862). James T. Dennison, *The Market Day of the Soul: The Puritan Doctrine of the Sabbath in England, 1532-1700* (Morgan, PA: Soli Deo Gloria Publications, 2001).

3. Nicholas Bownd, *The Doctrine of the Sabbath, plainely layde forth and soundly proved* (1595). The first edition was based upon sermons delivered in 1586. "We have now come to the commencement of the earliest sabbatic contest, entitled to the name, in the Christian Church." Gilfillan, 66.

4. See Dennison, 10-11 n33.

5. See David S. Katz, *Sabbath and Sectarianism in Seventeenth-Century England* (New York: E.J. Brill, 1988) 5.

6. Gervase Babington, *A very fruitful Exposition of the Commandments* (London, 1583). See Dennison, 34.

7. See the life of Andrew Willet in Benjamin Brook's *The Lives of the Puritans* (Morgan, PA: Soli Deo Gloria Publications, 1994) 2.284-288.

8. *Synopsis Papismi, that is, a generall viewe of papistrise: wherein the whole mysterie of iniquitie, and summe of Antichristian doctrine is set downe...* (London: Printed by Thomas Orwin, for Thomas Man, 1592; new edition, London, 1852).

of 1562 to 1583 as the time of "precisionizing" the Puritan doctrine of the Sabbath (Dennison, 26). By 1570, there are indications of widely held Sabbatarianism in practice out in the English countryside,<sup>5</sup> and the incident at Paris Garden in 1583 brought forth "a national clamor for the better observance of the Lord's day" (Dennison, 33). That same year Gervase Babington published the first unambiguous Puritan exposition of the fourth commandment.<sup>6</sup>

On the development of the Puritan doctrine of the Sabbath, Dennison writes (Dennison, 18-19):

... it should not be concluded that because the sources are not more explicitly strict, Sabbatarianism is nowhere to be found before 1583. Then how did it happen that, in 1583, Gervase Babington penned a statement on the fourth commandment which could have passed for a summary of Nicolas Bownd? In this writer's opinion the answer is contained in the underground development of Puritanism via prophesyings, lecturings and the universities. One must not neglect to weigh the almost certain effect of the biblical discussions in these Puritan gatherings—discussions which undoubtedly touched on the Sabbath discussion... Consider the fact that the following men, all of whom later expressed sentiments of a Puritan nature upon the fourth commandment, at one time attended Cambridge University, the "nursery" of Puritanism: John Knewstub, Edward Dering, William Perkins, Richard Greenham, Nicholas Bownd, John Stockwood, Philip Stubbes, Gervase Babington, William Fulke, and Andrew Willet. Furthermore, the Puritan lectureships and prophesyings were in full swing in the first decade of Elizabeth's reign.

The Latin prefatory to Nicholas Bownd's monumental work on the Christian Sabbath, translated here for the first time, was written by the last of the aforementioned men, Andrew Willet. Born in 1562,<sup>7</sup> Andrew was the son of Thomas Willet, who was sub-almoner to King Edward the Sixth, who suffered under Mary's persecution, and "was preferred to a prebend in the church of Ely" under Queen Elizabeth. By an early age Andrew exhibited "uncommon genius" and by the age of fourteen he was sent to Cambridge, where he became friends with men such as William Perkins and John Downham. He would go on to become a celebrated theologian, penning many commentaries, and the massive *Synopsis Papismi*,<sup>8</sup> a refutation of Roman Catholicism which brought him wide celebrity. In this preface to Bownd's work, Willet provides personal testimony which supports Dennison's contention that his time at Cambridge was his introduction to Sabbatarian views.

CHRIS COLDWELL

*To the Pious Reader*

In this degenerate age, inclined to evil, when not only does zeal for piety fail throughout but also the health of doctrine slips, nothing can be brought forth which assists more for the moment either in correcting errors or in cultivating the purity of virtue, than that the worship of God be kept whole and inviolate for God on that day set aside for him, the Lord's Day. For God has said: "Observe my Sabbaths, since they are a sign between me and you, that you may know that I am the Lord who sanctifies you."<sup>9</sup> If indeed God wishes to render anyone more holy, then he calls the pious mind to holiness on *that* day. If he should think it worthy to reveal himself to anyone, then at that quite sacred time he insinuates himself, opens the spirit to visions, and imbues it with spiritual service: something which we read that John happily experienced in Rev 1: 10. It is not because the divine work is circumscribed by the time (for the Spirit works without restraint), but because the media have been used by which the business of the soul is promoted: public prayers, the administration of the word and sacraments, are assuredly brought together on that day. Just as it is fitting for the family to obtain food in the market place at some point during the week, so is the Christian Sabbath, as it were, the better part of the soul, in which heavenly nourishment is sought for the rest of the week. Well did Isocrates have it, that men become better when they approach God, nor is it credible that there is anything of goodness in the one hastening to church, to present himself before God, though in the final analysis he thinks and feels it not at all holy. Just as we observe that birds ascend to the threshold of the lofty heavens, as it were, by the movement of their wings, so men on the Lord's day are joined to heaven by the conveyance of their prayers. Thus the Christian Sabbath is called by worthy Chrysostom *the architect of all virtue*,<sup>10</sup> in Nyssenus, *the custodian of self-control*, and in Basilus, *the necessary debt*, which is paid to God. Let that day be kept entirely sacred, consecrated with divine exercises only. Let all hear the word attentively; let them celebrate the divine mysteries devotedly; let them offer prayers humbly; let them eagerly sound forth hymns; let them compare pious sermons; let them meditate studiously on the works of God; let them kindly help the poor; let them courteously visit the sick; let them mercifully console those who mourn; let them not ply the hand in their accustomed works nor delight in frivolities; let them not indulge in vain pleasure-seeking; let them not be idle in drinking parties or games. Whatever things are of God, by the rule of Christ must be returned to God (Matt. 22:21, Acts 20:7, 1 Cor. 16:2). God does not permit an equal partner, nor does he allow what is his by right to be transferred to another.

They are Judaizers who, clinging to the external rest itself, are said to be addicted too much to ceremony. Others,

contrary to them, detract greatly from the honor of the day when they wish to rest the celebration solely on ecclesiastical tradition, and cause other days to be equal to it. There is yet a third class of profane men who think that whatever they wish is permitted to them on the Lord's day. You might say that the first are those who run ahead of the way, the second are those who run behind the way, and the third are those who run outside the way.<sup>11</sup> To all these errors, the most serious and learned author of this book has prepared an antidote, which now again has come forth into the light, much better than before, and more complete than all other works of a similar nature. Hereupon, as I happily remember my initiation into these studies at Cambridge Academy, so now I rejoice in those same streams from which first I tasted privately, that so rich a vein of all erudition and piety might flow abroad to all. I therefore heartily commend to all this work, pleasing in its manifold variety, sincere in the purity of its doctrine, necessary for further use, and quite worthy of our contemplation. Therefore I conclude with the sentiment of Ambrosius, appropriate to the Sabbath (though he offered it concerning fasting):<sup>12</sup> "You seek remedy, and yet flee the Sabbath, as though you were able to find some other, greater remedy." Farewell, most gentle reader, and that which here is most piously taught, faithfully pursue. If you praise the design of the author, then at the same time apply it, that the design of your life might be praiseworthy according to this rule:<sup>13</sup> *Practice according to what you read, and read with an eye to what you should practice.*

*I have written of these things of ancient times as proof of friendship and esteem.*

Andrew Willet, Doctor of Sacred Theology.

TRANSLATED BY N. E. BARRY HOFSTETTER, Th.M. ■

9. [Exodus 31:13. Willet either paraphrases or offers his own translation. Willet, *Sabbata mea observate, quoniam signum est inter me, et vobis, ut sciatis quod ego Dominus, qui sanctifico vos. The Vulgate has: loquere filiis Israhel et dices ad eos videte ut sabbatum meum custodiat quia signum est inter me et vos in generationibus vestris ut sciatis quia ego Dominus qui sanctifico vos* (Tell the sons of Israel and say to them: "See to it that you are to keep my Sabbath, since it is a sign between me and you in your generations that you may know that I am the Lord who sanctifies you").]

10. [Willet cites the original Greek without noting the source; This is a rendering of his Latin translation, which here and in the two following examples are fair translations of the Greek.]

11. [Possibly an allusion to Psalm 1.]

12. Isadore Pel[usium]

13. [Ed. Literally, "Practice logically and read practically." The Greek text is very difficult to discern given the copy of the text consulted and the old orthography. It may be *prassete logikos kai lege pragmatikos*, or *praktis logikos kai lege praktikos*. Our thanks go to Ray Lanning for his input on this particular part of the text.]

## ANTIQUARY

### The Development of the Traditional Form of *The Westminster Standards*

The Westminster Confession of Faith was approved and adopted by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland on August 27, 1647. Subsequently, the Confession was published for the first time with both the Larger and Shorter Catechisms in 1648, which catechisms had been approved respectively on July 2<sup>nd</sup> and July 28<sup>th</sup> of that year.<sup>1</sup> Other items began to be published along with the three doctrinal standards beginning in 1649, though these did not always appear in later editions. After nearly eighty years, the traditional complement of documents making up “The Westminster Standards” was set and fixed by the Lumisden and Robertson edition of 1728 (Warfield, 627).

While the form of the Standards was firmly established in 1728, its general layout and structure actually originated much earlier. The Edinburgh printing firm of Thomas Lumisden and John Robertson had published the 1725 rival to Dunlop’s Collection of Confessions (1719-21), the editing of which the Carruthers assigned to the Reformed Presbyterians.<sup>2</sup> These were the Covenanters who had suffered through the persecution known as the “Killing Times” (1660-1688), and had remained outside the Church of Scotland after the 1690 Revolution Settlement. During the period of persecu-

1. B. B. Warfield, “Notes Toward A Bibliography of the Westminster Confession: I. Britain,” *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, xii (1901) 621. Hereafter, Warfield.

2. S. W. Carruthers, *Three Centuries of the Westminster Shorter Catechism* (New Brunswick: Published for the Beaverbrook Foundations by the University of New Brunswick, 1957) 59. Hereafter *Three Centuries*. William Carruthers, *The Shorter Catechism of the Westminster Assembly of Divines: Being a facsimile of the First Edition, which was ordered to be printed by the House of Commons, 25<sup>th</sup> November, 1647. With Historical Account and Bibliography* (London: Publication Office of the Presbyterian Church of England, 1897) 48.

3. *Dictionary of Scottish Church History & Theology*, Nigel M. de S. Cameron, David F. Wright, David C. Lachman, Donald E. Meek, eds. (Downers Grove: IVP, 1993) “Covenanters,” 218-219; “Brown, John (of Wamphray),” 98-99; “Killing Times,” 458; “MacWard, Robert,” 537-538. Hereafter DSCHT.

4. See Chris Coldwell, “Examining the Work of S. W. Carruthers” beginning on page 43 of this issue of *The Confessional Presbyterian*.

5. B. B. Warfield, “The Printing of the Westminster Confession,” *The Westminster Assembly and Its Work* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1981) *Works*, 6.344.

tion, ministers such as Robert MacWard and John Brown of Wamphray were banished to Holland,<sup>3</sup> and from there were published many works both directly and indirectly supportive of the Covenanter cause. It was presumably from somewhere in Holland in 1679, that the primogenitor of the traditional form of the Standards was issued, which set the preferred content and appearance later copied by Lumisden and Robertson, albeit with some minor variations.

This 1679 edition is probably the one referred to in the Advertisement in the second volume of William Dunlop’s “Collections,” which, as noted by B. B. Warfield, is described by David Hay Fleming in *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for April, 1899 (x. 320-321): “The edition thus referred to as having been printed in Holland was probably that of 1679, which has neither printer’s name nor place of issue, but bears an unmistakable resemblance to those covenanting books which were printed in Holland during the persecution” (Warfield, 633). S. W. Carruthers confirmed this from an inscription in a copy of this edition, which he examined at Cambridge. He noted that this “is the first edition where the supplementary documents are given in the order ultimately followed by all modern editions” (*Three Centuries*, 56).

This raises the possibility that the Reformed Presbyterians may also have been responsible for the preparation of the 1728 Lumisden & Robertson edition, or at least had some influence on its final form. They understandably would have been partial to the form of the 1679 edition. Also, while the text of the 1728 is generally dependent upon Dunlop’s ‘critical text,’ it is clear that variants traceable to the Reformed Presbyterian text of 1725 were incorporated, which points at least to the influence of that edition, if not to any direct involvement by the Reformed Presbyterians themselves.<sup>4</sup>

What led to this rather large collection of documents, which became the traditional form of the Westminster Standards? B. B. Warfield in his article on the “Printing of the Westminster Confession,” rested the explanation for the progressive expansion of content over the later half of the seventeenth century, in the effort of printers to “supply as comprehensive a collection as possible” fueled by the dual desires for a volume that would function as an ecclesiastical manual, as well as a “richly furnished popular book of religion.”<sup>5</sup> This impulse to expand the Standards produced two general forms: one Scottish and the other English.

