Course Description

A study of theological prolegomena (introduction, theological method), theology proper (God, Trinity, creation, providence) and anthropology (man, Fall, sin). Our survey of doctrine will be based on the exegesis of Scripture, with continual reference to historical theology. All along we will remember the crucial nexus between faith and life, doctrine and practice, and thus endeavor to stress the importance of these doctrines for Christian thought, life, and ministry.

“…the battle cry of ‘Exegesis, exegesis, exegesis!’ that I hear coming from some sections of the evangelical world has its shortcomings here as well. Of course, exegesis is a basic element of all sound theology; but, like the foundations or frame of a house, if that’s all there is, you’re going to get wet, very wet, when it rains. It can lead to a fragmentary approach to the Bible which never sees the whole picture, or the priorities which exist within the overall witness of scripture. It can be profoundly anti-intellectual, eschewing all questions that a superficial reading of the text does not raise. Its frequent failure to rise to theological and ethical synthesis, and to engage modestly and thoughtfully with the priorities of the creedal and confessional trajectories of the church, leaves it inadequate to deal with really big issues in any kind of historical, social or ecclesiastical perspective. Exegesis is important; but it needs to stand in relation to other theological and ethical tasks if it is not to prove itself the basis for a highly unstable, selective and inconsistent church policy. Preachers, as well as believers, have their pick-‘n-mix priorities, against which the testimony of the centuries, embodied in the creeds and confessions, can go some way to help. No-one, therefore, should be allowed within a million miles of a pulpit who does not have a proper respect for biblical theology in terms of the overall story of redemptive history, a firm grasp of the importance of systematic theology, creeds and confessions, and a critical handle on contemporary culture. Only then can he begin to deal with the latest big thing in any kind of biblical, theological and historical perspective.”

Carl Trueman
The Wages of Spin
(Mentor, 2005)

Prerequisites

MFT students should consult Louis Berkhof’s Manual of Christian Doctrine (Eerdmans, 2002 [1933]) for a quick introduction to the discipline of Systematic Theology. MDiv students should consult the RTS Guide on Shorter Catechism memorization requirements for ST courses. Please consult with the Academic Dean’s secretary for further information on this issue.

MDiv Students who are wondering as to the value of Systematic Theology to preaching should consult the following:

Course Objectives

The principal aim of the Systematic courses (1ST508, 1ST512, and 1ST518) is to provide students with a comprehensive understanding of the main doctrines of Christianity. The course aims at introducing the student to the discipline of systematic theology, in particular, to Theological Prolegomena, and the doctrines of Scripture, God and man. Students should have a competent grasp of the issues involved and a facility to communicate them with some fluency. Some memorization is essential in this process. Theology is both exegetical and historical, sociological and ecclesiastical, biblical and systematic. Tensions often arise when one aspect is stressed at the expense of another. This is a course in systematic theology—concerned with the answer to a series of inter-related questions: What does the entire Bible teach on a specific issue? How have theologians of the past and present formulated this issue? Answers to these questions are often expressed confessionally, and many branches of the church require of their ordained clergy (teaching elders) a commitment to these doctrines in a more or less strict sense. Students ought to be able to handle themselves well in the modern debate over controversial issues. Many students will be examined on these doctrines in church courts and this objective will also be maintained. Additionally, all good theology should be doxological. Obedience in worship will be the chief objective of this course.

Note should be taken of the following quotations:

“Theology seems often to the outsider just so much word-spinning air-borne discourse which never touches down except disastrously.” [Ian Ramsey, Models for Divine Activity (London: SCM Press, 1973), 1]

“There are theologians in the bottom of hell who are more interested in their own thoughts about God than in God himself.” [C. S. Lewis]

“Theology is the science of living blessedly for ever” [William Perkins, The Golden Chaine (1590), 1]

Students should achieve the following:

1. A basic familiarity with the traditional loci of Christian theology
2. Acquaintance with the history of Christian thought, particularly its Patristic, Protestant, Puritan (Westminsterian) and Modern phases.
3. Awareness of contemporary challenges to Christian orthodoxy and an ability to assess their strengths and weaknesses
4. Critical awareness of current trends in Christian theology
5. Familiarity with the tools and resources available for study of theological issues; and an ability to use these tools for independent research and analysis
6. A sense of theological proportion, enabling the student to distinguish between what is primary and what is secondary in Christian doctrine
7. The development of a respect for traditional theological formulations together with an ability to critically evaluate them

Theological Standpoint

The course will be taught from the standpoint of a personal commitment to the Westminster Confession of Faith (full disclosure of presuppositional bias!). In particular, it reflects the theology of sixteenth and seventeenth century theologians (students advocating separation rather than continuity in theological expression here need to read the 4-volumed work of Richard Muller, Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics 4 vols. (Baker, 2003), before challenging the
professor about it!). In particular, students will detect a penchant for puritan theologians of the caliber of Owen, Manton, Sibbes and Charnock. Scottish sympathies abound, especially for William Cunningham (his view of Calvin on the Supper notwithstanding). Additional input will be evidenced from the Princetonians (Warfield and Hodge), the wisdom of John Murray (his four-volume set of “complete writings” ought to be in every student’s library). As the professor gets older, greater recognition of theology’s Patristic roots are taking shape.

Teaching/Class Methodology

Lectures will cover all the major topics, but there will not be uniformity. Some topics are more important than others. Some topics are covered adequately in the reading material (when this is the case, it will be pointed out in class). Due to the mixed nature of the class-room, questions will be limited, but welcome. Special seminars will be arranged on a voluntary basis for students who wish to ask questions of a “I don’t understand this” nature. It is all too easy to slow things down to a snail’s pace if this is not adhered to.

All lectures are given via Powerpoint™ and outlines will be accessible for download from my website. Details of how to access this site, plus the necessary password will be given in class.

Course Requirements

I. READING

Required Texts

Careful reading is required of the following materials:

Stephen Prothero, God is NOT ONE (SP)(HarperOne, 2010) (330)
Herman Bavinck, Reformed Dogmatics: God and Creation (HB) (Baker, 2004).
1-620 (620)
J. I. Packer, Concise Theology (Tyndale House, 2001) (reference only)
Donald MacLeod, Shared Life (SL), 1-96. (96)
Anthony Hoekema, Created in God’s Image (Eerdmans)
Henri Blocher, Original Sin: Illuminating the Riddle (OS) (Eerdmans) (158)

Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechism (Free Presbyterian Publications): WCF 1-9; WLC 1-29; 91-152; WSC 1-19.

