

THE
GREAT CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE
OF
ORIGINAL SIN

BY

JONATHAN EDWARDS

Copyright (Public Domain)

www.reformedontheweb.com/home/.html

(Reformed on the Web)

464

THE

GREAT CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE

OF

ORIGINAL SIN

DEFENDED;

EVIDENCES OF ITS TRUTH PRODUCED,

ARGUMENTS TO THE CONTRARY ANSWERED,

Containing, in Particular,

**A REPLY TO THE OBJECTIONS OF
DR. JOHN TAYLOR,**

IN HIS BOOK, ENTITLED,

*“The Scripture-Doctrine of Original Sin Proposed to Free
and Candid Examination, etc.”*

ADVERTISEMENT,

**CONTAINING A BRIEF ACCOUNT OF THIS BOOK AND ITS
AUTHOR, BY THE FIRST EDITOR.**

THE Reverend Author of the following piece, was removed by death before its publication. But, ere his decrease, the copy was finished and brought to the press, and a number of sheets passed his own review. They

who were acquainted with the author, or know his just character, and have any taste for the serious theme, will want nothing to be said in recommendation of the ensuing tract, but only that Mr. Edwards wrote it.

Several valuable pieces on this subject have lately been published! upon the same side of the question. But he had no notice of so much as the very first of them, till he had wholly concluded what he had in view: nor has it been thought, that any thing already printed should supersede this work; being designed on a more extensive plan — comprising a variety; of arguments, and answers to many objections, that fell not in the way of the other worthy writers — and the whole done with a care of familiar method and language, as well as clear reasoning, accommodated very much to common capacities. It must be a sensible pleasure to every friend of truth, that so masterly a hand undertook a reply to Dr. Taylor; notwithstanding the various answers already given him, troth at home and abroad.

Since it has been thought unfit, that this posthumous book should go unattended with a respectful memorial of the author, it is hoped, the reader will candidly accept the following:

As he lived cheerfully resigned in all things to the will of Heaven, so he died, or rather, as the Scripture emphatically expresses it, in relation to the saint in Christ Jesus. he fell asleep, without the least appearance of pain, and with great calm of mind. Indeed, when he first perceived the symptoms upon him to be mortal, he is said to have been a little perplexed for a while, about the meaning of this mysterious conduct of Providence, in calling him out from his beloved privacy, to a public scene of action and influence, and then so suddenly, just upon his entrance into it, translating him from thence, in such a way, by mortality! However, he quickly got believing and composing views of the wisdom and goodness of God in this-surprising event: and readily yielded to the sovereign disposal of Heaven, with the most placid submission. Amidst the joy of faith, he departed this world, to go and see Jesus, whom his soul loved; to be with him, to behold his glory, and rejoice in his kingdom.

In person, he was tall of stature, and of a slender make. There was something extremely delicate in his constitution; which always obliged him to observe the exactest rules of temperance, and every method of cautious and prudent living. By such means he was helped to go through incessant

labors, and to bear up under much study, which, Solomon observes, is a weariness to the flesh. Perhaps never was a man more constantly retired from the world; giving himself to reading, and contemplation. And a wonder it was, that his feeble frame could subsist under such fatigues, daily repeated and so long continued. Yet upon occasion of some remark upon it by a friend, which was only a few months before his death, he told him, "He did not find but he was then as well able to bear the closest study, as he was thirty years before; and could go through the exercises of the pulpit with as little weariness or difficulty." In his youth he appeared healthy, and with a good degree of vivacity, but was never robust. In middle life, he appeared very much emaciated (I had almost said, mortified) by severe studies, and intense applications of thought. Hence his voice was a little languid, and too low for a large assembly; though much relieved and advantaged by a proper emphasis, just cadence, well-placed pauses, and great distinctness in pronunciation.

He had a piercing eye, the truest index of the mind. His aspect and mine had a mixture of severity and pleasantry. He had a natural turn for gravity and sedateness; ever contemplative and in conversation usually reserved, but always observant of a genuine decorum in his deportment; free from sullen supercilious, and contemptuous airs, and without any appearance of ostentation, levity, or vanity. As to imagination, he had enough of it for a great and good man: but the gaities of a luxuriant fancy, so captivating to many, were what he neither affected himself, nor was much delighted with in others. He had a natural steadiness of temper, and fortitude of mind which being sanctified by the Spirit of God, was ever of vast advantage to him, to carry trim through difficult services, and support him under trying afflictions in the course of his life. Personal injuries he bore with a becoming meekness and patience, and a disposition to forgiveness. The humility, modesty, and serenity of his behavior, much endeared him to his acquaintance and made him appear amiable in the eyes of such as had the privilege of conversing with him. He was a true and faithful friend and showed much of a disinterested benevolence to his neighbor. The several relations sustained by him, he adorned with an exemplary conduct, and was solicitous to fill every station with its proper duty. He kept up an extensive correspondence, with ministers and others, in various parts, and his letters always contained some significant and valuable communications.

In his private walk, as a Christian, he appeared an example of truly rational, consistent, uniform religion and virtue: a shining instance of the power and efficacy, of that holy faith, to which he was so firmly attached, and of which he was so strenuous a defender. He exhibited much of spirituality, and a heavenly bent of soul. In him one saw the loveliest appearance, a rare assemblage of christian graces, united with the richest gifts, and mutually subserving and recommending one another.

As a scholar; his intellectual furniture exceeded what is common, considering the disadvantages we labor under in this remote corner of the world. He very early discovered a genius above the ordinary size; which gradually ripened and expanded, by daily exertion and application. He was remarkable for the penetration and extent of his understanding, for his powers of criticism and accurate distinction, quickness of thought, solidity of judgment, and force of reasoning; which made him an acute and strong disputant. By nature he was formed for a logician, and a metaphysician; but by speculation, observation, and converse, greatly improved. He had a good insight into the whole circle of liberal arts and sciences; possessed a very valuable stock of classic learning, philosophy, mathematics, history, chronology, etc. By the blessing of God on his indefatigable studiousness, to the last, he was constantly treasuring up useful knowledge, both human and divine.

Thus he appears uncommonly accomplished for the arduous and momentous province to which he was finally called. And had Heaven indulged us with the continuance of his precious life, we have reason to think, he would have graced his new station, and been a signal blessing to the college, and therein extensively served his generation, according to the will of God.

After all, it must be owned, divinity was his favourite study; and the ministry, his most delightful employment. Among the luminaries of the church, in these American regions, he was justly reputed a star of the first magnitude thoroughly versed in all the branches of theology, didactic, polemic, casuistic, experimental, and practical. In point of divine knowledge and skill, he had few equals, and perhaps no superior, at least in these parts. On the maturest examination of the different schemes of principles, obtaining in the world, and on comparing them with the sacred

Scriptures, the oracles of God and the great standard of truth, he was a Protestant and a Calvinist in judgment, adhering to the main articles of the reformed religion with an unshaken firmness, and with a fervent zeal, but tempered with charity and candour, and governed by discretion. He seemed as little as most men under the bias of education, or the influence of bigotry. As to practical and vital Christianity, no man appeared to have a better acquaintance with its nature and importance, or to understand true religion, and feel its power, more than he, which made him an excellently fit guide to inquiring souls, and qualified him to guard them against all false religion. His internal sense of the intercourse between God and souls, being brought by him to the severe test of reason and revelation, preserved him, both in sentiment and conduct, from the least tincture of enthusiasm. The accomplished divine enters deep into his character.

As a preacher, he was judicious, solid, and instructive. Seldom was he known to bring controversy into the pulpit; or to handle any subject in the nicer modes and forms of scholastic dissertation. His sermons, in general, seemed to vary exceedingly from his controversial compositions. In his preaching, usually, all was plain, familiar, sententious, practical, and very distant from any affectation of appearing the great man, or displaying his extraordinary abilities as a scholar. But still he ever preserved the character of a skillful and thorough divine. The common themes of his ministry were the most weighty and profitable; and especially, the great truths of the gospel of Christ, in which he himself lived by faith. His method in preaching was, first to apply to the understanding and judgment, laboring to enlighten and convince them, and then to persuade the will, engage the affections, and excite the active powers of the soul. His language was with propriety and purity, but with a noble negligence; nothing ornamented. Florid diction was not the beauty he preferred. His talents were of a superior kind. He regarded thoughts, rather than words. Precision of sentiment and clearness of expression are the principal characteristics of his pulpit style. Neither quick nor slow of speech, there was a certain pathos in his utterance, and such skill of address, as seldom failed to draw the attention, warm the hearts, and stimulate the consciences of the auditory. He studied to show himself approved unto God, a workman that needed not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth. And he was one who gave himself to prayer, as well as to the ministry of the word.

Agreeably it pleased God to put great honor upon him, by crowning his labors with surprising successes, in the conversion of sinners, and the edification of saints, to the advancement of the kingdom and glory of God our Savior Jesus Christ.

As a writer, Mr. Edwards distinguished himself in controversy, to which he was called on a variety of occasions. Here the superiority of his genius eminently appeared. He knew to arrange his ideas in an exact method: and close application of mind, with the uncommon strength of his intellectual powers, enabled him in a manner to exhaust every subject he took under consideration. He diligently employed the latter part of his life in defending Christianity, both in its doctrinal and practical views, against the errors of the times. Besides his excellent writings in behalf of the power of godliness, which some years ago happily prevailed in many parts of the British America, he made a noble stand against enthusiasm and false religion, when it threatened to spread, by his incomparable treatise upon religious affections. And more lately in opposition to Pelagian, Arminian, and other false principles, he published a very elaborate Treatise upon the Liberty of the human Will. A volume, that has procured him the elogy of eminent divines abroad Several professors of divinity in the Dutch universities very lately sent him their thanks, for the assistance he had given them in their inquiry into some controverted points; having carried his own further than any author they had ever seen. And now this volume of his, on the great Christian doctrine of original sin, is presented to public view; which, though studiously adapted to lower capacities, yet carries in it the evident traces of his great genius, and seems with superior force of argument to have entirely baffled the opponent.

His writings will perpetuate his memory, and make his name blossom in the dust. The blessing of Heaven attending the perusal of them, will make them effectually conducive to the glory of God, and the good of souls; which will brighten the author's crown, and add to his joy, in the day of future retribution.

THE AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

THE following Discourse is intended, not merely as an answer to any particular book written against the doctrine of Original Sin, but as a general defense of that great important doctrine. Nevertheless, I have in this defense taken notice of the main things said against this doctrine, by such of the more noted opposers of it as I have had opportunity to read: particularly those two late writers, Dr. Turnbull and Dr. Taylor, of Norwich; but especially the latter, in what he has published in those two books of his, the first entitled, *The Scripture-Doctrine of Original Sin proposed to free and candid Examination*, the other, his *Key to the Apostolic Writing, with a Paraphrase and Notes on the Epistle to the Romans*. I have closely attended to Dr. Taylor's Piece on Original Sin, in all its parts, and have endeavored that no one thing there said, of any consequence in this controversy, should pass unnoticed, or that any thing which has the appearance of an argument, in opposition to this doctrine, should be left unanswered. I look on the doctrine as of great importance, which every body will doubtless own it is, if it be true. For, if the case be such indeed, that all mankind are by nature in a state of total ruin, both with respect to the moral evil of which they are the subjects, and the afflictive evil to which they are exposed, the one as the consequence and punishment of the other; then, doubtless, the great salvation by CHRIST stands in direct relation to this ruin, as the remedy to the disease; and the whole gospel, or doctrine of salvation, must suppose it, and all real belief, or true notion of that gospel, must be built upon it. Therefore, as I think the doctrine is most certainly true and important, I hope, my attempting a vindication of it, will be candidly interpreted; and that what I have done towards its defense, will be impartially considered, by all that will give themselves the trouble to read the ensuing discourse: in which it is designed to examine every thing material throughout the Doctor's whole book, and many things in that other book, containing his *Key and Exposition on Romans*; as also many things written in opposition to this doctrine by some other modern authors. Moreover, my discourse being not only intended for an answer to Dr. Taylor, and other opposers of the doctrine of original sin, but for a general defense of that doctrine; producing the evidence of the truth of the doctrine, as well as answering objections made

against it, I hope this attempt of mine will not be thought needless, nor be altogether useless, notwithstanding other publications on the subject.

I would also hope that the extensiveness of the plan of the following treatise will excuse the length of it. And that when it is considered how much was absolutely requisite to the full executing of a design formed on such a plan; how much has been written against the doctrine of original sin, and with what plausibility; how strong the precludes of many are in favor of what is said in opposition to this doctrine — and that it cannot be expected, any thing short of a full consideration of almost every argument advanced by the main opposers, especially by this late and specious writer, Dr. Taylor, will satisfy many readers — how much must unavoidably be said in order to a full handling of the arguments in defense of the doctrine, and how important the doctrine must be, if true; I trust, the length of the following discourse will not be thought to exceed what the case really required. However, this must be left to the judgment of the intelligent and candid reader.

Stockbridge, May 26, 1757.

THE
GREAT CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE
OF
ORIGINAL SIN DEFENDED.

PART 1

Wherein Are Considered Some Evidences of Original Sin From Facts and Events, as Founded by Observation and Experience, Together With Representations and Testimonies of Holy Scripture, and the Confession and Assertion of Opposes.

CHAPTER 1.

The Evidence of Original Sin From What Appears in Fact of the Sinfulness of Mankind.

SECTION 1

All mankind constantly, in all ages without fail in any one instance, run into that moral evil, which is in effect their own utter and eternal perdition in a total privation of GOD'S favor, and suffering of his vengeance and wrath.

BY Original Sin, as the phrase has been most commonly used by divines, is meant the innate sinful depravity of the heart. But get when the doctrine of original sin is spoken of, it is vulgarly understood in that latitude, which includes not only the depravity of nature, but the imputation of Adam's first sin, or, in other words, the liableness or exposedness of Adam's Posterity, in the divine judgment, to partake of the punishment of that sin.

So far as I know, most of those who have held one of these, have maintained the other, and most of those who have opposed one, have opposed the other; both are opposed by the author chiefly attended to in the following discourse, in his book against original sin: and it may perhaps appear in our future consideration of the subject, that they are closely connected; that the arguments which prove the one establish the other, and that there are no more difficulties attending the allowing of one, than the other.

I shall, in the first place, consider this doctrine more especially with regard to the corruption of nature, and as we treat of this, the other will naturally come into consideration, in the prosecution of the discourse, as connected with it. As all moral qualities, all principles either of virtue or vice, lie in the disposition of the heart, I shall consider whether we have an evidence, that the heart of man is naturally of a corrupt and evil disposition. This is strenuously denied by many late writers, who are enemies to the doctrine of original sin, and particularly by Dr. Taylor.

The way we come by the idea of any such shine as disposition or tendency, is by observing what is constant or general in event, especially under a great variety of circumstances, and above all, when the effect or event continues the same through great and various opposition, much and manifold force and means used to the contrary not prevailing to hinder the effect. I do not know, that such a prevalence of effects is denied to be an evidence of prevailing tendency in causes and agents; or that it is expressly denied by the opposers of the doctrine of original sin, that if, in the course of events, it universally or generally proves that mankind are actually corrupt, this would be an evidence of a prior corrupt propensity in the world of mankind; whatever may be said by some, which, if taken with its plain consequences, may set in to imply a denial of this; which may be considered afterwards. But by many the fact is denied, that is, it is denied, that corruption and moral evil are commonly prevalent in the world: on the contrary, it is insisted on, that good preponderates, and that virtue has the ascendant.

To this purpose, Dr. Turnbull says, “With regard to the prevalence of vice in the world, men are apt to let their imagination run out upon all the robberies, piracies, murders, perjuries, frauds, massacres, assassinations

they have either heard of, or read in history thence concluding all mankind to be very wicked. As if a court of justice were a proper place to make an estimate of the morals of mankind, or an hospital of the healthfulness of a climate. But ought they not to consider, that the member of honest citizens and farmers far surpasses that of all sorts of criminals in any state, and that the innocent and kind actions of even criminals themselves surpass their crimes in numbers that it is the reality of crimes, in comparison of innocent or good actions, which engages our attention to them, and makes them to be recorded in history, while honest, generous domestic actions are overlooked, only because they are so common? as one great danger, or one month's sickness, shall become a frequently repeated story during a long life of health and safety. — Let not the vices of mankind be multiplied or magnified. Let us make a fair estimate of human life, and set over against the shocking, the astonishing instances of barbarity and wickedness that have been perpetrated in any age, not only the exceeding generous and brave actions with which history shines, but the prevailing innocency, goodnature, industry, felicity, and cheerfulness of the greater part of mankind at all times, and we shall not find reason to cry out, as objectors against Providence do on this occasion; that all men are vastly corrupt, and that there is hardly any such thing as virtue in the world. Upon a fair computation, the fact does indeed come out, that very great villages have been very uncommon in all ages, and looked upon as monstrous, so general is the sense and esteem of virtue." — It seems to be with a like view that Dr. Taylor says, "We must not take the measure of our health and enjoyments from a lazar-house, nor of our understanding from Bedlam, nor of our morals from a gaol." (P. 77. S.)

With respect to the propriety and pertinence of such a representation of things, and its force as to the consequence designed, hope we shall be better able to judge, and in some measure to determine, whether the natural disposition of the hearts of mankind be corrupt or not, when the things which follow have been considered. But for the greater clearness, it may be proper here to premise one consideration, that is of great Importance in this controversy, and is very much overlooked by the opposers of the doctrine of original sin in their disputing against it.

That it is to be looked upon as the true tendency of the innate disposition of man's heart, which appears to be its tendency, when we consider things

as they are in themselves, or in their own nature, without the interposition of divine grace. Thus, that state of man's nature, that disposition of the mind, is to be looked upon as evil and pernicious, which, as it is in itself, tends to extremely pernicious consequences, and would certainly end therein, were it not that the free mercy and kindness of God interposes to prevent that issue. It would be very strange if any should argue, that there is no evil tendency in the case, because the mere favor and compassion of the Most High may step in and oppose the tendency, and prevent the sad effect. Particularly, if there be any thing in the nature of man, whereby he has an universal unfailing tendency to that moral evil, which, according to the real nature and true demerit of things, as they are in themselves, implies his utter ruin, that must be looked upon as an evil tendency or propensity, however divine grace may interpose, to save him from deserted ruin, and to overrule things to an issue contrary to that which they tend to of themselves. Grace is sovereign, exercised according to the good pleasure of God, bringing good out of evil. The effect of it belongs not to the nature of things themselves, that otherwise have an ill tendency, any more than the remedy belongs to the disease; but is something altogether independent on it, introduced to oppose the natural tendency, and rever. the course of things. But the event to which things tend, according to their own demerit, and according to divine justice, is the event to which they tend in their own nature as Dr. T's own words fully imply, (Pref. to Par. on Romans p. 131.) "God alone (says he) can declare whether he will pardon or punish the ungodliness and unrighteousness of mankind, which is in ITS OWN NATURE punishable." Nothing is more precisely according to the truth of things, than divine justice: it weighs things in an even balance, it views and estimates things no otherwise than they are truly in their own nature. Therefore undoubtedly that which implies a tendency to ruin, according to the estimate of divine justice, does indeed imply such a tendency in its own nature.

And then it must be remembered, that it is a moral depravity we are speaking of; and therefore when we are considering whether such depravity do not appear by a tendency to a bad effect or issue, it is a moral tendency to such an issue, that is the thing to be taken into the account. A moral tendency or influence is by desert. Then may it be said, man's nature or state is attended with a pernicious or destructive

tendency, in a moral sense, when it tends to that which deserves misery and destruction. And therefore it equally shows the moral depravity of the nature of mankind in their present state, whether that nature be universally attended with an effectual tendency to destructive vengeance actually executed, or to their deserving misery and ruin, or their just exposed, to destruction, however that fatal consequence may be prevented by grace or whatever the actual event be.

One thing more is to be observed here, that the topic mainly insisted on by the opposers of the doctrine of original sin's is the justice of God, both in their objections against the imputation of Adam's sin, and also against its being so ordered, that men should come into the world with a corrupt and ruined nature, without having merited the displeasure of their Creator by any personal fault. But the latter is not repugnant to God's Justice, if men actually are born into the world with a tendency to sin, and to misery and ruin for their sin, which actually will be the consequence unless mere grace steps in and prevents it. If this be allowed, the argument from justice is given up: For it is to suppose, that their liableness to misery and ruin comes in a way of justice; otherwise there would be no need of the interposition of divine grace to save them. Justice alone would be sufficient security, if exercised, without grace. It is all one in this dispute about what is just and righteous, whether men are born in a miserable state, by a tendency to ruin, which actually follows, and that justly, or whether they are born in such a state as tends to a desert of ruin, which might justly follow, and would actually follow, did not grace prevent. For the controversy is not, That grace will do, but what justice misfit do.

I have been the more particular on this head, because it enervates many of the reasonings and conclusions by which Dr. T. makes out his scheme, in which he argues from that state which mankind are in lay divine grace, yea, which he himself supposes to be by divine grace; and yet not making any allowance for this, he from hence draws conclusions against what others suppose of the deplorable and ruined state mankind are in by the fall. Some of his arguments and conclusions to this effect, in order to be made good, must depend on such a supposition as this; — that God's dispensations of grace, are rectification's or amendments of his foregoing constitutions and proceedings, which were merely legal; as though the dispensations of grace, which succeed those of mere law, implied an

acknowledgment, that the preceding legal constitution would be unjust, if left as it was, or at least very hard dealing with mankind; and that the other were of the nature of a satisfaction to his creatures, for former injuries, or hard treatment. So that, put together the injury with the satisfaction, the legal and injurious dispensation, taken with the following good dispensation, which our author calls grace, and the unfairness or improper severity of the former amended by the goodness of the latter, both together made up one righteous dispensation.

The reader is desired to bear in mind what I have said concerning the interposition of divine grace not altering the nature of things, as they are in themselves. Accordingly, when I speak of such and such an evil tendency of things, belonging to the present nature and state of mankind, understand me to mean their tendency at they are in themselves, abstracted from any consideration of that remedy the sovereign and infinite grace of God has provided. — Having premised these things, I now assert, that mankind are all naturally in such a state, as is attended, without fail, with this consequence or issue; that **THEY UNIVERSALLY RUN THEMSELVES INTO THAT WHICH IS, IN EFFECT, THEIR OWN UTTER ETERNAL PERDITION**, as being finally accursed of God, and the subjects of his remediless wrath through sin. — From which I infer, that the natural state of the mind of man is attended with a propensity of nature, which is prevalent and effectual, to such an issue; and that therefore their nature is corrupt and depraved with a moral depravity, that amounts to and implies their utter undoing.

Here I would first consider the truth of the proposition; and then would show the certainty of the consequence which I infer from it. If both can be clearly and certainly proved, then I trust, none will deny but that the doctrine of original depravity is evident, and so the falseness of Dr. T.'s scheme demonstrated; the greatest part of whose book, called the, *Scripture Doctrine out Original Sin*, etc. is against the doctrine of innate depravity. In p. 107. S. he speaks of the conveyance of a corrupt and sinful nature to Adam's posterity as the grand point to be proved by the maintainers of the doctrine of original sin.

In order to demonstrate what is asserted in the proposition laid down, there is need only that these two things should be made manifest: ore is

this fact, that all mankind come into the world in such a state, as without fail comes to this issue, namely, the universal commission of sin; or that every one who comes to act in the world as a moral agent, is, in a greater or less degree, guilty of sin. The other is, that all sin deserves and exposes to utter and eternal destruction, unto God's wrath and curse; and would end in it, were it not for the interposition of divine grace to prevent the effect. Both which can be abundantly demonstrated to be agreeable to the word of God, and to Dr. T's own doctrine.

That every one of mankind, at least such as are capable of acting as moral agents, are guilty of sin, (not now taking it for granted that they come guilty into the world,) is most clearly and abundantly evident from the Holy Scriptures:

“If any man sin against thee, for there is no man that sinneth not.”

(^{<1086>}1 Kings 8:46)

^{<1070>}Ecclesiastes 7:20. “There is not a just man upon earth that doeth good, and sinneth not.” ^{<800D>}Job 9:2, 3. “I know it is so of a truth, (i. e. as Bildad had just before said, that God would not cast away a perfect man, etc.) but how should man be just with God? If he will contend with him, he cannot answer him one of a thousand.” To the like purpose,

“Enter not into judgment with thy servant; for in thy sight shall no man living be justified.” (^{<8E0D>}Psalm 143:2)

So the words of the apostle, (in which he has apparent reference to those of the Psalmist,) ^{<8E0D>}Romans 3:19, 20. That every mouth may be stopped, and All the world become guilty before God. Therefore by the deeds of the law they shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin.” So, ^{<80E6>}Galatians 2:16. ^{<800F>}1 John 1:7-10. “If we walk in the light, the blood of Christ cleanseth us from all sin. If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us.” In this and innumerable other places, confession and repentance of sin are spoken of as duties proper for ALL; as also prayer to God for pardon of sin also forgiveness of those that injure us, from that motive, that we hope to be forgiven of God. Universal

guilt of sin might also be demonstrated from the appointment, and the declared use and end of the ancient sacrifices; and also from the ransom, which every one that was numbered in level, was directed to pay, to make atonement for his soul. (^{<RB>}Exodus 30:11-16.) All are represented, not only as being sinful, but as having great and manifold iniquity. (^{<RB>}Job 9:2, 3. ^{<SB>}James 3:1, 2.)

There are many scriptures which both declare the universal sinfulness of mankind, and also that all sin deserves and justly exposes to everlasting destruction, under the wrath and curse of God; and so demonstrate both parts of the proposition I have laid down. To which purpose that passage in ^{<RB>}Galatians 3:10. is exceeding full: "For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse; for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law, to do them." How manifestly is it implied in the apostle's meaning here, that there is no man but what fails in some instances of doing all things that are written in the book of the law, and therefore as many as have their dependence on their fulfilling the law, are under that curse which is pronounced on them that fail of it. And hence the apostle infers in the next verse, "that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God:" as he had said before in the preceding chapter, verse 16. "By the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." The apostle shows us he understands, that by this place which he cites from Deuteronomy, "the Scripture hath concluded, or shut up, all under sin." (^{<RB>}Galatians 3:22.) So that here we are plainly taught, both that every one of mankind is a sinner, and that every sinner is under the curse of God.

To the like purpose is ^{<RB>}Romans 4:4. also ^{<RB>}2 Corinthians 3:6, 7, 9. where the law is called "the letter that kills, the ministration of death, and the ministration of condemnation." The wrath, condemnation, and death, which is threatened in the law to all its transgressors, is final perdition, the second death, eternal ruin; as is very plain, and indeed is confessed. And this punishment which the law threatens for every sin, is a just punishment; being what every sin truly deserves; God's law being a righteous law, and the sentence of it a righteous sentence.

All these things are what Dr. Taylor himself confesses and asserts. He says, that the law of God requires perfect obedience. (Note on ^{<RB>}Romans

7:6. p. 308.) “God can never require imperfect obedience, or by his holy law allow us to be guilty of any one sin, how small soever. And if the law, as a rule of duty, were in any respect abolished, then we might in some respects transgress the law, and yet not be guilty of sin. The moral law, or law of nature, is the truth, everlasting, unchangeable; and therefore, as such, can never be abrogated. On the contrary, our Lord Jesus Christ has promulgated it anew under the gospel, fuller and clearer than it was in the mosaical constitution, or any where else: — having added to its precepts the sanction of his own divine authority.” And many things which he says imply, that all mankind do in some degree transgress the law. In p. 228. speaking of what may be gathered from Romans 7 and 8 he says, “We are very apt, in a world full of temptation, to be deceived, and drawn into sin by bodily appetites, etc. And the case of those who are under a law threatening death to every sin, must be quite deplorable, if they have no relief from the mercy of the lawgiver”

But this is very fully declarer in what he says in his note on ^{<R10>}Romans 5:20. p. 297. His words are as follows: “Indeed as a rule of action prescribing our duty, it (the law) always was and always must be a rule ordained for obtaining life; but not as a rule of justification, not as it subjects to death for every transgression. For if it **COULD** in its utmost rigour have given us life, then, as the apostle argues, it would have been against the promises of God. For if there had been a law, in the strict and rigorous sense of law, **WHICH COULD HAVE MADE us LIVE**, verily justification should have been by the law. But he supposes, no such law was ever given: and therefore there is need and room enough for the promises of grace; or as he argues, ^{<R12>}Galatians 2:21. it would have frustrated, or rendered useless, the grace of God. For if justification came by the law, then truly Christ is dead in vain, then he died to accomplish what was, or **MIGHT HAVE BEEN, EFFECTED** by law itself without his death. Certainly the law was not brought in among the Jews to be a rule of justification, or to recover them out of a state of death, and to procure life by their sinless obedience to it: For in this, as well as in another respect, it was **WEAK**; not in itself, but through the **WEAKNESS** of our flesh, ^{<R13>}Romans 8:3. The law, I conceive, is not a dispensation suitable to the infirmity of the human nature in our present state; or it cloth not seem congruous to the goodness of God to afford us no other way of salvation,

but by LAW; WHICH IF WE ONCE TRANSGRESS, WE ARE RUINED FOR EVER. FOR WHO THEN, FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE WORLD, COULD BE SAVED?"

How clear and express are these things, that no one of mankind, from the beginning of the world, can ever be justified by law, because every one transgresses it!

And here also we see, Dr. T. declares, that by the law men are sentenced to everlasting ruin for one transgression. To the like purpose he often expresses himself. So p. 207. "The law requireth the most extensive obedience, discovering sin in all its branches. — It gives sin a deadly force, subjecting every transgression to the penalty of death; and yet supplieth neither help nor hope to the sinner, but leaving him under the power of sin and sentence of death." In p. 213. he speaks of the law as extending to lust and irregular desires, and to every branch and principle of sin; and even to its latent principles, and minutes! branches; again (Note on ^{<small>ROM} Romans 7:6. p. 308.) to every sin, have small soever. And when he speaks of the law subjecting every transgression to the penalty of death, he means eternal death, as he from time to time explains the matter. In p. 212. he speaks of the law in the condemning power of it, at; binding us in everlasting chains. In p. 120. S. he lays, that death which is the wages of sin, is the second death; and this, p. 18. he explains of final perdition. In his Key, p. 107. 296. he says, "The curse of the law subjected men for every transgression to eternal death." So in Note on ^{<small>ROM} Romans 5:20. p. 291. "The law of Moses subjected those who were under it to death, meaning by death, eternal death." These are his words.

He also supposes, that this sentence of the law, thus subjecting men for every, even the least, sin, and every minutest branch and latent principle of sin, to so dreadful a punishment, is just and righteous, agreeable to truth and the nature of things, or to the natural and proper demerits of sin. In this he is very full. Thus in p. 186. P. "It was sin (says he) which subjected us to death by the law, JUSTLY threatening sin with death. Which law was given us, that sin might appear; might be set forth IN ITS PROPER COLOURS, when we saw It subjected us to death by a law PERFECTLY HOLY, JUST, and GOOD; that sin by the commandment, by the law, might be represented WHAT IT REALLY IS, an exceeding great and deadly evil." So

in note on ^{<BIB>}Romans 5:20. p. 299. “The law or ministration of death, As it subjects to death for every transgression, is still of use to show the NATURAL AND PROPER DEMERIT OF SIN.” Ibid. p. 292. “The language of the law, dying thou shalt die, is to be understood of the demerit of the transgression, that which it deserves.” Ibid. p. 298. “The law was added, saith Mr. Locke on the place, because the Israelites, the posterity of Abraham, were transgressors as well as other men, to show them their sins, and the punishment and death, which in STRICT JUSTICE they incurred by them. And this appears to be a true comment on ^{<BIB>}Romans 7:13. — Sin, by virtue of the law, subjected you to death for this end, that sin, working death in us, by that which is holy, just, and good, PERFECTLY CONSONANT TO EVERLASTING TRUTH AND RIGHTEOUSNESS. — Consequently even sin is in strict justice deserving of wrath and punishment, and the law in its rigour was given to the Jews, to set home this awful truth upon their consciences, to show them the evil and pernicious NATURE of sin, and that being conscious they had broke the LAW of God, this might convince them of the great need they had of the FAVOR of the lawgiver, and oblige them, by faith in his GOODNESS, to fly to his MERCY, for pardon and salvation.”

If the law be holy, just, and good, a constitution perfectly agreeable to Modes holiness, justice, and goodness; then he might have put it exactly in execution, agreeably to all these his perfections. Our author himself says, p. 133. S. “How that constitution, which establishes a law, the making of which is inconsistent with the justice and goodness of God, and the executing of it inconsistent with his holiness, can be a righteous constitution, I confess, is quite beyond my comprehension.”

Now the reader is left to judge, whether it be not most plainly and fully agreeable to Dr. T.’s own doctrine, that there never was any one person from the beginning of the world, *vitro* came to act in the world as a moral agent, and that it world as a moral agent, and that it is not to be hoped there ever will be any, but what is a sinner or transgressor of the law of God; and that therefore this proves to be the issue and event of things, with respect to all mankind in all ages, that, by the natural and proper demerit of their own sinfulness, and in the judgment of the law of God, which is perfectly constant to truth, and exhibits things in their true colors, they are the proper subjects of the curse of God, eternal death, and

everlasting ruin; which must be the actual consequence, unless the grace or favor of the lawgiver interpose, and mercy prevail for their pardon and salvation. The reader has seen also how agreeable this is to the doctrine of the Holy Scripture. If so, and if the interposition of divine grace alters not the nature of things as they are in themselves, and that it does not in the least affect the state of the controversy we are upon — concerning the true nature and tendency of the state in which mankind come into the world — whether grace prevents the fatal effect or no, I trust, none will deny, that the proposition laid down, is fully proved, as agreeable to the word of God, and Dr. T.'s own words, viz. That mankind are all naturally in such a state, as is attended, without fail, with this consequence or issue that they universally are the subjects of that guilt and sinfulness, which is, in ejects their utter and eternal ruin, being cast wholly out of the favor of God, and subjected to everlasting wrath and curse.

SECTION 2

It follows from the proposition proved in the foregoing, section that all mankind are under the influence of a prevailing effectual tendency in their nature, to that sin and wickedness, which implies their utter and eternal ruins.

THE proposition laid down being proved, the consequence of it remains to be made out, viz. That the mind of man has a natural tendency or propensity to that event, which has been shown universally and infallibly to take place; and that this is a corrupt or depraved propensity. — I shall here consider the former part of this consequence, namely, Whether such an universal, constant, indelible event is truly a proof of any tendency or propensity to that event; leaving the evil and corrupt nature of such a propensity to be considered afterwards.

If any should say, they do not think that its being a thing universal and infallible in event, that mankind commit some sin, is a proof of a prevailing tendency to sin; because they do good, and perhaps more good than evil: Let them remember, that the question at present is not, HOW much sin there is a tendency to; but whether there be a prevailing propensity to that issue, which it is allowed all men do actually come to — that all fail of keeping the law perfectly-whether there be not a tendency to such

imperfection of obedience, as always without fail comes to pass to that degree of sinfulness, at least, which all fall into and so to that utter ruin, which that sinfulness implies and infers. Whether an effectual propensity to this be worth the name of depravity, because the good that may be supposed to balance it, shall be considered by and by. If all mankind in all nations and ages, were at least one day in their lives deprived of the use of their reason, and raving mad; or that all, even every individual person, once cut their own throats, or put out their own eyes; it might be an evidence of some tendency in the nature or natural state of mankind to such an event; though they might exercise reason many more days than they were distracted, and were kind to and tender of themselves oftener than they mortally and cruelly wounded themselves.

To determine whether the unfailing constancy of the above-named event be an evidence of tendency, let it be considered, What can be meant by tendency, but a prevailing liableness or exposedness to such or such an event? Wherein consists the notion of any such shine, but some stated prevalence or preponderation in the nature or state of causes or occasions, that is followed try, and so proves to be effectual to, a stated prevalence or commonness of any particular kind of effect? Or something in the permanent state of things, concerned in bringing a certain soft of event to pass, which is a foundation for the constancy, or strongly prevailing probability, of such an event? If we mean this by tendency, (and I know not what else can be meant by it, but this; or something like,) then it is manifest, that where we see a staled prevalence of any effect there is a tendency to that effect in the nature and State of its causes. A common and steady effect shows, that there is somewhere a preponderation, a prevailing exposedness or liableness in the state of things, to what comes so steadily to pass. The natural dictate of reason shows, that where there is an effect, there is a cause, and a cause sufficient for the effect; because, if it were not sufficient, it would not be effectual; and that therefore, where there is a staled prevalence of the effect, there is a stated prevalence in the cause. A steady effect argues a steady cause. We obtain a notion of tendency, no other way than by observation: and we can observe nothing but events: and it is the commonness or constancy of events, that gives us a notion of tendency in all cases. Thus we judge of tendencies in the natural world. Thus we judge of the tendencies or propensities of nature in

minerals, vegetables, animals, rational and irrational creatures. A notion of a stated tendency, or fixed propensity, is not obtained by observing only a single event. A stated preponderation in the cause or occasion, is argued only by a stated prevalence of the effect. If a die be once thrown, and it falls on a particular side, we do not argue from hence, that that side is the heaviest; but if it be thrown without skill or care, many thousands or millions of times, and it constantly falls on the same side, we have not the least doubt in our minds, but that there is something of propensity in the case, by superior weight of that side, or in some other respect. How ridiculous would he make himself, who should earnestly dispute against any tendency in the state of things to cold in the winter, or heat in the summer or should stand to it, that although it often happened that water quenched fire, yet there was no tendency in it to such an effect!

In the case we are upon, human nature, as existing in such an immense diversity of persons and circumstances, and never failing in any one instance of coming to that issue — that sinfulness, which implies extreme misery and eternal ruin — is as the die often cast. For it alters not the case in the least, as to the evidence of tendency whether the subject of the constant event be an individual, or a nature and kind. Thus, if there be a succession of trees of the same sort, proceeding one from another, from the beginning of the world, growing in all countries, soils, and climates all bearing ill fruit; it as much proves the nature and tendency of the kind, as if it were only one individual tree, that had remained from the beginning of the world often transplanted into different soils, and had continued to bear only bad fruit. So, if there were a particular family, which, from generation to generation, and through every remove to innumerable different countries, and places of abode, all died of a consumption, or all men distracted, or all murdered themselves, it would be as much an evidence of the tendency of something in the nature or constitution of that race, as it would be of the tendency of something in the nature or state of an individual, if some one person had lived all that time, and some remarkable event had often appeared in which he had been the agent or subject of from year to year, and from age to age, continual and without fail.

Thus a propensity, attending the present nature or natural state of mankind, eternally to ruin themselves by sin, may certainly be inferred from apparent and acknowledged Act. — And I would now observe

further, that not only does this follow from facts acknowledged by Dr. T but the things he asserts, and the expressions which he uses, plainly imply that all mankind have such a propensity; yea, one of the highest kind, a propensity that is invincible or a tendency which really amounts to a fixed, constant, unfailling necessity. There is a plain confession of a propensity or proneness to sin, p. 143. — “Man, who drinketh in iniquity like water; who is attended with so many sensual appetites, and so APT to indulge them.” — And again, p. 228. “WE ARE VERY APT, in a world full of temptation, to be deceived, and drawn into sin by bodily appetites.” — If we are very apt or prone to be drawn into sin by bodily appetites, and sinfully to indulge them, and very apt or prone to yield to temptation to sin, then we are prime to sin; for to yield to temptation to sin is sinful. — In the same page he shows, that on this account, and its consequences, the case of those who are under a law, threatened death for every sin, must be quite deplorable, if they have no relief from the mercy of the lawgiver. Which implies, that their case is hopeless; as to an escape from death, the punishment at sin, by any other means than God’s mercy. And that implies such an aptness to yield to temptation and renders it hopeless that any of mankind should wholly avoid it. But he speaks of it elsewhere, over and over, as truly impossible, or what cannot be, as in the words before cited in the last section, from his note on ^{<small>Romans} Romans 5:20. where he repeatedly speaks of the law, which subjects us to death for every transgression, as what CANNOT GIVE LIFE and states, that if God offered us no other way of salvation, no man from the beginning If the world COULD be saved. In the same place he cites with approbation Mr. Locke’s words, in which, speaking of the Israelites, he says, “All endeavors after righteousness was LOST LABOUR, since any one slip forfeited life, and it was IMPOSSIBLE for them to expect ought but death.” Our author speaks of it as impossible for the law requiring sinless obedience to give life, not that the law was weak in itself; hut through the weakness of our flesh. Therefore he says, he conceives the law not to be a dispensation suitable to the infirmity of the human nature in its present state. These things amount to a full confession, that the proneness in men to sin, and to a demerit of and just exposedness to eternal ruin, is universally invincible, or, which is the same thing, amounts to invincible necessity which surely is the highest kind of tendency, or propensity . and that not the less, for his laying this propensity to our infirmity or

weakness, which may seem to intimate some defect, rather than any thing positive: and it is agreeable to the sentiments of the best diving, that all sin originally comes from a DEFECTIVE or PRIVATLVE cause. But sin does not cease to be sin, justly exposing to eternal ruin, (as implied in Dr. T.'s own words,) for arising from infirmity or defect; nor does an invincible propensity to sin cease to be a propensity to such demerit of eternal ruin, because the proneness arises from such a cause.

It is manifest, that this tendency, which has been proved, does not consist in any particular external circumstances that persons are in, peculiarly influencing their minds, but is inherent, and is seated in that nature which is common to all mankind, which they carry with them wherever they go, and still remains the same, however circumstances may differ. For it is implied in what has been proved, and shown to be confessed, that the same event comes to pass in all circumstances. In God's sight no man living can be justified, but all are sinners, and exposed to condemnation. This is true of persons of all constitutions, capacities, conditions, manners, opinions, and education's; in all countries, climates, nations, and ages; and through all the mighty changes and revolutions, which have come to pass in the habitable world.

We have the same evidence, that the propensity in this case lies in the nature of the subject — and does not arise from any particular circumstances — as we have in any case whatsoever; which is only by the effects appearing to be the same in all changes of time and place, and under all varieties of circumstances. It is in this way only we judge, that any propensities, which we observe in mankind, are seated in their nature, in all other cases. It is thus we judge of the mutual propensity betwixt the sexes, or of the dispositions which are exercised in any of the natural passions or appetites, that they truly belong to the nature of man; because they are observed in mankind in general, through all countries, nations, and ages, and in all conditions.

If any should say, Though it be evident that there is a tendency in the state of things to this general event — that all mankind should fail of perfect obedience, and should sin, and incur a demerit of eternal ruin; and also that this tendency does not lie in any distinguishing circumstances of any particular people, person, or age — yet it may not lie in mans nature,

but in the general constitution and frame of this world. Though the nature of man may be good, without any evil propensity inherent in it; yet the nature and universal state of this world may be full of so many and strong temptations, and of such powerful influence on such a creature as man, dwelling in so infirm a body, etc. that the result of the whole may be a strong and infallible tendency in such a state of things, to the sin and eternal ruin of every one of mankind.

To this I would reply, that such an evasion will not at all avail to the purpose of those whom I oppose in this controversy. It alters not the case as to this question, Whether man, in his present state, is depraved and ruined by propensities to sin. If any creature be of such a nature that it proves evil in its proper place, or in the situation which God has assigned it in the universe, it is of an evil nature. That part of the system is not good, which is not good in its place in the system; and these inherent qualities of that part of the system, which are not good but corrupt, in that place, are justly looked upon as evil inherent qualities. That propensity is truly esteemed to belong to the nature of any being, or to be inherent in it, that is the necessary consequence of its nature, considered together with its proper situation in the universal system of existence, whether that propensity be good or bad. It is the nature of a stone to be heavy; but yet, if it were placed, as it might be, at a distance from this world, it would have no such quality. But being a stone, is of such a nature, that it will have this quality or tendency, in its proper place, in this world, where God has made it, it is properly looked upon as a propensity belonging to its nature. And if it be a good propensity here, in its proper place, then it is a good quality of its nature, but if it be contrariwise, it is an evil natural quality. So, if mankind are of such a nature, that they have an universal effectual tendency to sin and ruin in this world where God has made and placed them, this is to be looked upon as a pernicious tendency belonging to their nature. There is perhaps, scarce any such thing, in beings not independent and self-existent, as any power or tendency, but what has some dependence on other beings, with which they stand connected in the universal system of existence. Propensities are no propensities, any otherwise, than as taken with their objects. Thus it is with the tendencies observed in natural bodies, such as gravity, magnetism, electricity, etc And

thus it is with the propensities observed in the various kinds of animals; and thus it is with most of the propensities in created spirits.

It may further be observed, that it is exactly the same thing, as to the controversy concerning an agreeableness with God's moral perfection's of such a disposal of things — that man should come into the world in a depraved and ruined state, by a propensity to sin and ruin — whether God has so ordered it, that this propensity should lie in his nature considered alone, or with relation to its situation in the universe, and its connexion with other parts of the system to which the Creator has united it, which is as much of God's ordering, as man's nature itself, most simply considered.

Dr. T. (p. 188, 189.) speaking of the attempt of some to solve the difficulty of God being the author of our nature, and yet that our nature is polluted, by suppose that God makes the soul pure, but unites it to a polluted body, (or a body so made, as tends to pollute the soul,) he cries out of it as weak and insufficient, and too gross to be admitted: For, says he, who infused the soul into the body? And if it is polluted by being infused into the body, who is the author and cause of its pollution? And who created the body? etc. — But is not the case just the same, as to those who suppose that God made the soul pure, and places it in a polluted world, or a world tending, by its natural state in which it is made, to pollute the soul, or to have such an influence upon it, that it shall without fail be polluted with sin, and eternally ruined? Here may not I also cry out, on as good grounds as Dr. T. — Who placed the soul here in this world? And if the world be polluted, or so constituted as naturally and infallibly to pollute the soul with sin, who is the cause of this pollution! And, who created the world?

Though in the place now cited, Dr. T. so insists upon it, that God must be answerable for the pollution of the soul, if he has infused or put the soul into a body that tends to pollute it, yet this is the very thing which he himself supposes to be fact, with respect to the soul being created by God, in such a body, and in such a world where he says, “We are apt, in a world full of temptation, to be drawn into sin by bodily appetites.” And if so, according to his way of reasoning, God must be the author and cause of this aptness to be drawn into sin. Again, p. 143. we have these words,

“Who drinketh in iniquity like water? Who is attended with so many sensual appetites, and so apt to indulge them?” In these words our author in effect says the individual things that he exclaims against as so gross, viz. The tendency of the body, as God has made it, to pollute the soul, which he has infused into it. These sensual appetites, which incline the soul, or make it apt, to a sinful indulgence, are either from the body which God hath made, or otherwise a proneness to sinful indulgence is immediately and originally seated in the soul itself, which will not mend the matter.

I would lastly observe, that our author insists upon it, p. 42. S. That this lower world, in its present state, “Is as it was, when, upon a review, God pronounced it, and all its furniture, very good. — And that the present form and furniture of the earth is full of God’s riches, mercy, and goodness, and of the most evident tokens of his love and bounty to the inhabitants.” If so, there can be no room for evading the evidences from fact, of the universal infallible tendency of man’s nature to sin and eternal perdition, since, on the supposition, the tendency to this issue does not lie in the general constitution and frame of this world, which God hath made to be the habitation of mankind.

SECTION 3

That propensity, which has been proved to be in the nature of all mankind, must be a very evil, depraved, and pernicious propensity; making it manifest, that the soul of man, as it is by nature, is in a corrupt, fallen, and ruined state; which is the other part of the consequence, drawn from the proposition laid down in the first section.

THE question to be considered, in order to determine whether man’s nature be depraved and ruined, is not, Whether he is inclined to perform as many good deeds as bad ones But, to which of these two he preponderates, in the frame of his heart, and the state of his nature, a state of innocence and righteousness, and favor with God or a state of sin, guiltiness, and abhorrence in the sight at God? — Persevering sinless righteousness, or else the guilt of sin, is the alternative, on the decision of which depends — according to the nature and truth of things, as they are in themselves, and according to the rule of right and of perfect justice — man being approved

and accepted of his Maker, and eternally blessed as good; or ho being rejected, and cursed as bad. And therefore the determination of the tendency of man's heart and nature, with respect to these terms, is that which is to be looked at, in order to determine whether his nature is good or evil, pure or corrupt, sound or ruined. If such be man's nature, and the state of his heart, that he has an infallibly effectual propensity to the latter of those terms; then it is wholly impertinent to talk of the innocent and kind actions, even of criminals themselves, surpassing their crimes in numbers, and of the prevailing innocence, good nature, industry, felicity; and cheerfulness of the greater part of mankind. Let never so many thousands or millions of acts of honesty, good nature, etc. be supposed; Yet, by the supposition, there is an unfailing propensity to such moral evil, as in a dreadful consequences infinitely outweighs all effects or consequences of any supposed good. Surely that tendency, which, in effect, is an infallible tendency to eternal destruction, is an infinitely dreadful and pernicious tendency: and that nature and frame of mind, which implies such a tendency, must be an infinitely dreadful and pernicious frame of mind. It would be much more absurd to suppose, that such a state of; nature is not bad, under a notion of men doing more honest and kind things than evil ones; than to say, the state of that ship is good, for crossing, the Atlantic ocean, though such as cannot hold together through the voyage, but will infallibly founder and sink, under a notion that it may probably go great part of the way before it sinks, or that it will proceed and sail above water more hours than it will be in sinking: or, to pronounce that road a good road to go to such a place, the greater part of which is plain and safe, though some parts of it are dangerous, and is certainly fatal, to them that travel in it, or to call that a good propensity, which is an inflexible inclination to travel in such a way.

A propensity to that sin which brings God's eternal wrath and curse (which has been proved to belong to the nature of man) is evil, not only as it is calamitous and sorrowful, ending in great natural evil; but as it is odious and detestable, for by the supposition, it tends to that moral evil, by which the subject becomes odious in the sight of God, and liable, as such, to be condemned, and utterly rejected, and cursed by him. This also makes it evident, that the state which it has been proved mankind are in, is a corrupt state in a moral sense, that it is inconsistent with the fulfillment

of the law of God, which is the rule of moral rectitude and goodness. That tendency which is opposite to what the moral law requires, and prone to that which the moral law utterly forbids, and eternally condemns, is doubtless a corrupt tendency, in a moral sense.

So that this depravity is both odious, and also pernicious, fatal and destructive, in the highest sense; as inevitably tending to that which implies man's eternal ruin. It shows, that man, as he is by nature, is in a deplorable state, in the highest sense. And this proves that men do not come into the world perfectly innocent in the sight of God, and without any just exposedness to his displeasure. For the being by nature in a lost and ruined state, in the highest sense, is not consistent with being by nature in a state of devour with God.

But if any should still insist on a notion of men's good deeds exceeding their bad ones, and that, seeing the good more than countervails the evil, they cannot be properly denominated evil; all persons and things being most properly denominated from that which prevails, and has the ascendant in them; I would say further, That if there is in man's nature a tendency to guilt and ill desert, in a vast overbalance to virtue and merit; or a propensity to sin, the demerit of which is so great, that the value and merit of all the virtuous acts that ever he performs, are as nothing to it; then truly the nature of man may be said to be corrupt and evil.

That this is the true case, may be demonstrated by what is evident of the infinite heinousness of sin against God, from the nature of things. The heinousness of this must rise in some proportion to the obligation we are under to regard the Divine Being and that must be in some proportion to his worthiness; of regard; which doubtless is infinitely beyond the worthiness of any of our fellow-creatures. But the merit of our respect or obedience to God is not infinite. The merit of respect to any being does not increase, but is rather diminished, in proportion to the obligations we are under in strict justice to pay him that respect. There is no great merit in paying a debt we owe, and by the highest possible obligations in strict justice are obliged to pay; but there is great demerit in refusing to pay it. That on such accounts as these, there is an infinite demerit in all sin against God, which must therefore immensely outweigh all the merit which can be supposed to be in our virtue, I think, is capable of full demonstration; and

that the futility of the objections which some have made against the argument, might most plainly be demonstrated. But I shall omit a particular consideration of the evidence of this matter from the nature of things, as I study brevity, and lest any should cry out, metaphysics! as the manner of some is, when any argument is handled against a tenet they are fond of, with a close and exact consideration of the nature of things. And this is not so necessary in the present case, inasmuch as the point asserted — that he who commits any one sin, has guilt and ill desert so great, that the value and merit of all the good which it is possible he should do in his whole life, is as nothing to it — is not only evident by metaphysics, but is plainly demonstrated by what has been shown to be fact, with respect to God's own constitutions and dispensations towards mankind. Thus, whatever acts of virtue and obedience a man performs, yet if he trespasses in one point, is guilty of any the least sin, he — according to the law of God, and so according to the exact truth of things, and the proper demerit of sin — is exposed to be wholly cast out of favor with God, and subjected to his curse, to be utterly and eternally destroyed. This has been proved; and shown to be the doctrine which Dr. T. abundantly teaches.