The Rothwell editions of 1658 set the English form, which included such things as the two epistles by Manton and forty-four Puritan divines, the ordinance calling the Westminster Assembly and the vow taken by its members, as well as a piece entitled *A Grave And Serious Advice Of The Ministers Of Scotland*, which is simply the *Directory for Family Worship* with a different title. Rothwell also introduced the emphasis in italic type of portions of the Scripture proof texts, which

was dropped by Dunlop and Lumisden & Robinson, and not restored until 1855 by Johnstone and Hunter.<sup>6</sup> These English editions did not include the Scottish *Sum of Saving Knowledge* by David Dickson and James Durham,<sup>7</sup> or the *Directory for Public Worship*, but often included the *Form of Church-Government*. Meantime, the Scottish editions early included the *Sum of Saving Knowledge* and the *Directory for Family Worship*, as well as the *Form of Church-Government*.

The apex of the drive to include all the documents that had appeared in previous editions was reached when the English and Scottish forms were combined. This was apparently first done by James Watson with his edition of 1707/1708.<sup>8</sup> The same mix of contents was included ten years later in the 1717 edition by Cruttenden & Cox. These editions differ from the 1728 Lumisden & Robertson: they lack some of the Acts approving various documents, and the material is ordered differently than that set by the 1679 edition. Some material is also included in duplicate! As already noted, the *Directions for Secret and Family Worship* had appeared in some English editions as *A Grave and Serious Advice of the Ministers of the Kirk of Scotland*. Both appear in these editions, the *Directions* toward the end following the *Directory for Public Worship* and the *Serious Advice* appearing in front sandwiched between the two customary epistles to the reader. Also, a *Postscript*, affixed to some editions in the Scottish tradition, concludes the volumes prior to the index.<sup>9</sup> But the text is simply an extract from Manton's epistle, which also appears at the front.

This combination of features in both the Watson and Cox editions did not include numbering the questions in the two catechisms. The chapters and paragraphs of the Confession of Faith were numbered from the first editions, but the catechisms are not even numbered in the surviving manuscripts. The benefit of having the questions numbered is obvious, and one can find examples of early editions where they have been numbered by hand. Yet despite this, the only seventeenth century editions found that numbered the questions were the two printings by George Swintoun and Thomas Brown of 1671 (Wing C5769) and 1683 (Wing C5770B). Carruthers notes that the Robert Sanders edition of 1703 does not number the questions (*Three Centuries*, 58), and it is likely the earlier Sanders editions are unnumbered. The catechisms in the 1710 Watson edition are also unnumbered.

The rules for rightly understanding the Ten Commandments in Larger Catechism 99 were numbered as early as the 1659 Latin edition by John Field, and presumably earlier in his 1656, of which the 1659 is a careful line for line setting (*Three Centuries*, 75). Rothwell 'B' of 1658 also numbers the rules (but 'A' does not), as does the Third of 1688 (Wing C5798), Glasgow Fourth (Sanders, 1675), and the two by Swintoun & Brown. The Covenanter 1679 edition was the earliest edition found that also numbers the aggravations of sin in Larger

Catechism 151. Other editions that number the subdivisions of both questions are the anonymously published editions of 1688, 1694, and 1700.

Happily, with the awareness of the need for a more critical approach having been raised by both the Dunlop and the Reformed Presbyterian Collections, the Lumisden & Robertson edition refined and brought to a more thoughtful completion, the merging of the English and Scottish forms, including the numbering of the catechisms, a feature found in both Collections. Thus while the traditional form of the Standards owes its general selection and order of documents to the Covenanter edition of 1679, it owes much as well to the subsequent merging of these two edition types, as well as to the critical work of the Collections of Dunlop, and of the Reformed Presbyterians

6. Rothwell was the first to include the texts of the Scripture proofs, and the italicized portions evidently were to emphasize what he at least thought were the key portions of the references adduced by the Westminster divines. Carruthers criticized the endeavor as having been done "in the most haphazard way," and he considered it "almost unbelievable that any man in 1855 could think it worth while to reproduce these hopelessly unintelligent italics..." S. W. Carruthers, *The Westminster Confession of Faith: Being an account of the Preparation and Printing of its Seven Leading Editions, to which is appended a critical text of the Confession with notes thereon* (Manchester: R. Aikman & Son, [1937]) 75.

7. DSCHT, "Dickson, David," 243; "Durham, James," 265-266.

8. For a complete bibliography for titles published by James Watson see: D. Wyn Evans, "James Watson of Edinburgh: A Bibliography of Works from his Press 1695-1722," *Edinburgh Bibliographical Society Transactions*, Volume V, Part 2, Sessions 1976-7, 1977-8, 1979-80 (Edinburgh: Printed for the Society by John G Eccles Printers Ltd, Inverness, 1982). Warfield and Carruthers on the authority of John Lee note an earlier 1701 edition by Watson [John Lee, *Memorial for the Bible Societies in Scotland* (Edinburgh: Printed for the Edinburgh Bible Society, 1824; 1826; 1839)], but neither traced an existing copy (Warfield, 635; *Three Centuries*, 58). Wyn, who consulted Lee as well, does not list such a title for that date. Neither does Wyn catalog one for 1709, another untraced edition which Carruthers lists out of "Orr's Catalogue." Watson did publish another edition in 1710, the only known copy of which is located by Wyn, Warfield and Carruthers at the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia. It follows older Scottish forms rather than the 1707-08, has the Scripture proofs by reference only, and beneath each section rather than in the margin, as in Sanders 1690, and the anonymously published editions of 1794 and 1700 (Wing C5776, C5776A, C5776C). Barry Waugh, Ph.D, who examined this rare volume for the author, notes that it has aged poorly, which may explain why more copies have not survived. See a summary of Dr. Waugh's presented in Appendix C.

9. The Postscript was probably first added to the 1679 edition. It appears also in the anonymously published editions of 1694 and 1700, as well as in Watson's 1710. It does not appear in the 1683 edition by George Swintoun and Thomas Brown (Wing C5770B), nor does it appear in Carruthers' Glasgow Fourth (Robert Sanders, 1675; Wing C5797). The later editions of 1687, 1690 and 1693 by Sanders (Wing C5772, C5775, C5776), and by his son Robert Sanders (1703, 1711), and those by Anderson for 1679, 1685 and 1697 (Wing C5770A, C5771, C5776B), were not examined.

in particular. This form of the Westminster Standards set by Lumisden and Robertson in 1728 is still kept in print by the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland.

#### APPENDIX A: THE TRADITIONAL CONTENTS OF THE WESTMINSTER STANDARDS

The following list presents the traditional content of the Westminster Standards as set and ordered by the Lumisden & Robertson edition (L&R, 1728). The edition of first appearance with the Confession and Catechisms is given in parentheses, which often is noted by either Warfield or the Carruthers. Where this is not the case, dates marked by a dagger (†) indicate the earliest edition found by the author. Editions cited in this article are described in Appendix B.

1. *To the Christian Reader, Especially Heads of Families* (Rothwell, 1658†).

2. *Mr. Manton's Epistle to the Reader* (Rothwell 'B', 1658†). Earlier variants of Rothwell lack this epistle to the Christian reader by Thomas Manton. Carruthers put the final tally of Rothwell variants at five, with one following what he styled as "Rothwell A", and two following his "Rothwell B," which is titled by the publisher as the "Second Edition" (*Three Centuries*, 55).

3. *Ordinance ... for the calling of an Assembly of learned and godly Divines* (Rothwell, 1658†). *Commission of the General Assembly to some ... to repair to the Kingdom of England* (L&R, 1728†). *The Promise and Vow taken by every member admitted to sit in the Assembly* (Rothwell, 1658†). The Ordinance calling the Assembly and the Vow by its members first appear in Rothwell. The Ordinance gives a list of the individuals appointed to attend the Assembly, and the Vow lists those who actually attended and took the vow, including the Scottish Commissioners and the Scribes. The relationship of the two lists is explained in a statement printed in Rothwell, on its own separate page between the Ordinance and the Vow: "Many of the Persons who were called to attend the Assembly

10. The editor of the RP Collection probably changed this statement in keeping with the 1647 Act by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland approving the Confession of Faith: "the Assembly understandeth some parts of the second article of the thirty-one chapter only of kirks not settled, or constituted in point of government: And that although, in such kirks, a synod of Ministers, and other fit persons, may be called by the Magistrate's authority and nomination, without any other call, to consult and advise with about matters of religion ... yet neither of these ought to be done in kirks constituted and settled..."

11. *Act Ratifying the Confession of Faith and Settling Presbyterian Church-government the seventh day of June, 1690* (Edinburgh, Printed by the heir of Andrew Anderson, 1690). The Act contains the text of the Confession of Faith only, without scripture proofs.

appeared not; Whereupon the whole Work lay on the hands of the Persons hereafter mentioned." This was reduced to a simple paragraph between the two documents in later editions. In the RP Collection of 1725 the list in the Ordinance was deleted and replaced with the Commission of the General Assembly appointing the Scottish Commissioners to attend upon the Assembly of Divines, and the subsequent paragraph was modified to read: "Many of the persons who were called by the foresaid Ordinance of the Lords and Commons (in that broken state of the Church)<sup>10</sup> to attend the Assembly appeared not; whereupon the whole work lay on the hands of the persons hereafter mentioned." And except for the omission of a note in the 1725 Collection stating that the Scottish Assembly's Commission was renewed in 1644, 1645, 1646, 1647 and 1648, this is the form the documents take in the L&R 1728. Dunlop simply gives the list of Divines from the Vow and omits the rest of the texts.

4. Act of the Scottish General Assembly approving the Confession of Faith, August 27, 1647 (Gideon Lithgow, 1649†). The Act is also in the Luice Elsever [Gideon Lithgow] edition of 1649; and judging from the pagination given by the card catalog listing at the University of Chicago, the Evan Tyler of 1649 has this Act as well.

5. Act by the Estates of Parliament in 1649 approving the Confession and Catechisms (L&R, 1728†). This appears to have been first printed in the Reformed Presbyterian Collection of 1725 and subsequently in the L&R 1728.

6. The Act of 1690 ratifying the Confession (1842†). The 1690 Act is not present in editions of the Westminster Standards up through the Blair and Bruce editions (1803-1841), and only appears in standard editions beginning with the 1842 of Francis Orr & Sons. Understandably, the Reformed Presbyterian Collection of 1725 did not include the 1690 Act, and likewise neither did the L&R 1728. It had previously appeared in Dunlop's Collection of 1719-21, and in the 1690 publication of the Act itself containing the text of the Confession of Faith.<sup>11</sup>

7. *Act approving the Larger Catechism* by the Assembly at Edinburgh, July 2, 1648 (Lithgow, 1649†). The text of the Act less the date appears in the Luice Elsever [Gideon Lithgow] edition of 1649, but the Act approving the Shorter Catechism is not present. Both acts are in the 1650 Lithgow edition.

8. *Act approving the Shorter Catechism* by the Assembly at Edinburgh, July 28, 1648 (Lithgow, 1649†). According to Carruthers this Act is also in the Tyler edition of 1649.

9. *The Sum of Saving Knowledge* (Lithgow, 1650). According to Warfield, some editions have in place of the *Sum*, the *Directions for Family Worship* and the *Solemn League and Covenant* (Warfield, 626).

10. *Act ordaining ... Subscription of the Confession of Faith and Covenant*, by the Assembly at Edinburgh, August 30, 1639.

And, *Act anent the Ratification of the Covenant*, at Edinburgh, June 11, 1640 (L&R, 1728<sup>†</sup>). These Acts are not in the 1679 Covenanter edition printed in Holland; neither do they appear in Watson or Cox. Dunlop and the Reformed Presbyterian Collections have several Acts relative to the National Covenant, but Dunlop does not have that of 1640.

11. *The National Covenant* (Holland, 1679<sup>†</sup>). This apparently was first included in the Covenanter edition of 1679. It is included in Dunlop and the Reformed Presbyterian Collections, and also appears in Watson and Cox, though after the title, Watson sets the rest of the text in two columns, a format Cox did not follow.

12. *The General Assembly's Approbation of the Solemn League & Covenant*, August 17, 1643. And, *Act anent the Ratification*, etc. July 15, 1644 (L&R, 1728<sup>†</sup>). The 1679 edition does not contain these; neither do Watson or Cox. The Reformed Presbyterian Collection of 1725 has several Acts relating to the *Solemn League and Covenant*, including these two subsequently placed in the 1728 L&R edition.