Less careful (!) reading of the following material will be required:

Supplemental Texts (on reserve in the library)

Basil, De Spiritu Sancto, BR 60. S41 1961 V. 8, pp 1-18; 33-43.
John Frame, The Doctrine of God, BT 103, F73, pp. 543-599.
Carl Henry, God, Revelation, and Authority, BT 75.2. H521 V. 3 c. 2, pp. 403-487.


**Reading Schedule**

1. Prothero, pp. 25-168; ICR, pp. 35-51. (150 pages)
3. ICR, pp. 74-93; HB, pp. 27-147. (139 pages)
4. ICR, pp. 93-99; HB, pp. 148-255. (143 pages)
5. ICR, pp. 99-116; SL, 1-50. (pages)
6. ICR, pp. 116-120; SL, pp. 51-96. (50 pages)
7. ICR, pp. 120-159; HB, pp. 256-336. (119 pages)
8. ICR, pp. 159-183; HB, pp. 337-442. (130 pages)
9. ICR, pp. 183-197; CGI, Chs. 1-7
10. ICR, pp. 197-37; CGI, Chs. 8-12
11. HB, pp. 443-510; OS, 15-81. (133 pages)
12. HB, pp. 511-590; OS, 83-158. (154 pages)

**II. Class Attendance**

Class attendance will be imperative for successful completion of this course. **I do not permit the use of LAPTOPS during class time.**

Students are expected to bring their copies of the *Westminster Confession of Faith* (Free Presbyterian), and the Bible to class every day.

**III. Evaluation**

The course will be divided into four unequal parts: Quizzes (15%), précis requirements (15%), a thesis paper (40%), and a final examination (30%).
a. **Quizzes (15%)**
   These are based on the scheduled reading assignments. Quizzes will take place at 8.20 am on Thursdays.

b. **Précis requirement (15%)**
   A précis is a concise abridgement of a larger treatment, or summary of a particular topic. In this exercise, the student will prepare a (no more than) one page précis of his views and understanding of 5 major doctrinal topics:

   1. God               Due         Sept 4
   2. Trinity           Due         Sept 25
   3. Creation          Due         Oct 16
   4. Providence        Due         Nov 6
   5. Man               Due         Nov 20

   These précis' should be typed. Students may **not** work together on this assignment.

   A sample précis is given in the appendices section at the end of this syllabus.

   J. I. Packer does a great job of providing a précis for most doctrines in his book *Concise Theology*. Refrain from merely duplicating his material! The professor has **two** copies of this book already!

c. **Final Exam (30%)**
   The examination will cover the entire material, including the reading material, and will test the student’s competence to integrate it into his overall theological skills. You may expect the examination to lengthy, requiring detailed knowledge.

d. **Course Paper (40%)**
   This paper of 10-12 pages will examine some issue of theology. Further requirements will be announced later in the semester at least one week prior to the due date.

d. **Extra Credit (5%)**
   This will **NOT** guarantee an A in this course, but it could help towards a better grade. Students wishing to ensure a better grade may write an additional 7-page *summary* paper evaluating one of the following works (due RTS Paper Day):

   - Douglas Kelly *Creation and Change* (Christian Focus Publications)
Recommended Books for your library (!)

In addition to the required texts, the following books are highly recommended for your reference during the course and purchase for your personal library. Married students who need me to give my lecture entitled, “Make sure you marry a wife who loves books more than she loves you!” should write me a personal note and include some suitable remuneration. Those who have already made their life-choice without taking into consideration this matter should perhaps reflect on their folly and, in penance, become adept at purchasing on [This is a work in progress and further books will be cited during the course of the semester. These make wonderful anniversary gifts!].

Systematic Theology
- Louis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*
- Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology* (3 vols.)
- John Owen, *Collected Works* (16 vols.)
- Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology* (3 vols.)
- Robert L. Dabney, *Systematic Theology*
- B.B. Warfield, *Collected Works* (10 vols.)
- John Murray, *Collected Writings* (4 vols.)
- Wayne Grudem, *Systematic Theology*
- Donald Macleod, *A Faith to Live By*
- Herman Bavinck, *Reformed Dogmatics* (4 Vols)
- Van Til, *An Introduction to Systematic Theology*

Theological prolegomena (Introduction, Theological Method)
- Richard Muller, *The Study of Theology*
- John Frame, *The Doctrine of the Knowledge of God*
- David Wells, *No Place for Truth*

Scripture (Revelation, Inspiration, Authority, Hermeneutics)
- N.B. Stonehouse and Paul Woolley, eds., *The Infallible Word*
- Nigel Cameron, *Evolution and the Authority of the Bible*
- D. A. Carson and John Woodbridge, eds., *Scripture and Truth Hermeneutics, Authority and Canon*
- Dan McCartney and C. Clayton, *Let the Reader Understand*
- Packer, J. I. *Fundamentalism and the Word of God*
- *God Has Spoken*

Theology proper (God, Trinity, Creation, Providence)
- Herman Bavinck, *Doctrines of God*
- John Frame *Doctrine of God*
- Donald Macleod, *Behold Your God*
- Sinclair B. Ferguson, *The Holy Spirit*
- D.G. Hagopian, ed., *The Genesis Debate*
- J.A. Pipa, Jr. and David W. Hall, eds., *Did God Create in Six Days?*
- Paul Helm, *The Providence of God*

Anthropology (Man, Fall, Sin)
- James B. Hurley, *Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective*
- George W. Knight III, *The Role Relationship of Men and Women*
- John Piper and Wayne Grudem, eds. *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*
- John Murray, *The Imputation of Adam’s Sin*
Iain D. Campbell, *The Doctrine of Sin*

**Pastoral Theology**
- Richard Baxter, *The Reformed Pastor*
- Charles Bridges, *The Christian Ministry*
- Patrick Fairbairn, *Pastoral Theology*
- J. I. Packer, *A Quest for Godliness*
- C. H. Spurgeon, *Lectures to My Students*

Unsure of a certain term? These should help you.

For the ‘advanced’ student who wants to learn some Latin:

![Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms](image)

Some ‘Barthian’ leanings here, so be careful.

![Pocket Dictionary of Theological Terms](image)

From the ‘old school’:

The $7 ‘save my bacon’ variety and for those unashamed to admit ignorance!
Please ensure that you supply a full address with your assignments if you wish them returned to you. Resident students may have them sent to their RTS mailboxes. If you do not have a mailbox at the seminary, please make sure that anything you turn in to the professor has your name and address on it. If you use Microsoft Word, for example, set up a template with this information set as its “Header”.