But how can it be agreeable to the nature of things, and exactly consonant to everlasting truth and righteousness, thus to deal with a creature for the least sinful act, though he should perform ever so many thousands of honest and virtuous acts, to countervail the evil of that sin? Or how can it be agreeable to the exact truth and real demerit of things, thus wholly to cast off the deficient creature, without any regard to the merit of all his good deeds, unless that he in truth the case, that the value and merit of all those good actions, bear no proportion to the heinousness of the least sin? If it were not so, one would think, that however the offending person might have some proper punishment, yet seeing there is so much virtue to lay in the balance against the guilt, it would be agreeable to the nature of things, that he should find some favor, and not be altogether rejected, and made the subject of perfect and eternal destruction, and thus no account at all be made of all his virtue, so much as to procure him the least relief or hope. How can such a constitution represent sin in its proper colors, and according to its true nature and desert, (as Dr. T. says it does,) unless this be its true nature, that it is so bad, that even in the least instance it

perfectly swallows up all the value of the sinner's supposed good deeds, let them be ever so many. So that this matter is not left to our metaphysics, or philosophy; the great lawgiver, and infallible judge of the universe, has clearly decided it, in the revelation he has made of what is agreeable to exact truth, justice, and the nature of things, in his revealed law, or rule of righteousness.

He that in any respect or degree is a transgressor of God's law, is a wicked man, yea, wholly wicked in the eye of the law; all his goodness being esteemed nothing, having no account made of it, when taken together with his wickedness. And therefore, without any regard to his righteousness, he is, by the sentence of the law, and so by the voice of truth and justice, to be treated as worthy to be rejected, abhorred, and cursed for ever, and must be so, unless grace interpose, to cover his transgression. But men are really, in themselves, what they are in the eye of the law, and by the voice of strict equity and justice however they may be looked upon, and treated by infinite and unmerited mercy.

So that, on the whole, it appears, all mankind have an infallibly effectual propensity to that moral evil, which infinitely outweighs the value of all the good that can be in them; and have such a disposition of heart, that the certain consequence of it is, their being, in the eye of perfect truth and righteousness, wicked men. And I leave all to judge, whether such a disposition be not in the eye of truth a depraved disposition?

Agreeable to these things, the Scripture represents all mankind, not only as having guilt, but immense guilt, which they can have no merit or worthiness to countervail. Such is the representation we have in ^{<1820}Matthew 18:21, to the end. There, on Peter's inquiring, How often his brother should trespass against him, and he forgive him, whether I until seven times? Christ replies, I say not unto thee, until seven times, but until seventy times seven; apparently meaning, that he should esteem no number of offenses too many, and no degree of injury it is possible our neighbor should be guilty of towards us too great, to be forgiven. For which this reason is given in the parable following, that if ever we obtain forgiveness and devour with God, he must pardon that guilt and injury towards his majesty, which is immensely greater than the greatest injuries that ever men are guilty of one towards another; yea, than the sum of all

their injuries put together, let them be ever so many, and ever so great; so that the latter would be but as an hundred pence to ten thousand talents, which immense debt we owe to God, and have nothing to pay; which implies, that we have no merit to countervail any part of our guilt. And this must be, because if all that may be called virtue in us, be compared with our ill desert, it is in the sight of God as nothing to it. The parable is not to represent Peter's case in particular, but that of all who then were, or ever should be, Christ's disciples; as appears by the conclusion of the discourse, (verse 35.) "So likewise shall my heavenly Father do, if ye, from your hearts, forgive not every one his brother their trespasses."

Therefore how absurd must it be for Christians to object, against the depravity of man's nature, a greater number of innocent and kind actions, than of crimes; and to talk of a prevailing innocency, good nature, industry, and cheerfulness of the greater part of mankind! Infinitely more absurd, than it would be to insist, that the domestic of a prince was not a bad servant, because though sometimes he contemned and affronted his master to a great degree, Yet he did not spit in his master's face so often as he performed acts of service. More absurd, than it would be to affirm, that his spouse was a good wife to him, because, although she committed adultery, and that with the; slaves and scoundrels sometimes, yet she did not do this so often as she did the duties of a wife. These notions would be absurd, because the crimes are too heinous to be atoned for, by many honest actions of the servant or spouse of the prince, there beings vest disproportion between the merit of the one, and the ill desert of the other: but infinitely less, than that between the demerit of our offenses against God, and the value of our acts of obedience.

Thus I have gone through with my first argument; having shown the evidence of the truth of the proposition laid down at first, and proved its consequence. But there are many other things, that manifest a very corrupt tendency or disposition in man's nature, in his present state which I shalt take notice of in the following sections.

SECTION 4

The depravity of nature appears by a propensity in all to sin immediately, as soon at they are capable of it, and to sin continually

and progressively; and also by the remains of sin in the best of men.

THE great depravity of man's nature appears, not only in that they universally commit sin, who spend any long time in the world, but in that men are naturally so prone to sin, that none ever fail of immediately transgressing God's law, and so of bringing infinite guilt on themselves, and exposing themselves to eternal perdition, as soon as they are capable of it.

The Scriptures are so very express upon it, that all mankind, all flesh, all the world, every man truing, are guilty of sin; that it must at least be understood, every one capable of active duty to God, or of sin against him. There are multitudes in the world, who have but very lately begun to exert their faculties; as moral agents; and so have but just entered on their state trial, as acting for themselves: many thousands constantly, who have not lived one month, or week, or day, since they have arrived at any period that can be assigned (for the commencement of their agency) from their birth to twenty years of age. Now — if there be not a strong propensity in men's nature to sin, that should, as it were hurry them on to speedy transgressions and if they have no guilt previous to their personal sinning — what should hinder, but that there might always be a great number, who have hitherto kept themselves free from sin, and have perfectly obeyed God's law, and so are righteous in his sight, with the righteousness of the law? And who, if they should be called out of the world without any longer trial, as great numbers die at all periods of life, would be justified by the deeds of the law? And how then can it be true, that in God's sight no man living can be justified, that no man can be just with God, and that by the deeds of the law no flesh can be justified, because by the law is the knowledge of sin? And what should hinder but that there may always be many in the world — who are capable subjects of instruction and counsel, and of prayer to God — for whom the calls of God's word to repentance, to seek pardon through the blood of Christ, and to forgive others their injuries because they need that God should forgive them, would not be proper; and for whom the Lord's prayer is not suitable, wherein Christ directs all his followers to pray, that God would forgive their sins, as they forgive those that trespass against them?

If there are any in the world — though but lately become capable of acting for themselves, as subjects of God’s law — who are perfectly free from sin; such are most likely to be found among the children of Christian parents, who give them the most pious education, and set them the best examples. And therefore, such would never be so likely to be found in any part or age of the world, as in the primitive Christian church, in the first age of Christianity, (the age of the church’s greatest purity,) so lone after Christianity had been established, that there had been time for great numbers of children to be born and educated by those primitive Christians. It was in that age, and in such a part of that age, that the apostle John wrote his first epistle to the Christians. But if there was then a number of them come to understanding, who were perfectly free from sin, why should he write as he does? ^{GEN}1 John 1:8, 9, 10. If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and the truth is not in us.”

Again, the reality and greatness of the depravity of man’s nature appears in this, That he has a prevailing propensity to be continually sinning against God. What has been observed above, will clearly prove this. That same disposition of nature, which is an effectual propensity to immediate sin, amounts to a propensity to continual sin. For a being prone to continual sinning; is nothing! but a proneness to immediate sin continued. Such appears to be the tendency of nature to sin, that as soon as ever man is capable, it causes him immediately to sin, without any considerable time to pass without sin. And therefore, if the same propensity be continued undiminished, there will be an equal tendency to immediate sinning again, without any considerable time passing. And so the same will always be a disposition still immediately to sin, with as little time passing without sin afterwards, as at first. The only reason that can be given why sinning must be immediate at first, is that the disposition is so great that it will not suffer any considerable time to pass without sin: and therefore, the same disposition being continued in equal degree, without some new restraint, or contrary tendency, it will still equally tend to the same effect. And though it is true, the propensity may be diminished, or have restraints laid upon it, by the gracious disposals of Providence, or the merciful influences of

God's Spirit, yet this is not owing to nature. That strong propensity of nature, by which men are so prone to immediate sinning at first, has no tendency in itself to a diminution; but rather to an increase, as the continued exercise of an evil disposition, in repeated actual sins, tends to strengthen it more and more: agreeable to that observation of Dr. T.'s, p. 228. "We are apt to be drawn into sin by bodily appetites, and when once we are under the government of these appetites, it is at least exceeding difficult, if not impracticable, to recover ourselves, by the mere force of reason." The increase of strength of disposition in such a case, is as in a falling body, the strength of its tendency to descend is continually increased, so long as its motion is continued. Not only a constant commission of sin, but a constant increase in the habits and practice of wickedness, is the true tendency of man's depraved nature, if unrestrained by divine grace, as the true tendency of the nature of a heavy body, if obstacles are removed, is not only to fall with a continual motion, but with a constantly increasing motion. And we see, that increasing iniquity is actually the consequence of natural depravity, in most men, notwithstanding all the restraints they have. Dispositions to evil are commonly much stronger in adult persons, than in children, when they first begin to act in the world as rational creatures.

If sin be such a thing as Dr. T. himself represents it, p. 69. "a thing of an odious and destructive nature, the corruption and ruin of our nature, and infinitely hateful to God;" then such a propensity to continual and increasing sin, must be a very evil disposition. And if we may judge of the perniciousness of an inclination of nature, by the evil of the effect it naturally tends to, the propensity of man's nature must be evil indeed: for the soul being immortal, as Dr. T. acknowledges, p. 94. S. it will follow from what has been observed above, that man has a natural disposition to one of these two things, either to an increase of wickedness without end, or till wickedness comes to be so great, that the capacity of his nature will not allow it to be greater. This being what his wickedness will come to by its natural tendency, if divine grace does not prevent, it may as truly be said to be the effect which man's natural corruption tends to, as that an acorn in a proper soil, truly tends by its nature to become a great tree.

Again, That sin which is remaining in the hearts of the best men on earth, makes it evident, that man's nature is corrupt, as he comes into the world.

A remaining depravity of heart in the greatest saints, may be argued from the sins of most of those who are set forth in Scripture as the most eminent instances and examples of virtue and piety: and is also manifest from this, that the Scripture represents all God's children as standing in need of chastisement. ^{<small>Scripture</small>} Hebrews 12:6, 7, 8. "For whom the Lord loveth, he chasteneth; and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. — What son is he, whom the father chasteneth not? — If ye are without chastisement, then are ye bastards, and not sons." But this is directly and fully asserted in some places as in ^{<small>Scripture</small>} Ecclesiastes 7:20. "There is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not." Which is as much as to say, there is no man on earth, that is so just, as to have attained to such a degree of righteousness, as not to commit any sin. Yea, the apostle James speaks of all Christians as often sinning, or committing, many sins, even in that primitive age of the Christian church, an age distinguished from all others by eminent attainments in holiness: ^{<small>Scripture</small>} James 3:2. "In many things we all offend." And that there is pollution in the hearts of all antecedent to all means for purification, is very plainly declared in ^{<small>Scripture</small>} Proverbs 20:9. "Who can say, I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my sin?"

According to Dr. T. men come into the world wholly free from sinful propensities. And if so, it appears from what has been already said, there would be nothing to hinder, but that many, without being better than they are by nature, might perfectly avoid the commission of sin. But much more might this be the case with men after they had, by care, diligence, and good practice, attained those positive habits of virtue, whereby they are at a much greater distance from sin, than they were naturally: — which this writer supposes to be the case with many good men. But since the Scripture teaches us, that the best men in the world do often commit sin, and have remaining pollution of heart, this makes it abundantly evident, that men, when they are no otherwise than they were by nature, without any of those virtuous attainments, have a sinful depravity; yea, must have great corruption of nature.

SECTION 5

The depravity of nature appears, in that the general consequence of the state and tendency of man's nature is a much greater degree of

sin, than righteousness; not only with respect to value and demerit, but matter and quantity.

I HAVE before shown, that there is a propensity in man's nature to that sin, which in heinousness and ill desert immensely outweighs all the value and merit of any supposed good, that may be in him, or that he can do. I now proceed to say further, that such is man's nature, in his present state, that it tends to this lamentable effect, that there should at all times, through the course of his life, be at least much more sin, than righteousness; not only as to weight and value, but as to matter and measure; more disagreement of heart and practice from the law of God, and from the law of nature and reason, than agreement and conformity. The law of God is the rule of right, as Dr. T. Often calls it: It is the measure of virtue and sin: so much agreement as there is with this rule, so much is there of rectitude, righteousness, or true virtue, and no more; and so much disagreement as there is with this rule, so much sin is there. Having premised this, the following things may be here observed.

I. The degree of disagreement from this rule of right is to be determined, not only by the degree of distance from it in excess, but also in defect, or in other words, not only in positive transgression, or doing what is forbidden, but also in withholding what is required. The divine Lawgiver does as much prohibit the one as the other, and does as much charge the latter as a sinful breach of his law, exposing to his eternal wrath and curse, as the former. Thus at the day of judgment, as described ^{<1201>}Matthew 25: The wicked are condemned as cursed, to everlasting fire, for their sin in defect and omission: I was an hungred, and ye gave me no meat, etc. And the case is thus, not only when the defect is in word or behavior, but in the inward temper and exercise of the mind. ^{<1622>}1 Corinthians 16 22. "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maranatha." Dr. T. speaking of the sentence and punishment of the wicked, (^{<1254>}Matthew 25:41, 46.) says, p. 159. "It was manifestly for WANT of benevolence, love, and compassion to their fellow-creatures, that they were condemned." And elsewhere, as was observed before, he says, that the law of God extends to the latent principles at sin to forbid them, and to condemn to eternal destruction for them. And if so, it doubtless also extends to the inward principles of holiness, to requite them, and in like manner to condemn for the want of them.

II. The sum of our duty to God, required in his law, is LOVE; taking love in a large sense, for the true regard of our hearts to GOD, implying esteem, honor, benevolence gratitude, complacence, etc. This is not only very plain by the Scripture, but it is evident in itself. The sum of what the law of God requires, is doubtless obedience to that law: no law can require more than that it be obeyed. But it is manifest, that obedience is nothing, any otherwise than as a testimony of the respect of our hearts to God: without the heart, man's external acts are no more than the motions of the limbs of a wooden image; have no more of the nature of either sin or righteousness. It must therefore needs be, that love to God, the respect of the heart, must be the sum of the duty required in his law.

III. It therefore appears from the premises, that whosoever withholds more of that love or respect of heart from God, which his law requires, than he affords, has more sin than righteousness. Not only he that has less divine love, than passions and affections which are opposite, but also he that does not love God half so much as he ought, or has reason to do, has justly more wrong than right imputed to him, according to the law of God, and the law of reason; he has more irregularity than rectitude, with regard to the law of love. The sinful disrespect of his heart towards God, is greater than his respect to him.

But what considerate person is there, even among the more virtuous part of mankind, but would he ashamed to say, and profess before God or men, that he loves God half so much as he ought to do; or that he exercises one half of that esteem, honor, and gratitude towards God, which would be altogether becoming him; considering what God is, and what great manifestations he has made of his transcendent excellency and goodness, and what benefits he receives from him? And if few or none of the best of men can with reason and truth make even such a profession, how far from it must the generality of mankind be?

The chief and most fundamental of all the commands of the moral law, requires, us to love the Lord our God with all our hearts, and with all our souls, with all our strength, and all our mind: that is, plainly, with all that is within us, or to the utmost capacity of our nature. God is in himself worthy of infinitely greater love, than any creature can exercise towards him, love equal to his perfections, which are infinite. God loves himself

with no greater love than he is worthy of, when he loves himself infinitely; but we can give God no more than we have. Therefore, if we give him so much, if we love him to the utmost extent of the faculties of our nature, we are excused. But when what is proposed, is only that we should love him as much as our capacity will allow, all excuse of want at capacity ceases, and obligation takes hold of us; and we are doubtless obliged to love God to the utmost of what is possible for us, with such faculties, and such opportunities and advantages to know God, as we have. And it is evidently implied in this great commandment of the law, that our love to God should be so great, as to have the most absolute possession of all the soul, and the perfect government of all the principles and springs of action that are in our nature.

Though it is not easy, precisely to fix the limits of man's capacity, as to love to God; yet in general we may determine that his capacity of love is coextended with his capacity of knowledge: the exercise of the understanding opens the way for the exercise of the other faculty. Now, though we cannot have any proper positive understanding of God's infinite excellency, yet the capacity of the human understanding is very great, and may be extended far. It is needless to dispute, how far man's knowledge may be said to be strictly comprehensive of things that are very great, as of the extent of the expanse of the heavens, etc. The word comprehensive, seems to be ambiguous. But doubtless we are capable of some proper positive understanding of the greatness of these things, in comparison of other things that we know. We are capable of some clear understanding of the greatness or considerableness of a whole nation; or of the whole world of mankind, as vastly exceeding that of a particular person or family. We can positively understand, that the whole globe of the earth is vastly greater than a particular hill or mountain. And can have some good positive apprehension of the starry heavens as so greatly exceeding the globe of the earth, that the latter is as it were nothing to it. So the human faculties are capable of a real and clear understanding of the greatness, glory, and goodness of God, and of our dependence upon him, from the manifestations which God has made of himself to mankind, as being beyond all expression above that of the most excellent human friend, or earthly object. And so we are capable of esteem and love to God, which

shall be proportionable, much exceeding that which we have to any creature.

These things may help us to form some judgment, how vastly the generality of mankind fall below their duty, with respect to love to God, yea how far they are from coming half way to that height of love, which is agreeable to the rule of right. Surely if our esteem of God, desires after him, and delight in him, were such as become us, considering the things forementioned, they would exceed our regard to other things, as the heavens are high above the earth, and would swallow up all other affections like a deluge. But how far how exceeding far, are the generality of the world from any appearance of being influenced and governed by such a degree of divine love as this!

If we consider the love of God, with respect to one exercise of it, gratitude, how far indeed do the generality of mankind come short of the rule of right and reason in this! If we consider how various, innumerable, and vast the benefits we receive from God, how infinitely great and wonderful that grace, which is revealed and offered to them who live under the gospel — in that eternal salvation which is procured by God giving his only-begotten Son to die for sinners and also how unworthy we are all, deserving (as Dr. T. confesses) eternal perdition under God's wrath and curse — how great is the gratitude that would become us, who are the subjects of so many and great benefits. What grace is this towards poor sinful lost mankind, set before us in so affecting a manner, as in the extreme sufferings of the Son of God; who was carried through those pains by a love stronger than death, a love that conquered those mighty agonies, a love whose length and breadth, and depth and height, passes knowledge? But oh! what poor returns! — How little the gratitude! How low, how cold and inconstant, the affection in the best, compared with the obligation! And what then shall be said of the gratitude of the generality? Or rather, who can express the ingratitude?

If the greater part of them who are called Christians, were no enemies to Christ in heart and practice, were not governed by principles opposite to him and his gospel, but had some real love and gratitude; yet if their love falls vastly short of the obligation, or occasion given, they are guilty of shameful and odious ingratitude. As, when a man has been the subject of

some instance of transcendent generosity, whereby he has been relieved from the most extreme calamity, and brought into very opulent, honorable, and happy circumstances, by a benefactor of excellent character, and yet expresses no more gratitude on such an occasion, than would be requisite for some kindness comparatively infinitely small, he may justly fall under the imputation of vile unthankfulness, and of much more ingratitude than gratitude; though he may have no ill will to his benefactor, or no positive affection of mind contrary to thankfulness and benevolence. What is odious in him is his defect, whereby he falls so vastly below his duty.

Dr. Turnbull abundantly insists, that the forces of the affections naturally in man are well proportioned; and often puts a question to this purpose, — How man's nature could have been better constituted in this respect? flow the affections of his heart could have been better proportioned? — I will now mention one instance, out of many that might be mentioned. Man, if his heart were not depraved, might have had a disposition to gratitude to God for his goodness, in proportion to his disposition to anger towards men for their injuries. When I say, in proportion, I mean considering the greatness and number of favors and injuries, and the degree in which the one and the other are unmerited, and the benefit received by the former, and the damage sustained by the latter. Is there not an apparent and vast difference and inequality in the dispositions to these two kinds of affection, in the generality of both old and young, adult persons and little children? How ready is resentment for injuries received from men! And how easily is it raised in most, at least to an equality with the desert! And is it so with respect to gratitude for benefits received from God, in any degree of comparison? Dr. Turnbull pleads for the natural disposition to anger for injuries, as being good and useful: but surely gratitude to God, if we were inclined to it, would be at least as good and useful as the other.

How far the generality of mankind are from their duty, with respect to love to God, will further appear, if we consider that we are obliged not only to love him with a love of gratitude for benefits received, but true love to God primarily consists in a supreme regard to him for what he is in himself. The tendency of true virtue is to treat every thing as it is, and according to its nature. And if we regard the Most High according to the infinite dignity and glory of his nature, we shall esteem and love him with

all our heart and soul, and to the utmost of the capacity of our nature, on this account; and not primarily because he has promoted our interest. If God be infinitely excellent in himself, then he is infinitely lovely on that account; or in other words, infinitely worthy to be loved. And doubtless, if he be worthy to be loved for this, then he ought to be loved for it. And it is manifest, there can be no true love to him, if he be not loved for what he is in himself. For if we love him not for his own sake, but for something else, then our love is not terminated on him, but on something else, as its ultimate object. That is no true value for infinite worth, which implies no value for that worthiness in itself considered, but only on the account of something foreign. Our esteem of God is fundamentally defective, if it be not primarily for the excellency of his nature, which is the foundation of all that is valuable in him in any respect. If we love not God because he is what he is, but only because he is profitable to us, in truth we love him not at all: if we seem to love him, our love is not to him, but to something else.

And now I must leave it to every one to judge for himself, from his own opportunities or observation and information concerning mankind, how little there is of this disinterested love to God, this pure divine affection, in the world. How very little indeed in comparison of other affections altogether diverse, which perpetually urge, actuate, and govern mankind, and keep the world, through all nations and ages, in a continual agitation and commotion. This is an evidence of a horrid contempt of God. It would justly be esteemed a great instance of disrespect and contempt of a prince, if one of his subjects when he came into his house, should set him below his meanest slave. But in setting the infinite JEHOVAH below earthly objects and enjoyments, men degrade him below those things, between Which and him there is an infinitely greater distance, than between the highest earthly potentate and the most abject of mortals. Such a conduct as the generality of men are guilty of towards God, continually and through all ages, in innumerable respects, would be accounted the most vile contemptuous treatment of a fellow-creature, of distinguished dignity. Particularly men's treatment of the offers God makes of himself to them as their friend, their father. their God, and everlasting portion, their treatment of the exhibitions he has made of his unmeasurable love, and the boundless riches of his grace in Christ, attended with earnest repeated calls

counsels, expostulations, and entreaties, as also of the most dreadful threatenings of his eternal displeasure and vengeance.

Before I finish this section, it may be proper to say something in reply to an objection, some may be ready to make, against the force of this argument — that men do not come half-way to that degree of love to God which becomes them, and is their duty. The objection is this: That the argument seems to prove too much, in that it will prove, that even good men themselves have more sin than holiness, which also has been supposed. flat if this were true, it would follow, that sin is the prevalent principle even in good men, and that it is the principle which has the predominancy in the heart and practice of the truly pious, which is plainly contrary to the word of God.

I answer, If it be indeed so, that there is more sin, consisting in defect of required holiness, than there is of holiness, in good men in this world; yet it will not follow, that sin has the chief government of their heart and practice, for two reasons.

1. They may love God more than other things, and yet there may not be so much love, as there is want of due love; or in other words, they may love God more than the world, and therefore the love of God may be predominant, and yet may not love God near half so much as they ought to do. This need not be esteemed a paradox: A person may love a father, or some great friend and benefactor, of a very excellent character, more than some other object, a thousand times less worthy of his esteem and affection, and yet love him ten times less than he ought; and so be chargeable, all things considered, with a deficiency in respect and gratitude, that is very unbecoming and hateful. If love to God prevails above the love of other things, then virtue will prevail above evil affections, or positive principles of Sin, by which principles it is, that sin has a positive power and influence. For evil affections radically consist in inordinate love to other things besides God. and therefore, virtue prevailing beyond these, will have the governing influence. The predominance of the love of God in the hearts of good men, is more from the nature of the object loved, and the nature of the principle of true love, than the degree of the principle. The object is one of supreme loveliness, immensely above all other objects in worthiness of regard; and it is by such a transcendent excellency, that he

is God, and worthy to be regarded and adored as God: and he that truly loves God, loves him as God. True love acknowledges him to be divinely and supremely excellent; and must arise from some knowledge, sense, and conviction of his worthiness of supreme respect: and though the sense and view of it may be very imperfect, and the love that arises from it in like manner imperfect; yet if there be any realizing view of such divine excellency, it must cause the heart to respect God above all.

2. Another reason, why a principle of holiness maintains the dominion in the hearts of good men, is the nature of the covenant of grace, and the promises of that covenant, on which true Christian virtue relies, and which engage God's strength and assistance to be on its side, and to help it against its enemy, that it may not be overcome. The just live by faith. Holiness in the Christian, or his spiritual life, is maintained, as it has respect by faith to its author and finisher, and derives strength and efficacy from the divine fountain, and by this means overcomes. For, as the apostle says, This is the victory that overcomes the world, even our faith. It is our faith in him who has promised never to leave nor forsake his people; not to forsake the works of his own hands, nor suffer his people to be tempted above their ability; that his grace shall be sufficient for them, his strength be made perfect in weakness, and that where he has begun a good work he will carry it on to the day of Christ.

SECTION 6

The corruption of man's nature appears by its tendency, in its present State, to an extreme degree of folly and stupidity in matters of religion.

IT appears, that man's nature is greatly depraved, by an apparent proneness to an exceeding stupidity and sottishness in those things wherein his duty and main interest are chiefly concerned. I shall instance in two things, use. men's proneness to idolatry; and a general, great disregard of eternal things, in them who live under the light of the gospel.

It is manifest, in the first instance, that man's nature in its present state is attended with a great propensity to forsake the acknowledgment and worship of the true God, and to fall into the most stupid idolatry. This has been sufficiently proved by known fact, on abundant trial: insomuch

as the world of mankind in general (excepting one small people, miraculously delivered and preserved) through all nations, in all parts of the world, ages after ages, continued without the knowledge and worship of the true God, and overwhelmed in gross idolatry, without the least appearance or prospect of its recovering itself from so great blindness, or returning from its brutish principles and customs, till delivered by divine grace.

In order to the most just arguing from fact, concerning the tendency of man's nature, as that is in itself, it should be inquired what the event has been, where nature has been left to itself, to operate according to its own tendency, with least opposition made to it by any thing supernatural; rather than in exempt places, where the infinite power and grace of God have interposed, and extraordinary means have been used to stem the current, and bring men to true religion and virtue. As to the means by which God's people of old, in the line of Abraham, were delivered and presented from idolatry, they were miraculous, and of mere grace. Notwithstanding which, they were often relapsing into the notions and ways of the heathen; and when they had backslidden, never were recovered, but by divine gracious interposition. And as to the means by which many gentile nations have been delivered since the days of the gospel, they are such as have been wholly owing to the most wonderful, miraculous, and infinite grace. God was under no obligation to bestow on the heathen world greater advantages than they had in the ages of their gross darkness; as appears by the fact, that God actually did not, for so long a time, bestow greater advantages.

Dr. T. himself observes, (Key, p. 1.) That in about four hundred years after the flood, the generality of mankind were fallen into idolatry. And thus it was every where through the world, excepting among that people that was saved and preserved by a constant series of miracles, through a variety of countries, nations, and climates, great enough — and through successive changes, revolutions, and ages, numerous enough — to be a sufficient trial of what mankind are prone to, if there be any such thing as a sufficient trial.

That men should forsake the true God for idols, is an evidence of the most astonishing folly and stupidity, by God's own testimony,

“Be astonished, ye heavens, at this, and be ye horribly afraid, be ye very desolate, saith the Lord: for my people have committed two evils, they have forsaken me, the fountain of living waters, and have hewed out to themselves cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water.” (^{34B2}Jeremiah 2:12, 13)

And that mankind in general did thus, so soon after the flood, was from the evil propensity of their hearts, and because they did not like to retain God in their knowledge; as is evident by ^{4B2}Romans 1:28. And the universality of the effect shows that the cause was universal, and not any thing belonging to the particular circumstances of one, or only some nations or ages, but something belonging to that nature, which is common to all nations, and which remains the same through all ages. And what other cause could this great effect possibly arise from, but a depraved disposition, natural to all mankind? It could not arise from want of a sufficient capacity or means of knowledge. This is in effect confessed on all hands. Dr. Turnbull (Chris. Philippians p. 21.) says: “The existence of one infinitely powerful, wise, and good mind, the Author, Creator, Upholder, and Governor of all things, is a truth that lies plain and obvious to all that will but think.” And (ibid. p. 245.) “Moral knowledge, which is the most important of all knowledge, may easily be acquired by all men.” And again, (ibid. p. 292.) “Every man by himself, if he would duly employ his mind in the contemplation of the works of God about him, or in the examination of his own frame, — might make very great progress in the knowledge of the wisdom and goodness of God. This all men, generally speaking, might do, with very little assistance; for they have all sufficient abilities for thus employing their minds, and have all sufficient time for it.” Mr. Locke says, (Hom. Und. p. 4:chapter 4:p. 242. edit. 11.) “Our own existence, and the sensible parts of the universe, offer the proofs of a Deity so clearly and cogently to our thoughts, that I deem it impossible for a considerate man to withstand them. For I judge it as certain and clear a truth, as can any where be delivered, that the invisible things of God are clearly seen from the creation of the world, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and godhead.” And Dr. T. himself (in p. 78. says, “The light given to all ages and nations of the world, is sufficient for the knowledge and practice of their duty.” And (p. 111, 112.) citing those words of the apostle, ^{4B4}Romans 2:14, 15. he says,

“This clearly supposes that the Gentiles, who were then in the world, might have done the things contained in the law by nature, or their natural power.” And in one of the next sentences he says, “The apostle, in ~~ROM~~Romans 1:19, 20, 21 affirms that the Gentiles had light sufficient to have seen God’s eternal power and godhead, in the works of creation: and that the reason why they did not glorify him as God, was because they became vain in their imaginations, and had darkened their foolish heart; so that they were without excuse. And in his paraphrase on those verses in the 1st of Romans he speaks of the very heathens, that were without a written revelation, as having that clear and evident discovery of God’s being and perfections, that they are inexcusable in not glorifying him suitably to his excellent nature, and as the author of their being and enjoyments.” And (p. 146. S.) he says, “God affords every man sufficient light to know his duty.” If all ages and nations of the world have sufficient light for the knowledge of God, and their duty to him, then even such nations and ages, in which the most brutish ignorance and barbarity prevailed, had sufficient light, if they had but a disposition to improve it; and then much more those of the heathen, which were more knowing and polished and in ages wherein arts and learning had made greatest advances. But even in such nations and ages, there was no advance made towards true religion; as Dr. Winder observes, (Hist. of Knowl. vol. 2:p. 336.) in the following words; “The pagan religion degenerated into greater absurdity, the further it proceeded; and it prevailed in all its height of absurdity, when the pagan nations were polished to the height. Though they set out with die talents of reason, and had solid foundations of information to build upon, it in fact proved, that with all their strengthened faculties, and growing powers of reason, the edifice of religion rose in the most absurd deformities and disproportion’s, and gradually went on in the most irrational, disproportioned, incongruous systems, of which the most easy dictates of reason would have demonstrated the absurdity. They were contrary to all just calculations in more mathematics.” He observes, “that their grossest abominations first began in Egypt, where was an ostentation of the greatest progress in learning and science: and they never renounced clearly any of their abominations, or openly resumed to the worship of the one true God, the Creator of all things, and to the original, genuine sentiments of the highest and most venerable antiquity. The pagan religion continued in this deep

state of corruption to the last. The pagan philosophers, and inquisitive men made great improvements in many sciences, an even in morality itself, yet the inveterate absurdities of pagan idolatry returned without remedy. Every temple smoked with incense to the sun and moon, and of her inanimate material luminaries, and earthly elements, to Jupiter, Juno, Mars, and Venus, etc. the patrons and examples of almost every vice (Hecatombs bled on the altar) of a thousand gods, as mad superstition inspired. And this was not the disgrace of our ignorant untaught northern countries only; but even at Athens itself, the infamy reigned, and circulated through all Greece: and finally prevailed, amidst all their learning and politeness, under the Ptolemies in Egypt, and the Caesar's at Rome. Now if the knowledge of the pagan world, in religion, proceeded no further than this; if they retained all their deities, even the most absurd of them all; their deified beasts, and deified men, even to the last breath of pagan power: we may justly ascribe the great improvements in the world, on the subject of religion, to divine revelation, either vouchsafed in the beginning, when this knowledge was competently clear and copious; or at the death of paganism, when this light shone forth in its consummate lustre at the coming of Christ."

Dr. T. often speaks of the idolatry of the heathen world, as great wickedness, in which they were wholly inexcusable; and yet often speaks of their case as remediless, and of them as being dead in sin, and unable to recover themselves. If so, and yet, according to his own doctrine, every age, every nation, and every man, had sufficient light afforded, to know God, and their whole duty to him; then their inability to deliver themselves must be a moral inability, consisting in a desperate depravity, and most evil disposition of heart.

And if there had not been sufficient trial of the propensity of the hearts of mankind, through all those ages that passed from Abraham to Christ, the trial has been continued down to this day, in all those vast regions of the face of the earth, that have remained without any effects of the light of the gospel, and the dismal effect continues every where unvaried. How was it with that multitude of nations inhabiting South and North America? What appearance was there, when the Europeans first came hither, of their being recovered, or recovering, in any degree, from the grossest ignorance, delusions, and most stupid paganism? And how is it at this day, in those

parts of Africa and Asia, into which the light of the gospel has not penetrated?

This strong and universally prevalent disposition of mankind to idolatry, of which there has been such great trial, and so notorious and vast proof, in facts is a most glaring evidence of the exceeding depravity of the human nature, as it is a propensity, in the utmost degree, contrary to the highest end, the main business, and chief happiness of mankind — consisting in the knowledge, service and enjoyment of the living, God, the Creator and Governor of the world — in the highest decree contrary to that for which mainly God gave mankind more understanding than the beasts of the earth, and made them wiser than the fowls of heaven, which was, that they might be capable of the knowledge of God. It is also in the highest degree contrary to the first and greatest commandment of the moral law, That we should have no other god, before JEHOVAH, and that we should love and adore him with all our heart, soul, mind, and strength. The Scriptures are abundant in representing the idolatry of the heathen world, as their exceeding wickedness, and their most brutish stupidity. They who worship and trust in idols, are said themselves to be like the lifeless statues they worship, like mere senseless stocks and stones. (¹³⁵Psalm 115:4-8. and ¹³⁵135:15-18.)

A second instance of the natural stupidity of mankind, is that great disregard of their own eternal interest, which appears so remarkably; so generally among them who live under the gospel.

Mr. Locke observes, (Romans Und. vol. 1:p. 207.) “Were the will determined by the views of good, as it appears in contemplation, greater or less to the understanding, it could never get loose from the infinite eternal joys of heaven, once proposed, and considered as possible; the eternal condition of a future state infinitely outweighing the expectation of riches or honor, or any other worldly pleasure, which we can propose to ourselves, though we should grant these the more probable to be obtained.” Again, (p. 228, 229.) “He that will not be so far a rational creature, as to reflect seriously upon infinite happiness and misery, must needs condemn himself, as not making that use of his understanding he should. The rewards and punishments of another life, which the Almighty has established, as the enforcements of his laws, are of weight enough to

determine the choice, against whatsoever pleasure or pain this life can show. When the eternal state is considered but in its bare possibility, which nobody can make any doubt of, he that will allow exquisite and endless happiness to be but the possible consequence of a good life here, and the contrary state the possible reward of a bad one, must own himself to judge very much amiss, if he does not conclude that a virtuous life; with the certain expectation of everlasting bliss, which may come, is to be preferred to a vicious one, with the fear of that dreadful state of misery, which it is very possible may overtake the guilty, or at least the terrible uncertain hope of annihilation. This is evidently so, though the virtuous life here had nothing but pain, and the vicious continual pleasure; which yet is for the most part quite otherwise, and wicked men have not much the odds to brag of, even in their present possession: nay, all things rightly considered have I think even the worst part here. But when infinite happiness is put in one scale, against infinite misery in the other; if the worst that comes to the pious man, if he mistakes, be the best that the wicked man can attain to, if he be in the right; who can, without madness, run the venture? Who in his wits would choose to come within a possibility of infinite misery? which if he miss, there is yet nothing to be got by that hazard: whereas, on the other side, the sober man ventures nothing, against infinite happiness to be got, if his expectation comes to pass.”

That disposition of mind which is a propensity to act contrary to reason, is a depraved disposition. It is not because the faculty of reason which God has given to mankind, is not sufficient fully to discover to them, that forty, sixty, or an hundred years, is as nothing in comparison of eternity — infinitely less than a second of time to an hundred years — that the greatest worldly prosperity is not treated with the most perfect disregard, in all cases where there is any degree of competition of earthly things, with salvation from exquisite, eternal misery, and the enjoyment of everlasting glory and felicity. But is it a matter of controversy, whether men in general show a strong disposition to act far otherwise, from their infancy, till death sensibly approaches? In things that concern their temporal interest, they easily discern the difference between things of a long and short continuance. It is no hard matter to convince men of the difference between being admitted to the accommodations and entertainment's of a

convenient, beautiful, well-furnished habitation, and to partake of the provisions and produce of a plentiful estate tot a day, or a night; and having all given them, and settled upon them, as their own, to possess as long as they live, and to be theirs and their heirs' for ever. There would be no need of preaching sermons, and spending strength and life, to convince them of the difference. Men know how to adjust things in their dealings and contracts one with another, according to the length of time in which anything agreed for is to be used or enjoyed. In temporal affairs they are sensible, that it concerns them to provide for future time, as well as for the present. Thus common prudence teaches them to take care in summer to lay up for winter; yea, to provide a fund, or an estate, whence they may be supplied for a long time to come. And not only so, but they are forward to spend and be spent, in order to provide for their children after they are dead; though it be guise uncertain, who shall enjoy what they lay up, after they have left the world. And if their children should have the comfort of it, as they desire, they will not partake with them in that comfort, or have any portion in any thing under the sun. In things which relate to men's temporal interest, they seem very sensible of the uncertainty of life, especially of the lives of others; and to make answerable provision for the security of their worldly interest, that no considerable part of it may rest only on so uncertain a foundation, as the life of a neighbor or friend. Common discretion leads them to take good care, that their outward possessions be well secured, by a good and firm title. In worldly concerns, men discern their opportunities, and are careful to improve them before they are past. The husbandman is careful to plough his ground, and sow his seed, in the proper season; otherwise he knows he cannot expect a crop; and when the harvest is come, he will not sleep away the time; for he knows, if he does so, the crop will soon be lost. How careful and eagle-eyed is the merchant to improve opportunities to enrich himself! How apt are men to be alarmed at the appearance of danger to their worldly estate, or any thing that remarkably threatens great damage to their outward interest! And how will they bestir themselves in such a case, if possible, to avoid the threatened calamity! In things purely secular, and not of a moral or spiritual nature, they easily receive conviction by past experience, when any thing, on repeated trial, proves unprofitable or prejudicial; and are ready to take warning by what they have found themselves, and also by the experience of their neighbors and forefathers.

But if we consider how men generally conduct themselves in things on which their well-being infinitely more depends, how vast is the diversity! In these things how cold, lifeless, and dilatory! With what difficulty are a few, out of multitudes, excited to any tolerable degree of care and diligence, by the innumerable means used, in order to make them wise for themselves! And when some vigilance and activity is excited, how apt is it to die away, like a mere force against a natural tendency! What need of a constant repetition of admonitions and counsels, to keep the heart from falling asleep! How many objections are made! How are difficulties magnified! And how soon is the mind discouraged! How many arguments, often renewed, variously and elaborately enforced, do men stand in need of, to convince them of things that are almost self-evident! As that things which are eternal, are infinitely more important than things temporal, and the like. And after all, how very few are convinced effectually, or in such a manner as to induce them to a practical preference of eternal things! How senseless are men of the necessity of improving their time, as to their spiritual interest, and their welfare in another world! Though it be an endless futurity, and though it be their own personal, infinitely important good, that is to be cared for. Though men are so sensible of the uncertainty of their neighbors lives, when any considerable part of their own estates depends on the continuance of them, how stupidly senseless do they seem to be of the uncertainty of their own lives, when their preservation from immensely great, remediless, and endless misery, is risked by a present delay, through a dependence on future opportunity! What a dreadful venture will men carelessly and boldly run, repeat, and multiply, with regard to their eternal salvation; who yet are very careful to have every shine in a deed or bond, firm, and without a flaw! How negligent are they of their special advantages and opportunities for their soul's good! How hardly awakened by the most evident and moment dangers, threatening eternal destruction, yea, though put in mind of them, and much pains taken to point them forth, show them plainly, and fully to represent them, if possible to engage their attention! How are they like the horse, that boldly rushes into the battle! How hardly are men convinced by their own frequent and abundant experience, of the unsatisfactory nature of earthly things, and the instability of their own hearts in their good frames and intentions! And how hardly convinced by their own observation, and the experience of all past generations, of the uncertainty of life and its

enjoyments! ^{<991>}Psalm 49:11, etc. “Their inward thought is that their houses shall continue for ever. — Nevertheless, man being in honor, abideth not; he is like the beasts that perish. This their way is their folly; yet their posterity approve their sayings. Like sheep are they laid in the grave.”

In these things, men who are prudent for their temporal interest, act as if they were bereft of reason: “They have eyes, and see not; ears, and hear not, neither do they understand: they are like the horse and mule, that have no understanding.” — ^{<987>}Jeremiah 8:7. “The stork in the heaven knoweth her appointed times; and the turtle, and the crane, and the swallow, observe the time of their coming: but my people know not the judgment of the Lord.”

These things are often mentioned in Scripture, as evidences of extreme folly and stupidity, wherein men act as great enemies to themselves, as though they loved their own ruin; ^{<986>}Proverbs 8:36. Laying wait for their own blood, ^{<985>}Proverbs 1:18. And how can these things be accounted for, but by supposing a most wretched depravity of nature? Why otherwise should not men be as wise for themselves in spiritual and eternal things, as in temporal? All Christians will confess, that man’s faculty of reason was given him chiefly to enable him to understand the former, wherein his main interest and true happiness consist. This faculty would therefore undoubtedly be every way as fit for understanding them, as the latter, if not depraved. The reason why these are understood, and not the other, is not that such things as have been mentioned, belonging to men’s spiritual and eternal interest are more obscure and abstruse in their own nature. For instance, the difference between long and short, the need of providing for futurity, the importance of improving proper opportunities, and of having good security, and a sure foundation, in affairs wherein our interest is greatly concerned, etc. these things are as plain in themselves in religious, as in other matters. And we have far greater means to assist us to be wise for ourselves in eternal than in temporal things. We have the abundant instruction of perfect and infinite wisdom itself, to lead and conduct us in the paths of righteousness, so that we may not err. And the reasons of things are most clearly, variously, and abundantly set before us in the word of God, which is adapted to the faculties of mankind, lending greatly to enlighten and convince the mind: whereas, we have no such excellent

and perfect rules to instruct and direct us in things pertaining to our temporal interest, nor any thing to be compared to it.

If any should say, It is true, if men gave full credit to what they are told concerning eternal things? and these appeared to them as real and certain things, it would be an evidence of a sort of madness in them, that they no greater regard to them in practice: but there is reason to think, this is not the case; the things of another world being unseen, appear to men as things of a very doubtful nature, and amended with greet uncertainly — In answer, I would observe, agreeable to what has been cited from Mr. Locke, though eternal things were considered in their bare possibility, if men acted rationally, they would infinitely outweigh all temporal things in their influence on their hearts. And I would also observe, that to suppose eternal things not to be fully believed, at least by them who enjoy the light of the gospel, does not weaken, but rather strengthen, the argument for the depravity of nature. For the eternal world being what God had chiefly in view in the creation of men, this world was made wholly subordinate to the other, man's state here being only a state of probation, preparation, and progression, with respect to the future state. Eternal things are in effect their all, their whole concern; to understand and know which, it chiefly was, that they had understanding given them; therefore we may undoubtedly conclude, that if men have not respect to them as real and certain things, it cannot be for want of sufficient evidence of their truth: but it must be from a dreadful stupidity of mind, occasioning a sottish insensibility of their truth and importance when manifested by the clearest evidence.

SECTION 7

That man's nature is corrupt, appears, in that by far the greater part of mankind, in all ages, have been wicked men.

THE depravity of man's nature appears, not only in its propensity to sin in some degree, which renders a man an evil or wicked man in the eye of the law, and strict justice, as was before shown; but it is so corrupt, that its depravity either shows that men are, or tends to make them to be, of such an evil character, as shall denominate them wicked men, according to the tenor of the covenant of grace.

This may be argued from several things which have been already observed: as from a tendency to continual sin; a tendency to much greater degrees of sin than righteousness, and from the general extreme stupidity of mankind. But yet the present state of man's nature, as implying, or tending to, a wicked character, may deserve to be more particularly considered, and directly proved. And in general, this appears, in that there have been so very few in the world, from age to age, ever since the world has stood, that have been of any other character.

It is abundantly evident in Scripture, and is what I suppose none that call themselves Christians will deny, that the whole world is divided into good and bad, and that all mankind at the day of judgment will either be approved as righteous, or condemned as wicked: either glorified, as children of the kingdom, or cast into a furnace of fire, as children of the wicked one.

I need not stand to show what things belong to the character of such as shall hereafter be accepted as righteous, according to the word of God. It may be sufficient for my present purposes to observe what Dr. T. himself speaks of, as belonging essentially to the character of such. In p. 203. he says, "This is infallibly the character of true Christians, and what is essential to such, that they have really mortified the flesh with its lusts; — they are dead to sin. and live no longer therein; the old man is crucified, and the body of sin destroyed: they yield themselves to God, as those that are alive from the dead, and their members as instruments of righteousness to God, and as servants of righteousness to holiness." — There is more to the like purpose in the two next pages. In p. 228. he says, "Whatsoever is evil and corrupt in us, we ought to condemn; not so, as it shall still remain in us, that we may always be condemning it, but that we may speedily reform, and be effectually delivered from it; otherwise certainly we do not come up to the character of the true disciples of Christ."

In p. 248. he says, "Unless God's favor be 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 and truth, and unless there be a kind and benevolent disposition towards our fellow-creatures, how can the mind be fit to dwell with God, in his house and family, to do him service in his kingdom, and to promote

the happiness of any part of his creation.” — And in his Key, 286. p. 101, 102, etc. showing there, what it is to be a true Christian, he says, among other things, “That he is one who has such a sense and persuasion of the love of God in Christ, that he devotes his life to the honor and service of God, in hope of eternal glory. And that to the character of a true Christian, it is absolutely necessary, that he diligently study the things that are freely given him of God, viz. his election, regeneration, etc. that he may gain a just knowledge of those inestimable privileges, may taste that the Lord is gracious, and rejoice in the gospel-salvation, as his greatest happiness and glory. — It is necessary, that he work these blessings on kits heart, till they become a vital principle, producing in him the love of God, engaging him to all cheerful obedience to his will, giving him a proper dignity and elevation of soul, raising him above the best and worst of this world, carrying his heart into heaven, and fixing his affections and regards upon his everlasting inheritance, and the crown of glory laid up for him there. Thus he is armed against all the temptations and trials resulting from any pleasure or pain, hopes or fears, gain or loss, in the present world. None of these things move him from a faithful discharge of any part of his duty, or from a firm attachment to truth and righteousness, neither counts he his very life dear to him, that he may do the will of God, and finish his course with joy. In a sense of the love of God in Christ, he maintains daily communion with God, by reading and meditating on his word. In a sense of his own infirmity, and the readiness of the divine favor to succor him, he daily addresses the throne of grace, for the renewal of spiritual strength, in assurance of obtaining it, through the one Mediator Christ Jesus. Enlightened and directed by the heavenly doctrine of the gospel,” etc.

Now I leave every one that has any degree of impartiality, to judge. whether there be not sufficient grounds to think, that it is but a very small part indeed, of the many myriads and millions which overspread this globe, who are of a character that in any wise answers these descriptions. However Dr. T. insists, that all nations, and every man on the face of the earth, have light and means sufficient to do the whole will of God, even they that live in the grossest darkness of paganism.

Dr. T. in answer to arguments of this kind, very impertinently from time to time objects, that we are no judges of the viciousness of men’s characters, nor are able to decide in what degree they are virtuous or

vicious. As though we could have no good grounds to judge, that any thing appertaining to the qualities or properties of the mind, which is invisible, is general or prevailing, among a multitude Or collective body, unless we can determine how it is with each individual. I think I have sufficient reason, from what I know and have heard of the American Indians, to judge, that there are not many good philosophers among them; though the thoughts of their hearts, and the ideas and knowledge they have in their minds, are things invisible; and though I have never seen so much as a thousandth part of the Indians; and with respect to most of them, should not be able to pronounce peremptorily concerning any one, that he was not very knowing in the nature of things, if all should singly pass before me. And Dr. T. himself seems to be sensible of the falseness of his own conclusions, that he so often urges against others; if we may judge by his practice, and the liberties he takes, in judging of a multitude himself. He, it seems, is sensible that a man may have good grounds to judge, that wickedness of character is general in a collective body; because he openly does it himself. (Key, p. 102). After declaring the things which belong to the character of a true Christian, he judges of the generality of Christians, that they have cast off these things, that they are a people that do err in their hearts, and have not known God's ways, p. 259. he judges that the generality of Christians are the most wicked of all mankind, when he thinks it will throw some disgrace on the opinion of such as he opposes. The like we have from time to time in other places, (as p. 168. p. 258. Key, p. 127,128.)

But if men are not sufficient judges, whether there are few of the world of mankind but what are wicked, yet doubtless God is sufficient, and his judgment, often declared in his word, determines the matter. ^{<1073} Matthew 7:13, 14. "Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be that go in thereat: because strait is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth to life, and few there be that find it." It is manifest, that here Christ is not only describing the state of things, as it was at that day, and does not mention the comparative smallness of the number of them that are saved, as a consequence of the peculiar perverseness of that people, and of that generation; but as a consequence of the general circumstances of the way to life, and the way to destruction, the broadness of the one, and the

narrowness of the other. In the straitness of the gate, etc. I suppose none will deny, that Christ has respect to the strictness of those rules, which he had insisted on in the preceding sermon, and which render the way to life very difficult. But certainly these amiable rules would not be difficult, were they not contrary to the natural inclinations of men's hearts; and they would not be contrary to those inclinations, were these not depraved. Consequently the wideness of the gate, and broadness of the way that leads to destruction, in consequence of which many go in thereat, must imply the agreeableness of this way to men's natural inclinations. The like reason is given by Christ, why few are saved. ^{<BRD>}Luke 13:23, 24. "Then laid one unto him, Lord, are there few saved? And he said unto them, Strive to enter in at the strait gate: for many say unto you, shall seek to enter in, and shall not be able." That there are generally but few good men in the world, even among them who have the most distinguishing and glorious advantages for it, is evident by that saying of our Lord, "Many are called, but few are chosen." And if there are but few among these, how few, how very few indeed, must persons of this character be, compared with the whole world of mankind! The exceeding smallness of the number of the saints, compared with the whole world, appears by the representations often made of them as distinguished from the world; in which they are spoken of as called and chosen out of the world, redeemed from the earth, redeemed from among men; as being those that are of God, while the whole world lieth in wickedness and the like.

And if we look into the Old Testament, we shall find the same testimony given.

