

it not necessarily imply pride, ambition, coveting what is another's; or envy, or malice, or revenge, on one side, if not on both? Still, then, sin is the baleful source of affliction; and consequently, the flood of miseries which covers the face of the earth,—which overwhelms not only single persons, but whole families, towns, cities, kingdoms,—is a demonstrative proof of the overflowing of ungodliness in every nation under heaven

PART II.

THE SCRIPTURAL METHOD OF ACCOUNTING FOR THIS DEFENDED.

I. 1. THE fact then being undeniable, I would ask, How is it to be accounted for? Will you resolve it into the prevalence of custom, and say, "Men are guided more by example than reason?" It is true: They run after one another like a flock of sheep, (as Seneca remarked long ago,) *non qua erundum est, sed qua itur*: "Not where they ought to go, but where others go." But I gain no ground by this; I am equally at a loss to account for this custom. How is it (seeing men are reasonable creatures, and nothing is so agreeable to reason as virtue) that the custom of all ages and nations is not on the side of virtue rather than vice? If you say, "This is owing to bad education, which propagates ill customs;" I own, education has an amazing force, far beyond what is commonly imagined. I own, too, that as bad education is found among Christians as ever obtained among the Heathens. But I am no nearer still; I am not advanced a hair's breadth toward the conclusion. For how am I to account for the almost universal prevalence of this bad education? I want to know when this prevailed first; and how it came to prevail. How came wise and good men (for such they must have been before bad education commenced) not to train up their children in wisdom and goodness; in the way wherein they had been brought up themselves? They had then no ill precedent before them: How came they to make such a precedent? And how came all the wisdom of after-ages never to correct that precedent? You must suppose it to have been of ancient date. Profane history gives us a large account

of universal wickedness, that is, universal bad education, for above two thousand years last past. Sacred history adds the account of above two thousand more: In the very beginning of which (more than four thousand years ago) "all flesh had corrupted their ways before the Lord!" or, to speak agreeably to this hypothesis, were very corruptly educated. Now, how is this to be accounted for, that, in so long a tract of time, no one nation under the sun has been able, by wholesome laws, or by any other method, to remove this grievous evil; so that, their children being well educated, the scale might at length turn on the side of reason and virtue?

These are questions which I conceive will not easily be answered to the satisfaction of any impartial inquirer. But, to bring the matter to a short issue: The first parents who educated their children in vice and folly, either were wise and virtuous themselves, or were not. If they were not, their vice did not proceed from education; so the supposition falls to the ground: Wickedness was antecedent to bad education. If they were wise and virtuous, it cannot be supposed but they would teach their children to tread in the same steps. X In nowise, therefore, can we account for the present state of mankind from example or education.

2. Let us then have recourse to the oracles of God. How do they teach us to account for this fact,—that "all flesh corrupted their way before God," even in the antediluvian world; that mankind was little, if at all, less corrupt, from the flood to the giving of the law by Moses; that from that time till Christ came, even God's chosen people were a "faithless and stubborn generation," little better, though certainly not worse, than the Heathens who knew not God; that when Christ came, both "Jews and Gentiles" were "all under sin; all the world was guilty before God;" that, even after the gospel had been preached in all nations, still the wise and virtuous were a "little flock;" bearing so small a proportion to the bulk of mankind, that it might yet be said, "The whole world lieth in wickedness;" that, from that time, "the mystery of iniquity" wrought even in the Church, till the Christians were little better than the Heathens; and, lastly, that at this day "the whole world," whether Pagan, Mahometan, or nominally Christian, (little, indeed, is the flock which is to be excepted,) again "lieth in wickedness;" doth not "know the only true God;" doth not

EST. YAZARENE COLLEGE
 NAMPA, IDAHO 83651

love, doth not worship him as God; hath not "the mind which was in Christ," neither "walketh as he walked;" doth not practise justice, mercy, and truth, nor do to others as they would others should do to them;—how, I say, do the oracles of God teach us to account for this plain fact?

3. They teach us, that "in Adam all die;" (1 Cor. xv. 22, compared with Genesis ii. & iii. ;) that "by" the first "man came" both natural and spiritual "death;" that "by" this "one man sin entered into the world, and death" in consequence of sin; and that from him "death passed upon all men, in that all have sinned." (Rom. v. 12.)

But you aver, that "no evil but temporal death came upon men in consequence of Adam's sin."* And this you endeavour to prove by considering the chief scriptures which are supposed to relate thereto.

The first you mention is Genesis ii. 17: "But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: For in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

On this you observe: "Death was to be the consequence of his disobedience. And the death here threatened can be opposed only to that life God gave Adam when he created him." (Page 7.) True; but how are you assured that God, when he created him, did not give him spiritual as well as animal life? Now, spiritual death is opposed to spiritual life. And this is more than the death of the body.

"But this is pure conjecture, without a solid foundation; for no other life is spoken of before." Yes, there is; "the image of God" is spoken of before. This is not, therefore, pure conjecture; but is grounded upon a solid foundation, upon the plain word of God.

Allowing then that "Adam could understand it of no other life than that which he had newly received;" yet would he naturally understand it of the life of God in his soul, as well as of the life of his body.

"In this light, therefore, the sense of the threatening will stand thus: 'Thou shalt surely die;' as if he had said, I have 'formed thee of the dust of the ground, and breathed into thy nostrils the breath of lives;'" (Third Edition, p. 8;) both of

* Dr. Taylor's "Doctrine of Original Sin," Part I., to whom I address myself in what follows. What is quoted from him, generally in his own words, is inclosed in commas.

animal life, and of spiritual life; and in both respects thou "art become a living soul." "But if thou eatest of the forbidden tree, thou shalt cease to be a living soul. For I will take from thee" the lives I have given, and thou shalt die spiritually, temporally, eternally.

But "here is not one word relating to Adam's posterity. Though it be true, if he had died immediately upon his transgression, all his posterity must have been extinct with him." It is true; yet "not one word" of it is expressed. Therefore, other consequences of his sin may be equally implied, though they are no more expressed than this.

4. The second scripture you cite is Gen. iii., from verse 7 to 24. (Pages 9, 10.)

On this you observe: Here "we have some consequences of our first parents' sin before God judged them; some appointed by his judicial sentence; and some which happened after that sentence was pronounced." (Page 11.)

"Immediately upon their transgression, they were seized with shame and fear. Guilt will always be attended with shame. And a state of guilt is often in Scripture expressed by being naked. Moses 'saw that the people were naked; for Aaron had made them naked to their shame among their enemies.' (Exod. xxxii. 25.)" Certainly, naked does not mean guilty here; but either stripped of their ornaments, (xxxiii. 5, 6,) or of their swords, or their upper garment. "Thy nakedness shall be uncovered; yea, thy shame shall be seen." (Isaiah xlvi. 3.) (Page 12.) Here also nakedness does not mean guilt; but is to be taken literally, as manifestly appears from the words immediately preceding: "Make bare the leg, uncover the thigh, pass over the rivers." (Verse 2.) And, "Blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame." (Rev. xvi. 15.) The plain meaning is, lest he lose the graces he has received, and so be ashamed before men and angels.

"Their fear is described: 'Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God among the trees of the garden.' (Gen. iii. 8.) They had no such fear while they were innocent; but now they were afraid to stand before their Judge." (Page 13.)

This is all you can discern in the Mosaic account as the consequence of our first parents' sin, before God judged them.

Mr. Hervey discerns something more. I make no apology for transcribing some of his words:—

“Adam violated the precept, and, as the nervous original expresses it, ‘died the death.’ He before possessed a life incomparably more excellent than that which the beasts enjoy. He possessed a divine life, consisting, according to the Apostle, ‘in knowledge, in righteousness, and true holiness.’ This, which was the distinguishing glory of his nature, in the day that he ate the forbidden fruit was extinct.

“His understanding, originally enlightened with wisdom, was clouded with ignorance. His heart, once warmed with heavenly love, became alienated from God his Maker. His passions and appetites, rational and regular before, shook off the government of order and reason. In a word, the whole moral frame was unhinged, disjointed, broken.

“The ignorance of fallen Adam was palpable. Witness that absurd attempt to hide himself from the eye of Omniscience among the trees of the garden. His aversion to the all-gracious God was equally plain; otherwise, he would never have fled from his Maker, but rather have hastened on the wings of desire, into the place of the divine manifestation.

“A strange variety of disorderly passions were evidently predominant in his breast. Pride; for he refuses to acknowledge his guilt, though he cannot but own the fact. Ingratitude; for he obliquely upbraids the Creator with his gift, as though it had been a snare rather than a blessing: ‘The woman thou gavest me.’ The female criminal acts the same unhumiliated part. She neither takes shame to herself, nor gives glory to God, nor puts up a single petition for pardon.

“As all these disasters ensued upon the breach of the commandment, they furnish us with the best key to open the meaning of the penalty annexed. They prove beyond any argument that spiritual death and all its consequences were comprised in the extent of the threatening.” (*Theron and Aspasio*, Dial. 11.)

5. However, “no other could in justice be punishable for that transgression, which was their own act and deed only.” (Page 13.) If no other was justly punishable, then no other was punished for that transgression. But all were punished for that transgression, namely, with death. Therefore, all men were justly punishable for it.

By punishment I mean suffering consequent upon sin, or pain

inflicted because of sin preceding. Now, it is plain, all mankind suffer death; and that this suffering is consequent upon Adam's sin. Yea, and that this pain is inflicted on *all men* because of his sin. When, therefore, you say, "Death does descend to us in consequence of his transgression," (*Doctrine of Original Sin*, p. 20,) you allow the point we contend for; and are very welcome to add, "Yet it is not a punishment for his sin." You allow the thing. Call it by what name you please.

But "punishment always connotes guilt." (Page 21.) It always connotes sin and suffering; and here are both. Adam sinned; his posterity suffer; and that, in consequence of his sin.

But "sufferings are benefits to us." Doubtless; but this does not hinder their being punishments. The pain I suffer as a punishment for my own sins may be a benefit to me, but it is a punishment nevertheless.

But "as they two only were guilty of the first sin, so no other but they two only could be conscious of it as their sin." (Page 14.) No other could be conscious of it as their sin, in the same sense as Adam and Eve were; and yet others may "charge it upon themselves" in a different sense, so as to judge themselves "children of wrath" on that account.

To sum up this point in Dr. Jennings's words: "If there be anything in this argument, that Adam's posterity could not be justly punishable for his transgression, because it was his personal act and not theirs, it must prove universally, that it is unjust to punish the posterity of any man for his personal crimes. And yet most certain it is, that God has in other cases actually punished men's sins on their posterity. Thus the posterity of Canaan, the son of Ham, is punished with slavery for his sin. (Gen. ix. 25, 27.) Noah pronounced the curse under a divine afflatus, and God confirmed it by his providence. So we do in fact suffer for Adam's sin, and that too by the sentence inflicted on our first parents. We suffer death in consequence of their transgression. Therefore we are, in some sense, guilty of their sin. I would ask, What is guilt, but an obligation to suffer punishment for sin? Now since we suffer the same penal evil which God threatened to, and inflicted on, Adam for his sin; and since it is allowed, we suffer this for Adam's sin, and that by the sentence of God, appointing all men to die, because Adam sinned; is not the consequence evident? Therefore we are all some way guilty of Adam's sin." (*Jennings's Vindication*.)

ES. VAZARENTE COLLEGE
 TAMPA, IDAHO 83651

6. "The consequences appointed by the judicial sentence of God are found in that pronounced on the serpent, or the woman, or the man." (Page 15.)

"The serpent is cursed, Gen. iii. 14, 15. And those words in the fifteenth verse: 'I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: He' (so the Hebrew) 'shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel,' imply, that God would appoint his only-begotten Son to maintain a kingdom in the world opposite to the kingdom of Satan, till he should be born of a woman, and by his doctrine, example, obedience, and death, give the last stroke, by way of moral means, to the power and works of the devil." (Page 16.)

I do not understand that expression, "By way of moral means." What I understand from the whole tenor of Scripture is, that the eternal, almighty Son of God, "who is over all, God blessed for ever," having reconciled us to God by his blood, creates us anew by his Spirit, and reigns till he hath destroyed all the works of the devil.

"Sentence is passed upon the woman, (verse 16,) that she should bring forth children with more pain and hazard than otherwise she would have done." (Page 17.) How? With "more pain and hazard" than otherwise she would have done! Would she otherwise have had any pain at all? or have brought forth children with any hazard? Hazard of what? Certainly, not of death. I cannot comprehend this.

"Lastly, the sentence upon the man (verses 17-19) first affects the earth, and then denounces death upon himself.

"After sentence pronounced, God, having clothed Adam and Eve, drove them out of paradise." (Page 18.)

Here, "observe, (1.) A curse is pronounced on the serpent and on the ground; but no curse upon the woman and the man." (Page 19.) But a curse fell upon them in that very moment wherein they transgressed the law of God. For, "cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are" contained "in the law to do them." Vainly, therefore, do you subjoin, "Though they are subjected to sorrow, labour, and death, these are not inflicted under the notion of a curse." "Surely they are; as the several branches of that curse which he had already incurred; and which had already not only "darkened and weakened his rational powers," but disordered his whole soul.

"Observe, (2.) Here is not one word of any other death, but

the dissolution of the body." Nor was it needful. He felt in himself that spiritual death, which is the prelude of death everlasting. "But the words, 'Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return,' restrain this death to this dissolution alone." (Page 20.) "This dissolution alone" is *expressed* in those words. But how does it appear, that nothing more is *implied*? The direct contrary appears from your own assertions; for if these words refer clearly to those, "And the Lord God formed man out of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of lives;" and if "the judicial act of condemnation clearly implieth the depriving him of that life which God then breathed into him;" it undeniably follows, that this judicial act implieth a deprivation of spiritual life as well as temporal; seeing God breathed into him both one and the other, in order to his becoming "a living soul."

It remains, that the death expressed in the original threatening, and implied in the sentence pronounced upon man, includes all evils which could befall his soul and body; death temporal, spiritual, and eternal.

7. You next cite 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22: "Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." (Page 22.)

On this you observe, (1.) "The Apostle is in this chapter proving and explaining the resurrection. It is this fact or event, and no other, which he here affirms and demonstrates." (Page 23.)

If you mean, "The resurrection of the body to that life which it enjoyed in this world is the only thing which the Apostle speaks of in this chapter," your assertion is palpably false; for he speaks therein of "that glorious life" both of soul and body, which is not, cannot be, enjoyed in this world.

You observe, (2.) "It is undeniable, that all mankind 'die in Adam;' all are mortal, in consequence of his sin." (Page 24.) (3.) "It is equally clear, that 'by Christ came the resurrection of the dead:' 'That, in Christ,' all who die in Adam, that is, all mankind, 'are made alive.'" It is neither clear nor true, that St. Paul affirms this, in either of the texts before us: For in this whole chapter he speaks only of the resurrection of the just, of "them that are Christ's." (Verse 23.) So that from hence it cannot be inferred at all, that all mankind will be "made alive." Admitting then,

“that the ‘resurrection of the dead,’ and being ‘made alive,’ are expressions of the same signification;” this proves nothing; since the Apostle affirms neither one nor the other, of any but of those “who are fallen asleep in Christ.” (Verse 18.) It is of these only that he here asserts, their death came by the first, their resurrection by the second, Adam; or, that in Adam they all died; in Christ, they all are made alive. Whatever life they all lost by means of Adam, they all recover by means of Christ.

“From this place we cannot conclude that any death came upon mankind in consequence of Adam’s sin, beside that death from which mankind shall be delivered at the resurrection.” (Page 25.)

Nay, from this place we cannot conclude, that mankind in general shall be delivered from any death at all; seeing it does not relate to mankind in general, but wholly and solely to “them that are Christ’s.”

But from this place we may firmly conclude that more than the mere death of the body came even upon these by man, by Adam’s sin; seeing the resurrection which comes to them by man, by Christ, is far more than the mere removal of that death: Therefore their dying in Adam implies far more than the bare loss of the bodily life we now enjoy; seeing their “being made alive in” Christ implies far more than a bare recovery of that life.

Yet it is true, that whatever death came on them by one man, came upon all mankind; and that in the same sense wherein they “died in Adam,” all mankind died likewise. And that all mankind are not “made alive in” Christ, as they are, is not God’s fault, but their own.

I know not therefore what you mean by saying, that after Dr. Jennings has proved this whole chapter, and consequently the two verses in question, to relate wholly and solely to the resurrection of the just, “he leaves you in full possession of your argument.” Surely if he proves this, he wrests your whole argument out of your hands. He leaves you not one shred of it.

8. “We come now,” you say, “to the most difficult scripture which speaks of this point:—

“‘As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin;’ *even* ‘so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.

“ ‘For until the law sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed when there is no law.

“ ‘Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come.

“ ‘But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.

“ ‘And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift; for the judgment was by one’ offence ‘to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification.

“ ‘For if by one man’s offence death reigned by one; much more they who receive the abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.

“ ‘Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.

“ ‘For as by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.’ (Romans v. 12–19.)” (Page 26.)

On this you observe: (1.) That this passage “speaks of temporal death, and no other.” (Page 28.) That it speaks of temporal death is allowed; but not that it speaks of no other. How prove you this? Why thus: “He evidently speaks of that death which ‘entered into the world’ by Adam’s sin; that death which is common to all mankind; which ‘passed upon all men;’ that death which ‘reigned from Adam to Moses;’ that whereby the ‘many,’ that is, all mankind, ‘are dead.’” He does so; but how does it appear that the death which “entered into the world by” Adam’s sin; which is common to all mankind; which “passed upon all men;” which “reigned from Adam to Moses;” and whereby the many, that is, all mankind, are dead; how, I say, does it appear, from any or all of these expressions, that this is temporal death only? Just here lies the fallacy: “No man,” say you, “can deny that the Apostle is here speaking of that death.” True; but when you infer, “Therefore he speaks of that only,” we deny the consequence.

9. You affirm: (2.) “By judgment to condemnation, (verses 16, 18,) he means the being adjudged to the forementioned death; for the ‘condemnation’ inflicted by the ‘judgment’

of God (verse 16) is the same thing with 'being dead.' (Verse 15.)" (Page 27.) Perhaps so; but that this is merely the death of the body still remains to be proved; as, on the other hand, that "the gift, or free gift," opposed thereto, is merely deliverance from that death.