13. *The Solemn League and Covenant* (Tyler, 1649). The Solemn League is also in Tyler's 1650 (the general title page is dated 1650, but the Catechisms have 1649; *Three Centuries*, 54), and is also in both Stationers (1651, 1652), which is not clear in Warfield (Warfield, 627). Also, as noted in 9 above, it appears in some Lithgow 1650 editions. It would seem that there was quite the competition between Tyler and Lithgow, to the extent that Lithgow not only published the fictitious and unauthorized 1649 imprint of the Confession of Faith under the name of Luice Elsever (*Three Centuries*, 54), but at least one other under the name of Evan Tyler.<sup>12</sup>

14. *Act of the Commission of the General Assembly for renewing the Solemn League and Covenant*, Edinburgh, October 5, 1648. And, *The Act of the Committee of Estates of Parliament for renewing the Solemn League and Covenant*; Edinburgh, October 14, 1648 (Holland, 1679<sup>†</sup>). These appear in the 1679 edition as well as in Watson and Cox, following the text of the *Solemn Acknowledgement* rather than before it, as in the L&R 1728 forward. As with the National Covenant, the text is set in two columns by Watson.

15. *A Solemn Acknowledgment of Publick Sins and Breaches of the Covenant* (Holland, 1679). This was subsequently included in Cox and Watson (again in two columns), and the RP Collection; but not Dunlop.

16. *An Act of the Parliament of the Kingdom of Scotland, approving and establishing the Directory for Publick Worship*, February 6, 1645. And, *Act of the General Assembly*, February 3, 1645 (L&R, 1728<sup>†</sup>). The RP Collection contains the Acts. They do not appear in the editions of Watson and Cox. Another Act or Acts common to many of the Scottish editions such as Watson's 1710, entitled *Acts against such as withdraw themselves from the publick Worship in their own congregations*,

was not included in the traditional text. Neither does it appear in Watson's earlier edition of 1707-1708 or in Cox.

17. *The Directory for the Publick Worship of God* (Stationers, 1652). In the 1652 Stationers edition this appears in a separately paginated 91-page section. Dunlop does not contain the *Directory*, as it was projected to have been included in the proposed third volume, which was never published due to Dunlop's death. It appears, less the Acts, in the Covenanter's 1679, as well as in Watson and Cox.

18. *Act of the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland approving the Propositions concerning Kirk-government, and Ordination of Ministers* (L&R, 1728<sup>†</sup>). Dunlop did not include the Form of Government (see 17 above). The Reformed Presbyterian Collection includes the Act, but it does not appear in the edition of 1679, Watson or Cox.

19. *The Form of Presbyterial Church-Government* (Bostock, 1649). This is the earliest document to appear along with the Confession and Catechisms.

20. *Act for observing the Directions of the General Assembly for secret and private Worship*. August 24, 1647 (L&R, 1728<sup>†</sup>). This Act was published with the text of the *Directions* as first issued alone in 1647. It also appears in the fictitious imprint mentioned in 13 above bound with the Luice Elsever edition of the Confession and Catechisms, but it may have originally been issued separately, as in 1647. The English editions before Watson, given the form in which the *Directions* are published in them, do not reprint the Act, and it does not appear to have been normally included in Scottish printings. It is not in the 1679 edition. The Act was published with the text of the *Directions* in both the Dunlop and RP Collections.

21. *Directions For Family-Worship* (Lithgow, 1650). See 9 above. Dunlop (1719) was evidently the first to title the *Directions of the General Assembly, concerning Secret and Private Worship*, as *The Directory for Family Worship*.

22. *A Table of the Chief Matters Contained in the Confession of Faith and Larger Catechism*. A subtitle states: "Con. signifies the Confession of Faith. The first number denotes the Chapter, the following figures denote the Paragraphs. Cat. signifies the Larger Catechism, and the figures denote the numbers of the Questions." Apparently, a table appears for the first time in the Rothwell 'B' edition of 1658, which relies on page numbers to give the subject location. This is reproduced exactly in Watson and Cox, except for varying the page number appropriately. Dunlop revised and expanded

12. *Directions of the Generall Assembly concerning Secret and Private Worship... With an act for observing these directions, and for censuring such as use to neglect family worship. And an act against such as withdraw themselves from the publike worship in their owne congregations* (Edinburgh: Re-printed by Evan Tyler, 1650). The entry in the card catalog at the British Library where this example resides notes: "The imprint is fictitious; probably printed by Gideon Lithgow in Edinburgh."

the table and subtitled it as represented here. Also, the dependence upon page number for locating the reference was removed by using chapter, paragraph and question numbers, making the index independent of any particular publication. This revised table was reproduced in the L&R 1728, and was faithfully reproduced through the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, ending with Johnstone & Hunter.

#### APPENDIX B: EDITIONS OF THE WESTMINSTER STANDARDS REFERENCED IN THIS ARTICLE.

Unless otherwise noted, the editions consulted for this collation are part of the author's research collection.

Lithgow, 1649. *The Confession of faith, and the Larger and Shorter Catechisme: First agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster. And now appointed by the Generall Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, to be a part of Uniformity in Religion between the Kirks of Christ in the three Kingdomes* (Edinburgh: Printed by Gedeon Lithgow, printer to the Universitie of Edinburgh, 1649). Wing 5760c. Dr. Anette Hagan, who is Curator of Rare Books at the National Library of Scotland, kindly checked the NLS copy of this edition for this collation. North Reading Room (George IV Bridge); reference F.7.g.46.

Tyler, 1649. *The Confession of Faith, and the Larger and Shorter Catechisme, etc. Together with the Solemn league and covenant of the three Kingdoms* (Edinburgh: Printed by E. Tyler, 1649). Wing C5760B. Wing locates a copy at University of Chicago Library. The above is the entry from the card catalog. Location: Special Collections, Rare Books BX9183.A3 1649.

Boſtock, 1649. *The Confession of Faith and Catechisms, Agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster: Together with their Humble Advice concerning Church Government and Ordination of Ministers* (R. Boſtock: London, 1648 [1649]). Warfield, relying upon the work of William Carruthers, gives the explanation why this is actually more likely a 1649 imprint, rather than 1648 as indicated on the title page (Warfield, 625). Wing C5760. UMI, Thomason Tracts, 255.1419:1.

Luice Elsever, 1649. *The Confession of Faith and the Larger and Shorter Catechisme, First agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, And now appointed by the Generall Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland to be a part of Uniformity in Religion between the Kirks of Christ in the three Kingdomes. [With "Directions of the Generall Assembly concerning Secret and Private Worship."]* (Amsterdam; for Andrew Wilson; Edinburgh: Printed by Luice Elsever, 1649). All are fictitious imprints. The "Directions of the Generall Assembly" is the imprint of 1650 noted in this article. The copy containing it is in the British Library. The copy available in Early English

Books does not contain the "Directions". Wing 5760A. Early English Books (1641-1700), 2350:05. Hereafter EEB.

Tyler, 1649/1650. *The Confession of Faith, etc. Together with the solemn League and Covenant of the three kingdoms.* (Edinburgh: Printed by Evan Tyler, printer to the Kings most excellent Majeſty, 1650). Individual title pages for the Catechisms are dated 1649. Wing C5760D. A copy is owned by the National Library of Scotland, but it was not checked for this collation. As of this writing, this edition of Evan Tyler is not available in EEB.

Lithgow, 1650. *The Confession of Faith, etc. [With] A brief Sum of Christian Doctrine contained in Holy Scripture, and holden forth in the Confession of Faith and Catechisms, etc. By David Dickson.* (Edinburgh: Gedeon Lithgow, 1650). Wing 5761. EEB 1791:30.

Stationers, 1652. *The Confession of Faith, etc. ... together with the Solemn League and Covenant of the three kingdoms* (London: First printed at Edenburgh, and now reprinted at London for the Company of Stationers, 1652). Wing 5764. EEB 1186:14.

Rothwell 'A', 1658. *The Confession of Faith, etc.* (London: Printed for the Company of Stationers and are to be sold by J. Rothwel, 1658). The first version of Rothwell is known as Rothwell 'A.' Carruthers thus concludes the theories and research of the Rothwell editions first begun by his father and continued by Warfield: "This is the first of the five 'Rothwell' printings of this year, which have not hitherto been properly differentiated. The Text is carelessly printed, nearly two score errors, mostly unimportant, occurring throughout. These 'Rothwell' editions were the first in which the proofs were printed 'at large'. Presumably it was this novel feature which caused the five printings. The large number of copies extant does not, however, necessarily mean that the printings were large" (*Three Centuries*, 55)

Rothwell 'A' has a variant with "S. Griffin" given as the printer on the title page. *The confession of faith, etc* (London: Printed by S. Griffin for the Company of Stationers, and to be sold by J. Rothwell at the Fountain in Cheapside, 1658). This is the form of Rothwell 'A' examined for this article. Carruthers notes it is from the same type as 'A' with "some typographical errors corrected." He comments: "Sarah [Griffin] was the widow of Edward Griffin who died in 1652. Presumably she printed the Confession in D 16 [i.e. 'Rothwell A'] as well as in this. Anne Maxey printed both Catechisms." (*Three Centuries*, 55). Wing W1433. EEB 1412:22.

Rothwell 'B', 1658. *Confession of Faith, Together with the Larger and Lesser Catechisms. ... Again Published with the Scriptures at large, and the Emphasis of the Scriptures in a different Character. To which is annexed two sheets of Church-Government with the Scriptures at large. [The Second Edition]* (London: Printed by E. M. for the Company of Stationers, and

are to be sold by John Rothwell at the Fountain in Cheapside. 1658). Carruthers styled this "Second Edition" as Rothwell "B" and there are two subsequent variant forms. Carruthers notes: "The type was re-set for this printing. On the general title it is noted—'the Emphasis of the Scriptures in a different Character'. In due time these somewhat unintelligent italics disappeared, to be revised, however, by Johnstone & Hunter in 1855. E. M. is probably Edward Mottershead." The first variant of Rothwell 'B,' which Carruthers numbers D 19, is from "the same type as the previous Edition, with some corrections." Of the final variant (D 20), he notes the "type has again been re-set" (*Three Centuries*, 55). Wing C5796. EEB 1482:24.

Covenanter, 1679. *The Confession of Faith, and the Larger and Shorter catechism, first agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster; and now approved by the General Assembly ...* (1679). Wing 5770AB. EEB 2683:21A.

Watson, 1707-08. *The Confession of Faith, etc. Again published with the Scriptures at large, and the emphasis of the Scriptures in a different character. Together with the Directory, and all other additions that have been hitherto printed. The Fourth Edition* (Edinburgh: Printed by James Watson, 1708). This is the same James Watson who later collaborated with William Dunlop to produce his "Collections." The 1707 is styled the "Fifth edition," but a careful collation by Carruthers, confirmed for this article by the Rev. Sherman Isbell, indicates these are printed from the same setting of type. Watson evidently thought better of the numbering of editions and changed it at some point in the middle of the print run, which must have spanned from late 1707 into 1708. For more information about these Watson editions, see the author's comments in "Examining the Work of S. W. Carruthers," printed earlier in this issue of *The Confessional Presbyterian*. NLS, North Reading Room (George IV Bridge) Cwn.504 (1708). The rare 1707 variant is in The Newbattle Collection, Newb. 2746, housed at Monteviot House, which Dr. Hagan kindly arranged to be transported to Edinburgh for collation with the 1708.

Cox, 1717. *The Confession of Faith, Together with the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, Composed by the Reverend Assembly of Divines Sitting at Westminster, etc. Together with the Directory, and all other Additions that have been hitherto Printed. The Fifth Edition* (London: Printed for S. Cruttenden and T. Cox, at the Bible and Three Crowns in Cheapside, near MercersChappel, 1717). It appears that Cox is set from Watson's Fourth of 1707/08. Warfield quotes Dr. Mitchell saying, "The fifth, bearing the date of 1717, is a large octavo, and perhaps the most handsomely printed of all these early editions of the Confession." Warfield also notes, "This edition was apparently the copy from which was prepared the first American edition, printed at Boston, in 1723, for D. Henschman, by S. Kneeland. There were no other successors in England or America of this

type." (Warfield, 636). Dr. Carruthers notes that there was a Scottish imprint of this edition which he numbers D 53 and describes it as: "The Fifth Edition. London, Printed for James MacEwen in Edinburgh. 1717." He comments: "This is from the same type as the previous one..." (*Three Centuries*, 59).

Dunlop, 1719. *A Collection of Confessions of Faith, Catechisms, Directions, Books of Discipline, etc.* (Edinburgh, James Watson, 1719-21). While they are not large volumes, Warfield was of the opinion that Dunlop "is one of the most beautiful editions of the Confession of Faith ever printed (though some impressions were also issued on inferior paper) ..." (Warfield, 638). The author's copy is a set once owned by the library of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Diocese of Massachusetts.