Should you need to contact me, you may do so the following e-mail address:

**dthomas@rts.edu**

**nb.** Should you attempt to contact me by e-mail, please remember that if you sign yourself ‘Jake’ or ‘Jemima’ I may not always know who you are. Please humor me by attaching a full name and the course in which you are enrolled. If you are really high-tech, you may attach a photograph too!
Bibliography on Scripture

Revelation and Inspiration
Baillie, J          Our Knowledge of God
Barth, K           Church Dogmatics, Vol I, Pt 2, Chapter III
Bruce, F F         Tradition Old and New
Calvin             Institutes, Bk. I. III, IV, V.
Comfort, P. W. (ed.) The Origin of the Bible
Cunningham, W      Theological Lectures, pp. 269 ff
Demarest, Bruce A. General Revelation
Dodd, C H          The Authority of the Bible
Helm, P            The Divine Revelation
Helm, P and Carl Trueman The Trustworthiness of God
Henry, C F H (Ed.) Revelation and the Bible
Jewett, P K        God, Creation and Revelation
Lewis, C S         Fern Seed and Elephants
Marshall, I H      Biblical Inspiration
Morris, Leon.      I Believe in Revelation
Noll, M            Between Faith and Criticism
Orr, J             Revelation and Inspiration
Packer, J. I.      Fundamentalism and the Word of God
Pannenberg, W      Systematic Theology, Vol. 1, pp. 189-258
Stonehouse and Wooley (Eds) The Infallible Word
Van Til            The Doctrine of Scripture
Warfield, B B      The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible
Wenham, J          Christ and the Bible

The Canon of Scripture
Bruce, F F         The Canon of Scripture
Harris, R. Laird   Inspiration and Canonicity of the Bible
Metzger, B         The Canon of the New Testament
Smith, W R         The Old Testament in the Jewish Church, Lecture VI
Westcott, B. F.    The Canon of the New Testament
The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia, 1929 edition, article "Canon of the Old Testament" (Vol 1, 554ff)
The Authority/Inerrancy of Scripture

Boice, James M.  The Foundations of Biblical Authority
Bullough, S  Roman Catholicism, pp. 161ff
Calvin, J  Institutes I. VII (“The Testimony of the Spirit”)
Craig, Samuel G. ed.,  The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible
Geisler, Norman.  Inerrancy
Gillespie, G  A Treatise of Miscellany Questions, XXI
Henry, Carl F. H..  God, Revelation and Authority.
Halyburton, T  Essay Concerning the Nature of Faith
Kline, Meredith  The Structure of Biblical Authority
Lindsell, Harold.  The Battle for the Bible
Macleod, D  Rome and Canterbury, pp. 20-42
McGowan, Andrew  The Divine Authenticity of Scripture
Montgomery, John, ed.  God's Inerrant Word: An International Symposium on the Trustworthiness of Scripture
Nicole, Roger & J. R. Michaels, eds.  Inerrancy and Common Sense
Owen, J  The Reason of Faith (Works, Vol. IV, p. 91)
Pache, Rene.  The Inspiration and Authority of Scripture
Packer, J.I.  Fundamentalism and the Word of God
Packer, J. I.  God Has Spoken: Revelation and the Bible
Packer, J. I.  God Speaks to Man: Revelation
Ramm, Bernard.  The Pattern of Religious Authority
_____  Special Revelation and the Word of God
Riches, John.  The Bible: a very short introduction
Ridderbos, Herman  Studies in Scripture and its Authority
Rogers, Jack.  Biblical Authority
Rogers, J. & D. McKim  The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible: An Historical Approach
Schaeffer, Francis.  No Final Conflict
Tenney, Merrill C.  The Bible: The Living Word of Revelation
Wenham, John.  Christ and the Bible
Wilson, Ian.  The Bible is History
Woodbridge, John H.  Biblical Authority
Young, Edward J.  Thy Word is Truth
Youngblood, Ron, ed.  Evangelicals and Inerrancy

The Text of Scripture

Bruce, F. F.  The English Bible: A History of Translations
_____  The New Testament Documents: Are they Reliable?
Macleod, D  "The Bible and Textual Criticism" (The Banner of Truth, December 1972)
Metzger, B  The Text of the New Testament
Hermeneutics

Spurgeon, C H
The Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit, 1886, pp. 475ff

Wallace, D B

Warfield, B B
Textual Criticism of the New Testament

Westcott & Hort
The New Testament in Greek, 1917

Barr, J
The Semantics of Biblical Language

Bultmann, R
Jesus Christ and Mythology

Colson, C
& Richard J. Neuhaus
Your Word is Truth: A Project of Evangelicals and Catholics Together

& Woodbridge(Eds)
Hermeneutics, Authority and Canon

Carson
Scripture and Truth

Fairbaim, P
The Interpretation of Prophecy

J B Green (Ed.)
The Typology of Scripture

Greidanus, S
Hearing the New Testament

Kaiser and Silva
The Modern Preacher and the Ancient Text

Kasemann, E.
An Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics

Lane, A N S (Ed.)
The New Testament: History of its Interpretation

Marshall, I H (Ed.)
Interpreting the Bible: Historical and Theological Studies

McKim, D K
New Testament Interpretation

Norris, N
The Authoritative Word

Powell, M A
Deconstruction: Theory and Practice

Vanhoozer, K
What Is Narrative Criticism?

Wright, D
"Calvin's Pentateuchal Criticism" (Calvin Theological Journal, April 1986)

"Incidentalism in Theology" (Themelios, April 1986)
Appendices

Paper Grading Guide

The following criteria will be used in grading all written work for this course, based on a 25% basis:

THESIS STATEMENT (5%)
Clear, brief, description of thesis statement (5)
No these statement (0)

DEVELOPMENT (ie. does it have a beginning, middle and end?) (5%)
Coherent (5) Begins well, but... (4) Falls apart after the first page (3) Stream of Consciousness stuff (2) Can’t make head nor tail of this (1) No paper! (0)

CONTENT (8%)
Shows thorough grasp of the material AND some independent thinking (5)
Shows thorough grasp of the material AND some borrowed thinking (4)
Raises more issues than can be answered (3)
Doesn’t contain enough data to deal with the issue (2)
Has virtually no content! (1)
No paper (0)

BIBLIOGRAPHY (3%)
Solid bibliographical content (5)
Adequate bibliography (3)
Inadequate bibliography (2)
No bibliography! (0)

ERRORS (5%)
Some coherent but different style (identified in a footnote on page 1) (4)
Some grammatical and/or typographical errors (3)
Solecisms abounding (2)
Paper written in a language other than English (1)
No paper (0)

Because the paper was late, I have had to reduce your grade by two points per day from the due date, in fairness to your peers.

The grade I have assigned you is based upon your fulfillment of the instructions for the assignment, the overall quality of your presentation, my assessment of your grasp of the subject matter, your skill in communication of the material, and how well you did your work in comparison with your peers in the course.
I include this ‘review’ of Anthony Hoekema’s work as given by Dr Duncan Rankin in his ST1 syllabus for your edification! Just be grateful that he isn’t reviewing something which you wrote! Read, mark and learn!