You add: "In all the Scriptures there is recorded but one 'judgment to condemnation;' one sentence, one judicial act of condemnation, which 'came upon all men.'" (Page 29.) Nay, in this sense of the word, there is not one; not one formal sentence, which was explicitly and judicially pronounced upon "all mankind." That which you cite, (Gen. iii. 17, 19,) was not; neither does all that sentence, in fact, "come upon all men." "Unto dust shalt thou return," does come upon all; but that other part does not,— "In sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life." This was formally pronounced, and actually fulfilled upon Adam; but it is not fulfilled upon all his posterity.

10. You affirm: (3.) "These words, in the 19th verse, 'As by one man's disobedience many were made sinners,' mean the same as those in the 18th,— 'As by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation.'" (Page 30.) Not exactly the same. The being "made sinners" is different from the being judged, condemned, or punished as such. You subjoin: "But these words, 'By the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation,' answer in sense to those, (verse 17,) 'By one man's offence death reigned by one.'" (*Ibid.*) Neither is this exactly true. "Condemnation" came first; and in consequence of this, "death reigned." You add: "And by 'death' most certainly is intended no other than temporal death." Most certainly this cannot be proved. Therefore it does not follow, "that these words, 'By one man's disobedience many were made sinners,' mean no more than, 'By one man's disobedience' mankind were made subject to temporal death." "Review," you say, "this reasoning, and see if you can find any flaw in it." There are several; but the grand flaw lies in the very first link of the chain. You have not yet proved that "death throughout this passage means only the death of the body."

This flaw is not amended by your observing that St. Paul was a Jew, and wrote to Jews as well as Gentiles; that he often uses Hebrew idioms; and that "the Hebrew word which signi-

fies to be a sinner, in *Hiphil* signifies to condemn, or make (that is, declare) a man a sinner by a judicial sentence;” that you can, by the help of your Concordance, “produce fifteen Hebrew texts, in which the word is so taken:” (Pages 31, 32.) For if it would follow from hence, that, “By the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation,” is just equivalent with, “By one man’s disobedience many were made sinners;” still this does not prove that the death in question is no other than temporal death.

But indeed it does not follow, that two expressions are just equivalent, because one Hebrew word may contain them both; nor can it, therefore, be inferred from hence, that, “Many were made sinners,” is just equivalent with, “Judgment came upon all men to condemnation.” Rather, the former expression answers to “All have sinned;” the latter, to “Death passed upon all men.” Sin is the cause of their condemnation, and not the same thing with it.

You go on: “Besides all this, it is here expressly affirmed, that the many are ‘made sinners’ by the disobedience of another man.” (Page 33.) It is expressly affirmed; and by an inspired Apostle; therefore I firmly believe it. “But they can be made sinners by the disobedience of another in no other sense than as they are sufferers.” (Page 34.) How is this proved? We grant the Hebrew words for sin and iniquity are often used to signify suffering. But this does not prove that the phrase, “Were made sinners,” signifies only, they were made sufferers.

“So ‘Christ was made sin for us.’” (Page 35.) No; not so; but as he was “made an offering for sin.” “He suffered on account of the sins of men, and so he ‘was made sin.’” Yes, “a sin-offering.” But it is never said, he was made a sinner; therefore the expressions are not parallel. But he need not have been made sin at all, if we had not been made sinners by Adam. “And men suffer on account of Adam’s sin, and so they are made sinners.” Are they made sinners so only? That remains to be proved.

“It seems then confirmed, beyond all doubt, that ‘by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners,’ meaneth only, By Adam’s sin, the many, that is, all mankind, ‘were made subject to death.’” He that will believe it (taking death in the common sense) may; but you have not confirmed it by one sound argument.

*discussions
of death - death?*

11. You affirm, (4.) "The Apostle draws a comparison between Adam and Christ; between what Adam did, with the consequences of it, and what Christ did, with the consequences of that. And this comparison is the main thing he has in view." (Page 36.)

This is true. "The comparison begins at the twelfth verse: 'Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin,'—there he stops awhile, and brings an argument to prove, that death came on mankind through Adam's transgression." (Pages 37, 38.) He does so; but not before he had finished his sentence, which literally runs thus: "As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, even so death passed upon all men, in that all had sinned." The comparison, therefore, between Adam and Christ begins not at the twelfth but the fourteenth verse. Of this you seem sensible yourself, when you say, "Adam is the 'pattern of Him that was to come.' Here a new thought starts into the Apostle's mind." (Page 39.) For it was not a new thought starting into his mind here, if it was the same which he began to express at the twelfth verse.

You proceed: "The extent of the free gift in Christ answers to the extent of the consequences of Adam's sin; nay, abounds far beyond them. This he incidentally handles, verses 15–17, and then resumes his main design, verses 18, 19, half of which he had executed in the twelfth verse." Not one jot of it. That verse is a complete sentence, not half of one only. And the particle *therefore*, prefixed to the eighteenth verse, shows, that the discourse goes straight forward; and that this, as well as the nineteenth verse, are closely connected with the seventeenth.

Allowing, then, that "the Apostle draws a comparison between the disobedience of Adam, by which all men are 'brought under condemnation,' and the 'obedience of Christ,' by which all men are, in some sense, 'justified unto life;'" (page 40;) still it does not appear either that this condemnation means no more than the death of the body, or that this justification means no more than the resurrection of the body.

12. You affirm, (5.) "The whole of the Apostle's argument stands upon these two principles, that, by the 'offence of one,' death passed upon all men; and, by 'the obedience of one,' all are justified."

This is allowed. But I cannot allow your interpretation of, "Sin is not imputed, where there is no law;" or, as you would

oddly, and contrary to all precedent, translate it, "where law is not in being." "The sins of mankind," say you, "were not imputed, were not taxed with the forfeiture of life, because the law which subjects the transgressor to death was not then in being; for it was abrogated upon Adam's transgression, and was not again in force till revived by Moses." (Page 41.) On this I would ask, (1.) Where is it written, that "the law which subjected the transgressor to death was abrogated by Adam's transgression?" I want a clear text for this. (2.) Suppose it was, how does it appear that it was not again in force till revived by Moses? (3.) Did not that law, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed," "subject the transgressor to death?" And was it "not in force" after Adam's transgression, and before Moses? (4.) What do you mean by that ambiguous expression, "Were not taxed with the forfeiture of life?" Your argument requires that it should mean, "Were not punished or punishable with death." But is this true? Were not the sins of the men of Sodom, and, indeed, the whole antediluvian world, punished with death during that period? (5.) Was not every wilful, impenitent transgressor, during this whole time, subject to death everlasting?

Neither can I allow that unnatural interpretation of, "Them who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression;" "Had not sinned against law, making death the penalty of their sin, as Adam did." (Page 42.) Do not the words obviously mean, "Had not sinned by any actual sin, as Adam did?"

Nay, "the Sodomites and Antediluvians are no objection to this." That is strange indeed! But how so? "Because extraordinary interpositions come under no rule, but the will of God." What is that to the purpose? Their sins were actually punished with death, "during that space wherein," you say, "mankind were not subject to death for their transgression." They *were* subject to death for their transgressions, as God demonstrated by those extraordinary interpositions.

You add, "That law, 'Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed,' makes death the penalty of murder." (Page 43.) It does; and thereby overthrows your whole assertion. "No; for, (1.) It was not enacted till the year of the world 1657." Well, and if it had been enacted only the year before Moses was born, it would still have destroyed your

argument. But, (2.) "It is given as a rule for Magistrates in executing justice, and not as a declaration of the penalty of sin to be inflicted by God himself." What then? What does it matter, whether the penalty annexed by God were inflicted by God or man? However, I suppose this punishment on the Antediluvians, and on Sodom and Gomorrah, was "inflicted by God himself." But, (3.) "None of these were made mortal by those sins." Certainly, infallibly true! And yet the case of any of these abundantly proves, that the law was in force from Adam to Moses, even according to your own definition of it: "A rule of duty with the penalty of death annexed, as due to the transgressor from God."

13. You affirm, (6.) "The consequences of Adam's sin answer those of Christ's obedience; but not exactly: 'Not as the offence, so is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace' (or favour) 'of God and the gift' (the benefits that are) 'by grace, which is by one man Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.' (Verse 15.) That is, he hath in Christ bestowed benefits upon mankind, far exceeding the consequences of Adam's sin; in erecting a new dispensation, furnished with a glorious fund of light and truth, means and motives." (Pages 43, 44.) This is true; but how small a part of the truth! What a poor, low account of the Christian dispensation!

You go on: "'Not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: For the judgment was by one offence to condemnation; but the free gift is of many offences unto justification;' (verse 16;) that is, the grace of God in Christ discharges mankind from the consequences of Adam's one offence." Does it entirely discharge them from these consequences? from sorrow, and labour, and death, which you affirmed a while ago to be the *only* consequences of it that affect his posterity? It "also sets them quite to rights with God, both as to a conformity to the law and eternal life."

Is not this allowing too much? Is it well consistent with what you said before? "In the 19th verse, the Apostle concludes the whole argument: 'As by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.'" (Page 29, *et seq.*) "Were made sinners," you aver means only, "were made mortal." If so, the counterpart, "made righteous," can only mean, "made immortal." And that

you thought so then, appears from your citing as a parallel text, "In Christ shall all be made alive;" which you had before asserted to mean only, "shall be raised from the dead."

14. "Hence it followeth, First, that the abounding of God's grace, and the blessing by that grace, doth not respect the consequences of Adam's sin, hath no reference to his transgression, but to the grace of God, and the obedience of Christ." (Page 45.) "The abounding of God's grace," you inform us, "has reference to the grace of God." Most sure: But this does not prove that it has no reference to the consequences of Adam's sin. If we gain more blessing by Christ than we lost by Adam, it is doubtless abounding grace. But still it has a reference to Adam's transgression, and the consequences of it. It is over these that it abounds; therefore it has a manifest respect to them.

"It followeth, Secondly, that in the 18th and 19th verses the Apostle considers the effects of Christ's obedience only so far as they answer to, and reverse the consequences of, Adam's disobedience; the additional benefits flowing therefrom having been mentioned apart in the 15th, 16th, and 17th verses." (Page 46.) In those verses the Apostle does undoubtedly show how the blessing by Christ abounded over the curse by Adam. But what then? How does this prove that the 18th and 19th verses do not respect all the benefits mentioned before? Without question they do: They are a general conclusion, not from one, but all the preceding verses.

"Again observe, that the 'justification to life' is such a justification as comes upon all men." (Page 47.) It may in some sense; but does it in fact? According to your sense of it, it comes upon none. For if it means, "the discharging men from the consequences of Adam's sin; and if the only consequences of that sin are sorrow, labour, and death;" it is manifest, no man upon earth is justified to this day.

But you go on: "As *justification to life* comes upon all men." No; not in the proper scripture sense of justification. That term is never once in the Bible used for the resurrection, no more than for heaven or hell.

It may be proper here, once for all, to observe, that what St. Paul says of abounding grace is simply this: (1.) The condemnation came by "one offence" only; the acquittal is from "many offences." (2.) They who receive this shall enjoy a far higher blessing by Christ than they lost by Adam.

In both these respects, the consequences of Christ's death abound over the consequences of Adam's sin. And this whole blessing by Christ is termed, in the 18th verse, "justification;" in the 19th, "being made righteous."

"Further, the phrase, 'being made righteous,' as well as 'being made sinners,' is a Hebrew way of speaking." (Page 49.) I do not allow that: Both the phrases, *καθιστασθαι δικαιοι*, or *αμαρτωλοι*, are pure and good Greek. That, therefore, there is any Hebraism at all in these expressions, cannot be admitted without proof. If, then, the same Hebrew word does signify to "make righteous," and to "acquit in judgment," it does not follow that the Greek word here translated, "made righteous," means only "being acquitted." You yourself say the contrary. You but now defined this very gift, "the benefits that are by grace;" (page 44;) and, in explaining those very words, "The free gift is of many offences unto justification," affirmed, That is, "the grace of God in Christ not only discharges mankind from the consequences of Adam's sin, but also sets them quite to rights with God, both as to a conformity to the law, and as to eternal life." And is this no more than "acquitting them in judgment," "or reversing the sentence of condemnation?"

Through this whole passage, it may be observed that "the gift," "the free gift," "the gift by grace," mean one and the same thing, even the whole benefit given by the abounding grace of God, through the obedience of Christ; abounding both with regard to the fountain itself, and the streams: Abundant grace producing abundant blessings.

If, then, these verses are "evidently parallel to those 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22," it follows even hence, that "dying," and "being made alive," in the latter passage, do not refer to the body only; but that "dying" implies all the evils, temporal and spiritual, which are derived from Adam's sin; and "being made alive," all the blessings which are derived from Christ, in time and in eternity.

Whereas, therefore, you add, "It is now evident, surely beyond all doubt," (strong expressions!) "that the consequences of Adam's sin here spoken of are no other than the 'death' which comes upon all men:" (Page 50:) I must beg leave to reply, It is not evident at all; nay, it is tolerably evident, on the contrary, that this "death" implies all manner of evils, to which either the body or soul is liable.

15. You next reconsider the 12th verse, which you understand thus : " Death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned," namely, in Adam. " ' All have sinned ; ' that is, are subjected to death through that one offence of his." (Page 51.)

You said before, " ' Death passed upon all men,' means, all were by a judicial sentence made subject to death." And here you say, " ' All have sinned,' means, all have been subjected to death." So the Apostle asserts, " All were subjected to death, because all were subjected to death !" Not so: Sin is one thing, death another ; and the former is here assigned as the cause of the latter.

Although the criticism on $\epsilon\phi' \varphi$ (p. 52) is liable to much exception, yet I leave that and the Hebrew citations as they stand ; because, though they may cause many readers to admire your learning, yet they are not to the point.

" Seeing then the phrase, ' All are made sinners,' hath been demonstrated to signify, all are subjected to death by a judicial sentence ; and seeing the Apostle's whole argument turns on this point, that all men die through the one offence of Adam ; who can doubt but, ' All have sinned,' means the same with, ' All are made sinners ?'" (Pages 53, 54.) I do not doubt it ; but I still deny that either phrase means no more than, " All are in a state of suffering."

16. In order fully to clear this important text, I shall here subjoin some of Dr. Jennings's remarks : " The Apostle having treated in the preceding chapter of the cause and manner of a sinner's justification before God, namely, through the merits of Christ, and by faith in his blood, and having spoken of the fruits of justification in the former part of this chapter, he proceeds, in the verses before us, to illustrate our salvation by Christ, by comparing it with our ruin by Adam. He compares Adam with Christ, and shows how what we lost by the one is restored by the other with abundant advantage. He makes Adam to be a figure or type of Christ ; considering them both as public persons, representing, the one, all his natural descendants ; the other, all his spiritual seed ; the one, Adam, all mankind, who are ' all guilty before God ; ' the other, Christ, all those ' who obtain the righteousness of God, which is by faith to all them that believe.'"

" Concerning the consequences of Adam's sin upon his posterity, we have here the following particulars :—

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
 LIBRARY
 TAMPA, IDAHO 83651

“(1.) That by one man sin entered into the world; that the whole world is some way concerned in Adam’s sin. And this indeed is evident, because,—

“(2.) Death, which is ‘the wages of sin,’ and the very punishment threatened to Adam’s first transgression, ‘entered by sin, and passed upon all men,’ is actually inflicted on all mankind. Upon which it is asserted in the next words,—

“(3.) That all have sinned: ‘Even so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.’ All men then are deemed sinners in the eye of God, on account of that one sin, of which alone the Apostle is here speaking. And,—

“(4.) Not only after, but before, and ‘until the law,’ given by Moses, ‘sin was in the world;’ and men were deemed sinners, and accordingly punished with death, through many generations. Now, ‘sin is not imputed where there is no law; nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses;’ plainly showing, that all mankind, during that whole period, had sinned in Adam, and so died in virtue of the death threatened to him; and death could not then be inflicted on mankind for any actual sin, because it was inflicted on so many infants, who had neither eaten of the forbidden fruit, nor committed any actual sin whatever, and therefore had not sinned in any sense, ‘after the similitude of Adam’s transgression.’ Therefore,—

“(5.) It was ‘through the offence of one that many are dead.’ (Verse 15.) ‘By one offence death reigned by one.’ (Verse 17.) And seeing the sin of Adam is thus punished in all men, it follows,—

“(6.) That they were all involved in that sentence of condemnation which God passed upon him. ‘The judgment was by one to condemnation.’ (Verse 16.) ‘By one offence judgment came upon all men to condemnation.’ (Verse 18.) And, since it is so plain that all men are actually punished for Adam’s sin, it must needs follow,—

“(7.) That they ‘all sinned in Adam. By one man’s disobedience many were made sinners.’ They were so constituted sinners by Adam’s sinning, as to become liable to the punishment threatened to his transgression.

“Between Adam and Christ, the type and the antitype, St. Paul draws the parallel in the following particulars:—

“(1.) Both have done something by which many others are affected, who either lose or gain by what they did: ‘Through,

*W. M. Ferguson
sin in Adam's
posterity*

LIBRARY

the offence of one many are dead; by one, the gift of grace hath abounded to many.' (Verse 15.)

"(2.) That which the first Adam did, by which many, that is, all men receive hurt, was sin, offence, and disobedience: They all suffer by one that sinned. (Verse 16.) 'By the offence of one, by one man's disobedience.' (Verses 18, 19.) That which the second Adam did, by which many, that is, all who believe, receive benefit, is righteousness and obedience: 'By the righteousness of one, by the obedience of one.' (Verses 18, 19.)

"(3.) The detriment which all men receive through Adam is, that they 'are made sinners;' that 'judgment is come upon them to condemnation;' in consequence of which, death, the wages of sin, is inflicted on every one of them. The benefit which all believers receive through Christ is grace, or the favour of God, justification, righteousness, or sanctification, and eternal life: 'The grace of God, and the gift by grace, hath, by one man, Jesus Christ, abounded to many. By the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men' who receive it 'to justification of life. By the obedience of one, many are made righteous.' (Verses 15, 18, 19.)