Reformed Presbyterian, 1725. *The Confessions of Faith, Catechisms, Directories, Form of Government, Discipline, etc. Of Publick Authority in the Church of Scotland* (Edinburgh: Printed by Thomas Lumisden and John Robertson, 1725).

Lumisden & Robertson, 1728. *The Confession of Faith, the Larger and Shorter catechisms, with the Scripture proofs at large. Together with The Sum of Saving Knowledge (contained in the Holy Scriptures, and held forth in the said Confession and Catechisms) and Practical Use thereof, Covenants National and Solemn League, Acknowledgment of Sins, and Engagement to Duties, Directories, Form of Church-Government [etc.] ...* (Edinburgh: Printed by Thomas Lumisden and John Robertson..., 1728). A copy of this edition is owned by Dallas Theological Seminary. Rare Books, BX9183 .C45 1728. The author owns the second edition of 1736, which closely follows the 1728.

Orr, 1842. *The Confession of Faith; the Larger ... etc.* (Glasgow: Francis Orr and Sons, 1842). The copy consulted is an example of the 1849 edition, which according to Carruthers was set from the same type as the 1842 edition (*Three Centuries*, 68). He lists editions for 1842, 1845, 1848 and 1849.

Johnstone & Hunter. *The Confession of Faith, etc.* (Edinburgh: Johnstone, Hunter, & Co.). This firm was the first to use stereotyping in British editions of the Standards (*Three Centuries*, 68). B. B. Warfield wrote to Mr. Hunter in 1901 about their editions and he received the following reply (Warfield, 452): "I cannot fix a date when we first issued it [the Confession of Faith], but it must have been about 1842 or 1843 in the 12mo size." However, this is off by a decade, as Carruthers does not list any Johnstone & Hunter editions prior to 1851. Also, Johnstone & Hunter did not succeed and take up the same address of the printing firm of John Johnstone until 1849, the year that firm's titles cease and those by Johnstone & Hunter appear in earnest.<sup>13</sup>

13. Earlier title listings may be misprints, or possibly there was a wider transition period. See "Johnstone [John] & Hunter [Robert] printers and bookbinders Edinburgh," in the NLS *Scottish Book Trade Index*. Also see the entry for the *Free Church Publication Scheme Depository*. <http://www.nls.uk/catalogues/resources/sbti/index.html>.

There are three Johnstone & Hunter editions, which Carruthers styles Johnstone 'A', Johnstone 'B', and Johnstone 'C'. Johnstone 'A' was first published in 1851, and apparently was set from an Orr edition because it also adds Mark 9:43 as a Scripture proof text at WLC 29. They printed 6,000 copies, and printed another 5,000 in 1852, and another 5,000 again in 1853 (*Three Centuries*, 68-69). Some of the 1851 have additional matter and are titled, *The Subordinate Standards ... of the Free Church of Scotland*. Johnstone 'B' (1855) was a larger 8vo format edition limited to 750 copies, with some printed on larger paper. A fire destroyed these earlier plates, and in 1860 new ones were created to publish the final form, Johnstone 'C'. This form was often reprinted, including versions for the Free Church. In 1933 Graham and Heslip, Belfast, published the regular edition of Johnstone 'C' and they also reprinted the version for the Free Church. The Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland also made use of this 1933 regular edition before publishing their own reprint of Johnstone 'B' beginning in 1958. In the late 1960s the FPCS corrected the text of the Confession of Faith against the manuscript text published by Carruthers in 1946, while leaving the rest of the Johnstone 'B' text unchanged. This edition was published in 1967 and again in 1970. However, evidently determining that the manuscript text was not the preferred text, after this they returned to a straight reprint of the Johnstone 'B' edition. Beginning in 1994, the FPCS again changed the text of the Confession, this time to Carruther's 1937 critical text, while keeping the rest of Johnstone 'B' as before. They have continued to make changes to the text as improvements or corrections were warranted.

APPENDIX C: *THE CONFESSION OF FAITH, ETC.* EDINBURGH: JAMES WATSON, 1710. PHSP CALL NUMBER: CR UC41 1710 SCO83.

As noted in this article, following his ground breaking 1707-1708 edition of *The Westminster Standards*, which merged the English and Scottish textual traditions, James Watson published another edition in 1710, reverting back to an earlier traditional Scottish form. Why he chose not to reprint his earlier text, the creation of which was perhaps sparked by the 1707 Act of Union placing England and Scotland under the one Parliament of Great Britain, is unclear. The simpler form no doubt was less expensive an undertaking, and it may be it was still a popular text or perhaps the earlier edition was not well received; some of its eccentricities have already been noted above.

The following description of the 1710 Watson edition is based upon notes prepared for the author by Barry Waugh,

Ph.D, who examined the only known copy. The book is evidently very rare, no other bibliographer having found another example other than the one residing with the Presbyterian Historical Society in Philadelphia.

THE | CONFESSION | OF | FAITH | And the Larger and Shorter | CATECHISMS: | *First agreed upon by the ASSEMBLY | of DIVINES at Westminster: | And now appointed by the General AS- | SSEMBLY of the Kirk of SCOTLAND, | to be a part of Uniformity in Religion, | between the Kirks of Christ in the | Three Kingdoms. | Together with the Directions of the Ge- | neral ASSEMBLY concerning secret | and private Wor- ship: And the Sum | of Saving Knowledge, with the practi- | cal Use thereof. | EDINBURGH | Printed by James Watson, and Sold at his | Shop next Door to the Red-Lyon, op- | posite to the Luken booths. 1710.*

### *Physical Description*

The volume is bound in brown leather with a decaying spine measuring 3.5 x 5.5 inches. On the spine is a gold on red label that reads, "The Confession of Faith." There is a design embossed into the leather of the front and back boards, which is two concentric rectangles with a leaf on a branch at each of the four corners. The volume may have been rebound at some point. There are a total of 276 pages, and there appear to be no pagination errors. The whole book is composed in a single column format.

### *Contents*

Pages 3-67. Confession of Faith. The text of the *Confession* is in block-print and the Scripture references are in italics in a smaller font. The Scriptures are by reference only and are located at the end of each paragraph or section. The footnote characters in the text are in italics, but are not in superscript type.

Pages 68-131. The Larger Catechism [*sic*], *First agreed upon | by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster. | And now appointed by the General Assembly | of the Church of Scotland, to be a Part of | Uniformity in Religion between the Two | Kirks of Christ in three King[doms]*

There is no separate title page. The text "doms" is penned in by hand. The Scripture references are at the end of each of the answers to the respective question. Both the question and the Scripture references are in italics, while the answers are in block print. The questions are not numbered, As noted in the article above, the numbering of the Catechism questions was not a common feature until the Dunlop edition of 1719-1721.

Pages 132-148. The Shorter Catechism, *First agreed upon*

| by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster: | *And now appointed by the General Assembly of | the Kirk of Scotland, to be a Part of Uni- | formity in Religion between the Kirks of | Christ in the Three Kingdoms.*

There is no separate title page. Similar to the Larger Catechism the questions are not numbered, and the Scripture proofs are by reference only. Beginning on page 149, the parenthesis enclose the page numbers, e.g. (149), (150), etc. which format continues through the last page (276).

Page (149). *The Ten Commandments*, Exodus XX.

Page (150) contains the Lord's Prayer from Matthew 6, and the Apostles Creed. Within the block of text of the Creed the following comment is included: "*descended into Hell*" means continued in the State of the Dead, and under the Power of Death till the third Day." The quotation marks are in the original.

Pages (150)-(151). Following the Lord's Prayer and the Creed is a short commentary by the Assembly on the importance of the Catechisms and the Creed.

Pages (151)-(152). *Acts against such as withdraw themselves from the publick Worship in their own Congregations.*

This is an exhortation to ministers to be diligent and faithful in their ministries. They are told that any people who leave the congregation are to be reported to the session. It calls for the diligence of the pastor in his duties, the congregation in its living, and the presbytery in its work of avoiding schism. This Act was common in Scottish editions, but did not become included in the traditional text as set by Lumisden and Robertson in 1728.

Pages (152)-(157). A brief Sum of | Saving Doctrine, | Contained in *Holy Scripture*, and holden forth in the *Confession of Faith*, and *Catechisms*. | Agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, | and received by the General Assembly of the Kirk of | Scotland: With the Practical Use thereof.

Pages (157)-(186). The Practical Use of | Saving Knowledge, | Contained in *Scripture*, and holden forth briefly in the | foresaid *Confession of Faith*, and *Catechisms*.

Pages (186)-(197). The National Covenant.

Pages (197)-(211). A SOLEMN LEAGUE AND CO- | VENANT, for Reformation, and De- | fence of Religion, *Etc.*

Pages (211)-(246). A DIRECTORY for PUBLIC PRAYER, | Reading the Holy Scriptures, Singing of Psalms, Preach- | ing of the Word, Administration of the Sacraments; | and other Parts of the Publick Worship of God, Ordi- | nary and Extraordinary.

Pages (246)-(257). To the Right Honourable the LORDS and | COMMONS Assembled in PARLIA- | MENT. | The Humble ADVICE of the Assembly of *Divines*, now | sitting by Ordinance of *Parliament* at Westminster, con- | cerning *Church-Government*.

Pages (257)-(264). To the Right Honourable the LORDS

and | COMMONS Assembled in PARLIA- | MENT. | The Humble ADVICE of the Assembly of *Divines*, now | sitting by Ordinance of *Parliament* at Westminster, con- | cerning the Doctrinal Part of Ordination of Ministers.

Pages (264)-(270). DIRECTIONS of the General Assembly, concerning | *Secret and Private Worship, and Mutual Edification; | For cherishing Piety, for maintaining Unity, and a- | voiding Schism and Division.*

Pages (270)-(276). POSTSCRIPT.

This section (an extract from Manton's epistle noted in the article above) is an encouragement to parents to discipline their children and teach them the catechisms. It contends that ministers are distracted from their general duties due to their inordinate use of time dealing with "unruly" children. Note: The text is all in italics and in a type size about twice that of those used in the rest of the book.

CHRIS COLDWELL ■

### *In Brief: Dr. Samuel Miller on Arminian and Pelagian Subscribers to the Westminster Confession of Faith*

Every one who is acquainted with the authors, the date, and the history of the Westminster Confession of Faith, knows that it was formed with the express and special view of excluding from the communion of those who adopted it, all Pelagians and Arminians. It is equally well known, that our Church, in receiving it as her Creed, and in proposing it as a test to all candidates for admission into her body, has avowed a peculiar desire to guard against the admission of Pelagians and Arminians into her ministry and eldership. This being the case, when he who is tinctured with Pelagian or Arminian errors, nevertheless subscribes it, without any disclosure of his real opinions; or subscribes it at all, however such an act may be winked at by unfaithful members of judicatories—he is guilty of something which appears to me to approach more nearly to what the Scriptures call "lying to the Holy Ghost," than most acts of ecclesiastical dishonesty. Letter V on Creeds and Confessions to William S. Plumer, *The Presbyterian*, 8.41 (13 October 1838) 160. See item 152.0 on page 23 in Mr. Sparkman's *Annotated Bibliography* of Dr. Miller's works in this issue of *The Confessional Presbyterian*. ■