"Most men will proclaim every man his own goodness: but a faithful man who can find?" (^{<BRD>}Proverbs 20:6)

By the faithful man, as the phrase is used in Scripture, is intended much the same as a sincere, upright, or truly good man; as in ^{<BRD>}Psalms 12:1. and ^{<BRD>}31:23. and ^{<BRD>}101:6. and other places. Again, ^{<QMS>}Ecclesiastes 7:15-29. "I applied mine heart to know, and to search, and to find out wisdom, and the reason of things, and to know the wickedness of folly, even of foolishness and madness: and I find more bitter than death, the woman whose heart is snares, etc. Behold, this have I found, saith the preacher, counting one by one, to find out the account, which yet my soul seeketh,

but I find not: one man among a thousand have I found: but a woman among, all these have I not found. Lo, this only have I found, that God made man upright, but they have sought out many inventions.” Solomon here signifies, that when he set himself diligently to find out the account or proportion of true wisdom, or thorough uprightness among men, the result was, that he found it to be but as one to a thousand, etc. Dr. T. on this place, p. 184. says, “The wise man in the context, is inquiring into the corruption and depravity of mankind, of the men and women, THAT LIVED IN HIS TIME. As though what he said represented nothing of the state of thing) in the world in general, but only in his time. But does Dr. T. or any body else, suppose this only to be the design of that book, to represent the vanity and evil of the world in that time, and to show that all was vanity and vexation of spirit in Solomon’s day? That day truly, we have reason to think, was a day of the greatest smiles of Heaven on that nation, that ever had been on any nation from the foundation of the world. Not only does the subject and argument of the whole book show it to be otherwise; but also the declared design of the book in the first chapter; where the world is represented as very much the same, as to its vanity and evil, from age to age. It makes little or no progress, after all its revolutions and restless motions, labors, and pursuits like the sea, that has all the rivers constantly emptying themselves into it, from age to age, and yet is never the fuller. As to that place, ^{Am}Proverbs 20:6. “A faithful man who can find?” there is no more reason to suppose that the wise man has respect only to his time, in these words, than in those immediately preceding, “Counsel in the heart of a man is like deep waters but a man of understanding will draw it out.” Or in tee words next following, “The just man walketh in his integrity: his children are blessed after him.” Or in any other proverb in the whole book. And if it were so, that Solomon in these things meant only to describe his own times, it would not at all weaken the argument. For, if we observe the history of the Old Testament, there is reason to think there never was any time from Joshua to the captivity, wherein wickedness was more restrained, and virtue and religion more encouraged and promoted, than in David’s and Solomon’s times. And if there was so little true piety in that nation, the only people of God under heaven, even in their best times, what may we suppose, concerning the world in general, take one time with another?

Notwithstanding what some authors advance concerning the prevalence of virtue, honesty, good neighborhood, cheerfulness, etc. in the world; Solomon, whom we may Justly esteem as wise and just an observer of human nature, and the state of the world of mankind, as most in these days (besides, Christians ought to remember, that he wrote by divine inspiration) — judged the world to be so full of wickedness, that it was better never to be born, than to be born to live only in such a world.

“So I returned and considered all the oppressions that are done under the sun; and behold, the tears of such as were oppressed, and they had no comforter: and on the side of their oppressors there was power; but they had no comforter. Wherefore, I praised the dead, which were already dead, more than the living, which are yet alive. Yea, better is he than both they, which hath not yet been; who hath not seen the evil work that is cane under the sun.”

(²⁰⁰⁷Ecclesiastes 4:1-3)

Surely it will not be said that Solomon has only respect to his time here too, when he speaks of the oppressions of them that were in power; since he himself, and others appointed by him, and wholly under his control, were the men that were in power in that land, and in almost all the neighboring countries.

The same inspired writer says,

“The heart of the sons of men is full of evil, and madness is in their heart while they live; and after that they go to the dead.”

(²⁰⁰⁸Ecclesiastes 9:3)

If these general expressions are to be understood only of some, and those the smaller part, when in general, truth, honesty, good-nature, etc. govern the world, why are such general expressions from time to time used? Why does not this wise and noble prince express himself in a more generous and benevolent strain, and say, wisdom is in the hearts of the sons of men while they live, etc. — instead of leaving in his writings so many sly, ill-natured suggestions which pour such contempt on human nature, and tend so much to excite mutual jealousy and malevolence, to taint the minds of mankind through all generations after him?

If we consider the various successive parts and periods of the duration of the world, it will, if possible, be yet more evident, that by far the greater part of mankind have in all ages, been of a wicked character. The short accounts we have of Adam and his family ate such as lead us to suppose, that the greater part of his posterity in his life-time, yea, in the former part of his life, were wicked. It appears, that his eldest son Cain, was a very wicked man, who slew his righteous brother Abel. And Adam lived an hundred and thirty years before Seth was born: and by that time, we may suppose, his posterity began to be considerably numerous: when he was born, his mother called his name Seth; for God, said the, hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel. Which naturally suggestion to our thoughts, that of all her seed then existing, none were of any such note for religion and virtue, as that their parents could have any great comfort in them, or expectation from them, on that account. And by the brief history we have, it looks as if — however there might be some intervals of a revival of religion, yet — in the genera!, mankind grew more and more corrupt till the flood. It is signified that when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, wickedness prevailed exceedingly, ~~OR~~ Genesis 6:1, etc. And that before God appeared to Noah, to command him to build the ark, one hundred and twenty years before the flood, the world had long continued obstinate in great and general wickedness, and the disease was become inveterate. The expressions (verse 3, 5, 6.) suggest as much: “And the Lord said, my spirit shall not always strive with man. — And God saw that the wickedness of man was great on the earth, and that every imagination of the thought of his heart was evil, only evil continually; and It repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart.” And by that time, “all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth,” (v. 12.) And so Dr. T. himself observes, (p. 122.) “Mankind were universally debauched into lust, sensuality, rapine, and injustice.”

And with respect to the period after the flood, to the calling of Abraham; Dr. T. says, as already observed, that in about four hundred years after the flood, the generality of mankind were fallen into idolatry; which was before all they were dead who came out of the ark. And it cannot be thought, the world went suddenly into that general and extreme degree of corruption, but that they had been gradually growing more and more

corrupt; though it is true, it must be by very swift degrees — however soon we may suppose they began — to get to that pass in one age.

And as to the period from the calling of Abraham to the coming of Christ, Dr. T. justly observes as follows: (Key, 133.) “If we reckon from the call of Abraham to the coming of Christ, the Jewish dispensation continued one thousand nine hundred and twenty-one years; during which period, the other families and nations of the earth, not only lay out of God’s peculiar kingdom, but also lived in idolatry great ignorance, and wickedness.” And with regard to the Israelites, it is evident that wickedness was the generally prevailing character among them, from age to age. If we consider how it was with Jacob’s family, the behavior of Rœuben with his father’s concubine, the behavior of Judah with Tamar, the conduct of Jacob’s sons towards the Sherbemites, and the behavior of Joseph’s ten brethren in their cruel treatment of him; we cannot think, that the character of true piety belonged to many of them, according to Dr. T.’s own notion of such a character, though it be true, they might afterwards repent. And with respect to the time the children of Israel were in Egypt; the Scripture, speaking of them in general, or as a collective body open represents them as complying with the abominable idolatries of the country. And as to that generation which went out of Egypt, and wandered in the wilderness, they are abundantly represented as extremely and almost universally wicked, perverse, and children of divine wrath And after Joshua’s death, the Scripture is that wickedness was the prevailing character in the nation, from age to age. So it was till Samuel’s time. (⁴⁸⁰⁷1 Samuel 8:7, 8.) “They should not reign over them; according to all their works which they have done, since the day at I brought them out of Egypt, unto this day.” Yea, so it was till Jeremiah’s and Ezekiel’s time. (⁴⁸²³Jeremiah 32:30, 31.) “For the children of Israel, and the children of Judah, have only done evil before me from their youth; for the children of Israel have only provoked me to anger with the work of their hands, saith the Lord: for this city hath been to me a provocation of mine anger, and of my fury, from the day they built it, even unto the day.” (Compare chapter ⁴⁸²⁹5:21, 23: and chapter ⁴⁸²⁷7:25, 26, 27.) So ⁴⁸¹⁸Ezekiel 2:3, 4. “I send thee to the children of Israel, to a rebellious nation, that hath rebelled against me, they and their fathers have transgressed against me, even unto this very day: for they are Impudent children, and stiff-hearted.” And it

appears by the discourse of Stephen, ⁴⁰⁰Acts 7.) that this was generally the case with that nation, from their first rise, even to the days of the apostles. After this summary rehearsal of the instances of their perverseness from the very time of their selling Joseph into Egypt, he concludes, (verse 51-53.) “Ye stiff-necked, and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost. As your fathers did, so do ye. Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted? And they have slain them which showed before of the coming of that just time, of whom ye have been now the betrayers and murderers: who have received the law by the disposition of angels, and have not kept it.”

Thus it appears, that wickedness was the generally prevailing character in all nations, till Christ came. And so also it appears to have been since his coming to this day. So in the age of apostles. There was a great number of persons of a truly pious character in the latter part of the apostolic age, when multitudes of converts had been made and Christianity was as yet in its primitive Purity; but what says the apostle John of the church of God at that time, as compared with the rest of the world?

“We know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness.” (⁴⁰¹1 John 5:19)

And after that Christianity came to prevail to that degree, that Christians had the upper hand in nations and civil communities, still the greater part of mankind remained in their old heathen state; which Dr. T. sneaks of as a state of great ignorance and wickedness. And besides, this is noted in all ecclesiastical history, that as the Christians gained in power and secular advantages, true piety declined, and corruption and wickedness prevailed among them. — And as to the state of the Christian world, since Christianity began to be established by human laws, wickedness for the most part has greatly prevailed; as is very notorious, and is implied in what Dr. T. himself says: In giving an account how the doctrine of original sin came to prevail among Christians, he observes, (p. 167. S.) “That the Christian religion was very early and grievously corrupted, by dreaming, ignorant, superstitious monks.” In p. 259: he says, “The generality of Christians have embraced this persuasion concerning original sin and the consequence has been, that the generally of Christians have been the most wicked, lewd, bloody, and treacherous of all mankind.”

Thus, a view of the several successive periods of the past duration of the world, from the beginning to this day, shows, that wickedness has ever been exceeding prevalent, and has had vastly the superiority in the world. And Dr. T. himself in effect owns, that it has been so ever since Adam first turned into the way of transgression. "It is certain (says he, p. 168.) the moral circumstances of mankind, since the time Adam first turned into the way of transgression, have been very different from a state of innocence. So far as we can judge from history, or what we know at present, the greatest part of mankind have been, and still are, very corrupt; though not equally so in every age and place." And lower in the same page, he speaks of Adam's posterity, as having sunk themselves into the most lamentable degrees of ignorance, superstition, idolatry, injustice, debauchery, etc.

These things clearly determine the point, concerning the tendency of man's nature to wickedness, if we may be allowed to proceed according to such rules and methods of reasoning, as are never denied or doubted to be good and sure, in experimental philosophy; or may reason from experience and facts, in that manner which common sense leads all mankind to in other cases. If experience and trial will evince any thing at all concerning the natural disposition of the human heart, one would think the experience of so many ages, as have elapsed since the beginning of the world, and the trial made by hundreds of different nations together, for so long a time, should be sufficient to convince all, that wickedness is agreeable to the nature of mankind in its present state.

Here, to strengthen the argument, if there were any need of it, I might observe, not only the extent and generality of the prevalence of wickedness in the world, but the height to which it has risen, and the degree in which it has reigned. Among innumerable things which confirm this, I shall now only observe, The degree in which mankind have from age to age been hurtful one to another. Many kinds of brute animals are esteemed very noxious and destructive, many of them very fierce, voracious, and many very poisonous, and the destroying of them has always been looked upon as a public benefit: but have not mankind been a thousand times as hurtful and destructive as any one of them, yea, as all the noxious beasts, birds, fishes, and reptiles in the earth, air, and water, put together, at least of all kinds of animals that are visible? And no

creature can be found any where so destructive of its own kind as man is. All others, for the most part, are harmless and peaceable, with regard to their own species. Where one wolf is destroyed by another wolf, one viper by another probably a thousand men are destroyed by those of their own species. Well therefore might our blessed Lord say when sending forth his disciples into the world, (⁴¹¹⁶Matthew 10:16, 17.) “Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves; — but, beware of men.” Why do I say wolves? I send you forth into the wide world of men, that are far more hurtful and pernicious, and of whom you had much more need to beware, than of wolves.

It would be strange indeed, that this should be the state of mankind, distinguished by reason, for that very end, that they might be capable of religion, which summarily consists in love, if men, as they come into the world, are in their nature innocent and harmless, undepraved, and perfectly free from all evil propensities.

SECTION 8

The nature depravity of mankind appears, in that there has been so little good effect of so manifold and great means, used to promote virtue in the world.

THE evidence of the native corruption of mankind, appears much more glaring, when it is considered that the world has been so generally, so constantly, and so exceedingly corrupt, notwithstanding the saviors, great, and continual means that have been used to restrain men from sin and promote virtue and true religion among them.

Dr. T. supposes, that sorrow and death, which come on mankind in consequence of Adam’s sin, was brought on them in great favor, as a benevolent father, exercising an wholesome discipline towards his children, to restrain them from sin, by increasing the vanity of all earthly things, to abate their force to tempt and delude, to induce them to be moderate in gratifying the appetites of the body; to mortify pride and ambition, and that men might always and before their eyes a striking demonstration that sin is infinitely hateful to God, by a sight of that, than which nothing is more proper to give than the utmost abhorrence at iniquity, and to fix in their minds a sense of the dreadful consequences of sin. etc. etc. And in

general, that they do not come as punishments, but purely as means to keep men from vice, and to make them better. — If it be so, surely they are great means. Here is a mighty alteration: mankind, once so easy and happy, healthful, vigorous, and beautiful, rich in all the pleasant and abundant blessings of paradise, now turned out, destitute, weak, and decaying, into a wide barren world, yielding briars and thorns, instead of the delightful growth and sweet fruit of the garden of Eden, to wear out life in sorrow and toil, on the round cursed for his sake.; and at last, either through long and lingering decay, or severe pain and acute disease, to expire and turn into putrefaction and dust. If these are only used as medicines, to present and to cure the diseases of the mind, they are sharp medicines indeed; especially death; which, to use Hezekiah's representation, is as it were breaking all his bones. And, one would think, should be very effectual, if the subject had no depravity — no evil and contrary bias, to resist, and hinder a proper effect — especially in the old world, when the first occasion of this terrible alteration, this seventy of means, was fresh in memory. Adam continued alive near two-thirds of the time before the flood, so that a very great part of those who were alive till the flood, might have opportunity of seeing and conversing with him, and bearing from his mouth, not only an account of his fall, and the introduction of the awful consequences of it, but also of his first finding himself in existence in the new-created world, of the creation of Eve, and what passed between him and his Creator in paradise.

But what was the success of these great means, to restrain men from sin, and to induce them to virtue? Did they prove sufficient? — instead of this, the world soon grew exceeding corrupt, till, to use our author's own words, mankind were universal debauched into lust, sensuality, rapine, and injustice.

Then God used further means: he sent Noah, a preacher of righteousness, to warn the world of the universal destruction which would come upon them by a flood of waters, if they went on in sin. This warning he delivered with circumstances tending to strike their minds, and command their attention. He immediately went about building that vast structure, the ark, in which he must employ a great number of hands, and probably spent all he had in the world to save himself and his family. And under these uncommon means God waited upon them one hundred and twenty

years — But all to no effect. The whole world, for ought appears, continued obstinate, and absolutely incorrigible: so that nothing remained to be done with them, but utterly to destroy the inhabitants of the earth and to begin a new world, from that single family who had distinguished themselves by their virtue, that from them might be propagated a new and purer race. Accordingly this was done: and the inhabitants of this new world, Noah's posterity, had these new and extraordinary means to restrain sin, and excite to virtue, in addition to the toil, sorrow, and common mortality, which the world had been subjected to before, in consequence of Adam's sin, viz. that God had newly testified his dreadful displeasure for sin, in destroying the many millions of mankind, all at one blow, old and young, men, women, and children, without pity on any for all the dismal shrieks and cries with which the world was filled. They themselves, the remaining family, were wonderfully distinguished by God's preserving goodness, that they might be a holy seed, being delivered from the corrupting examples of the old world; and being all the offspring of a living parent, whose pious instructions and counsels they had, to enforce these things upon them, to prevent sin, and engage them to their duty. These inhabitants of the new earth, must, for a long time have before their eyes many evident and striking effects of that universal destruction, to be a continual affecting admonition to them. And besides all this, God now shortened the life of man to about one half of what it used to be. The shortening man's life, Dr. T. says, (p. 68.) "Was that the wild range of ambition and lust might be brought into narrower bounds, and have less opportunity of doing mischief, and that death, being still nearer to our view, might be a more powerful motive to regard less the things of a transitory world, and to attend more to the rules of truth and wisdom.

And now let us observe the consequence. — These new and extraordinary means, in addition to the former, were so far from proving sufficient, that the new world degenerated, and became corrupt, by such swift degrees, that as Dr. T. observes, mankind in general were sunk into idolatry, in about four hundred years after the flood, and so in about fifty years after Noah's death, they became so wicked and brutish, as to forsake the true God, and turn to the worship of inanimate creatures.

When things were come to this dreadful pass, God was pleased, for a remedy, to introduce a new and wonderful dispensation — separating a

particular family, and people, from all the rest of the world, by a series of most astonishing miracles, done in the open view of the world; and fixing their dwelling, as it were, in the midst of the earth, between Asia, Europe, and Africa, and in the midst of those nations which were most considerable for power, knowledge, and arts — that might, in an extraordinary manner, dwell among that people, in visible tokens of his presence. There he manifested himself, and thence to the world, by a course of miraculous operations and effects, for many agrees; that the people might be holy to God, as a kingdom of priests, and might stand as a city on a hill, to be a light to the world. He also gradually shortened man's life, till it was brought to about one twelfth part of what it used to be before the flood, and so, according to Dr. T. greatly diminishing his temptations to sin, and increasing his excitements to holiness. — And now let us consider what the success of these means was, both as to the Gentile world, and the nation of Israel.

Dr. T. justly observes, (Key, p. 24-75.) “The Jewish dispensation had respect to the nations of the world, to spread the knowledge and obedience of God in the earth and was established for the benefit of all mankind.” — But how unsuccessful were these means, and all other means used with the heathen nations, so long as this dispensation lasted! Abraham was a person noted in all the principal nations then in the world, as in Egypt, and the eastern monarchies God made his name famous by his wonderful, distinguishing dispensations towards him, particularly by so miraculously subduing, before him and his trained servants, those armies of the four eastern kings This great work of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth, was greatly noticed by Melchizedek, and one would think, should have been sufficient to awaken the attention of all the nations in that part of the world, and to lead them to the knowledge and worship of the only true God, especially if considered in conjunction with. that miraculous and most terrible destruction of Sodom and all the cities of the plain, for their wickedness, with Lot's miraculous deliverance, facts which doubtless in their day were much famed abroad in the world. But there is not the least appearance, in any accounts we have, of any considerable good effect. On the contrary, those nations which were most in the way of observing and being affected with these things, even the nations of Canaan, grew worse and worse, till their iniquity came to the full, in Joshua's time.

And the posterity of Lot, that saint so wonderfully distinguished, soon became some of the most gross idolaters, as they appear to have been in Moses time. (See ^{<0251>}Numbers 25.) Yea, and the far greater part even of Abraham's posterity, the children of Ishmael. Ziman, Juksham, Medan, Midian, Ishbak and Shuah, and Esau, soon forgot the true God, and fell off to heathenism.

Great things were done in the sight of the nations, tending to awaken them, and lead them to the knowledge and obedience of the true God, in Jacob's and Joseph's time; in that God did miraculously, by the hand of Joseph, preserve from perishing by famine, as it were the whole world; as appears by ^{<0118>}Genesis 12:56, 57. Agreeably to which, the name that Pharaoh gave to Joseph, Zaphnath Pauncah, as is said, in the Egyptian language, signifies savior of the world. But there does not appear to have been any good abiding effect of this; no, not so much as among the Egyptians, the chief of all the heathen nations at that day, who had these great works of Jehovah in their most immediate view. On the contrary, they grew worse and worse, and seem to be far more gross in their idolatries and ignorance of the true God, and every way more wicked, and ripe for ruin, when Moses was sent to Pharaoh, than they were in Joseph's time.

After this, in Moses and Joshua's time, the great God was pleased to manifest himself in a series of the most astonishing miracles, for about fifty years together, wrought in the most public manner, in Egypt, in the wilderness, and in Canaan, in the view as it were of the whole world; miracles by which the world was shaken, the whole frame of the visible creation, earth, seas, and rivers, the atmosphere, the clouds, sun, moon, and stars were affected; miracles, greatly tending to convince the nations of the world, of the vanity of their false gods, showing Jehovah to be infinitely above them, in the thing wherein they dealt most proudly, and exhibiting God's awful displeasure at the wickedness of the heathen world. And those things are expressly spoken of as one end of these great miracles. (^{<0114>}Exodus 9:14. ^{<0112>}Numbers 14:21. ^{<0102>}Joshua 4:23 24.) However, no reformation followed but by the scripture account, the nations which had them most in view, were dreadfully hardened, stupidly refusing all conviction and reformation, and obstinately went on in opposition to the living God, to their own destruction.

After this, God from time to time very publicly manifested himself to the nations of the world, by wonderful works wrought in the time of the Judges, of a like tendency with those already mentioned. Particularly in so miraculously destroying, by the hand of Gideon, almost the whole of that vast army of the Midianites, Amalekites, and all the children of the east, consisting of about 135,000 men. (Judy. 7:18. and 8:10.) But no reformation followed this, or the other great works of God, wrought in the times of Deborah and Barak, Jephtha and Samson.

After these things, God used new, and in some respects, much greater means with the heathen world, to bring them to the knowledge and service of the true God, in the days of David and Solomon. He raised up David, a man after his own heart, a most fervent worshipper of the true God, and zealous hater of idols, and subdued before him almost all the nations between Egypt and Euphrates; often miraculously assisting him in his battles with his enemies. And he confirmed Solomon his son in the full and quiet possession of that great empire, for about forty years; and made him the wisest, richest, most magnificent, and every way the greatest monarch that ever had been in the world; and by far the most famous, and of greatest name among the nations, especially for his wisdom, and things concerning the name of his God; particularly the temple he built, which was exceeding magnificent, that it might be of fame and glory throughout all lands; ^{<106>}1 Chronicles 22:5. And we are told, that there came of all people to hear the wisdom of Solomon, from all kings of the earth. (^{<106>}1 Kings 4:34. and ^{<106>}10:24.) And the Scripture informs us, that these great things were done, that the nations in far countries might hear of God's great name, and of his out-stretched arm: that all the people of the earth might fear him, as well as his people Israel: and that all the people of the earth might know, that the Lord was God, and that there was none else. (^{<106>}1 Kings 8:41-43, 60.) But still there is no appearance of any considerable abiding effect, with regard to any one heathen nation.

After this, before the captivity in Babylon, many great things were done in the sight of the gentile nations, very much tending to enlighten, affect, and persuade them. As God destroying the army of the Ethiopians of a thousand thousand, before Asa; Elijah's and Elisha's miracles especially Elijah miraculously confounding Baal's prophets and worshippers; Elisha healing Naamun, the king of Syria's prime minister, and the miraculous

victories obtained, through Elisha's prayers, over the Syrians, Moabites, and Edomites; the miraculous destruction of the vast united army of the children of Moub, Ammon, and Edom, at Jehoshaphat's prayer. (2 Chronicles 20.) Jonah's preaching at Nineveh, together with the miracle of his deliverance from the whale's belly; which was published, and well attested, as a sign to confirm his preaching: but more especially that great work of God, in destroying Sennachib's army by an angel, for his contempt of the God of Israel, as if he had been no more than the gods of the heathen.

When all these things proved ineffectual, God took a new method with the heathen world, and used, in some respects, much greater means to convince and reclaim them, than ever before. In the first place, his people, the Jews, were removed to Babylon, the head and heart of the heathen world, (Chaldea having been very much the fountain of idolatry,) to carry thither the revelations which God had made of himself, contained in the sacred writings; and there to bear their testimony against idolatry; as some of them, particularly Daniel, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, did, in a very open manner before the king, and the greatest men of the empire, with such circumstances as made their testimony very famous in the world. And God confirmed it with great miracles; which were published through the empire, by order of its monarch, as the mighty works of the God of Israel, showing him to be above all gods: Daniel, that great prophet, at the same time being exalted to be governor of all the wise men of Babylon, and one of the chief officers of Nebuchadnezzar's court.

After this, God raised up Cyrus to destroy Babylon, for its obstinate contempt of the true God, and injuriousness towards his people; according to the prophecies of Isaiah, speaking of him by name, instructing him concerning the nature and dominion of the true God. (²³⁴⁰Isaiah 14.) Which prophecies were probably shown to him, whereby he was induced to publish his testimony concerning the God of Israel, as ONE GOD. (Ezra 1:2, 3.) Daniel, about the same time, being advanced to be prime minister of state in the new empire, erected under Darius, did in that place appear openly as a worshipper of the God of Israel and him alone, God confirming his testimony for him before the king and all the grandees of his kingdom, by preserving him in the den of lions; whereby Darius was Educated to publish to all people, nations, and languages that dwelt in all the

earth, his testimony, that the God of Israel was the living God, and stedifast for ever, etc.

When, after the destruction of Babylon, some of the Jews returned to their own land, multitudes never returned, but were dispersed abroad through many parts of the vast Persian empire; as appears by the book of Esther. And many of them afterwards, as good histories inform us, were removed into the more western parts of the world and so were dispersed as it were all over the heathen world, having the Holy Scriptures with them, and synagogues every where, for the worship of the true God. And so it continued to be, to the days of Christ and his apostles; as appears by the Acts of the Apostles. Thus that light, which God had given them, was carried abroad into all parts of the world: so that now they had far greater advantages to come to the knowledge of the truth, in matters of religion, if they had been disposed to improve their advantages.

And besides all these things, from about Cyrus's time learning and philosophy increased, and was carried to a great height. God raised up a number of men of prodigious genius, to instruct others, and improve their reason and understanding, in the nature of things: and philosophic knowledge having gone on to increase for several ages, seemed to beget to its height before Christ came, or about that time.

And now let it be considered what was the effect of all these things. — Instead of a reformation, or any appearance or prospect of it, the heathen world in general rather grew worse. As Dr. Winder observes, "The inveterate absurdities of pagan idolatry continued without remedy, and increased as arts and learning increased; and paganism prevailed in all its height of absurdity, when pagan nations were polished to the height, and in the most polite cities and countries; and thus continued to the last breath of pagan power." And so it was with respect to wickedness in general, as well as idolatry; as appears by what the apostle Paul observes in Romans 1:— Dr. T. speaking of the time when the gospel scheme was introduced, (Key, 289.) says, "The moral and religious state of the heathen was very deplorable, being generally sunk into great ignorance, gross idolatry, and abominable vice." Abominable vices prevailed, not only among the common people, but even among their philosophers themselves, yea, some of the chief of them, and of greatest genius; so Dr.

T. himself observes, as to that detestable vice of sodomy, which they commonly and openly allowed and practiced without shame. (See Dr. T.'s note on ^{<B127}Romans 1:27.)

Having thus considered the state of the heathen world, with regard to the effect of means used for its reformation, during the Jewish dispensation, from the first foundation of it in Abraham's time; let us now consider how it was with that people themselves, who were distinguished with the peculiar privileges of that dispensation. The means used with the heathen nations were great, but they were small, if compared with those used with the Israelites. The advantages by which that people were distinguished, are represented in Scripture as vastly above all parallel, in passages which Dr. T. takes notice of. (Key, 54.) And he reckons these privileges among those which he calls antecedent blessings, consisting in motives to virtue and obedience; and says, (Key, 66.) "That this was the very end and design of the dispensation of God's extraordinary favors to the Jews, viz. to engage them to duty and obedience, or that it was a scheme for promoting virtue, is clear beyond dispute, from every part of the Old Testament."

Nevertheless, the generality of that people, through all the successive periods of that dispensation, were men of a wicked character. But it will be more abundantly manifest, how strong the natural bias to iniquity appeared to be among that people, by considering more particularly their condition from time to time.

Notwithstanding the great things God had done in the times of Abraham, If Isaac, and Jacob, to separate them and their posterity from the idolatrous world, that they might be a holy people to himself; yet in about two hundred years after Jacob's death, and in less than one hundred and fifty years after the death of Joseph, and while some were alive who had seen Joseph, the people had in a great measure lost the true religion, and were apace conforming to the heathen world. For a remedy, and the more effectually to alienate them from idols, and engage them to the god of their fathers, God appeared, in order to bring them out from among the Egyptians, and separate them from the heathen world, and to reveal himself in his glory and majesty, in so affecting and astonishing a manner, as tended most deeply and durably to impress their minds

that they might never forsake him any more. But so perverse were they, that they murmured even in the midst of the miracles that God wrought for them in Egypt, and murmured at the Red sea, in a few days after God had brought them out with such a mighty hand. When he had led them through the sea, they sang his praise, but forgot his works. Before they got to mount Sinai they openly manifested their perverseness from time to time, so that God says of them,

“How long refuse ye to keep my commandments, and my laws?”
 (Exodus 16:28)

Afterwards they murmured again at Rephidim.

In about two months after they came out of Egypt, they came to mount Sinai, where God entered into a most solemn covenant with the people that they should be an holy people unto him, with such astonishing manifestations of his power, majesty, and holiness, as were altogether unparalleled. God puts the people in mind,

“For ask now of the days that are past, which were before thee, since the day that God created man upon the earth, and ask from one side of heaven unto the other, whether there has been any such thing as this great thing is, or hath been heard like it. Did ever people hear the voice of God speaking out of the midst of the fire, as thou hast heard, and live? Or hath God assayed to take him a nation from the midst of another nation?”
 (Deuteronomy 4:32-34)

etc. And these great things were in order to impress their minds with such a conviction and sense of divine truth, and their obligations, that they might never forget them, as god says,

“Lo, I come unto thee in a thick cloud, that the people may hear when I speak with thee, and believe thee for ever.”
 (Exodus 19:9.)

But what was the effect of all? It was not more than two or three months, before that people, under that very mountain, resumed to their old Egyptian idolatry, and were singing and dancing before a golden calf, which they had set up to worship. And after awful manifestations of God’s

displeasure for that sin, and so much done to bring them to repentance, and confirm them in obedience, it was but a few months before they came to that violence of spirit, in open rebellion against God, that with the utmost vehemence they declared their resolution to follow God no longer, but to make them a captain to return into Egypt. And thus they went on in perverse opposition to the Most High, from time to time repeating their open acts of rebellion, in the midst of continued astonishing miracles, till that generation was destroyed. And though the following generation seems to have been the best that ever was in Israel, yet notwithstanding their good example, and notwithstanding all the wonders of God's power and love to that people in Joshua's time, how soon did that people degenerate, and begin to forsake God and join with the heathen in their idolatries, till God by severe means, and by sending prophets and judges, extraordinarily influenced from above, reclaimed them! But when they were brought to some reformation by such means, they soon fell away again into the practice of idolatry; and so from one age to another; and nothing proved effectual for any abiding reformation.

After things had gone on thus for several hundred years, God used new methods with his people, in two respects: First, he raised up a great prophet, under whom a number of young men were trained up in schools, that from among them there might be a constant succession of great prophets in Israel, of such as God should choose; which seems to have been continued for more than five hundred years. Secondly, God raised up a great king, David, one eminent for wisdom, piety, and fortitude, to subdue all their heathen neighbors, who used to be such a snare to them; and to confirm, adorn, and perfect the institutions of his public worship; and by him to reveal more fully; the great salvation, and future glorious kingdom of the Messiah. And after him was raised up his son, Solomon, the wisest and greatest prince that ever was on earth, more fully to settle and establish those things which his father David had begun, concerning the public worship of God in Israel, and to build a glorious temple for the honor of JEHOVAH, and the institutions of his worship, and to instruct the neighbor nations in true wisdom and religion. But what was the success of these new and extraordinary means? If we take Dr. T. for our expositor of Scripture, the nation must be extremely corrupt in David's time, for he supposes he has respect to his own times, in those words, ^{144D} Psalm 14:2,

3. “The Lord looked down from heaven, to see if there were any that did understand, and seek god; they are all gone aside: they are together become filthy; there is none that doeth good; no, not one.” But, whether Dr. T. be in the right in this, or not yet if we consider what appeared in Israel, in Absalom’s and Sheba’s rebellion, we shall not see cause to think, that the greater part of the nation at that day were men of true wisdom and piety. As to Solomon’s time, Dr. T. supposes, as has been already observed, that Solomon speaks of his own times, when he says, he had found but one in a thousand that was a thoroughly upright man.

However, it appears, that all those great means used to promote and establish virtue and true religion, in Samuel’s, David’s, and Solomon’s times, were so far from having any general abiding good effect in Israel, that Solomon himself, with all his wisdom, and notwithstanding the unparalleled favors of God to him, had his mind corrupted, so as openly to tolerate idolatry in the land, and greatly to provoke God against him. And as soon as he was dead, ten tribes of the twelve forsook the true worship of God, and instead of it, openly established the like idolatry that the people fell into at mount Sinai, when they made the golden calf; and continued fully obstinate in this apostacy, notwithstanding all means that could be used with them by the prophets, whom God sent, one after another, to reprove, counsel, and warn them, for about two hundred and fifty years; especially those two great prophets, Elijah and Elisha. Of all the kings that reigned over them, there was not so much as one but what was of a wicked character. And at last their case seemed utterly desperate so that nothing remained to be done with them, but to remove them out of God’s sight. Thus the scripture represents the matter, ^{<3070>}2 Kings 17.

And as to the other two tribes, though their kings were always of the family of David, and they were favored in many respects far beyond their brethren, yet they were generally exceeding corrupt. Their kings were, most of them, wicked men, and their other magistrates, and priests, and people, were generally agreed in the corruption. Thus the matter is represented in the scripture history, and the books of the prophets. And when they had seen how God had east off the ten tribes, instead of taking warning, they made themselves vastly more vile than ever the others have done. ^{<2775>}2 Kings 17:15, 19. ^{<3160>}Ezekiel 16:46, 47, 51. God indeed waited longer upon them, for his servant David’s sake, and for Jerusalem’s sake,

that he had chosen and used more extraordinary means with them; especially by those great prophets, Isaiah and Jeremiah, but to no effect: I so that at last, as the prophet represent the matter, they were like a body universally and desperately diseased and corrupted, that would admit of no cure, the whole head sick, and the whole heart faint, etc.

Things being come to that pass, God took this method with them, he utterly destroyed their city and land, and the temple. which he had among them, made thorough work in purging the land of them; as when a man empties a dish, wipes it, and turns it upside down; or when a vessel is cast into a fierce fire, till its filthiness is thoroughly burnt out. (^{<21>}2 Kings 21:13. ^{<361>}Ezekiel chapter 24.) they were carried into captivity, and there left, till that wicked generation was dead, and those old rebels were purged out; that afterwards the land might be resettled with a more pure generation.

After the return from the captivity, and God had built the Jewish church again in their own land, by a series of wonderful providence; yet they corrupted themselves again, to so great a degree, that the transgressors were come to the full again in the days of Antiochos Epiphanies; as the matter is represented in the prophecy of Daniel. (^{<78>}Daniel 8:23.) And then God made them the subjects of a dispensation, little, if any thing, less terrible, than that which had been in Nebuchadnezzar's days. And after God had again delivered them, and restored the state of religion among them, by the instrumentality of the Maccabees, they degenerated again so that when Christ came, they were arrived to that extreme degree of corruption which is represented in the accounts given by the evangelists.

It may be observed here in general, that the Jews, though so vastly distinguished with advantages, means, and motives to holiness, yet are represented, from time to time, as more wicked in the sight of God, than the very worst of the heathen. As, of old, God swore by his life, that the wickedness of Sodom was small, compared with that of the Jews; (^{<367>}Ezekiel 16:47, 48, etc. also chapter ^{<385>}5:5-10.) So, Christ speaking of the Jews, in his time, represents them as having much greater guilt than the inhabitants of Tyre and Sydon. or even Sodom and Gomorrah.

But we are now come to the time when the grandest scene was displayed that ever was opened on earth. After all other schemes had been so long

and so thoroughly tried, and had so greatly failed of success, both among Jews and Gentiles, that wonderful dispensation was at length introduced — the greatest scheme for suppressing and restraining iniquity among mankind, that ever infinite wisdom and mercy contrived — even the glorious gospel of Jesus Christ. “A new dispensation of grace was erected (to use Dr. T.’s own words, p. 239, 240.) for the more certain and effectual sanctification of mankind, into the image of God; delivering them from the sin and wickedness, into which they might fall, or were already fallen to redeem them from all iniquity, and bring them to the knowledge and obedience of God.” In whatever high and exalted terms the Scripture speaks of the means and motives which the Jews enjoyed of old; yet their privileges are represented as having no glory in comparison of the advantages of the gospel. Dr. T.’s words (p. 233.) are worthy to be here repeated. “Even the heathen (says he) knew God, and might have glorified him as God, but under the glorious light of the gospel, we have very clear ideas of the divine perfection’s, and particularly of the love of God as our Father, and as the God and Father of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. We see our duty in the utmost extent, and the most cogent reasons to perform it: we have eternity opened to us, even an endless state of honor and felicity, the reward of virtuous actions; and the Spirit of God promised for our direction and assistance. And all this may and ought to be applied to the purifying of our minds, and the perfecting of holiness. And to these happy advantages we are born for which we are bound for ever to praise and magnify the rich grace of God in the Redeemer.” And he elsewhere says, “The gospel constitution is a scheme the most perfect and effectual for restoring true religion, and promoting virtue and happiness, that ever the world has yet seen. And admirably adapted to enlighten our minds, and sanctify our heart. And never were motives so divine and powerful proposed, to induce us to the practice of all virtue and goodness.

And yet even these means have been ineffectual upon the far greater part of them with whom they have been used; of the many that have been called, few have been chosen.

As to the Jews, God’s ancient people, with whom they were used in the first place, and used long by Christ and his apostles, the generality of them rejected Christ and his gospel, with extreme pertinacity of spirit. They not only went on still in that career of corruption which had been increasing

from the time of the Maccabees; but Christ's coming, his doctrine and miracles, the preaching of his followers, and the glorious things that attended the same, were the occasion, through their perverse misimprovement, of an infinite increase of their wickedness. They crucified the Lord of glory, with the utmost malice and cruelty, and persecuted his followers; they pleased not God, and were contrary to all men, they went on to grow worse and worse, till they filled up the measure of their sin, and wrath came upon them to the uttermost, and they were destroyed, and cast out of God's sight, with unspeakably greater tokens of the divine abhorrence and indignation, than in the days of Nebuchadnezzar. The greater part of the whole nation were slain, and the rest were scattered abroad through the earth in the most abject and forlorn circumstances. And in the same spirit of unbelief and malice against Christ and the gospel, and in their miserable dispersed circumstances, do they remain to this day.

And as to the gentile nations, though there was a glorious success of the gospel amongst them, in the apostles' days, yet probably not one in ten of those that had the gospel preached to them embraced it. The powers of the world were set against it, and persecuted it with insatiable malignity. And among the professors of Christianity, there presently appeared in many a disposition to abuse the gospel to the service of pride and licentiousness. The apostles foretold a grand apostasy of the Christian world, which should continue many ages, and observed, that there appeared a disposition to such an apostasy, among professing Christians, even in that day. (^{scrip}2 Thessalonians 2:7.) The greater part of the ages now elapsed, have been spent in that grand and general apostacy, under which the christian world, as it is called, has been transformed into what has been vastly more dishonorable and hateful to God, and repugnant to true virtue, than the state of the heathen world before: which is agreeable to the prophetic descriptions given of it by the Holy Spirit.

In these latter ages of the Christian church, God has raised up a number of great and good men, to bear testimony against the corruptions of the church of Rome, and by their means introduced that light into the world, by which, in a short time! at least one-third part of Europe was delivered from the more gross enormities of Antichrist: which was attended at first with a great reformation, as to vital and practical religion. But how is the gold become dim! To what a pass are things come in protestant countries

at this day, and in our nation in particular! To what a prodigious height has a deluge of infidelity, profaneness, luxury, debauchery, and wickedness of every kind, arisen! The poor savage Americans are mere babes, if I may so speak, as to proficiency in wickedness, in comparison of multitudes in the Christian world. Dr. T. himself, as before observed, represents, that the generality of Christians have been the most wicked, lewd, bloody, and treacherous of all mankind; and (Key, 388) that “The wickedness of the Christian world renders it so much like the heathen, that the good effects of our change to Christianity are but little seen.”

With respect to the dreadful corruption of the present day, it is to be considered, besides the advantages already mentioned, that great advances in reaming and philosophic knowledge have been made in the present and past century; affording great advantage for a proper and enlarged exercise of our rational powers, and for our seeing the bright manifestation of God’s perfections in his works. And it is to be observed, that the means and inducements to virtue, which this age enjoys, are in addition to most of those which were mentioned before, as given of old, and I among other things, in addition to the shortening of man’s life to 70 or 80 years, from near a thousand. And, with regard to this, I would observe, that as the case now stands in Christendom, take one with another of those who ever come to years of discretion, their life is not more than forty or forty-five years; which is but about the twentieth part of what it once was: and not so much in great cities, places where profaneness, sensuality, and debauchery, commonly prevail to the greatest degree.

Dr. T. (Key, 1.) truly observes, That God has from the beginning exercised wonderful and infinite wisdom, in the methods he has, from age to age, made use of to oppose vice, cure corruption, and promote virtue in the world, and introduced several schemes to that end. It is indeed remarkable, how many schemes and methods were tried of old, both before and after the flood; how many were used in the times of the Old Testament, both I with Jews and heathens and how ineffectual all these ancient methods proved, for 4000 years together, till God introduced that grand dispensation, for redeeming men from all iniquity, and purifying them to himself, a people zealous of good works; which the Scripture represents as the subject of the admiration of angels. But even this has now so long proved ineffectual, with respect to the generality, that Dr. T. thinks there

is need of a new dispensation, the present light of the gospel bring insufficient for the full reformation of the Christian world, by reason of its corruptions: (Note on ~~127~~Romans 1:27.) — And yet all these things, according to him, without any natural bias to the contrary, no stream of natural inclination or propensity at all, to oppose inducements to goodness; no native opposition of heart, to withstand those gracious means, which God has ever used with mankind, from the beginning of the world to this day, any more than there was in the heart of Adam, the moment God created him in perfect innocence.

Surely Dr. T.'s scheme is attended with strange paradoxes. And that his mysterious tenets may appear in a true light, it must be observed that — at the same time he supposes these means, even the very greatest and best of them, to have proved so ineffectual, that help from them, as to any general reformation, is to be despaired of — that he maintains all mankind, even the heathen in all parts of the world, yea, every single person in it, (which must include every Indian in America, before the Europeans came hither; and every inhabitant of the unknown parts of Africa and Terra Australis,) has ability, light, and means sufficient to do their whole duty; yea, many passages in his writings plainly suppose, to perform perfect obedience to God's law, without the least degree of vice or iniquity.

But I must not omit to observe, that Dr. T. supposes, the reason why the gospel-dispensation has been so ineffectual, is, that it has been greatly misunderstood and perverted. In his Key, (389.) he says, “Wrong representations of the scheme of the gospel have greatly obscured the glory of divine grace, and contributed much to the corruption of its professors. — Such doctrines have been almost universally taught and received, as quite subvert it. Mistaken notions about nature, grace, election and reprobation, justification, regeneration, redemption, calling, adoption, etc. have quite taken away the very ground of the Christian life.”

But how came the gospel to be so universally and exceedingly misunderstood? Is it because it is in itself so very dark and unintelligible, and not adapted to the apprehension of the human faculties? If so, how is the possession of such an obscure and unintelligible thing, so glorious an advantage? — Or is it because of the native blindness, corruption, and superstition of mankind? But this is giving up the thing in question, and

alloying a great depravity of nature Dr. T. speaks of the gospel as far otherwise than dark and unintelligible; he represents it as exhibiting the clearest and most glorious light, calculated to deliver the world from darkness, and to bring them into marvellous light. He speaks of the light which the Jews had, under the Mosaic dispensation, as vastly exceeding the light of nature, which the heathen enjoyed; and yet he supposes that even the latter was so clear, as to be sufficient men to the knowledge of God, and their whole duty to him. He speaks of the light of the gospel as vastly exceeding the light of the Old Testament, and says of the apostle Paul in particular, “That he wrote with great perspicuity; that he takes great care to explain every part of his subject; that he has left no part of it unexplained and unguarded; and that never was an author more exact and cautious in this.” Is it not strange, therefore, that the Christian world, without any native depravity, should be so blind in the midst of such glaring light, as to be all, or the generally, agreed, from age to age, so essentially to misunderstand that which is made so very plain?

Mr. T. says, (p. 167. S.) “It is my persuasion, at the christian religion was very early and grievously corrupted, by dreaming, ignorant, superstitious monks, too conceited to be satisfied with the plain gospel; and has long remained in that deplorable state.” — But how came the whole Christian world, without any blinding depravity, to hearken to these ignorant foolish men, rather than unto wiser and better teachers? especially, when the latter had plain gospel on their side, and the doctrines of the other were (as our author supposes) so very contrary not only to the plain gospel, but to men’s reason and common sense. Or were all the teachers of the Christian church nothing but a parcel of ignorant dreamers? If so, this is very strange indeed, unless mankind naturally love darkness rather than light; seeing in all parts of the Christian world, there was a great multitude in the work of the ministry, who had the gospel in their hands, and whose whole business it was to study and teach it; and therefore had infinitely greater advantages to become truly wise, than the heathen philosophers. But if, by some strange and inconceivable means, notwithstanding all these glorious advantages, all the teachers of the Christian church though the world, without any native evil propensity, very early became silly dreamers — and also in their dreaming generally stumbled on the same individual monstrous opinions, and so the world might be blinded for a while — yet,

why did not they hearken to that wise an great man, Pelagius, and others like him, when he plainly held forth the truth to the Christian world? Especially seeing his instructions were so agreeable to the plain doctrines, and the bright and clear light of the gospel of Christ, and also so agreeable to the plainest dictates of the common sense and understanding of all mankind; but the other so repugnant to it, that (according to our author) if they were true, it would prove understanding to be no unduly standing, and the word of God to be no rule of truth, nor at all to be relied upon, and god to be a Being worthy of no regard?

Besides; if the inefficacy of the gospel to restrain sin and promote virtue, be owing to the general prevalence of these doctrines, which are supposed to be so absurd and contrary to the gospel, here is this further to be accounted for, namely, Why, since there has been so great an increase of light in religious matters (as must be supposed on Dr. T.'s scheme) in this and the last age, an these monstrous doctrines of original sin, election, reprobation, justification, regeneration, etc. have been so much exploded, especially in our nation, there has been no reformation attending this great advancement of light and truth; but on the contrary, vice, and every thing opposite to practical Christianity, has, one on to increase, with unless God mercifully interposes, speedily to swallow up all that is virtuous and praiseworthy.

Many other things might have been mentioned under this head — the means which mankind have had to restrain vice, and promote virtue — such as wickedness being many ways contrary to men's temporal interest and comfort, and their having continually before their eyes so many instances of persons made miserable by their vices; the restraints of human laws, without which men cannot live in society; the judgments of God brought on men for their wickedness, with which history abounds, and the providential rewards of virtue; and innumerable particular means, that God has used from age to age to curb the wickedness of mankind, which I have omitted. But there would be no end of a particular enumeration of such things. They that will not be convinced by the instances which have been mentioned, probably would not be convinced, if the world had stood a thousand times so long, and we had the most authentic and certain accounts of means having been used from the beginning, in a thousand times greater variety and now dispensations had been introduced, after

others had been tried in vain, ever so often, and still to little effect. He that will not be convinced by a thousand good witnesses, it is not likely that he would be convinced by a thousand thousand.

The proofs that have been extant in the world, from trial and fact of the depravity of man's nature, are inexpressible, and as it were infinite, beyond the representation of all similitude. If there were a piece of ground which abounded with briars and thorns, or some poisonous plant and all mankind had used their endeavors, for a thousand years together, to suppress that evil growth — and to bring that ground by manure and cultivation, planting and sowing, to produce better fruit, all in vain; it would still be overrun with the same noxious growth — it would not be a proof, that such a produce was agreeable to the nature of that soil, in any wise to be compared to that which is given in divine providence, that wickedness is a produce agreeable to the nature of the field of the world of mankind. For the means used with it have been various, great, and wonderful, contrived by the unsearchable and boundless wisdom of God: medicines procured with infinite expense, exhibited with a vast apparatus a marvellous succession of dispensations, introduced one after another, displaying an incomprehensible length and breadth, depth and height, of divine wisdom, love, and power, and every perfection of the godhead, to the eternal admiration of principalities and powers in heavenly places.

SECTION 9.

Several evasions of the arguments for the depravity of nature, from trial and event's considered.

Evasion I. Dr. T. says, (p. 231, 232.) “Adam's nature, it is allowed, was very far from being sinful; yet he sinned and therefore, the common doctrine of Original Sin, is no more necessary to account for the sin that has been or is in the world, than it is to account for Adam's sin.” Again, (p. 52-54. S. etc.) “If we allow mankind to be as wicked as R. R. has represented them to be; and suppose that there is not one upon earth that is truly righteous, and without sin, and that some are very enormous sinners, Yet it will not thence follow, that they are naturally corrupt: — For, if sinful action infers a nature originally corrupt, then, whereas Adam (according to them that hold the doctrine of Original Sin) committed the

most heinous and aggravated sin, that ever was committed in the world; for, according to them, he had greater light than any other man in the world, to know his duty, and greater power than any other man to fulfill it, and was under greater obligations than any other man to obedience; he sinned, when he knew he was the representative of millions, and that the happy or miserable state of all mankind, depended on his conduct, which never was, nor can be, the case of any other man in the world: — then, I say, it will follow, that his nature was originally corrupt, etc. — Thus their argument from the wickedness of mankind, to prove a sinful and corrupt nature, must inevitably and irrecoverably fall to the ground. — Which will appear more abundantly, if we take in the case of the angels, who in numbers sinned, and kept not their first estate, though created with a nature superior to Adam's." Again, (p. 145. S.) "When it is inquired, how it comes to pass that our appetites and passions are now so irregular and strong, as that not one person has resisted them, so as to keep himself pure and innocent? If this be the case, if such as make the inquiry will tell the world, how it came to pass that Adam's appetites and passions were so irregular and strong, that he did not resist them, so as to keep himself pure and innocent, when upon their principles he was far more able to have resisted them; I also will tell them how it comes to pass, that his posterity does not resist them. Sin doth not alter its nature, by it? being general; and therefore how far soever it spreads, it must come upon all just as It came upon Adam.

These things are delivered with much assurance. But is there any reason in such a way of talking? One thing implied in it, and the main thing, if any at all to the purpose, is, that because an effect being general, does not alter the nature of the effect, therefore nothing more can be argued concerning the cause, from its happening constantly, and in the most steady manner, than from its happening but once. But how contrary is this to reason! Suppose a person, through the deceitful persuasions of a pretended friend, once takes a poisonous draught of a liquor to which he had before no inclination; but after he has once taken of it, he is observed to act as one that has an insatiable, incurable thirst after more of the same, in his constant practice obstinately continued in as long as he lives, against all possible arguments and endeavors used to dissuade him from it. And suppose we should from hence argue a fixed inclination, and begin to

suspect that this is the nature and operation of the poison, to produce such an inclination, or that this strong propensity is some way the consequence of the first draught. In such a case, could it be said with good reason, that a fixed propensity can no more be argued from his consequent constant practice, than from his first draught? Or, suppose a young man, soberly inclined, enticed by wicked companions, should drink to excess, until he had got a habit of excessive drinking, and should come under the power of a greedy appetite after strong drink, so that drunkenness should become a common and constant practice with him: and suppose an observer, arguing from this general practice, should say, "It must needs be that this young man has a fixed inclination to that sin; otherwise, how should it come to pass that he should make such a trade of it?" And another ridiculing the weakness of his arguing, should reply, "Do you tell me how it came to pass, that he was guilty of that sin the first time, without a fixed inclination, and I will tell you how he is guilty of it so generally without a fixed inclination. Sin does not alter its nature by being general: and therefore, how common soever it becomes, it must come at all times by the same means that it came at first." I leave it to every one to judge, who would be chargeable with weak arguing in such a case.