"Thus the Apostle shows the parity between the effects of Adam's sin, and of Christ's righteousness. Only in two instances he shows that the effect of the latter vastly exceeds the effect of the former:—

“(1.) It removes many sins, besides that one sin of Adam, which so affected all his posterity: 'If through one offence many be dead, much more the grace of God by Jesus Christ hath abounded to many. The judgment was by one to condemnation; but the free gift is of many offences unto justification.' (Verses 15, 16.)

“(2.) Christ raises believers to a far happier state than that which Adam enjoyed in paradise: 'Much more they who receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.' (Verse 17.)” (*Jennings's Vindication.*)

17. Your paraphrase on the text, (*Taylor's Doctrine, &c.*, pp. 55–64,) being only a repetition of what you had said over and over before, does not require any separate consideration. Only I must observe a few mistakes which have not occurred before: (1.) “The resurrection is the first and fundamental step in the gospel salvation.” (Page 64.) No; “He shall save his

CO. VAZARINE COLLEGE
 TAMPA, FLAHO 83651

people from their sins ;” this is the first and fundamental step. (2.) You have very grievously mistaken the meaning of four texts in John vi. : “ This is the Father’s will, that, of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day.” (Verse 39.) “ This is the will of Him that sent me, that every one that seeth the Son, and believeth on him, should have everlasting life : And I will raise him up at the last day.” (Verse 40.) “ No man can come to me except the Father draw him : And I will raise him up at the last day.” (Verse 44.) “ Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life ; and I will raise him up at the last day.” (Verse 54.) Now, you cite all these texts as relating to the general resurrection, whereas not one of them relates to it at all. They are all promises made to true believers only ; and relate wholly and solely to the resurrection of the just.

18. It remains then, all that has been advanced to the contrary notwithstanding, that the only true and rational way of accounting for the general wickedness of mankind, in all ages and nations, is pointed out in those words : “ In Adam all die.” In and through their first parent, all his posterity died in a spiritual sense ; and they remain wholly “ dead in trespasses and sins,” till the second Adam makes them alive. By this “ one man sin entered into the world, and passed upon all men :” And through the infection which they derive from him, all men are and ever were, by nature, entirely “ alienated from the life of God ; without hope, without God in the world.”

(1.) Your Appendix to the first part of your book is wholly employed in answering two questions : “ One is, How is it consistent with justice, that all men should die by the disobedience of one man ? The other, How shall we account for all men’s rising again, by the obedience of another man, Jesus Christ ?” (Page 65.)

You may determine the former question as you please, since it does not touch the main point in debate. I shall therefore take no farther pains about it, than to make a short extract of what Dr. Jennings speaks on the head :—

“(2.) As to the first question, Dr. Taylor gets rid of all difficulty that may arise from the consideration of God’s justice, by ascribing it wholly to his goodness, that ‘ death passed upon all men.’ ‘ Death,’ he tells us, ‘ is upon the whole a benefit.’ It is certain that believers in Christ receive benefit by it. But this gentleman will have death to be an ‘ original benefit, and

that to all mankind; merely intended to increase the vanity of all earthly things, and to abate their force to delude us.' He afterward displays the benefit of shortening human life to its present standard: 'That death being nearer to our view, might be a powerful motive to regard less the things of a transitory world.' But does the 'nearer view of death,' in fact, produce this effect? Does not the common observation of all ages prove the contrary? Has not covetousness been the peculiar vice of old age? As death is nearer to the view, we plainly see that men have more and more regard for the things of a transitory world. We are sure, therefore, that death is no such benefit to the generality of men. On the contrary, it is the king of terrors to them, the burden of their lives, and bane of their pleasures. To talk, therefore, of death's being a benefit, an original benefit, and that to all mankind, is to talk against the common sense and experience of the whole world.

"It is strange, death should be originally given by God as a benefit to man, and that the shortening of man's life afterward should be designed as a farther benefit; and yet that God should so often promise his peculiar people long life as the reward of obedience, and threaten them with death as a punishment of disobedience!

"'But the Scripture,' he says, 'affirms that sufferings are the chastisements of our heavenly Father, and death in particular.' But does not every chastisement suppose a fault? Must he not be a cruel father who will chasten his children for no fault at all? If then God does but chasten us for Adam's sin, the fault of it must some way lie upon us; else we suppose God's dealings with his children to be unreasonable and unrighteous." (*Vindication*, p. 36, &c.)

(3.) I would only add two or three obvious questions: (i.) Did God propose death as a benefit in the original threatening? (ii.) Did he represent it as a benefit in the sentence pronounced on Adam: "Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return?" (iii.) Do the inspired writers speak of God's "bringing a flood on the world of the ungodly, as a benefit, or a punishment?" (iv.) Do they mention the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah as designed for a benefit to them? (v.) Is it by way of benefit that God declares, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die?" Certainly this point is not defensible. Death is properly not a benefit, but a punishment,

CS. WAZEMONT VILLAGE
 WAMPA, IDAHO 83651

(4.) The other question is, "How shall we account for all men's rising again, by the obedience of another man, Jesus Christ?" (*Taylor's Doctrine, &c.*, p. 70.)

"To set this in a clear light, I ask another question: What was it that gave the glorious Personage, emblemized by 'the Lamb,' (Rev. v. 1, &c.) his superior worthiness, his prevailing interest in God, beyond all others in heaven and earth? It was his being slain; that is, his obedience to God, and goodwill to men: It was his consummate virtue. 'Thou art worthy.'—Why? Because thou hast exhibited to God such an instance of virtue, obedience, and goodness. Thou hast sacrificed thy life in the cause of truth, and 'hast redeemed us' by that act of the highest obedience." (Pages 71, 72.)

With what extreme wariness is this whole paragraph worded! You do not care to say directly, "Jesus Christ is either a little God, or he is no God at all." So you say it indirectly, in a heap of smooth, laboured, decent circumlocutions. Yet permit me to ask, Was "that act of obedience, the original and sole ground" of his prevailing interest in God, and of his worthiness, not only "to open the book," but "to receive" from all the armies of heaven "the power, and the riches, and the wisdom, and the strength, and the honour, and the glory, and the blessing?" (Rev. v. 12.) And is this act the original and the sole ground, why "all men" must "honour him even as they honour the Father?" Yea, and why "every creature which is in the heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and on the sea, and all that are in them, say, To him that sitteth upon the throne and to the Lamb, is the blessing, and the honour, and the glory, and the power, for ever and ever?" (Verse 13.)

"To Him that sitteth on the throne and to the Lamb:"—Does that mean, to the great God and the little God? If so, when all "creatures in heaven and earth," all throughout the universe, thus "honour him even as they honour the Father," are they not doing him too much honour? "My glory," saith the Lord, "I will not give to another." How comes it then to be given to the Lamb?

(5.) You proceed: "The worthiness of Christ is his consummate virtue, obedience to God, and benevolence to his creatures." Is this the only ground of his worthiness to be "honoured even as the Father?" Is it on this ground alone, that "all the angels of God" are to "worship him?" Or rather,

because "in the beginning," from everlasting, he "was with God, and was God?"

"Virtue is the only price which purchaseth everything with God. True virtue, or the right exercise of reason, is true worth, and the only valuable consideration which prevails with God." (Page 73.)

Do you then conceive this to be the exact meaning of St. Paul, when he says, "Ye are bought with a price?" and that where he speaks of "the Church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood," he means with his own virtue? Agreeable to which, "Thou hast redeemed us by thy blood," must mean, by the *right exercise of thy reason*? Well, then, might Father Socinus say, *Tota redemptionis nostræ per Christum metaphora*: "The whole metaphor of our redemption by Christ." For on this scheme there is nothing real in it.

"It was not the mere natural power or strength of the Lamb, but his most excellent character."—Sir, do "you honour the Son, even as you honour the Father?" If you did, could you possibly talk of him in this strain?

However, all this does not affect the question; but it still remains an unshaken truth, that all men's dying in Adam is the grand cause why "the whole world lieth in wickedness."

NEWINGTON, January 18, 1757.

1. In your Second Part you profess to "examine the principal passages of Scripture, which Divines have applied in support of the doctrine of original sin; particularly those cited by the Assembly of Divines in their Larger Catechism." (Pages 87, 88.) To this I never subscribed; but I think it is in the main a very excellent composition, which I shall therefore cheerfully endeavour to defend, so far as I conceive it is grounded on clear Scripture.

But I would first observe in general, with Dr. Jennings, that there are two kinds of texts in the ensuing collection: Some that directly prove, others that properly illustrate, the doctrine of original sin. And there are so many in which it is either directly spoken of, or evidently implied, that the author might well have spared his observation, "The Scripture speaks very sparingly of the consequences of Adam's sin upon us, because as these are freely reversed to mankind by Christ, we are not so much concerned to know them." (Page 50.) The fact here affirmed is equally true with the reason assigned for it.

2. The First proposition in the Catechism, which relates to original sin, is this:—

“The covenant being made with Adam as a public person, not for himself only, but for his posterity, all mankind descending from him by ordinary generation, sinned with him, and fell with him, in that first transgression.

—“‘God hath made of one blood all nations of men.’ (Acts xvii. 26.)” (Pages 91, 92.)—I believe Dr. Jennings’s remark here will suffice:—

—“This is quoted to prove that all mankind descend from Adam. But Dr. Taylor adds, ‘That is, hath made all the nations of the world of one species, endowed with the same faculties.’” (*Jennings’s Vindication*, p. 49, &c.) And so they might have been, if all men had been created singly and separately, just as Adam was; but they could not then, with any propriety of language, have been said to be of one blood. This Scripture, therefore, is very pertinently quoted to prove what it is brought for. That ‘Adam was a public person, including all his posterity, and, consequently, that all mankind, descending from him by ordinary generation, sinned in him, and fell with him in his first transgression,’ the Assembly have proved very methodically and substantially: First, from Gen. ii. 16, 17, where death is threatened to Adam in case of his sinning; then from Romans v. 12–20, and 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22, where we are expressly told that “all men die in Adam;” and that, “by his offence, judgment is come upon all men to condemnation.”

Proposition. “All mankind sinned in him, and fell with him in that first transgression.” Which they prove by Gen. ii. 16, 17, compared with Romans v. 15–20.

On this you remark, “The threatening, ‘Thou shalt surely die,’ is addressed to Adam personally; and therefore nothing can be concluded thence, with regard to Adam’s posterity.” (Pages 93, 94.) Is this consequence good? Was not the sentence also grounded on this threatening, “Unto dust thou shalt return,” personally directed to him? And is this nothing to his posterity? Nay, does it not from this very consideration appear, that all his posterity were concerned in that threatening, because they are all partakers of the death which was so threatened to Adam?

“But we cannot gather from Romans v., or 1 Cor. xv., ‘that all mankind sinned in Adam,’ if we understand sinned as distinguished from suffering.” It has been largely proved that we

can; and that sinning must necessarily be understood there, as distinguished from suffering.

“But the Apostle says, ‘The offence of one’ brought death into the world; whereas, had all mankind sinned in Adam when he sinned, then that offence would not have been ‘the offence of one,’ but of millions.” (Page 95.) It might be, in one sense, the offence of millions, and in another, “the offence of one.”

“It is true, Adam’s posterity so fell with him in that first transgression, that if the threatening had been immediately executed, he would have had no posterity at all.” *The threatening!* What was the threatening to them? Did not you assure us, in the very last page, “The threatening is addressed to Adam personally; and therefore nothing can be concluded from thence with regard to his posterity?”

And here you say, Their very “existence did certainly fall under the threatening of the law, and into the hands of the Judge, to be disposed of as he should think fit.” *As he should think fit.* Then he might, without any injustice, have deprived them of all blessings; of being itself, the only possible ground of all! And this, for the sin of another.

You close the article thus: “We cannot from those passages conclude, that mankind, by Adam’s offence, incurred any evil but temporal death.” Just the contrary has been shown at large.

3. Their Second proposition is, “The fall brought mankind into a state of sin and misery.” (Page 96.)

To prove this, they cite Romans v. 12; a proof which all the art of man cannot evade; and Romans iii. 23, “All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.” “But this,” you say, “means only, Jews as well as Gentiles, men of all nations, have sinned.” (Page 97.) Nay, it is most certain, as Dr. Jennings observes, that he “means all men of all nations; or he means nothing to the purpose of his conclusion and his inferences. (Verses 19–22.) The Apostle concludes from the view he had given before of the universal corruption of mankind, that ‘every mouth must be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God.’ (Verse 19.) From whence he draws two inferences: (1.) ‘Therefore by the works of the law there shall no flesh be justified.’ (2.) The only way of justification for all sinners is, ‘by faith in Jesus Christ.’ For there is no difference, as to the way of justification; ‘for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.’ And,

therefore, whoever they are whom Dr. Taylor excludes from this 'all,' ('all have sinned,') he must likewise exclude from having any need of justification by Christ." (*Jennings's Vindication*, p. 50, &c.)

Be this as it may, it is certain, (1.) That mankind are now in a state of sin and suffering. (2.) That they have been so in all ages, nearly from the time that Adam fell. Now, if his fall did not bring them into that state, I would be glad to know what did.

4. Their Third proposition is, "Sin is any want of conformity to, or transgression of, the law of God, given as a rule to the reasonable creature." "This," you say, "has no immediate relation to our present design." (*Taylor's Doctrine*, &c., p. 98.) But it had to theirs; which was to illustrate the preceding assertion: "That the fall of Adam brought mankind into a state of sin," in both these senses of the word.

5. Their Fourth proposition is, "The sinfulness of that state into which man fell consists in the guilt of Adam's first sin; the want of that righteousness wherein he was created; and the corruption of his nature, whereby he is utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all that is spiritually good, and wholly inclined to evil, and that continually; which is commonly called original sin, and from which do proceed all actual transgressions."

On the first article of this you say, "Adam's first sin was attended with consequences which affect all his posterity. But we could not, on account of his sin, become obnoxious to punishment." (Page 99.) By *punishment* I mean *evil*, suffered on account of sin. And are we not obnoxious to any evil on account of Adam's sin?

To prove the rest of the proposition, they cite first, Rom. iii. 10-20. On which you remark, "The Apostle is here speaking of Jews and Gentiles, not in a personal, but in a national, capacity. 'The mouth,' says he, of all sorts of people is 'stopped,' and both Jews and Gentiles are brought in guilty; for I have proved that there are transgressors among the Jews, as well as among the Gentiles." (Page 102.) Not at all. If he proved no more than this, not one person would "become guilty before God." Not one "mouth" of Jew or Gentile would "be stopped," by showing, "there were Jewish as well as Heathen transgressors."

I proceed to your observations:—

(1.) "In this whole section there is not one word of Adam." There is enough in the next chapter but one. The Apostle first describes the effect, and afterwards point out the cause.

(2.) "He is here speaking, not of all men, but of the Jews; of those alone who were 'under the law,' (verse 19,) and proving from their own writings that there were great corruptions among them as well as other people." (Page 103.)

He is speaking of them chiefly; but not of them only, as appears from the ninth verse: "We have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin: As it is written, There is none righteous," (neither among the Jews nor Gentiles,) "no, not one." Does this respect them in their national only, not personal, capacity? Does it prove no more than, that there were great corruptions among the Jews, as well as other people?

(3.) "The section consists of several quotations out of the Old Testament; but, (i.) None of them, taken separately, speaks of any depravity of nature; but of habits of wickedness, which men had themselves contracted." (Page 103.) They do speak of habits which men had contracted themselves; but do they speak of these only? The way to know this is, not to "take them separately;" not to consider the precise meaning, wherein they were occasionally spoken by David, Solomon, or Isaiah; but to take them conjointly, as they are here put together by the Holy Ghost, to form the character of all mankind.

On one of them, "separately taken," you say, "How could God look down from heaven, to see if there were any that did seek God, if he knew all mankind were naturally disabled from seeking him?" Why not, if, whatever they were by nature, the grace of God was more or less given to all? Though they were wholly inclined to all evil by nature, yet by grace they might recover all goodness.

You affirm, (ii.) "In none of these places does God speak strictly of every individual Jew under David or Solomon. Very many were bad; but some were good." (Page 104.) They were; though by grace, not nature. But among all those of whom God speaks by St. Paul, "there" was "none" good or "righteous, no, not one;" every individual, whether Jew or Heathen, was guilty before God.

"I conclude, therefore, (i.) That none of those texts refer to any corruption common to all mankind." (Page 106.) Perhaps they do not, as spoken by David; but they do as

spoken by St. Paul. "I conclude, (ii.) Such a general corruption as admits of no exception was not necessary to the Apostle's argument." (Page 107.) Absolutely necessary; had it not included every individual person, no person's "mouth" would have been "stopped."

These texts, therefore, do "directly and certainly prove" that, at the time when the Apostle wrote, every individual Jew and Gentile (excepting only those who were "saved by grace") "were all under sin;" "that there was none" of them "righteous, no, not one; none that understood or that sought after" God. This was the fact: And who can find out a more rational way of accounting for this universal wickedness, than by a universal corruption of our nature, derived from our first parent?

6. The next proof is, Eph. ii. 1-3: "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein, in time past, ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience; among whom, also, we all had our conversation in times past, in the desires of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others." (Page 108.)

(1.) "Nothing is here intimated of any ill effects of Adam's sin upon us." No! Not if we are "children of wrath by nature?"

(2.) "The Ephesians were Gentiles converted to the faith." Yea, and Jews also. In this very passage the Apostle speaks of both; first, the Gentile, then the Jewish, converts.

(3.) "In these verses he is describing their wretched state, while they were in Gentile darkness,"—and while they were in Jewish darkness; the Jews having been just as wicked before their conversion as the Heathens. Both the one and the other had "walked," till then, "in the vanity of their mind; having their understanding darkened," being equally "dead in trespasses and sins," equally "alienated from the life of God, through the blindness of their heart:"—A very lively description, not so much of a wicked life, as of an evil nature.

(4.) "When he saith, they were 'dead in trespasses and sins,' he speaks of their personal iniquities." (Page 109.) True, both of heart and life. I must make some variation in the rest of your paraphrase. "Wherein," saith he, "in times

past, ye," Heathens particularly, "walked;" inwardly and outwardly, "according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now" (still) "worketh in the children of disobedience; among whom we Jews also had our conversation;" being as "dead in trespasses and sins" as you.