Anthony Hoekema, Created in God’s Image (Eerdmans)

This work we can give a qualified endorsement. Its strengths are several. Clearly and simply written, it is one of the few recent works on the doctrine of man, or Christian anthropology, from an evangelical and Reformed perspective. Hoekema also incorporates repeated application to the fields of psychology and Christian counseling/therapy, making it especially relevant to students in the MFT program. There are, however, facets to A.A. Hoekema's work (AAH) which give us some pause in making it required reading for ST1:

1) Hoekema and his audience at Calvin Theological Seminary were all primarily concerned with theology as developed in the Dutch ethnic stream in the Netherlands, Canada, and the USA, making much of the material he references inaccessible to the average American audience.

2) This Dutch milieu skews his treatment in a decidedly Continental direction, focusing on developments in Germany at the expense of Great Britain and America, which have historically adopted the Westminster Confession of Faith as their Reformed subordinate standard.

3) Hoekema gives a vast amount of space to modern theology—especially that of Barth, Brunner, Bultmann, and Berkouwer—at the expense of both the Patristic and Puritan periods.

4) The judgment exercised by Hoekema on certain doctrinal matters is at times rather curious or even inclusivist.

While each of these objections is worthy of sober consideration and due caution, none are so insurmountable as to merit the elimination of this work from the required reading list.

p. vii NB: the chapter headings indicate the major areas of doctrinal interest in Christian anthropology: the image of God and sin

p. 17 G.C. Berkouwer (b. 1903): former Professor of Dogmatics at the Free University of Amsterdam, noted sympathetic critic of Barthianism, and author of the series Dogmatics in Outline. See article in New Dictionary of Theology (NDT), DOWNERS GROVE: INTERVARSITY PRESS, 1988, p. 89f.

p. 22 Rationality is a prerequisite of true love. Why does AAH make them sound almost antithetical?

p. 24 Is "victim" language appropriate for the Fall?

p. 25 NB: John Murray's treatment of "old self" or "old man". This is vital for a proper view of sanctification.

p. 36 Note the jump across 1000 years of church history! Don’t get whiplash! 22

p. 39 love vs. intellect: apples vs. oranges (This is not one of AAH's more brilliant comments about God.)

p. 43f Caution: AAH has relied very heavily upon the dated work on Calvin's anthropology by the Scottish Barthian T. F. Torrance. This early work has been attacked and corrected by Mary Potter Engel's John Calvin's Perspectival Anthropology, in American Academy of Religion Academy Series, no. 52, ed. by Susan Thistlthwaite. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1988. Torrance asserts--like Karl Barth--that the image of God is not in man but above him only in the person of Christ. AAH does avoid this more radical teaching, in spite of his use of Torrance's tome.
p. 49 NB: Karl Barth's typically negative, protesting stance. Often his protests contain a grain of truth when viewed within their contemporary context. But, be warned: that does not mean his neo-orthodox conclusions should be uncritically adopted. Much of Barth's "I-Thou" musing is not uniquely Christian, being based on the philosophical exercises of Jewish scholar Martin Buber.

p. 51 NB: "On this point Barth does not give us a clear answer." You will find this not to be an uncommon trait of Barth, especially for the non-expert. Be careful not to read your own subjective feelings into Barth's inviting text, a common fallacy in American neo-orthodox circles.

p. 52 It is not clear to me that Brunner draws a historical distinction between Creation and Sin, but rather a logical one. Does AAH see the same?

p. 57 NB: "What Brunner means, I presume....." Like with Barth's, the non-expert is liable to be either confused or invited to read his own feelings into Brunner's text. The pastoral and theological advice of your instructor is that you focus your own personal reading on the classics, especially Calvin. This will be of much more help in your counseling/therapy work than neo-orthodox tomes.

p. 59 What can unveil "the secret of the whole man"? What limits does this place upon your use of material from natural revelation in counseling/therapy? How important is the Bible to your work?

p. 65 The recurrent theme of "static vs. dynamic" or "being vs. doing" or "noun vs. verb" is of fairly recent origin. Be careful! All "dynamic" systems are not equally valid or correct. What do these terms mean in this context?

p. 73 AAH asserts the primacy of Christ's love in His life. On what grounds does AAH assert this "fact"? [When you discover it, then please let your instructor know!] While it may sound warm and fuzzy, AAH is traveling across very deep theological waters here, which could be developed in a number of liberal/heretical directions. Thankfully, he does not seem to develop this idea to any great extent. You do the same--leave this thread unpulled!

p. 74 Admit it or not, AAH is into Christology here--the study of the person and work of Christ. Unfortunately, he does not expound his Christology here in traditional categories (e.g., according to the munus triplex pattern), but instead is using rather vague modern terms. To say that Christ is "wholly directed toward" God or His fellow man is to speak in relational categories without a clear ethical reference to the Word and Law of God. Always make your own foundational principle or commitment clear, especially in the moral realm.

p. 75f AAH follows his non-classic Christological categories in outlining his anthropology. Since Jesus in the perfect imago Dei, so we too can be analyzed along AAH's Christological lines. This is not bad, but just don't lose sight of your absolutes in the fog of emotional/relational language.

p. 78 Is AAH's call for social fellowship outside of our own people group a biblical imperative or an encroachment of postmodern multi-culturalism? Were our grandparents any less in the image of God because they didn't interact with other cultures and peoples on a daily basis? NB: the concept of biblical fellowship is being stretched here beyond its biblical intent. Careful!

p. 79 The "cultural mandate" is key: read with care!

p. 83 By "structure of man" AAH means man's make-up as body, soul, and their relationship. Each and every part or faculty of man was touched and twisted by the Fall.

p. 86 Note the definitions of "regeneration" and "sanctification." NB: do not confuse emotional excitement per se with sanctification, which is a common American evangelical sin! Just because you feel closer to someone does not necessarily mean you are more sanctified. Just because you are excited by an idea or event does not necessarily mean you are more sanctified.
p. 88 AAH is here developing the concept of a Christian world and life view. What is your world and life view? How biblical (and therefore pleasing to God) is it?

p. 89 The "ecclesiastical aspect" of the image of God in man is an often overlooked fact. Being active in a local biblical church is a sanctification issue, even when you are a busy student. Don't neglect this dimension of your life while at RTS!

p. 93 AAH seems to imply here that all national, cultural, and ethnic distinction will be cleansed in heaven. This is rather speculative, owing more to egalitarianism than the Scriptures.

p. 98 This speculative musing on sex in heaven I find of little help. Perhaps you can enlighten me.