It is true, there is no effect without some cause, ground, or reason of that effect, and some cause answerable to the effect. But certainly it will not follow, that a transient effect requires a permanent cause, or a fixed propensity. An effect happening once, though great, yea, though it may come to pass on the same occasion in many subjects at the same time, will not prove any fixed propensity, or permanent influence. It is true, it proves an influence great and extensive, answerable to the effect, once exerted, or once effectual; but it proves nothing in the cause fixed or constant. If a particular tree, or a great number of trees standing together, have blasted fruit on their branches at a particular season — or if the fruit be very much blasted, and entirely spoiled — it is evident that something was the occasion of such an effect at that time; but this alone does not prove the nature of the tree to be bad. But if it be observed, that those trees, and all other trees of the kind, wherever planted, and in all soils, countries, climates, and seasons and however cultivated and managed, still bear ill fruit from year to year, and in all ages, it is a good evidence of the evil nature of the tree. And if the fruit, at all these times, and in all these

cases, be very bad, it proves the nature of the tree to be very bad. If we argue, in like manner, from what appears among men, it is easy to determine, whether the universal sinfulness of mankind — all sinning immediately, as soon as capable of it, and continually and generally being of a wicked character, at all times, in all ages, in all places, and under all possible circumstances, against means and motives inexpressibly manifold and great, and in the utmost conceivable variety — be from a permanent internal great cause.

If the voice of common sense were heard, there would be no occasion for labor in multiplying arguments to show, that one act does not prove a fixed inclination; but that constant pursuit does. We see that, in fact, it is agreeable to the reason of all mankind, to argue fixed principles, tempers, and prevailing inclinations, from repeated and continued actions — though the actions are voluntary, and performed of choice — and thus to Judge of the tempers and inclinations of persons, eyes, sexes, tribes, and nations. But is it the manner of men to conclude, that whatever they see others once do, they have a fixed abiding inclination to do? Yea, there may be several acts seen, and yet not be taken as good evidence of an established propensity, even though that one act, or those several acts, are followed by such constant practice, as afterwards evidences fixed disposition. As for example; there may be several instances of a man drinking some spirituous liquor, and those instances be no sign of a fixed inclination to that liquor: but these acts may be introductory to a settled habit or propensity, which may be made very manifest afterwards by constant practice.

From these things it is plain, that what is alleged concerning the first sin of Adam, and of the angels, without a previous fixed disposition to sin, cannot in the least weaken the arguments brought to prove a fixed propensity to sin in mankind, in their present state. From the permanence of the cause has been argued, the permanence of the effect. And that the permanent cause consists in an internal fixed propensity, and not in any particular external circumstances, has been argued from the effects being the same, through a vast variety and change of circumstances. But the first acts of sin in Adam or the angels, considered in themselves, were no permanent, continued effects. And though a great number of the angels sinned, and the effect on that account was the greater, and more extensive;

yet this extent of the effect is a very different thing from that permanence, or settled continuance of effect, which is supposed to show a permanent cause, or fixed propensity. Neither was there any trial of a vast variety of circumstances attending a permanent effect, to show the fixed cause to be internal, consisting in a settled disposition of nature, in the instances objected. And however great the sin of Adam, or of the angels, was, and however great the means, motives, and obligations were against which they sinned — and whatever may be thence argued concerning the transient cause, occasion, or temptation, as being very subtle, remarkably tending to deceive and seduce, etc. — yet it argues nothing of any settled disposition, or fixed cause, either great or small; the effect both in the angels and our first parents, being in itself transient, and, for ought appears, happening in each of them under one system or coincidence of influential circumstances.

The general continued wickedness of mankind, against such means and motives, proves each of these things, viz. that the cause is fixed, and that the fixed cause is internal in man's nature, and also that it is very powerful. It proves, that the cause is fixed, because the effect is so abiding, through so many changes. It proves that the fixed cause is internal, because the circumstances are so various — including a variety of means and motives — and they are such circumstances as cannot possibly cause the effect, being most opposite to it in their tendency. And it proves the greatness of the internal cause; or that the propensity is powerful, because the means which have opposed its influence, have been so great, and yet have been statedly overcome.

But here I may observe, by the way, that with regard to the motives and obligations against which our first father sinned, it is not reasonably alleged, that he sinned when he knew his sin would have destructive consequences to all his posterity, and might in process of time, pave the whole globe with skulls, etc. It is evident, by the plain account the scripture gives us of the temptation which prevailed with our first parents to commit that sin, that it was so contrived by the subtlety of the tempter, as first to blind and deceive them as to that matter, and to make them believe that their disobedience should be followed with no destruction or calamity at all to themselves, (and therefore not to their posterity) but on the contrary, with a great increase and advancement of dignity and happiness.

Evasion II. Let the wickedness of the world be ever so general and great, there is no necessity of supposing any depravity of nature to be the cause: man's own free will is cause sufficient. Let mankind be more or less corrupt, they make themselves corrupt by their own free choice. This Dr. T. abundantly insists upon, in many parts of his book.

But I would ask, how it comes to pass that mankind so universally agree in this evil exercise of their free will? If their wills are in the first place as free to good as to evil, what is it to be ascribed to, that the world of mankind, consisting of so many millions, in so many successive generations, without consultation, all agree to exercise their freedom in favor of evil? If there be no natural tendency or preponderation in the case, then there is as good a chance for the will being determined to good as to evil. If the cause be indifferent, why is not the effect in some measure indifferent? If the balance be no heavier at one end than the other, why does it perpetually preponderate one way? How comes it to pass, that the free will of mankind has been determined to evil, in like manner before the flood and after the flood; under the law and under the gospel; among both Jews and Gentiles, under the Old Testament, and since then, among Christians, Jews, Mahometans; among papists and Protestant's; in those nations where civility, politeness, arts, and learning most prevail, and among the Negroes and Hottentots in Africa, the Tartars in Asia, and Indians in America, towards both the poles, and on every side of the globe; in greatest cities and obscurest villages; in places and in huts, wigwams, and cells under ground! Is it enough to reply, It happens so, that men every where, and in all times, choose thus to determine their own wills, and so to make themselves sinful, as soon as ever they are capable of it, and to sin constantly as long as they live, and universally to choose never to come up half way to their duty?

A steady effect requires a steady cause; but free will, without any previous propensity to influence its determinations, is no permanent cause; nothing can be conceived of, farther from it: for the very notion of freedom of will, consisting in self-determining power, implies contingency; and if the will is perfectly free from any government of previous inclination, its freedom must imply the most absolute and perfect contingency: and surely nothing can be conceived of more unfixed than that. The notion of liberty of will, in this sense, implies perfect freedom from every thing that

should previously fix, bind, or determine it; that it may be left to be fixed and determined wholly by itself: therefore its determinations must be previously altogether unfixed. And can that which is so unfixed, so contingent, be a cause sufficient to account for an effect, in such a manner, and to such a degree, permanent, fixed, and constant?

When we see any person going on in a certain course with great constancy, against all manner of means to dissuade him, do we judge this to be no argument of a fixed disposition of mind, because, being free, he may determine if he will, without any such disposition if we see a nation, or people, that differ greatly from other nations, in such and such instances of them constant conduct — as though their tempers and inclinations were very diverse — and any should say, We cannot judge at a of the temper or disposition of people, by any thing observable in their constant practice or behaviour, because they have all free will, and therefore may all choose to act so they please, without any thing in their temper or inclination to bias them Would such an account of such effects satisfying to the reason of mankind? But infinitely further would it be from satisfying a cindererate mind, to account for the constant and universal sinfulness of mankind, by saying that their will is free, and therefore all may, if they first, begin to act as moral agents, and therefore all may if they please, begin to sin as soon as they begin to act: they are free as long as they continue to act in the world, and therefore they may all commit sin continually, if they will: men of all nations are free, and therefore all nations may act alike in these respects, if they please, though some do not know how other nations do act. Men of high and low condition, reamed and ignorant, are free, and therefore they may agree in acting wickedly, if they please, though they do not consult together. Men in all ages are free, and therefore men in one age may all agree with men in every other age in wickedness, if they please, though they do not know how men in other ages have acted, etc. Let every one judge whether such an account of things can satisfy reason.

Evasion III. It is said by many opposers of the doctrine of original sin, that the corruption of mankind may be owing not to a depraved nature, but to bad example. And I think we must understand Dr. T. as having respect to the powerful influence of bad instruction and example, when he says, (p. 118.) “The Gentiles in their heathen state, when incorporated into the body of the gentile world, were without strength, enable to help or

recover themselves.” And in several other places to the like purpose. If there was no depravity of nature, what else could there be but bad instruction and example, to hinder the heathen world, as a collective body, (for as such Dr. T. speaks of them, as may be seen p. 117, 118.) from emerging out of their corruption, on the rise of each new generation? As to their had instruction, our author insists upon it, that the heathen notwithstanding all their disadvantages, had sufficient light to know God, and do their whole duty. Therefore it must be chiefly bad example, according to him, that rendered their case helpless.

Now concerning this way of accounting for the corruption of the world, by the influence of bad example, I would observe,

1. It is accounting for the thing by the thing itself. It is accounting for the corruption of the world by the corruption of the world. For, that bad examples are general all over the world to be followed by others, and have been so from the beginning, is only an instance, or rather a description, of that corruption of the world which is to be accounted for. If mankind are naturally no more inclined to evil than good, then how come there to be so many more bad examples than good ones, in all ages? And if there are not, how come the had examples that are set, to be so much more followed than the good? If the propensity of man’s nature be not to evil, how comes the current of general example, every where, and at all times, to be so much to evil? And when opposition has been made by good examples, how comes it to pass that it has had so little effect to stem the stream of general wicked practice?

I think from the brief account the Scripture gives us of the behavior of our first parents, and of the expressions of their faith and hope in God’s revealed mercy, we have reason to suppose, that before ever they had an children, they repented, were pardoned, and became truly pious. So that God planted the world at first with a noble vine; and at the beginning of their generations, he set the stream of example the right way. And we see, that children are more apt to follow the example of their parents, than of any others, especially in early youth, their forming time, when those habits are generally contracted, which abide by them all their days. Besides, Adam’s children had no other examples to follow, but those of their parents. How therefore came the stream so soon to turn, and to

proceed the contrary way, with so violent a current! When mankind became so universally and desperately corrupt, as not to be fit to live on earth any longer, and the world was every where full of bad examples, God destroyed them all at once — except righteous Noah and his family — in order to remove those bad examples, and that the world might be planted again with good example, and the stream again turned the right way. How therefore came it to pass, that Noah's posterity did not follow his good example, especially when they had such extraordinary things to enforce it, but so generally, even in his life-time, became exceeding corrupt? One would think, the first generations at least, while all lived together as one family, under Noah, their venerable father, might have followed his good example. And if they had done so, then, when the earth came to be divided in Pelage's time, the heads of the several families would have set out their particular colonies with good examples, and the stream would have been turned the right way in all the various divisions, colonies, and nations of the world. But we see, in fact, that in about fifty years after Noah's death, the world in general was overrun with dreadful corruption, so that all virtue and goodness was like soon to perish from among mankind, unless something extraordinary should be done to prevent it.

Then, for a remedy, God separated Abraham and his family from all the rest of the world, that they might be delivered from the influence of bad example, and that in his posterity he might have an holy seed. Thus God again planted a noble vine Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob being eminently pious. But how soon did their posterity degenerate, till true religion was like to be swallowed up! We see how desperately and almost universally corrupt they were, when God brought them out of Egypt, and led them in the wilderness.

Then God was pleased, before he planted his people in Canaan, to destroy that perverse generation in the wilderness, that he might plant them there a noble vine, wholly a right seed, and set them out with good example, in the land where they were to have their settled anode. ⁽³⁴²⁾Jeremiah 2:21. It is evident, that the generation which came with Joshua into Canaan was an excellent generation, by innumerable things said of them. But how soon did that people, nevertheless, become the degenerate plant of a strange vine!

And when the nation had a long time proved desperately and incurably corrupt, God destroyed them, and sent them into captivity — till the old rebels were dead and purged out, in order to deliver their children from their evil example. And when the following generation was purified as in a furnace, God planted them again in the land of Israel, a noble vine, and set them out with good example; which yet was not followed by their posterity.

When again the corruption was become inveterate, the Christian church was planted; and a glorious out-pouring of the Spirit of God caused true virtue and piety to be exemplified far beyond whatever had been on earth before; and thus the Christian church was planted a noble vine. But that primitive good example has not prevailed, to cause virtue to be generally and steadfastly maintained in the Christian world. To how great a degree it has been otherwise, has already been observed.

After many ages of general and dreadful apostasy, God was pleased to erect the Protestant church, as separated from the more corrupt part of Christendom; and true piety flourished in it very much at first; God planted it a noble vine: but notwithstanding the good examples of the first reformers, what a melancholy pass is the Protestant world come to at this day!

When England grew very corrupt, God brought over a number of pious persons, and planted them in New England this land was planted a noble vine. But how is the gold become dim! How greatly have we forsaken the pious examples of our fathers!

So prone have mankind always proved themselves to degeneracy and backsliding, that it shows plainly their natural propensity. And when good has revived, and been promoted among men, it has been by some divine interposition, opposing the natural current; the fruit of some extraordinary means. And the efficacy of such means has soon been overcome by constant natural bias the effect of good example presently lost, and evil has regained the dominion. Like a heavy body, which may by some great power be caused to ascend, against its nature, a little while, but soon goes back again towards the center, to which it naturally and constantly tends.

So that evil example will in no wise account for the corruption of mankind, without supposing a natural proneness to sin. The tendency of example alone will not account for general wicked practice, as consequent on good example. And if the influence of bad example is a reason of some of the wickedness, that alone will not account for men becoming worse than the example set, degenerating more and more, and growing worse and worse, which has been their manner.

2. There has been given to the world an example of virtue, which, were it not for a dreadful depravity of nature, would have influence on them who live under the gospel, far beyond all other examples; that is, the example of Jesus Christ.

God, who knew the human nature, and how apt men are to be influenced by example, has made answerable provision. His infinite wisdom has contrived that we should have set before us the most amiable and perfect example, in such circumstances, as should have the greatest tendency to influence all the principles of man's nature, but his corruption. Men are apt to be moved by the example of others like themselves, or in their own nature: therefore this example was given in our nature. Men are ready to follow the example of the great and honorable; and this — though that of one in our nature, yet — was the example of one infinitely higher and more honorable than kings or angels. A people are apt to follow the example of their prince. This is the example of that glorious person, who stands in a peculiar relation to Christians as their Lord and King, the supreme head of the church; and not only so, but the King of kings supreme head of the universe and head over all things to the church. Children are apt to follow the example of their parents; this is the example of the Author of our being, and of our holy and happy being; the Creator of the world, and everlasting Father of the universe. Men are very apt to follow the example of their friends: the example of Christ is that of one who is infinitely our greatest friend, standing in the most endearing relations of brother, redeemer, spiritual head and husband, whose grace and love expressed to us, transcends all other love and friendship, as much as heaven is higher than the earth. The virtues and acts of his example were exhibited to us in the most endearing and engaging circumstances that can possibly be conceived of. — His obedience and submission to God, his humility, meekness, patience, charity, self-denial, etc. being exercised and expressed

in a work of infinite grace, love, condescension and beneficence to us — and had all their highest expressions in his laying down his life, and meekly, patiently, and cheerfully undergoing unutterable suffering for our eternal salvation. Men are peculiarly apt to follow the example of those from whom they have great benefits: but it is utterly impossible to conceive of greater benefits, that we could have by the virtues of any person, than we have by the virtuous acts of Christ; we, who depend upon being thereby saved from eternal destruction, and brought to inconceivable, immortal glory at God's right hand. Surely if it were not for an extreme corruption of the human heart, such an example would have that strong influence on it, which would as it were swallow up the power of all the evil and hateful examples of a generation of vipers.

3. The influence of bad example, without corruption of nature, will not account for children universally committing sin as soon as capable of it: which, I think, is a fact that has been made evident by the Scripture. It will not account for it in the children of eminently pious parents; the first example set in their view being very good, which was especially the case of many children in Christian families in the apostolic days, when the apostle John supposes that every individual person had sin to repent of, and confess to God.

4. What Dr. T. supposes to have been fact, with respect to a great part of mankind — the state of the heathen world, which he supposes, considered as a collective body, was helpless, dead in sin, and unable to recover itself — cannot consistently be accounted for from the influence of bad example. Not evil example alone, no, nor as united with evil instruction, can be supposed a sufficient reason why every new generation that arose among them, should not be able to emerge from the idolatry and wickedness of their ancestors, in any consistence with his scheme. The ill example of ancestors could have no power to oblige them to sin, any other way than as a strong temptation. But Dr. T. himself says, (p.72. S.) “To suppose men's temptations to be superior to their powers, will impeach the goodness and justice of God, who appoints every man's trial.” And us to bad instructions, as he supposes that they all, yea every individual person, hat light sufficient to know God, and do their whole duty. And if each one could do this for himself, then surely they might all be agreed in it through

the power of free will, as well as the whole world be agreed in corruption by the same power.

Evasion IV. Some modern opposers of the doctrine of original sin, thus account for the general prevalence of wickedness, viz. that in the course of nature our senses grow up first, and the animal passions get the start of reason. So Dr. Turnbull, "Sensitive objects first affect us, and inasmuch as reason is a principle, which, in the nature of things, must be advanced to strength and vigor, by gradual cultivation, and these objects are continually assailing and soliciting us; so, unless a very happy education prevents, our sensitive appetites must have become very strong, before reason can have force enough to call them to an account, and assume authority over them." From hence Dr. Turnbull supposes it comes to pass, "That though some few may, through the influence of virtuous example, be said to be sanctified from the womb, so liberal, so generous, so virtuous, so truly noble is their unit of mind, get generally speaking, the whole world lieth in such wickedness, that, with respect to the far greater part of mankind, the study of virtue is beginning to reform, and is a severe struggle against bad habits, early contracted, and deeply rooted, it is therefore putting off an old inveterate corrupt nature, and putting on a new form and temper, it is moulding ourselves anew, it is a being born again, and becoming as children. — And how few are there in the world who escape its pollutions, so as not to be early in that class, or to be among the righteous that need no repentance!"

Dr. Taylor, though not so explicit, seems to hint at the same thing, (p. 192.) "It is by slow degrees that children come to the use of understanding, the animal passions being for some years the governing part of their constitution. And therefore, though they may be forward and apt to displease us, yet how far this is sin in them, we are not capable of judging. But it may suffice to say, that it is the will of God that children should have appetites and passions to regulate and restrain, that he hath given parents instructions and commands to discipline and inform their minds, that if parents first learned true wisdom for themselves, and then endeavored to bring up their children in the way of virtue, there would be less wickedness in the world."

Concerning these things I would observe, that such a scheme is attended with the very same difficulties, which they who advance it would avoid by it; liable to the same objections, which they make against God's ordering it so, that men should be brought into being with a prevailing propensity to sin. For this scheme supposes the Author of nature has so ordered things, that men should come into being as moral agents, that is, should first have existence in a state and capacity of moral agency under a prevailing propensity to sin. (or that strength, which sensitive appetites and animal passions come to by their habitual exercise, before persons come to the exercise of their rational powers, amounts to a strong propensity to sin, when they first come to the exercise of those rational powers, by the supposition: because this is given as a reason why the scale is turned for sin, and why, generally speaking, the whole world lies in wickedness, and the study of virtue is a severe struggle against bad habits, early contracted, and deeply rooted. Those deeply rooted habits must imply a tendency to sin; otherwise they could not account for that which they are brought to account for, namely, prevailing wickedness in the world: for that cause cannot account for an effect, which is supposed to have no tendency to that effect. And this tendency which is supposed, is altogether equivalent to a natural tendency, being as necessary to the subject. For it is supposed to be brought on the person, who is the subject of it, when he has no power to oppose it; the habit, as Dr. Turnbull says, becoming very strong, before reason can have force enough to call the passion to account, or assume authority over them. And It is supposed, that this necessity, by which men become subject to this propensity to sin, is from the ordering and disposal of the Author of nature; and therefore must be as much from his hand, and as much without the hand of I the person himself, as If he were first brought into being with such a propensity. Moreover, it is supposed that the effect is truly wickedness. For it is alleged as a cause why the whole world lies in wickedness, and why all but a very few are first in the class of the wicked, and not among the righteous, that need no repentance. If they need repentance, what they are guilty of is truly and properly wickedness, or moral evil; for certainly men need no repentance for that which is no sin, or blamable evil. If, as a consequence of this propensity, the world lies in wickedness, and the far greater part are of a wicked character, without doubt the far greater part go to eternal perdition: for death does not pick and choose, only for men of a righteous character.

And certainly that is an evil, corrupt state of things, which naturally tends to and issues in this consequence, that as it were the whole world lies and lives in wickedness, dies in wickedness, and perishes eternally. And this by the supposition, is a state of things, wholly ordered by the Author of nature before mankind are capable of having any hand in the affair. And is this any relief to the difficulties, which these writers object against the doctrine of natural depravity?

And I might here also observe, that this way of accounting for the wickedness of the world amounts to just the same thing with that solution of man's depravity, mentioned before, against which Dr. T. cries out, as too gross to be admitted, (p. 188,189.) viz. God creating the soul pure, and putting it into such a body, as naturally tends to pollute it. I or this scheme suppose, that God creates the soul pure, and puts it into a body, and into such a state in that body, that the natural consequence is a strong propensity to sin as soon as the soul is capable of sinning.

Dr. Turnbull seems to suppose, that the matter could not have been ordered otherwise, consistent with the nature of things, than that animal passions should be so beforehand with reason, as that the consequence should be that which has been mentioned; because reason is a faculty of such a nature, that it can have strength and vigor no otherwise than by exercise and culture. But can there be any force in this? Is there any thing in nature, to make it impossible, but that the superior principles of man's nature should be so proportioned to the inferior, as to prevent such a dreadful consequence, as the moral and natural ruin, and eternal perdition of the far greater part of mankind? Could not those superior principles be in much greater strength at first, and yet be capable of endless improvement? And what should hinder its being so ordered by the Creator, that they should improve by vastly swifter degrees than they do? If we are Christians, we must be forced to allow it to be possible in the nature of things, that the principles of human nature should be so balanced, that the consequence should be no propensity to sin, in the very beginning of a capacity for moral agency because we must own, that it was so in fact in Adam, when first created, and also in the man Christ Jesus; though the faculties of the latter were such as grew by culture and improvement, so that he increased in wisdom as he grew in stature.

Evasion V. Seeing men in this world are in a state of trial, it is fit that their virtue should meet with trials, and consequently that it should have opposition and temptation to overcome; not only from without, but from within, in the animal passions and appetites; that by the conflict and victory our virtue may be refined and established. Agreeably to this Dr. T. (p. 253.) says, “Without a right use and application of our powers, were they naturally ever so perfect, we could not be judged fit to enter into the kingdom of God. — This gives a good reason why we are now in a state of trial and temptation, viz. to prove and discipline our minds, to season our virtue, and to fit us for the kingdom of God; for which, in the judgment of infinite wisdom, we cannot be qualified, but by overcoming our present temptations.” And, (p. 78. S.) “We are upon trial, and it is the will of our Father that our constitution should be attended with various passions and appetites, as well as our outward condition with various temptations.” He says the like in several other places. To the same purpose very often Dr. Turnbull, particularly Chris. “What merit (he says) except from combat! What virtue without the encounter of such enemies, such temptations, as arise both from within and from abroad? To be virtuous, is to prefer the pleasures of virtue to those which come into competition with it and vice holds forth to tempt us, and to dare to adhere to truth and goodness, whatever pains and hardships it may cost. There must therefore, in order to the formation and trial, in order to the very being of virtue, be pleasures of a certain kind to make temptations to vice.”

In reply to these things I would say, either the state of temptation, which is supposed to be ordered for men’s trial, amounts on the whole to a prevailing tendency to that state of general wickedness and ruin, which has been proved to take place, or it does not. If it does not amount to a tendency to such an effect, then how does it account for it? When it is inquired, by what cause such an effect should come to pass, is it not absurd to allege a cause, which is owned at the same time to have no tendency to such an effect? Which is as much as to confess, that it will not account for it. I think it has been demonstrated, that this effect must be owing to some prevailing tendency. — But if the other part of the dilemma be taken, and it be said, that this state of things does imply a prevailing tendency to that effect, which has been proved, viz. that all mankind, without one exception, sin against God, to their own deserved eternal ruin

— and not only so, but sin thus immediately, as soon as capable of it, and continually, have more sin than virtue, and have guilt that infinitely outweighs the value of all the goodness any ever have, and that the generality of the world in all ages are extremely stupid and foolish, of a wicked character, and actually perish for ever — then I say, if the state of temptation implies a natural tendency to such an effect as this it is a very evil, corrupt, and dreadful state of things, as has been already largely shown.

Besides, such a state has a tendency to defeat its own supposed end, which is to refine, ripen, and perfect virtue, and so to fit men for the greater eternal happiness and glory: whereas, the effect it tends to, is the rever. of this, viz. general, eternal infamy and ruin, in all generations. It is supposed, that men's virtue must have passions and appetites to struggle with, in order to have the glory and reward of victory: but the consequence is, a prevailing, continual, and generally effectual tendency — not to men's victory over evil appetites and passions, and the glorious reward of that victory, but — to the victory of evil appetites and lusts over men, utterly and eternally destroying them. If a trial of virtue be requisite, yet the question is, Whence comes so general a failing in the trial, if there be no depravity of nature? If conflict and war be necessary whence the necessity that there should be more cowards than good soldiers? and whence is it necessary that the whole world as it were should lie in wickedness, and die in cowardice?

I might also here observe, that Dr. Turnbull is not very consistent, in supposing, that combat with temptation is requisite to the very being of virtue. For I think it clearly follows from his own notion of virtue, that it must have a being prior to any virtuous or praiseworthy combat with temptation. For by his principles, all virtue lies in good affection, and no actions can be virtuous, but what proceed from good affection. Therefore, surely the combat itself can have no virtue in it, unless it proceeds from virtuous affection: and therefore virtue must have an existence before the combat, and be the cause of it.

CHAPTER 2

Universal Mortality Original Sin, Particularly the Death of Infants With its Various Circumstances.

THE universal reign of death over persons of all ages indiscriminately, with the awful circumstances and attendants of death, prove that men come sinful into the world. — It is needless here particularly to inquire, whether God has not a sovereign right to set bounds to the lives of his own creatures, be they sinful or not, and as he gives life, so to take it away when he pleases? Or how far God has a right to bring extreme suffering and calamity on an innocent moral agent! For death, with the pains and agonies with which it is usually brought on, is not merely a limiting of existence, but is a most terrible calamity; and to such a creature as man-capable of conceiving of immortality, made with an earnest desire after it, capable of foresight and reflection on approaching death, and having an extreme dread of it—is a calamity above all others terrible. I say, it is needless elaborate; to consider, whether God may not, consistent with his, perfections by absolute sovereignty, bring so great a calamity on mankind when perfectly innocent. It is sufficient. It we have good evidence from Scripture, that it is not agreeable to God's manner of dealing with mankind so to do.

It is manifest, that mankind were not originally subjected to this calamity: God brought it on them afterwards, on occasion of man's sin, when manifesting his great displeasure, and by a sentence pronounced by him as a judge, which Dr.T. often confesses. Sin entered into the world as the apostle says, and death by sin. Which certainly leads us to suppose, that this affair was ordered, not merely by the sovereignty of a creator, but by the righteousness of a judge. And the Scripture every where speaks of all great afflictions and calamities, which God in his providence brings on mankind, as testimonies of his displeasure for sin, in the subjects of those calamities excepting those sufferings which are to atone for the sins of others. He ever taught his people to look on such calamities as his rod, the rod of his anger, his frown, the hidings of his face in displeasure. Hence such calamities are in Scripture so often called by the name of judgments, being what God brings on men as a judge, executing a righteous sentence

for transgression. Yea, they are often called by the name of wrath especially calamities consisting or issuing in death. And hence also is that which Dr. T. would have us take so much notice of, that sometimes, in the Scripture calamity and suffering is called by such names as sin, iniquity, being guilty, etc. which is evidently by a metonymy of the cause for the effect. It is not likely that, in the language used of old among God's people, calamity or suffering would have been called by the names of sin and guilt, if it had been so far from having any connection with sin, that even death itself, which is always spoken of as the most terrible of calamities, is not so much as any sign of the sinfulness of the subject, or any testimony of God's displeasure for his guilt, as Dr. T. supposes.

Death is spoken of in Scripture as the chief of calamities, the most extreme and terrible of all natural evils in this world. Deadly destruction is spoken of as the most terrible destruction. (^{<051>}1 Samuel 5:11.) Deadly sorrow, as the most extreme sorrow. (^{<271>}Isaiah 17:11. ^{<163>}Matthew 26:38.) And deadly enemies, as the most bitter and terrible enemies. (^{<97>}Psalms 17:9.) The extremity of Christ's sufferings is represented by his suffering unto death. (^{<23>}Philippians 2:8. and other places.) Hence the greatest testimonies of God's anger for the sins of men in this world, have been by inflicting: death, as on the sinners of the old world; on the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah; on Onan, Pharaoh, and the Egyptians on Nadab and Abihu, Korah and his company, and the rest of the rebels in the wilderness; on the wicked inhabitants of Canaan; on Habintans and Phinehas, Ananias and Sapphira, and the unbelieving Jews, upon whom wrath came to the uttermost, in the time of the last destruction of Jerusalem. This calamity is often spoken of as in a peculiar manner the fruit of guilt. ^{<24>}Exodus 28:43. "That they bear not iniquity and die." ^{<22>}Leviticus 22:9. "Lest they bear sin for it and die." (So ^{<18>}Numbers 18:22. compared with ^{<10>}Leviticus 10:1, 2.) The very light of nature, or tradition from ancient revelation, led the heathen to conceive of death as in a peculiar manner an evidence of divine vengeance. THUS we have an account, (^{<28>}Acts 28:4.) That "when the barbarians saw the venomous beast hang on Paul's hand, they said among themselves, no doubt this man is a murderer, whom though he hath escaped the seas, yet vengeance suffereth not to live."

Calamities, very small in comparison of the universal temporal destruction of mankind by death, are spoken of as manifest indications of God's great

displeasure for the sinfulness of the subject; such as the destruction of particular cities, countries, or numbers of men, by war or pestilence.

Deuteronomy 29:24. “All nations shall say Wherefore hath the Lord done thus unto this land ? what meaneth the heat of this great anger?” (Compare Deuteronomy 32:30. 1 Kings 9:8. and Jeremiah 22:8, 9.) These calamities, thus spoken of as plain testimonies of God’s great anger, consisted only in hastening, on that death, which otherwise, by God’s disposal, would most certainly have come in a short time. Now to take off thirty or forty years from seventy or eighty, supposing it to be so much, one with another, in the time of these extraordinary judgments, is but a small matter, in comparison of God first making man mortal, cutting off his hope of immortality subjecting him to inevitable death, which his nature so exceedingly dreads; and afterwards shortening his life further, by cutting off more than eight hundred years of it: so bringing it to be less than a twelfth part of what it was in the first ages of the world. Besides that innumerable multitudes in the common course of things without any extraordinary judgment, die in youth, in childhood, and infancy. Wherefore how inconsiderable a thing is the additional or hastened destruction. that is sometimes brought on a particular city or country by war, compared with that universal havoc which death makes of the whole human race, from generation to generation, without distinction of sex, age, quality, or condition; with all the infinitely various dismal circumstances, torments, and agonies, which attend the death of old and young, adult persons and little infants I If those particular and comparatively trivial calamities, extending perhaps not to more than the thousandth part of one generation, are clear evidences of God’s great anger; certainly this universal destruction-by which the whole world, in all generations, is swallowed up, as by a flood that nothing can resist-must be a most glaring manifestation of God’s anger for the sinfulness of mankind. Yea, the Scripture is express, that it is so: (Psalm 90:3, etc.) “Thou turnest man to destruction, and sayest, Return, ye children of men. — Thou carriest them away as with a flood: they are as a sleep: in the morning they are like grass, which groweth up; in the morning it flourisheth and groweth up; in the evening it is cut down and withereth. For we are consumed by shine anger, and by thy wrath are we troubled. Thou hast set our iniquities before thee, our secret sins in the light of thy countenance. For all our days are passed away in thy wrath: we spend our years as a tale that is told. The days of

our years are threescore years and ten: and if by reason of strength they be fourscore years, yet is their strength labor and sorrow; for it is soon cut off, and we fly away. Who knoweth the power of thine anger? According to thy fear, so is thy wrath. So teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom.” How plain and full is this testimony, that the general mortality of mankind is an evidence of God’s anger for the sin of those who are the subjects of such a dispensation!

Abimelech speaks of it as what he had reason to conclude from God’s nature and perfection, that he would not slay a righteous nation.

Genesis 20:4. By a righteous evidently meaning innocent. And if so, much less will God slay a righteous world — consisting of so many nations, repeating the great slaughter in every generation subject the whole world of mankind to death, when they are considered as innocent, as Dr. T. supposes. We have from time to time in Scripture such phrases as—worthy of death, and guilty of death: but certainly the righteous Judge of all the earth will not bring death on thousands of millions, not only that are not worthy of death, but are worthy of no punishment at all.

Dr. T. from time to time speaks of affliction and death as a great benefit, as they increase the vanity of all earthly things, and tend to excite sober reflections, and to induce us to be moderate in gratifying the appetites of the body, and to mortify pride and ambition, etc. To this I would say,

1. It is not denied but God may see it needful for mankind in their present state, that they should be mortal, and subject to outward afflictions, to restrain their lusts, mortify their pride, etc. But then is it not an evidence of man’s depravity, that it is so? Is it not an evidence of distemper of mind, yea, strong disease, when man stands in need of such sharp medicines, such severe and terrible means to restrain his lusts, keep down his pride, and to make him willing, and obedient to God? It must be owing to a corrupt and ungrateful heart, if the riches of divine bounty, in bestowing life and prosperity, things comfortable and pleasant, will not engage the heart to God and virtue, love and obedience. Whereas he must always have the rod held over him, be often chastised, and held under the apprehensions of death, to keep him from running wild in pride, contempt, and rebellion; ungratefully using the blessings dealt forth from God’s hand, in sinning against him, and serving his enemies. If man has no natural dis-

ingenuity of heart, it must be a mysterious thing indeed, that the sweet blessings of God's bounty have not as powerful an influence to restrain him from sinning against God, as terrible afflictions. If any thing can be a proof of a perverse and vile disposition, this must be a proof of it, that men should be most apt to forget and despise God, when his providence is most kind; and that they should need to have God chastising them with great severity, and even killing them, to keep them in order. If we were as much disposed to gratitude to God for his benefits, as we are to anger at our fellow-creatures for injuries, as we must be (so far as I can see) if we are not of a depraved heart, then the sweetness of divine bounty, and the height of every enjoyment pleasing to innocent human nature, would be as powerful incentives to a proper regard for God-tending as much to promote religion and virtue-as to have the world filled with calamities, and to have God (to use the language of Hezekiah, ²⁰⁰⁰Isaiah 28:13. describing death and its agonies) as a lion, breaking all our bones, and from day even to night, making an end of us. Dr. T. himself (p. 252.) says, "that our first parents before the fall were placed in a condition proper to engage their gratitude, love, and obedience "Which is as much as to say, a condition proper to engage them to the exercise and practice of all religion. And if the paradisaical state was proper to engage to all religion and duty, and men still come into the world with hearts as good as the two first of the species, why is it not proper to engage them to it skill? What need of so vastly changing man's state, depriving him of all those blessings, and instead of them allowing to him a world full of briers and thorns, affliction, calamity, and death, to engage him to it? The taking away of life, and all those pleasant enjoyments man had at first, by a permanent constitution, would he no stated benefit to mankind, unless there was in them a stated disposition to abuse such blessings. The taking of them away, is supposed to be a benefit, under the notion of their tending to lead men to sin: but they would have no such tendency, at least in a stated manner, unless there was in men a fixed tendency to make that unreasonable misimprovement of them. Such a temper of mind, as amounts to a disposition to make such a misimprovement of blessings, is often spoken of in Scripture as most astonishingly vile and perverse. So concerning Israel abusing the blessings of Canaan, that land flowing with milk and honey, their ingratitude in it is spoken of by the prophets, as enough to astonish all heaven and earth, and as more than brutish stupidity and

vileness. ^{<241D>}Jeremiah 2:7. “I brought them into a plentiful country, to eat the fruit there of, and the goodness thereof. But when ye entered, ye I defiled my land,” etc. See the following verses, especially verse 12. “Be astonished, O ye heavens, at this.” So ^{<240D>}Isaiah 1:2-4. “Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth, I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me. The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master’s crib; but my people doth not know, Israel doth not consider. Ah, sinful nation! a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evil-doers, children that are corrupters.” (Compare ^{<631D>}Deuteronomy 32:6-19.) If to be disposed thus to abuse the blessings of so fruitful and pleasant a land as Canaan, showed so great depravity, surely it would be an evidence of a corruption no less astonishing, to be inclined to abuse the blessings of Eden, and the garden of God.

2. If death be brought on mankind only as a benefit, and in that manner which Dr. T. mentions, — to mortify or moderate their carnal appetites and affections, wean them from the world, excite them to sober reflections, and lead them to the fear and obedience of God, etc. — is it not strange that it should fall so heavily on infants, who are not capable of making any such improvement of it, so that many more of mankind suffer death in infancy, than in any other equal part of the age of man? Our author sometimes hints, that the death of infant may be for the correction and punishment of parents. But hath God any need of such methods to add to parents’ afflictions? Are there not other ways for increasing their trouble, without destroying the lives of such multitudes of those who are perfectly innocent, and who, on the supposition, have in no respect any sin belonging to them? On whom death comes at an age, when not only the subjects are not capable of reflection, or making any improvement of it, either in suffering, or the expectation of it: but also at an age when parents and friends—who alone can improve, and whom Dr. T. supposes alone to be punished by it—suffer least by being bereaved of them; though the infants themselves sometimes suffer to great extremity?

3. To suppose, as Dr. T. does, that death is brought on mankind in consequence of Adam’s sin, not at all as a calamity but only as a favor and benefit, is contrary to the gospel; which teaches, that when Christ, as the second Adam, comes to remove and destroy that death, which came by the first Adam, he finds it not as a friend, but an enemy. ^{<612D>}1 Corinthians

15:22. “For as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive,” (with ver 25, and 26.) “For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last ENEMY that shall be destroyed, is DEATH.

Dr. T. urges, that the afflictions to which mankind are subjected, and particularly their common mortality, are represented in Scripture as the chastisements of our heavenly Father, and therefore are designed for our spiritual good, and consequently are not of the nature of punishments. (So in 68, 69, 38, 39 S.)

Though I think the thing asserted far from being true viz. that the Scripture represents the afflictions of mankind in general, and particularly their common mortality as the chastisement of a heavenly Father, yet it is needless to stand to dispute that matter. For if it be so, it will be no argument that the afflictions and death of mankind are not evidences of their sinfulness. Those would be strange chastisements from the hand of a wise and good Father, which are wholly for nothing especially such severe chastisements, as to break the child’s bones, when at the same time the father does not suppose any guilt, fault, or offense, in any respect, belonging to the child but it is chastised in this terrible manner, only for fear that it will be faulty hereafter. I say, these would be a strange sort of chastisements; yea, though he should be able to make it up to the child afterwards. Dr. T. sneaks of representations made by the whole current of Scripture; I am certain, it is not agreeable to the current of Scripture, to represent divine fatherly chastisement) after this manner. It is trite, the Scripture supposes such chastenings to be the fruit of God’s goodness; yet at the same time it evermore represents them as being for the sin of the subject, and as evidences of the divine displeasure for its sinfulness. Thus the apostle (^{461B} 1 Corinthians 11:30-32.) speaks of God chastening his people by mortal sickness, for their good, that they might not be condemned with the world and yet signifies that it was for their sin; FOR THIS CAUSE many are weak and sickly among you and many sleep: that is, for the profaneness and sinful disorder be fore mentioned. So Elihu, (^{463B} Job 33:16, etc.) speaks of the same chastening by sickness, as for men’s good; to withdraw man from his sinful purpose, and to bide pride from man, and keep back his soul from the pit; that there fore God chastens man with pain on his bed, and the multitude of his, bones with strong pain. But these chastenings are for his SINS, as appears by what follows; (verse 28.)

Where it is observed, that when God by this means has brought men to repent, and humbly confess their sins, he delivers them. Again, the same Elihu, speaking of the unfailing love of God to the righteous, even when he chastens them, and they are bound in fetters, and holden in cords of affliction, (chapter ^{<3810>}36:7, etc.) yet speaks of these chastenings as being for their SINS, (verse 9.) “Then he showeth them their work, and their transgressions, that they have exceeded “So David (Psalm 30.) speaks of God’s chastening by some afflictions, as being for his good, and issuing joyfully; and yet being the fruit of God’s anger for his sin, (verse 5.) God’s ANGER endureth but for a moment, etc. (compare ^{<3836>}Psalm 119:67, 71, 75.) God’s fatherly chastisements are spoken of as being for sin. (^{<3074>}2 Samuel 7:14, 15.) “I will be his father, and he shall be my son. If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men; but my mercy shall not depart away from him.” So the prophet Jeremiah speaks of the great affliction that God’s people suffered in the time of the captivity, as being for their good. (^{<3123>}Lamentations 3:25, etc.) But yet these chastisements are spoken of as being for their SIN, (see especially verse 39, 40.) -So Christ says,

“As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten.” (^{<6189>}Revelation 3:19)

But the words following show, that these chastening from love are for sin that should be repented of: “Be zealous therefore, and repent.” And though Christ tells us, they are blessed that are persecuted for righteousness’ sake, and have reason to rejoice and be exceeding glad; yet even the persecutions of God’s people, as ordered in divine providence, are spoken of as divine chastenings for sin, like the just corrections of a father, when the children deserve them ^{<5811>}Hebrews 12: The apostle there speaking to the Christians concerning the persecutions which they suffered, calls their sufferings by the name of divine rebuke; which implies testifying against a fault: and that they may not be discouraged, puts them in mind, that whom the Lord loves he chastens, and scourgeth every son that he receiveth. It is also very plain, that the persecutions of God’s people, as they are from the disposing hand of God, are chastisements for SIN.

If divine chastisement in general are certain evidences that the subjects are not wholly without sin, some way belonging to them, then in a peculiar manner is death so; for these reasons:

1. Because slaying, or delivering to death, is often spoken of as, in general, a more awful thing than the chastisements which are endured in this life. Thus, ^{}Psalm 118:17, 18. “I shall not die, but live, and declare the works of the Lord. The Lord hath chastened me sore but he hath not given me over unto death.” So the Psalmist, (^{}Psalm 88:15.) setting forth the extremity of his affliction, represents it as what was next to death. “I am afflicted, and ready to die, -while I suffer thy terrors, I am distracted.” (See ^{}1 Samuel 20:3.) And so God’s tenderness towards persons under chastisement, is, from time to time, set forth, that he did not proceed so far as to make an end of them by death. God’s people often pray, when under great affliction, that God would not proceed to this, as the greatest extremity. ^{}Psalm 13:3. “Consider, and hear me, O Lord, my God lighten mine eyes, lest I sleep the sleep of death.”

Especially may death be looked upon as the most extreme of all temporal sufferings, when attended with such dreadful circumstances, and extreme pains, which Providence sometimes brings it on infants; as on the children that were offered up to Moloch, and some other idols who were tormented to death in burning brass. Dr. T. says, (p. 83, 128. S.) “The Lord of all being can never want time, and place and power, to compensate abundantly any suffering) indents now undergo in subserviency to his good providence.” But there are no bounds to such a licence, in evading evidences from fact. It might as well be said, that there is not and cannot be any such thing as evidence, from events of God’s displeasure; which is most contrary to the whole current of Scripture, as may appear in part from what has been observed. This gentleman might as well go further still, and say, that God may cast guiltless persons into hell fire, to remain there in the most unutterable torments for ages of ages, (which bear no greater proportion to eternity than a quarter of an hour,) and if he does so, it is no evidence of God’s displeasure; because he can never want time, place, and power, abundantly to compensate their sufferings afterwards. If it be so, it is not to the purpose, as long as the Scripture so abundantly teaches us to look on great calamities and sufferings which God brings on men,

especially death, as marks of his displeasure for sin, and for sin belonging to them who suffer.

2. Another thing—which may well lead us to suppose death, in a peculiar manner, above other temporal sufferings, to be intended as a testimony of God’s displeasure for — that death is attended with that awful appearance, that gloomy and terrible aspect, which naturally suggests to our minds God’s awful displeasure. Of this Dr. T. himself takes particular notice, when (p. 69.) speaking of death; “Herein (says he) have we before our eyes a striking demonstration, that sin is infinitely hateful to God, and the corruption and ruin of our nature. Nothing is more proper then such a sight to give us the utmost abhorrence of all iniquity,” etc. Now, if death be no testimony of god’s displeasure for sin—no evidence that the subject is looked upon, by him who inflicts it, as any other than perfectly innocent, free from all imputation of guilt, and treated only as an object of favor — is it not strange, that God should annex to it such affecting appearances of his hatred and anger for sin, more than to other chastisements? Which yet the Scripture teaches us are always for sin. These gloomy and striking manifestations of God’s hatred of sin attending death, are equivalent to the awful frowns of God attending the stroke of his hand. If we should see a wise and just father chastising his child, mixing terrible frowns with severe strokes, we should justly argue that the father considered his child as having in him something displeasing, and that he did not thus treat his child only under a notion of mortifying him, and preventing his being faulty hereafter, and making it up to him afterwards, when he had been perfectly innocent, and without fault, either of action or disposition.

We may well argue from these things, that infants are not sinless but are by nature children of wrath, seeing this terrible evil come; so heavily on mankind at this early period. But, besides the mortality of infants in general, there are some particular cases of their death attended with circumstances, which, in a peculiar manner, give evidence of their sinfulness, and of their just exposedness to divine wrath. Particularly,

The destroying of the infants in Sodom and the neighboring cities, may be pleaded in evidence, for these cities destroyed in so miraculous and awful a manner, are set forth as a signal example of God’s dreadful vengeance for sin. (Jude, verse 7.) God did not reprove, but manifestly countenanced,

Abraham, when he said, with respect to the destruction of Sodom, (^(GEN)Genesis 18:23, 25.) “Wilt thou destroy the righteous with the wicked? That be far from thee to do after this manner, to day the righteous with the wicked, and that the righteous should be as the wicked, that be far from thee. Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?” Abraham’s words imply that God would not destroy the innocent with the guilty. We may well understand innocent as included in the word righteous, according to the language usual in Scripture, in speaking of such cases of judgment and punishment. Eliphaz says,

“Who ever perished, being innocent?
Or where were the righteous cut off?” (^(JOB)Job 4:7)

We see what great care God took that Lot should not be involved in that destruction. He was miraculously rescued by angels, sent on purpose; who laid hold on him, brought him, set him without the gates of the city, and told him that they could do nothing till he was out of the way. (^(GEN)Genesis 19:22) And not only was he thus miraculously delivered, but his two wicked daughters for his sake. The whole affair, both the destruction and the rescue, was miraculous; and God could as easily have delivered the infants which were in those cities. And if they had been without sin, their perfect innocence, one should think, would have pleaded much more strongly for them, than those lewd women’s relation to Lot pleaded for them. When in such a case, we must suppose these infants much further from deserving to be involved in that destruction, than even Lot himself. To say, that God could make it up to those infants in another world, must be an insufficient reply. For so he could as easily have made it up to Lot, or to ten or fifty righteous, if they had been destroyed in the same fire. Nevertheless, it is plainly signified, that this would not have been agreeable to the wise and holy proceedings of the judge of all the earth.

Since God declared, that if there had been found but ten righteous in Sodom, he would have spared the whole city for their sakes, may we not well suppose, if infants are perfectly innocent, that he would have spared the old world, in which there were, without doubt, many hundred thousand infants, and in general, one in every family, whose perfect innocence pleaded for its preservation? Especially when such vast care was taken to save Noah and his family, (some of whom, one at least, seem

to have been none of the best,) that they might not be involved in that destruction. If the perfect sinlessness of infants had been a notion entertained among the people of God, in the ages next following the flood—handed down from Noah and his children, who well knew that vast multitudes of infants perished in the flood—is it likely that Eliphaz who lived within a few generations of Shem and Noah would have said to Job, (^{<ROOT>}Job 4:7.) “Who ever perished, being innocent? and when were the righteous cut off? Especially’ since in the same discourse (chapter ^{<ROOT>}5:1.) he appeals to the tradition of the ancients for a confirmation of this very point, (also in chapter ^{<ROOT>}15:7-to. and ^{<ROOT>}22:15, 16.) and he mentions the destruction of the wicked by the flood, as an instance of that perishing of the wicked, which he supposes to be peculiar to them, for Job’s conviction; in which the wicked were cut down out of time, their foundation being overflowed with a flood. Where it is also observable, that he speaks of such an untimeliness of death as they suffered by the flood, as one evidence of guilt as he also does, chapter ^{<ROOT>}15:32, 33. “It shall be accomplished before his time; and his branch shall not be green.” But those who were destroyed by the flood in infancy, above all the rest, were cut down out of time; when instead of living above nine hundred years, according to the common period of man’s life, at that time, many were cut down before they were one year old.

When God executed vengeance on the ancient inhabitants of Canaan, he not only did not spare their cities and families for the sake of their infants, nor took care that they should not be involved in the destruction; but he often repeated his express commands, that their infants should not be spared, but should be utterly destroyed, without any pity; while Rahab the harlot (who had been far from innocence, though she expressed her faith in entertaining and safely dismissing the spies) was preserved and all her friends for her sake. And when God executed his wrath on the Egyptians, by slaying their first-born—though the children of Israel, who were most of them wicked men, as was before shown, were wonderfully spared by the destroying angel, yet the Egyptian infants were not spared. They not only were not rescued by the angel, and no miracle wrought to save them, (as was observed in the case of the infants of Sodom,) but the angel destroyed them by his own immediate hand, and a miracle was wrought to kill them.

Not to be particular, concerning, the command by Moses respecting the destruction of the infants of the Midianites (^{<0817>}Numbers 31:17.) and that given to Saul to destroy all the infants of the Amalekites (^{<0933>}1 Samuel 15:3.) and what is said concerning Edom

“Happy shall he be that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones.” (^{<0379>}Psalm 137:9)

I proceed to take notice of something remarkable concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, represented in Ezekiel 9:when command was given to destroy the inhabitants, verse 1-8. And this reason is given for it, that their iniquity required it and it was a just recompence of their sin, (verse 9, 10.) God at the same time, was most particular and exact in his care, that such as had proved by their behavior, that they were not partakers in the abominations of the city, should by no means be involved in the slaughter. Command was given to the angel to go through the city, and set a mark upon their foreheads, and the destroying angel had a strict charge not to come near any man, on whom was the mark, yet the infants were not marked, nor a word said of sparing, them: on the contrary, infants were expressly mentioned as those that should be utterly destroyed, without pity, (verse 5, 6.) “Go through the city and smite: let not your eye spare, neither have ye pity. Slay utterly old and young, both maids and little children: but come not near any man upon whom is the mark.”