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- *Faith Shewn by Works: A Sermon on James 2:18*, by Samuel Miller, D. D. Pages 3-9.
- Miller, Samuel (1816-1883). *Life of Samuel Miller*, D.D. LL.D. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen, and Haffelfinger, 1869.
- Samuel Miller Manuscript Collection, Princeton Theological Seminary. "Faith Shewn by Works: A Sermon on James II.18." (No. 22). Dover, Oct 1792. Box 9, item 18.
- In 'Brief: Samuel Miller (1769-1850). Pages 9-10.*
- Miller, Samuel (1769-1850). *Letters on Clerical Manners and Habits: Addressed to a Student in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N.J.* New York, 1827; first edition. Revised edition, Princeton, 1835; Philadelphia, 1852.
- Nevin, Alfred, D.D., LL.D., ed. *Encyclopædia of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America: Including the Northern and Southern Assemblies*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Publishing Co., No. 1510 Chestnut Street [1884].
- Sprague, William B. *Annals of the American Pulpit. Presbyterian*. Robert Carter & Bros. 1858.
- *The Rev. Dr. Samuel Miller (1769-1850), An Annotated Bibliography*, compiled by Wayne Sparkman. Pages 11-40.
- Curnow, Lane Belden, *Democracy and the Ruling Eldership: Samuel Miller's Responses to Tensions between Clerical Power and Lay Activity in Early Nineteenth Century America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Theological Seminary, 1976; Ph.D. dissertation.
- Miller, Margaret, "A List of the Writings of Samuel Miller, D.D., LL.D., 1769-1850, Second Professor in Princeton Theological Seminary, 1813-1850," *The Princeton Theological Review*, 9.4 (October 1911).
- Miller, Samuel (1816-1883). *Life of Samuel Miller*, D.D. LL.D. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen, and Haffelfinger, 1869.
- Sprague, William B. "List of Dr. Miller's Publications," in *A Discourse commemorative of the Rev. Samuel Miller, D.D.* Albany [NY]: Erastus H. Pease & Co., 1850.
- The National Union Catalog, Pre-1956 Imprints* (London: Mansell Information/Publishing Ltd., 1975).
- In 'Brief: Samuel Miller on the Regulative Principle of Worship. Page 40-42.*
- Miller, Samuel. *Presbyterianism the Truly Primitive and Apostolical Constitution of the Church of Christ*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1835.
- *Open Letter on the Observance of Christmas*. Letter to the Editor of the Commercial Advertiser. New York, December 29, 1825.
- *Examining the Work of S. W. Carruthers*, by Chris Coldwell. Pages 43-64.
- (Also see the editions of the Westminster Standards mentioned in Endnotes A & B of this article.)
- Bownd, Nicholas. "To the Studious, and Diligent Reader," *Sabbatum Veteris et Novi Testamenti: Or, The True Doctrine of the Sabbath*. London: Felix Kyngston for Thomas Man and John Porter, 1606.
- Britten, James. *From the Journal of 'Botany September 1922*. "In Memory of William Carruthers (1830-1922)." London: Taylor and Francis. n.d.
- Burgh, James. *Britain's remembrancer: or, the danger not over*. Edinburgh: T. Lumisden and E. Robertson, 1757.
- Cameron, Nigel M. de S; Wright, David F; Lachman, David C; and Meek, Donald E, eds. *Dictionary of Scottish Church History & Theology*. Downers Grove: IVP, 1993.
- Carruthers Manuscript Collection. Westminster College, Cambridge.
- Carruthers, S. W. *The Confession of Faith of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster. Tercentenary Edition*. London: Publishing Office of the Presbyterian Church of England, [1946].
- *Three Centuries of the Westminster Shorter Catechism*. New Brunswick: Published for the Beaverbrook Foundations by the University of New Brunswick, 1957.
- *The Westminster Confession of Faith: Being an account of the Preparation and Printing of its Seven Leading Editions, to which is appended a critical text of the Confession with notes thereon*. Manchester: R. Aikman & Son, [1937].
- Carruthers, William. *The Confession of Faith of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster with the texts of scripture annexed; from the original editions printed, under the care of the Assembly, by order of the House of Commons, in 1646 and 1647, collated with the edition issued by authority of Parliament in 1648*. London: Presbyterian Church of England, [1890?].
- *The Shorter Catechism of the Westminster Assembly of Divines: Being a facsimile of the First Edition, which was ordered to be printed by the House of Commons, 25<sup>th</sup> November, 1647. With Historical Account and Bibliography*. London: Publication Office of the Presbyterian Church of England, 1897.
- Coldwell, Chris. *Draft Transcription of The Larger Catechism MSS. The Westminster Assembly Project*, 2004. Unpublished.
- "The Development of the Traditional Form of the Westminster Standards." *The Confessional Presbyterian*, vol. 1 (2005).
- Dunlop, William. "Advertisement," *A Collection of Confessions of Faith, Catechisms, Directions, Books of Discipline*, etc. Volume 1. Edinburgh, James Watson, 1719.
- Early English Books 1475-1640, STC I*. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, [1937?]-1993.
- Early English Books 1641-1700, STC II*. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, [1975?]-.
- The Eighteenth Century*. Primary Source Microfilm, an Imprint of the Gale Group.
- Ferguson, W. Craig. *Occasional Papers of the Bibliographical Society Number 4: The Loan Book of The Stationers' Company: With a List of Transactions 1592-1692*. London: The Bibliographical Society, 1989.
- Gaskell, Philip. *A New Introduction to Bibliography*. New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll Press, 1972.
- Greetham, D. C. *Textual Scholarship: An Introduction*. New York: Garland Publishing Inc, 1994.
- Greg, W. W. *Some Aspects and Problems of London Publishing Between 1550 and 1650*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1956.

- Hooker, Richard. *Laws of Ecclesiasticall Politie. The Fifth Book*. London: John Windet, 1597.
- House of Lords. *Parliamentary History Part 2: The Braye Manuscripts from the House of Lords Record Office*. Braye MSS. Vol. 7. Reel 3. Item 1. "Declaration of Both Houses. 19 May 1642." Adam Matthew Publications, 1995.
- Houses of Lords and Commons. *The declaration or remonstrance of the Lords and Commons in Parliament assembled: with divers depositions and letters thereunto annexed*. London: Printed for Joseph Hunscoot and John Wright, 1642. See other editions listed at Endnote C.
- Lambert, Sheila. "The Printers and the Government, 1604-1640," *Aspects of Printing From 1600*. Edited by Robin Myers and Michael Harris. Oxford Polytechnic Press, 1987.
- Lightfoot, D. D. John. *The Whole Works of the Rev. John Lightfoot, D.D.* Vol. 13: *The Journal of the Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines From January 1, 1643, to December 31, 1644*. Edited by the Rev. John Rogers Pitman, A. M. London: J. F. Dove, 1824.
- McKenzie, D. F. "Printers of the Mind: Some Notes on Bibliographical Theories and Printing-House Practices." *Studies in Bibliography*, Volume 22 (1969) 1-77.
- McKerrow, Ronald B. *An Introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students*. Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1927. Rpt. Oak Knoll Press, 1994. Introduction by David McKitterick.
- "The Relationship of English Printed Books to Authors' Manuscripts during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (The 1928 Sandars Lectures)." Edited by Carlo M. Bajetta. *Studies in Bibliography*, Volume 53 (2003) 1-65.
- Mitchell, Alexander F. and Struthers, John, eds. *Minutes of the Sessions of the Westminster Assembly of Divines*. Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1874.
- Murray, John. "The Westminster Confession of Faith by S. W. Carruthers," *Collected Writings of John Murray*, volume 3. Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth, 1982.
- Myers, Robin and Harris, Michael. "Introduction," *The Stationers' Company and the Book Trade 1550-1990*. New Castle: Oak Knoll Press, 1997.
- National Library of Scotland. *Scottish Book Trade Index*. <http://www.nls.uk/catalogues/resources/sbti/index.html>.
- Reformed Presbyterians. "Advertisement," *The Confessions of Faith, Catechisms, Directories, Form of government, Discipline, etc, of publick Authority in the Church of Scotland*, etc. Edinburgh, Thomas Lumisden and John Robertson, 1725.
- Simpson, Percy. *Proof-Reading in the Sixteenth, Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*. Oxford University Press, 1935. Rpt. 1970.
- The Scottish Printing Archival Trust. *A Reputation for Excellence: A History of the Glasgow Printing Industry*. Edinburgh: Merchriston Publishing, 1994.
- Tsushima, Jean. "Members of the Stationers' Company who serviced in the Artillery Company before the Civil War: Ralphe Mabbe and his network," *The Stationers' Company and the Book Trade 1550-1990*. Edited by Robin Myers and Michael Harris. New Castle: Oak Knoll Press, 1997.
- Van Dixhoorn, Chad. "Reforming the Reformation: Theological debate at the Westminster Assembly, 1643-1652," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cambridge, 2004.
- Personal Correspondence: Chad Van Dixhoorn to Chris Coldwell, Tuesday, September 14, 2004.
- Personal Correspondence: Chad Van Dixhoorn to Chris Coldwell, Tuesday, December 7, 2004.
- Ward, Rowland S. *The Directory for Public Worship*. Westminster Assembly 2004: A Conference on the Westminster Standards. Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, PA. Unpublished.
- Warfield, B. B. "Notes Toward A Bibliography of the Westminster Confession: I. Britain, *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, xii (1901).
- Westminster Assembly. *Directory for the Publique Worship of God*. London: for E. Tyler, A. Fifield, R. Smith and J. Field, 1644 [1645].
- Larger Catechism. *The Advice of the Assembly of Divines, Now by Authority of Parliament sitting at Westminster, Concerning A Larger Catechisme*. London: Printed by A. M. [n.d. Thomason date: Oct. 22, 1647].
- Larger Catechism MSS. Copy 1: To the Right Honble: The Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament. The Humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines sitting at Westminster Concerning A Larger Catechism. Undated. Signed by Charles Herle, Prolocutor, Cornelius Burges, Assessor, Henry Robrough, scribe, and Adoniram Byfield, scribe. In hand 'B'. Copy 2: To the Right Honble: The Lords & Comons Assembled in Parliament. The Humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines Sitting at Westminster Concerning a Larger Catechism. In hand 'A'. Dated: October 1647 "The larger Catechism." Signed by Charles Herle, Prolocutor, Cornelius Burges, Assessor, Henry Robrough, scribe, and Adoniram Byfield, scribe. Nalson MSS Collection, vol 22, ff. 133r-157v and 158r-176v. Bodleian Library, Oxford.
- Minutes of the Westminster Assembly. Dr. Williams's Library, MS 38.
- Shorter Catechism MS. To the Right Honble the [Lo]rds and Comons assembled in Parliament. The Humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines, now, by Authority of Parliament, sitting at Westminster, concerning A Shorter Catechisme. Nalson MSS Collection, vol 22, ff. 179r-185r. Bodleian Library, Oxford. See Also, Carruthers, S. W. *Three Centuries of the Westminster Shorter Catechism*.
- Wing, Donald. *Short-title catalogue of books printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and British America, and of English books printed in other countries, 1641-1700*. Compiled by Donald Wing. Second edition newly revised and enlarged; revised and edited by John J. Morrison and Carolyn W. Nelson, editors, and Matthew Seccombe, assistant editor. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1994-.
- *Jonathan Edwards on Scripture & Salvation*, by W. Gary Crampton, Ph.D. Pages 65-93.
- Bogue, Carl W. *Jonathan Edwards and the Covenant of Grace*. Cherry Hill, New Jersey: Mack Publishing Company, 1975.
- Brand, David C. *Profile of the Last Puritan*. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1991.
- Calvin, John. *Commentaries*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1981. Commentary on Micah.
- *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. McNeill, John T. ed., and Battles, Ford Lewis, transl. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1960.
- *Selected Works of John Calvin: Tracts and Letters*. Edited by Henry Beveridge and Jules Bonnet. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1983.
- *Sermons on Deuteronomy*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1987.
- Cherry, Conrad. *The Theology of Jonathan Edwards: A Reappraisal*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1990.
- Crampton, W. Gary. *Meet Jonathan Edwards*. Morgan, PA: Soli Deo Gloria, 2004.