p. 103 NB: AAH (re)defines "self-image" in a more helpful Christian direction.

p. 104 What change in Adam and Eve's self-image SHOULD have occurred due to the Fall? What did God think of them? Should they not think the same?

p. 106 AAH's "realistic image" is quite helpful.

p. 107 Note the definitions of "justification" and "sanctification".

p. 109 Does AAH take the real guilt and real consequences of abiding sin in the believer's life seriously enough? I think not. How should we feel when we sin or when God chastises us for our sins?

p. 111 Too bad AAH balances his treatment with only one key sentence on abiding sin in the life of the believer. A more expanded treatment would be more helpful in this important pastoral care and counseling area.

p. 116 NB: AAH has shifted his argument from a purely exegetical/textual level to a theological level. Train yourself to pick up on such moves!

p. 117 "Redemptive history" is history studied with a view to God's redeeming of His people. Thus, it starts with Adam and moves forward through the Scriptures.

p. 119 AAH's position against the terminology of "the covenant of works" is one of great debate. The Westminster Confession and Catechisms are happy enough using the term. AAH and others in the 20th Century object for the reasons he gives here. We'll deal with this matter in class lecture. However, note that AAH maximizes criticism of terminology and minimizes affirmation of substance to just one sentence. This is unbalanced. While on some levels I prefer the Westminster Larger Catechism's terminology of "covenant of life," I find AAH's simplistic objections inadequate.

p. 123 Were there really "no actual witnesses to some of the events described in Genesis 1-3"? What about God and the heavenly host of angels?

p. 124 Based partly on "recent scientific evidence," AAH concludes that "the literary genre of these chapters is different from that of other historical sections of the Bible." Note AAH's uncritical acceptance of the conclusions of recent scientific study, which is most often based on atheistic presuppositions. Note further that to protect the Bible from supposed errors in this area, AAH leaps to the claim that Genesis is a different literary genre than other sections of the Bible. If he had made even a feeble attempt to derive this claim from the text of Genesis itself, we might be willing to take it more seriously. As stated, this is speculation of the worst sort.

p. 125 Thankfully AAH continues to hold to a literal interpretation of the Genesis narrative, even if he is non-exclusivist in doing so.
p. 126 God told Moses! Aalders’ position was also taught 100 years earlier by James Woodrow of Columbia Theological Seminary, who was deposed from the Faculty for such teachings.

p. 127 There is little unique about the literary character of the Genesis narrative. The reckless remedy of genre shifting would be cricket too for many other key passages.

p. 128 Read carefully the first full paragraph!

p. 131 AAH’s stress on the mystery of the origin of sin is defensive and perhaps too broad. He is, however, attempting to protect God from the charge of being the author of sin, which in itself is true and helpful. Adam and Eve were strong enough to stand and weak enough to fall.

p. 132 AAH’s claim of the irrationality of sin is so broad as to sound like an ontological necessity rather than a moral/ethical fact. AAH is dancing to Barth’s tune here. Does God not know the why of sin? Could He not tell us? Certainly this mystery is not deeper than the Trinity or the incarnation. Perhaps one day we shall hear more from Him on the why of sin, if He wishes to tell us!

p. 133 Use this passage of Scripture in discussing sin with those experiencing disappointment, shame, guilt, and fear!

p. 134 NB: the Protoevangelium AAH claims: "God’s first response to human sin, therefore, is a response of grace." Is this really true? Look at the passage in question. Does not grace follow the condemnation of sin?
BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR DEFENDING THE TRINITY

John H. Farrar and Ligon Duncan


The 17th century Reformed theologians tackles most of the major heresies that challenged the doctrine of the Trinity. In particular he addresses the Socinians “To understand this primary question which we agitate with the ancient as well as the more modern anti-Trinitarians, take notice that the orthodox faith is this: in the one only and most simple essence of God these are three distinct persons so distinguished form each other by incommunicable properties or modes of subsisting that one cannot be the other-although by an inexpressible circum-insession (emperichoresis) they always remain and exist in each other mutually.” p. 265 Turrettin has a section on the modalists starting on page 270 and going to page 282.


This is another excellent work from the pen of B. B. Warfield. Warfield surveys the entire New Testament for the designations for Jesus Christ. Because of the increasing denials of Jesus’ Deity Warfield emphasized all those designations which proclaimed the Deity of Christ. The bulk of the book considers the four Gospels.


Warfield is the late 19th century early 20th century equivalent to John Owen. Even his short articles resemble German panzer divisions rolling across the Dutch country side in the effect they have on error. One of Warfield’s main arguments is as follows “In a word, Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit are the fundamental proof of the doctrine of the Trinity. This is as much as to say that all the evidence of whatever kind, and from whatever source derived, that Jesus Christ is God manifested in the flesh, and that the Holy Spirit is a Divine Person, is just so much evidence for the doctrine of the Trinity.” p. 146


B.B. Warfield surveys the teaching of Paul, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the other Epistles, and the teaching of Jesus regarding to the person of Christ. While the thrust of the article is to demonstrate the integrity of the person of Christ as being God and man in one person Warfield does demonstrate the true divinity of Jesus, the Son of God, the second person of the Trinity.


B.B. Warfield shows how the phrase "God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ" is a Christian periphrasis for God. Warfield also shows how the periphrasis is also used in many of Paul’s closing prayers to "designate the Divine Being to whom the prayer is offered.” This article is another example of the Warfield’s exhaustive defense of orthodoxy.

According to Warfield Paul, the apostle, believed that the Lordship of Jesus Christ pointed to the full divinity of Jesus Christ. Warfield is combating one of the numerous 19th century opponents of Christ's divinity, in particular, W. Bousett.


A short article the three stages or three planes of revelation by which God is revealed to man, (a) God, the Infinite Spirit (b) God, the Redeemer of sinners, and (c) God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.


Warfield demonstrates that the Synoptics, the writings of Paul, the other epistles, Acts, and the Gospel of John all portray Jesus as a supernatural "divine" person unlike the "Lives of Christ" which the 19th century liberals presented.


Many 19th century academic theologians revolted against the two natures of Jesus in order to deny that Jesus was fully God. Warfield surveys the revolt and then systematically demolishes it. He says "The significance of this revolt becomes at once apparent, when we reflect that the doctrine of the Two Natures is only another way of stating the doctrine of the Incarnation; and the doctrine of the Incarnation is the hinge on which the Christian system turns. No Two Natures, no Incarnation; no Incarnation, no Christianity in any distinctive sense." (p.259)


This article is Warfield's response to Kenotism. "The idea is that the Son of God, in becoming man, abandoned His deity, extinguished it, so to speak, by immersing it in the stream of human life." (p. 375) Kenotism has reappeared today particularly among certain "Christian" sects.