And if any should suspect, that such instances as these were peculiar to a more severe dispensation, under the Old Testament, let us consider a remarkable instance in the days of the glorious gospel of the grace of God; even the last destruction of Jerusalem. This was far more terrible, and with greater testimonies of God’s wrath and indignation, than the destruction of Sodom, or of Jerusalem in Nebuchadnezzar’s time, or any thing that ever had happened to any city, or people, from the beginning of the world to that time. (Agreeable to ^{<1821>}Matthew 24:21. and ^{<0712>}Luke 21:22, 23.) At that time particular care was taken to distinguish and to deliver God’s people; as foretold, ^{<0711>}Daniel 12:1. And we have in the New Testament a particular account of the care Christ took for the preservation of his followers: he gave them a sign, by which they might know when the desolation of the city was nigh, that they who were in Jerusalem might flee

to the Mountains, and escape. And, as history relates, the Christians followed the directions given, and escaped to a place in the mountains called Pella, and wee preserved. Yet no care was taken to preserve the infants of the city in general, but according to the predictions of that event they were involved With of-hers m that great destruction. So heavily did the calamity fall upon them, that those words were verified,

“Behold the days are coming, in which they shall say, Blessed are the barren, and the womb that never bare, and the paps which never gave suck” (^{<1233>}Luke 23:29)

and that prophecy in ^{<1520>}Deuteronomy 32:21-25. which has undoubtedly a special respect to this very time, and is so applied by the best commentators; — “I will provoke them to jealousy with those that are not a people: for a fire is kindled in mine anger-and it shall burn to the lowest hell. I will heap mischiefs upon them: I will spend mine arrows upon them. They shall be burnt with hunger, and devoured with burning heat, and bitter destruction. The sword without, and terror within, shall destroy both the young man, and the virgin the suckling also, with the man of gray hairs.” And, by the history of that destruction appears, that then it was a remarkable fulfillment of ^{<1520>}Deuteronomy 27:53-57. concerning parents eating their children in the siege, — and the tender and delicate woman eating her newborn child. And here it must be remembered, that these very destructions of that city and land are spoken of as clear evidences of God’s wrath, to all nations who shall behold them. And if so, they were evidences of God’s wrath towards infants; who, equally with the rest, were the subject of the destruction. If a particular kind or rank of persons, which made a very considerable part of the inhabitants, were from time to time partakers of the overthrow, without any distinction made in Divine Providence, and yet this was no evidence at all of God’s displeasure with any of them; then being the subjects of such a calamity could not be an evidence of God’s wrath against any of the inhabitants, to the reason of all nations, or any nation, or so much as one person.

PART 2

*Containing Observations on Particular Parts of the Holy Scripture,
Which Prove the Doctrine of Original Sin.*

CHAPTER 1.

*Observations Relating to Things Contained in the Three First Chapters
of Genesis, With Reference to the Doctrine: of Original Sin.*

SECTION 1

*Concerning original righteousness; and whether our first parents
were created with righteousness, or moral rectitude of heart?*

THE doctrine of Original Righteousness, or the creation of our first parents with holy principles and dispositions, has a close connection, in several respects, with the doctrine of original sin. Dr. T. was sensible of this; and accordingly he strenuously opposes this doctrine, in his book against original sin. And therefore in handling the subject, I would in the first place remove this author's main objection against this doctrine, and then show how it may be inferred from the account which Moses gives us, in the three first chapters of Genesis.

Dr. T.'s grand objection against this doctrine, which he abundantly insists on, is this: that it is utterly inconsistent with the nature of virtue, that it should be co-created with any person; because, if so, it must be by an act of God's absolute power without our knowledge or concurrence; and that moral virtue, in its very nature, implieth the choice and consent of the moral agent, with out which it cannot be virtue and holiness: that a necessary holiness is no holiness. So p. 180. where he observes, "That Adam must exist, he must be created, yea he must exercise thought and reflection, before he was righteous." (See also p. 250, 251.) In p 161. S. he says "To say, that God not only endowed Adam with a capacity of being righteous, but moreover that righteousness and true holiness were created with him, or wrought into his nature, at the same time he was made, is to

affirm a contradiction, or what is inconsistent with the very nature of righteousness.” And in like manner Dr. Turnbull in many places insists upon it, that it is necessary to the very being of virtue, that it be owing to our own choice, and diligent culture.

With respect to this, I would observe, that it consists in a notion of virtue quite inconsistent with the nature of things, and the common notions of mankind, and also inconsistent with Dr. T.’s own notions of virtue. Therefore, if to affirm that to be virtue or holiness, which is not the fruit of preceding thought, reflection, and choice, is to affirm a contradiction, I shall show plainly, that for him to affirm otherwise, is a contradiction to himself.

In the first place, I think it a contradiction to the nature of things, as judged of by the common sense of mankind. It is agreeable to the sense of men, in all nations and ages, not only that the fruit or effect of a good choice is virtuous but that the good choice itself, from whence that effect proceeds, is so; yea, also the antecedent good disposition, temper, or affection of mind, from whence proceeds that good choice, is virtuous. This is the general notion-not that principles derive their goodness from actions but-that actions derive their goodness from the principles whence they proceed, so that the act of choosing what is good, is no further virtuous, than it proceeds from a good principle, or virtuous disposition of mind.

Which supposes, that a virtuous disposition of mind may be before a virtuous act of choice; and that, therefore, It is not necessary there should first be thought, reflection, and choice, before there can be any virtuous disposition. If the choice be first, before the existence of a good disposition of heart, what is the character of that choice? There can, according to our natural notions, be no virtue in a choice which proceeds from no virtuous principle, but from mere self-love, ambition, or some animal appetites therefore, a virtuous temper of mind may be before a good act of choice, as a tree may be before the fruit, and the fountain before the stream which proceeds from it.

The following things, in Mr. Hutcheson’s inquiry concerning moral good and evil, are evidently agreeable to the nature of things, and the voice of human sense and reason. (Sect, 11. p. 132,133.) “Every action which we

apprehend as either morally good or evil, is always supposed to FLOW FROM some affections towards sensitive natures. And whatever we call virtue or vice, is either some such affection, or some action CONSEQUENT UPON IT. — All the actions counted religious in any country, are supposed by those who count them so, to FLOW FROM some affections towards the Deity: and whatever we call social virtue, we still suppose to FLOW FROM affections towards our fellow-creatures. — Prudence, if it is only employed in promoting private interest, is never imagined to be a virtue.” In these things Dr. Turnbull expressly agrees with Mr. Hutcheson, his admired author.

If a virtuous disposition or affection is aware of its acts, then they are before those virtuous acts of choice which proceed from it. Therefore, there is no necessity that all virtuous dispositions or affections should be the effect of choice: and so, no such supposed necessity can be a good objection against such a disposition, being natural, or from a kind of instinct, implanted in the mind in its creation. Agreeably to this Mr. Hutcheson says, (*Ibid.* Section III. p. 196, 197.) “I know not for what reason some will not allow that to be virtue, which flows from instinct or passions. But how do they help themselves? They say, virtue arises from reason. What is reason, but the sagacity we have in prosecuting any end? The ultimate end proposed by common moralists, is the happiness of the agent himself. And this certainly he is determined to pursue from instinct. Now may not another instinct towards the public, or the good of others, be as proper a principle of virtue as the instinct towards private happiness? If it be said, that actions from instinct are not the effect of prudence and choice, this objection will hold full as strongly against the actions which flow from self-love.

And if we consider what Dr. T. declares, as his own notion of the essence of virtue, and which he so confidently and often affirms, that it should follow choice, and proceed from it, we shall find it is no less repugnant to that sentiment, than it is to the nature of things, and the general notions of mankind. For it is his notion, as well as Mr. Hutcheson’s, that the essence of virtue lies in good affection, and particularly in benevolence or love; as he very fully declares in these words in his *Key*, “That the word that signifies goodness and mercy should also signify moral rectitude in general, will not seem strange, if we consider that love is the fulfilling of the law.

Goodness, according to the sense of Scripture, and the nature of things, includes all morel rectitude; which, I reckon, may every part of it, where it true and genuine, be resolved into this single principle.” If it be so indeed, then certainly no act whatsoever can have moral rectitude, but what proceeds from this principle. And consequently no act of volition or choice can have any moral rectitude, that takes place before this principle exists. And yet he most confidently affirms, that thought, reflection, and choice must go before virtue, and that all virtue or righteousness must be the fruit of preceding choice. This brings his scheme to an evident contradiction. For no act of choice can be virtuous but what proceeds from a principle of benevolence or love; for he insists that all genuine moral rectitude, in every part of it, is resolved into this single principle. And yet the principle of benevolence itself cannot be virtuous, unless it proceeds from choice; for he affirms, that nothing can have the nature of virtue but what comes from choice. So that virtuous love as the principle of all virtue, must go before virtuous choice, and be the principle or spring of it, and yet virtuous choice must be before virtuous benevolence, and be the spring of that. If a virtuous act of choice goes before a principle of benevolence, and produces it, then this virtuous act is something distinct from that principle which follows it, and is its effect. So that here is at least one part of virtue, yea the spring and source of all virtue, viz. a virtuous choice, that cannot be resolved into that single principle of love.

Here also it is worthy to be observed, that Dr. T. (p. 128.) says the cause of every effect is alone chargeable with the effect it produceth or which proceedeth from it, and so he argues, that if the effect be bad, the cause alone is sinful. According to which reasoning, when the effect is, good, the cause alone is righteous or virtuous. To the cause is to be ascribed all the praise of the good effect it produceth. And by the same reasoning it will follow, that if, etc Dr. Taylor says Adam must choose to be righteous before he was righteous, and if it be essential to the nature of righteousness, or moral rectitude, that it be the effect of choice, and hence a principle of benevolence cannot have moral rectitude, unless it proceeds from choice, then not the principle of benevolence, which is the effect, but to the foregoing choice alone is to be ascribed all the virtue or righteousness that is in the case. And so, instead of all moral rectitude, in every part of it, being resolved into that single principle of benevolence, no

moral rectitude, in any part of it, is to be resolved into that principle, but all is to be resolved into the foregoing choice, which is the cause.

But yet it follows from these inconsistent principles that there is no moral rectitude or virtue in that first act of choice, that is the cause of all consequent virtue. This follows two ways,

1. Because every part of virtue lies in the benevolent principle, which is the effect; and therefore no part of it can lie ill the cause.
2. The choice of virtue, as to the first act at least, can have no virtue or righteousness at all, because it does not proceed from any foregoing choice. For Dr. T. insists, that a man must first hate reflection and choice, before he can have righteousness and that it is essential to holiness that it proceed from choice. So that the first choice from which holiness proceeds can have no virtue at all, because, by the supposition, It does not proceed from choice, being the first choice. Hence, if it be essential to holiness that it proceeds from choice, it must proceed from an unholy choice, unless the first holy choice can be before itself.

And with respect to Adam, let us consider how upon Dr. T. s principles, it was possible he ever should have any such thing as righteousness, by any means at all. In the state wherein God created him, he could have no such thing as love to God, or any benevolence in his heart. For if so, there would have been original righteousness; there would have been genuine moral rectitude; nothing would have been wanting: for our author says, True genuine moral rectitude, in every part of it is to be resolved into this single principle. But if he were wholly without any such thing as love to God, or any virtuous love, how should he come by virtue? The answer doubtless will be, by act of choice: he must first choose to be virtuous. But what if he did choose to be virtuous! It could not be from love to God, or any virtuous principle, that he chose it, for, by the supposition, he has no such principle in his heart. And if he chooses it without such a principle, still, according to this author, there is no virtue in his choice, for all virtue, he says, is to be resolved into that single principle of love. Or will he say, there may be produced in the heart a virtuous benevolence by an act or acts of choice, that are not virtuous? But this does not consist with what he implicitly asserts, that to the cause alone is to be ascribed

what is in the effect. So that there is no way that can possibly be devised, in consistence with Dr. T.'s scheme, in which Adam ever could have any righteousness, or could ever either obtain any principle of virtue, or perform any one virtuous act.

These confused inconsistent assertions, concerning virtue and moral rectitude, arise from the absurd notions in vogue, concerning freedom of will, as if it consisted in the will's self-determining power, supposed to be necessary to moral agency, virtue, and vice. The absurdities of which, with the grounds of these errors, and what the truth is respecting these matters, with its evidences, I have, according to my ability, fully and largely considered, in my "Inquiry" on that subject; to which I must refer the reader, who desires further satisfaction, and is willing to give himself the trouble of reading that discourse.

Having considered this great argument, and pretended demonstration of Dr. T. against original righteousness; I proceed to the proof of the doctrine. And, in the first place, I would consider, whether there be not evidence of it in the three first chapters of Genesis: or, whether the history there delivered does not lead us to suppose, that our first parents were created in a state of moral rectitude and holiness.

I. This history leads US to suppose, that Adam's sin, with relation to the forbidden fruit, was the first sin he committed. Which could not have been, had he not always, till then, been perfectly righteous, righteous from the first moment of his existence; and consequently, created or brought into existence righteous. In a moral agent, subject to moral obligations, it is the same thing, to be perfectly innocent, as to be perfectly righteous. It must be the same, because these can no more be any medium between sin and righteousness, or between being right and being wrong, in a moral sense, than there can be a medium between straight and crooked, in a natural sense. Adam was brought into existence capable of acting immediately, as a moral action, and therefore he was immediately under a rule of right action. He was obliged as soon as he existed to act aright. And if he was obliged to act aright as soon as he existed, he was obliged even then to be inclined to act right. Dr. T. says, (p. 166. S.) "Adam could not sin without a sinful inclination:" and, just for the same reason, he could not do aright, without an inclination to right action. And as he was obliged to act rightly

from the first moment of his existence, and did so, till he sinned in reference to the forbidden fruit, he must have had a disposition of heart to do rightly the first moment of his existence, and that is the same as to be created, or brought into existence, with an inclination to right action, or, which is the same thing, a virtuous and holy disposition of heart.

Here it will be in vain to say, “It is true, that it was Adams duty to have a good disposition or inclination, as soon as it was possible to be obtained, in the nature of things; but as it could not be without time to establish such a habit, which requires antecedent “bought, reflection, and repeated right action; therefore all that Adam could be obliged to, in the first place, was to reflect, and consider things in a right manner, and apply himself to right action, in order to obtain a right disposition:” for this supposes, that even the reflection and considerations to which he was obliged, was right action. Surely he was obliged to it no otherwise than as a thing that was right: an I therefore he must have an inclination to this right action immediately, before he could perform those first right actions. And as the inclination to them should be right, the principle, or disposition from which he performed even these actions, must be good: Otherwise the actions would not be right in the sight of him who looks at the heart; nor would they answer his obligations, if he had done them for some sinister end, and not from a regard to God and his duty. Therefore there must have been a regard to God and his duty implanted in him at his first existence: otherwise it is certain, he would have done nothing from a regard to God and his duty; no, not so much as to reflect and consider, and try to obtain such a disposition. The very supposition of a disposition to right action being first obtained by repeated right action, is grossly inconsistent with itself: for it supposes a course of right action, before there is a disposition to perform any right action.

These are no invented quibbles or sophisms. If God expected from Adam any obedience, or duty to him at all, when he first made him-whether it was in reflecting, considering, or any way exerting his faculties-then he was expected immediately to exercise love to God. For how could it be expected, that Adam should have a strict and perfect regard to God’s commands and authority, and his duty to him, when he had no love nor regard to him in his heart, nor could it be expected he should have any? If Adam from the beginning did his duty to God, and had more respect to the

will of his Creator, than to other things and as much respect to him as he ought to have; then from the beginning he had a supreme and perfect respect and love to God: and if so, he was created with such a principle. There is no avoiding the consequence. Not only external duties, but internal ones, such as summarily consist in love, must be immediately required of Adam, as soon as he existed, if any duty at all was required. For it is most apparently absurd, to talk of a spiritual being, with the faculties of understanding and will, being required to perform external duties, without internal. Dr. T. himself observes, that love is the fulfilling of the law, and that all moral rectitude, even every part of it, must be revolved into that single principle. Therefore; if any morally right act at all, reflection, consideration, or any thing else, was required of Adam immediately, on his first existence, and was performed as required; then he must, the first moment of his existence, have his heart possessed of that principle of divine love, which implies the whole of moral rectitude in every part of it according to our author's own doctrine and so the whole of moral rectitude or righteousness must begin with his existence: which is the thing taught in the doctrine of original righteousness.

Let us consider how it could be otherwise, than that Adam was always, in every moment of his existence, obliged to exercise such respect of heart toward) every object, as was agreeable to the apparent merit of that object. For instance, would it not at any time have become Adam on the exhibition of God's infinite goodness to him, to have exercised answerable gratitude; and would not the contrary have been unbecoming and odious? And if some thing had been presented to Adam's view, transcendently amiable in itself, for instance, the glorious perfection of the divine nature, would it not have become him to love, relish, and delight in it? Would not such an object have merited this? And if the view of an object so amiable in itself did not affect his mind with complacence, would it not, according to the plain dictates of our understanding, have shown an unbecoming temper of mind? Time, by culture, to form and establish a good disposition, would not have taken off the odiousness of the temper. And if there had been never so much time, I do not see how it could be expected he should improve it aright in order to obtain a good disposition? if he had not already some good disposition to engage him to it.

That belonging to the will, and disposition of the heart, which is in itself either odious or amiable, unbecoming or decent, always would have been Adam's virtue or sin, in any moment of his existence, if there be any such thing as virtue or vice; by which terms nothing can be meant, but something in our moral disposition and behavior, which is becoming or unbecoming, amiable or odious.

Human nature must be created with some dispositions; a disposition to relish some things as good and amiable, and to be averse to other things as odious and disagreeable: otherwise, it must be without any such thing as inclination or will; perfectly indifferent, without preference, without choice, or aversion, towards any thing as agreeable or disagreeable. if it had any concreated dispositions at all, they must be either right or wrong, either agreeable or disagreeable to the nature of things. If man had at first the highest relish of things excellent and beautiful, a disposition to have the quickest and highest delight in those things which were most worthy of it, then his dispositions were morally right and amiable, never can be excellent in a higher sense. But if he had a disposition to love most those things that were inferior and less worthy, then his dispositions were vicious. And it is evident there can be no medium between these.

II. This notion of Adam being created without a principle of holiness in his hearts, taken with the rest of Dr. T.'s scheme, is inconsistent with what the history in the beginning of Genesis leads us to suppose of the great favors and smiles of Heaven, which Adam enjoyed while he remained in innocence. The Mosaic account suggests to us, that till Adam sinned, he was in happy circumstances, surrounded with testimonies and fruits of God's favor. This is implicitly owned by Dr. T. when he says, (p. 252.) "That in the dispensation our first parents were under before the fall, they were placed in a condition proper to engage their gratitude, love, and obedience." But it will follow, on our author's principles, that Adam, while in innocency, was placed in far worse circumstances, than he was in after his disobedience, and infinitely worse than his posterity are in; under unspeakably greater disadvantages for avoiding sin, and the performance of duty. For by this doctrine, Adam's posterity come into the world with their hearts as free from any propensity to sin as he, and he was made as destitute of any propensity to righteousness as they: and yet God, in favor to them, does great things to restrain them from sin, and excite them

to virtue, which he never did for Adam in innocency, but laid him, in the highest degree, under contrary disadvantages. God, as an instance of his great favor, and fatherly love to man, since the fall, has denied him the ease and pleasures of paradise, which gratified and allured his senses, and bodily appetites, that he might diminish his temptations to sin. And as a still greater means to restrain from sin, and promote virtue, has subjected him to labor, toil, and sorrow in the world: and not only so, but as a means to promote his spiritual and eternal good far beyond this, has doomed him to death. When all this was found insufficient, he, in further prosecution of the designs of his love, shortened men's lives exceedingly, made them twelve or thirteen times shorter than in the first ages. And yet this, with all the innumerable calamities which God, in great favor to mankind, has brought on the world—whereby their temptations are so vastly cut short, and the inducements to virtue heaped one upon another to so great a degree have we proved insufficient, now for so many thousand years together, to restrain from wickedness in any considerable degree; while innocent human nature, all along, comes into the world with the same purity and harmless dispositions that our first parents had in paradise. What vast disadvantages indeed then must Adam and Eve be in, who had no more in their nature to keep them from sin, or incline them to virtue, than their posterity, and yet were without all those additional and extraordinary means! They were not only without such exceeding great means as we now have, when our lives are made so very short, but had vastly less advantages than their antediluvian posterity, who to prevent their being wicked, and to make them good, had so much labor and toil, sweat and sorrow, briers and thorns, with a body gradually decaying and resuming to the dust. Our first parents had the extreme disadvantage of being placed amongst many and exceeding great temptations — not only without toil or sorrow, pain or disease, to humble and mortify them, and a sentence of death so wean them from the world, but—in the midst of the most exquisite and alluring sensitive delights: the rever. in every respect, and the highest degree, of that most gracious state of requisite means, and great advantages, which mankind now enjoy. If mankind now, under these vast restraints, and great advantages are not restrained from general, and as it were universal wickedness, how could it be expected that Adam and Eve, created with no better hearts than men bring into the world now, and

destitute of all these advantages, and in the midst of all contrary disadvantages, should escape it?

These things are not agreeable to Mose's account. That represents a happy state of peculiar favors and blessings before the fall, and the curse coming afterwards; but according to this scheme, the curse was before the fall, and the great favors and testimonies of love followed the apostacy. And the curse before the fall must be a Curse with a witness, being to so high a degree the rever. of such means, means so necessary for such a creature as innocent man, and in all their multitude and fullness proving too little. Paradise therefore must be a mere delusion I There was indeed a great show of favor, in placing man in the midst of such delights. But this delightful garden it seems, with all its beauty and sweetness, was in its real tendency worse than the apples of Sodom. It was but a mere bait, (God forbid the blasphemy,) the more effectually enticing by its beauty and deliciousness, to Adam's eternal ruin. Which might be the more expected to be fatal to him, seeing he was the first man, having no capacity superior to his posterity, and wholly without the advantage of their observations, experiences, and improvements.

I proceed now to take notice of an additional proof of the doctrine we are upon, from another part of the Holy Scripture. A very clear text for original righteousness we have in ^{<072>}Ecclesiastes 7:29.

“Lo, this only have I found, that God made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions.”

It is an observation of no weight which Dr. T. makes on this text, that the word man is commonly used to signify mankind in general, or mankind collectively taken. It is true, it often signifies the species of mankind; but then it is used to signify the species, with regard to its duration and succession from its beginning, as well as with regard to its extent. The English word mankind is used to signify the species: but what then? Would it be an improper very of speaking, to say, that when God first made mankind, he placed them in a pleasant paradise, (meaning in their first parents,) but now they live in the midst of briars and thorns? And it is certain, that to speak thus of God making mankind — his giving the species an existence in their first parents, at the creation is agreeable to the scripture use of such an expression. As in ^{<062>}Deuteronomy 4:32.

“Since the day that God created man upon the earth.”

“Knowest thou not this of old, since man was placed upon the earth.” (^{<310>}Job 20:4.)

“I have made the earth, and created man upon it: I, even my hands, have stretched out the heavens.” (^{<342>}Isaiah 14:12.)

“I have made the earth, the man and the beast that are upon the ground, by my great power.” (^{<321>}Jeremiah 22:5.)

All these texts speak of God making man, signifying the species of mankind, and yet they all plainly have respect to God making man at first, when he made the earth, and stretched out the heavens. In all these places the same word, Adam, is used as in ecclesiastes; and in the last of them, used with (HE emphaticum) the emphatic sign, as here; though Dr. T. omits it, when he tells us he gives us a catalogue of all the places in Scripture where the word is used. And it argues nothing to the Doctor’s purpose, that the pronoun ‘they’ is used, — They have sought out many inventions. This is properly applied to the species, which God made at first upright: the species begun with more than one, and continued in a multitude. As Christ speaks of the two sexes, in the relation of man and wife, continued in successive generations; ^{<191>}Matthew 19:4. “He that made them at the beginning, made them male and female;” having reference to Adam and Eve. No less impertinent, and also very unfair, is his criticism on the greek word translated upright. Because the word sometimes signifies? right, he would from thence infer, that it does not properly signify moral rectitude, even when used to express the character of moral agents. He might as well insist, that the English word upright, sometimes, and in its most original meaning, signifies right up, or in an erect posture, therefore it does not properly signify any moral character, when applied to moral agents. And indeed less unreasonably; for it is known, that in the Hebrew language, in a peculiar manner, most words used to signify moral and spiritual things, are taken from external and natural objects. The greek word is used, as applied to moral agents, or to the words and actions of such, (if I have not misreckoned,) about an hundred and ten times in Scripture; and about an hundred of them, without all dispute, to signify virtue, or moral rectitude, (though Dr. T. is pleased to say, the word does not generally signify a moral character,) and for the most part it signifies

true virtue, or virtue in such a sense, as distinguishes it from all false appearances of virtue, or what is only virtue in some respects, but not truly so in the sight of God. It is used at least eighty times in this sense: and scarce any word can be found in the Hebrew language more significant of this. It is thus used constantly in Solomon's writings, (where it is often found) when used to moral agents. And it is express a character of property of moral agents. And it is beyond all controversy, that he uses it in this place, (the 7th of Ecclesiastes) to signify moral rectitude, or a character of real virtue and integrity. For the wise man is speaking of persons with respect to their moral character, enquiring into the corruption and depravity of mankind, (as is confessed, p. 184.) and he here declares, he had not found more than one among a thousand of the right stamp, truly and thoroughly virtuous and upright: which appeared a strange thing! But in this text he clears God, and lays the blame on man: man was not made thus at first. He was made of the right stamp, altogether good in his kind, (as all other things were,) truly and thoroughly virtuous, as he ought to be; but they have sought out many inventions. Which last expression signifies things sinful, or morally evil; (as is confessed, p. 185.) And this expression, used to signify those moral evils he found in man, which he sets in opposition to the uprightness man was made in, shows, that by uprightness he means the most true and sincere goodness. The word rendered inventions, most naturally and aptly signifies the subtle devices, and crooked deceitful ways, of hypocrites, wherein they are of a character contrary to men of simplicity and godly sincerity; who, though wise in that which is good, are simple concerning evil. Thus the same wise man, in [Proverbs 12:2](#). sets a truly good man in opposition to a man of wicked devices, whom God will condemn. Solomon had occasion to observe many who put on an artful disguise and fair show of goodness; but on searching thoroughly, he found very few truly upright. As he says, [Proverbs 20:6](#). "Most men will proclaim every one his own goodness: but a faithful man who can find?" So that it is exceeding plain, that by uprightness, in this place, ([Ecclesiastes 7.](#)) Solomon means true moral goodness.

What our author urges concerning many inceptions whereas Adam's eating of the forbidden fruit was but one invention, is of as little weight as the test of what he says on this text. For the many lusts and corruption's of mankind, appearing in innumerable ways of sinning, are all the

consequence of that sin. The great corruption men are fallen into by the original apostacy appears in the multitude of the wicked ways to which they are inclined. And therefore these are properly mentioned as the fruits and evidences of the greatness of that apostacy and corruption.

SECTION 2

Concerning the kind of death, threatened to our first parents, if they should eat if the forbidden fruit.

DR. T. in his observations on the three first chapters of Genesis says, (p. 7.) “The threatening to man in case of transgression was, that he should surely die. — Death IS the losing of life. Death is opposed to life, and must be understood according to the nature of that life, to which it is opposed. Now the death here threatened can, with any certainty, be opposed only to the life God gave Adam, when he created him (verse 7.). Any thing besides this must be pure conjecture, without solid foundation.”

To this I would say; it is true, Death it opposed to life, and must be understood according to the nature of that life, to which it is opposed. But does it therefore follow, that nothing can be meant by it but the loss of life? Misery is opposed to happiness, and sorrow is in Scripture often opposed to joy; but can we conclude from thence, that nothing is meant in Scripture by sorrow, but the loss of joy? or that there is no more in misery, than the loss or absence of happiness? And if the death threatened to Adam can, with certainty, be opposed only to the life given to Adam, when God created him; I think, a state of perfect, perpetual, and hopeless misery is properly opposed to that state Adam was in when God created him. for I suppose it will not be denied, that the life Adam had, was truly a happy life; happy in perfect innocency, in the favor of his Maker, surrounded with the happy fruits and testimonies of his love. And I think it has been proved, that he also was happy in a state of perfect righteousness. Nothing is more manifest, than that it is agreeable to a very common acceptation of the word life, in Scripture, that it be understood as signifying a state of excellent and happy existence. Now that which is most opposite to that life and state in which Adam was created, is a state of total, confirmed wickedness, and perfect hopeless misery, under the

divine displeasure and curse; not excluding temporal death, or the destruction of the body, as an introduction to it.

Besides, that which is much more evident, than any thing Dr. T. says on this head, is, that the death which was to come on Adam, as the punishment of his disobedience, was opposed to that life, which he would have had as the regard of his obedience in case he had not sinned. Obedience and disobedience are contraries; the threatenings and promises which are sanctions of a law, are set in direct opposition, and the promises, regards, and threatened punishments, are most properly taken as each others' opposites. But none will deny, that the life which would have been Adam's reward, if he had persisted in obedience, was eternal life. And therefore we argue justly that the death which stands opposed to that life, (Dr. T. himself being judge, p. 120. S.) is manifestly eternal death, a death widely different from the death we now die. — to use his own word). If Adam, for his persevering obedience, was to have had everlasting life and happiness in perfect holiness, union with his Maker, and enjoyment of his favor, and this was the life which was to be confirmed by the tree of life; then, doubtless, the death threatened in case of disobedience, which stands in direct opposition to this, was an exposure to everlasting wickedness and misery, in separation from God, and in enduring his wrath.

When God first made mankind, and made known to them the methods of his moral government towards them, in the revelation he made of himself to the natural head of the whole species — and letting him know, that obedience to him was expected, and enforcing his duty with the sanction of a threatened punishment, called by the name of death — we may with the greatest reason suppose, in such a case, that by death was meant the most proper punishment of the sin of mankind, and which he speaks of under that name throughout the Scripture, as the proper wages of sin; and this was always, from the beginning, understood to be so in the church of God. It would be strange indeed, if it should be otherwise. It would have been strange, if, when the law of God was first said, and enforced by the threatening of a punishment, nothing at all had been mentioned of that great punishment, ever spoken of under the name of death — in the revelations which he has given to mankind from age — as the proper punishment of the sin of mankind.

And it would be no less strange, if when the punishment which was mentioned and threatened on that occasion, was called by the same name, even death, yet we must not understand it to mean the same thing, but something infinitely diverse, and infinitely more inconsiderable.

But now let us consider what that death is, which the Scripture ever speaks of as the proper wages of sin, and is spoken of as such by God's saints in all ages of the church. I will begin with the New Testament. When the apostle Paul says, (^{<RB2>}Romans 6:23.) "The wages of sin is death," Dr. T. tells us, (p. 120. S.) that this means eternal death, the second death, a death widely different from the death we now die. The same apostle speaks of death as the proper punishment due for sin, (^{<RB5>}Romans 7:5. and chapter 8:13. ^{<RB20>}2 Corinthians 3:7. ^{<RB56>}1 Corinthians 15:56. In all which places, Dr. T. himself supposes the apostle to intend eternal death. And when the apostle James seeks of death, as the proper reward, fruit, and end of sin, (^{<RB15>}James 1:15.) "Sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death;" it is manifest, that our author supposes eternal destruction to be meant. And the apostle John, agreeably to Dr. T.'s sense, speaks of the second death as that which sin unrepented of will bring all men to at last. ^{<RB11>}Revelation 2:11. ^{<RB16>}20:6, 14. and ^{<RB21>}21:8. In the same sense the apostle John uses the word in his first epistle chapter ^{<RB34>}3:14. "We know that we have passed from death to life because we love the brethren. He that hateth his brother, abideth in death." In the same manner Christ used the word from time to time, when he was on earth, and spake concerning the punishment of sin.

"He that heareth my word, and believeth, etc. hath everlasting life and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death to life." (^{<RB31>}John 5:24.)

Where, according to Dr. T.'s own way of arguing, it cannot be the death which we now die, that Christ speaks of, but eternal death, because it is yet in opposition to everlasting life,

"This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die." (^{<RB61>}John 6:50)

Chapter ^{<RB51>}8:51. "Verily, verily I say unto you, if a man keep my saying, he shall never see death." Chapter ^{<RB126>}11:26. "And whosoever liveth and

believeth in me, shall never die.” In which places it is plain Christ does not mean that believers shall never see temporal death. (See also ^{<1028>}Matthew 10:28. and ^{<1029>}Luke 10:28.) In like manner, the word was commonly used by the prophets of old, when they spake of death as the proper end and recompence of sin. So, abundantly by the prophet Ezekiel.

“When I say unto the wicked man, thou shalt surely die.”

(^{<1030>}Ezekiel 3:18)

In the original it is, Dying, thou shalt die: the same form of expression, which God used in the threatening to Adam. We have the same words again, chapter ^{<1031>}33:18. In chapter ^{<1032>}18:4. it is said, “The soul that sinneth it shall die.” And that temporal death is not meant in these places is plain, because it is promised most absolutely, that the righteous shall not die the death spoken of Chapter ^{<1033>}18:21. “He shall surely live he shall not die.” (So verse 9, 17, 19, and 22. and chapter ^{<1034>}3:21.) And it is evident the prophet Jeremiah uses the word in the same sense. ^{<1035>}Jeremiah 31:30. “Every one shall die for his own iniquity.” And the same death is spoken of by the prophet Isaiah. ^{<1036>}Isaiah 11:4. “With the breath of his tips shall he slay the wicked.” (See also chapter ^{<1037>}66:16. with verse 24.) Solomon, who we must suppose was thoroughly acquainted with the sense in which the word was used by the wise, and by the ancients, continually speaks of death as the proper fruit, issue, and recompence of sin, using the word only in this sense. ^{<1038>}Proverbs 11:19. “As righteousness tendeth to life, so he that pursueth evil pursued it to his own death.” — He cannot mean temporal death, for he often speaks of it as a punishment of the wicked, wherein the righteous shall certainly be distinguished from them: as in ^{<1039>}Proverbs 12:28. “In the way of righteousness is life, and in the pathway thereof is no death.” (So in chapter ^{<1040>}10:2. ^{<1041>}11:4. ^{<1042>}13:14. ^{<1043>}14:27. and many other places.) Put we find this same wise man observes, that as to temporal death, and temporal events in general, there is no distinction, but that they happen alike to good and bad. (^{<1044>}Ecclesiastes 2:4-16. ^{<1045>}8:14. and ^{<1046>}9:2, 3.) His words are remarkable in ^{<1047>}Ecclesiastes 7:15. “There is a just man that perisheth in his righteousness, and there is a wicked man that prolongeth his life, in his wickedness.” So we find, David in the book of Psalm uses the word death in the same sense, when he speaks of it as the proper wages and issue of sin, ^{<1048>}Psalm 34:21. “Evil shall slay the wicked.” He speaks of it as a certain thing, ^{<1049>}Psalm 139:19.

“Surely thou wilt slay the wicked, O God.” And he speaks of it as a thing wherein the wicked are distinguished from the righteous, ^{<BIB>}Psalm 69:28. “Let them be blotted out of the book of the living, and not be written with the righteous.” — And thus we find the word death used in the Pentateuch, where we have the account of the threatening of death to Adam. When, in these books, it is spoken of as the proper fruit, and appointed reward of sin, it is to be understood of eternal death. Thus, ^{<BIB>}Deuteronomy 30:15. “See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil.” Verse 19. “I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing.” The life that is spoken of here, is doubtless the same that is spoken of in ^{<BIB>}Leviticus 18:5. “Ye shall therefore keep my statutes and my judgments, which if a man do, he shall live in them.” This the apostle understands of eternal life; as is plain by ^{<BIB>}Romans 10:5. and ^{<BIB>}Galatians 3:12. But that the death threatened for sin in the law of Moses meant eternal death, is what Dr. T. abundantly declares. So in his note on ^{<BIB>}Romans 5:20. (Par. p. 291.) “Such a constitution the law of Moses was, subjecting, those who were under it to death for every transgression: meaning, by death ETERNAL DEATH.” These are his words. The like he asserts in many other places. When it is said, in the place now mentioned, I have set before thee LIFE and DEATH, blessing and cursing, without doubt, the same blessing and cursing is meant which God had already set before them with such solemnity, in the 27th and 28th chapters; where we have the sum of the curses in those last words of the 27th chapter, Cursed is every one that continueth not all the words of this law, to do them. Which the apostle speaks of as a threatening of eternal death; and with him Dr. T. himself: In this sense also Job and his friends spoke of death, as the wages and end of sin, who lived before any written revelation, and had their religion, and their phraseology about religion, from the ancients.

If any should insist upon it as an objection — against supposing that death was intended to signify eternal death ill the threatening to Adam — that this use of the word is figurative: I reply, that though this should be allowed, yet it is by no means so figurative as many other phrases used in the history contained in these three chapters: as when it Is said, God said, Let there be light, God said Let there be a firmament, etc. as though God spake such words with a voice. So when it is said, God called the light,

day: God called the firmament, heaven, etc. God rested on the seventh day; as though he had been weary and then rested. And when it is said, They heard the voice of God walking; as though the Deity had feet, and took steps on the ground. Dr. T. supposes, that when it is said of Adam and Eve, Their eyes were opened, and they were that they were naked; by the word naked is meant a state of guilt. (P. 12.) which sense of the word, naked, is much further from the common use of the word, than the supposed sense of the word death. SO this author supposes the promise concerning the seed of the woman bruising the serpent's head, while the serpent should bruise his heel, is to be understood of the Messiah destroying the power and sovereignty of the devil, and receiving some slight hurt from him. (P. 15,16.) Which makes the sentence full of figures. And why might not God deliver threatenings to our first parents in figurative expressions, as well as promises?

But indeed, there is no necessity of supposing the word death, or the Hebrew word so translated, if used in the manner that has been supposed, to have been figurative at all. It does not appear but that this word, in its true and proper meaning, might signify perfect misery, and sensible destruction, though the word was also applied to signify something more external and visible. There are many words in our language, such as heart, sense, view, discovery, conception, light, and many others, which are applied to signify external things as that muscular part of the body called heart; external feeling, called sense; the sight of the bodily eye, called view; the finding of a thing by its being uncovered, called discovery; the first beginning of the fetus in the womb, called conception; and the rays of the sun, called light. Yet these words do as truly and properly signify other things of a more spiritual internal nature; such as the disposition, affection, perception, and thought of the mind, and manifestation and evidence to the soul. Common use, which governs the propriety of language, makes the latter things to be as much signified by those words, in their proper meaning, as the former. It is especially common in the hebrew, and I suppose, other Oriental languages, that the same word that signifies something external, does no less properly and usually signify something more spiritual. So the Hebrew words used for breath, have such a double signification; Neshama signifies both breath and the soul; and the latter as commonly as the former: Ruach is used for breath or wind, but yet more

commonly signifies spirit. Nephesh is used for breath, hut yet more commonly signifies soul. So the word Lebh, heart, no less properly signifies the soul, especially with regard to the will and attentions, than that part of the body so called. The word Shalom, which we render peace, no less properly signifies prosperity and happiness, than mutual agreement. The word translated life, signifies the natural life of the body, and also the perfect and happy state of sensible active being; and the latter as properly as the former. So the word death, signifies destruction, us to outward sensibility, activity, and enjoyment: but it has most evidently another signification, which in the Hebrew tongue is no less proper, viz. perfect, sensible hopeless ruin and misery.

It is therefore wholly without reason urged, that death properly signifies only the loss of this present life, and that therefore nothing else was meant by that death which was threatened for eating the forbidden fruit. Nor does it at all appear but that Adam—who, from what God said concerning the seed of the woman, could understand that relief was promised as to the death which was threatened, as Dr. T. himself supposes — understood the death which was threatened, in the more important sense. Especially seeing temporal death, considered originally and in itself is evermore, excepting as changed by divine grace, an entrance into that dismal state of misery which is shadowed forth by the awful circumstances of this death; circumstances naturally suggesting to the mind the most dreadful state of hopeless, sensible ruin.

As to the objection, that the phrase, Dying thou shalt die, is several times used in the books of Moses, to signify temporal death, it ran be of no force. For it has been shown already, that the same phrase is sometimes used in Scripture to signify eternal death, in instances much more parallel with this. But indeed nothing can be certainly argued concerning the nature of the thing intended, from its being expressed in such a manner. For it is evident, that such repetitions of a word in the Hebrew language, are no more than an emphasis upon a word in the more modem languages, to signify the great degree of a thing, the importance or certainly of it. etc. When we would signify and impress these, we commonly put an emphasis on our words. Instead of this, the Hebrews, when they would express a thing strongly, repeated or doubled the word, the more to impress the mind of the hearer; as may be plain to every one in the least conversant

with the Hebrew Bible. The repetition in the threatening to Adam, therefore, only implies the solemnity and importance of the threatening. But God may denounce either eternal or temporal death with peremptoriness and solemnity, and nothing can certainly be inferred concerning the nature of the thing threatened, because it is threatened with emphasis more than this, that the threatening is much to be regarded. Though it be true, that it might in an especial manner be expected that a threatening of eternal death would be denounced with great emphasis, such a threatening being infinitely important, and to be regarded above all others.

SECTION 3

Wherein it is inquired, whether there be any thing in the history of the three first chapters no Genesis, which should lead us to suppose, that God in his constitution with Adam, dealt with mankind in general, as included in their first father, and that the threatening of death, in case he should eat the forbidden fruit, had respect not only to him, but his posterity?

Dr. T. rehearsing that threatening to Adam, Thou shalt surely die, and giving us his paraphrase of it, (p. 7, 8.) concludes thus; “Observe, here is not one word relating to Adam’s posterity.” But it may be observed, in opposition to this, that there is scarcely one word that we have an account of, which God ever said to Adam or Eve, but what does manifestly include their posterity in the meaning and desire of it. There is as much of a word said about Adam’s posterity in that threatening, as there is in those words of God to Adam and Eve,

“Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it;”
(^{GEN}Genesis 1:28.)

and as much in events, to lead us to suppose Adam’s posterity to be included. There is as much of a word of kits posterity in that threatening, as in those words, (verse 29.) “Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, and every tree in which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed,” etc. Even when God was about to create Adam, what he said on that occasion, had not respect only to Adam, but to his posterity. ^{GEN}Genesis 1:26. “Let us make man in our image, and let them have dominion over the

fish of the sea,” etc. And, what is more remarkable, there is as much of a word said about Adam’s posterity in the threatening of death, as there is in that sentence, (~~GEN~~ Genesis 3:19.) “Unto dust shalt thou return.” Which Dr. T. himself supposes to be a sentence pronounced for the execution of that very threatening, Thou shalt surely die. This sentence he himself also often speaks of as including Adam’s posterity: and, what is much more remarkable still, is a sentence which Dr. T. himself often speaks of as including his posterity, at a SENTENCE OF CONDEMNATION, as a JUDICIAL sentence and a sentence which God pronounced with regard to Adam’s POSTERITY, ACTING THE PART OF A JUDGE, and as such condemning them to temporal death. Though he is therein utterly inconsistent with himself, inasmuch as he at the same time abundantly insists, that death is not brought on Adam’s posterity in consequence of his sin, at all as a punishment, but merely by the gracious disposal of a father, bestowing a benefit of the highest nature upon him.

But I shall show, that I do not in any of these things falsely charge or misrepresent Dr. T. — He speaks of the sentence in chapter ~~GEN~~ 3:19. as pronounced in pursuance of the threatening in the former chapter, in these words, (p. 17, 18.) “The sentence upon the man, verse 17,18,19. First affects the earth, upon which he was to subsist: the ground should be encumbered with many noxious weeds, and the tillage of it more toilsome: which would oblige the man to procure a sustenance by hard labor, till he should die, and drop into the ground, from whence he was taken.

Thus death entered by sin into the world, and man became mortal, ACCORDING TO THE ‘THREATENING IN THE FORMER CHAPTER.’ Now, if mankind became mortal, and must die, according to the threatening in the former chapter, then doubtless the threatening in the former chapter, Thou shalt die, had respect not only to Adam, but to mankind, and included Adam’s posterity. Yea, and Dr. T. is express in it, and very often so, that the sentence concerning dropping into the ground, or resuming to the dust, did include Adam’s posterity. So, p. 20. speaking there of that sentence, “Observe (says he) that we their prosperity are in fact subjected to the same affliction and mortality, here by sentence inflicted upon our first parents.” — P. 42. Note. “But yet man through that long tract, were all subject to death, therefore they must be included in the sentence.” The

same he affirms in innumerable other places, some of which I shall have occasion to mention presently.

The sentence which is founded on the threatening, and (as Dr. T. says) according to the threatening, extends to as many as were included in the threatening and to no more. If the sentence be upon a collective subject, indefinitely, the greatest part of which were not included in the threatening, nor were ever threatened at all, then certainly this sentence is not according to the threatening, nor built upon it. If the sentence be according to the threatening, then we may justly explain the threatening by the sentence. And if we find the sentence spoken to the same person whom the threatening was spoken, and spoken in the second person singular in like manner with the threatening, founded on the threatening, and according to it; and if we find the sentence includes Adam's posterity, then we may certainly infer, that so did the threatening. And hence, that both the threatening and sentence were delivered to Adam as the public head and representative of his posterity.

And we may also further infer from it, in another respect. directly contrary to Dr. T.'s doctrine, that the sentence which included Adam's posterity, was to death, as a punishment to that posterity, as well as to Adam himself. For a sentence pronounced in execution of a threatening, is for a punishment. Threatenings are of punishments. Neither God nor man are wont to threaten others with favors and benefits.

But lest any of this author's admirers should stand to it, that it may very properly be said, God threatened mankind with bestowing great kindness upon them, I would observe, that Dr. T. himself open speaks of this sentence as pronounced by God on all mankind, as condemning them; as a sentence of condemnation judicially pronounced, or a sentence which God pronounced on all mankind acting as their judge, and in a judicial proceeding. This he affirms in multitudes of places. In p. 20. speaking of this sentence, which, he there says, subjects us, Adam's and Eve's posterity, to affliction and mortality, he calls it a judicial act of condemnation. "The judicial act of condemnation (says he) clearly implies, a taking him to pieces, and turning, him to the ground from whence he was taken." And (p. 28, 29. Note.) "In all the Scripture from one end to the other, there is recorded but one judgment to condemnation, which came

upon all men, and that is, ^{<0087>}Genesis 3:17-19. Dost thou art, etc. P. 40. speaking of the same, he says, “All men are brought under condemnation.” In p. 27, 28. “BY judgment, judgment to condemnation, it appeareth evidently to me, he (Paul) means the being adjudged to the aforementioned death; he means the sentence at death, of a general mortality, pronounced upon mankind, in consequence of Adam’s first transgression. And the condemnation inflicted by the judgment of God, answereth to, and is in effect the same thing with; being dead.” P. 30. “The many, that is mankind, were subject to death by the judicial act of God.” P. 31. “Being made sinners may very well signify, being adjudged, or condemned to death. — for the Hebrew word, etc. signifies to make one a judicial sentence, or to condemn.” — P. 178. Par on ^{<8589>}Romans 5:19. “Upon the account of one man’s disobedience, mankind were judicially constituted sinners that is subjected to death by the sentence of God the Judge, — And there are many other places where he repeats the same thing. And it is pretty remarkable, that (page 48, 49.) immediately after citing ^{<0175>}Proverbs 17:15. “He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the just, are both an abomination to the Lord” — and when he is careful in citing these words, to put us in mind, that it is meant of a judicial act yet, in the very next words, he supposes that God himself does so, since he constantly supposes that Adam’s posterity, whom God condemns, are innocent. His words are these, “From all this it followeth, that as the judgment, that passed upon all men to condemnation, is death’s coming upon all need, by the judicial act of God, upon occasion of Adam’s transgression: so,” etc.-And it is very remarkable, that (p. 3, 4, 7. S.) he insists, “That in Scripture no action is said to be imputed, reckoned, or accounted to any person for righteousness or CONDEMNATION, but the proper act and deed of that person.” — And Yet he thus continually affirms, that all mankind are made sinners by a judicial act at God the Judge, even to condemnation and judicially-constituted sinners, and so subjected to a judicial sentence of condemnation, on occasion of Adam’s sin, and all according to the threatening denounced to Adam, “Thou shalt surely die:” though he supposes Adam’s posterity were not included in the threaten, and are looked upon as perfectly innocent, and treated wholly as such.

I am sensible Dr. T. does not run into all this inconsistency only through oversight and blundering; but that he is driven to it, to make out his matters in his evasion of that noted paragraph in the fifth chapter of Romans; especially those three sentences; (verse 16.) “The judgment was by one to condemnation.” (verse 18.) “By the offense of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation;” and (verse 19.) “By one man’s disobedience many were made sinners.” And I am also, sensible of what he offers to salve the inconvenience, viz. “That if the threatening had immediately been executed on Adam, he would have had no posterity; and that so far the possible existence of Adam’s posterity fell under the threatening of the law, And into the hands of the judge, to be disposed of as he should think fit: and that this is the ground of the judgment to condemnation, coming upon all men.” But this is trifling, to a great degree: for,

1. Suffering death, and failing of possible existence, are entirely different things. If there had never been any such thing as sin committed, there would have been infinite numbers of possible beings, which would have failed of existence, by God’s appointment. God has appointed (If the phrase be allowable) not to bring into existence numberless possible worlds, each replenished with innumerable possible inhabitants. But is this equivalent to God’s appointing them all to suffer death?

2. Our author represents, that by Adam’s sin, the possible existence of his posterity fell into the hand’ of the Judge, to be disposed of as he should think fit. But there was no need of any sin of Adam, or of any body else, in order to their being brought into God’s hands, in this respect. The future possible existence of all created beings is in God’s hands, antecedently to the existence of any sin. And therefore, infinite members of possible beings without any relation to Adam, or any other sinning being fail of their possible existence. And if Adam had never sinned, yet it would be unreasonable to suppose, but that innumerable multitudes of his possible posterity would have failed of existence by God’s disposal. For will any be so unreasonable as to imagine, that God would and must have brought into existence as many of his posterity as it was possible should be, if he had not sinned? Or, that then it would not have been possible, that any other persons of his posterity should ever had existed, shall those Individual persons who now actually suffer death, and return to the dust?

3. We have many accounts in Scripture, which imply the actual failing of the possible existence of innumerable multitudes of Adam's posterity, yea, of many more than ever come into exigency. As, of the possible posterity of Abel, the possible posterity of all them that were destroyed by the flood, and the possible posterity of the innumerable multitudes, which we read of in Scripture, destroyed by sword, pestilence? etc. And if the threatening to Adam reached his posterity, In no other respect than this, that they were liable to be deprived by it of their possible existence, then these instances are much more properly a fulfillment of that threatening, than the suffering of death by such as actually come into existence, and so is that which is most properly the judgment to condemnation, executed by the sentence of the Judge, proceeding on the ground of that threatening. But where do we ever find this so represented in Scripture? We read of multitudes cut off for their personal sins, who thereby fails from their possible posterity. And these are mentioned as God's judgments on them, and effects of God's condemnation of them: but when are they ever spoken of as God judicially proceeding against, and condemning their possible posterity?

4. Dr. T. in what he says concerning this matter, speaks of the threatening of the law delivered to Adam, which the possible existence of his posterity fell under, as the ground of the judgment to condemnation coming upon all men. But herein he is exceeding inconsistent with himself: for he affirms in a place fore-cited, that the Scripture never speaks of any sentence of condemnation coming upon all men, but that sentence in the third of Genesis, concerning man fuming to dust. But, according to him, the threatening of the law delivered to Adam, could not be the ground of that sentence; for he greatly insists upon it, that that law was entirely abrogated before that sentence was pronounced, had no existence to have any such influence as might procure a sentence of death, and therefore this sentence was introduced entirely on another footing, a new dispensation of grace. The reader may see this matter strenuously urged, and particularly argued by him p. 113-120. S. So that this sentence could not, according to him, huge the threatening of that law for its ground, as he supposes; for it never stood upon that ground. It could not be called a judgment of condemnation, under any such view; for it could not be viewed in circumstances where It never existed.

5. If, as our author supposes, that the sentence of death on all men comes under the notion of a judgment to condemnation by this means, viz. that the threatening to Adam was in some respect the ground of it; then it also comes under the notion of a punishment: for threatening annexed to breaches of laws, are to punishments; and a judgment of condemnation to the thing threatened, must be to punishment; and the thing condemned to, must have as much the notion of a punishment, as the sentence has the notion of a judgment to condemnation. But this Dr. T. wholly denied: he denies that death comes as any punishment at all; but insists that it comes only as a savor and benefit, and a fruit of fatherly love to Adam's posterity, respected not as guilty, but wholly innocent. So that his scheme will not admit of its coming under the notion of a sentence to condemnation in any respect whatsoever Our author's supposition, that the possible existence of Adam's posterity comes under the threatening of the law, and into the hands of the Judge, angst is the ground of the condemnation of all men to death, implies, that death by this sentence is appointed to mankind us an evil, at least negatively so; as it is a privation of good: for he manifestly speaks of a non-existence as a negative evil. But herein he is inconsistent with himself: for he continually insists, that mankind are subjected to death only as a benefit, as has been before shown. According to him, death is not appointed to mankind, as a negative evil. as any cessation of existence, or even diminution of good; but on the contrary, as a means of more happy existence, and a great increase of good.