- Edwards, Jonathan. *Charity and Its Fruits*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1986.
- *The Freedom of the Will*. Morgan, PA: Soli Deo Gloria, 1996.
- *Justification by Faith Alone*. Morgan, PA: Soli Deo Gloria, 2000.
- *Religious Affections*. Portland, Oregon: Multnomah Press, 1984.
- Sermon on Genesis 6:22 in *Pressing Into the Kingdom*. Edited by Don Kistler. Morgan, PA: Soli Deo Gloria, 1998.
- Sermon on Romans 2:10 in *The True Believer*. Edited by Don Kistler. Morgan, PA: Soli Deo Gloria, 2001.
- *To All the Saints of God*. Morgan, PA: Soli Deo Gloria, 2003.
- *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*. Revised and corrected by Edward Hickman. Carlisle, Pennsylvania: Banner of Truth Trust, 1834; 1974.
- *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, Volume 2. Edited by John E. Smith. *Religious Affections*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1959.
- Volume 3. *Original Sin*. Edited by Clyde A. Holbrook. 1970.
- Volume 5. *Apocalyptic Writings*. Edited by Stephen J. Stein. 1977.
- Volume 6. *Scientific and Philosophical Writings*. Edited by Wallace E. Anderson. 1980.
- Volume 8. *Ethical Writings*. Edited by Paul Ramsey. 1989.
- Volume 9. *A History of the Work of Redemption*. Edited by John F. Wilson. 1989.
- Volume 11. *Typological Writings*. Edited by Wallace E. Anderson, Mason I. Lowance, Jr. and David Watters. 1993.
- Volume 12. *Ecclesiastical Writings*. Edited by David D Hall. 1994.
- Volume 13. *The "Miscellanies" a-500*. Edited by Thomas A. Schafer. 1994.
- Volume 14. *Sermons and Discourses: 1723-1729*. Edited by Kenneth P. Minkema. 1997.
- Volume 15. *Notes on Scripture*. Edited by Stephen J. Stein. 1998.
- Volume 16. *Letters and Personal Writings*. Edited by George S. Claghorn. 1998.
- Volume 18. *The "Miscellanies" 501-832*. Edited by Ava Chamberlain. 2000.
- Volume 20. *The "Miscellanies" 833-1152*. Edited by Amy Plantinga Pauw. 2002.
- Volume 21. *Writings on the Trinity, Grace, and Faith*. Edited by Sang Hyun Lee. 2003.
- Fiering, Norman. *Jonathan Edwards's Moral Thought in Its British Context*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1981.
- Gerstner, John H. *Heaven & Hell: Jonathan Edwards on the Afterlife*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1980; Ligonier Ministries, 1991.
- *Jonathan Edwards: Evangelist*. Morgan, PA: Soli Deo Gloria, 1995.
- *The Rational Biblical Theology of Jonathan Edwards*. Powhatan, Virginia: Berea Publications; Orlando, Florida: Ligonier Ministries, 1991-1993.
- Grosart, Alexander. ed. *Selections From the Unpublished Writings of Jonathan Edwards*. Morgan, PA: Soli Deo Gloria, 1992.
- Hodge, A. A. *Evangelical Theology*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1976.
- Hulse, Erroll. *Who Are the Puritans? And What Do They Teach?* Darlington, England: Evangelical Press, 2000.
- Jenson, Robert W. *America's Theologian*. New York: Oxford, 1988.
- Kistler, Don. ed. *The Puritan Pulpit*. Morgan, PA: Soli Deo Gloria, 2004.
- Logan, Jr., Samuel T. "The Doctrine of Justification in the Theology of Jonathan Edwards," *Westminster Theological Journal* ("WTJ") 46. (1984).
- Marsden, George M. *Jonathan Edwards: A Life*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 2003.
- McClymond, Michael J. *Encounters with God: An Approach to the Theology of Jonathan Edwards*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- McDermott, Gerald R. *Jonathan Edwards Confronts the Gods*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- *One Holy and Happy Society*. University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992.
- Morgan, Irvonwy. *The Godly Preachers of the Elizabethan Church*. London: Epworth Press, 1965.
- Murray, Ian H. *Jonathan Edwards: A New Bibliography*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1987.
- Nichols, Stephen J. *An Absolute Sort of Certainty*. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 2003.
- Packer, J.I. *A Quest For Godliness*. Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway Books, 1990.
- Piper, John. *God's Passion For His Glory*. Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway Books, 1998.
- *The Supremacy of God in Preaching*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1990.
- Reymond, Robert L. *The Reformation's Conflict with Rome*. Ross-shire, Great Britain: Christian Focus Publications, 2001.
- Schafer, Thomas. "Jonathan Edwards and Justification by Faith," *Church History*, XX (December 1951).
- Scheick, William J. *The Writings of Jonathan Edwards*. College Station, Texas: Texas A & M University Press, 1975.
- Smith, John E. *Review of Metaphysics*. December 1976. In *Classical Apologetics*. By R. C. Sproul, John H. Gerstner, and Arthur Lindsley. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1984.
- Smith, John E., Stout, Harry S. and Minkema, Kenneth P. eds. *A Jonathan Edwards Reader*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1995.
- The "Ministerial and Declarative" Powers of the Church and *In Thesi* Deliverances, by C. N. Willborn, Ph.D. *Pages 94-101*.
- Adger, John B. "Deliverances of Church Courts," *Southern Presbyterian Review* 31, no. 3 (July 1880).
- "The General Assembly at Louisville," *S'PR* 30, no. 3 (July 1879).
- Central Presbyterian*, July 14, 1880.
- Cunningham, William. *Discussions on Church Principles*. 1863; Rpt. Edmonton, AB, Canada: Still Waters Revival Books, 1991.
- Dabney, R. L. "The Dancing Question," *S'PR*, 30, no. 2 (April 1879).
- [Girardeau] John Lafayette Girardeau Collection. John L. Girardeau to Rev. James McDowell, January 27, 1883. Microfilm #160, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina.
- Gustafson, Robert. *James Woodrow (1828-1907): Scientist, Theologian, Intellectual Leader*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1995.
- Mullally, Francis. "The Church's Power to Make Declarations," *The Presbyterian Quarterly*, 1895.
- North Carolina Presbyterian*. September 6, 1871.

- Peck, Thomas. "The Action of the General Assembly of 1879 on Worldly Amusements," *SPR* 31, no. 2 (April 1880).
- "The Powers of Our Several Church Courts," *Miscellanies of Rev. Thomas E. Peck*. Richmond: The Presbyterian Committee of Publication, 1896.
- Presbyterian Church in America. *Book of Church Order*. Lawrenceville, GA: The Committee for Christian Education and Publications, sixth edition, 2003.
- "PRJC Letter Regarding Women in Combat". PCA Office of Administration.
- Presbyterian Church in the United States. *A Digest of the Acts and Proceedings of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, 1861-1965*. Atlanta, GA: Office of the General Assembly, 1966.
- *Minutes of the General Assembly PCUS, 1869*.
- *Minutes of the General Assembly, PCUS, 1879*.
- Presbyterian Church in the United States, Synod of Georgia. *Minutes of the Synod of Georgia, 1878*.
- Presbyterian Church in the United States, Synod of South Carolina. *Minutes of the Synod of South Carolina, 1881*.
- Shaw, Robert. *The Reformed Faith: An Exposition of the Confession of Faith of the Westminster Assembly...* 1845; Rpt. Inverness, Scotland: Christian Focus Publications, 1973.
- Thompson, Ernest Trice. *Presbyterians in the South*. 3 vols. Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1963; 1973.
- Webb, R. A. "The Presbyter." *The Life Work of John L. Girardeau, D.D., LL.D.* Edited by George A. Blackburn, D.D. Columbia, SC: The State Company, 1916.
- A Critical Examination of N. T. Wright's Doctrine of Justification, by J. V. Fesko, Ph.D. *Pages 102-115*.
- Abegg, Martin. "4QMMT, Paul, and 'Works of the Law,'" in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation*. Edited by Peter W. Flint. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- "Paul, 'Works of the Law' and MMT," *Biblical Archaeology Review* 20/6 (1994).
- Anderson, A. A. *The Book of Psalms*, vol. 2. London: Marshall, Morgan, and Scott, 1972.
- Anderson, Gary A. "Intentional and Unintentional Sin in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Migrom*. Edited by David P. Wright, et al. Winona: Eisenbrauns, 1995.
- Bauer, Walter, et al. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- Block, Daniel I. *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 25-48*, NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Botterweck, G. Johannes, et al. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, v. 12. Trans. by Douglas W. Scott. Eerdmans, 2003.
- Briggs, Charles A. *Psalms*, vol. 1, ICC. 1909; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1969.
- Brown, Francis, et al. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated by Edward Robinson. 1907; Oxford: Clarendon, 1976.
- Calvin, John. *Psalms 93-150*, CTS. Translated by James Anderson. Rpt. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979.
- Childs, Brevard S. *Old Testament Theology in its Canonical Context*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- Craigie, Peter C. *Psalms 1-50*, Word Biblical Commentary. Dallas: Word, 1983.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. *Romans*, ICC, vol. 1. 1975; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2001.
- Das, A. Andrew. *Paul, the Law, and the Covenant*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2001.
- Davies, W. D. and Allison, Dale C. *The Gospel According to Matthew*, vol. 3, ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997.
- Delitzsch, Franz. *The Psalms*, vol. 2. Translated by Francis Bolton. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1901.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Jesus, Paul, and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1990.
- Eisenman, Robert and Wise, Michael. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*. New York: Penguin, 1992.
- Ellis, E. E. *Gospel of Luke*, NCB. London: Thomas Nelson, 1966.
- Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke: 10-24*, AB, vol. 28a. Garden City: Doubleday, 1985.
- Gaffin, Richard B. *Resurrection and Redemption: A Study in Paul's Soteriology*. 1978; Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 1987.
- Gathercole, Simon J. *Where is Boasting?: Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul's Response in Romans 1-5*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Green, Joel B. *The Gospel of Luke*, NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Habel, Norman C. *The Book of Job*, OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1985.
- Hamilton, Victor P. *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1-17*, NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.
- Harris, R. Laird, et al. *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. Chicago: Moody, 1980.
- Hartley, John E. *The Book of Job*, NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.
- Hays, Richard B. "Adam, Israel, Christ: The Question of Covenant in the Theology of Romans: A Response to Leander E. Keck and N. T. Wright," in *Pauline Theology*, vol. 3. Edited by David M. Hay and E. Elizabeth Johnson. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
- Kidner, Derek, *Psalms 1-72*, TOTC. Downers Grove: IVP, 1973.
- *Psalms 73-150*, TOTC. Downers Grove: IVP, 1973.
- Kirkpatrick, A. F. *The Book of Psalms*. Cambridge: CUP, 1902.
- Kittel, Gerhard. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 2. Translated by Geoffrey Bromiley. Eerdmans, 1964.
- Kraus, Hans-Joachim, *Psalms 1-59*. Translated by Hilton C. Oswald. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- Liddell, H. G. and Scott, Robert. *A Greek-English Lexicon*, rev. ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. *Ephesians*, WBC, vol. 42. Dallas: Word, 1990.
- "Ephesians 2.8-10: A Summary of Paul's Gospel," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 45/4 (1983).
- "The Theology of Ephesians," in *The Theology of the Later Pauline Letters*. Edited by Andrew T. Lincoln and Al J. M. Wedderburn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Machen, J. Gresham. *The Origin of Paul's Religion*. 1925; Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2002.
- McGrath, Alister E. "Reality, Symbol and History: Theological Reflections on N. T. Wright's Portrayal of Jesus," in *Jesus and the Restoration of Israel: A Critical Reassessment of N. T. Wright's Jesus and the Victory of God*. Edited by Carey C. Newman. Downers Grove: IVP, 1999.
- Milgrom, Jacob. *Numbers*, JPSTC. Philadelphia: JPS, 1990.
- Moo, Douglas J. *The Epistle to the Romans*, NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Morris, Leon. *The Gospel According to Matthew*, PNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.