"Therefore, (5.) When he adds, 'And were by nature the children of wrath, even as others,' he cannot mean, they were liable to wrath, by that nature which they brought into the world." (Page 110.) Why not? This does not follow from anything you have said yet. Let us see how you prove it now: "This nature is now no other than God's own work. The nature of every man comes out of the hands of God." The same may be said of those who are still "dead in trespasses and sins." Their original nature came from God, and was no other than God's own work; yet the present corruption of their nature came not from God, and is not his work. "Consequently, the nature of every person, when brought into being, is just what God sees fit it should be." This is true of the original nature of mankind, when it was first "brought into being;" but it is not true of our present corrupt nature. This is not "what God sees fit it should be." "It is his power alone that forms it." Yes, that forms us men; but not that forms us sinful men. "To say, The nature he gives is the object of his wrath, is little less than blasphemy." As he gave it, it is not the object of his wrath; but it is, as it is defiled with sin. "Far was it from the Apostle to depreciate our nature." True, our original nature; but never did man more deeply depreciate our present corrupt nature. "His intent is to show the Ephesians they were children of wrath, through the sins in which they walked." Yea, and through "the desires of the flesh and the mind," mentioned immediately before; "through the vanity of their mind;" through "the blindness of their hearts, past feeling, alienated from the life of God." Is he "not here speaking of their nature, but of the vicious course of life they had led?" (Page 111.) "He well understood the worth of the human nature;"—he did, both in its original and in its present state;—"and elsewhere shows it was endowed, even in the Heathens, with light and power sufficient to know God, and obey his will." In what Heathens, in Europe, Asia, Africa, or America, is nature now endowed with this light and power? I have never found it in any Heathen yet; and I have conversed with many, of various nations. On the contrary, I

have found one and all deeply ignorant of the very end of their existence. All of them have confirmed what a heathen *Meeko* (or Chief) told me many years ago: "He that sitteth in heaven knoweth why he made man; but we know nothing."

"But St. Paul says, 'When the Gentiles which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, they are a law to themselves.' This supposes, they might have done them 'by nature,' or their natural powers." But how does it appear, that, "by nature," here means, "By their mere 'natural powers?'" It is certain they had not the written law; but had they no supernatural assistance? Is it not one God "who works in" us and in them, "both to will and to do?" They who, by this help, do the things contained in the law, we grant, "are not the objects of God's wrath."

"Again: He affirms, the Gentiles had light sufficient to have seen God's eternal power and Godhead." (Rom. i. 19-21.) They had; but how does it appear that this was the merely natural light of their own unassisted reason? If they had assistance from God, and did not use it, they were equally without excuse. "Nay, if their nature was corrupt, and therefore they did not glorify God, they had a fair excuse." (Page 112.) True, if God had not offered them grace to balance the corruption of nature: But if he did, they are still without excuse; because they might have conquered that corruption, and would not. Therefore we are not obliged to seek any other sense of the phrase, "By nature," than, "By the nature we bring into the world."

However, you think you have found another: "*By nature*, may signify *really* and *truly*. Thus St. Paul calls Timothy, *γνησιον τεκνον*, 'his own, genuine son in the faith;' not to signify he was the child of the Apostle, but that he was a real imitator of his faith. In like manner he calls the Ephesians, *φυσει τεκνα*, 'genuine children of wrath;' not to signify they were related to wrath by their natural birth, but by their sin and disobedience." (Page 113.)

This is simply begging the question, without so much as a shadow of proof; for the Greek word in one text is not the same, nor anyway related to that in the other. Nor is there the least resemblance between the Apostle's calling Timothy his "own son in the faith," and his affirming that even those who are now "saved by grace," were "by nature children of wrath."

To add, therefore, "Not as they came under condemnation by the offence of Adam," is only begging the question once more; though, it is true, they had afterwards inflamed their account by "their own trespasses and sins."

You conclude: "'By nature,' therefore, may be a metaphorical expression, and consequently is not intended" (*may be* in the premises, *is not* in the conclusion! A way of arguing you frequently use) "to signify nature in the proper sense of the word; but to mean, they were really and truly children of wrath." (Page 114.) But where is the proof? Till this is produced, I must still believe, with the Christian Church in all ages, that all men are "children of wrath by nature," in the plain, proper sense of the word.

7. The next proof is Rom. v. 6: "While we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly." You answer, (1.) "The Apostle is here speaking, not of mankind in general, but of the Gentiles only; as appears by the whole thread of his discourse, from the beginning of the Epistle." (Page 115.) From the beginning of the Epistle to the 6th verse of the 5th chapter is the Apostle speaking of the Gentiles only? Otherwise it cannot appear, "by the whole thread of his discourse from the beginning of the Epistle." "But it appears especially from chap. iii.9: 'What then? Are we,' Jews, 'better than they,' Gentiles?" (Page 116, &c.) Nay, from that very verse he speaks chiefly of the Jews. And you yourself, a few pages ago, roundly affirmed that "he there spoke of the Jews only."

And will you affirm that, in the 4th chapter likewise, "he is speaking of the Gentiles only?" Is it not manifest, that he does not speak of them at all in a considerable part of that chapter? How then does it appear, by "the whole thread of his discourse from the beginning of the Epistle, that he is here speaking, not of mankind in general, but of the Gentiles only?"

However, you boldly go on: "Having established the point, that the Gentiles have as good a title to God's favour as the Jews." (Page 116.) How? Is this the only, or the chief point, which St. Paul establishes in the 4th chapter? Is not his main point throughout that chapter to prove, that both Jews and Gentiles were "justified by faith?" or, is he "speaking this, not of mankind in general, but of the Gentiles only?" "He proceeds: (Chap. v. 1:) 'Therefore, being justified by faith, we,' Gentiles, 'have peace with God.'" In the same

manner you thrust in the word Gentiles into each of the following verses. Had then the Gentiles only "peace with God?" You might with more colour have inserted Jews in every verse; for of them chiefly the Apostle had been speaking. To say that "he principally speaks of and to the Gentiles, to the end of the 6th chapter," (page 117,) is another assertion which cannot be proved. It is therefore by no means true, that "he is in this verse speaking of the Gentiles in contradistinction to the Jews."

You affirm, (2.) "By the same argument, he here considers the Gentiles only in a body, as distinguished from the body of the Jews; for so he does all along in the four first chapters." No, not in one of them. If he had, the "mouth" of no one individual person had been "stopped." On the contrary, he speaks both here, and all along, of every individual, that every one might believe in Him "who died for" every one of "the ungodly."

You affirm, (3.) "In this verse he describes the condition of the converted Gentiles when in their heathen state, in which they were 'without strength,' unable to recover themselves; they were 'ungodly,' yea, 'sinners,' and 'enemies to God.'" (Page 118.) And were not the unconverted Jews also "sinners," and "enemies to God, ungodly," and "without strength" to recover themselves? These four characters, therefore, are no proof at all, "that the Gentiles only are here spoken of."

"Their sin, and enmity, and ungodliness, consisted in their wicked works." Primarily, in their wicked tempers. But how came all men, Jews and Gentiles, to have those wicked tempers, and to walk in those wicked works? How came they all, till converted, to be "dead in sin," and "without strength" to recover from it, unless "in Adam all died," in a deeper sense than you are willing to allow?

You sum up your argument thus: "The Apostle is not speaking here of all mankind's being corrupted in Adam, but of the Gentiles being corrupted by the idolatry and wickedness into which they had plunged themselves, and out of which they were unable to recover themselves, without the extraordinary interposal of divine grace." (Page 120.)

If this was the case of the Heathens only, then the Jews were not "without strength," but were able to recover themselves from their wickedness, without any such interposal!

But with regard to the Heathens, I ask, (1.) Was this the state of all the heathen nations, or of some only? (2.) If of some only, which were they that were not corrupted? (3.) If it was the state of all heathen nations, how came it to be so? How was it, that there was not one uncorrupted nation on earth? (4.) How could any heathen nation be in this state; "without strength; unable to recover themselves" from sin, without the extraordinary interposal of the divine grace? since you are clear in this, "that all the Gentiles are endowed with light and power sufficient to know God, and perform obedience to his will, by their natural powers of reason and understanding." (Page 111.) If you say, "They were once endowed with these powers, but now they had cast them away;" I am not satisfied still. What, did all nations cast away their natural powers of reason and understanding? Surely not. But if not, how came they all to plunge themselves into this dreadful corruption?

8. Another proof is. "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God." (Rom viii. 7, 8.)

On this you observe, (1.) "Here is not one word of Adam, or any consequence of his sin upon us."

The whole passage speaks of that corruption of our nature which is the consequence of Adam's sin.

The plain and obvious sense of it is this: "What the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh," (too weak to contend with our corrupt nature,) God hath done: "Sending his own Son," he hath "condemned" that "sin" which was "in our flesh;" (verse 3;) hath given sentence that it should be destroyed: "That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit;" (verse 4;) who are guided in all our thoughts, words, and actions, not by corrupt nature, but by the Spirit of God. "They that are after the flesh"—who are still guided by corrupt nature—"mind the things of the flesh;" have their thoughts and affections fixed on such things as gratify corrupt nature; "but they that are after the Spirit"—who are under his guidance—"mind the things of the Spirit;" (verse 5;) think of, relish, love the things which the Spirit hath revealed; which he moves us to, and promises to give us. "For to be carnally minded"—to mind the things of the flesh, of our corrupt nature—"is death;" the sure mark of spiritual

death, and the way to death everlasting: "But to be spiritually minded"—to mind the things of the Spirit—"is life;" (verse 6;) the sure mark of spiritual life, and the way to life everlasting; and attended with the "peace" of God, and peace *with* God, which otherwise can have no place. "Because the carnal mind"—the mind, taste, inclination, the whole bias of our evil nature—"is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be;" (verse 7;) being as opposite thereto as hell to heaven. "So then they that are in the flesh"—still unrenewed by the Spirit, still following the bent of corrupt nature—"cannot please God." (Verse 8.) Every man may see now whether this passage does not strongly illustrate the depravity of our nature.

9. The last proof of this part of the proposition is: "God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." (Gen. vi. 5.) And below: "The earth was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence." (Verse 11.) (Page 122.)

"Mankind," you say, "was universally debauched into lust and sensuality, rapine and violence." And how came this universal wickedness, if all mankind were quite upright by nature? You answer, "They had corrupted themselves: So the text, (verse 12,) 'All flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth.'" This expression does not necessarily imply any more than that all flesh, all men, were corrupted. But taking it literally, I ask, How came all flesh to corrupt themselves? O, "by Seth's posterity intermarrying with the Cainites." But how came all the Cainites to corrupt themselves; and all the Sethites to follow, not reform, them? If the balance was even, if nature leaned neither way, there ought to have been as many good as bad still; and the Sethites ought to have reformed as many of the children of Cain, as the Cainites corrupted of the children of Seth. How came it, then, that "only Noah was a just man?" And does one good man, amidst a world of the ungodly, prove that the "nature of mankind in general is not corrupted;" or, rather, strongly prove that it is? It does not prove that Noah himself was not naturally inclined to evil; but it does, that the world was.

"But if the corruption of nature was the reason why the old world was destroyed, it is a reason for the destruction of the world at any time." (Page 123.) This alone was never sup-

posed to be the reason; but their actual wickedness added thereto.

You add: "It may be urged, that God said, 'I will not again curse the ground for man's sake; for the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth.' (Gen. viii. 21.) But the Hebrew particle כִּי sometimes signifies *although*." That does not prove that it signifies so here. But what, if it does? What, if the text be rendered, *Though* "the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth?" Even thus rendered, it implies as strongly as it did before, that "man's heart" is naturally inclined to evil.

The Hebrew word, translated *youth*, (Page 124,) is always applied to *childhood* or *tender age*; (Isaiah vii. 16;) כִּי־נַר signifies a *little child*: And none of the texts you have cited prove the contrary. Heman, the author of the eighty-eighth Psalm, was doubtless "afflicted from his youth," or childhood. The Babylonians (mentioned Isaiah xlvii. 12) may well be supposed to have been trained up in the way of their fathers, from their earliest childhood: And the plain meaning of Jeremiah, (iii. 24, 25,) "Shame hath devoured the labour of our fathers from our youth: We lie down in our shame; for we have sinned against the Lord our God, we and our fathers from our youth," is,—Ever since we began to think or act, we have gone astray from God.

10. The preceding texts were brought to prove (and they do abundantly prove it) that our nature is deeply corrupted, inclined to evil, and disinclined to all that is spiritually good; so that, without supernatural grace, we can neither will nor do what is pleasing to God. And this easily accounts for the wickedness and misery of mankind in all ages and nations; whereby experience and reason do so strongly confirm this scriptural doctrine of original sin.

Yet it will not "follow, that men are no moral agents." (Page 125.) If you ask, "Why, how are they capable of performing duty?" I answer, By grace; though not by nature. And a measure of this is given to all men.

Nor does it follow, "that we can by no means help or hinder that sin which is natural to us." Yes, we can. Anger, for instance, is natural to me; yea, irregular, unreasonable anger. I am naturally inclined to this, as I experience every day. Yet I can help it, by the grace of God; and do so, as long as I watch and pray.

Dr. Jennings answers this assertion more at large: "If sin be natural, then it is necessary." If by sin is meant the corrupt bias of our wills, that indeed is natural to us, as our nature is corrupted by the fall; but not as it came originally out of the hand of God. Therefore it is improperly compared to the appetites of hunger and thirst, which might be in our original nature. Now, this bias of the will is certainly evil and sinful, and hateful to God; whether we have contracted it ourselves, or whether we derive it from Adam, makes no difference. A proud or passionate temper is evil, whether a man has contracted it himself, or derived it from his parents. Therefore the inference, 'if natural and' (in some sense) 'necessary, then no sin,' does by no means hold.

"But if by sin be meant sinful actions, to which this corrupt bias of the will inclines us; it remains to be proved, that a corrupt bias of the will makes the actions necessary, and, consequently, not sinful. And, indeed, if a corrupt bias makes sin to be necessary, and, consequently, to be no sin, then the more any man is inclined to sin, the less sin he can commit; and as that corrupt bias grows stronger, his actual sinning becomes more necessary: And so the man, instead of growing more wicked, grows more innocent." (*Jennings's Vindication*, p. 68, &c.)

11. That this doctrine has been long "held in the Church of Rome," (*Taylor's Doctrine*, &c., p. 126.) is true. But so it has in the Greek Church also; and, so far as we can learn, in every Church under heaven; at least from the time that God spake by Moses.

From this infection of our nature (call it original sin, or what you please) spring many, if not all, actual sins. And this St. James (i. 14) plainly intimates, even according to your paraphrase on his words: "'Every man is tempted,' is overcome by temptation, 'when he is drawn away by his own lust,'—his own irregular desire; where the Apostle charges the wickedness of men on its proper cause,—their 'own lust.'" Very true. And irregular desire is (not so much a fruit as a) part of original sin. For to say, "Eve had irregular desires before she sinned," (p. 127,) is a contradiction; since all irregular desire is sin.

12. Another proof that actual sins spring from original, is, "Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies." (Matt. xv. 19.)

"But what has this text to do with Adam's sin?" It has

much to do with the point it is brought to prove; namely, that actual sin proceeds from original; evil works, from an evil heart. Do not, therefore, triumph over these venerable men, (as you have done again and again,) because a text cited in proof of one clause of a proposition does not prove the whole.)

But "neither of those texts proves that all our wickedness proceeds from our being corrupted by Adam's sin." (Page 128.) But they both prove what they were brought to prove,—that all outward wickedness proceeds from inward wickedness. Those pious men, therefore, did not mix "the forgery of their own imagination with the truth of God."

But "if all actual transgressions proceed from Adam's sin, then he is the only guilty person that ever lived. For if his sin is the cause of all ours, he alone is chargeable with them."

True; if all our transgressions so proceed from his sin, that we cannot possibly avoid them. But this is not the case; by the grace of God we may cast away all our transgressions: Therefore, if we do not, they are chargeable on ourselves. We *may* live; but we *will* die.

Well, but "on these principles all actual sins proceed from Adam's sin; either by necessary consequence, or through our own choice; or partly by one, and partly by the other." (Page 129.) Yes; partly by one, and partly by the other. We are inclined to evil, antecedently to our own choice. By grace we may conquer this inclination; or we may choose to follow it, and so commit actual sin.

13. Their Fifth proposition is, "Original sin is conveyed from our first parents to their posterity by natural generation, so as all that proceed from them in that way are conceived and born in sin." (Page 130.)

In proof of this they urge: "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me. (Psalm li. 5.)" (Page 131.)

On this you observe: "The word which we translate 'shapen, signifies to *bring forth*, or *bear*. So here it means, 'Behold, I was brought forth, or born, in iniquity.'"

Suppose it does, (which is not plain; for you cannot infer from its meaning so sometimes, that it means so here,) what have you gained? If David was born in iniquity, it is little different from being "shapen" therein.

That the Hebrew word does not always mean "to be born," but rather to be "shapen, formed, or made," evidently appears

from Psalm xc. 2; where it is applied to the formation of the earth: And in this very text, the Seventy render it by *επλασθη*, —a word of the very same import. It is therefore here very properly rendered “shapen;” nor can it be more exactly translated.

But “the word *ידמתני* properly signifies, *warmed me.*” You should say, *literally* signifies. But it signifies *conceived me*, nevertheless. And so it is taken, Gen. xxx. 38, 39, 41, &c.; xxxi. 10. “Nay, it signifies there the *act of copulation.* So several translators render it.” (Page 132, 133.) And several render it otherwise: So this does not determine the point either way.

It must therefore be determined by the sense. Now, for what end did Jacob put the “pilled rods before the cattle?” That the lambs might be marked as the rods were. And when is it that females of any kind mark their young? Not in that act; but some time after, when the fœtus is either forming or actually formed. Throw a plum or a pear at a woman before conception, and it will not mark the fœtus at all; but it will, if thrown while she is conceiving, or after she has conceived; as we see in a thousand instances. This observation justifies our translators in rendering the word by *conceiving* in all those places.