John Owen was one of the greatest Puritan theologians. Much of his treatise was to counter one of the chief opponent to trinitarian theology Socinus, a 16th century theologian who argued that Jesus was a mere man and that the Holy Spirit was God's energy. Socinus was the forerunner of modern Unitarianism. John Owen is heavy reading but thorough.

Chapter 3 titled "Divine Nature and Personality of the Holy Spirit proved and Vindicated" specifically affirms and defends the doctrine that the Holy Spirit is fully God and yet a distinct person. See pages 64-92.


In book one Calvin attacks Servetus an anti trinitarian writer who Calvin says "God is assumed to be tripartite when three persons are said to reside in his essence; this is an imaginary mad, because it clashes with ideas which do not truly subsist in God's essence, but represent God to us in one manifestation or another." (p. 147) Calvin refutes Servetus heresy and the tackles the heresy of Valentine Gentile who according to Calvin "From this morass another similar monster has come forth. For certain rascals, to escape the invidiousness and shame of Servetus' impiety, indeed confessed that there are three persons; but they added the provision that the Father, who is truly and properly the sole God, in forming the Son and the Spirit, infused into them his own deity." Calvin marshals Scriptural and Patristic evidence against these and other anti trinitarian positions.


A more philosophical treatment of the trinity but extremely detailed. Aquinas quotes the Bible, the Patristics and other Medieval theologians.


Tertullian, an early Latin theologian, answered Praxeas, one the earliest modalists. Praxeas argued that Christ was but the manifestation of the Father. Tertullian's treatise tackles the meaning of "persona" in order to affirm the unity of God while affirming the distinctiveness of the three persons, The Father, The Son, and the Holy Spirit.


The greatest Latin theologian who defended the Nicene creed against the heresy of Arius. According to R.P.C. Hanson in The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God (Edinburgh: T&T Clark 1988) Hilary "relies constantly on Tertullian: he followed him in almost every detail (though not quite every detail) of this theology." (p.472) Hilary is not heavily influenced by the theology of Origen or Clement of Alexander. According to Hanson "Hilary is an unusual theologian. He has been called the Western Athanasius. In fact his thought little resembles that of Athanasius, but in originality and insight he is nearly his equal." (p. 477) It is essential to see Hilary as distinct from the Eastern wing of Christendom. He is not derived from them and is not therefore as affected by Neo Platonism as Origen and even the Cappadocians.


Athanasius was one of the great opponents of Arianism in the East. His work was highly polemic but firmly based in Scripture even though his use of certain Scriptures such as Proverbs 8:22 are

The Trinity


A major Patristic defense of the Trinity. See introduction of William G. T. Shedd in the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers vol 3. Shedd argues that Augustine divides his treatise into two lines of defense, Scriptural or exegetical and rational. Augustine's philosophical defense uses the idea that God's personality requires trinality. "the personality of God depends upon the trinality of the Divine Essence--that if there are not interior distinctions in the infinite Being, he cannot be self-contemplative, self-cognitive, or self-communing." (o. 7-8 Shedd introduction)


Richard of St. Victor was a medieval mystic whose work on the Trinity advanced the Church's understanding the Trinity affects the Church's understanding of love, community and man himself.

MODERN REFERENCES

Creeds, Councils & Christ Gerald Bray (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press 1984)

Bray gives a popular defense of historic creeds and their necessity for the Christian Church. He starts with the erosion of orthodoxy during the 19th and 20th century. He then goes back to articulate how creeds and confessions functioned in the early Church. He then traces the development of Christian theology in the early Church. He gives an excellent apology for the ecumenical creeds and their Scriptural base.

The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God R.P.C. Hanson (Edinburgh: T&T Clark 1988)

A recent scholarly treatment of the Arian controversy 318-381 AD. Hanson surveys all the major Pro-Nicene and Anti-Nicene theologians. He clearly differentiates the Latin Fathers from the Greek. The book is carefully written and detailed.


Grillmeier deals with the person of Christ from the Apostolic age to Chalcedon. See in particular his treatment of Tertullian and the word "persona" pages 117-131


A short (152 pages including indexes) treatment of the doctrine of God that includes the doctrine of the Trinity. Kaiser briefly surveys Biblical data and then covers the history of the development of the doctrine of God. It is a good summary treatment. See his contrast between St. Richard of Victor and Thomas Aquinas (page 88-91)


Toon edited a series of articles given at Durham in 1978 by the historical theology group of the British Tyndale Fellowship. The first five chapters deal with the meaning of the Trinity, the Trinity in the New Testament and the Patristic period. The last five chapters deal with 20th century theology and the Trinity, Barth, Lonergan, Moltmann, Process theology and recent British
theology. The article on recent British theology is by Brian Habbethwaite who deals principally with the work of Wiles and Lampe. Unfortunately Habbethwaite's own methodology poses real problems. "The doctrine of the Trinity cannot be established simply by citing authoritative texts, whether of Scripture or tradition. Its primary source is certainly divine revelation, but, as Leonard Hodgson saw, revelation is a matter of events, of divine actions in human history and in human lives. Revelation is not opposed to reason. Part of our response to God's self-revealing acts is precisely our rational reflection on the sense they make." pages 160-161 The above shows a Barthian view of revelation which undercuts any authoritative formulation on the Trinity or any other doctrine.

Jesus as God (The New Testament use of Theos in Reference to Jesus) Murray J. Harris (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1992)

A detailed treatment of all the uses of Θεός for Jesus in the New Testament. Murray tackles John 1:1-14 and John 20:28 as well as all the main passages where Jesus is called God.

Shared Life Donald Macleod (Manilla: Campus Harvest, 1994)

This book provides an ideal beginner's introduction to the doctrine of the Trinity. It is biblical, simple, clear, straightforward, and practical (without being superficial). For the more advanced reader, it offers other benefits. It is compact and learned—chock full of historical insights, astute theological observations, and strong experiential applications. The simplicity of its style belies the author's grasp and penetration of the subject. Macleod is a master of making difficult things seem simple, without compromising their profundity or detracting from the proper mystery which should characterize our study of God. It furnishes the reader with: 1) an excellent overview of biblical teaching on the trinity; 2) a fine summary of the historical development of the church doctrine of the trinity; 3) challenging practical application of this great truth to daily Christian living; and 4) a helpful response to current attacks on the Christian doctrine of the trinity. All of this, Macleod manages to squeeze into less than a hundred pages.

A Foreword to the British edition by Dr. Andrew McGowan, (Highland Theological College, Scotland).