So that this evasion of Dr. T. is so far from helping the matter, that it increases and multiplies the inconsistency. And that the law, with the threatening of death annexed, was given to Adam as the head of mankind, and to his posterity as included in him, not only follow from some of our author's own assertions-and the plain, full declarations of the apostle in the fifth of Romans, which drove Dr. T. into such gross inconsistencies — but the account given in the three first chapters of Genesis, directly and inevitably teed us to such a conclusion.

Though the sentence, ^{OEE>} Genesis 3:19. "Unto dust thou shalt return." be not of equal extent with the threatening in the foregoing chapter, or an execution of the main curse of the law therein denounced-for, that it should have been so, would have been inconsistent with the intimations of mercy just before given — yet it is plain, this sentence is in pursuance of that

threatening, being to something that was included in it. The words of the sentence were delivered to the same person with the words of the threatening, and in the same manner, in like singular terms, and as much without any express mention of his posterity. Yet it manifestly appears by the consequence, as well as all circumstances, that his posterity were included in the words of the sentence, as is confessed on all hands. And as the words were apparently delivered in the form of the sentence of a judge, condemning for something that he was displeased with, and ought to be condemned, viz. sin, and as the sentence to him and his posterity was but one, dooming to the same suffering, under the same circumstances, both the one and the other sentenced in the same words, spoken but once, and immediately to but one person, we hence justly infer, that it was the same thing to both; and not as Dr. T. suggests, (p. 67.) a sentence to a proper punishment to Adam, but a mere promise of favor to his posterity.

Indeed, sometimes our author seems to suppose, that God meant the thing denounced in this sentence, as a favor both to Adam and his posterity. But to his posterity or mankind in general, who are the main subject, he ever insists, that it was purely intended as a favor. And therefore, one would have thought, the sentence should have been delivered, with manifestations and appearances of favor, and not of anger. How could Adam understand it as a promise of great favor, considering the manner and circumstances of the denunciation? how could he think, that God would go about to delude him, by clothing himself with garments of vengeance, using words of displeasure and rebuke, setting forth the heinousness of his crime, attended with cherubims and a flaming sword;

when all that he meant was only higher testimonies of devour than he had before in a state of innocence, and to manifest fatherly love and kindness, in promises of great blessings? If this was the case, God's words to Adam must be understood thus: "Because thou, hast done so wickedly, hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee, saying, thou shalt not eat of it, therefore I will be more kind to thee than I was in thy state of innocence, and do now appoint for thee the following great favors: Cursed be the ground for thy sake," etc. And thus Adam must understand what was said, unless any will say, (and God forbid that any should be so blasphemous,) that God clothed himself with appearances of displeasure, to deceive Adam,

and make him believe the contrary of what he intended, and lead him to expect a dismal train of evils on his posterity, contrary to all reason and justice, implying the most horribly unrighteous treatment of millions of perfectly innocent creatures. It is certain, there is not the least appearance in what God said, or the manner of it, as Moses, gives its the account, of any other, than that God was now testifying displeasure, condemning the subject of the sentence he was pronouncing, as justly exposed to punishment for sin, and for that sin which he mentions.

When God was pronouncing this sentence, Adam doubt less understood, that God had respect to his posterity, as well as himself, though God spake wholly in the second person singular, Because then trust eaten,-In sorrow thou shalt eat, — Unto the dust shalt thou return. But he had as much reason to understand God as having respect to his posterity, when he directed his speech to him in like manner in the threatening, Thou shalt surely die. The sentence plainly refers to the threatening, and results from it. The threatening says, by thou eat, thou shall die: the sentence says, Because thou hast eaten thou shall die. And Moses, who wrote the account, had no reason to doubt but that the affair would be thus understood by his readers; for such a way of speaking was well understood in those days: the history he gives us of the origin of things, abounds with it. Such a manner of speaking to the heads of the race, having respect to the progeny, is not only used in almost every thing that God said to Adam and Eve, but even in what he said to the very birds and fishes, ^{<0022>}Genesis 1:22. And also in what he said afterwards to Noah, ^{<0010>}Genesis 9:10 Shem, Ham, and Japheth, and Canaan, ^{<0015>}Genesis 9:5-27. So in promises made to Abraham, God directed his speech to him, and spake in the second person singular, from time to time, but meant chiefly his posterity: To thee will I give this fund. In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed, etc. etc. And in what is said of Ishmael, as of his person, but meant chiefly of his posterity, ^{<0012>}Genesis 16:12. and ^{<0017>}17:20. Thus in what Isaac said to Esau and Jacob, in his blessing he spake to them in the second person singular, but meant chiefly their posterity. And so for the most part in the promises made to Isaac and Jacob; and in Jacob blessing Ephraim and Manasseh, and his twelve sons.

But I shall take notice of one or two things further, showing that Adam's posterity were included in God's establishment with him, and the

threatening denounced for his sin, and that the calamities which come upon them in consequence of his sin, are brought on them as punishments.

This is evident from the curse on the ground; which if it be any curse at all, comes equally on Adam's posterity with himself. And if it be a curse, then against whomsoever it is designed, and on whomsoever terminates, it comes as a punishment, and not as a blessing, so far as it comes in consequence of that sentence.

Dr. T. (p. 19.) says, "A curse is pronounced upon the ground, but no curse upon the woman and the man." And (p. 45, 46. S.) he insists that the ground only was cursed, and not the man: as though a curse could terminate on lifeless, senseless earth wise than as terminating upon man though the ground would be as senseless as to suppose the meaning to be, The ground shall be punished and shall be miserable for thy sake. Our author interprets the curse on the ground; of its being encumbered with noxious weeds: but would these weeds have been any curse on the ground, if there had been no inhabitants, or if the inhabitants had been of such a nature, that these weeds should not have been noxious, but useful to them? It is said,

"Cursed shall be thy basket, and thy store:"

(~~1237~~ Deuteronomy 28:17)

and would he not be thought to talk very ridiculously, who should say, "Here is course upon the basket, but not a word of any curse upon the owner: and therefore we have no reason at all to look upon it as any punishment upon him, or any testimony of Gods displeasure towards him." How plain is it, that when lifeless things, not capable either of benefit or suffering, are said to be cursed or blessed with regard to sensible beings-who use or possess these things, or have connection with them-the meaning must be, that these sensible beings are cursed or blessed in the other or with respect to them! In ~~1235~~ Exodus 23:25. it is said "He shall bless thy bread and thy water." And I suppose, never any body yet proceeded to such a degree of subtlety in distinguishing as to say, "Here is a blessing on the bread and the water which went into the possessor's mouth, but no blessing on him." To make such a distinction, with regard to the curse God pronounced on the ground, would in some respects be more unreasonable, because God is express in explaining the matter declaring that it was man's

sake, expressly referring this curse to him, as being for the sake of his guilt, and as consisting in the sorrow and suffering he should have from it: “In sorrow shalt thou eat of it. — Thorns and thistles shall it bring forth to thee.” So that God’s own words tell us where the curse terminates. The words are parallel with those in ^(OLD)Deuteronomy 28:16. but only more plain and explicit, “Cursed shalt thou be in the field, or in the ground.”

If this part of the sentence was pronounced under no notion of any curse or punishment at all upon mankind, but, on the contrary, as making an alteration for the better, as to them-that instead of the sweet, but tempting, pernicious fruit of paradise, it might produce wholesome fruits, more for the health of the soul; that it might bring forth thorns and thistles, as excellent medicines, to prevent or cure moral distempers, diseases which would issue in eternal death-then it was a blessing on the ground, and not a curse, and it might more properly have been said, “Blessed shall the ground be for thy sake.-I will make a happy change in it, that it may be a habitation more fit for a creature so infirm, and so apt to be overcome with temptation, as thou art.”

The event makes it evident, that in pronouncing this curse, God had as much respect to Adam’s posterity, as to himself. And so it was understood by his pious posterity before the flood, as appears by what Lamech, the father of Noah, says,

“And he called his name Noah; saying, This same shall comfort us concerning our work, and the toil of our hands, because of the ground which the Lord hath cursed.” (^(OLD)Genesis 5:29)

Another thing which argues, that Adam’s posterity were included in the threatening of death-and that our first parents understood, when fallen, that the tempter, in persuading them to eat the forbidden fruit, had aimed at the punishment and ruin of both them and their posterity, and had procured it — is Adam immediately giving his wife that new name, Eve or Life, on the promise or intimation of the disappointment and overthrow’ of the tempter in that matter by her seed. This Adam understood to be by his procuring LIFE; not only for themselves, but for many of their posterity, and there delivering them from that death and ruin which the serpent had brought upon them. Those that should be thus delivered, and obtain life, Adam calls the living. And because he observed, be what God

said, that deliverance, or life, was to be by the seed of the woman he therefore remarks, that she is the mother of all living, and thereupon gives her a new name, LIFE, ⁽¹⁶¹⁾Genesis 3:20.

There is a great deal of evidence, that this is the occasion of Adam giving his wife her new name. This was her new honor, and the greatest honor, at least in her present state, that the Redeemer was to be of her seed. New names were wont to be given for something that was the person's peculiar honor. So it was with regard to the new names of Abraham, Sarah, and Israel. Dr. T. himself observes, that they who are saved by Christ, are called, (hi I, ⁽¹⁶²⁾2 Corinthians 4:11.) the living or they that live.

Thus we find in the Old Testament, the righteous are exiled by the name of the living,

“Let them be blotted out of the book of the living, and not he written with the righteous.” ⁽¹⁶³⁾Psalms 69:28)

If what Adam meant by her being the mother of all living, was only her being the mother of mankind, and gave her the name life upon that account, it were much the most likely that he would have given her this name at first, when God first united them, under that blessing be fruitful and multiply, and when he had a prospect of her being: the mother of mankind in a state of immortality, living indeed, living and never dying.

But that Adam should at that time give her only the name of Isha, and then immediately on that melancholy change, by their coming under the sentence of death, with all their posterity — having now a new awful prospect of her being the mother of nothing but a dying rare, all from generation to generation turning to dust, through her folly he should chance her name into life, calling her now the mother of all living, is (on that supposition) perfectly unaccountable. Besides, it is manifest, that it was not her being the mother of all mankind-or her relation, as a mother, to her posterity-but the quality of those of whom she was to be the mother, Adam had in view, in giving his wife this new name; as appears by the name itself, which signifies life. And if it had been only a natural and mortal life he had in view, this was nothing to distinguish her posterity from the brutes; for the very same name of living ones; or living things, is given from time to time to them. Besides, if by life the quality of her

posterity was not meant, there was nothing in it to distinguish her from Adam, for thus she was no more the mother of all living, than he was the father of all living; and she could no more properly be called by the name of life on any such account, than he: but names are given for distinction. Doubtless Adam took notice of something distinguishing concerning her, that occasioned his giving her this new name. And I think it is exceeding natural to suppose, that as Adam had given her the first name from the manner of her creation, so he gave her the new name from redemption, and as it were new creation, through a Redeemer, of her seed. And, it is equally probable, that he should give her this name from that which comforted him, with respect to the curse that God had pronounced on him and the earth, as Lamech named Noah,

“Saying, this same shall comfort us concerning our work, and toil of our hands, because of the ground which the Lord hath cursed.”
 (◊◊◊◊ Genesis 5:29)

Accordingly he gave her this new name not at her first creation, but immediately after the promise of a Redeemer. (See ◊◊◊◊ Genesis 3:15-20.)

Now, as to the consequence which I infer from Adam giving his wife this name, on the intimation which God had given-that Satan should by her seed be overthrown and disappointed, as to his malicious design in tempting the woman-it is, that great numbers of mankind should be saved, whom he calls the living, they should be saved from the effects of this malicious design of the old serpent, and from that ruin which he had brought upon them by tempting their first parents to sin- and so the serpent would be, with respect to them, disappointed and over thrown in his design. But how is any death, or indeed any calamity at all, brought upon their posterity by Satan’s malice in that temptation, if instead of that, all the consequent death and sorrow was the fruit of God’s fatherly love? an instance of his free and sovereign favor? And if multitudes of Eve’s posterity are saved from either spiritual or temporal death, by a Redeemer, one of her seed how is that any disappointment of Satan’s design, in tempting our first parents? How came he to have any such thing in view, as the death of Adam’s and Eve’s posterity, by tempting them to sin, or any some have objected, against his posterity being included in the threatening delivered to Adam, that the threatening itself was inconsistent

with his having any posterity: it being that he should die on the day that he sinned To this I answer, that the threatening was not inconsistent with his having posterity, on two accounts:

I. Those words, In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die, according to the use of such like expressions among the Hebrew, do not signify immediate death, or that the execution shall be within twenty-four hours from the commission of the fact; nor did God by those words limit himself as to the time of executing the threatened punishment, but that was still left to God's pleasure. Such a phrase, according to the idiom of the Hebrew tongue, signifies no more than these two things:

1. A real connection between the sin and the punishment. So ^{<332>}Ezekiel 33:12, 13. "The righteousness of the righteous shall not deliver him in the day of his transgression. As for the wickedness of the wicked, he shall not fall thereby in the day that he turneth from his wickedness: neither shall the righteous be able to live in the day that he sinneth: hut for his iniquity that he hath committed, he shall die for it." Here it is said, that in the day he sinneth, he shall not be able to live, but he shall die; not signifying the time when death shall be executed upon him, but the connection between his sin and death; such a connection as in our present common use of language is signified by the adverb of time, when; as if one should say, "According to the laws of our nation, so long as a man behaves himself as a good subject, he may live; but when he turns rebel, he must die:" not signifying the hour, day, or month, in which he must be executed, but only the connection between his crime and death.

2. Another thing which seems to be signified by such an expression is, that Adam should be exposed to death by one transgression, without waiting to try him the second time. If he eat of that tree, he should immediately fall under condemnation, though afterwards he might abstain ever so strictly. In this respect the words are much of the same force with those words of Solomon to Shimei; ^{<105>}1 Kings 2:37. "For it shall be that on the day that thou goest out, and passest over the brook Kidron, thou shalt know for certain that thou shalt surely die." Not meaning, that he should certainly be executed on that day, but that he should be assuredly liable to death for the first offense, and that he should not have another trial to see whether he would go over the brook Kidron a second time.-Besides.

II. If the words had implied, that Adam should die that very day (within twenty-four or twelve hours) or that moment in which he transgressed, yet it will by no means follow, that God obliged himself to execute the punishment in its utmost extent on that day. The sentence was in great part executed immediately; he then died spiritually. he lost his innocence and original righteousness, and the favor of God, a dismal alteration was made in his soul, by the loss of that holy divine principle, which was in the highest sense the life of the soul. In this he was truly ruined and undone that very day; becoming corrupt, miserable, and helpless. And I think it has been shown, that such a spiritual death was one great thing implied in the threatening. And the alteration then made in his body and external state, was the beginning of temporal death. Grievous external calamity is called by the name of death in Scripture, ^{Exo}Exodus 10:17 “Entreat the Lord that he may take awe! this death.” Not only way Adam’s soul ruined that day, but his BODY was ruined; it lost its beauty and vigor, and became a poor, dull, decaying, dying thing.

And besides all this, Adam was that day undone in a more dreadful sense, he immediately fell under the curse of the law, and condemnation to eternal perdition. In the language of Scripture, he is dead, that is, in a state of condemnation to death; even as our author often explains this language in his exposition upon Romans. In scripture language, he that believes in Christ, immediately, receives life. He passes at that time from death to life, and thenceforward (to use the apostle John’s phrase) “has eternal life abiding in him.” But yet, he does not then receive eternal life-in its highest completion; he has but the beginning of it; and receives it in a vastly greater degree at death. The proper time for the complete fullness, is not till the day of judgment. When the angels sinned, their punishment was immediately executed in a degree; but their full punishment is not till the end of the world. And there is nothing in God’s threatening to Adam that bound him to execute his full punishment at once; nor any thing which determines, that he should have no posterity. The constitution which God established and declared determined, that IF he sinned, and had posterity, he and they should die. But there was no constitution determining the actual being of his posterity in this case; what posterity he should have, how many, or whether any at all. All these things God had reserved in his own power: the law and its sanction not with the matter.

It may be proper in this place also to take some notice of that objection of Dr. T. against Adam being supposed to be a federal head for his posterity, that it gives him greater honor than Christ, as it supposes that all his posterity would have had eternal life by his obedience, if he had stood, and so a greater number would have had the benefit of his obedience, than are saved by Christ. — I think, a very little consideration is sufficient to show, that there is no weight in this objection. For the benefit of Christ's merit may nevertheless be vastly beyond that which would have been by the obedience of Adam. For those that are saved by Christ, are not merely advanced to happiness by his merits, but saved from the infinitely dreadful effects of Adam's sin, and many from immense guilt, pollution, and misery, by personal sins. They are also brought to a holy and happy state through infinite obstacles, and exalted to a far greater degree of dignity, felicity, and glory, than would have been due for Adam's obedience; for aught I know, many thousand times so great. And there is enough in the gospel-dispensation, clearly to manifest the sufficiency of Christ's merits for such effects in all mankind. And how great the number will be, that shall actually be the subjects of them, or how great a proportion of the whole race, considering the vast success of the gospel that shall be in that future, extraordinary, and glorious season, often spoken of, none can tell. And the honor of these two federal heads arises not so much from what was proposed to each for his trial, as from their success, and the good actually obtained; and also the manner of obtaining. Christ obtains the benefits men have through him by proper merit of conditioning, and a true purchase by an equivalent, which would not have been the case with Adam if he had obeyed.

I have now particularly considered the account which Moses gives us, in the beginning of the Bible, of our first parents, and God's dealings with them; the constitution he established with them, their transgression, and what followed. And on the whole, if we consider the manner in which God apparently speaks to Adam from time to time; and particularly, if we consider how plainly and undeniably his posterity are included in the sentence of death pronounced on him after his fall, founded on the foregoing threatening, and consider the curse denounced on the ground for his sake, for his sorrow, and that of his posterity; and also consider, what is evidently the occasion of his giving his wife the new name of Eve, and

his meaning in it-and withal consider apparent fact in constant and universal events, with relation to the state of our first parents and their posterity from that time forward, through all ages of the world-I cannot but think, it must appear to every impartial person, that Moses's account does, with sufficient evidence, lead all mankind, to whom his account is communicated, to understand, that God, in his constitution wish Adam, dealt with him as a public person — as the head of the human species-and had respect to his posterity, as included in him. And it must appear, that this history is given by divine direction, in the beginning of the first written revelation, in order to exhibit to our view the origin of the present sinful, miserable state of mankind, that we might see what that was, which first gave occasion for all those consequent wonderful dispensations of divine mercy and grace towards mankind, which are the great subject of the Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament, and that these things are not obscurely and doubtfully pointed forth, but delivered in a plain account of things, which easily and naturally exhibits, them to our understandings.

CHAPTER 2

Observations on Other Parts of the Holy Scriptures, Chiefly in the Old Testament, That Prove the Doctrine of Original Sin.

ORIGINAL depravity may well be argued, from wickedness being often spoken of in Scripture, as a thing belonging to the race of mankind, and as if it were a property of the species. So in ^{<BIB>}Psalm 14:2, 3. “The LORD looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand, and seek God. They are all gone aside, they are all together become filthy: there is none that doeth good, no, not one.” The like we have again, ^{<BIB>}Psalm 53:2, 3.-Dr. T. says, (p. 104,105.) “The HOLY Spirit does not mean this of every individual; because in the very same psalm, he speaks of some that were righteous, verse 5. God is in the generation of the righteous.” But how little is this observation to the purpose? For who ever supposed, that no unrighteous men were ever chanced by divine grace, and afterwards made righteous? The psalmist is speaking of what men are as they are the children of men, born of the corrupt human race; and not as born of God, whereby they come to be the children of God, and of the generation of the righteous. The apostle Paul cites this place in ^{<BIB>}Romans 3:10-12. to prove the universal corruption of mankind, but yet in the same chapter he supposes the same persons spoken of as wicked, may become righteous, through the righteousness and grace of God.

Wickedness is spoken of in other places in the book of Psalm, as a thing that belongs to men, as of the human race as sons of men. Thus, in ^{<BIB>}Psalm 4:2. O ye sons of men how long will ye turn my glory into shame? How long will ye love vanity?” etc. ^{<BIB>}Psalm 57:4 “I lie among them that are set on fire, even the sons of men, whose teeth are spears and arrows, and their tongue a sharp sword.” ^{<BIB>}Psalm 58:1, 2. Do ye indeed speak righteousness, O Congregation? Do ye judge uprightly, O ye sons of men? Yea, in heart ye work wickedness; ye weigh out the violence of your hands in the earth.” Our author mentioning these places, says, (p. 105. note,) “There was a strong party in Israel disaffected to David’s person and government, and sometimes he chooseth to denote them by the sons or children of men.” But it would have been worth his while to have

inquired, Why the psalmist should choose to denote the worst men in Israel by this name? Why he should choose thus to disgrace mankind, as if the compellation of sons of men most property belonged to such as were of the vilest character, and as if all the sons of men, even every one of them, were of such a character, and none of them did good; no, not one? Is it not strange, that the righteous should not be thought worthy to be called sons of men, and ranked with that noble race of beings, who are born into the world wholly right and innocent? It is a good, easy, and natural reason; why he chooseth to call the wicked, sons of men, as a proper name for them, That by being of the sons of men, or of the corrupt, ruined race of mankind, they come by their depravity. And the psalmist himself leads us to this very reason, ^{<58B>}Psalm 58. “Do ye judge uprightly, O ye son of men yea, in heart ye work wickedness ye weigh out the violence of your hands. The wicked are estranged from the womb,” etc. Of which I shall speak more by and by.

Agreeable to these places in ^{<21B>}Proverbs 21:8.

“The way of man is froward and strange; but as for the pure,
his work is right.”

He that is perverse in his walk, is here called by the name of man, as distinguished from the pure: which I think is absolutely unaccountable, if all mankind by nature are pure, and perfectly innocent, and all such as are froward and strange in their ways, therein depart from the native purity of all mankind. The words naturally lead us to suppose the contrary; that depravity and perverseness properly belong to mankind as they are naturally, and that a being made pure, is by an after-work by which some are delivered from native pollution, and distinguished from mankind in general: which is perfectly agreeable to the representation in ^{<64B>}Revelation 14:4. where we have an account of a number that were not defiled, but were pure, and followed the Lamb; of whom it is said, “These were redeemed from among men.”

To these things agree ^{<347B>}Jeremiah 17:5, 9. In verse 5. it is said, “Cursed is he that trusteth in man.” And in verse 9 this reason is given, “The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked; who can know it?” What heart is this so wicked and deceitful? Why? evidently the heart of him, who, it was said before, we must not trust; and that is MAN. It alters

not the case as to the present argument, whether the deceitfulness of the heart here spoken of, be in deceitfulness to the man himself, or to others. So ^{<100>}Ecclesiastes 9:3. “Madness is in the heart of the sons of men, while they live.” And those words of Christ to Peter, ^{<100>}Matthew 16:23. “Get thee behind me, Satan—for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men. Signifying plainly, that to be carnal and vain, and opposite to what is spiritual and divine, is what properly belongs to men in their present state. The same thing is supposed in that of the apostle, ^{<100>}1 Corinthians 3:3. “For ye are yet carnal. For whereas there is among you envying and strife, are ye not carnal, and walk as men?” And that in ^{<100>}Hosea 6:7. “But they, like men, have transgressed the covenant.” To these places may be added ^{<100>}Matthew 7:2. “If ye being evil, know how to Live good gifts.” ^{<100>}James 4:5. “Do ye think that the scripture saith in vain, the spirit that dwelleth in, us, lusteth to envy?”-^{<100>}1 Peter 4:2. “That he no longer should live the rest of his time in the lusts of men, but to the will of god.”-Yet above all, that in ^{<100>}Job 15:16. “How much more abominable and filthy is man, who drinketh iniquity like water?” Of which more presently.

Now what account can be given of these things, on Dr. T.’s scheme? How strange is it, that we should have such descriptions, all over the Bible, of MAN, and the sons OF MEN! Why should man be so continually spoken of as evil, carnal, perverse, deceitful, and desperately wicked, if all men are by nature as perfectly innocent, and free from any propensity to evil, as Adam was the first moment of his creation, all made right, as our author would have us understand ^{<100>}Ecclesiastes 7:29;? Why, on the contrary, is it not said, at least as often, and with equal reason. that the heart of man is right and pure; that the way of man is innocent and holy, and that he who savours true virtue and wisdom, savors the things that be of men? Yea, and why might it not as well have been said, the Lord looked down from heaven on the sons of men, to see if there were any that did understand, and did seek after God, and they were all right, altogether, pure, there was none inclined to do wickedness, no, not one.

Of the like import with the texts mentioned are those which represent wickedness as what properly belongs to the WORLD and that they who are otherwise, are saved from the world and called out of it. As ^{<100>}John 7:7. “The world cannot hate you; but me it hateth; because I testify of it, that

the works thereof are evil.” Chapter ^{<B329>}8:23. “Ye are of this world: I am not of this world. Chapter ^{<B447>}14:17. “The spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive; because it seeth him not neither knoweth him: but ye know him.” Chapter ^{<B558>}15:18, 19. “If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it bated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love its own; but because ye are not of the world, hut I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you.” ^{<B448>}Revelation 14:3, 4. “These are they which were deemed on the earth, — redeemed from among men.

^{<B170>}John 17:9. “I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me.” Verse 14. “I have given them thy word, and the world hath hated them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world ^{<B183>}1 John 3:13 “Marvel not, my brethren, if the world hate you.” Chapter ^{<B105>}4:5. “They are of the world, therefore speak they of the world, and the world heareth them.” Chapter ^{<B169>}5:19. “We are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness.” It is evident, that in these places, by the world is meant the world of mankind; not their habitation, but the inhabitants: for, it is the world spoken of as loving, hating, doing evil works speaking, hearing, etc. The same thing is shown, when wickedness is often spoken of as being man’s OWN, in contradistinction from virtue and holiness. So men’s lusts are often called their OWN hearts’ lusts, and their practicing wickedness is called walking in their OWN ways, walking in their OWN counsels, in the imagination of their own heart, and in the sight of their own eyes, according to their OWN devices, etc. These things denote wickedness to be a quality belonging properly to the character and nature of mankind in their present state: as, when Christ would represent that lying is remarkably the character and the very nature of the devil in his present state, he expresses it thus,

“When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his OWN: for he is a liar, and the father of it.” (^{<B181>}John 3:44)

And that wickedness belongs to the very nature of men in their present state, may be argued from those places which speak of mankind as being wicked in their children, or from their childhood. So ^{<B1215>}Proverbs 22:15.

“Foolishness is bound in the heart of a child: but the rod of correction shall drive it far from him.”

Nothing is more manifest, than that the wise man in this book continually uses the word folly, or foolishness, for wickedness; and that this is what he means in this place, the words themselves explain. For the rod of correction is proper to drive away no other foolishness, but that which is of amoral nature. The word rendered bound, signifies (as observed in Pool's Synopsis) a close and firm union. The same word is used in chapter ^{<1062>}6:21. "Bind them continually upon shine heart." And chapter ^{<1007>}7:3. "Bind them upon thy finales write them upon the table of thine heart." The same verb is used, ^{<0801>}1 Samuel 18:1. "The soul of Jonathan was knit, or bound, to the soul of David, and Jonathan loved him as his own soul." — But how comes wickedness to be so firmly bound, and strongly fixed, in the hearts of children, if it be not there naturally? They have had no time firmly to fix habits of sin, by long custom in actual wickedness, as those who have lived many years in the world.

The same thing is signified in that noted place,

"For the imagination of man's heart is evil, from his youth."
(^{<0027>}Genesis 8:21)

It alters not the case, whether it be translated for or though the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth, as Dr. T. would have it. The word translated youth, signifies the whole of the former liars of the age of man, which commences from the beginning of life. The word in its derivation, has reference to the birth or beginning of existence. It comes from a word to shake off, as a tree shakes off its ripe fruit, or a plant its seed; the birth of children being commonly represented by a tree yielding fruit, or a plant yielding seed. So that the word here translated youth, comprehends not only what we in English most commonly call the time of youth, but also childhood and infancy, and is very often used to signify these latter. Dr. T. says, (p. 124. note.) that he "conceives, from the youth, is a phrase signifying the greatness or long duration of a thing. But if by long duration he means any thing else than what is literally expressed, viz. from the beginning of life, he has no reason to conceive so, neither has what he offers so much as the shadow of a reason for his conception. There is no appearance in the words of the two or three texts he mentions, of their meaning anything else than what is most literally signified. And it is certain, that what he suggests is not the ordinary import of such a phrase

among the Hebrews; but that thereby is meant from the beginning, or the early time of life, or existence, as may be seen in the places following, where the same word in the Hebrew is used as in the eighth of Genesis.

^{<912E>}1 Samuel 12:2. “I am old and gray-headed and I have walked before you from my childhood unto this day.” ^{<970B>}Psalm 71:5, 6. “Thou art my trust from my youth: by thee have I been holden up from the womb. Thou art he that took me out of my mother’s bowels.” (Verse 17, 18.) “O God, thou hast taught me from any youth; and hitherto have I declared thy wondrous works: now also, when I am old and gray-headed, forsake me not.” ^{<8C9D>}Psalm 129:1, 2. “Many a time have they afflicted me from my youth, man Israel now say: many a time have they afflicted me from my youth; yet have they not prevailed against me.” ^{<347D>}Isaiah 47:10 “Stand now with the multitude of thy sorceries, wherein thou hast labored from thy youth.” (So also verse 15.) ^{<10E0>}2 Samuel 19:7. “That will be worse unto thee, than all the evil that befell thee from thy youth until now.”

^{<47B3>}Jeremiah 3:24, 25. “Shame hath devoured the labor of our fathers, from our youth. — We have sinned against the Lord our God from our youth, even to this day.”

And it is to be observed, that according to the manner of the Hebrew language, when it is said, such a thing has been from youth or the first part of existence, the phrase is to be understood as including that first time of existence. So ^{<462E>}Joshua 6:21. “They utterly destroyed all, from the young to the old,” (so in the Hebrew) i. e. including both. (So ^{<100B>}Genesis 19:4. and ^{<477D>}Esther 3:18.) And as mankind are represented in Scripture, as being of wicked heart from their youth, so in other places they are spoken of as being thus from the womb.

“The wicked are estranged from the womb: they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies.” (^{<1E8B>}Psalm 58:3)

It is observable, that the psalmist mentions this as what belongs to the wicked, as the SONS OF MEN: for, these are the preceding words, “Do ye judge uprightly, O Ye sons of men? Yea, in heart ye work wickedness.” Then it follows, the wicked are estranged from THE WOMB, etc. The next verse is, their poison is like the poison of a serpent. Serpents are poisonous as soon as they come into the world and they derive a poisonous nature by their generation. Dr. T. (p. 134,135.) says, “It is

evident that this is a scriptural figurative way of aggravating wickedness on the one hand, and of signifying early and settled habits of virtue on the other, to speak of it as being from the womb." And as a probable instance of the latter, he cites that in ^{<3811>}Isaiah 49:1. "The Lord hath called me from the womb, from the bowels of my mother hath he made mention of my name." But I apprehend, that in order to seeing this to be either evident or probable, a man must have eyes peculiarly affected. I humbly conceive that such phrases as that in the 49th of Isaiah, of God's calling the prophet from the womb, are evidently not of the import which he supposes, but mean truly from the beginning, of existence, and are manifestly of like signification with that which is said of the prophet Jeremiah, ^{<3105>}Jeremiah 1:5. "Before I formed thee in the belly, I knew thee: before thou camest out of the womb, I sanctified thee, and ordained thee a prophet unto the nations." Which surely means something else besides a high degree of virtue: it plainly signifies that he was, from his first existence, set apart by God for a prophet. And it would be as unreasonable to understand it otherwise, as to suppose the angel meant any other than that Samson was set apart to be a Nazarite from the beginning of his life, when he says to his mother, "Behold, thou shalt conceive and bear a son: and now drink no wine, nor strong drink, etc. it or the child shall be a Nazarite to God, from the womb, to the day of his death." By these instances it is plain, that the phrase, from the womb as the other from the youth, as used in Scripture, properly signifies from the beginning of life.

Very remarkable is that place, ^{<3814>}Job 15:14-16. "What is man, that he should be clean? And he that is born of a woman, that he should be righteous? Behold, he putteth no trust in his saints; yea, the heavens are not clean in his sight: how much more abominable and filthy is man, which drinketh iniquity like water!" And no less remarkable is our author's method of managing it. The 16th verse expresses an exceeding degree of wickedness, in as plain and emphatical terms, almost, as can be invented; every word representing this in the strongest manner: "How much more abominable and filthy is man, that drinketh iniquity like water!" I cannot now recollect where we have a sentence equal to it in the whole Bible, for an emphatical, lively and strong representation of great wickedness of heart. Any one of the words, as such words are used in Scripture, would

“present great wickedness: if it had been only said, “How much more abominable is man! Or, how much more filthy is man! Or, man that drinketh iniquity.” But all these are accumulated with the addition of like water, — the further to represent the boldness or greediness of men in wickedness. Though iniquity be the most deadly poison, yet men drink it as boldly as they drank water, are as familiar with it as with their common drink, and drink it with like greediness, as he that is thirsty drinks water. That boldness and eagerness in persecuting the saints, by which the great degree of the depravity of man’s heart often appears, as thus represented,

“Have the workers of iniquity no knowledge, who eat up my people as they eat bread?” (⁹⁴⁰Psalm 14:4)

And the greatest eagerness of thirst is represented by thirsting as an animal thirsts after water, (⁹³⁹Psalm 13:1. Now let us see the soft, easy, light manner, in which Dr. T. treats this place. (p. 143.) “How much more abominable and, filthy is man, IN COMPARISON OF THE DIVINE PURITY, who drinketh iniquity like water! who is attended with so many sensual appetites, and so apt to indulge them.

You see the argument, man in his present weak and fleshly state, cannot be clean before God. Why so? Because he is conceived and born in sin, by reason of Adam’s 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. Which is a demonstration to me, not only that Job and his friends did not intend to establish the doctrine we are now examining, but that they were wholly strangers to it.” Thus he endeavors to reconcile this text with his doctrine of the perfect native innocence of mankind; in which we have a notable specimen of his demonstrations, as well as of that great impartiality and fairness in examining and expounding the Scripture, of which he so often makes a profession!

In this place we are not only told, how wicked man’s heart is, but also how men come by such wickedness; even by being of the race of mankind, by ordinary generation: What is man, that he should be clean? and be that is born of a woman, that he should be righteous? Our author (p. 141, 142.) represents man being born of a woman, as a periphrasis, to signify man; and that there is no design in the words to give a reason, why man is not clean and righteous. But the case is most evidently otherwise, if we may

interpret the book of Job by itself. It is most plain, that man's being horn of a woman is given as a reason of his not being clean; chapter ^{13:40}14:4. "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?" Job is speaking there expressly of man's being born of a woman, as appears in verse 1. And here how plain is it that this is given as a reason of man's not being clean.

Concerning this Dr. T. says, That this has no respect to any moral uncleanness, but only common frailty, etc. But how evidently is this also otherwise I when that uncleanness, which a man has by being born of a woman, is expressly explained of unrighteousness, in the next chapter at the 14th verse, "What is man that he should be clean? And he that is born of a woman, that he should be righteous?" Also in chapter ^{13:20}25:4. "How then can man be justified with God? And how can he be clean that is born of a woman?" It is a moral cleanness Bildad is speaking of, which a man needs in order to his being justified. His design is to convince Job of his mortal impurity and from thence of God's righteousness in his severe judgments upon him; and not of his natural frailty.

And, without doubt, David has respect to this way of derived wickedness of heart, when mother conceive me." It alters not the case, as to the argument we are upon, whether the word conceive signifies to conceive, or to nurse; which latter, our author takes so much pains to prove: for, when he has done all, he speaks of it as a just translation of the words to render them thus, I was BORN in iniquity, and in sin did my mother nurse me. (p. 135.) If it is owned that man is Born in no, it is not worth the while to dispute, whether It Is expressly asserted, that he is conceive in sin. But Dr. T. after his manner, insists, that such expressions, as being born in sin, being transgressors from the womb, and the like, are only phrases figuratively to denote aggravation, and a high degree of wickedness. But the contrary has been already demonstrated, from many plain scripture instances Nor is one instance produced, in which there is any evidence that such a phrase is used in such a manner. A poetical sentence out of Virgil's Eneid has here been produced, and made much of by some, as parallel with this, in what Dido says to Aeneas, in these lines: In which she tells Aeneas, that not a goddess was his mother, nor Anchises his father; but that he had been brought forth by a horrid rocky mountain, and nursed at the dugs of tigers, to represent the greatness of his cruelty to her. But now unlike and unparallel is this! Nothing could be more natural, than for a

woman overpowered with the passion of love, and distracted with raging jealousy and disappointment thinking herself treated with brutish perfidy and cruelty, by a lover whose highest fame had been his being the son of a goddess, to aggravate his inhumanity and hard-heartedness with this, that his behavior was not worthy the son of a goddess, nor becoming one whose father was an illustrious prince: and that he acted more as if he had been brought forth by hard unrelenting rocks, and had sucked the dugs of tigers. But what is there in the case of David parallel, or at all in like manner leading him to speak of himself as born in sin, in any such figurative sense? He is not speaking himself, nor any one speaking to him, of any excellent and divine father and mother, of whom he was born: nor is there any appearance of his aggravating his sin, by its being unworthy of his high birth. There is nothing else visible in David's case to lead him to take notice of his being born in sin, but only his having such experience of the continuance and power of indwelling sin, after so long a time, and so many and great means to engage him to holiness; which showed that sin was inbred, and in his very nature.

Dr. T. often objects to these and other texts, brought by divines to prove original sin, that there is no mention made in them of Adam, nor of his sin. He cries out, Here is not the least mention, or intimation of Adam, or any ill effects of his sin upon us. — Here is not one word nor the least hint of Adam, or any consequences of his sin, etc. etc. He says, "If Job and his friends had known and believed the doctrine of a corrupt nature, derived from Adam's sin only, they ought in reason and truth to have given this as the true and only reason of the human imperfection and uncleanness they mention." But these objections and exclamations are made no less impertinently, than frequently. It is no more a proof, that corruption of nature did not come by Adam's sin, because many times when it is mentioned, his sin is not expressly mentioned as the cause of it; than that death did not come by Adam's sin, as Dr. T. says it did. For though death as incident to mankind, is mentioned so often in the Old Testament, and by our Savior in his discourses, yet Adam's sin is not once expressly mentioned, after the three first chapters of Genesis, any where in all the Old Testament, or the four Evangelists, as the occasion of it.

What Christian has there ever been, that believed the moral corruption of human nature, who ever doubted that it came in the way, of which the

apostle speaks, when he says, “By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin?” Nor indeed have they any more reason to doubt of it, than to doubt of the whole history of our first parents, because Adams name is so rarely mentioned, on any occasion in Scripture, after that first account of him, and Eve’s never at all; and because we have no more any express mention of the particular manner, in which mankind were first brought into being, either with respect to the creation of Adam or Eve. It is sufficient, that the abiding, most visible effects of these things, remain in the view of mankind in all ages, and are often spoken of in Scripture and that the particular manner of their being introduced is once plainly set forth in the beginning of the Bible, in that history which gives us an account of the origin of all things And doubtless it was expected, by the great author of the Bible, that the account in the three first chapters of Genesis should be taken as a plain account of the introduction of both natural and moral evil into the world. The history of Adam’s sin, with its circumstances God’s threatening, the sentence pronounced upon him after his transgression and the immediate consequences, consisting in so vast an alteration in his state-and the state of the world, with respect to all his posterity-most directly and sufficiently lead us to understand the rise of calamity, sin, and death, in this sinful, miserable world.

It is first we all should know, that it does not become us to tell the Most High, how often he shall particularly explain and give the reason of any doctrine which he teaches, he order to our believing what he says. If he has at all given us evidence that it is a doctrine agreeable to his mind, it becomes us to receive it with full credit and submission; and not sullenly to reject it, because our notions and humors are not suited in the manner, and number of times, of his particularly explaining it. How often is pardon of sins promised in the Old Testament to repenting and resuming sinners! How many hundred times is God’s special devour there promised to the sincerely righteous, without any express mention of these benefits being through Christ! Would it therefore become us to say that inasmuch as our dependence on Christ for these benefits is a doctrine, which, if true, is of such importance, God ought expressly to have mentioned Christ’s merits as the reason and ground of the benefits, if he knew they were the ground of them; and should have plainly declared it sooner, and more frequently, if ever he expected we should believe him, when he did tell us of it? How

oft is vengeance and misery threatened in the Old Testament to the wicked, without any clear and express signification of any such thing intended, as that everlasting fire, where there is wailing and gnashing of teeth, in another world, which Christ so often speaks of as the punishment appointed for all the wicked! Would it now become a Christian, to object and say, that if God really meant any such thing, he ought in schemes and truth to have declared it plainly and fully; and not to have been so silent about a matter of such vast importance to all mankind, for four thousand years together!

CHAPTER 3

Observations on Various Other Places of Scripture Principally of the New Testament, Proving; the Doctrine of Original Sin.

SECTION 1

Observation, on ^{CHR}John 3:6. in connection with some other passages in the New Testament.

THOSE words of Christ, giving a reason to Nicodemus, why we must be born again, ^{CHR}John 3:6. “That which is born of the flesh, is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit,” have not without good reason been produced by divines, as a proof of the doctrine of original sin: supposing, that by flesh here is meant the human nature in a debased and corrupt state. Yet Dr. T. (p. 144.) thus explains these words, that which is born of the flesh, is flesh, “that which is born by natural descent and propagation, is a man consisting of body and soul, or the mere constitution and powers of a man in their natural state.” But the constant use of these terms, flesh and spirit, in other parts of the New Testament, when thus set in opposition, and the latter said to be produced by the Spirit of God, as here — and when expressive of the same thing, which Christ is here speaking of to Nicodemus, viz. the requisite qualifications to salvation — will fully vindicate the sense, of our divines. Thus in the 7th and 8th chapters of Romans, where these terms flesh and spirit are abundantly repeated, and set in opposition, as here. 30 chapter 7:14. The law is spiritual, but I am carnal, sold under sin. He cannot only mean, “I am a man consisting of body and soul, and having the powers of a man.” Verse 18. “I know that in me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing.” He does not mean to condemn his frame, as consisting of body and soul, and to assert, that in his human constitution, with the power of a man, dwells no good thing. And when he says in the last verse of the chapter, “With the mind, I myself serve the law of God, but with the flesh, the law of sin;” he cannot mean, “I myself serve the law of God; but with my innocent human constitution, as having the powers of a man, I serve the law of sin.” And when he says in the next words, the beginning of the 8th chapter, “there is no condemnation to them, — that walk not after the flesh, but after the

spirit;” and verse 4. “The righteousness of the law is fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh;” he cannot mean, “there is no condemnation to them that walk not according to the powers of a man,” etc. And when he says, (verse 5 and 6.) “They that are after the flesh, do mind the things of the flesh: and to be carnally minded is death,” he does not intend, “they that are according to the human constitution, and the powers of a man, do mind the things of the human constitution and powers; and to mind these is death.” And when he says, (verse 7 and 8.) “The carnal (or fleshly) mind is enmity against God, and is not subject to the law of God neither indeed can be: so that they that are in the flesh cannot please God,” he cannot mean that to mind the things which are agreeable to “the powers and constitution of a man,” who as our author says, is constituted or made right, is enmity against God, and that a mind which is agreeable to this right human constitution, as God hath made it, is not subject to the law of God, nor indeed can be; and that they who are according to such a constitution, cannot please God. And when it is said, (verse 9.) “Ye are not in the flesh, but in the spirit;” the apostle cannot mean, “ye are not in the human nature, as constitution of body and soul, and with the powers of a man.” It is most manifest, that by the flesh here the apostle means a nature that is corrupt, of an evil tendency, and directly opposite to the law and holy nature of God, so that to walk according to it, and to have a mind so conformed, is to be an utter enemy to God and his law; in a state of perfect inconsistency with subjection to God, and of being pleasing to him; and in a sure and infallible tendency to death and utter destruction. And it is plain, that here by walking, after or according to, the flesh, is meant the same thing as walking according to a corrupt and sinful nature; and to walk according to the spirit, is to walk according to a holy and divine nature, or principle: and to be carnally minded, is the same as being viciously and corruptly minded; and to be spiritually minded, is to be of a virtuous and holy disposition.

When Christ says,

“That which is born of the flesh, is flesh,” (~~ROM~~ John 3:6)

he represents the flesh not merely as a quality: for it would be incongruous to speak of a quality as a thing born. Therefore man, as in his whole nature corrupt, is called flesh; which is agreeable to other scripture

representations, where the corrupt nature is called the old Adam, the body of sin, and the body of death. Agreeable to this are those representations in the 7th and 8th chapters of Romans. There, flesh is figuratively represented as a person, according to the apostle's manner. This is observed by Mr. Locke, and after him by Dr. T. who takes notice, that the apostle, in the 6th and 7th of Romans, represents sin as a person; and that he figuratively distinguishes in himself two persons, speaking of flesh as his person. For I know that in ME, that is, in my FLESH, dweller no good thing. And it may be observed, that in the 8th chanter he still continues this representation, speaking of the flesh as a person. Accordingly, in the 6th and 7th verses, he speaks of the mind of the flesh, and of the mind of the spirit, as if the flesh and spirit were two opposite persons, each having a mind contrary to that of the other. Dr. T. interprets this mind of the flesh, and mind of the spirit, as though the flesh and the Spirit were the different objects, about which the mind is conversant. But this is plainly beside the apostle's meaning; who speaks of the flesh and spirit as the subjects in which the mind is; and in a sense the agents, but not the objects, about which it acts. We have the same phrase again, verse 27. "He that searcheth the hearts, knoweth what is the mind of the spirit." The mind of the spiritual nature in the saints is the same with the mind of the Spirit of God himself, who imparts and actuates that spiritual nature; and here the spirit is the subject and agent; but not the object. The same apostle, in a similar manner, uses the word, for mind

"Vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind, by the mind of his flesh."

(^{STP}Colossians 2:18)

And this agent so often called flesh, represented by the apostle as altogether evil, without any good thing dwelling in it, or belonging to it — yea perfectly contrary to God and his law, and tending only to death and ruin, and directly opposite to the spirit — is what Christ speaks of to Nicodemus as born in the first birth, and furnishing a reason why there is a necessity of a new birth, in order to a better production.

One thing is particularly observable in that discourse of the apostle — in which he so often uses the term flesh, as opposite to spirit — that he expressly calls it sinful, flesh, ^{STP}Romans 8:3. It is manifest, that by sinful flesh he means the same thing with that flesh spoken of in all the context:

and that when it is said, Christ was made in the likeness of sinful flesh, the expression is equipollent with those that speak of Christ as made sin, and made a curse for us flesh and spirit are opposed to one another in Galatians 5: in the same manner as in the 8th of Romans. And there, assuredly, by flesh cannot be meant only the human nature of body and soul, or the mere constitution and powers of a man, as in its natural state, innocent and right. In the 16th verse the apostle says, “Walk in the spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lusts of the flesh: “the flesh, is something of an evil inclination, desire, or lust. But this is more strongly signified in the next words; “For the flesh lusteth against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other.” What could have been said more plainly, to show that what the apostle means by flesh, is something very evil in its nature, and an irreconcilable enemy to all goodness? And it may be observed, that in these words, and those that follow, the apostle still figuratively represents the flesh as a person or agent, desiring, acting, having lusts, and performing works. And by works of the flesh, and fruits of the spirit, which are opposed to each other, (from verse 19, to the end,) are plainly meant the same a works of a sinful nature, and fruits of a holy renewed nature. “Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies,” etc. “But the fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness,” etc. The apostle, by flesh, does not mean any thing that is innocent and good in itself, which only needs to be restrained, and kept in proper bounds, but something altogether evil, which is to be destroyed.

“To deliver such an one to Satan, for the destruction of the flesh.”

(^{488B}1 Corinthians 5:5.)

We must have no mercy or it; we cannot be too cruel to it; it must even be crucified.

“They that are Christ’s, have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts.” (^{488B}Galatians 5:24.)

The apostle John — the same apostle that writes the account of what Christ said to Nicodemus — by the spirit means the same thing as a new, divine, and holy nature, exerting itself in a principle of divine love, which

is the sum of all Christian holiness. ^{<GEB>}1 John 3:23, 24. “And that we should love one another, as he gave us commandment, and he that keepeth his commandments, dwelleth in him, and he in him: and hereby we know that he abideth in us by the spirit it that he hath given us. Chapter ^{<GMB>}4:12, 13. “If we love one another. God dwelleth in us, and his love is perfected in us: hereby know we, that we dwell in him, because he hath given us of his Spirit.”

The spiritual principle in us being as it were a communication of the Spirit of God to us.

And as by spirit, is meant a holy nature, so by the epithet, spiritual is meant the same as truly virtuous and holy. ^{<GMB>}Galatians 6:1:”Ye that are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness.” The apostle refers to what he had just said at the end of the foregoing chapter, where he had mentioned meekness as a fruit of the spirit. And so by carnal, or fleshly, is meant the same as sinful. ^{<GMB>}Romans 7:14. “The law is spiritual, (i. e. holy,) but I am carnal, sold under sin.”

And it is evident, that by flesh, as the word is used in the New Testament, and opposed to spirit, when speaking of the qualifications for eternal salvation, is meant — not only what is now vulgarly called the sins of the flesh, consisting in inordinate appetites of the body, and their indulgence; but — the whole body of sin, implying those lusts that are most subtle, and farthest from any relation to the body; such as pride, malice, envy, etc. When the works of the flesh are enumerated, ^{<GMB>}Galatians 5:19-21. they are vices of the latter kind chiefly that are mentioned “idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath strife, seditions, heresies, envyings.” So, pride of heart is the effect or operation of the flesh.

^{<GMB>}Colossians 2:18. “Vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind.” in the Greek, (as before observed,) by the mind of the flesh. So, pride, envying, and strife, and division, are spoken of as works of the flesh, ^{<GMB>}1 Corinthians 3:3, 4. “For ye are yet carnal fleshly). For whereas there is envying, and strife, and division, are ye not carnal, and walk as men? For while one saith, I am of Paul, and another, I am of Apollos, are ye not carnal?” Such kind of lusts do not depend on the body, or external senses; for the devil himself has them in the highest degree, who has not, nor ever had, any body or external senses to gratify.

Here, if it should be inquired, how corruption or depravity in general, or the nature of man as corrupt and sinful, came to be called flesh, and not only that corruption which consists in inordinate bodily appetites? I think, what the apostle says in the last cited place, “Are ye not carnal and walk as men?” leads us to the true reason. It is because a corrupt and sinful nature is what properly belongs to mankind, or the race of Adam, as they are in themselves, and as they are by nature. the word flesh is often used in both the Old and the New Testament to signify mankind in their present state. To enumerate all the places, would be very tedious, I shall therefore only mention a few in the New Testament. ^{<BIB>}Matthew 24:22. “Except those days should be shortened no flesh should be saved.” ^{<BIB>}Luke 3:6. “All flesh shall; see the salvation of God.” ^{<BIB>}John 17:2. “Thou hast given him power over all flesh.” Man’s nature, being left to itself; forsaken of the Spirit of God, as it was when man fell, and consequently forsaken of divine and holy principles, of itself became exceeding corrupt, utterly depraved and ruined: and so the word flesh which signifies man came to be used to signify man as he is in himself, in his natural state, debased, corrupt, and ruined. On the other hand, the word spirit came to be used to signify a divine and holy principle, or new nature, because that is not of man, but of God, by the indwelling and vital influence of his Spirit. And thus to be corrupt, and to be carnal, or fleshly, and to wick as men, are the same thing. And so in other parts of Scripture, to savor the things that be of man, and to savor things which are corrupt, are the same; and, sons of men, and wicked men, also are the same, as observed before. And on the other hand, to savor the thirsts that be of God, and to receive the things of the Spirit of God, are phrases that signify as much as relishing and embracing true holiness or divine virtue.