And indeed you own, “David could not apply that word to his mother, in the sense wherein you would apply it to the cattle.” You therefore affirm, “It means here, to nurse.” (Page 134.) You may as well say it means to roast. You have as much authority from the Bible for one interpretation as for the other. Produce, if you can, one single text, in which *הט* signifies to nurse, or anything like it.

You stride on: (1.) “The verse means, ‘In sin did my mother nurse me:’ (2.) That is, ‘I am a sinner from the womb:’ (3.) That is, ‘I am a great sinner:’ (4.) That is, ‘I have contracted strong habits of sin.’”

By this art you make the most expressive texts mean just anything or nothing.

So Psalm lviii. 3: “‘The wicked are estranged from the womb; they go astray as soon as they are born, telling lies.’ That is, My unjust persecutors in Saul’s court are exceedingly wicked.” If this was all David meant, what need of *וררי*, “are alienated?” and that from the “bowels” of their mother? Nay, but he means as he speaks. They “are alienated from the

life of God," from the time of their coming into the world. From the time of their birth, they "knew not the way of truth;" neither can, unless they are "born of God."

You cite as a parallel text, "'Thou wast called a transgressor from the womb;" that is, set to iniquity by prevailing habits and customs." Nay, the plain meaning is, The Israelites in general had never kept God's law since they came into the world.

Perhaps the phrase, "from the womb," is once used figuratively, namely, Job xxxi. 18. But it is manifest, that it is to be literally taken, Isaiah xlix. 1: "The Lord hath called me from the womb; from the bowels of my mother hath he made mention of my name." For, (1.) This whole passage relates to Christ; these expressions in particular. (2.) This was literally fulfilled, when the angel was sent while he was yet in the womb, to order that his "name" should be "called Jesus." This is not therefore barely "an hyperbolical form of aggravating sin;" but a humble confession of a deep and weighty truth, whereof we cannot be too sensible.

"But you have no manner of ground to conclude, that it relates to Adam's sin." (Page 136.)

Whether it relates to Adam's personal sin or no, it relates to a corrupt nature. This is the present question; and your pulling in Adam's sin only tends to puzzle the reader.

But how do you prove (since you *will* drag this in) that it does not relate to Adam's sin?

Thus: "(1.) In the whole Psalm there is not one word about Adam, or the effects of his sin upon us."

Here, as usual, you blend the two questions together; the ready way to confound an unwary reader. But first, to the first: "In the whole Psalm there is not one word about Adam; therefore it relateth not to him." Just as well you may argue, "In the whole Psalm there is not one word about Uriah; therefore it relateth not to him." The second assertion, "There is not one word of the effects of his sin," is a fair begging the question.

"(2.) The Psalmist is here charging himself with his own sin." He is; and tracing it up to the fountain.

"(3.) But according to our version, he does not charge himself with his sin, but some other person. He throws the whole load of his sin from off himself, on God who shaped him, and his mother who conceived him."

What you say might have had weight, if he had offered this

in excuse of his sin, or even in extenuation of it. But does he do this? Does he, in fact, "throw the whole blame, or any part of it, from off himself?" Just the reverse. He acknowledges and bewails his own total iniquity; not to excuse but to abase himself the more before God, for his inward as well as outward wickedness.

And yet he might, in perfect consistency with this, when God had caused "the bones which had been broken to rejoice," cry out, "I will praise thee, O God; for I am fearfully and wonderfully made;" yea, and repeat all that follows in the same Psalm; which proves so much, and no more, that every fœtus in the womb is formed by the power and wisdom of God. Yet does it not follow, that the sin transmitted from the parent "must be attributed to God." (Page 137.)

"But how could he with pleasure reflect upon his formation, or praise God for it?" As I can at this day; though I know I was "conceived in sin, and shapen in iniquity." But, "where sin abounds, grace does much more abound." I lose less by Adam, than I gain by Christ.

This also perfectly consists with the following verse: "Behold, thou desirest truth," or, It is thy will that we should have truth, "in the inward parts;" (page 138;) thou art willing to remove all that "iniquity" wherein "I was shapen;" to "give me a clean heart, and renew a right spirit within me;" and in the hidden part thou hast made me to know wisdom; thou hast "shown me what was good." So that I am everyway without excuse; I knew thy will, and did it not.

"But if, after all, you will adhere to the literal sense of this text, why do you not adhere to the literal sense of that text: 'This is my body,' and believe transubstantiation?" (*Ibid.*) For those very reasons which you suggest: (1.) Because it is grossly absurd, to suppose that Christ speaks of what he then held in his hands, as his real, natural body. But it is noway absurd, to suppose the Psalmist was "conceived in sin." (2.) The sense of, "This is my body," may be clearly explained by other scriptures, where the like forms of speech are used; but there are no other scriptures where the like forms with this of David are used in any other sense. (3.) Transubstantiation is attended with consequences hurtful to piety; but the doctrine of original sin, and faith grounded thereon, is the only foundation of true piety.

14. The next proof is, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one." (Job xiv. 4.)

On this you observe: "Job is here speaking of the weakness of our nature; not with regard to sin, but to the shortness and afflictions of life." (Page 139.) Certainly, with regard both to the one and the other. For though, in the first and second verses, he mentions the shortness and troubles of life, yet even these are mentioned with a manifest regard to sin. This appears from the very next verse: (Page 140:) "And dost thou open thy eyes upon such a one;" to punish one already so wretched? "And bringest me into judgment with thee;" by chastising me still more? It then immediately follows, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one." It does therefore by no means appear, that "Job is here speaking only with regard to the shortness and troubles of life."

Part of the following verses too run thus: "Now thou numberest my steps: Dost thou not watch over my sin? My transgression is sealed up in a bag, and thou sowest up mine iniquity." (Verses 16, 17.) Let any one judge then, whether Job in this chapter does not speak of "the sinfulness, as well as the mortality, of human nature."

Not that he "urges his natural pravity as a reason why he should not be 'brought into judgment;'" (page 141;) no more than David urges his being "shapen in wickedness," as an excuse for that wickedness. Rather, Job (as well as David) humbly acknowledges his total sinfulness; confessing that he deserved the judgment, which he yet prays God not to inflict.

15. Another proof is, "What is man, that he should be clean? and he that is born of a woman, that he should be righteous?" (Job xv. 1.)

On this you observe: "'Born of a woman,' signifies no more than a man." Often it does not; but here it is emphatical. "The phrase indeed includes frailty and imperfection." (Page 142.) How can that be? Was Adam made frail and imperfect? And have you forgot that every man is now born in as good a state as Adam was made at first? "But it is not to be understood as the reason why man is unclean and unrighteous." From the placing of the words, one would really judge it was; and how do you prove it is not? Why, "Job and his friends use this manner of speech in other places of this book: 'Shall mortal man be more just

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
 LIBRARY
 ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN 48106
 33651

than God? Shall a man be more pure than his Maker? (iv. 17.)” Nay, this is not the manner of speech which is in question; so you are here quite wide of the mark. “How-ever that is, ‘How can man be justified with God? or how can he be clean that is born of a woman?’ (xxv. 4.)”

And does not this point at original sin? You say, No: For “if Job and his friends had known that the reason of our uncleanness and imperfection was our receiving a corrupted nature from Adam, they ought to have given this reason of it.” And do they not in the very words before us? You say, “No; they turn our thoughts to a quite different reason; namely, the uncleanness of the best of creatures in his sight.” This is not a different reason, but falls in with the other; and the natural meaning of these texts is, “How can he be clean that is born of a woman;” and so conceived and born in sin? “Behold, even to the moon, and it shineth not, compared with God; ‘yea, the stars are not pure in his sight!’” How “much less man that is a worm!” (xxv. 6.) In how much higher and stricter a sense is man impure, that carries about with him his mortality, the testimony of that unclean nature which he brought with him into the world?

“‘Shall mortal man be more just than God? Shall a man be more pure than his Maker?’ (Job iv. 17, &c.)” (Page 143.) Shall man dare to arraign the justice of God; to say God punishes him more than he deserves? “Behold, he puts no trust in his servants; and his angels he charged with folly.” Many of these left their first estates; even their wisdom was not to be depended on: “How much less in them that dwell in houses of clay;” whose bodies, liable to pain, sickness, death, are standing monuments of the folly and wickedness which are deep rooted in their souls!

“What is man, that he should be clean; and he which is born of a woman, that he should be righteous? Behold, he putteth no trust in his holy ones;” yea, the heavens “are not pure in his sight.” His holy angels have fallen, and the highest creatures are not pure in comparison of him. “How much more abominable and filthy,” in the strictest sense, “is man;” every man born into the world: “Who drinketh iniquity like water;” (Job xv. 16, &c.) iniquity of every kind; so readily, so naturally, as being so thoroughly agreeable to the “desires of” his “flesh and of” his “mind!”

You conclude the head thus: “Man, in his present weak

and fleshly state, cannot be clean before God." Certainly as clean as the moon and stars at least; if he be as he was first created. He was "made but a little lower than the angels;" consequently, he was then far higher and more pure than these, or the sun itself, or any other part of the material creation. You go on: "Why cannot a man be clean before God? because he is conceived and born in sin? No such thing. But because, if the purest creatures are not pure in comparison of God, much less a being subject to so many infirmities as a mortal man." *Infirmities!* What then, do innocent infirmities make a man unclean before God? Do labour, pain, bodily weakness, or mortality, make us "filthy and abominable?" Surely not. Neither could they make a man pure from sin, less pure than the moon and stars. Nor can we conceive Adam, as he came out of the hands of God, to have been, in any sense, less clean than these. All these texts, therefore, must refer to that sinful impurity which every man brings into the world.

You add: "Which is a demonstration to me that Job and his friends were wholly strangers to this doctrine." A demonstration of a peculiar kind! I think neither mathematical nor logical.

16. The last proof is, "'That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.' (John iii. 6.)" (Page 144.)

"Here, by 'flesh,' Dr. Taylor understands nothing else but the mere parts and powers of a man; and by 'being born of the flesh,' the being 'born of a woman,' with the constitution and natural powers of a man." (*Jennings's Vindication*, p. 78, &c.) Now, let us suppose that human nature is not at all corrupted; and let us try what sense we can make of other scriptures where the word flesh is used in opposition to Spirit, as it is here: "There is no condemnation to them who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit;" (Rom. viii. 1;) that is, not after the pure, uncorrupted constitution and powers of man. Again: "They that are in the flesh cannot please God;" (verse 8;) that is, they that have the parts and powers of a man. Again: "If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die;" that is, if ye live suitably to the constitution and powers of your nature. Once more: How shall we understand, "The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh;" (Gal. v. 17;) if flesh means nothing but the pure and uncorrupted powers of human nature?

"But this text (John iii. 3) is," according to Dr. Taylor,

“so far from implying any corruption of our nature, that, ‘on the contrary, it supposes we have a nature susceptible of the best habits, and capable of being born of the Spirit.’” (Page 145.) And who ever denied it? Who ever supposed that such a corruption of nature, as for the present disables us for spiritual good, renders us incapable of being “born of the Spirit?”

“But if natural generation is the means of conveying a sinful nature from our first parents to their posterity, then must itself be a sinful and unlawful thing.” I deny the consequence. You may transmit to your children a nature tainted with sin, and yet commit no sin in so doing.

“Again: We produce one another only as the oak produces the acorn. The proper production of a child is from God. But if God produces a fœtus which has sinful dispositions, he produces those dispositions.” (Page 146.) Your argument proves too much. It would prove God to be the author of all actual as well as original sin. For “it is the power of God, under certain laws and established rules,” which produces not only the fœtus, but all the motion in the universe. It is his power which so violently expands the air, on the discharge of a pistol or cannon. It is the same which produces muscular motion, and the circulation of all the juices in man. But does he therefore produce adultery or murder? Is he the cause of those sinful motions? He is the cause of the motion; (as he is of the fœtus;) of the sin, he is not. Do not say, “This is too fine a distinction.” Fine as it is, you must necessarily allow it: Otherwise, you make God the direct author of all the sin under heaven. To apply this more directly to the point: God does produce the fœtus of man, as he does of trees; empowering the one and the other to propagate each after its kind; and a sinful man propagates, after his kind, another sinful man. Yet God produces, in the sense above mentioned, the man, but not the sin.

17. Their Sixth proposition is, “The fall brought upon mankind the loss of communion with God, his displeasure and curse; (Gen. iii. 8, 10, 24;) so as ‘we are by nature children of wrath,’ (Eph. ii. 2, 3,) bond-slaves to Satan, and justly liable to all punishments, (2 Tim. ii. 26,) in this world, and that which is to come. (Gen. ii. 17; Rom. vi. 23.)”

In proof of the first clause of this proposition, they cite Gen. iii. 8, 10, 24. On this you observe: “Adam and Eve by their

sin did forfeit communion with God. But God did not take the forfeiture." (Page 147.) Surely he did, when "they were afraid, and hid themselves from his presence." "But afterward they had frequent communion with him." This does not prove they did not lose it before.

"But their posterity did not. Abel had communion with him, and so had the Patriarchs and Prophets; and so have we at this day. So that, as we could not justly have lost this communion by Adam's sin, it is true, in fact, that we have not lost it: We still have 'fellowship with the Father and the Son.'" (Page 148.)

Could we not justly, by Adam's sin, have lost our very existence? And if we had not existed, could we have had communion with God? "But we have not lost it, in fact. We still have 'fellowship with the Father and with the Son.'" Who have? all men born into the world? all Jews, and Turks, and Heathens? Have all that are called Christians? Have the generality of Protestants "fellowship with the Father and with the Son?" What fellowship? Just as much as light has with darkness; as much as Christ has with Belial. The bulk of mankind, Christians as well as Heathens, Protestants as well as Papists, are at this day, and have been ever since they were born, "without God,"—*Atheoi, Atheists*, "in the world."

We need not therefore say, "Their fellowship with God is owing to his mercy, through a Redeemer." They have none at all: No fellowship with "the only true God, and" with "Jesus Christ whom he hath sent." Indeed they have no great need of Jesus Christ, according to your account; seeing, "all that God's grace doeth for us in Christ, to repair what we lost in Adam, is, raising us up at the last day!" You add, "And therefore communion with God is either the same grace which was vouchsafed to Adam, continued to us;" (to every man born into the world, as naturally as seeing or hearing!) "or, if there be anything extraordinary in it," (which you judge can hardly be allowed!) "it belongs to the redundancy of grace, which has no relation to anything we lost by Adam." (Page 149.) That that whole passage has relation to what we lost in Adam, has been shown already. But what conception you have of communion with God is easily seen by this wonderful account of it.

"However, this text gives no intimation that Adam's posterity lost communion with God for his sin." It shows that Adam did

so ; and all his posterity has done the same. Whence is this, unless from his sin ?

“ So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden, Cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life.” (Gen. iii. 24.)

Although God is equally present in every place, yet this was a clear token that man had not now that near communion with him which he had enjoyed before his sin.

18. Proposition. “ The fall brought upon mankind God’s displeasure and curse, so as we are ‘by nature the children of wrath.’”

“ The text on which this is grounded, (Eph. ii. 2, 3,) we have considered before.” (Page 150.) And those considerations have been answered at large.

You add : “ How mankind could be justly brought under God’s displeasure for Adam’s sin, we cannot understand: On the contrary, we do understand, it is unjust. And therefore, unless our understanding or perception of truth be false, it must be unjust. But understanding must be the same in all beings, as far as they do understand. Therefore, if we understand that it is unjust, God understands it to be so too.” (Page 151.)

Plausible enough. But let us take the argument in pieces: “ How mankind could be justly brought under God’s displeasure for Adam’s sin, we cannot understand.” I allow it. I cannot understand, that is, clearly or fully comprehend, the deep of the divine judgment therein ; no more than I can, how “ the whole” brute “ creation,” through his sin, should have been “ made subject to vanity,” and should “ groan together,” in weakness, in various pain, in death, “ until this day.” “ On the contrary, we do understand, it is unjust.” I do not understand it is. It is quite beyond my understanding. It is a depth which I cannot fathom. “ Therefore, unless our understanding or perception of truth be false, it must be unjust.” Here lies the deceit. You shift the terms, and place as equivalent those which are not equivalent. Our perception of truth cannot be false ; our understanding or apprehension of things may. “ But understanding must be the same in all beings.” Yes, in the former sense of the word, but not the latter. “ Therefore, if we understand (apprehend) it is unjust, God understands it so too.” Nay, verily : “ As the heavens are higher than the earth, so are his thoughts higher than our thoughts.”

“What a God must he be, who can curse his innocent creatures before they have a being! Is this thy God, O Christian?” Bold enough! So Lord B——, “Is Moses’s God your God?” He is mine, although he said, “Cursed be Canaan,” including his posterity before they had a being; and although he now permits millions to come into a world which everywhere bears the marks of his displeasure. And he permits human souls to exist in bodies which are (how we know not, but the fact we know) “conceived and born in sin;” by reason whereof, all men coming into the world are “children of wrath.” But he has provided a Saviour for them all; and this fully acquits both his justice and mercy.

19. “So as we are by nature bond-slaves to Satan: ‘And that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive at his will.’ (2 Tim. ii. 26.)” (Page 152.)

But you say, “The Apostle speaks this of the unconverted Gentiles, who were slaves to Satan, not through Adam, but through their own fault.” Both one and the other. But how does it appear, that he speaks this of the Gentiles only?

Without offering at any proof of this, you go on: “The clause, ‘Taken captive by him,’ is spoken, not of the devil, but of ‘the servant of the’ Lord; for thus the place should be rendered: ‘That they may awake out of the snare of the devil, being revived by him,’ that is, the servant of the Lord, ‘to his,’ that is, God’s, ‘will.’” (Page 153.)

Well, the proof. “The word ζῳργεω signifies, *to revive*; and so here, to restore men to life and salvation.” As a proof of this sense of the word, you cite Luke v. 10. But this rather proves the contrary; for there it has nothing to do with reviving. We read, in the verse before, of the “fishes which they had taken;” alluding to which, Jesus “said unto Simon, From henceforth thou shalt catch men;” take them captive in the gospel net. Although, therefore, it were allowed, (which cannot be done,) that *his* related, not to the word immediately preceding, but to another which stands three verses off, yet even this would avail nothing; since the sense which you impose upon ζῳργεω is what it will by no means bear.