- Robertson, O. Palmer. "Genesis 15:6: New Covenant Expositions of an Old Covenant Text," *WTJ* 42 (1980).
- Sanders, E. P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1977.
- Sarna, Nahum M. *Genesis*, JPSTC. New York: JPS, 1989.
- Seifrid, Mark A. *Christ, our Righteousness: Paul's theology of justification*. Downers Grove: IVP, 2000.
- "Righteousness Language in the Hebrew Scriptures and Early Judaism," in *Justification and Variegated Nomism*, vol. 1, *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*. Edited by D. A. Carson, et al. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001.
- Sharp, Carolyn J. "Phinehan Zeal and Rhetorical Strategy in 4QMMT," *Revue de Qumran* 18/2 (1997).
- Stendahl, Krister. "The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West," in *Paul Among the Jews and Gentiles*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.
- Thiselton, A. C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Turretin, Francis. *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, vol. 1. Translated by George Musgrave Giger. Edited by James T. Dennison. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 1994.
- Van-Gemeren, Willem A. *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*, vol. 3. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997.
- Vermes, Geza. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. 1962; NY: Penguin Books, 1998.
- von Rad, Gerhard. *Old Testament Theology*, vol. 1. 1962; Louisville: Westminster / John Knox, 2001.
- Vos, Geerhardus, *The Pauline Eschatology*. 1930; Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 1994.
- Wenham, Gordon J. *Genesis 1-15*. Dallas: Word, 1987.
- *Numbers*, TOTC. Downers Grove: IVP, 1981.
- Westminster Confession of Faith*. Glasgow: Free Presbyterian Publications, 1976.
- Wright, N. T. *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.
- *The New Testament and the People of God*, Christian Origins and the Question of God, vol. 1. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, Christian Origins and the Question of God, vol. 3. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.
- *Romans*, The New Interpreter's Bible. Nashville: Abingdon, 2002.
- *What Saint Paul Really Said: Was Paul of Tarsus the Real Founder of Christianity?* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- "Justification," in *New Dictionary of Theology*. Edited by Sinclair B. Ferguson, David F. Wright and J. I. Packer. Downers Grove: IVP, 1988.
- "Paul and Qumran," *Bible Review* 14/5 [1998].
- "Romans and the Theology of Paul," in *Pauline Theology*, vol. 3. Edited by David M. Hay and E. Elizabeth Johnson. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
- Reframing Presbyterian Worship: A Critical Survey of the Worship Views of John M. Frame and R. J. Gore, by Frank J. Smith, Ph.D. Pages 116-150.
- Editor's Introduction. Pages 116-118.
- Adger, John B. "A Denial of Divine Right for Organs in Public Worship," *Southern Presbyterian Review*, 20.1 (January 1869).
- Bannerman, James. *The Church of Christ*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1868. Rpt. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1960; 1974.
- Calvin, John. "On the Necessity of Reforming the Church," *Selected Works of John Calvin: Tracts and Letters*. Edited by Henry Beveridge and Jules Bonnet. Edinburgh: 1844; Rpt. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1983.
- Carruthers, S. W. *The Westminster Confession of Faith: Being an account of the Preparation and Printing of its Seven Leading Editions, to which is appended a critical text of the Confession with notes thereon*. Manchester: R. Aikman & Son, [1937].
- Cunningham, William. "Church Power," *Discussions on Church Principles*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1863.
- "The Reformers and the Regulative Principle," in *The Reformation of the Church: A collection of Reformed and Puritan documents on Church issues*. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1965; Rpt. 1987.
- *The Reformers and the Theology of the Reformation*. Rpt. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1979.
- Frame, John M. *Worship in Spirit and Truth*. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 1996.
- Gillespie, George. *A Dispute Against the English Popish Ceremonies*. Edited by Christopher Coldwell. Dallas: Naphtali Press, 1993.
- Girardeau, John L. "The Discretionary Power of the Church," *Sermons*. Edited by Rev. George A. Blackburn. Columbia, SC: The State Company, 1907. Rpt. in *Life Work and Sermons of John L. Girardeau*, Sprinkle Publications, nd.
- Knox, John. "A Vindication of the Doctrine that the Sacrifice of the Mass is Idolatry," *The Works of John Knox*. Edited by David Laing. Edinburgh: Printed for the Bannatyne Club, 1854; Rpt. NY: AMS Press, 1966.
- Miller, Samuel. *Presbyterianism the Truly Primitive and Apostolical Constitution of the Church of Christ*, "The Worship of the Presbyterian Church." Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1835.
- Mitchell, Alexander F. and Struthers, John eds. *Minutes of the Sessions of the Westminster Assembly of Divines*. Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1874.
- Murray, John, et al. "Report of the Committee on Song in Worship Presented to the Thirteenth General Assembly, on the Teaching of Our Standards Respecting the Songs That May Be Sung in the Public Worship of God," *Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Minutes of the General Assembly* (1946).
- Owen, John. "Discourse Concerning Liturgies," *The Works of John Owen*, v. 15. Edited by William H. Goold. Rpt. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1966.
- Rutherford, Samuel. *The Divine Right of Church Government and Excommunication*. London, 1646.
- Thornwell, James Henley. "Church Boards and Presbyterianism," *The Collected Writings of James Henley Thornwell*. Rpt. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1974.
- Reframing Presbyterian Worship, Pages 118-150.
- Bacon, Richard E. *A Pattern in the Heavens, Part One: Ecclesiology* (Blue Banner Ebooks, 2001). <http://www.fpcr.org>.
- Bannerman, James. *The Church of Christ*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1868. Rpt. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1960; 1974.
- Calvin, John. *A harmonie vpon the three euangelists, Matthew, Mark and Luke ... whereunto is also added a commentarie vpon the euangelist S. Iohn*. Londini: Impensis Geo. Bishop, 1584.
- Dickson, David. *A Commentary on the Psalms*. Glasgow: J. Dow, 1834. Rpt. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1959.

- Frame, John M. "The Lordship of Christ and the Regulative Principle of Worship," written for the Worship Task Force of the Committee on Mission to North America, PCA. Unpublished.
- "Reply to T. David Gordon," *WTJ* 56 (Spring 1994).
  - "Some Questions about the Regulative Principle," *WTJ* 54 (Fall 1992).
  - ST 323 Doctrine of the Christian Life, Lecture Outline, Part III, Spring 1979. Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia.
  - *Worship in Spirit and Truth*. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Pub., 1996.
- Gillespie, George. *A Dispute Against the English Popish Ceremonies*. Edited by Christopher Coldwell. Dallas: Naphtali Press, 1993.
- *Works in The Presbyterian's Armoury*. Edinburgh: Robert Ogle and Oliver and Boyd, 1846.
- Gordon, T. David. Personal Correspondence, Dr. T. David Gordon, Professor of Religion and Greek, Grove City College, to Frank J. Smith, Ph.D., D.D., February 28, 2005.
- "Review Article: The Westminster Assembly's Unworkable and Unscriptural View of Worship," *WTJ* 65 (2003).
  - "Some Answers About the Regulative Principle," *WTJ* 55 (Fall 1993).
- Gore, R. J. Jr. *Covenantal Worship: Reconsidering the Puritan Regulative Principle*. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 2002.
- "The Pursuit of Plainness: Rethinking the Regulative Principle of Worship." Ph.D. Dissertation, Westminster Theological Seminary, 1988.
  - "Review: Smith, Frank J. and Lachman, David C. eds., *Worship in the Presence of God: A collection of essays on the nature, elements, and historic views and practice of worship*," *WTJ* 56 (1994).
  - "Reviewing the Puritan Regulative Principle of Worship," *Presbyterian* 20.1 (1994).
  - "Reviewing the Regulative Principle. Part II," *Presbyterian* 21.1 (1995).
- Hooker, Richard. *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. Books I-IV*. 1593.
- Hoşpinian, Rudolph. *Festa Christianorum: hoc est, De origine progressu, ceremoniis et riti bus festorum dierum Christianorum*. Zurich, 1587.
- Liturgical Press. *Synopsis of Christian Worship in North America A Retrospective: 1955-1995* by James F. White. <http://www.stgabriel.com/pages/lp61564.html>.
- M'Crie, Thomas. *Lectures on the Book of Esther*. Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons, 1838.
- Mitchell, Alexander F. and Struthers, John eds. *Minutes of the Sessions of the Westminster Assembly of Divines*. Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1874.
- Murray, John, et al. "Minority Report of the Committee on Song in the Public Worship of God Submitted to the Fourteenth General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church," *Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Minutes of the General Assembly*, 1947.
- Pipa, Joseph. Review: "Worship in Spirit and Truth," *Presbyterian & Reformed News* v. 2, #4 [Fall 1996] 10-11.
- Reed, Kevin. "Presbyterian Worship: Old and New: A Review and Commentary upon *Worship in Spirit and Truth*, a book by John Frame." <http://www.all-of-grace.org/pub/others/regulativeprinciple.html>.
- Schwertley, Brian. "The Neo-Presbyterian Challenge to Confessional Presbyterian Orthodoxy: A Biblical Analysis of John Frame's *Worship in Spirit and in Truth*." <http://www.reformed.com/pub/frame.htm>.
- Warfield, B. B. "The Westminster Assembly and its Work," *Works*, vol. 6. Rpt. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1981.
- Endnotes. Page 150.
- Perkins, William. *Workes*. Cambridge: John Legate, 1608-09. Cited from William Young, *The Puritan Principle of Worship Part IV*. <http://members.aol.com/RSIGRACE/puritan4.html>.
- Ames, William. *The Marrow of Theology*, Translated from the third Latin edition, 1629, and edited by John D. Eusden. Pilgrim Press, 1968. Rpt. Durham, NC: The Labyrinth Press, 1983.
- Steuart, Walter, of Pardovan. *Collections and Observations Concerning the Worship, Discipline, and Government of the Church of Scotland*. Edinburgh: 1709, cited from Edinburgh: W. Gray and R. Inglis, 1770.
- **Reviews & Responses. Pages 151-163.**
- Review: Westerholm, Stephen. *Perspectives Old And New On Paul: The 'Lutheran' Paul And His Critics*. Grand Rapids: Erdmans, 2004. Reviewed by Rowland S. Ward.
- Wrede, W[illiam]. *Paul*. Translated by Edward Lummis (Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1908).
- Westerholm, Stephen. *Israel's Law and the Church's Faith: Paul and His Recent Interpreters*. Erdmans, 1988.
- Wright, N. T. *What Saint Paul Really Said: Was Paul of Tarsus the Real Founder of Christianity?* Erdmans, 1997.
- Review: Coppes, Leonard J. *The Divine Days of Creation*. Thornton: Providence Presbyterian Press, 2004. Reviewed by Benjamin Shaw.
- Barr, James. *The Semantics of Biblical Language*. Oxford University Press, 1961.
- Morris, Henry & Whitcomb, John C. *The Genesis Flood: The Biblical Record and It's Implications*. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1961.
- Young, E. J. *In the Beginning: Genesis Chapters 1 to 3 and the Authority of Scripture*. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1976.
- *Studies in Genesis One*. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Pub., 1999.
- Review: Shepherd, Norman. *Law and Gospel in Covenantal Perspective*. Holland: Norman Shepherd, 2004. Reviewed by Wayne Forkner, Pastor of Covenant Presbyterian Church, Berkeley, CA (OPC).
- Berkhof, Louis. *Systematic Theology*. Grand Rapids: Wm B Eerdmans Publishing, 2000.
- à Brakel, Wilhelmus. *The Christian's Reasonable Service*. Morgan, PA: Soli Deo Gloria, 1992.
- Robertson, O Palmer. *The Current Justification Controversy*. Unicoi: The Trinity Foundation, 2003.
- Sandlin, Andrew P. ed. *The Backbone of the Bible: Covenant in Contemporary Perspective*. Nacogdoches: Covenant Media Press, 2004.
- Shepherd, Norman. *The Call of Grace*. Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing, 2000.
- Review: Traill, Robert. *Justification Vindicated*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 2002. Reviewed by Andrew J. Webb.
- à Brakel, Wilhelmus. *The Christian's Reasonable Service*. Volume 2. Morgan, PA: Soli Deo Gloria, 1993, 1999.
- Shepherd, Norman. *Thirty-four Theses on Justification in Relation to Faith, Repentance, and Good Works*, Presented to the Presbytery of Philadelphia of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, November 18, 1978.