All these things confirm what we have supposed to be Christ’s meaning, in saying, “That which is born of the flesh, is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit, is spirit.” His speech implies, that what is born in the first birth of man, is nothing but man as he is of himself; without any thing divine in him; depraved, debased; sinful, ruined man, utterly unfit to enter into the kingdom of god, and incapable of the spiritual divine happiness of that kingdom. But that which is born, in the new birth, of the Spirit of God, is a spiritual principle, a holy and divine nature, meet for the heavenly kingdom. It is no small confirmation of this being the true

meaning, that the words understood in this sense, contain the proper and true reason, why a man must be born again, in order to enter into the kingdom of God; the reason given every where in other parts of Scripture for the necessity of a renovation, a change of mind, a new heart, etc. in order to salvation: to give a reason of which to Nicodemus, is plainly Christ's design in the words which have been insisted on. — Before I proceed, I would observe one thing as a corollary from what has been said.

Corol. If by flesh and spirit, when spoken of in the New Testament, and opposed to each other, in discourses on the necessary qualifications for salvation, we are to understand what has been now supposed, it will not only follow, that men by nature are corrupt, but wholly corrupt, without any good thing. If by flesh is meant man's nature, as he receives it in his first birth, then therein dwelleth no good thing; as appears by ^{<BIB>}Romans 7:18. It is wholly opposite to God, and to subjection to his law, as appears by ^{<BIB>}Romans 8:7, 8. It is directly contrary to true holiness, and wholly opposes it, as appears by ^{<BIB>}Galatians 5:17 So long as men are in their natural state, they not only have no good thing, but it is impossible they should have or do any good thing; as appears by ^{<BIB>}Romans 8:8. There is nothing in their nature, as they have it by the first birth, whence should arise any true subjection to God; as appears by ^{<BIB>}Romans 8:7. If there were any thing truly good in the flesh, or in man's nature, or natural disposition, under a moral view, then it should only be amended; but the Scripture represents as though we were to be enemies to it, and were to seek nothing short of its entire destruction, as before observed. And elsewhere the apostle directs not to the amending of the old man, but putting it off, and putting on the new man, and seeks not to have the body of death made better, but to be delivered from it, and says, "that if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature, (which doubtless means the same as a man new born,) old things are (not amended, but) passed away, and all things are become new."

But this will be further evident, if we particularly consider the apostle's discourse in 1 Corinthians the latter part of the second chapter and the beginning of the third. There the apostle speaks of the natural man, and the spiritual man; where natural and spiritual are opposed just in the same manner as carnal and spiritual often are. In chapter ^{<BIB>}2:14, 15. he says, "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are

foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. But he that is spiritual, judgeth all things. “And not only does the apostle here oppose natural and spiritual, just as he elsewhere does carnal and spiritual, but his following discourse evidently shows, that he means the very same distinction, the same two distinct and opposite things. For immediately on his thus speaking of the difference between the natural and the spiritual man, he says, “And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal.” Referring manifestly to what he had been saying, in the immediately preceding discourse, about spiritual and natural men, and evidently using the word, carnal, as synonymous with natural. By which it is put out of all reasonable dispute, that the apostle by natural men means the same as men in that carnal, sinful state, that they are in by their first birth; — notwithstanding all the glosses and criticisms, by which modern writers have endeavored to palm upon us another sense of this phrase, and so to deprive us of the clear instruction the apostle gives in that 14th verse, concerning the sinful miserable state of man by nature. Dr. T. says, this is the animal man, the man who maketh sense and appetite the law of his action. If he aims to limit the meaning of the word to external sense, and bodily appetite, his meaning is certainly not the apostle’s. For the apostle in his sense includes the more spiritual vices of envy, strife, etc. as appears by the four first verses of the next chapter; where, as I have observed, he uses the word carnal. So the apostle Jude used the word in like manner opposing it to spiritual, or having the Spirit, verse 19. “These are they that separate themselves, sensual, not having the Spirit.” The vices he had been just speaking of, were chiefly of the more spiritual kind, verse 16. “These are murmurers, complainers, walking after their own lusts; and their mouth speaketh great swelling words, having men’s persons in admiration, because of advantage.” The vices mentioned are much of the same kind with those of the Corinthians, for which he calls them carnal; envy, strife, divisions, saying, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos; and being puffed up for one against another. We have the same word again, ^{SHB}James 3:14, 15. “If ye have bitter envying and strife, glory not, and lie not against the truth: this wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, and devilish,” where also the vices the apostle speaks of are of the more spiritual kind.

So that on the whole, there is sufficient reason to understand the apostle, when he speaks of the natural man, in ^{<4124>}1 Corinthians 2:14. as meaning man in his native corrupt state. And his words represent him as totally corrupt, wholly a stranger and enemy to true virtue or holiness, and things appertaining to it, which it appears are commonly intended in the New Testament by things spiritual, and are doubtless here meant by things at the Spirit of God. These words also represent, that it is impossible man should be otherwise, while in his natural state. The expressions are very strong: The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, is not susceptible of things of that kind, neither can he know them can have no true sense or relish of them, or notion of their real nature and true excellency; because they are spiritually discerned; they are not discerned by means of any principle in nature; but altogether by a principle that is divine, something introduced by the grace of God's Holy Spirit, which is above all that is natural. The words are in a considerable degree parallel with those of our Savior, ^{<4146>}John 14:16 17. "He shall give you the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know; him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you."

SECTION 2

Observations on ^{<4189>}Romans 3:9-24.

If the Scriptures represent all mankind as wicked in their first state, before they are made partakers of the benefits of Christ's redemption, then they are wicked by nature: for doubtless men's first state is their native state, or that in which they come into the world. But the Scriptures do thus represent all mankind.

Before I mention particular texts to this purpose, I would observe, that it alters not the case, as to the argument in hand, whether we suppose these texts speak directly of infants, or only of such as understand something of their duty and state. For if all mankind, as soon as ever they are capable of reflecting, and knowing their own moral state, find themselves wicked, this proves that they are wicked by nature; either born so, or born with an infallible disposition to be wicked as soon as possible, if there be any difference between these; and either of them will prove men to be born

exceedingly depraved. I have before proved, that a native propensity to sin certainly follows from many things said of mankind in the Scripture; but what I intend now, is to prove by direct scripture testimony, that all mankind, in their first state, are really of a wicked character.

To this purpose, exceeding full, express, and abundant is that passage of the apostle, in ~~ROM~~ Romans 3:9-24. which I shall set down at large, distinguishing the universal terms which are here so often repeated, by a distinct character. The apostle having in the first chapter (verse 16, 17.) laid down his proposition, that none can be saved in any other way than through the righteousness of God, by faith in Jesus Christ, he proceeds to prove this point, by showing particularly that all are in themselves wicked, and without any righteousness of their own. First, he insists on the wickedness of the Gentiles, in the first chapter; next, on the wickedness of the Jews, in the second chapter.

And then, in this place, he comes to sum up the matter, and draw the conclusion in the words following: “What then, are we better than they! No, in no wise; for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are ALL under sin: as it is written, there is NONE righteous, No, NOT ONE; there is NONE that understandeth, there is NONE that seeketh after God, they are ALL gone out of the way they are TOGETHER become unprofitable; there is NONE that doeth good, No, NOT ONE. Their throat is an open sepulcher, with their tongues they have used deceit: the poison of asps is under their lips, whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness, their feet are swift to shed blood, destruction and misery are in their wars, and the way of peace they have not known; there is no fear of God before their eyes. Now we know, that whatsoever things the law saith, it saith to them that are under the law, that EVERY mouth may be stopped, and ALL THE WORLD may become guilty before God. Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no FLESH be justified in his sight, for by the law is the knowledge of sm. But now the righteousness of God without the law, is manifest, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ, unto ALL, and upon ALL them that believe, for there is No DIFFERENCE. For ALL have sinned, and come short of the glory of God. Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption which is in Jesus Christ.”

Here the thing, which I would prove, viz. that mankind in their first state, before they are interested in the benefits of Christ's redemption, are universally wicked, is declared with the utmost possible fullness and precision. So that if here this matter be not set forth plainly, expressly, and fully, it must be because no words can do it, and it is not in the power of language, or any manner of terms and phrases, however contrived and heaped up one upon another, determinately to signify any such thing.

Dr. T. to take off the force of the whole, would have us to understand, (p. 104-107.) that these passages quoted from the Psalm, and other Parts of the Old Testament do not speak of all mankind, nor of all the Jews; but only of them of whom they were true. He observes, there were many that were innocent and righteous; though these were also many a strong party, that were wicked, corrupt, etc. of whom these texts were to be understood. Concerning which I would observe the following: things:

1. According to this, the universality of the terms in these places, which the apostle cites from the Old Testament, to prove that all the world, both Jews and Gentiles, are under sin, is nothing to his purpose. The apostle uses universal terms in his proposition, and in his conclusion, that ALL are under sin, that EVERY MOUTH is stopped, ALL THE WORLD guilty, — that by the deeds of the law NO FLESH can be justified. And he chooses out a number of universal sayings or clauses out of the Old Testament, to confirm this universality; as, There is none righteous; no, not one: they are all gone out of the way; there is none that understandeth, etc. But yet the universal terms found in them have no reference to any such universality, either in the collective, or personal sense; no universality of the nations of the world, or of particular persons in those nations, or in any one nation in the world: “but only of those of whom they are true!” That is, there is none at them righteous, of whom it is true, that they are not righteous: NO, not one; there it none that understand, of whom it is true, that they understand not: they are all gone out of the way, of whom it is true, that they are gone out of the way, etc. Or these expressions are to be understood concerning that strong party in Israel, in David and Solomon's days, and in the prophets' days; they are to be understood of them universally. And what is that to the apostle's purpose! How does such an universality of wickedness — that all were wicked in Israel, who were wicked, or, that there was a particular evil party, all of which were wicked

— confirm that universality which the apostle would prove, viz. That all Jews and Gentiles, and the whole world, were wicked, and every mouth stopped, and that no flesh could be justified by their own righteousness.

Here nothing can be said to abate the nonsense, hut this, that the apostle would convince the Jews, that they were capable of being wicked, as well as other nations; and to prove it, he mentions some texts, which show that there was a wicked party in Israel a thousand years ago. And as to the universal terms which happened to be in these texts, the apostle had no respect to them but his reciting them is as it were accidental they happened to be in some texts which speak of an evil party in Israel, and the apostle cites them as they are, not because they are any more to his purpose for the universal terms, which happen to be in them. But let the reader look on the words of the apostle, and observe the violence of such a supposition. Particularly let the words of the 9th and 10th verses, and their connection, be observed. All are under sin: as it is written, There is none righteous: no, not one. How plain it is, that the apostle cites that latter universal clause out of the 14th Psalm, to confound the preceding universal words of his own proposition! And yet it will follow from what Dr. T. supposes, that the universality of the terms in the last words, there is none righteous; no, not one hath no relation at all to that universality he speaks of in the preceding clause, to which they are joined, all are under sin: and is no more a confirmation of it, than if the words were thus, “There are some or there are many in Israel, that are not righteous.”

2. To suppose, the apostle’s design in citing these passages, was only to prove to the Jews, that of old there was a considerable number of their nation that were wicked men, is to suppose him to have gone about to prove what none of the Jews denied, or made the least doubt of, even the Pharisees, the most self-righteous sect of them, who went furthest in glorying in the distinction of their nation from other nations, as a holy people, knew it, and owned it; they openly confessed that their forefathers killed the prophets, (¹⁰²Matthew 23:29-31. And if the apostle’s design had been only to refresh their memories, to put them in mind of the ancient wickedness of their nation, to lead to reflection on themselves as guilty of the like wickedness, as Stephen does, (⁴¹⁰Acts 7.) what need had he to go so far about to prove this — gathering up many sentences here and there which prove, that their scriptures speak of some as wicked men

— and then to prove, that the wicked men spoken of must be Jews, by this argument, that what things soever the law saith, it saith to, them that are under the law, or that whatsoever the books of the Old Testament said, it must be understood of that people who had the Old Testament? What need had the apostle of such an ambages as this, to prove to the Jews, that there had been many of their nation in past ages, which were wicked men; when the Old Testament was full of passages that asserted this expressly, not only of a strong party, but of the nation in general? How much more would it have been to such a purpose, to have put them in mind of the wickedness of the people in general in worshipping the golden calf; of the unbelief, murmuring, and perverseness of the whole congregation in the wilderness, for forty years, as Stephen does! Which things he had no need to prove to he spoken of their nation, by any such indirect argument as this, Whatsoever things the laws saith, it saith to them that are under the law.

3. It could have been impertinent to the apostle's purpose, even as our author understands his purpose, for him to have gone admit to convince the Jews, that there had been a strong party of bad men in the time of David and Solomon, and the prophets. For Dr. T. supposes, the apostle's aim is to prove the great corruption of both Jews and Gentiles when Christ came into the world.

In order the more fully to evade the clear and abundant testimonies to the doctrine of original sin, contained in this part of the Holy Scripture, our author says. the apostle is here speaking of bodies of people, of Jews and Gentiles in a collective sense, as two great bodies into which mankind are divided, speaking of them in their collective capacity, and not with respect to particular persons, that the apostle's design is to prove, that neither of these two great bodies, in their collective sense can be justified by law, because both were corrupt; and so that no more is implied, than that the generality of both were wicked. On this I observe,

(1.) That this supposed sense disagrees extremely with the terms and language which the apostle here makes use of. For according to this, we must understand, either,

First, That the apostle means no universality at all, but only the far greater part. But if the words which the apostle uses, do not most

fully and determinately signify an universality, no words ever used in the Bible are sufficient to do it. I might challenge any man to produce any one paragraph in the Scripture, from the beginning to the end, where there is such a repetition and accumulation of terms, so strongly, and emphatically, and carefully, to express the most perfect and absolute universality; or any place to be compared to it. What instance is there in the Scripture or indeed in any other writing, when the meaning is only the much greater part where this meaning is signified in such a manner, They are all, — They are all — They are all — together, — every one, — all the world; joined to multiplied negative terms, to show the universality to be without exception, saying, There is no flesh, — there is none, — there is none, — there is none, — there none, four times over; besides the addition of No, not one, — no, not one, — once and again! Or,

Secondly, If any universality at all be allowed, it is only of the collective bodies spoken of: and these collective bodies but two, as Dr. T. reckons them, viz. the Jewish nation, and the Gentile world; supposing the apostle is here representing each of these parts of mankind as being wicked. But is this the way of men using language, when speaking of but two things, to express themselves in such universal terms, when they mean no more than that the thing affirmed is predicated of both of them? If a man speaking! of his two feet as both lame, should say, All my feet are lame — They are all lame — All together are become weak — None of my feet are strong — None of them are sound — No, not one, would not he be thought to be lame in his understanding, as well as his feet? When the Apostle says, That crater mouth may be stopped, must we suppose, that he speaks only of these two great collective bodies, figuratively ascribing to each of them a mouth, and means that these two mouths are stopped? Besides, according to our author's own interpretation, the universal terms used in these texts, cited from the Old Testament, have no respect to those two great collective bodies, nor indeed to either of them; but to some in Israel, a particular disaffected party in that one nation, which was made up of wicked men. So that his interpretation is every way absurd and inconsistent.

(2.) If the apostle is speaking only of the wickedness or guilt of great collective bodies, then it will follow, that also the justification he here treats of, is no other than the justification of such collective bodies. For, they are the same of whom he speaks as guilty and wicked, and who cannot be justified by the works of the law, by reason of their being wicked. Otherwise his argument is wholly disannulled. If the guilt he speaks of be only of collective bodies, then what he argues from that guilt, must be only, that collective bodies cannot be justified by the works of he law, having no respect to the justification of particular Persons. And indeed this is Dr. T.'s declared opinion. he supposes the apostle here, and in other parts of this epistle, is speaking of men's justification considered only as in their collective capacity. But the contrary is most manifest. The 26th and 28th verses of this third chapter cannot, without the utmost violence, be understood otherwise than of the justification of particular persons. "That he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus. — Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law." So in chapter 6:5. "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." And what the apostle cites in the 6th, 7th, and 8th verses from the book of Psalm, evidently shows, that he is speaking of the justification of particular persons. "Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered." David says these things in the 32nd Psalm, with a special respect to his own particular case; There expressing the great distress he was in, while under a sense of personal sin and guilt, and the great joy he had when God forgave him.

And what can be plainer, that in the paragraph we have been upon, (^{<RB1}Romans 3:20.) it is the justification of particular persons of which the apostle speaks. "Therefore by the deeds of the law, there shall no flesh be justified in his sight." He refers to Psalm. 143:2. "Enter not into judgment with thy servant, for in thy sight shall no man living be justified." Here the psalmist is not speaking of the justification of a nation, as a collective body, or of one of the two parts of the world, but of a particular man. And it its further manifest, that the apostle is here speaking of personal justification, inasmuch as this place is evidently parallel with ^{<RB1}Galatians

3:10, 11. “For as many as are of the works of the law, are under the curse: for it is written Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law to do them. But that no man is justified by the works of the law, is evident; for, The just shall live by faith.” It is plain, that this place is parallel with that in the 3rd of Romans, not only as the thing asserted is the same, and the argument by which it is proved — that all are guilty, and exposed to condemnation by the law. — But the same saving of the Old Testament is cited, (~~ROM~~ Galatians 2:16.) Many other things demonstrate, that the apostle is speaking of the same justification in both places, which I omit for brevity’s sake.

And besides all these things, our author’s interpretation makes the apostle’s argument wholly void another way. The apostle is speaking of a certain subject which cannot be justified by the works of the law; and his argument is, that the same subject is guilty. and is condemned by the law. If he means, that one subject, suppose a collective body or bodies, cannot be justified by the law, because another subject, another collective body, is condemned by the law, it is plain, the argument would be quite vain and impertinent. Yet thus the argument must stand according to Dr. T.’s interpretation. The collective bodies which he supposes are spoken of as wicked, and condemned by the law, considered as in their collective capacity, are those two, the Jewish nation, and the heathen world: but the collective body which he supposes the apostle speaks of as justified without the deeds of the law, is neither of these, but the christian church, or body of believers; which is a new collective body, a new creature, and a new man, (according to our author’s understanding of such phrases,) which never had any existence before it was justified, and therefore never was wicked or condemned, unless it was with regard to the individuals of which it was constituted and it does not appear, according to our author’s scheme that these individuals had before been generally wicked. For according to him, there was a number both among the Jews and Gentiles, that were righteous before. And how does it appear, but that the comparatively few Jews and Gentiles, of which this new-created collective body was constituted, were chiefly of the best of each!

So that in every view, this author’s way of explaining the passage appears vain and absurd. And so clearly and fully has the apostle expressed himself, that it is doubtless impossible to invent any other sense to put

upon his words, than that which will imply, that all mankind, even every individual of the whole race, but their Redeemer himself are in their first original state corrupt and wicked.

Before I leave this passage, (^{<RB>}Romans 3:9-14.) it may be proper to observe, that it not only is a most clear and full testimony to the native depravity of mankind, but also plainly declares that natural depravity to be total and exceeding great. It is the apostle's manifest design in these citations from the Old Testament, to show these three things.

1. That all mankind are by nature corrupt.
2. That every one is altogether corrupt, and, as it were, depraved in every part.
3. That they are in every part corrupt in an exceeding degree.

With respect to the second of these, it is plain the apostle puts together those particular passages of the Old Testament, wherein most of those members of the body are mentioned, that are the soul's chief instruments or organs of external action. The hands (implicitly) in those expressions, "They are together become unprofitable. There is none that doth good." The throat, tongue, and mouth, the organs of speech, in those words, "Their throat is an open sepulcher: with their tongues they have used deceit, the poison of asps is under their lips, whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness." The feet in those words, verse 15. "Their feet are swift to shed blood." These things together signify, that man is as it were all over corrupt in every part. And not only is the total corruption thus intimated, by enumerating the several parts, but also by denying all good; any true understanding or spiritual knowledge, any virtuous action, or so much as a truly virtuous desire, or seeking after God. "There is none that understandeth; there is none that seeketh after God; there is none that doth good, the way of peace have they not known." And in general, by denying all true piety or religion in men in their first state, verse 18. "There is no fear of God before their eyes." — The expressions also are evidently chosen to denote a most extreme and desperate wickedness of heart. An exceeding depravity is ascribed to every part: to the throat, the scent of an open sepulcher; to the tongue and lips, deceit, and the poison asps; to the mouth, cursing and bitterness; of their feet it is said, they are swift to

shed, blood: and with regard to the whole man, it is said, destruction and misery are in their ways. The representation is very strong of each of these things, viz. That all mankind are corrupt, that every one is wholly and altogether corrupt, and also extremely and desperately corrupt. And it is plain, it is not accidental, that we have here such a collection of such strong expressions, so emphatically signifying these things; but that they are chosen of the apostle on design, as being directly and fully to his purpose, which purpose appears in all his discourse in the whole of this chapter, and indeed from the beginning of the epistle.

SECTION 3

Observations on <sup>^{Rom}Romans 5:6-10. and <sup>^{Eph}Ephesians 2:3. with the content, and Romans 7.

ANOTHER passage of this apostle, which shows that all who are made partakers of the benefits of Christ's redemption, are in their first state wicked, desperately wicked, is from <sup>^{Rom}5:6-10. "For when we were yet without strength in due time Christ died for the ungodly. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die; yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if while we were enemies we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son; much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life." — Here all for whom Christ died, and who are saved by him, are spoken of as being in their first state sinners, ungodly, enemies to God, exposed to divine wrath, and without strength, without ability to help themselves, or deliver their souls from this miserable state.

Dr. T. says the apostle here speaks of the Gentiles only in their heathen state, in contradistinction to the Jews; and that not of particular persons among the heathen Gentiles, or as to the state they were in personally; but only of the Gentiles collectively taken, or of the miserable state of that great collective body, the heathen world: and that these appellations, sinners, ungodly, enemies, etc. were names by which the apostles in their writings were wont to signify and distinguish the heathen world, in opposition to the Jews and that in this sense these appellations are to be

taken in their epistles, and in this place in particular. And it is observable, that this way of interpreting these phrases in the apostolic writings is become fashionable with many late writers; whereby they not only evade several clear testimonies to the doctrine of original sin, but make void great part of the New Testament; on which account it deserves the more particular consideration.

It is allowed to have been long common and customary among the Jews, especially the sect of the Pharisees, in their pride and confidence in their privileges as the peculiar people of God, to exalt themselves exceedingly above other nations, and greatly to despise the Gentiles, calling them by such names as sinners enemies, dogs, etc. Themselves they accounted, in general, (excepting the publicans, and the notoriously profligate,) as the friends, the special favorites and children, of God; because they were the children of Abraham, were circumcised, and had the law of Moses as their peculiar privilege, and as a wall of partition between them and the Gentiles.

But it is very remarkable that a Christian divine, who has studied the New Testament and the epistle to the Romans in particular, so diligently as Dr. T. has done, should so strongly imagine that the apostles of Jesus Christ countenance and cherish these self-exalting, uncharitable dispositions and notions of the Jews which gave rise to such a custom, so far as to fall in with that custom, and adopt that language of their pride and contempt; and especially that the apostle Paul should do it. It is a most unreasonable imagination on many accounts.

1. The whole gospel dispensation is calculated entirely to overthrow and abolish every thing to which this self-distinguishing self-exalting, language of the Jews was owing. It was calculated wholly to exclude such boasting, and to destroy the pride and self-righteousness which were the causes of it. It was calculated to abolish the enmity, and break down the partition-wall between Jews and Gentiles, and of twain, to make one new man, so making peace to destroy all dispositions in nations and particular persons to despise one another, or to say one to another, Stand by thyself, come not near to me; for I am holier than thou, and to establish the contrary principles of humility, mutual esteem, honor and love. and universal union, In the most firm and perfect manner.

2. Christ when on earth, set himself through the whole course of his ministry, to militate against this pharisaical spirit practice, and language of the Jews; by which they showed so much contempt of the Gentiles publicans, and such as were openly lewd and vicious, and thus exalted themselves above them; calling them sinners and enemies, and themselves holy, and God's children; not allowing the Gentile to be their neighbour, etc. He condemned the Pharisees for not esteeming themselves sinners, as well as the publicans; trusting, in themselves that they were righteous, and despising others. He militated against these things in his own treatment of some Gentiles, publicans, and others, whom they called sinners and in what he said on those occasions.

He opposed these notions and manners of the Jews in his parables, and in his instructions to his disciples how to treat the unbelieving Jews; and in what he says to Nicodemus about the necessity of a new birth, even for the Jews, as well as the unclean Gentiles with regard to their proselytism, which some of the Jews looked upon as a new birth. And in opposition to their notions of their being the children of God, because the children of Abraham, but the Gentiles by nature sinners and children of wrath, he tells them that even they were children of the devil.

3. Though we should suppose the apostles not to have been thoroughly brought off from such notions, manners and language of the Jews, till after Christ's ascension, yet after the pouring out of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, or at least, after the calling of the Gentiles begun in the conversion of Cornelius, they were fully instructed in this matter, and effectually taught no longer to call the Gentiles unclean, as a note of distinction from the Jews, ⁴⁰⁰⁵Acts 10:28. which was before any of the apostolic epistles were written.

4. Of all the apostles, none were move perfectly instructed in this matter, than Paul, and none so abundant in instructing others in it, as this great apostle of the Gentiles. None of the apostles had so much occasion to exert themselves against the fore-mentioned notions and language of the Jews in opposition to Jewish teachers and judaizing Christians who strove to keep up the separation — wall between Jews and Gentiles, and to exalt the former, and set at nought the latter.

5. This apostle, in his epistle to the Romans, above all his other writings, exerts himself in a most elaborate manner, and with his utmost skill and power, to bring the Jewish Christians off from every thing of this kind. He endeavors by all means that there might no longer be in them any remains of these old notions, in which they had been educated, of such a great distinction between Jews and Gentiles, as were expressed in the names they used to distinguish them by, the Jews, holy children of Abraham, friends and children of God, but the Gentiles, sinners, unclean, enemies, and the like. He makes it almost his whole business, from the beginning of the epistle, ^{<BIB>}Romans 5:6 &c. to convince them that there was no ground for any such distinction, and to prove that in common, both Jews and Gentiles, all were desperately wicked, and none righteous, no not one. He tells them, chapter ^{<BIB>}3:9. that the Jews were by no means better than the Gentiles and (in what follows in that chapter) that there was no difference between Jews and Gentiles; and represents all as without strength, or ant sufficiency of their own in the affair of justification and redemption. And in the continuation of the same discourse, in the 4th chapter, he teaches that all who were justified by Christ, were in themselves ungodly; and that being the children of Abraham was not peculiar to the Jews. In this 5th chapter still in continuation of the same discourse — on the same subject and argument of justification through Christ, and by faith in him — he speaks of Christ dying for the ungodly and sinners, and those who were without strength or sufficiency for their own salvation, as he had done all along before. But now, it seems, the apostle by sinners and ungodly, must not he understood according as he used there words before: but must be supposed to mean only the Gentiles as distinguished from the Jews adopting the language of those self-righteous, self-exalting, disdainful judaizing teachers, whom he was with all his might opposing: countenancing the very same thing in them, which he had been from the beginning of the epistle discountenancing arid endeavoring to discourage, and utterly to abolish, with all his art and strength.

One reason why the Jews looked on themselves better than the Gentiles, and called themselves holy, and the Gentiles sinners, was, that they had the law of Moses. They made their boast of the law. But the apostle shows them, that this was so far front making them better, that it condemned them, and was an occasion of their being sinners in a higher

degree, and more aggravated manner and more effectually and dreadfully dead in sin.

It cannot be justly objected here, that this apostle did, in fact, use this language, and call the gentiles sinners, in contradistinction to the Jews, in what he said to Peter, ^{<R1B>}Galatians 2:15, 16. “We who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by faith in Jesus Christ.” It is true, that the apostle here refers to this distinction, as what was usually made by the self-righteous Jews, between themselves and the Gentiles; but not in such a manner as to adopt, or favor it; but on the contrary, so as plainly to show his disapprobation of it; “Though we were born Jews, and by nature are of that people which are wont to make their boast of the law, expecting to be justified by it, and trust in themselves that they are righteous, demising others, calling the Gentiles sinners, in distinction from themselves; yet we being now instructed in the gospel of Christ know better; we now know that a man is not justified by the works of the law; that we are all justified only by faith in Christ, in whom there is no difference, no distinction of Greek or Gentile, and Jew, but all are one in Christ Jesus.” And this is the very thing he there speaks of, which he blamed Peter for, that by his withdrawing and separating himself from the Gentiles, refusing to eat with them, etc. he had countenanced this self-exalting, self-distinguishing, separating spirit and custom of the Jews, whereby they treated the Gentiles, as in a distinguishing manner sinners and unclean and not fit to come near them who were a holy people.

6. The very words of the apostle in this place, show plainly, that he uses the term sinners, not as signifying Gentiles, in opposition to Jews, but as denoting the morally evil, in opposition to such as are righteous or good. This latter distinction between sinners and righteous is here expressed in plain terms. “Scarcely for a righteous than will one are; yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die; but God commended his love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.” By righteous men are doubtless meant the same that are meant by such a phrase, throughout this apostle’s writings, throughout the New Testament, and throughout the Bible. Will any one pretend, that by the righteous man, for whom men would scarcely die, and by the good man, for whom perhaps some might even dare to die, is meant a Jew? Dr. T.

himself does not explain it so, in his exposition of this epistle; and therefore is not very consistent with himself, in supposing, that in the other part of the distinction the apostle means Gentiles, as distinguished from the Jews. The apostle himself had been laboring abundantly, in the preceding part of the epistle, to prove, that the Jews were sinners in opposition to righteous; that all had sinned, that all were under sin, and therefore could not be justified, could not be accepted as righteous, by their own righteousness.

7. Another thing which makes it evident that the apostle, when he speaks in this place of the sinners and enemies for whom Christ died, does not mean only the Gentiles, is that he includes himself among them, saying, while WE were sinners, and when WE were enemies.

Our author from time to time says, the apostle, though he speaks only of the Gentiles in their heathen state, yet puts himself with them, because he was the apostle of the Gentiles. But this is very unreasonable. There is no more sense in it, than there would be in a father ranking himself among his children, when speaking to his children of the benefits they have by being begotten by himself; and saying, We children. Or in a physician ranking himself with his patients, when talking to them of their diseases and cure, saying, We sick folks. Paul being the apostle of the Gentiles to save them from their heathenism is so far from being a reason for him to reckon himself among the heathen that on the contrary, it is the very thing that would render it in a peculiar manner unnatural and absurd for him so to do. Because, as the apostle of the Gentiles, he appears as their healer and deliverer from heathenism and therefore in that capacity, in a peculiar manner, appears in his distinction from the heathen, and in opposition to the state of heathenism. For it is by the most opposite qualities only, that he is fitted to be an apostle of the heathen and recoverer from heathenism. As the clear light of the sun is what makes it a proper restorative from darkness and, therefore, the sun being spoken of as such a remedy none would suppose to be a good reason why it should be ranked among dark things. Besides, the apostle, in this epistle, expressly ranks himself with the Jews when he speaks of them as distinguished from the Gentiles: as in chapter ^{ROM}3:9. “What then? are we better than they?” That is, are we Jews better than the Gentiles?

It cannot justly be alleged in opposition to this, that the apostle Peter puts himself with the heathen,

“For the time part of our life may suffice us to have wrought the will of the Gentiles, when we walked in lasciviousness, lusts, excess of wine, revellings banquetings and abominable idolatries.”
(¹ Peter 4:3)

For the apostle Peter (who by the way was not an apostle of the Gentiles) here does not speak of himself as one of the heathen, but as one of the church of Christ in general, made up at those who had been Jews, proselytes, and heathens who were now all one body. of which body he was a member. It is this society, therefore, and not the Gentiles, that he refers to in the pronoun us. He is speaking of the wickedness that the members of this body or society had lived in before their conversion; not that every member had lived in all those vices here mentioned, but some in one, others in another. Very parallel is the passage with that of the apostle Paul to Titus, chapter ¹3:3. “For we ourselves also” (i. e. we of the Christian church) “were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving, divers lusts and pleasures,” (some one lust and pleasure, others another,) “living in malice, envy, hateful, and hating one another,” etc. There is nothing in this, but what is very neutral. That the apostle, speaking to the Christian church, and of that church, confessing its former sins, should speak of himself as one of that society, and yet mention some sins that he personally had not been guilty of, and among others, heathenish idolatry, is quite a different thing from what it would have been; for the apostle, expressly distinguishing those of the Christians, which had been heathen, from those which had been Jews, to have ranked himself with the former, though he was truly of the latter.

If a minister in some congregation in England, speaking in a sermon of the sins of the nation, being himself of the nation, should say, “We have greatly corrupted ourselves, and provoked God by our deism; blasphemy, profane swearing, lasciviousness, venality,” etc. speaking in the first person plural, though he himself never had been a deist, and perhaps none of his hearers, and they might also have been generally free from other sins he mentioned; yet there would be nothing unnatural in his thus expressing himself. But it would be quite a different thing, if one part of the British

dominions, suppose our kings American dominions, had universally apostatized from Christianity to deism, and had long been in such a state, and if one who had been born and brought up in England among Christians, the country being universally Christian, should be sent among them to show them the folly and great evil of deism, and convert them to Christianity; and this missionary, when making a distinction between English Christians, and these deists, should rank himself with the latter, and say, WE American deist, WE foolish blind infidels, etc. This indeed would be very unnatural and absurd.

Another passage of the apostle, to the like purpose with that which we have been considering in the 5th of Romans, is that in ~~the~~ Ephesians 2:3

“And were by nature children of wrath, even as others.”

This remains a plain testimony to the doctrine of original sin, as held by those who used to be called orthodox Christians, after all the pains and art used to torture and pervert it. This doctrine is here not only plainly and fully taught, but abundantly so, if we take the words with the context; where Christians are once and again represented as being, in their first state, dead in sin, and as quickened and raised up from such a state of death, in a most marvellous display of free rich grace and love, and a exceeding greatness of God’s power, etc.

With respect to those words, we were by nature children of wrath, Dr. T. says, p. 112-114.) “The apostle means no more by this, than truly or really children of wrath; using a metaphorical expression, borrowed from the word that is used to signify a true and genuine child of a family, in distinction from one that is a child only by adoption.” In which it is, owned, that the proper sense of the phrase is, being a child by nature, and the same sense as a child by birth or natural generation; but only he supposes, that here the word is used metaphorically. The instance he produces as parallel, to confirm his supposed metaphorical sense of the phrase, as meaning only truly, really, or properly children of wrath, viz. the apostle Paul’s calling Timothy his own son in faith, is so far from confirming his sense, that it is rather directly against it. For doubtless the apostle uses the word here in its original signification, meaning his begotten son; being the adjective from offspring’s, or the verb, to beget, as much as to say, Timothy my begotten son in the faith. For as there are

two ways of being begotten, one natural, and the other spiritual, the first generation, and regeneration; so the apostle expressly signifies which of these he means in this place, Timothy my begotten son IN THE FAITH, in the same manner as he says to the Corinthians,

“In Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel.”
(⁴⁰¹⁵1 Corinthians 4:15)

To say the apostle uses the word, in ⁴⁰¹⁶Ephesians 2:3. only as signifying real, true, and proper, is a most arbitrary interpretation, having nothing to warrant it in the whole Bible. The word is no where used in this sense in the New Testament.

Another thing which our author alleges to evade the force of this, is, that the word rendered nature, sometimes signifies habit contracted by custom, or an acquired nature. But this is not its proper meaning. And it is plain, the word in its common use, in the New Testament, signifies what we properly express in English by the word nature. There is but one place where there can be the least pretext for supposing it to be used otherwise; and that is ⁴⁰¹⁷1 Corinthians 11:14.

“Doth not even nature itself teach you, that if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him?”

And even here there is, I think, no manner of reason for understanding nature otherwise than in the proper sense. The emphasis used, nature itself, shows that the apostle does not mean custom, but nature in the proper sense. It is true, it was long custom which made having the head covered a token of subjection, and a feminine appearance; as it is custom that makes any outward action or word a sign or signification of any thing. But nature itself; nature in its proper sense, teaches, that it is a shame for a man to appear with the established signs of the female sex, and with significations of inferiority, etc. As nature itself shows it to be a shame for a father to bow down or kneel to his own child or servant, or for men to bow to an idol, because bowing down is by custom an established token or sign of subjection and submission. Such a sight therefore would be unnatural, shocking to a man's very nature. So nature would teach, that it is a shame for a woman to use such and such lascivious words or gestures,

though it be custom that establishes the unclean signification of those gestures and sounds.

It is particularly unnatural and unreasonable to understand the phrase, in this place, any otherwise than in the proper sense, on the following accounts.

1. It may be observed, that both the words, in their original signification, have reference to birth or generation. So the word which signifies to beget or bring forth young, or to bud forth, as a plant, that brings forth young buds and branches. And so the word which signifies to bring forth children. —
2. As though the apostle took care by the word used here, to signify what we are by birth, he changes the word he used before for children. In the preceding verse he was speaking of the children of disobedience; but here, is a word derived, as observed, to bring forth a child, and more properly signifies a begotten or born child. —
3. It is natural to suppose that the apostle here speaks in opposition to the pride of some, especially the Jews, (for the church in Ephesus was made up partly of Jews, as well as the church in Rome,) who exalted themselves in the privileges they had by birth, because they were born the children of Abraham, and were Jews by nature as the phrase in, ^{<KIDS>}Galatians 2:15. In opposition to this proud conceit, he teaches the Jews, that notwithstanding this they were by nature children of wrath, even as others, i. e. as well as the Gentiles, which the Jews had been taught to look upon as sinners, and out of favor with (rod by nature, and born children of wrath. —
4. It is more plain, that the apostle uses the word nature in its proper sense here, because he sets what they were by nature in opposition to what they are by grace. In this verse, the apostle shows what they are by nature, viz. children of wrath; and in the following verses he shows, how very different their state is by grace; saying, verse 5. "By grace ye are saved;" repeating it again, verse 8. "By grace ye are saved." But if, by being children of wrath by nature, were meant no more than only their being really and truly children of wrath, as Dr. T. supposes, there would be no opposition in the signification of these phrases, for in this

sense they were by nature in a state salvation, as much as by nature children of wrath; for they were truly, really, and properly in a state of salvation.

If we take these words with the context, the whole abundantly proves, that by nature we are totally corrupt, without any good thing in us. For if we allow the plain scope of the place, without attempting to hide it by doing extreme violence to the apostle's words, the design here is strongly to establish this point; that what Christians have that is good in them, or in their state, is in no part of it naturally in themselves, or from themselves, but is wholly from divine grace all the gift of God, and his workmanship, the effect of his power; his free and wonderful love. None of our good works are primarily from ourselves, but with respect to them all, we are God's workmanship, created unto good works, as it were out of nothing. Not so much as faith itself, the first principle of good works in Christians, is of themselves, but that is the gift of God. Therefore the apostle compares the work of God, in forming Christians to true virtue and holiness, not only to a new creation, but a resurrection, or raising from the dead. Verse 1. "You hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins." And again, verse 5. "Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ." In speaking of Christians being quickened with Christ, the apostle has reference to what he had said before, in the latter part of the foregoing chapter, of God manifesting the exceeding greatness of his power towards christian converts in their conversion, agreeable to the operation of his mighty power, when he raised Christ from the dead. So that it is plain by every thing in this discourse, the apostle would signify, that by nature we have no goodness; but are as destitute of it as a dead corpse is of life. And that all goodness, all good works, and faith the principle of all, are perfectly the gift of God's grace, and the work of his great, almighty, and exceeding excellent power. I think, there can be need of nothing but reading the chapter, and minding what is read, to convince all who have common understanding, of this; whatever any of the most subtle critics have done, or ever can do, to twist, rack, perplex, and pervert the words and phrases here used.

Dr. T. here again insists, that the apostle speaks only of the Gentiles in their heathen state, when he speaks of those that were dead in sin, and by nature children of wrath; and that though he seems to include himself

among those, saying, WE were by nature children of wrath, WE were dead in sins; yet he only puts himself among them because he was the apostle of the Gentiles. The gross absurdity of this may appear from what was said before. But besides the things which have been already observed, there are some things which make it peculiarly unreasonable to understand it so here. It is true, the greater part of the church of Ephesus had been heathens, and therefore the apostle often has reference to their heathen state, in this epistle. But the words in this ^{verse} chapter 2:3. plainly show, that he means himself and other Jews in distinction from the Gentiles; for the distinction is fully expressed. After he had told the Ephesians, who had been generally heathen, that they had been dead in sin, and had walked according to the course of this world, etc. (verse 1, and 2.) he makes a distinction and says, “among whom we also had our conversation, etc. and were by nature children of wrath, even as others.” Here first he changes the person; whereas, before he had spoken in the second person, “ye were dead, — ye in time past walked,” etc. now he changes style, and uses the first person, in a most manifest distinction, among whom WE ALSO, that is, we Jews, as well as ye Gentiles: not only changing the person, but adding a particle of distinction, also; which would be nonsense, if he meant the same without distinction. And besides all this, more fully to express the distinction, the apostle further adds a pronoun of distinction; WE also, even as OTHERS, or we as well as others: most evidently having respect to the notions, so generally entertained by the Jews, at their being much better than the Gentiles, in being Jews by nature, children of Abraham, and children of God; when they supposed the Gentiles to be utterly cast off, as born aliens, and by nature children of wrath: in opposition to this, the apostle says, “We Jews, after all our glorying in our distinction, we by nature children of wrath, as well as the rest of the world.” And a yet further evidence that the apostle here means to include the Jews, and even him self, is the universal term he uses, Among whom also we all had our conversation, etc. Though wickedness was supposed by the Jews to be the course of this world, as to the generality of mankind, yet they supposed themselves an exempt people, at least the Pharisees, and the devout observers of the law of Moses and traditions of the elders whatever might be thought of publicans and harlots. But in opposition to this, the apostle asserts, that they all were no better by nature than others,

but were to be reckoned among the children of disobedience, of children of wrath.

Besides if the apostle chooses to put himself among the Gentiles, because he was the apostle of the Gentiles, I would ask, why does he not do so in the 11th verse of the same chapter, where he speaks of the Gentile state expressly? “Remember that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh.” Why does he here make a distinction between the Gentiles and himself? Why did he not say, let us remember, that we being in time past Gentiles! And why does the same apostle, even universally, make the same distinction, speaking either in the second or third person and never in the first, where he expressly speaks of the Gentilism of those to whom he wrote, or of whom he speaks, with reference to their distinction from the Jews? So every where in this same epistle; as in chapter ^{<BIB>}1:12, 13. where the distinction is made just in the same manner as here, by the change of the person, and by the distinguishing particle, also: “That we should be to the praise of his glory who first trusted in Christ, (the first believers in Christ being of the Jews, before the Gentiles were called, in whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation.” And in all the following part of this second chapter, as verse 11, 17, 19, and 22. in which last verse the same distinguishing particle again is used; “In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit.”

Though I am far from thinking our author’s exposition of the 7th chapter of Romans to be in any wise agreeable to the true sense of the apostle, yet it is needless here to stand particularly to examine it; because the doctrine of original sin may be argued not the less strongly, though we should allow the thing wherein he mainly differs from SUCH as he opposes in his interpretation, viz. that the apostle does not speak in his own name, or to represent the state of a true Christian, but as representing the state of the Jews under the law. For even on this supposition, the drift of the place will prove, that every one who is under the law, and with equal reason every one of mankind, is carnal, sold under sin, in his first state, and till delivered by Christ. For it is plain, that the apostle’s design is to show the insufficiency of the law to give life to any one whatsoever. This appears by what he says when he comes to draw his conclusion, in the continuation of this discourse; chapter ^{<BIB>}8:3. “For what the law could not

do in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son," etc. Our author supposes what is here spoken of, viz. "that the law cannot give life, because it is weak through the flesh," is true with respect to every one of mankind. And when the apostle gives this reason, in that it is weak through the flesh, it is plain, that by the flesh, which here he opposes to the spirit, he means the same thing which in the preceding part of the same discourse, in the foregoing chapter, he had called by the name flesh, verse 5, 14, 18. and the law of the members, verse 23. and the body of death, verse 24. This is what, through this chapter, he insists on as the grand hindrance why the law could not give life? just as he does in his conclusion, chapter 8:3. Which, in his last place, is given as a reason why the law cannot give life to any of mankind. And it being the same reason of the same thing, spoken of in the same discourse, in the former part of it — this last place being the conclusion, of which that former part is the premises — and inasmuch as the reason there given is being in the flesh, and being carnal, sold under sin: therefore, taking the whole of the apostle's discourse, this is justly understood to be a reason why the law cannot give life to any of mankind; and consequently, that all mankind are in the flesh, and are carnal, sold under sin, and so remain till delivered by Christ: and consequently, all mankind in their first original state are very sinful; which was the thing to be proved.

CHAPTER 4

Containing Observations on ^{<REF>}Romans 5:12, to the End.

SECTION 1.

Remarks on Dr. T's way of explaining this text.

THE following things are worthy of notice, concerning our author's exposition of this remarkable passage.

I. He greatly insists, that by death in this place no more is meant than that death which we all die, where this present life is extinguished, and the body returns to That no mole is meant in the 12, 14, 15, and 17th verses, (p. 27.) he declares as evidently, clearly, and infallibly so because the apostle is still discoursing on the same subject; plainly implying, that infallibly the apostle means no more by death, throughout this paragraph on the subject. But as infallible as this is, if we believe what Dr. T. says elsewhere, it must needs be otherwise: for (p. 120. S.) speaking, of those words in Romans 6 23. "The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord," he says, "Death in tills place is widely different from the death die now die; as it stands there opposed to eternal life, which is the gift of God through Jesus Christ it manifestly signifies eternal death, the second death, or that death which they shall hereafter die, who live after the flesh." But the death (in the conclusion of the paragraph we are upon) that comes by Adam, and the life that comes be Christ, (in the last verse of the chapter,) is apposed to eternal life just in the same manner as in the last verse of the next chapter: "That as sin has reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord." So that by our author's own argument in this place also, is manifestly widely different from the death we now die, as it stands here opposed to eternal life, through Jesus Christ; and signifies eternal death, the second death. And get this is a part of the same discourse, begun in the 12th verse; as reckoned by Dr. T. himself in his division of paragraphs, in his paraphrase and notes or the epistle. So that if we will follow him, and admit his reasonings in the various parts of his book, here is manifest proof, against infallible evidence! So that it is

true; the apostle throughout this whole passage on the same subject, by death, evidently, clearly, and infallibly means no more than that death we now die, when this life, is extinguished; and yet by death, in some part of this passage, is meant something widely different from the death we now die MANIFESTLY eternal death, the second death.

But had our author been so consistent with himself; in laying it down as certain and infallibly, that because the apostle has a special respect to temporal death, in the 14th verse, “Death reigned from Adam to Moses,” therefore he means no more in the several consequent parts of this passage, yet he is doubtless too confident and positive in this matter. This is no more evident, clear, and infallibly, than that Christ meant by perishing-in ^{<B1B>}Luke 13:5. When he says, I tell you, Nay, but except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish no more than such a temporal death, as came on those who died by the fall of the tower of Siloam, spoken of in the preceding words of the same speech; and no more infallible, than that by life, Christ means no more than this temporal life, in each part of that one sentence —

“He that findeth his life shall lose it; and he that loseth his life for my sake, shall find it” (^{<B1B>}Matthew 10:39)

because in the first part of each clause he has respect especially to temporal life.

The truth of the case with respect to what the apostle here intends by the word death is this, viz. The whole of that death which be, and the Scripture every where, speaks of as the proper wages and punishment of sin, including death temporal, spiritual, and eternal, though in some parts of this discourse he has a more special respect to one part of this whole, in others to another. as his argument leads him, without any more variation than is quite common in the same discourse. That life, which the Scripture speaks of as the reward of righteousness. is a whole containing several parts viz. The life of the body, union of soul and body, and the most perfect sensibility, activity, and felicity of both, which is the chief thing. In like manner the death, which the Scripture speaks of as the punishment of sin is a whole including the death of the body and the death of the soul, and the eternal, sensible perfect destruction and misery of both. It is this latter whole that the apostle speaks of by the name of death in this

discourse, in Romans 5 though in some sentences he has a more special respect to one part, in others to another: and this, without changing the signification of the word. For having respect to several things included in the extensive signification of the word, is not the same thing as using the word in several distinct signification's. As for instance, the appellative, man, or the proper name of any particular man, is the name of a whole, including the different parts of soul and body. And if any one in speaking of James or John, should say, he was a wise man, and a beautiful man in the former part of the sentence, respect would be had more especially to his soul, in the latter to his body, in the word man: but yet without any proper change of the signification of the name to distinct senses. In ^{<B207>}John 21:7. it is said, Peter was naked, and in the following part of the same story it is said, Peter was grieved. In the former proposition, respect is had especially to his body, in the latter to his soul: but yet here is no proper change of the meaning of the name, Peter. And as to the apostle's use of the word death in the passage now under consideration, on the supposition that he in general means the whole of that death which is the wages of sin, there is nothing but what is perfectly natural in supposing that-in order to evince that death, the proper punishment of sin comes on all mankind in consequence of Adam's sin-he should take notice of that part of this punishment which is visible in this world, and which every body therefore sees does in fact come on all mankind, (as in verse 14.) And is it not equally natural from thence to infer, that all mankind are exposed to the whole of that death which is the proper punishment of sin, whereof temporal death is a part and a visible image of the whole, and (unless chanced by divine grace) an introduction to the principal, and infinitely the most dreadful, part?

II. Dr. T.'s explanation of this passage makes wholly insignificant those first words, By one man sin entered into the world, and leaves this proposition without any sense at all. The apostle had been largely and elaborately representing, how the whole world was full of sin, both among Jews and Gentiles, and all exposed to death and condemnation. It is plain, that in these words he would tell us how this came to pass, namely, that the sorrowful event came by one man, even the first man. That the world was full of sin, and full of death, were two great and notorious facts, deeply affecting the interests of mankind; and they seemed very wonderful

facts, drawings the attention of the more thinking part of mankind every where, who often asked this question, Whence comes evil, moral and natural evil? It is manifest, the apostle here means to tell us, how these came into the world, and came to prevail in it as they do. But all that is meant, according to Dr. T.'s interpretation, is, "He begun transgression." As if all that the apostle meant, was, to tell us who happened to sin first; not how such a malady came upon the world, or how any one in the world, besides Adam himself, came by such a distemper. The words of the apostle, "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin," show the design to be, to tell us how these evils came, as affecting the state of the world; and not only as reaching one man in the world. If this were not plain enough in itself, the words immediately following demonstrate it; "And so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." By sin bring in the world, the apostle does not mean being in the world only in that one instance of Adam's first transgression, but being abroad in the world, among the inhabitants of the earth, in a wide extent, and continued series of wickedness; as is plain in the first words of the next verse, "For until the law, sin was in the world." And therefore when he gives us an account how it came to be in the world, or, which is the same thing, how it entered into the world, he does not mean only coming in one instance.

If the case were as Dr. T. represents, that the sin of Adam, either in its pollution or punishment, reached none but himself, any more than the sin of any other man, it would be no more proper to say, that by one man sin entered into the world, than If-were it inquired, how mankind came into America, and there had anciently been a ship of the Phenician's wrecked at sea, and a single man of the crew was driven on this continent, and here died as soon as he reached the shore — it should be said, By that one man mankind came into America.

Besides, it is not true, that by one man, or by Adam, sin entered into the world, in Dr. T.'s sense: for it was not he but Eve that began transgression. By one man Dr. T. understands Adam, as the figure of Christ. And it is plain, that it was for his transgression, and not Eve's, that the sentence of death was pronounced on mankind after the fall, ^{<OVER>}Genesis 3:19. It appears unreasonable to suppose the apostle means to include Eve when he speaks of Adam for he lays great stress on it, that it was BY ONE, repeating it several times.

III. In like manner this author brings to nothing the sense of the causal particles, in such phrases as these, so often repeated, “Death by sin,” verse 12. “If through the offense of one, many be dead,” verse 15. “by one that sinned, judgment was by one to condemnation.” verse 16. “By one man’s offense; death reigned by one,” verse 17.