You say, indeed, “It always means, *to take alive*, or *save alive*.” (Page 154.) It does mean, *to take alive*. But you bring not one authority to prove that it ever means, *to save alive*. It therefore “suits the devil and his snare” admirably

well; for he does not take therein those who are free among the dead; but those who are alive in a natural, though dead in a spiritual, sense.

“But, however this be, they were not led captive through Adam’s sin, but their own wickedness.” (Page 155.) They were “bond-slaves to Satan,” (which was the point to be proved,) through Adam’s sin, and their own wickedness.

“Yea, but what an inconsistency must that be in the divine dispensations and in the Scriptures, if it can be made appear from them, that God hath, for no fault of ours, but only for Adam’s one sin, put us all into the hands of the devil; when he hath been, in all ages, providing means to preserve or rescue mankind from him?” (Page 155.) What can be made appear from the Scriptures is this: “That from “Adam sin passed upon all men;” that hereby all men, being by nature “dead in sin,” cannot of themselves resist the devil; and that, consequently, all who will not accept of help from God are “taken captive by Satan at his will.” And there is no inconsistency between this and any of the Divine dispensations.

Proposition. “And justly liable to all punishments in this world, and that which is to come.”

That all men are liable to these for Adam’s sin alone, I do not assert; but they are so, for their own outward and inward sins, which, through their own fault, spring from the infection of their nature. And this, I think, may fairly be inferred from Rom. vi. 23: “The wages of sin is death;” (pages 157, 158;) its due reward; death, temporal, spiritual, and eternal. God grant that we may never feel it so!

20. You conclude this Part: “I cannot see that we have advanced one step further than where we were at the conclusion of the First Part; namely, That the consequences of Adam’s first sin upon us are labour, sorrow, and mortality, and no other.” (Page 162.)

The contrary to this having been so largely proved, instead of repeating those proofs over again, I shall close this Part with that beautiful description of the present state of man, which Mr. Hervey gives us from Mr. Howe’s “Living Temple.” “Only,” says he, “let me hint, that it considers the human soul as originally a habitation of God through the Spirit:”—

“That he hath withdrawn himself, and left this his temple desolate, we have many sad and plain proofs before us. The

stately ruins are visible to every eye, and bear in their front (yet extant) this doleful inscription: 'Here God once dwelt.' Enough appears of the admirable structure of the soul of man to show the divine presence did sometime reside in it; more than enough of vicious deformity to proclaim, He is now retired and gone. The lamps are extinct; the altar overturned; the light and love are now vanished, which did the one shine with so heavenly brightness, the other burn with so pious fervour. The golden candlestick is displaced, to make room for the throne of the prince of darkness. The sacred incense, which sent up its rich perfumes, is exchanged for a poisonous hellish vapour. The comely order of this house is all turned into confusion; the beauties of holiness into noisome impurities; the house of prayer into a den of thieves: Thieves of the worst kind; for every lust is a thief, and every theft is sacrilege. The noble powers which were designed and dedicated to divine contemplation and delight in God, are alienated to the service of the most despicable idols, and employed in the vilest embraces: To behold and admire lying vanities; to indulge and cherish lust and wickedness.

"There is not now a system, an entire table, of coherent truths to be found, or a frame of holiness: but some shivered parcels. And if any with great toil and labour apply themselves to draw out here one piece, and there another, and set them together; they serve rather to show, how exquisite the divine workmanship was in the original composition, than to the excellent purposes for which the whole was at first designed. Some pieces agree, and own one another; but how soon are our inquiries nonplussed and superseded! How many attempts have been made, since that fearful fall and ruin of this fabric, to compose again the truths of so many several kinds into their distinct orders, and make up frames of science or useful knowledge! And after so many ages, nothing is finished in any kind. Sometimes truths are misplaced; and what belongs to one kind is transferred to another, where it will not fitly match; sometimes falsehood inserted, which shatters or disturbs the whole frame. And what with much fruitless pains is done by one hand, is dashed in pieces by another; and it is the work of a following age, to sweep away the fine-spun cobwebs of a former. And those truths which are of greatest use, though not most out of sight, are least regarded; their tendency and

design are overlooked, or they are so loosened and torn off, that they cannot be wrought in, so as to take hold of the soul, but hover as faint, ineffectual notions that signify nothing.

“Its very fundamental powers are shaken and disjointed, and their order toward one another confounded and broken; so that what is judged considerable, is not considered; what is recommended as lovely and eligible, is not loved and chosen. Yea, ‘the truth which is after godliness’ is not so much disbelieved, as hated, or ‘held in unrighteousness;’ and shines with too feeble a light in that malignant darkness which ‘comprehends it not.’ You come, amidst all this confusion, into the ruined palace of some great Prince, in which you see, here the fragments of a noble pillar, there the shattered pieces of some curious imagery, and all lying neglected and useless, among heaps of dirt. He that invites you to take a view of the soul of man gives you but such another prospect, and doth but say to you, ‘Behold the desolation!’ All things rude and waste. So that, should there be any pretence to the Divine presence, it might be said, ‘If God be here, why is it thus?’ The faded glory, the darkness, the disorder, the impurity, the decayed state in all respects of this temple, too plainly show, ‘the Great Inhabitant is gone!’”

NEWINGTON, *Jan. 21.*

In your Third Part you propose, First, to answer some objections and queries; and then to consider the connexion of the doctrine of original sin with other parts of religion.

“Objection 1. Are we not in worse moral circumstances than Adam was before he fell? I answer:—

“(1.) If by moral circumstances you mean, the state of religion and virtue, it is certain the greatest part of mankind ever were and still are very corrupt. But this is not the fault of their nature, but occasioned by the abuse of it, in prostituting reason to appetite, whereby, in process of time, they have sunk themselves into the most lamentable degree of ignorance, superstition, idolatry, injustice, debauchery.” (Page 168.)

But how came this? How came all nations thus to “abuse their nature,” thus to “prostitute reason to appetite?” How came they all to sink into this “lamentable ignorance, superstition, idolatry, injustice, debauchery?” How came it, that half of them, at least, if their nature was uncorrupt, did not

use it well? submit appetite to reason, and rise while the other sunk? "Process of time" does not help us out at all; for if it made the one half of mankind more and more vicious, it ought, by the same degrees, to have made the other half more and more virtuous. If men were no more inclined to one side than the other, this must absolutely have been the event. Turn and wind as you please, you will never be able to get over this. You will never account for this fact, that the bulk of mankind have, in all ages, "prostituted their reason to appetite," even till they sunk into "lamentable ignorance, superstition, idolatry, injustice, and debauchery," but by allowing their very nature to be in fault, to be more inclined to vice than virtue.

"But if we have all a corrupt nature, which as we cannot, so God will not, wholly remove in this life, then why do we try to reform the world?" Why? Because, whether the corrupt nature be wholly removed or no, men may be so far reformed as to "cease from evil," to be "renewed in the spirit of their mind, and by patient continuance in well-doing," to "seek" and find, "glory, and honour, and immortality."

"I answer: (2.) If by moral circumstances you mean, provision and means for spiritual improvement, those given us through Christ are far greater than Adam had before he sinned." (Page 169.) To those who believe in Christ they are. But above four-fifths of the world are Mahometans or Pagans still. And have these (immensely the greater part of mankind, to say nothing of Popish nations) greater provision and means for spiritual improvement than Adam before he sinned?

"But if, (3.) by moral circumstances you mean moral" (rather natural) "abilities, or mental powers;" (a consideration quite foreign to the question;) "I answer, The Scriptures nowhere compare our faculties with Adam's. Nor know I how we can judge, but by comparing the actions of Adam in innocence with what men have performed since." (Page 170.)

Yes, we can judge thus: There could be no defect in Adam's understanding, when he came first out of the hands of his Creator; but there are essential defects in mine and yours, and every man's whom we know. Our apprehension is indistinct, our judgment false, our reasoning wrong in a thousand instances. So it always was; and so it is still, after all the care

we can possibly take : Therefore, "our faculties are not as sound and fit for right action as Adam's were before he sinned."

"But any man of common understanding might have dressed and kept the garden as well as he." I can neither affirm nor deny this ; for we know not how he dressed and kept it.

"Nor doth it appear, that in giving names to all the creatures, he showed any extraordinary penetration into their natures ; for that the names he gave truly expressed the several qualities of them is a mere fiction, without any foundation in Scripture history, or the names of animals in the original Hebrew." (Page 171.)

This is really strange ! that any man of learning should be so hardy as to affirm this, after the numberless instances which have been produced of Hebrew names expressing the most essential property of each animal.

And is this supposition likewise "without any foundation in Scripture history?" What is that? "And the Lord God brought every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air, unto Adam, to see what he would call them ;" to make proof of his understanding. "And whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof." (Gen. ii. 19.) Now, whether those names were Hebrew or no, (which you affect to doubt,) can it be supposed that God would have permitted them to stand, if they had not suited the nature of each creature? It is bold therefore to affirm, that "many of his posterity could have given names to them as well as he ; and that therefore this is not a proof that he had any capacity superior to us." (Page 172.)

You proceed : "Surely his eating the forbidden fruit is no evidence of superior abilities." (Page 173.) And it is no evidence of the contrary ; "seeing," as you yourself observe, "what his special temptation was, we do not know." Therefore, neither do we know whether any of his posterity could have overcome it ; much less, that "many of his posterity have overcome temptations more violent than his." All this is talking in the dark, "not knowing what we say, neither whereof we affirm."

"And now let any man see whether there be any ground in revelation for exalting Adam's nature as Divines have done, who have affirmed that all his faculties were eminently perfect, and entirely set to the love and obedience of his Creator." (Page 175.) "And yet these same suppose him to have been guilty of the vilest act that ever was committed." (Page 176.)

They suppose Adam to have been created holy and wise, like his Creator; and yet capable of falling from it. They suppose farther, that through temptations, of which we cannot possibly judge, he did fall from that state; and that hereby he brought pain, labour, and sorrow on himself and all his posterity; together with death, not only temporal, but spiritual, and (without the grace of God) eternal. And it must be confessed, that not only a few Divines, but the whole body of Christians in all ages, did suppose this, till after seventeen hundred years a sweet-tongued orator arose, not only more enlightened than silly Adam, but than any of his wise posterity, and declared that the whole supposition was folly, nonsense, inconsistency, and blasphemy!

“Objection 2. But do not the Scriptures say, Adam was created after God’s own image? And do his posterity bear that image now?”

“The Scriptures do say, ‘God created man in his own image.’ (Gen. i. 27.) But whatever that phrase means here, it doubtless means the same in Gen. ix. 6: ‘Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed: For in the image of God made he man.’” (Page 177.) Certainly it has the same meaning in both places; for the latter plainly refers to the former. And thus much we may fairly infer from hence, that “the image of God,” wherein “man was” at first “created,” whereinsoever it consisted, was not utterly effaced in the time of Noah. Yea, so much of it will always remain in all men, as will justify the punishing murderers with death. But we can in nowise infer from hence, that that entire image of God, in which Adam was at first created, now remains in all his posterity.

The words of Gen. v. 3, rendered literally, are, “He begat in his likeness, according to his image.” “Adam,” says Mr. Hervey, “was created ‘in the image of God.’ After his fall, the sacred historian varies his style, and, with a remarkable peculiarity, as well as propriety, says, ‘Adam begat a son in his own likeness;’—so it must be translated, according to all the rules of grammar, Adam being the nearest antecedent. That every reader may advert to this melancholy but important truth, it is enforced by a very emphatical repetition: ‘After his own image,’ as contradistinguished from that ‘image of God,’ mentioned in the preceding verse; which

expressions are evidently intended to denote the difference between the state in which Adam was created and Seth begotten."

"The two following texts are brought by the Assembly, to show what the image of God was in which Adam was made:

"'And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge, after the image of Him that created him.' (Col. iii. 10.)

"'Put on the new man, which after the image of God is created in righteousness and true holiness.' (Ephesians iv. 24.)" (Page 178.)

"I answer, These texts are parallel. 'The old man' means a wicked life; 'the new man,' a good life; to which they were formed and 'created' by the gospel dispensation. And this 'new man,' this new life, is 'after the image,' that is, agreeable to the nature, 'of God.'" (Page 179.)

As you advance no proof of this perfectly new interpretation, I leave it to shift for itself.

To disprove the common interpretation, you add, "Adam could not be originally created in righteousness and true holiness; because habits of holiness cannot be created without our knowledge, concurrence, or consent. For holiness in its nature implies the choice and consent of a moral agent, without which it cannot be holiness." (Page 180.)

What is holiness? Is it not essentially love? the love of God, and of all mankind? love producing "bowels of mercies, humbleness of mind, meekness, gentleness, long-suffering?" And cannot God shed abroad this love in any soul without his concurrence, antecedent to his knowledge or consent? And supposing this to be done, will love change its nature? Will it be no longer holiness? This argument can never be sustained, unless you would play upon the word *habits*. Love is holiness wherever it exists. And God could create either men or angels, endued from the very first moment of their existence with whatsoever degree of love he pleased.

You "think, on the contrary, it is demonstration that we cannot be righteous or holy, we cannot observe what is right, without our own free and explicit choice." I suppose you mean, *practise* what is right. But a man may be righteous before he does what is right; holy in heart before he is holy in life. The confounding these two, all along, seems to be the ground of your strange imagination, that Adam "must choose to be righteous, must exercise thought and reflection,

before he could be righteous." Why so? "Because righteousness is the right use and application of our powers." Here is your capital mistake. No, it is not; it is the right state of our powers. It is the right disposition of our soul, the right temper of our mind. Take this with you, and you will no more dream that "God could not create man in righteousness and true holiness;" or that "to talk of wanting that righteousness in which Adam was created, is to talk of nothing we want." (Page 181.)

On Romans ii. 14, you observe: "This text clearly proves that natural reason and understanding is a rule of action to all mankind, and that all men ought to follow it. This, therefore, overthrows the whole doctrine of original sin." (Page 183.)

How do you prove the consequence? May not men have some reason left, which in some measure discerns good from evil, and yet be deeply fallen, even as to their understanding as well as their will and affections?

On Eccles. vii. 29, "God hath made man upright; but they have found out many inventions," you say,—

"'Man' here means all mankind; 'upright,' endued with powers to know and perform their duty." (Pages 184, 185.) You offer no proof for either of these assertions; and without it I cannot receive them.

Again: "'They,'" you say, "means mankind in general." I rather believe it means our first parents, who are by Moses likewise comprehended under the common name of man, or rather אדם "Adam." So Gen. v. 2: "God called their name Adam in the day when they were created." And in the day that they fell, whoever reads Genesis iii., will see, "they found out," not one, but "many inventions." This text, therefore, in its obvious meaning, teaches both the original uprightness and subsequent fall of man.

From all these texts it manifestly appears, (1.) That man was created in the image of God. (2.) That this image consisted, not only in his rational and immortal nature, and his dominion over the creatures, but also in knowledge, actual knowledge, both of God and of his works; in the right state of his intellectual powers, and in love, which is true holiness.

"Objection 3. But do we not derive from Adam a moral taint and infection, whereby we have a natural propensity to sin?"

"I answer: We have many natural appetites and passions,

HARVARD-YENCHING-UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

which, if they grow irregular, become sinful. But this does not amount to a natural propensity to sin." (Page 186.) But is not pride sin? Is not idolatry sin? And is it not idolatry, to "love the creature more than the Creator?" Is not revenge sin? Is it not sin to "look upon a woman," so as "to lust after her?" And have not all men a natural propensity to these things? They have all, then, a natural propensity to sin. Nevertheless, this propensity is not necessary, if by necessary you mean irresistible. We can resist and conquer it too, by the grace which is ever at hand.

This propensity to pride, to revenge, to idolatry, (call it taint, or anything,) cannot be pleasing to God, who yet in fact does permit that it should descend from Adam to his latest posterity. And "we can neither help nor hinder" its descending to us. Indeed we can heap up plausible arguments to prove the impossibility of it: But I feel it, and the argument drops. Bring ever so many proofs that there can be no such thing as motion: I move, and they vanish away.

"But nature cannot be morally corrupted, but by the choice of a moral agent." (Page 187.) You may play upon words as long as you please; but still I hold this fast: I (and you too, whether you will own it or no) am inclined, and was ever since I can remember, antecedently to any choice of my own, to pride, revenge, idolatry. If you will not call these moral corruptions, call them just what you will; but the fact I am as well assured of, as that I have any memory or understanding.

"But some have attempted to explain this intricate affair." (Page 188.) I do not commend their wisdom. I do not attempt to explain even how I, at this moment, stretch out my hand, or move my finger.

One more of your assertions I must not pass over. "It is absurd to say, infection is derived from Adam, independent of the will of God; and to say, it is by his will, is to make him the author of the pollution." (Page 189.)

We answer: It is not derived from Adam, independent of the will of God; that is, his permissive will. But our allowing this, does not make him the author of the pollution.

"Objection 4. But do not the vices of parents often infect their children?" (Pages 190, 191.)

I think we cannot deny it.

"Objection 5. How can we account for children's beginning

so soon to sin, but by supposing they have a natural propensity to it?

“I answer: Who can tell how soon they begin?” (Page 192.) Then they begin, when they first show wrong tempers; such as plain, undeniable frowardness, revenge, self-will; which is as soon as they have any exercise of reason. So that the use of reason, and the abuse, generally commence and grow up together. As soon as their faculties appear at all, they appear to be disordered; the wrong state of their powers being easily inferred from their continual wrong application of them.

“But if parents were wise and virtuous themselves, and then endeavoured to bring up their children virtuously, there would be less wickedness in the world.” There would: But this does not reach the point; nor, that “undisciplined children contract bad habits.” I have known wise and virtuous parents who did earnestly labour to bring up their children virtuously; and disciplined them with all possible care, from the very first dawn of reason; yet these very children showed bad tempers before it was possible they should “contract bad habits.” They daily evidenced the wrong state of all their faculties, both of their understanding, will, and affections; just contrary both to the examples and instructions of all that were round about them. Here, then, these wrong tempers were not owing to “the fault of careless or ungodly parents;” nor could be rationally accounted for, but by supposing those children to have a natural propensity to evil.