Dr Robert Reymond is Professor of Systematic Theology at Knox Theological Seminary in Fort Lauderdale, Florida and it is good to be able to welcome the publication of this, the second edition of his one volume systematic theology. I have been using this book as the core text in my systematic theology classes now for four years and would heartily recommend it. There are few changes in this second edition, except in chapter nine, where Reymond’s exposition of Calvin’s position is spelled out in more detail.

The book follows the normal ordo for a systematic theology: revelation and Scripture; the doctrines of God and of man; salvation and the covenant of grace; the Person and Work of Christ; the doctrines of the church and the means of grace; and eschatology. It is useful for those who have never studied theology, as a way in to the ‘big picture’ and it is useful for theological students and teachers because of the sharp and challenging way in which it deals with these doctrines. In most sections it also expounds the relevant sections of the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, which makes it useful for elder training in the Presbyterian tradition.

The book is written from a Reformed perspective, and interacts with the Reformed tradition, although not uncritically. Indeed, one of the great strengths of the book is that Reymond is his own man and is not afraid to challenge even well established views where he feels that they are not soundly based on Scripture. In this regard his views on Chalcedon and the filioque clause spring to mind. Even in those places where one might disagree with Reymond’s judgement, however, or want to further debate his conclusions, his work is stimulating, challenging and magisterial.

The nearest comparison to this volume would be the *Systematic Theology* of Louis Berkhof. Why should someone buy this book rather than Berkhof? For two reasons: first, because it deals with prolegomena and the doctrines of revelation and Scripture, which Berkhof covered in a separate volume (only recently published alongside Berkhof’s *Systematic Theology* in the Muller edition). Second, because it is a recent publication and therefore mentions recent debates, for example, Open Theism. There is, however, at least one negative comparison with Berkhof, namely, the absence of any serious interaction with modern theology. Berkhof interacted with Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Harnack, Hermann and so on, the main scholars of his day, whereas Reymond largely interacts with the Reformed tradition. As a teacher of theology I would have liked Reymond to have interacted with Barth, Moltmann and Pannenberg etc. This, however, is a minor problem which can be remedied by consulting other volumes on modern theology.

Above all, the book is biblical. Much modern theology is philosophical or linguistic or political but here is a man who takes God’s Word seriously and seeks to build everything he says on solid exegetical foundations. He is convinced that the Bible is God-breathed and inerrant and is therefore the final authority for decision-making.

Read it, enjoy it and recommend it to your students!

Professor A.T.B. McGowan
Highland Theological College, Dingwall, Scotland

Additional reviews of Reymond’s book:

www.fpcr.org/blue_banner_articles/Reymond_Review.htm
www.dbts.edu/media/journals/1999/bookreviews.pdf
Précis sample 1

Marshall Brown
ST III – Dr. J.L. Duncan

Précis on Union with Christ

D Thomas: “It is impossible to think of any aspect of salvation without thinking of union with Christ”

“Soteriology bridges the gap between Anthropology and Christology. Christ accomplished what man did not and could not” (Kelly, 35)

“Reformed Soteriology takes its starting point in the union established in the pactum salutis (Covenant of Salvation)” (Berkhof, 418) Because of this, it ought to precede any discussion of the ordo salutis (cf. Murray, 161, and Berkhof, 448, where the discussion is similar though the terms a bit different).

“It is through this union to X that the whole application of redemption is effectuated on the sinner’s soul.” (Dabney, 612)

I. In Three Dimensions
   A. Eternal Union
      1. Dimension of the Union that transcends our personal existence, this is not an existential union (see below)
      2. Source: the election of the Father before the foundation of the world
         a. “God cannot think of past, present, or future apart from Christ” (Murray, 164)
         b. Chosen in Christ
         c. Monergistic
      3. Scripture references: Eph. 1:3-14
   B. Incarnational Union
      1. Defined: when we become actual partakers of Christ at point of application of redemption (cf. Ephesians 2:12 esp. in light of what was written in chapter 1, Eph 2:3, I Cor. 1:9, the implications of John 3:36, Rom 8, Heb 2:11-15, Gal. 4:4-5, John 14:23, John 17 esp. verses 20-23)
      2. Spiritual – i.e. bond of the union is the Holy Spirit himself
         a. Essential bond – the Holy Spirit
         b. Instrumental bond – Faith
      3. Mystical – i.e. kept secret until manifested and made known in accord with will of God – “the fact that it is a mystery underlines the preciousness of it and the intimacy of the relation it entails” (Murray, 167).
         a. Organic and vital
         b. Mediated by the Holy Spirit
         c. Implies reciprocity
         d. It is both personal and transformational
      4. Exemplified: Acts 9:4 “Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me?” (also, I Cor 12, 14, Ephesians 4)
   C. Existential Union
      1. Defined: How we live in light of our union
         a. This part of the union is synergistic? (cf. Warfield??)
         b. While we are influenced by our past life, Christ’s past is dominant (Rom 6, I Cor. 15:21-23).
         c. We are becoming more fully human as effect of union as the dross of sin is burned away
      2. This union is NOT our deification
      3. Especially note Calvin III.i.

II. Images
   A. Old Testament – High priest and suffering servant of Isaiah
   B. New Testament
      1. Head to body (Col 1:8, Eph 4:15-16)
      2. Wife/Husband (Eph 5)
      3. Vine/branches (John 15)
      4. Chief cornerstone (Eph 2:19-22, I Peter 2:4-5)

III. Benefits that accrue to believer because of this union
   A. Legal union – justification
   B. Spiritual union – transforming power of Christ dwelling within
   C. Fellowship with Christ
   D. Communion of saints

Selected Bibliography

Berkhof, Louis. Systematic Theology, 447-453
Calvin, Jean. Institutes of the Christian Religion, esp. III.i.1-4, II.ii.7
Dabney, R.L. Systematic Theology, Lecture LI, 612-617
Kelly, D.F. Systematic III Notes, 36-47
Murray, John. Redemption Accomplished and Applied, 161-173
Final Examination Sample 1

Name ____________________________________________

T508/808 Systematic Theology I Final Exam

Please do not take longer than two hours to take the test. Use your own paper and staple or clip it to this sheet.

Part One: Reading Assignments

1. Indicate what percentage of the assigned reading for the course you have completed: _______________.

Part Two: Long Essays

Answer both questions. You may look at the questions and organize your material before you begin the exam. You may use your Bible, textbooks, and notes on these two questions.

1. A new convert to Christ comes to you and says that she was visited by an evangelistic team, claiming to be Christians, the previous evening who said in the course of conversation that the doctrine of the trinity was not taught in the Scriptures. They told her that the word “trinity” is not found in the Bible and that it was not until the 4th century before churches adopted belief in the trinity. This young disciple wants to know what you think about these things. How would you explain to her where such false views come from and present to her the Biblical teaching on the Trinity? Be sure to also to note the practical importance of the doctrine of the trinity.