- Wright, N. T. *What Saint Paul Really Said*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Review: *The Auburn Avenue Theology, Pros and Cons: Debating the Federal Vision*. Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Knox Theological Seminary, 2004. Reviewed by J. Ligon Duncan III, Ph.D.
- Auburn Avenue Presbyterian Church, Monroe, LA. "Summary Statement of AAPC's Position on the Covenant, Baptism, and Salvation." Approved by the church session, September 26, 2002.
- Reformed Church of the United States. "Report Of The Special Committee To Study Justification In Light Of The Current Justification Controversy. 258<sup>th</sup> Synod, May 10-13, 2004.
- Reformed Presbyterian Church in the United States, Covenant Presbytery. "Resolution with reference to the 'New Perspective on Paul Movement,'" and "Call to Repentance." June 22, 2002.
- Sandlin, Andrew, ed. *Backbone of the Bible: Covenant in Contemporary Perspective*. Nacogdoches, Texas: Covenant Media Press, 2004.
- Shepherd, Norman. *The Call of Grace*. Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing, 2000.
- Waters, Guy. *Covenant Theology Improved?* (P&R, forthcoming).
- Wilkins, Steve and Garner, Duane. *The Federal Vision: A Collection of Essays on the Covenant*. Monroe, LA: Athanasius Press, 2004.
- Wilson, Doug. "Reformed" is Not Enough: *Recovering the Objectivity of the Covenant*. Moscow, Idaho: Canon Press, 2002.
- Wisz, Gary. "The Monroe Four Speak Out," and "Response," *Christian Renewal*, April 23, 2003. Rpt. Counsel of Chalcedon, June, 2004.
- *Psallo*: Psalm 109: 1-10. Pages 164-165.
- Keil C. F. and Delitzsch, F. *Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes*. Volume 5: *Psalms* (Eerdmans's, Rpt: 1984).
- **In Translation: Andrew Willet's *To the Pious Reader Prefaced to Book One of Nicholas Bownd's SABBATHVM VETERIS ET NOVI TESTAMENTI*. Pages 166-167.**
- Babington, Gervase. *A very fruitful Exposition of the Commandments*. London, 1583.
- Bownd, Nicholas. *The Doctrine of the Sabbath, plainly layde forth and soundly proved*. 1595.
- *SABBATHVM VETERIS ET NOVI TESTAMENTI: The True Doctrine of the Sabbath....* London, 1606.
- Brook, Benjamin. "Andrew Willet." *The Lives of the Puritans*. Morgan, PA: Soli Deo Gloria, 1994.
- Dennison, James T. *The Market Day of the Soul: The Puritan Doctrine of the Sabbath in England, 1532-1700*. Morgan, PA: Soli Deo Gloria, 2001.
- Gilfillan, James. *The Sabbath Viewed in the Light of Reason, Revelation, and History....* NY: American Tract Society & New York Sabbath Committee, c. 1862.
- Katz, David S. *Sabbath and Sectarianism in Seventeenth-Century England*. New York: E.J. Brill, 1988.
- Willet, Andrew. *Synopsis Papismi, that is, a generall viewe of papistrie: wherein the whole mysterie of iniquitie, and summe of Antichristian doctrine is set downe....* London: Printed by Thomas Orwin, for Thomas Man, 1592; new edition, London, 1852.
- *Antiquary*: The Development of the Traditional Form of The Westminster Standards. Pages 168-175.
- In addition to the works cited below, see the editions of the Westminster Standards given in the appendices.
- Cameron, Nigel M. de S; Wright, David F; Lachman, David C; and Meek, Donald E, eds. *Dictionary of Scottish Church History & Theology*. Downers Grover: IVP, 1993.
- Carruthers, S. W. *Three Centuries of the Westminster Shorter Catechism*. New Brunswick: Published for the Beaverbrook Foundations by the University of New Brunswick, 1957.
- *The Westminster Confession of Faith: Being an account of the Preparation and Printing of its Seven Leading Editions, to which is appended a critical text of the Confession with notes thereon*. Manchester: R. Aikman & Son, [1937].
- Carruthers, William. *The Shorter Catechism of the Westminster Assembly of Divines: Being a facsimile of the First Edition, which was ordered to be printed by the House of Commons, 25<sup>th</sup> November, 1647. With Historical Account and Bibliography*. London: Publication Office of the Presbyterian Church of England, 1897.
- Church of Scotland. *Act Ratifying the Confession of Faith and Settling Presbyterian Church-government the seventh day of June, 1690*. Edinburgh, Printed by the heir of Andrew Anderson, 1690.
- *Directions of the Generall Assembly concerning Secret and Private Worship, and mutuall edification, for cherishing piety, for maintaining unity, and avoiding schism and division. With an act for observing these directions, and for censuring such as use to neglect family worship. And an act against such as withdraw themselves from the publike worship in their owne congregations*. Edinburgh: Re-printed by Evan Tyler, 1650.
- Coldwell, Chris. "Examining the Work of S. W. Carruthers," *The Confessional Presbyterian*, vol. 1 (2005).
- Evans, D. Wyn, "James Watson of Edinburgh: A Bibliography of Works from his Press 1695-1722," *Edinburgh Bibliographical Society Transactions*, Volume V, Part 2, Sessions 1976-7, 1977-8, 1979-80. Edinburgh: Printed for the Society by John G Eccles Printers Ltd, Inverness, 1982.
- Lee, John. *Memorial for the Bible Societies in Scotland*. Edinburgh: Printed for the Edinburgh Bible Society, 1824; 1826; 1839.
- Waugh, Barry. Notes. Item: *The Confession of Faith*, etc. Edinburgh, James Watson, 1710. PHSP. Call Number: CR UC41 1710 Sco83. Submitted to Chris Coldwell, October 27, 2004. Unpublished.
- Warfield, B. B. "Notes Toward A Bibliography of the Westminster Confession: I. Britain, *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, xii (1901).
- "The Printing of the Westminster Confession," *Works*, vol. 6. *The Westminster Assembly and its Work*. Rpt. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1981.
- Wing, Donald. *Short-title catalogue of books printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and British America, and of English books printed in other countries, 1641-1700*. Second edition newly revised and enlarged; revised and edited by John J. Morrison and Carolyn W. Nelson, editors, and Matthew Seccombe, assistant editor. NY: Modern Language Association of America, 1994. ■

**Editorial, Continued from Page 2.**

pastor of First Presbyterian Church of Rowlett, Texas, presents a setting for Psalm 109:1-10, and briefly defends singing from even the most imprecatory portions of the Psalter.

We trust *In Translatiōe* will provide some space for new translation work of material of interest to Confessional Presbyterians. The importance of the piece presented in this first issue is that it supports the theory as stated by James T. Dennison, that the spread of the Puritan view of the Sabbath in the mid to latter part of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, was due at least in part to “the underground development of Puritanism via prophesyings, lecturings and the universities.” In this preface to Nicholas Bownd’s work on the Christian Sabbath, translated here as far as we know for the first time, Andrew Willet states that his introduction to Sabbatarian views came while at the university at Cambridge.

*Antiquary* is anticipated to be a forum for articles of an historical, biographical or bibliographical significance, concerning the ruins and relics as it were of Presbyterianism, reminiscent of the contributions of the historian and antiquary David Hay Fleming. In this installment, the editor traces the development of what would become and still remains the traditional form of The Westminster Standards, indicating when the various portions began to be commonly printed with the Confession and Catechisms. In the Appendices, bibliographical details are given for key editions which introduced changes or first included new material, and a very rare 1710 James Watson edition is described in some detail (the only known copy of which resides at the Presbyterian Historical Society in Philadelphia).

Finally, it is intended that each issue will be completed with a *Bibliography* covering all the material presented, which we trust will be useful to the general reader as well as the bibliophile.

With this introductory editorial to the format out of the way, we leave the reader to the contents of this first issue of *The Confessional Presbyterian, a Journal for Discussion of Presbyterian Doctrine & Practice*.

CHRIS COLDWELL ■

**Fesko on N. T. Wright, Continued from Page 115.**

justified, innocent before God because of the intercessory work of Christ. Moreover, for those who place their faith in Christ, in his work—life, death, and resurrection—God reckons, or credits them with righteousness, innocence and loyalty to the Torah. It appears, therefore, that the classic reformed view of justification as it comes through the Westminster Standards is correct. Justification is indeed an act of God’s free grace, wherein he pardons all our sins, and accepts us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and received by faith alone. ■

**Review by J. Ligon Duncan III, Ph.D., of *The Auburn Avenue Theology*, Continued from Page 163.**

The fourth and final section of the book relates to the Federal Vision teaching on the sacraments, and Douglas Wilson’s and Steve Wilkins’ chapters are not to be missed. Indeed, reading these pieces will give the reader a feel for how much of the theological project of the Federal Vision is juxtaposed with baptist ecclesiology and sacramentology. Indeed, though the Federal Vision casts its conversation partner as the degenerated reformed tradition under the influence of two centuries of revivalism, the real dialogue is with their own personal story—in both baptist and reconstructionist aspects and phases. Cal Beisner’s concluding comments in chapter twenty-three provide a superb summary of the problems of the Federal Vision, all the more valuable because they come from the pen and heart of a man who has tried valiantly to think the very best of his friends involved in this theological revision movement.

One question that ought to be asked is who should read this book, or anything else for that matter on the Federal Vision? Well, obviously ministers and professors need at least some passing acquaintance with the issue if they are to be of help to folks struggling with these topics. This volume provides, for that purpose, a good one-stop resource. When Guy Waters’ *Covenant Theology Improved?* (P&R, forthcoming) appears later this year it will furnish a nice companion to this compilation. Ministerial students too will benefit from hearing both sides in their own words. However, material on the Federal Vision is not something that I would recommend to congregants (unless there is some special circumstance). Better that the laity feed upon healthy food and more edifying subjects. For as Cal Beisner observes: “Extensive study of [Federal Vision proponents’] oral and written teachings on the special concerns of the Federal Vision convinces me that they have taught, alongside some wonderful truths, some serious errors about covenant theology and its implications for salvation, personal and corporate spirituality and piety, the use and understanding of the sacraments and the conduct of theology and biblical studies in general. Sadly, their mistakes undermine their very laudable goals. Their attempt to assure tender souls who doubt their salvation while they trust in Christ collapses and the poor souls are left more confused than before, because the objectivity of the covenant is inadequate to the task—while the presumptuous, who hear that aspect of their message may be led, inadvertently, to the false assurance of formalism. At the same time, their attempt to destroy the complacency of the presumptuous is in profound danger of promoting a false legalistic notion of works righteousness.” ■

**Contributing Editors:** Dr. Richard E. Bacon (Amer. RPC). Dr. Bacon is pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Rowlett, Texas. He has written many articles and books, including *What Mean Ye By This Service: Paedocommunion in Light of Passover, The Visible Church & the Outer Darkness, and Revealed to Babes: Children in the Worship of God*.

Dr. W. Gary Crampton (RPCGA). Dr. Crampton holds the degrees of Th.M and Th.D (Whitefield Theological Seminary) and Ph.D. (Central School of Religion, Surrey, England). He is the author of many books and articles, including: *What Calvin Says, Study Guide to the Westminster Confession, The Scripturalism of Gordon H. Clark, By Scripture Alone, What the Puritans Taught and Meet Jonathan Edwards*.

Dr. J. Ligon Duncan, Ph.D. (PCA). Dr. Duncan is Senior Minister of the First Presbyterian Church, Jackson, MS. He is the author of numerous articles and books, including, *The Westminster Assembly: A Guide to Basic Bibliography* (with David W. Hall), *A Short History of the Westminster Assembly* (with William Beveridge), and William Cunningham's *An Introduction to Theological Studies* (edited and introduced).

John T. Dyck (BPC). John Dyck is the pastor of the Edmonton Bible Presbyterian Church, Edmonton, AB. He is also the website manager for the Westminster Shorter Catechism Project ([www.shortercatechism.com](http://www.shortercatechism.com)) and co-editor of *Pulpit & Pew*, an online journal of pastoral theology ([www.pastoraltheology.com](http://www.pastoraltheology.com)).

Dr. David W. Hall, Ph. D. Dr. Hall is the Senior Pastor of Midway Presbyterian Church (PCA), Powder Springs, GA, and is the author or editor of several books, including *The Arrogance of the Modern* (1997), *Savior or Servant: Putting Government in Its Place* (1996), *Election Day Sermons* (1996), *Paradigms in Polity* (1994), *The Practice of Confessional Subscription* (1997), and *The Genevan Reformation and the American Founding* (2003). He previously served as Pastor of the Covenant Presbyterian Church and the Founding Director of the Kuyper Institute in Oak Ridge, TN.

R. Sherman Isbell (FCSC). Mr. Isbell is minister of Westminster Presbyterian Church, Bethesda, Maryland, a congregation of the Free Church of Scotland (Continuing), which has a presbytery in North America.

Ray B. Lanning (ARPC): Mr. Lanning is a graduate of Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, PA (M.Div., 1977) and served as Student Assistant from 1973-1977 to Dr. James M. Boice, Tenth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia. He has served churches in various Presbyterian and Reformed denominations (ARPC, PCA, CRC) and presently is minister of the ARPC of Grand Rapids. He is also instructor at Puritan and Reformed Seminary in Grand Rapids, and editorial as-

sistant to the seminary's president, Dr. Joel R. Beeke. He is the editor, coauthor and author of numerous articles and chapters in books, periodicals and reference books.

John R. Muether (OPC). Mr. Muether is Library Director and Associate Professor of Church History at Reformed Theological Seminary in Orlando. He also serves as the Historian of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

Thomas G. Reid (RPCNA). Mr. Reid is Assistant Professor, Librarian and Registrar at Reformed Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh.

Dr. Frank J. Smith (CRPC). Dr. Smith is author of *The History of the Presbyterian Church in America: The Continuing Church Movement*, and co-edited with Dr. David C. Lachman, *Worship in the Presence of God: A collection of essays on the nature, elements, and historic views and practice of worship* (1992). He is pastor of the Covenant Reformed Presbyterian Church of Sheboygan, Wisconsin.

Wayne Sparkman, M.A.R., M.Div. (PCA). Mr. Sparkman is director of the PCA Historical Center, St. Louis, MO.

Alan Strange (OPC). Mr. Strange is Associate Professor of Church History, Theological Librarian, and Registrar for Mid America Reformed Seminary, and he is associate pastor for New Covenant Community Church, New Lenox, IL.

C. N. Willborn, Ph.D. (PCA). Dr. Willborn is Associate Professor of Church History at Greenville Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Greenville, SC.

**Editorial Assistance:** Our thanks go to Mr. Carl Betsch for laying out the musical score in *Psallo*.

**General Editor:** Chris Coldwell. Through Naphtali Press, Mr. Coldwell has edited and published new editions of classic Presbyterian and Reformed books since 1987. These include two substantial works: a critical edition of George Gillespie's *A Dispute Against the English Popish Ceremonies* (1993), and James Durham's *Christ Crucified: Or, the Marrow of the Gospel in Seventy-Two Sermons on the Fifty-Third Chapter of Isaiah* (2001), both now out of print. He has also published new editions of Durham's *Lectures on Job*, and on the *Ten Commandments*. Mr. Coldwell is currently compiling a new critical text of the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, building upon the work of Dr. S. W. Carruthers. In 2004, as a research associate of the Westminster Assembly Project, he completed a draft transcription of the two surviving manuscripts of the Westminster Larger Catechism.

**General Oversight:** The production of *The Confessional Presbyterian* is under the oversight of the Session of First Presbyterian Church Rowlett, Texas: Dr. Richard Bacon, Rev. Todd L. Ruddell, Elders Thomas Allie, Carl Betsch, and David Seekamp. ■