It is indeed a general rule, “Train up a child in the way he should go: And when he is old, he will not depart from it:” (Prov. xxii. 6:) And there is much truth in that observation, “Foolishness is bound in the heart of a child; but the rod of correction shall drive it far from him:” (Verse 15:) That is, prudent correction is the most probable means which you can use to remove that foolishness. Yet this no way contradicts, what is matter of daily experience, that we have a natural propensity to evil. Nay, the latter of these texts strongly confirms it; for if there be no such propensity, how comes “foolishness” (that is, wickedness, in the language of Solomon) to be “bound in the heart of a child?” of every child, of children in general, as the phrase manifestly imports? It is not from education here: It is supposed to be antecedent to education, whether good or bad. “O, foolishness means only strong appetite.” (Page 193.) Yes,

WAMPADAHO 3351

strong appetite to evil; otherwise it would not call for "the rod of correction," or need to be "driven far from him."

"Objection 6. Might not Adam's posterity be said to sin in him, as Levi is said to 'pay tithes in Abraham?' (Heb. vii. 9.)"

If the querist means, not to prove a doctrine already proved, but only to illustrate one expression by another, your answer, that "it is a bold figure," (page 195,) does not at all affect him. It is so; but still it may be pertinently cited to illustrate a similar expression.

"Objection 7. 'But there is a law in our members which wars against the law of our minds, and brings us into captivity to the law of sin and death.' (Rom. vii. 23.) And does not this prove, that we come into the world with sinful propensities?" (Page 199.)

You answer, (1.) "If we come into the world with them, they are natural; but if natural, necessary; and if necessary, then no sin." (Page 200.)

If the consequence were good, with regard to what is so natural and necessary as to be irresistible, yet certainly it is not good with regard to those propensities which we may both resist and conquer.

You answer, (2.) "The Apostle does not in this chapter speak of any man as he comes into the world, but as he is afterward depraved and corrupted by his own wicked choice."

Where is the proof? How does it appear that he does not speak of men corrupted both by choice and by nature?

You answer, (3.) "He does not speak of himself, or any regenerate man, but of a Jew under the power of sin." (*Ibid.*) Nay, your argument proves, he does not speak of any Jew; for in order to prove, "the Apostle does not speak of himself," you say, "The persons of whom he speaks were, 'before the commandment came,' that is, before they came under the law, 'once without the law.' But the Apostle never was 'without the law.'" No, nor any Jew. "For he was born and continued 'under the law' till he was a Christian." So did all the Jews as well as he,— "and therefore it cannot be true, that he," or any Jew whatever, "was 'without the law' before he came under it." So you have clearly proved, that the Apostle does not in this passage speak of any Jew at all.

But why do you think he does speak of Jews? nay, of them only? It "appears," you say, "from verse 1, 'I speak to them that know the law.' For the Gentiles never were 'under the

law." Yes, they were : All the Gentiles who were "convinced of sin" were "under the law" in the sense here spoken of, under the condemning power of the law "written in their hearts;" for transgressing which they were under the wrath of God. And this whole chapter, from verses 7 to 24, describes the state of all those, Jews or Gentiles, who saw and felt the wickedness both of their hearts and lives, and groaned to be delivered from it.

Many passages in your paraphrase on the former part of this chapter are liable to much exception; but as they do not immediately touch the point in question, I pass on to the latter part:—

"Verse 14: I am 'carnal, sold under sin.' He means a willing slavery." (Page 216.) Quite the contrary; as appears from the very next words: "For that which I do, I allow not: For what I would, I do not; but what I hate, that I do." "What I hate;" not barely, "what my reason disapproves;" but what I really detest and abhor, yet cannot help.

"Verse 17: 'Now then, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.' It is my sinful propensities, my indulged appetites and passions." (Page 217.) True; but those propensities were antecedent to that indulgence.

"But the Apostle cannot mean, that there is something in man which makes him sin whether he will or no; for then it would not be sin at all." Experience explains his meaning. I have felt in me, a thousand times, something which made me transgress God's law, whether I would or no. Yet I dare not say, that "transgression of the law" was "no sin at all."

Verse 18: "For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh," (not my "fleshy appetites" only, but my whole nature while unrenewed,) "dwelleth no good thing. For to will" indeed "is present with me;" not barely "that natural faculty, the will," but an actual will to do good; as evidently appears from the following words: "But how to perform that which is good I find not:" I have the desire, but not the power.

Verse 19: "For the good that I would,"—that I desire and choose,— "I do not; but the evil which I would not,"—which I hate,— "that I do."

Verse 20: "Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I, but sin that dwelleth in me;" but "the prevalency of sensual affections," (page 218,) yea, sinful tempers of every kind, "settled and ruling in my heart," both by nature and habit.

Verse 21: "I find then that when I would do good," when I

choose and earnestly desire it, I cannot; "evil is present with me;" as it were, gets in between.

"Verse 22: 'For I delight in the law of God, after the inward man:.' My mind, my conscience approves it.

"Verse 23: 'But I see another law in my members, which warreth against the law in my mind:.' Another principle of action, which fights against my reason and conscience, 'and bringeth me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members:.' Which captivates and enslaves me to the principle of wickedness." (Page 219.) (Strange language for you to use!) "Seated in the lusts of the flesh:." Seated indeed in all my tempers, passions, and appetites, which are the several members of "the old man."

"O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" (Verse 24.) He is under the power of such passions as his own reason disapproves, but is too weak to conquer; and, N. B., being a Jew, he stands condemned to eternal death by the law. How shall such a wretched Jew be delivered from sinful lusts, and the curse of the law?" Did, then, none but a Jew ever cry out, under the burden of sin, "Wretched man that I am?" Are none but Jews "under the power of such passions as their own reason disapproves, but is too weak to conquer?" And does the law of God condemn to eternal death no sinners beside Jews? Do not Christians also (in the wide sense of the word) groan to be delivered "from the body of this death?" With what truth, with what sense, can you restrain this passage to a Jew any more than to a Turk?

I cannot but observe, upon the whole, the question is, Does not Rom. vii. 23, show that we come into the world with sinful propensities? (This is all that is pertinent in the objection awkwardly proposed, page 199.) But instead of keeping to this, you spend above twenty pages in proving that this chapter does not describe a regenerate person! It may, or it may not; but this does not touch the question: Do not men come into the world with sinful propensities?

We have, undoubtedly, an additional proof that they do, in the words of Jeremiah: "'The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked; who can know it?'" (xvii. 9.)" (Page 224.) On this you descant: (One instance of a thousand of your artful manner of declaiming, in order to forestal the reader's judgment, and "deceive the hearts of the simple:.")

"Christians, too generally neglecting the study of the Scripture, content themselves with a few scraps, which, though wrong understood, they make the test of truth, in contradiction to the whole tenor of Revelation. Thus this text has been misapplied to prove that every man's heart is so desperately wicked, that no man can know how wicked his heart is." O what *πιθανολογια*, "persuasiveness of speech!" After reading this, I was much inclined to believe, without going a step further, that this text had been "generally misunderstood." I thought, Probably it has been misapplied, and does not assert that every man's "heart is desperately wicked." But no sooner did I read over the very verses you cite, than the clear light appeared again. "'Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and whose heart departeth from the Lord.' (Verse 5.)" (Page 225.) That *man*, whom we are not to trust in, means man in general, cannot be denied. After repeating the intermediate verses, you yourself add, "He subjoins a reason, which demonstrates the error of trusting in man: 'The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked; who can know it?' (Verse 9.) This text, therefore, does not mean, Who can know his own heart, but another's?" Whether it means one or both, it positively asserts, that "the heart" of man, of men in general, of every man, is "desperately wicked." Therefore, as to the main point contained therein, "Christians do not understand it wrong;" (page 224;) neither misapply it at all.

When I say, "I feel I have a 'wicked heart,'" (another thing which you do not understand,) "I mean this: I feel much pride remaining in my heart, much self-will, much unbelief." (Page 225.) Now, I really believe pride, and self-will, and unbelief to be essentially wicked tempers. Therefore, in whatever heart they remain, (and they remain in yours as well as mine,) that is a "wicked heart."

After a long pause, you return to the seventh of the Romans, and affirm: "We cannot, from anything in that chapter, infer, that we came into the world with sinful dispositions derived from Adam; for the Apostle says nothing about Adam." (Page 229.) He had said enough in the fifth chapter of the cause: Here he only describes the effect; the state of those who are now "brought to the birth;" but "there is not" yet "strength to bring forth."

"Nor can we infer from hence, that any man sins through

WAMPA DAHO 8.651

a principle which it was never in his power to command ; for then it would be no sin." Upon this I would only ask, Are you assured that no man transgresses God's law (whether you will call it sin or not) through a principle which it was never in his power to command ; at least, not for any time together ? Every passionate man can confute you in this. He has sad experience of the contrary.

To those objections which you have, in some sort, answered, you subjoin the following questions :—

"1. Is not the doctrine of original sin necessary to account for the being of so much wickedness in the world ?"

You answer, "Adam's nature, it is allowed, was not sinful ; and yet he sinned. Therefore this doctrine is no more necessary to account for the wickedness of the world than to account for Adam's sin." (Page 231.) Yes, it is. I can account for one man's sinning, or a hundred, or even half mankind, suppose they were evenly poised between vice and virtue, from their own choice, which might turn one way or the other : But I cannot possibly, on this supposition, account for the general wickedness of mankind in all ages and nations.

Again : "If men were never drawn into sin any other way than as Adam was, namely, by temptations offered from without, there might be something in this answer ; but there are numberless instances of men sinning, though no temptation is offered from without. It is necessary, therefore, some other account should be given of their sinning, than of Adam's. And how to account for the universal spread of sin over the whole world without one exception, if there were no corruption in their common head, would be an insurmountable difficulty." (*Jennings's Vindication*, p. 110.)

"2. How, then, are we born into the world ?"

You answer, "As void of actual knowledge as the brutes." (*Taylor's Doctrine, &c.*, p. 232.)

And can you really imagine that text, "Vain man would be wise," (evidently spoken of man in general,) "though a man be born like a wild ass's colt," (Job xi. 12,) implies no more than, "Men are born void of actual knowledge ?" Do we need inspiration to make this discovery, that a new-born child has no actual knowledge ? Is man compared to a "wild ass," of all animals the most stupid, to teach us no more than this ? "yea, a wild ass's colt ?" Does not this intimate anything of

untractableness, sullenness, stubbornness, perverseness? "How keenly is the comparison pointed! Like the 'ass;' an animal stupid even to a proverb: Like the 'ass's colt;' which must be still more egregiously stupid than its dam: Like the 'wild ass's colt;' which is not only blockish, but stubborn and refractory; neither has valuable qualities by nature, nor will easily receive them by discipline. The image in the original is yet more strongly touched. The particle 'like' is not in the Hebrew, 'Born a wild ass's colt;' or, as we should say in English, a mere 'wild ass's colt.'" (*Theron and Aspasio*, Dial. 13.)

Yes, "we are born with many sensual appetites and passions; but every one of these are in themselves good." I grant all the appetites and passions originally implanted in our nature were good in themselves: But are all that now exist in us good? "If not, they become evil only by excess or abuse." First, this may be doubted. I do not know that love of praise, of power, of money, become evil only by abuse. I am afraid these and other passions, which we have had from our infancy, are evil "in themselves." But be that as it may, in how few do we find even the more innocent passions and appetites clear of excess or abuse! "But all that is wrong in them is from habit." This cannot be allowed as universally true. The little children of wise and pious parents have not yet contracted ill habits; yet before they can go alone, they show such passions as are palpably excessive, if not evil in themselves.

But whatever they are in themselves, here is the "grand difficulty, of which you give us no manner of solution: Whence comes it to pass, that those appetites and passions which, no doubt, were at first kindly implanted in our nature by a holy God, are now become so excessive or irregular, that no one man, from the beginning of the world, has so resisted them as to keep himself pure and innocent?"

"But without these appetites and passions, our nature would be defective, sluggish, or unarmed. Nor is there any one of them which we can at present spare." We could very well spare the excess and irregularity of them all; and, possibly, some of the passions themselves, as love of praise, and love of revenge: The love of God would more than supply the place of both. Neither does it suffer us to be sluggish or inactive; nor does calm Christian fortitude leave us unarmed against any danger which can occur. "But our reason would have nothing to struggle

NANPA IDAHO 3351

with." (Page 233.) O yes; not only all our reason, but all the grace we have received, has enough to struggle with, even when we do not "wrestle with flesh and blood." We are still abundantly "exercised" by "principalities, and powers, and spiritual wickedness in high places."

"On the other hand, we are born with rational powers which grow gradually capable of the most useful knowledge. And we under the gospel have clear ideas of the divine perfections; we see our duty, and the most cogent reasons to perform it." This sounds well. But will knowledge balance passion? Or are rational powers a counterpoise to sensual appetites? Will clear ideas deliver men from lust or vanity? or seeing the duty to love our enemies, enable us to practise it? What are cogent reasons opposed to covetousness or ambition? A thread of tow that has touched the fire. "But the Spirit of God is promised for our assistance." Nay, but what need of Him, upon your scheme? Man is sufficient for himself. "He that glorieth," on this hypothesis, must "glory" in himself, not "in the Lord."

3. "How far is our present state the same with that of Adam in paradise?"

I suppose "our mental capacities are the same as Adam's; only that some are above, some below, his standard. Probably there are many in the world much below Adam in rational endowments: But possibly the force and acuteness of understanding was much greater in our Sir Isaac Newton than in Adam." (Page 235.)

I do not apprehend this requires any answer. He that can believe it, let him believe it.

"We are next to inquire upon what true grounds those parts of religion stand, which the Schoolmen have founded upon the doctrine of original sin, particularly the two grand articles of *Redemption* and *Regeneration*."

In what century did the Schoolmen write? how long before St. Augustine,—to go no higher? A sad specimen this of "the honesty and impartiality with which you deliver your sentiments!"

I. REDEMPTION.

"Our fall, corruption, and apostasy in Adam, has been made the reason why the Son of God came into the world, and 'gave himself a ransom' for us."

And undoubtedly it is the reason. Accordingly, the very first promise of the Redeemer was given presently after the fall; and given with a manifest reference to those evils which came on all men through Adam's transgression. Nor does it appear from any scripture, that he would have come into the world at all, had not "all men died in Adam."

You yourself allow, "the Apostle affirms, (Rom. v. 18, 19,) that by 'the righteousness and obedience of Christ,' all men are delivered from the condemnation and sentence they came under through Adam's disobedience; and that thus far the redemption by Christ stands in connexion with Adam's transgression." (Page 238.)

"But the redemption by Christ extends far beyond the consequences of Adam's transgression." It does. Men receive far greater blessings by Christ, than those they lost by Adam. But this does not prove, that our fall in Adam is not the ground of our redemption by Christ.

Let us once more consider the text itself: "But not as the offence, so is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace," (the blessing which flows from the mere mercy of God,) "which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many." (Rom. v. 15.) "For not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift; for the judgment was by one offence to condemnation; but the free gift is of many offences unto justification." (Verse 16.) In this respect, First, the free gift by Christ "hath abounded much more" than the loss by Adam. And in this, Secondly, "If by one man's offence, *death*" spiritual and temporal, leading to death eternal, "*reigned* by one" over his whole posterity; "much more they who receive the abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness," the free gift of justification and sanctification, "shall *reign* in life" everlasting, "by one, Jesus Christ." (Verse 17.) Let any one who calmly and impartially reads this passage, judge if this be not the plain, natural meaning of it.

But let us now observe your comment upon it: "Here the Apostle asserts a grace of God, which already 'hath abounded,' beyond the effects of Adam's sin upon us." (Page 239.) It has, upon them that are justified and sanctified; but not upon all mankind. "And which has respect, not to his one offence,"—(not to that only,)—"but also to the 'many offences' which men have personally committed: Not

to the '*death*' which '*reigned*' by him." Yes, verily; but over and above the removal of this, it hath also respect "to the '*life*' in which 'they who receive' the '*abounding grace*' shall '*reign*' with him for ever."

Thus far you have proved just nothing. But you go on: "The death consequent on Adam's sin is reversed by the redemption in Christ. But this is not the whole end of it by far. The grand reason and end of redemption is, '*the grace of God, and the gift by grace.*'" (Page 239.) Infallibly it is; but this is not a different thing, but precisely the same with the "*free gift.*" Consequently, your whole structure raised on the supposition of that difference is a mere castle in the air. But if "*the gift by grace,*" and "*the free gift,*" are the very same thing, and if "*the gift by grace*" is "*the grand reason and end of redemption,*" then our fall in Adam, to which you allow "*the free gift*" directly refers, is "*the reason of Christ's coming into the world.*"

"But the Scriptures of the New Testament (excepting Rom. v. 12-19, and 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22) always assign the actual wickedness of mankind as the reason of Christ's coming into the world." (Page 240.) They generally do assign this,—their outward and inward wickedness. But this does not exclude the wickedness of their nature, springing from their fall in Adam. Rather this, which is expressed in those two places at least, is pre-supposed in all places; particularly in the beginning of the Epistle to the Romans, where he describes the enormous wickedness both of the Jews and Gentiles. It is true "he begins his discourse with an account of the actual transgressions of the idolatrous Gentiles." (Page 166, &c.) Afterwards, (chap. iii.,) he treats of the depravity and corruption of all mankind; and then proceeds (chap. v.) to show, that we are all "*made sinners by Adam,*" and that "*by his offence judgment is come upon all men to condemnation.*" The Apostle's method is clear and natural. He begins with that which is most obvious, even actual sin; and then proceeds to speak of original sin, as the joint cause of the necessity of redemption for all men. But which way can we infer, that because he begins with the mention of actual sins, in order to demonstrate the necessity of redemption, therefore he excludes original out of the account? Neither can we infer, that because "it is not expressly mentioned in other texts, therefore it is not implied." (Page 241.)