2. A Christian friend comes to you, distressed at having found many passages in the Bible which indicate that God chooses or predestines some to salvation. This teaching of predestination is troubling to him and he has always been taught that it is wrong and that it undercuts man’s free will. In a sympathetic way, show him that the Bible does teach both God’s predestination and man’s responsibility. Then show the pastoral application of the doctrine of predestination to us: how it gives all glory to God for salvation, strengthens the Christian’s assurance, and bolsters his hope of glory.

Part Three: Short Answers

Again answer all questions. You may look at the questions and organize your material before you begin the exam, BUT, this time, you may NOT use your textbooks, and notes (you may use your Bible). Give scriptural references in all answers. Answer the questions fully but briefly (that is, in a few sentences).

1. In outline, what is the Biblical view of the image of God in man?

2. What does "total depravity" mean? Defend it from Scripture.

3. What is "immediate imputation" of Adam's sin? Defend it from Scripture.

4. What is the difference between original sin and actual sin?

5. What is the doctrine of the "inerrancy" of Scripture? Defend it biblically. What do we mean by "plenary verbal inspiration?"
Final Examination Sample 2

Duration: 2 hours
No external aids allowed

Name: ________________________
E-mail: _______________________
Address: _______________________

Most of these questions requires a simple true or false answer. Others require a precise, yet concise answer. Please answer on the question sheets and return to the proctor following completion of the examination.

1. The biblical use of language for the purposes of revelation is:
   a. anatomical
   b. univocal
   c. analogical
   d. anthropological

2. Cite two principal passages elucidating the doctrine of general revelation:
   i. _______________________
   ii. _______________________

3. In describing revelation we said three things: one of which was that revelation is an act of grace (because the initiative is God's). Name the other two features:
   i. _______________________
   ii. _______________________

4. Which of the following activities in special revelation continues:
   i. revelation on the stage of history
   ii. revelation in the words of Scripture
   iii. revelation in the hearts of sinners enlightening Scripture

5. Which of the following did not believe in General Revelation:
   i. Emil Brunner
   ii. Karl Barth
   iii. Louis Berkhof

6. Name five attributes of God that are discerned in general revelation:
   i. _______________________
   ii. _______________________
   iii. _______________________
   iv. _______________________
   v. _______________________

7. According the Romans 1, the natural man (without the Bible)
   i. understands some of that revelation
   ii. understands all of that revelation
8. According to the Bible, the natural man without a Bible and with only general revelation to go by may come to an understanding of the way of salvation. True or False?

9. Name three forms of special revelation God used before the canon of Scripture was complete:
   i. __________________________
   ii. __________________________
   iii. __________________________

10. What is meant by organic inspiration?

11. What is meant by plenary inspiration?

12. Cite two passages in the New Testament which speak to inspiration:
   i. __________________________
   ii. __________________________

13. Cite two human attributes of Scripture:
   i. __________________________
   ii. __________________________

14. Which (if any) of the following are incompatible with a doctrine of biblical inerrancy:
   i. Textual criticism
   ii. Source criticism
   iii. Redaction criticism

15. Define the doctrine of inerrancy as applied to Scripture.

16. What is wrong with the expression: “Hear the Word of God as we find it in the Gospel of Matthew.”

17. Name two issues which have led some to a denial of inerrancy:
   i. __________________________
   ii. __________________________

18. Name three things that attest to the authority of Scripture:
   i. __________________________
   ii. __________________________
   iii. __________________________

19. Define what we understand by the perspicuity of Scripture:

20. What did Calvin mean when he suggested that Scripture is *autopiston*?

21. What do we mean by the following:
   i. God is immutable __________________________
   ii. God is impassible __________________________
   iii. God is eternal __________________________
22. In what passage in the Old Testament does God reveal his covenant name?

23. What do we mean by saying that “God is a spirit”? 

24. Distinguish between the Latin expression:
   i. _Quid est Deus_ _______________________________
   ii. _Qualis est Deus_ ______________________________

25. What do we understand by the following-
   i. the retributive righteousness of God ______________________________
   ii. the remunerative righteousness of God ______________________________

26. Which of the following statements are true:
   i. God exists in unity and plurality
   ii. God is One in essence

27. Which of the following are true:
   i. God is three in essence
   ii. God is both three persons and one person

28. Is the following true or false:
   i. The Son is eternally subordinate to the Father in his essence
   ii. The Son is eternally subordinate to the Father as the Mediator
   iii. Jesus is consubstantial with the Father

29. Give the technical term for the following:
   i. The Father, Son and Holy Spirit are three roles performed by the One God:

30. Distinguish the following:
   i. economic trinitarianism _______________________________
   ii. essential trinitarianism _______________________________

31. Cite two passages in which the doctrine of the trinity is _clearly_ evident:
   i. ______________________________
   ii. ______________________________

32. Name one of the Cappadocian Fathers:
   i. ______________________________

33. Distinguish _homoousios_ and _homoiousios_:
   i. ______________________________
   ii. ______________________________

34. “There was not a time when the Son was not.” Who said this?
   i. ______________________________

35. What does the term _perichoresis_ mean? ______________________________

36. Are the decrees of God singular or plural? ______________________________

37. God has foreordained whatsoever comes to pass. In chapter 3 of the Westminster Confession, three caveats are entered at this point. What are they?
38. Define supralapsarianism carefully and accurately:

39. What indicators in chapter 3 of the Westminster Confession are there to suggest that the decree of reprobation is NOT equally ultimate with the decree of election?

40. From the narratives of Genesis 1 and 2, name three doctrines that relate to the area of anthropology:
   i. ________________________________
   ii. ________________________________
   iii. ________________________________

41. What do we understand by trichoticism?

42. Distinguish between creationist and traducianist views of the origin of the soul.

43. Distinguish between the natural and moral image of God in man.

44. Name five aspects of the natural image of God in man:
   i. ________________________________
   ii. ________________________________
   iii. ________________________________
   iv. ________________________________
   v. ________________________________

45. In the opening chapters of Genesis, name three specific mandates that God give to man:
   i. ________________________________
   ii. ________________________________
   iii. ________________________________

46. Define the covenant of grace.

47. Name three other covenants in the Bible:
   i. ________________________________
   ii. ________________________________
   iii. ________________________________
48. How do Baptists and paedo-baptists distinguish themselves within this definition of the covenant of grace?

49. Distinguish between mediate and immediate imputation of sin:
   i. ____________________________
   ii. ____________________________

50. What, according to Augustine, is the sin against the Holy Spirit?
   i. ________________________________