“But the Redeemer himself saith not one word of redeeming us from the corruption of nature derived from Adam. And seeing he spake exactly according to the commission which the Father gave him, we may safely conclude, it was no part of his commission to preach the doctrine of original sin.’ (Page 242.) Just as safely may we conclude, that it was no part of his commission to teach and make known to men the ‘many things’ which he ‘had to say to’ his Apostles before his death, which they ‘could not’ then ‘bear;’ (John xvi. 12;) but which, according to his promise, he afterward taught them by his Spirit, and by them to the world. It makes no difference as to the ground of our faith, whether a doctrine was delivered by Christ himself, or by his Apostles; and whether it be written in any of the four Gospels, or of the divine Epistles. There is only this difference: The Epistles were wrote after the resurrection and ascension of Christ; therefore, after the full commencement of the gospel dispensation; whereas the discourses of Christ recorded in the Gospels were delivered before the gospel dispensation was properly begun; therefore we are to look for the peculiar doctrines of Christ rather in the Epistles than in the Gospels. However, Christ did speak of this, and referred to it more than once, during his personal ministry, particularly in his discourse with Nicodemus, and Matt. xxiii. But it is not surprising that he did not speak so largely of redeeming us from sin, original or actual, by the price of his blood, before that price was actually paid, as the Apostles did afterward. He considered the littleness of their knowledge, with the violence of their prejudices; therefore we have no cause to be surprised that no more is said on this head in those discourses which Christ delivered before his death. But to us he has told it plainly, and we do find the doctrines of original sin, and redemption from it by Jesus Christ, distinguished emphatically in almost every page of the inspired Epistles.” (*Jennings’s Vindication*, page 116, &c.)

To sum up this: 1. Christ speaks very sparingly of many things, whereof his Apostles have spoken largely. 2. Yet he does speak of the corruption of our nature, (which St. Paul expressly tells us is derived from Adam,) particularly in the 23d of St. Matthew, and the 3d of St. John. 3. Wherever he speaks of “saving that which was lost,” he in effect speaks of this; especially Matt. xviii. 11, where he mentions “little children” as

lost; which could not be by actual sin. 4. There was the less need of our Lord's speaking much on this head, because it was so fully declared in the Old Testament, and was not questioned by any of those false teachers against whom he was chiefly concerned to warn his disciples.

You add: "It has been delivered as a fundamental truth, that no man will come to Christ, the Second Adam, who is not first thoroughly convinced of the several things he lost in the first Adam." (*Taylor's Doctrine, &c.*, p. 243.) This is a fundamental truth; none will come to Christ as a Redeemer until he is thoroughly convinced he wants a Redeemer. No man will ever come to him as a Saviour, till he knows and feels himself a lost sinner. None will come to the "Physician" but "they that are sick," and are thoroughly sensible of it; that are deeply convinced of their sinful tempers, as well as sinful words and actions. And these tempers, they well know, were antecedent to their choice, and came into the world with them. So far "every man who comes to Christ is first convinced of the several things he lost by Adam;" though he may not clearly know the source of that corruption which he sees and feels in his own heart and life. "But why does our Lord never mention Adam, or the corruption of our nature through him?" He does mention this corruption, and he presupposes it in all his public discourses. He does not mention it largely and explicitly, for the reasons above recited. "But the Apostles are wholly silent on this head, in their sermons recorded in the Acts, and in their Epistles too." (Pages 243, 244.) Are they wholly silent in their Epistles? This is a violent mistake. And as to their sermons, it may be observed, 1. That we have not one whole sermon of any one Apostle recorded in the Acts; nor, it may be, the twentieth part of one. 2. That it was not needful for them to prove what none of their hearers denied: No, not even the Heathens; even these allowed the corruption of human nature. Even these received it as an undeniable fact,

Vitiis nemo sine nascitur:

"No man is born without vices."

These acknowledged, (as Seneca expresses,) *Omnia in omnibus vitia sunt*: "All vices are in all men." These saw there were hardly any good men to be found upon the face of the earth; and openly testified it.

*Rari quippe boni ; numero vix sunt totidem quot
Thebarum portæ, vel divitis ostia Nili :*

“The good lie scatter'd in this barren soil,
Few as the gates of Thebes, or mouths of Nile.”

They had also among them some faint account of the cause of that overflowing corruption. So Horace, immediately after he had asserted the fact,—

*Audax omnia perpeti
Gens humana ruit per vetitum nefas,—*

“Lawless and unrestrain'd, the human race
Rushes through all the paths of daring wickedness,”—

glances at the cause of it, in their fabulous manner:—

*Audax Japeti genus
Ignem fraude malâ gentibus intulit;
Post ignem æthered domo
Subductum, macies, et nova febrium
Terris incubuit cohors:
Semotique prius tarda necessitas
Lethi corripuit gradum.*

“Prometheus first provok'd the heavenly Sire,
Purloning Jupiter's authentic fire:
Evil, from hence derived, and brooding pain,
And strange disease, with all the ghastly train,
Pour'd in upon the wretched sons of men:
While hasty Fate quicken'd the lingering pace
Of distant death, unveil'd the monster's face,
And gave into his hands our whole devoted race.”

I observe, 3. It was neither needful nor proper for an Apostle, in his first sermon to a congregation wholly unawakened, to descant upon original sin. No man of common sense would do it now. Were I to preach to a certain congregation at Norwich, I should not say one word of Adam, but endeavour to show them that their lives, and therefore their hearts, were corrupt and abominable before God.

You conclude this head: “Guilt imputed is imaginary guilt, and so no object of redemption.” I dare not say so as to my own particular. I pray God, of his tender mercy, to free me from this and all other guilt, “through the redemption which is in Jesus Christ!”

II. REGENERATION.

“Why must we be ‘born again?’” (Page 245.) You subjoin the common, but, as you suppose, absurd, answer:

“Because we are ‘born in sin;’ nature is averse to all good, and inclined to all evil : Therefore we must be born again, before we can please God.”

In order to confute this, you assert, “Then it cannot be our duty to be born again ; nor, consequently, our fault if we are not ; because it is not in our power.” It is, by grace ; though not by nature : By this we may all be born again. Therefore it is our duty ; and if we fall short herein, it is our own fault.

“But being born again does really signify, the gaining those habits of virtue which make us children of God.” (Page 246.) Then St. Paul ought to have said, not, “Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus ;” but, “Ye are all the children of God” by gaining habits of virtue !

Nay, but, according to the whole tenor of Scripture, the being born again does really signify the being inwardly changed by the almighty operation of the Spirit of God ; changed from sin to holiness ; renewed in the image of Him that created us. And why must we be so changed ? Because “without holiness no man shall see the Lord ;” and because, without this change, all our endeavours after holiness are ineffectual. God hath indeed “endowed us with understanding, and given us abundant means :” But our understanding is as insufficient for that end, as are the outward means, if not attended with inward power.

You proceed to explain yourself at large : “Christ informs us, that ‘except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God ;’” (page 246 ;) “and thereby teaches us,—

“1. That God hath erected a kingdom, united in and under him, for his glory, and men’s mutual happiness.” (Page 247.)

“2. He will finally admit none into it who are not disposed to relish and promote the happiness of it.” (Page 247.)

(Both these propositions I willingly allow.)

“3. All wickedness is quite contrary to the nature and end of this kingdom ; therefore no wicked men can be fit members of it, unless there be a full persuasion, that reverence, love, and obedience are due to God :” (I add, and unless it be actually paid him ; otherwise that persuasion but increases our condemnation :) “Unless his favour is preferred before all other enjoyments whatsoever ; unless there be a delight in the worship of God, and in converse with him ; unless every appetite be brought into subjection to reason ;” (add, and reason to the

word of God;) "how can any man be fit to dwell with God, or to do him service in his kingdom?" (Page 248.)

"4. It is one thing to be born into God's creation, another to be born into his peculiar kingdom. In order to an admittance into his peculiar kingdom, it is not enough for an intelligent being to exist." (Pages 250, 251.) I do not know that. Perhaps it is not possible for God to create an intelligent being, without creating it duly subject to himself, that is, a subject of his peculiar kingdom. It is highly probable, the holy angels were subjects of his peculiar kingdom from the first moment of their existence. Therefore, the following peremptory assertion, and all of the like kind, are wholly groundless: "It is absolutely necessary, before any creature can be a subject of this, that it learn to employ and exercise its powers suitably to the nature of them." It is not necessary at all. In this sense, surely God "may do what He will with his own." He may bestow his own blessings as he pleases. "Is thine eye evil, because he is good?"

The premises then being gone, what becomes of the conclusion: "So that the being 'born' into God's peculiar kingdom depends upon a right use and application of our life and being, and is the privilege only of those wise men whose spirits attain to a habit of true holiness?"

This stands without any proof at all. At best, therefore, it is extremely doubtful. But it must appear extremely absurd to those who believe, God can create spirits both wise and holy; that he can stamp any creature with what measure of holiness he sees good, at the first moment of its existence.

The occasion of your running into this absurdity seems to be, that you stumbled at the very threshold. In the text under consideration, our Lord mentions two things,—the "new birth," and the "kingdom of God." These two your imagination blended into one; in consequence of which you run on with "born into his kingdom," (a phrase never used by our Lord, nor any of his Apostles,) and a heap of other crude expressions of the same kind, all betraying that confusedness of thought which alone could prevent your usual clearness of language.

Just in the same manner you go on: "Our first parents in Paradise were to form their minds to an habitual subjection to the law of God, without which they could not be received into his spiritual kingdom." (Pages 252, 253.) This runs upon the

same mistaken supposition, that God could not create them holy. Certainly he could and did; and from the very moment that they were created, their minds were in subjection to the law of God, and they were members of his spiritual kingdom.

“But if Adam was originally perfect in holiness,” (say, perfectly holy, made in the moral image of God,) “what occasion was there for any farther trial?” That there might be room for farther holiness and happiness. Entire holiness does not exclude growth; nor did the right state of all his faculties entitle him to that full reward which would have followed the right use of them.

“Upon the whole, regeneration, or gaining habits of holiness, takes in no part of the doctrine of original sin.” (Page 254.) But regeneration is not “gaining habits of holiness;” it is quite a different thing. It is not a natural, but a supernatural, change; and is just as different from the gradual “gaining habits,” as a child’s being born into the world is from his growing up into a man. The new birth is not, as you suppose, the progress, or the whole, of sanctification, but the beginning of it; as the natural birth is not the whole of life, but only the entrance upon it. He that “is born of a woman,” then begins to live a natural life; he that is “born of God,” then begins to live a spiritual. And if every man “born of a woman” had spiritual life already, he would not need to be “born of God.”

“However, I allow the Spirit of God assists our endeavours; but this does not suppose any naturalpravity of our minds.” (Page 255.) Does not his “quickenings,” then, suppose we were dead; his “opening our eyes” suppose we were blind; and his “creating us anew” imply something more than the assisting our endeavours? How very slender a part in sanctification will you allow to the Spirit of God! You seem very fearful of doing him too much honour, of taking from man the glory due to his name!

Accordingly, you say, “His aids are so far from supposing the previous inaptitude of our minds” (to the being born again), “that our previous desire of the Spirit’s assistance is the condition of our receiving it.” But who gave us that desire? Is it not God “that worketh in us to will,” to desire, as well as “to do?” His grace does accompany and follow our desires: But does it not also prevent, go before, them? After this we may ask and seek farther assistance; and, if we do, not otherwise, it is given.

I cannot but add a few words from Dr. Jennings: “Dr.

Taylor believes, 'the influence of the Spirit of God, to assist our sincere endeavours, is spoken of in the gospel, but never as supposing any natural pravity of our minds.' But certain it is, that Christ opposeth our being 'born of the Spirit,' to our being 'born of the flesh : ' 'That which is born of the flesh is flesh ; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.' (John iii. 6.) Therefore, the influence of the Spirit in regeneration supposeth something that we are 'born' with ; which makes such an influence necessary to our being 'born again.' And if this be not some natural pravity, let our author tell us what it is. It is plain it is not any ill habit afterward acquired ; for it is something that we are born with. And if to be 'born of the flesh,' means only 'to have the parts and powers of a man ;' and if these parts and powers are all 'pure and uncorrupted,' we have no need of any such influence of the Spirit to be superadded to our natural powers. Without this, our own sincere endeavours will suffice for attaining all habits of virtue." (*Jennings's Vindication*, p. 125.)

I proceed to your conclusion : " Is it not highly injurious to the God of our nature, whose hands have formed and fashioned us, to believe our nature is originally corrupted ?" (*Taylor's Doctrine, &c.*, p. 256.) It is ; but the charge falls not on us, but you. We do not believe " our nature is originally corrupted." It is you who believe this ; who believe our nature to be in the same state, moral and intellectual, as it originally was ! Highly injurious indeed is this supposition to the God of our nature. Did he originally give us such a nature as this ? so like that of a wild ass's colt ; so stupid, so stubborn, so intractable ; so prone to evil, averse to good ? Did his hands form and fashion us thus ? no wiser or better than men at present are ? If I believed this, — that men were originally what they are now, — if you could once convince me of this, I could not go so far as to be a Deist ; I must either be a Manichee or an Atheist. I must either believe there was an evil God, or that there was no God at all.

" But to disparage our nature is to disparage the work and gifts of God." (Page 257.) True ; but to describe the corruption of our nature as it is, is not disparaging the work of God. For that corruption is not his work. On the other hand, to say it is ; to say God created us as corrupt as we are now, with as weak an understanding and as perverse a will ; this is disparaging the work of God, and God himself, to some purpose !

"But doth not this doctrine teach you to transfer your wickedness and sin to a wrong cause? Whereas you ought to blame yourself alone, you lay the whole blame upon Adam." (Page 258.) I do not: I know God is willing to save me from all sin, both original and actual. Therefore, if I am not saved, I must lay the whole blame upon myself.

"But what good end does this doctrine promote?" The doctrine, that we are by nature "dead in sin," and therefore "children of wrath," promotes repentance, a true knowledge of ourselves; and thereby leads to faith in Christ, to a true knowledge of Christ crucified. And faith worketh love; and, by love, all holiness both of heart and life. Consequently, this doctrine promotes (nay, and is absolutely, indispensably necessary to promote) the whole of that religion which the Son of God lived and died to establish.

"We are told, indeed, that it promotes humility; but neither our Lord nor his Apostles, when inculcating humility, say a word about natural corruption." Supposing (not granting) that they did not, yet it cannot be, in the very nature of the thing, that any whose nature is corrupt should be humble, should know himself, without knowing that corruption.

"But what can be more destructive to virtue, than to represent sin as altogether unavoidable?" (Page 259.) This does not follow from the doctrine. Corrupt as we are, through almighty grace we may avoid all sin.

But it is destructive of virtue. For 'if we believe we are by nature worse than the brutes, what wonder if we act worse than brutes?' Yea, if we are so, what wonder if we act so? And this it is absolutely certain men do, whether they believe one way or the other; for they who do not believe this, live no better than those that do. Therefore, if "the generality of Christians have been the most wicked, lewd, bloody, and treacherous of all mankind," it is not owing to this belief. But, in truth, they have not been so; neither are they at this day. The generality of Christians, so called, are perhaps but little better, yet surely they are no worse, either in tempers or actions, than the rest of mankind. The generality of Jews, yea, of Turks and Pagans, are full as "lewd, bloody, and treacherous" as they.

You go on: "It is surprising that Christians" (you mean those of them who believe original sin) "have lost even a sense

Quote

of the beneficence of God, in giving them a rational nature." (Page 260.) Nay, surely, Christians have lost that rational nature itself, or they retain it to very little purpose, if "the generality of them are the most wicked, lewd, bloody, and treacherous of all mankind!" They ought "to be humbled" for yielding to those evil propensities, which, through the grace of God, they may conquer. And they who do conquer, ought to be continually "thanking God" for this and all his benefits.

With great decency you proceed: "Who can believe that to be a revelation from God, which teacheth so absurd a doctrine? I make no doubt, this, with other like principles, have filled our land with infidels." However, the gentlemen who disclaim these absurd principles, of original sin, redemption, and regeneration, may very easily convert those infidels; since there is scarce any room for contention left between them.

"Is not this doctrine hurtful to the power of godliness, as it diverts men from the heavenly and substantial truths of religion?" (Page 261.) Just the reverse. There is no possibility of the power of godliness without it. The power of godliness consists in the love of God and man; this is heavenly and substantial religion. But no man can possibly "love his neighbour as himself," till he loves God; and no man can possibly love God, till he truly believes in Christ; and no man truly believes in Christ, till he is deeply convinced of his own sinfulness, guiltiness, and helplessness. But this no man ever was, neither can be, who does not know he has a corrupt nature.

This doctrine, therefore, is the "most proper" of all others "to be instilled into a child:" That it is by nature a "child of wrath," under the guilt and under the power of sin; that it can be saved from wrath only by the merits, and sufferings, and love of the son of God; that it can be delivered from the power of sin only by the inspiration of his Holy Spirit; but that by his grace it may be renewed in the image of God, perfected in love, and made meet for glory.

But "must it not lessen the due love of parents to children, to believe they are the vilest creatures in the world?" (Pages 262, 263.) Far from it; if they know how God loves both them and theirs, vile and sinful as they are. And it is a certain fact, that no persons love their children more tenderly, than those who firmly believe this doctrine; and that none are more careful to "bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

But "how can young people 'remember' their 'Creator' without horror, if he has given them life under such deplorable circumstances?" They can remember him with pleasure, with earnest thankfulness, when they reflect "out of" what a "pit" he hath "brought them up;" and that if "sin abounded," both by nature and habit, "grace" did "much more abound."

You conclude: "Why should we subject our consciences to tales and fables, invented by Priests and Monks?" (Page 264.) This fable, as you term it, of original sin, could not be invented by Romish Priests or Monks, because it is by many ages older than either; yea, than Christianity itself.

I have now weighed, as my leisure would permit, all the arguments advanced in your Three Parts. And this I have done with continual prayer, that I might know "the truth as it is in Jesus." But still I see no ground to alter my sentiments touching the general corruption of human nature. Nor can I find any better or any other way of accounting for that general wickedness which has prevailed in all nations, and through all ages, nearly from the beginning of the world to this day.

LEWISHAM,
January 25, 1757.

PART III.

AN ANSWER TO DR. TAYLOR'S SUPPLEMENT.

You subjoin to your book a very large Supplement, in answer to Dr. Jennings and Dr. Watts. All that they have advanced, I am not engaged to defend; but such parts only as affect the merits of the cause.

You divide this part of your work into eight sections. The first treats

OF IMPUTED GUILT.

And here you roundly affirm, "No action is said in Scripture to be imputed to any person for righteousness or condemnation, but the proper act and deed of that person." (*Supplement*, page 7.)