“By the offense of one, judgment came upon all,” etc. verse 18. “By one man’s disobedience,” verse 19. These casual particles, so variously repeated, unless they make mere nonsense of the discourse, signify some connection and dependence, by some sort of influence of that sin of ye man, or some tendency to that effect, which is so often said to come BY it. But according to Dr. T. there can be no real dependence or influence in the case, of any sort whatsoever. There is no connection by any natural influence of that one act to make all mankind mortal. Our author does not pretend to account for this effect in any such manner, but in another most diverse, viz. A gracious act of God, laying mankind under affliction, toil, and death, from special favor and kindness. Nor can there be any dependence of this effect on that transgression of Adam, by my moral influence, as deserving such a consequence, or exposing to it on any moral account: for he supposes, that mankind are not in this way exposed to the least degree of evil. Nor has this effect any legal dependence on that sin or any connection by virtue of any antecedent constitution, which God had established with Adam: for he insists, that in that threatening, “In the day thou eatest thou shalt die,” there is not a word said of his posterity, (p. 8.) And death on mankind, according to him, cannot come by virtue of that legal constitution with Adam because the sentence by which it came was after the annulling and abolishing that constitution, (p. 113. S.) And it is manifest, that this consequence cannot be through and kind of tendency of that sin to such an effect; because the effect comes only as a benefit, and is the fruit of mere favor: but sin has no tendency, either natural or moral to benefits, and divine favors. And thus that sin of Adam could neither be the efficient cause, nor the procuring cause; neither the natural, moral, nor legal cause; nor an exciting and moving cause, any more than Adam’s eating of any other tree of the garden. And the only real relation that the effect can have to that sin, is a relation as to time, viz. that it is after it. And when the matter is closely examined, the whole amounts to no more than this, that God is pleased, of his mere good will and pleasure, to bestow a greater

favor upon us, than he did upon Adam in innocence, offer that sin of his eating the forbidden fruit; which sin we are no more concerned in, than in the sin of the king of Pegu, or the emperor of China.

IV. It is altogether inconsistent with the apostle's scope, and the Import of what he says, to suppose that the death of which he here speaks, as coming on mankind by Adam's sin, comes not as a punishment, but only as a favor. It quite makes void the opposition, in which the apostle sets the consequences of Adam's sin, and the consequences of the grace and righteousness of Christ. They are set in opposition to each other, as opposite effects, arising from opposite causes, throughout the paragraph: one, as the just consequence of an offense; the other, a free gift, verse 15-18. Whereas, according to the scheme, there is no such opposition in the case; both are benefits, and both are free gifts. A very wholesome medicine to save from perishing, ordered by a kind father, or a shield to preserve from an enemy, bestowed by a friend, is as much a free gift as pleasant food. The death that comes by Adam, is set in opposition to the life and happiness that comes by Christ, as being the fruit of sin, and judgment for sin: when the latter is the fruit of divine grace verse 15,17, 20, 21.

Whereas, according to our author, both came by grace. Death comes on mankind by the free kindness and love of God, much more truly and properly than by Adam's sin. Dr. T. speaks of it as coming occasion of Adams sin: but as I have observed, it is an occasion without any influence. Yet the proper CAUSE is Gods grace. So that the true cause is wholly good. Which, by the way, is directly repugnant to the apostle's doctrine in ^{<BIB>}Romans 7:13. Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good." Where the apostle utterly rejects any such suggestion, as though that which is good were the proper cause of death; and signifies that sin is the proper cause, and that which is good, only the accretion. But according to this author, the reverse is true: that which is good in the highest sense, even the love of God, and a divine gracious constitution, is the proper cause of death, and sin only the occasion.

But to return, it is plain, that death by Adam, and life and happiness by Christ, are here set in opposition: the latter being spoken of as good, the other as evil; one as the effect of righteousness the other of an offense, one of the fruit of obedience, the other of disobedience; one as the fruit of

God's favor in consequence of what was pleasing and acceptable to him, but the other the fruit of his displeasure, in consequence of what was displeasing and hateful to him; the latter coming by justification, the former by the condemnation of the subject. But according to the scheme of our author, there can be no opposition in any of these respects: the death here spoken of, neither comes as an evil, nor from an evil cause; either an evil efficient cause, or procuring cause, nor at all as any testimony of God's displeasure to the subject, but as properly the effect of his favor, no less than that which is spoken of as coming by Christ; yea, as much as an act of JUSTIFICATION of the subject; as he understands and explains the word justification; for both are by a great of favor, and are in stances of mercy and goodness. And he abundantly insists upon its that "ANY grant of favor, ANY instance of mercy and goodness, whereby God delivers and exempts from any kind of danger, suffering, or calamity, or confers ANY favor blessing, or privilege, is called justification in the scripture-sense and use of the word."

Moreover, our author makes void the grand and fundamental opposition to illustrate which is the chief scope of this whole passage between the first and second, Adam; in the death that comes by one, and the life and happiness by the other. For, according to his doctrine, both come by Christ and Adam; both by his grace, righteousness, and obedience: the death to which God sentenced mankind (^{COBE}Genesis 3:19.) being a great deal more properly and truly by Christ, than by Adam. For, according to him, that sentence was not pronounced on the basis of the covenant with Adam; because that was abrogated, and entirely set aside, as he largely insists for many pages together, (p. 113-120. S.) "This covenant with Adam was dis-annulled immediately after Adam sinned. Even before God passed sentence upon Adam, grace was introduced." "The death that mankind are the subject of now, stands under the covenant of grace. — In the counsel and appointment of God, it stood in this very light, even before the sentence of death was pronounced upon Adam: and consequently, death is no proper and legal punishment of sin. And he often insists, that it comes only as a favor and benefit and standing, as he says, under the covenant of grace, which is by Christ, therefore is truly one of the benefits of the new covenant, which comes by Christ, the second Adam. For he himself is decided, to use his own "That all the grace

of the gospel is dispensed to us, IN, BY, or THROUGH the Son of God.” “Nothing is clearer (says he) from the whole current of Scripture, than that all the mercy and love of God, and all the blessings of the gospel, from first to last, are IN, By, and THROUGH Christ, and particularly by his blood, by the redemption that is in him. This can bear no dispute among Christians.” What then becomes of all this discourse of the apostle’s, about the great difference and opposition between Adam and Christ, as death is by one, and eternal life and happiness by the others This grand distinction between the two Adams, it seems and the other instances of opposition and difference here insisted on — as between the effects of sin and righteousness, the consequences of obedience and disobedience, of the offense and the free gift, judgment and grace, condemnation and justification — all come to nothing. And this whole discourse of the apostle, wherein he seems to labor much as if it were to set forth some very grand and most important distinction and opposition in the state of things, as derived from the two great heads of mankind, proves nothing, but a multitude of words without meaning, or rather a heap of inconsistencies.

V. Our author’s own doctrine entirely makes void what he supposes to be the apostle’s argument, in the 13th and 14th verses, in these words; “For until the law, sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed where 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.”

What he supposes the apostle would prove here, is, that the mortality of mankind comes only by Adam’s sin, and not by men’s personal sins, because there was no law threatening death to Adam’s posterity for personal sins, before the law of Moses; but death, or the mortality of Adam’s posterity, took place many ages before the law was given; therefore death could not be by any law threatening death for, personal sins, and consequently could be by nothing but Adam’s sin. On this I would observe,

1. That which he supposes the apostle to take for a truth in this argument, viz. That there was no law Of God in being, by which men were exposed to death for personal sin, during the time from Adam to Moses’s, is neither true, nor agreeable to this apostle’s own doctrine.

First, The assertion is not true. For the law of nature, written in men's hearts, was then in being, and was a law by which men were exposed to death for personal sin. That there was a divine establishment, fixing the death and destruction of the sinner as the consequence of personal sin, which was well known before the givings of the law by Moses, is plain by many passages in the book of Job, as fully and clearly implying a connection between such sin and such a punishment, as any passage in the law of Moses: such as that in ^{<R1B>}Job 24:19.

“Drought and heat consume the snow-waters so doth the grave them that have sinned.”

(Compare verse 20, and 24.) Also chapter ^{<R1B>}36:6. “He preserveth not the life of the wicked.” Chapter ^{<R1B>}21:29-32. “Have ye not asked them that go by the way? and do se not know their tokens? That the wicked is reserved to the day of destruction; they shall be brought forth to the day of wrath.” Verse 32. “He shall be brought to the grave.”

Secondly. To suppose that there is no law in being, by which men are exposed to death for personal sins, when a revealed law of God is not in being, is contrary to our apostles own doctrine in this epistle.

^{<R1B>}Romans 2:12, 14,15.

“For as many as have sinned without law (i. e. the revealed law) shall perish without law.” But how they can be exposed to die and perish, who have not the law of Moses, nor any revealed law, the apostle shows us in the 14th and 15th verses, viz. in that they have the law of nature, by which they fall under sentence to this punishment. “For when the Gentile, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these having not the law, are a law to themselves, which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness.”-Their conscience not only bore witness to the duty prescribed by this law, but also to the punishment before spoken of, at that which they who sinned without law, were liable to suffer, viz. that they should perish in which the apostle is yet more express, chapter 1:32. speaking more especially of the heathen, “Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things, are worthy of death.” Dr. T. often calls the law the rule of right and this rule of right sentenced those sinners to death, who were not under the law of Moses, according to this author's own paraphrase of this

verse, in these words), “The heathen were not ignorant of the rule of right, which God had implanted in the human nature, and which shows that they which commit such crimes, are deserving of death.” And he himself supposes Abraham, who lived between Adam and Moses, to be under law, by which he would have, been exposed to punishment without hope, were it not for the promise of grace.- Paraph. on ~~ROM~~ Romans 4:15.

So that in our author’s way of explaining the passage before us, the grand argument which the apostle insists upon here to prove his main point, viz. that death does not come by men’s personal sins, but by Adam’s sin, because it came before the law was given, that threatened death for personal sin: I say, this argument which Dr. T. supposes so clear and stronger is brought to nothing more than a mere shadow without substance, the very foundation of the argument having no truth. To say, there was no such law actually expressed in any standing revelation, would be mere trifling. For it no more appears, that God would not bring temporal death for personal sins without a standing revealed law threatening it, than that he would not bring eternal death before there was a revealed law threatening that: which yet wicked men that lived in Noah’s time, were exposed to, as appears by ~~1~~1 Peter 3:19, 20 and which Dr. T. supposes all mankind are exposed to by their personal sins, and he himself says, “Sin in its own unalterable nature leads to death.” Yea, it might be argued with as much strength of reason, that God could bring on men no punishment at all for any sin, that was committed from Adam to Moses, because there was no standing revealed law then extant threatening any punishment. It may here be properly observed, that our author supposes, the shortening of man’s days, and hastening of death, entered into the world by the sin of the antediluvians in the same sense as death and mortality entered into the world by Adam’s sin. But where has there any standing revealed law for that, though the event was so universal? If God might bring this on all mankind, on occasion of other men’s sins, for which they deserved nothing without a revealed law, what could there be to hinder God bringing death on men for their personal sins, for which their own consciences tell them they deserve death without a revealed law?

2. If from Adam to Moses there had been no law in being, of any kind, revealed or natural, by which men could be properly exposed to temporal death for personal sin, yet the mention of Moses’s law would have been

wholly impertinent, and of no signification in the argument, according to our author. He supposes that what the apostle would prove, is, that temporal death comes by Adam; and not by any law threatening such a punishment for personal sin; because this death prevailed before the law of Moses was in being, which is the only law threatening death for personal sin. And yet he himself supposes, that the law of Moses, when it was in being, threatened no such death for personal sin. For he abundantly asserts, that the death which the law of Moses threatened for personal sin, was eternal death, as has been already noted: and he says in express terms, that eternal death is of a nature widely different from the death we now die; as was also observed before.

How impertinently therefore does Dr. T. make an inspired writer argue, when, according to him, the apostle would prove, that this kind of death did not come by any law threatening this kind of death, because it came before the existence of a law threatening another kind of death, of a nature widely different! How is it to the apostle's purpose, to fix on that period, the time of giving Moses's law, as if that had been the period wherein men began to be threatened with this punishment for their personal sins, when in truth it was no such thing? And therefore it was, no more to this purpose to fix on that period, from Adam to Moses than from Adam to David, or any other period whatsoever Dr. T. holds, that even now, since the law of Moses has been given, the mortality of mankind, or the death we now die, does not come by that law; but that it always comes only by Adam. And if it never comes by that law, we may be sure it never was threatened in that law.

3. If we should allow the argument in Dr. T.'s sense of it, to prove that death does not come by personal sin, yet it will be whole without force to prove the main point even that it must come by Adam's sin: for it might come by God's sovereign and gracious pleasure, as innumerable other divine benefits do. If it be ordered, agreeable to our author's supposition, not as a punishment, nor as a calamity, but only as a favor what necessity of any settled constitution, or revealed sentence, in order to bestow such a favor, more than either favors, particularly more than that great benefit, which he says entered into the world by the sin of the antediluvians, the shortening men's lives so much after the flood? Thus the apostle's arguing

by Dr. T.'s explanation of it, is fumed into mere trifling, a vain and impertinent use of words, without any real force

VI. The apostle here speaks of that great benefit which we have by Christ, as the antitype of Adam, under the notion of the fruit of GRACE. I do not mean only that super-abounding of grace wherein the benefit we have by Christ goes beyond the damage sustained by Adam, but that benefit, with regard to which Adam was the figure of him that was to come, and which is as it were the counterpart of the suffering by Adam, and which repairs the loss we have by him. This here spoken of as the fruit of the free grace of God; (as appears by verse 35-18, 20, 21.) which according to our author, is the restoring of mankind to that life which they lost in Adam and he himself supposes this restoration of life by Christ to be what grace does for us, and calls it the free gift of God, and the grace and favor of the lawgiver. And speaking of this restoration, he breaks out in admiration of the unspeakable riches of this grace.

But it follows from his doctrine, that there is no grace at all in this benefit, and it is no more than a mere act of justice, being only a removing of what mankind suffer, being innocent. Death, as it commonly comes on mankind, and even on infants, (as has been observed,) is an extreme, positive calamity, to bring which on the perfectly innocent, unremedied, and without any thing to countervail it, we are sufficiently taught, is not consistent with the righteousness of the judge of all the earth. What grace therefore, worthy of being so celebrated, would there be in affording remedy and relief, after there had been brought on innocent mankind that which is (as Dr. T. himself represents) the dreadful and universal destruction of their nature; being a striking demonstration how infinitely hateful sin is to God! What grace in delivering from such shocking ruin, them who did not deserve the least calamity! Our author says "We could not justly lose communion with God by Adam's sin." If so, then we could not justly lose our lives, and be annihilated, after a course of extreme pains and agonies of body and mind, without any restoration, which would be an eternal loss of communion with God, and all other good, besides the positive suffering. We apostle, throughout this passage, represent the death which is the consequence of Adam's transgression, as coming in a way of judgment and condemnation for sin; but deliverance and life through Christ, as by grace, and the free gift of God. Whereas, on the

contrary, by Dr. T.'s scheme, the death that comes by Adam, comes by grace. great grace; it being a great benefit, ordered in fatherly love and kindness, and on the basis of a covenant of Grace: but in the deliverance and restoration by Christ, there is grace at all. So things are turned topsy-turvy, the apostle's scope and scheme entirely inverted and confounded.

VII. Dr. T. explains the words, judgment, condemnation, justification, and righteousness, as used in this place in a very unreasonable manner.

I will first consider the sense he puts upon the two former, judgment and condemnation. He often calls this condemnation a judicial act, and a sentence of condemnation. But, according to his scheme, it is a judicial sentence of condemnation passed upon them who are perfectly innocent, and viewed by the judge, even in passing the condemnatory sentence, as having no guilt of sin, or any fault at all chargeable upon them-and a judicial proceeding, passing sentence arbitrarily, without any law or rule of right before established. For there was no proceeding law threatening death, that he or any one else ever pretended to have been established, but only this, "In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." And concerning this he insists, that there is not a word said in it of Adam's posterity. So that the condemnation spoken of, is a sentence of condemnation to death, for, or in consequence of, the sin of Adam, without any law by which that sin could be imputed to bring any such consequence, contrary to the apostle's plain scope. And not only so, but, over and above all this, it is a judicial sentence of condemnation to that which is no calamity, nor is considered as such in the sentence; but a condemnation to a great favor!

The apostle uses the words judgment and condemnation in other places; they are no strange and unusual terms with him: but never are they used by him in this sense, or any like it; nor are they ever used thus any where else in the New Testament. This apostle, in this epistle to the Romans, often speaks of condemnation, using the same or similar terms and phrases as here, but never in the above said sense. This will be plain to every one who casts his eye on those places. And if we look into the former part of this chapter, the apostle's discourse makes it evident, that he is speaking of a condemnation, which is no testimony of favor to the innocent; but of God's displeasure towards those to whom he is not reconciled, but looks

on as offenders and enemies, and holds as the objects of his wrath, from which we are delivered by Christ. (See verse 6-11.)

And even viewing this discourse itself, in the very paragraph we are upon, if we may judge any thing by language there is every thing to lead us to suppose, that the apostle uses words there, as he does elsewhere, properly, and as implying a supposition of sin, chargeable on the subject, and exposing to punishment. He speaks of condemnation as what comes by sin, a condemnation to death, which seems to be a most terrible evil, and capital punishment, even in what is temporal and visible and this in the way of judgment and execution of justice, in opposition to grace or favor and gift or a benefit coming by favor. And sin, offense, transgression, and disobedience are, over and over again, spoken of as the ground of the condemnation, and of the capital suffering, for ten verses successively that is, in every verse in the whole paragraph.

The words, justification and righteousness, are explained by Dr. T. in a manner no less unreasonable. He understands justification, in verse 18. and righteousness in verse 19. in such a sense, as to suppose they belong to all, and are actually to be applied to all mankind, good and bad, believers and unbelievers; to the worst enemies of God, remaining such, as well as his peculiar favorites, and many that never had any sin imputed to them meaning thereby no more than what is fulfilled; Universal resurrection from the dead, at the last day! Now this is a most arbitrary, forced sense. Though these terms are used all over the New Testament, yet nothing like such an use of them is to be found in any one instance. The words justify, justification, and righteousness, as from God to men, are never used but to signify a privilege belonging only to some, and that which is peculiar to distinguished favorites. This apostle in particular, above all the other writers of the New Testament, abounds in the use of these terms, so that we have all imaginable opportunity to understand his language and know the sense in which he uses these words; but he never elsewhere uses them in the sense supposed here, nor is there any pretense that he does. Above all, this apostle abounds in the use of these terms in this epistle.

JUSTIFICATION is the subject he had been upon through all the preceding part of the epistle. It was the grand subject of all the foregoing chapters, and the preceding part of this chapter, where these terms are continually repeated. And the word, justification, is constantly used to signify

something peculiar to believers, who had been sinners; implying some reconciliation and forgiveness of sin, and special privilege in nearness to God, above the rest of the world. Yea, the word is constantly used thus, according to Dr. T's own explanations, in his paraphrase and notes on this epistle: And there is not the least reason to suppose but that he is still speaking of the same justification, which he kind dwelt upon from the beginning to this place. He speaks of justification and righteousness here, just in the same manner as he had done in the preceding part of the epistle. He had all along spoken of justification as standing in relation to sin, disobedience to God, and offense against him, and so he does here. He had before been speaking of justification through free grace, and so he does here. He before had been speaking of justification through righteousness, as in Christ JESUS, and so he does here. And if we look into the former part of this very chapter, we shall find justification spoken of just in the same sense as in the rest of the epistle; which is also supposed by our author in his exposition. It is still justification by faith, justification of them who had been sinners, justification attended with reconciliation, justification peculiar to them who had the love of God shed abroad in their heart. The apostle's foregoing discourse on justification by grace through faith-and what he kind so greatly insisted on as the evidence of the truth of this doctrine; even the universal sinfulness of mankind in their original state-is plainly what introduces this discourse in the latter part of this 5th chapter; where he shouts how all mankind came to be sinful and miserable and so to, need this grace of God, and righteousness of; Christ. And therefore we cannot, without the most absurd violence, suppose any other than that he is still speaking of the same justification.

And as to the universal expression used in the 18th verse, "by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men to justification of life;" it is needless here to go into the controversy between the remonstrants and anti-remonstrant, concerning universal redemption, and their different interpretations of this place. If we take the words even as the Arminians do; yet, in their sense of them, the free gift comes on all men to justification only conditionally, i.e. proved they believe, repent, etc. But in our author's sense. it actually comes on all, whether they believe and repent, or not; which certainly cannot be inferred from the universal expression, as here used. Dr. T. himself supposes, the main

design of the apostle in this universal phrase, all men, is to signify that the benefits of Christ shall come on Gentiles as well as Jews. And he supposes that the Many and the ALL, here signify the same; but it is quite certain, that all the benefits here spoken of, which the apostle says are to the many, does not actually come upon all mankind, as particularly the abounding, of grace, verse 15. “The grace of God, and the gift by grace, hath abounded unto the many.”

This abounding of grace our author explains thus; “a rich overplus of grace, in erecting a new dispensation, furnished with a glorious fund of light, means, and motives,” (p. 44.) But will any pretend, that all mankind have actually been partakers of this new fund of light, etc. How were the many millions of Indians, on the American side of the globe, partakers of it, before the Europeans came hither? Yea, Dr. T. himself supposes, that It is only free for all that are willing to accept of it. The agreement between Adam as the type or figure of him that was to come, and Christ as the anti-type, appears full and clear, if we suppose that ALL, who are IN CHRIST (to use the common scripture phrase) have the benefit of his obedience, even as ALL who are IN ADAM have the sorrowful fruit of his disobedience. The Scripture speaks of believers as the seed or posterity of Christ. (^{<483>}Galatians 3:29.) They are in Christ by grace as Adam’s posterity are in him by nature. See also ^{<455>}1 Corinthians 15:45-49. The spiritual seed are those which this apostle often represents as CHRIST’S body: and the here spoken of as made righteous by Christ’s obedience, are doubtless the same with the words which he speaks of in chapter 12:5. We being many, are one body, or, we, the many. And again, ^{<407>}1 Corinthians 10:17. And the same which the apostle had spoken of in the preceding chapter. (^{<408>}Romans 4:18. compared with ^{<415>}Genesis 15:5.

Dr. T. insists much on ^{<452>}1 Corinthians 15:21, 22. “For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead, for as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive,” to confirm his suppositions, that the apostle in the 5th of Romans, speaking of the death and condemnation which come by Adam, has respect only to the death we all die. when this life ends: and that by the justification and life which come by Christ, he has respect only to the general resurrection at the last day. But it is observable, that his argument is wholly built on these two suppositions, viz. First, that the resurrection meant by the apostle, ^{<451>}1 Corinthians

15:is the resurrection of all mankind; both just and unjust. Secondly, That the opposite consequences of Adam's sin, and Christ's obedience, in ^{<BIB>}Romans 5:are the very same, neither more nor less, than are spoken of there But there are no grounds for supposing either of these things to be true.

1. There is no evidence, that the resurrection there spoken of, relates both to the just and unjust; but abundant evidence of the contrary. The resurrection of the wicked is seldom mentioned in the New Testament. and rarely included in the meaning of the word, it being esteemed not worthy to be called a rising to life, being only for a great increase of the misery and darkness of eternal death: and therefore by the resurrection is most commonly meant a rising to life and happiness." The saints are called the children of the resurrection, as Dr. T Observes in his note on ^{<BIB>}Romans 8:11. And it is exceeding evident, that it is the resurrection to life and happiness, which the apostle is speaking of in ^{<BIB>}1 Corinthians 15:21, 22 As appears by each of the three foregoing verse". Verse 18. "Then they which are fallen asleep in Christ (i. e. the saints) are perished." Verse 19. "If in this life only we (Christians or apostles) have hope in Christ, (and have no resurrection and eternal life to hope for,) we are of all men most miserable." Verse 20. "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and is become the first-fruit. of them that slept." He is the forerunner and first-fruits only with respect to them that are his; who are to follow him, and partake with him in the glory and happiness of his resurrection: but he is not the first-fruits of them that shall come forth to the resurrection of damnation. It also appears by the verse immediately following, verse 23. "But every man in his own order; Christ the first-fruits, and afterwards they that are Christ's, at his coming." The same is plain by what is said in verse 29-32. and by all that is said from the 35th verse to the end of the chapter, for twenty-three verses together: it there expressly appears, that the apostle is speaking only of a rising to glory, with a Glorious body, as the little grain thee is sown, being quickened, rises a beautiful flourishing plant. He there speaks of the different degrees of glory among them that shall rise, and compares it to the different degrees of glory among the celestial luminaries. The resurrection he treats of, is expressly, being, raised in incorruption, in glory, in power; with a spiritual body, having the image of the second man, the spiritual and heavenly Adam: a resurrection

wherein this corruptible shall put on incorruption and thy mortal put on immortality, and death be swallowed up in victory, and the saints gloriously triumph over that last enemy. Dr. T. himself says what is in effect owning that the resurrection here spoken of is only of the righteous, for it is expressly a resurrection. (verse 53, and 42.)

But Dr. T. says, These are never attributed to the wicked in Scriptures. So that when the apostle says here, “As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive,” it is as much as if he had said, As in Adam we all die, and our bodies are sown in corruption, in dishonor, and in weakness: so in Christ we all (we Christians, whom I have been all along speaking of) shall be raised in power, glory, and incorruption, spiritual and heavenly, conformed to the second Adam. For as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly, verse 49. Which clearly explains and determines his meaning in verse 21, 22.

2. There is no evidence, that the benefit by the second Adam, spoken of in Romans 5: is the very same (containing neither more nor less) as the resurrection spoken of in 1 Corinthians 15: It is no evidence of it, that the benefit is opposed to the death that comes by the first Adam, in like manner in both places. The resurrection to eternal life though it be not the whole of that salvation and happiness which comes by the second Adam, yet is it that wherein this salvation is principally obtained. The time of the saints’ glorious resurrection is often spoken of as the proper time of their salvation, The day of their redemption, the time of their adoption, glory, and recompense. All that happiness which is given before, is only a prelibation and earnest of their great reward. Well therefore may that consummate salvation bestowed on them, be set in opposition to the death and ruin which comes by the first Adam, in like manner as the whole of their salvation is opposed to the same in Romans 5. Dr. T. himself observes, That the revival and resurrection of the body, is frequently put for our advancement to eternal life. It being the highest part, it is often put for the whole. This notion as if the justification, righteousness, and life spoken of in Romans 5 implied the resurrection of damnation is not only without ground from Scripture, but contrary to reason. For those are there spoken of as great benefits, by the grace and free gift of God: but this is the contrary, in the highest degree possible; the most consummate calamity. To obviate this, our author supposes the resurrection of all to be

a great benefit in itself; though turned into a calamity by the sin and folly of obstinate sinners, who abuse God's goodness. But the far greater part of mankind, since Adam, have never had opportunity to abuse this goodness, it having never been made known to them. Men cannot abuse a kindness, which they never had either in possession, promise, offer, or some intimation: but a resurrection is made known only by divine revelation which few comparatively have enjoyed. So that as to such wicked men as die in lands of darkness, if their resurrection comes at all by Christ, it comes from him, and to them, only as a curse, and not a blessing; for it never comes to them at all by any conveyance, grant, promise, or offer, or any thing by which they can claim it, or know anything of it, till it comes as an infinite calamity, past all remedy.

VIII. In a peculiar manner is there an unreasonable violence used in our author's explanation of the words sinner's and sinned, in the paragraph before us. He says, "These words, By one man's disobedience many were made sinners, mean neither more nor less, than that by one man's disobedience, the many were made subject to death, by the judicial act of God:" And he says in the same place, "By death, most certainly, is meant no other than the death and mortality common to all mankind." And those words, verse 12. "For that all have sinned," he thus explains, "All men became sinners, as all mankind are brought into a state of suffering." Here I observe,

1. The main thing, by which he justifies such interpretations, is, that sin, in various instances, is used for suffering, in the Old Testament. To which I reply; though it be true, that the original word signifies both sin, and a sin-offering-and though this, and some other Hebrew words which signify sin, iniquity, and wickedness, are sometimes put for the effect or punishment of iniquity, by a metonymy of the cause for the effect-yet it does not appear, that these words are ever used for suffering, where that suffering is not a punishment, or a fruit of God's anger for sin. And therefore none of the instances he mentions, come up to his purpose. When Lot is commanded to leave Sodom, that he might not be consumed in the iniquity of the city, meaning in that fire which was the effect and punishment of the iniquity of the city; this is quite another thing, than if that fire came on the city in general, as no punishment at all, nor as any fruit of a charge of iniquity, but as a token of God's favor to the

inhabitants. For according to Dr. T. the death of mankind is introduced only as a benefit, from a covenant of grace. And especially is this quite another thing, than if, in the expression used, the iniquity had been ascribed to Lot, and God, instead of saving; Lest thou be consumed in the iniquity of the city had said Lest thou be consumed in thine iniquity, or, Lest thou sin, or be made a sinner. Whereas the expression is such, as expressly removes the iniquity spoken of from Lot, and fixes it on the city. The place cited by our author in ²⁵¹⁰Jeremiah 51 is exactly parallel. And as to what Abimelech says to Abraham, “What have I offended thee, that thou hast brought on me, and on my kingdom, a great sin?” It is manifest, Abimelech was afraid that God was angry for what he had done to Sarah; or would have been angry with him, if he had done what he was about to do, as imputing, sin to him for it. Which is a quite different thing from calling some calamity, sin, under no notion of its being any punishment of sin, nor in the least degree from God’s displeasure. And so with regard to every place our author cites in the margin, it is plain, that what is meant in each of them, is the punishment of sin, and not some suffering which is no punishment at all. And as to the instance he mentions in his Supplement, (p. 8.) the two that look most favorable to his design are those in ²⁵¹³Genesis 31:39. and ²⁵¹⁷2 Kings 7:9. With respect to the former, where Jacob says, that which; was torn of beast, I bare the loss of it. Dr. T. is pleased to translate it, I was the sinner; but properly rendered, it is, I expiated it; the verb in Pihel properly signifying to expiate, and the plain meaning is, I bore the blame of it, and was obliged to pay for it, as being supposed to be lost through my fault or neglect: which is a quite different thing from suffering without any supposition of fault. And as to the latter place, where the lepers say, this day is a day of good tidings, and we hold our peace: if we tarry till morning some mischief will befall us: in the Hebrew it is as iniquity will find us, that is, some punishment of our fault will come upon us. Elsewhere such phrases are used, as your iniquity will find you out, and the like. But certainly this is a different thing from suffering. without hurt, or supposition of fault. And it does not appear, that the verb in Hiphil, rendered to condemn, is ever put for amen, in any other sense than for sin, or guilt, or supposed guilt belonging to the subject condemned. This word is used in the participle of hiphil to signify CONDEMNING, in ²⁵¹⁸Proverbs 17:15.

“He that justifieth the wicked, and be that condemneth the just, even both are an abomination to the Lord.”

This Dr. T. observes, as if it were to his purpose, when he is endeavoring to show, that in this place (⁴⁸⁸Romans 5.) the apostle speaks of God himself as condemning the just, or perfectly innocent, in a parallel signification of terms. Nor is an instance produced, wherein the verb sin, which is used by the apostle when he says, all have sinned, is any where used in our authors sense, for beings, brought into a state of suffering, and that not as a punishment for sin, or as any thing arising from God’s displeasure; much less for being the subject of what comes only as the fruit of divine love, and as a benefit of the HIGHEST NATURE. Nor can any thing like this sense of the verb be found in the whole Bible.

2. If there had been any thing like such an use of the words sin and sinner, as our author supposes, in the Old Testament, it is evident that such an use of them is quite alien from the language of the New Testament. Where can an instance be produced of any thing like it, in any one place besides what is pretended in this? and particularly in any of this apostle’s writings? He have enough of his writings, by which to learn his way of speaking about sin, condemnation, punishment, death, and suffering. he wrote much more of the New Testament than any other person. He very often has occasion to speak of condemnation: but where does he express it by such a phrase as being, made sinners? Especially how far is he elsewhere from using such a phrase, to signify being condemned without guilt, or any imputation or supposition of guilt? Vastly more still is it remote from his language, to use the verb sin, and to say, man sinneth, or has sinned, though hereby meaning nothing more nor less, than that he, by a judicial art, is condemned, according to a dispensation of grace, to receive a great favor! he abundantly uses the words sin and sinner, his writings are full of such terms; but where else does he use them in such a sense? He has much occasion in his epistles to speak of deaths temporal and eternal; to speak of suffering of all kinds, in this world, and the world to come: but where does he call these things or denominate innocent men sinners, meaning, that they are brought into a state of suffering? If the apostle, because he was a Jew, was so addicted to the Hebrew idiom, as thus in one paragraph to repeat this particular Hebraism, which, at most, is comparatively rare even in the Old Testament; is it not strange, that never

any thing like it should appear any where else in his writings ? and especially, that he should never fall into such a war of speaking in his epistle to the Hebrews, written to Jews only, who were most used to the Hebrew idiom? And why does Christ never use such language in any of his speeches, though he was born and brought up among the Jews, and delivered almost all his speeches to Jews only? And why do none of the other New-Testament writers ever use it, who were all born and educated Jews, (excepting, perhaps Luke,) and some of them wrote especially for the benefit of the Jews?

It is worthy to be observed, what liberty is taken and boldness is used with this apostle. Certain words are abundantly used by him elsewhere in this and other epistles, when speaking, as here, of Christ's redemption and atonement, the general sinfulness of mankind, the condemnation of sinners, the justification by Christ, death as the consequence of sin, and restoration to life by Christ, yet no where are any of these words used, but in a sense very remote from what is suppose! by Dr. T. however, in this place, it seems, these terms must have a distinguished singular sense annexed to them! A new language must be coined for the apostle, to which he is evidently quite unused, for the sake of evading, this clear, precise, and abundant testimony of his, to the doctrine of original sin.

3. To put such a sense on the word sin, in this place, is not only to make the apostle greatly disagree with himself in the language he uses every where else, but also in this very passage. He often here uses the word sin, and other words plainly of the same import, such as transgression, disobedience, offense. Nothing can be more evident, than that these are used as several names of the same thing; for they are used interchangeably, and put one for another. And these words are used no less than seventeen times in this one paragraph. Perhaps we shall find no place in the whole Bible, in which the word sin, and other words plainly synonymous; are used so often in so little compass: and in all these instances, in the proper sense as signifying moral evil, and even so understood by Dr. T. himself, (as appears by his own exposition,) but only in these two places, (verse 12, 19.) where, in the midst of all, to evade a clear evidence of the doctrine of original so, another meaning must be found out, and it must be supposed that the apostle uses the word in a sense entirely different,

signifying something that neither implies nor supposes any moral evil at all in the subject.

Here it is very remarkable, how the gentleman who so greatly insisted upon it, that the word death must needs be understood in the same sense throughout this paragraph; yea, that it is evidently, clearly, and infallibly so, Inasmuch as the apostle is still discoursing on the same subject; yet can, without the least difficulty, suppose the word sin, to be used so differently in the very same passage, wherein the apostle is discoursing on the same thing. Let us take that One instance in verse 12. “Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.” Here, by sin, implied in the word sinned, in the end of the sentence, our author understands something perfectly and altogether diverse from what is meant by the word sin, twice in the former part of the very same sentence, of which this latter part 15 the explication. And a sense entirely different from the use of the word twice in the next sentence, wherein the apostle is still most plainly discoursing on the same subject, as is not denied. And so our author himself understands verse 14. Afterwards (verse 19.) the apostle uses the word sinners, which our author supposes to be in a somewhat different sense still. So that here is the utmost violence of the kind that can be conceived of, to make out a scheme against the plainest evidence, in changing the meaning of a word backward and forward in one paragraph, all about one thing, and in different parts of the same sentence, occurring in quick repetitions, with a variety of other synonymous words to fix its signification. To which we may add, the continued use of the word in all the preceding and subsequent parts of this epistle; in none of which places is it pretended, but that the word is used in the proper sense, by our author in his paraphrase and notes on the whole epistle.

But indeed we need go no further than verse 12. What the apostle means by sin, in the latter part of the verse, is evident, by comparing it with the former. part; the test clause being exegetical of the first. “Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that (or unto which) all have sinned.” Here sin and death are so spoken of in the former and in the latter part that the same things are clearly meant by the terms in both parts. Besides, to interpret sinning, here, by falling under the suffering of death, is Yet the more violent and

unreasonable, because the apostle in this very place once and again distinguishes between sin and death, plainly speaking of one as the effect, and the other the cause. So in the 21st verse “that as sin hath reigned unto death.” and in the 12th verse, “sin entered into the world, and death by sin.”

And this plain distinction holds through all the discourse, as between death and the offense, verse 15. and verse 17. and between the offense and condemnation, verse 18.

4. Though we should omit the consideration of the manner in which the apostle uses the words, sin, sinned, etc. in other places, and in other parts of this discourse, yet Dr. T.’s interpretation of them would be very absurd.

The case stands thus: according to his exposition, we are said to have sinned by an active verb, as though we had actively sinned; Yet this is not spoken truly and properly, but it is put figuratively for our becoming sinners passively, our being name or constituted sinners. Yet again, not that we do truly become sinners passively, or are really made sinners, by any thing that God does; this also is only a figurative or tropical representation: and the meaning is only, we are condemned, and treated As If we were sinners. Not indeed that we are properly condemned for God never truly condemns the innocent: but this also is only a figurative representation of the thing. It is but as it were condemning; because it is appointing to death, a terrible evil, as it were a punishment. But then, in reality, here is no appointment to a terrible evil, or any evil at all; but truly to a benefit a great benefit, and so in representing death as a punishment, another figure is used, and an exceeding bold one; for, as we are appointed to it, it is so far from being an evil or punishment, that it is really a favor, and that of the highest nature appointed by mere grace and love, though it seems to be a calamity.

Thus we have tropes and figures multiplied, one upon another; and all in that one word, sinned, according to the manner, as it is supposed, in which the apostle uses it. We have a figurative representation, not of a reality but of a figurative representation. Neither is this a representation of a reality, but of another thing that still is but a figurative representation of something else: yea, even this something else is still but a figure, and one

that is very harsh and far-fetched. So that here we have a figure to represent a figure, even a figure of a figure, representing some very remote figure, which most obscurely represent the shine intended; if the most terrible evil can indeed be said at all to represent the contrary good of the highest kind. And now, what cannot be made of any place of Scripture, in such a way as this? And is there any hope of ever deciding any controversy by the Scripture, in the way of using such a license in order to force it to a compliance with our own schemes? If the apostle indeed uses language after so strange a manner in this place, it is perhaps such an instance, as not only there is not the like in all the bible besides, but perhaps in no writing whatsoever. And this, not in any parabolical, visionary, or prophetic description, in which difficult and obscure representations are wont to be made, nor in a dramatic or poetical representation; in which a great license is often taken, and bold figures are commonly to be expected. But it is in a familiar letter, wherein the apostle is delivering gospel-instruction, as a minister of the New Testament: and wherein, as he professes, he delivers divine truth without the veil of ancient figures and similitude's, and uses great plainness of speech. And in a discourse that is wholly didactic, narrative, and argumentative; evidently setting, himself to explain the doctrine he is upon, in the reason and nature of it, with a great variety of expressions, turning it as it were on every side, to make his meaning plain, and to fix in his readers the exact notion of what he intends. Dr. T. himself observes, "This apostle takes great care to guard and explain every part of his subject: and I may venture to say. he has left no part of it unexplained or unguarded. Never was an author more exact and cautious in this than he. Sometimes he writes notes on a sentence liable to exception, and wanting explanation." Now I think, this care and exactness of the apostle no where appears more than in the place we are upon. Now I scarcely know another instance equal to this, of the apostle's care to be well understood, by being very particular, explicit, and precise, setting the matter forth in every light, going over and over again with his doctrine, clearly to exhibit, and fully to settle and determine the thing at which he aims.

SECTION 2

Some observations on the connections, scope, and sense of this remarkable paragraph, ^{CHAP.} Romans 5:12, etc. With some reflections on the evidence which we here have of the I doctrine of original sin.

THE connection of this remarkable paragraph with the foregoing discourse in this epistle, is not obscure and difficult nor to be sought for at a distance. It may be plainly seen, only by a general glance on what goes before, from the beginning of the epistle: and indeed what is said immediately before in the same chapter, leads directly to it. The apostle in the preceding part of this epistle had largely treated of the sinfulness and misery of all mankind Jews as well as Gentiles. He had particularly spoken of the depravity and ruin of mankind in their natural state, in the foregoing part of this chapter; representing them as being sinners, ungodly, enemies, exposed to divine wrath and without strength. This naturally leads him to observe how this so great and deplorable an event came to pass how this universal sin and ruin came into the world. And with regard to the Jews in particular, though they might allow the doctrine of original sin in profession, they were strongly prejudiced against what was implied in it, or evidently followed from it, with regard to themselves. In this respect they were prejudiced against the doctrine of universal sinfulness, and exposedness to wrath by nature, looking on themselves as by nature holy, and favourites of God's because they were the children of Abraham, and with them the apostle had labored most in the foregoing part of the epistle, to convince them of their being by nature as sinful, and as much the children of wrath, as the Gentiles it was therefore exceeding proper, and what the apostle's design most naturally led him to, that they should take off their eyes from their father Abraham, their father in distinction from other nations, and direct them to their father Adam, who was the common father of mankind, equally of Jews and Gentiles. And when he had entered on this doctrine of the derivation of sin and death, to all mankind from Adam, no wonder if he thought it needful to be somewhat particular in it, seeing he wrote to JEWS and Gentiles: the former of which had been brought up under the prejudices of a proud opinion of themselves, as a holy people by nature, and the latter had been educated in total ignorance.

Again, the apostle had, from the beginning of the epistle, been endeavoring to evince the absolute dependence of all mankind on the free grace of GOD for salvation, and the greatness of this Grace - and particularly in the former part of this chapter. The greatness of this grace he shows especially by two things.

- (1.) The universal corruption and misery of mankind, as in all the foregoing chapters, and in several preceding verses of this chapter, (verse 6-10.)
- (2.) The greatness of the benefits which believers receive, and the greatness of the glory for which they hope.

So especially in verse 1-5, and 11th of this chapter And here, ver: 12, to the end, he still pursues the same design of magnifying the grace of God, in the favor, life, and happiness which believers in Christ receive speaking here of the grace of God, the gift by grace, the abounding of grace and the reign of grace. And he still sets forth the freedom and riches of grace by the same two arguments, viz. The universal sinfulness and ruin of mankind, all having sinned, all being naturally exposed to death, judgment and condemnation; and the exceeding greatness of the benefit received, being far greater than the misery which comes by the first Adam, and abounding beyond it. And it is by no means consistent with the apostle's scope, to suppose, that the benefit which we have by Christ, as the antitype of Adam, here mainly insisted on, is without any grace at all, being only a restoration to life of such as never deserved death.

Another think observable in the apostle's grand scope from the beginning of the epistle, is, at he endeavors to show the greatness and absoluteness of dependence on the redemption and righteousness of CHRIST, for justification and life that he might magnify and exalt the Redeemer; in which design his whole heart was up, and may he looked upon as the main design of the whole epistle. And this is what he had been upon in the preceding part of this chapter, inferring it from the same argument, even the utter sinfulness and ruin of all men. And he is evidently still on the same thing from the 12th verse to the end: speaking of the some justification and righteousness, which he had dwelt on before, and not another totally diverse. No wonder, when the apostle is treating so fully and largely of our restoration, righteousness, and life by Christ, that he is

led by it to consider our fall, sin, death, and ruin by Adam, and to observe wherein these two opposite heads of mankind agree, and wherein they differ, in the manner of conveyance of opposite influences and communications from each.

Thus, if the place be understood, as it used to be understood by orthodox divines, the whole stands in a natural, easy, and clear connection with the preceding part of the chapter, and all the former part of the epistle, and in a plain agreement with the express design of all that the apostle had been saving; and also in connection with the words last before spoken, as introduced by the two immediately preceding verses, where he is speaking of our justification, reconciliation, and salvation by Christ; which leads the apostle directly to observe, how, on the contrary, we have sin and death by Adam. Taking this discourse of the apostle in its true and plain sense, there is no need of great extent of learning, or depth of criticism, to find out the connection. But if it be understood in Dr. T.'s sense, the plain scope and connection are wholly lost, and there was truly need of skill in criticism, and the art of discerning, beyond or at least different from that of former divines, and a faculty of seeing what other men's sight could not reach, in order to find out the connection.

What has been already observed, may suffice to show the apostle's general scope in this place. But yet there seem to be some other things to which he alludes in several expressions. As particularly the Jews had a very superstitious and extravagant notion of their law delivered by Moses, as if it were the prime, grand, and indeed only role of God's proceeding with mankind as their judge, both in their justification and condemnation, or from whence all, both sin and righteousness, was imputed, and had no consideration of the law of nature, written in the hearts of the Gentiles, and of all mankind. Herein they ascribed in finitely too much to their particular law, beyond the true design of it. They made their boast of the law, as if their being distinguished from all other nations by that great privilege, the giving of the law, sufficiently made them a holy people, and God's children. This notion of theirs the apostle evidently refers to, chapter ^{ROM}2:13, 17-19. and indeed through that whole chapter. They looked on the law of Moses as intended to be the only rule and means of justification; and as such, trusted in the works of the law, especially circumcision; which appears by the third chapter. But as for the Gentiles,

they looked on them as by nature sinners, and children of wrath; because born of uncircumcised parents, and aliens from their law, and who themselves did not know, profess, and submit to the law of Moses, become proselytes, and receive circumcision. What they esteemed the sum of their wickedness, and condemnation, was, that they did not turn Jews, and act as Jews. To this notion the apostle has a plain respect, and endeavors to convince them of its falseness, in chapter 2:12-16. And he has a manifest regard again to the same thing here. (Chapter ^{REF12}5:12-14.) Which may lead us the more clearly to see the true sense of those verses, about the sense of which is the main controversy, and the meaning of which being determined, it will settle the meaning of every other controverted expression through the whole discourse.

Dr. T. misrepresents the apostle's argument in these verses; which, as has been demonstrated, is in his sense altogether vain and impertinent. He supposes, the think which the apostle mainly intends to prove, is, that death or mortality does not come on mankind by personal sin: and that he would prove it by this medium, that death resigned when there was no law in being which threatened personal sin with death. It is acknowledged, that this is implied, even that death came into the world by Adam's sin: yet this is not the main thing the apostle designs to prove. But his main point evidently is, that sin and guilt, and just exposedness to Goliath and ruin, came into the world by Adam's sin; as righteousness, justification, and a title to eternal life come by Christ. Which point be confirms by this consideration, that from the fiery time when Adam sinned, sin, guilt, and desert of ruin, became universal in the world, long before the law given by Moses to the Jewish nation had any being.

The apostle's remark, that sin entered into the world by one man, who was the father of the whole human race, was an observation which afforded proper instruction for the Jews, who looked on themselves as an holy people, because they had the law of Moses, and were the children of Abraham, an holy father; while they looked on other nations as, by nature unholy and sinners, because they were not Abraham's children. He leads them up to a higher ancestor than this patriarch, even to Adam, who being equally the father of Jews and Gentiles, both alike come from a sinful father; from whom Built and pollution were derived alike to all mankind. And this the apostle proves by an argument, which of all that could

possibly be invented, tended the most briefly and directly to convince the Jews; even by this reflection, that death had come equally on all mankind from Adam's time, and that the posterity of Abraham were equally subject to it with the rest of the world. This was apparent in fact, a thing they all knew. And the Jews had always been taught that death which began in the destruction of the body, and of this present life) the proper punishment of sin. This they were taught in Moses's history of Israel, and God's first threatening of punishment for sin, and by the constant doctrine of the law and the prophets; as already observed.

And the apostle's observation-that sin was in the world long before the law was given, and was as universal in the world from the times of Adam, as it had been among the heathen since the law of Moses-showed plainly, that the Jews were quite mistaken in their notion of their particular law and that the law which is the original and universal rule of righteousness and judgment for all mankind, was another law, of far more ancient date, even the law of nature. This began as early as the human nature began, and was established with the first father of mankind, and in him with the whole race. The positive precept of abstaining from the forbidden fruit, was given for the trial of his compliance with this law of nature; of which the main rule is supreme regard to God and his will. And the apostle proves that it must be thus, because if the law of Moses had been the highest rule of judgment, and if there had not been a superior, prior, divine rule established, mankind in general would not have been judged and condemned as sinners, before that was given, (for "sin is not imputed, when there is no law,") as it is apparent in fact they were, because death reigned before that time, even from the time of Adam.

It may be observed, that the apostle, both in this epistle, and in that to the Galatians, endeavors to convince the Jews of these two things, in opposition to the notions and prejudices they had entertained concerning their law.

(1.) That it never was intended to be the covenant, or method by which they should actually be justified.

(2.) That it was not the highest and universal rule or law, by which mankind in general and particularly the heathen world, were condemned.

And he proves both by similar arguments.-He proves, that the law of Moses was not the covenant, by which any of mankind were to obtain justification, because that covenant was of older date, being expressly established in the time of Abraham, and Abraham himself was justified by it. This argument the apostle particularly handles in the third chapter of Galatians, particularly in verse 17-19. and especially in ~~the~~ Romans 4:13-15. He proves also, that the law of Moses was not the prime rule of judgment, by which mankind in general, and particularly the heathen world, were condemned. And this he proves also the same way, viz. but something superadded to both, superadded to the latter, to illustrate and confirm it, that the offense might abound; and superadded to the former, to be as a schoolmaster, to prepare men for its benefits, and to magnify divine grace in it, that this might much more abound.

The chief occasion of obscurity and difficulty, attending the scope and connection of the various clauses of this discourse, particularly in the 13th and 14th verses, is that there are two things (although closely connected) which the apostle has in view at ones. He would illustrate the grand point he had been upon from the beginning, even justification through Christ's righteousness alone, by showing now we are originally in a sinful miserable state, how we derive tints sin and misery from Adam, and how we are delivered and justified by Christ as a second Adam. At the same time he would confute those foolish and corrupt notions of the Jews, about their nature, and their law, which were very inconsistent with these doctrines. And he here endeavors to establish, at once, these two things in opposition to those Jewish notions.

(1.) That it is our natural relation to Adam, and not to Abraham, which determines our native moral state: and that, therefore, being natural children of Abraham, will not make us by nature holy in the sight of God, since we are the natural seed of sinful Adam. Nor does the Gentiles being not descended from Abraham. denominate them sinners, any more than the Jews, seeing both alike are descended from Adam.

(2.) That the law of Moses is not the prime and general law and rule of judgment for mankind, to condemn them and denominate them sinners; but that the state they are in with regard to a higher, more ancient, and universal law, determines them in general to be sinners in the sight of

God, and liable to be condemned as such. Which observation is, in many respects, to the apostle's purpose; particularly in this respect, that if the Jews were convinced, that the law, which was the prime rule of condemnation, was given to all, was common to all mankind, and that all fell under condemnation through the violation of that law by the common father of all, both Jews and Gentiles, their they would be led more easily and naturally to believe, that the method of justification, which God had established, also extended equally to all mankind: and that the Messiah, by whom we have this justification, is appointed, as Adam was, for a common head to all, both Jews and Gentiles. — The apostle aiming to confute the Jewish notion, is the principal occasion of those words in the 13th verse, “for until the law, sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed, when there is no law.”

As to the import of that expression, “even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression,” not only is the thing signified, in Dr. T's sense of it, not true; or if it had been trite, would have been impertinent, as has been shown: but his interpretation is, otherwise, very much strained and unnatural. According to him, “by sinning after the similitude of Adam's transgression,” is not meant any similitude of the act of sinning, nor of the command sinned against, nor properly any circumstance of the sin, but only the similitude of a circumstance of the command, viz. the threatening with which it is attended. A far-fetched thing, truly, to be called a similitude of sinning! Besides, this expression in such a meaning, is only a needless, impertinent, and awkward repetition of the same thing, which it is supposed the apostle had observed in the foregoing verse, even after he had proceeded another step in the series of his discourse. As thus, in the foregoing verse the apostle had plainly laid down his argument, (as our author understands it,) by which he would prove, that death did not come by personal sin, viz. because death resigned before and law, threatening death for personal sin, was in being: so that the sin then committed was against no law, threatening death for personal sin. Having laid this down, the apostle leaves this part of his argument, and proceeds another step, nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses: and then returns, in a strange unnatural manner, and repeats that argument or assertion again, but only more obscurely than before, in these words, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's

transgression; i. e. over them, that had not sinned against a law threatening death for personal sin. Which is just the same them as if the apostle had said, “they that sinned before the law, did not sin against a law threatening death for personal sin for there was no such law for any to sin against at that time: nevertheless death reigned at that time, even over such as did not sin against a law threatening death for personal sin.” Which latter clause acts nothing to the premises, and tends nothing to illustrate what was said before, but rather to obscure and darken it. The particle even, when prefixed in this manner, is used to signify something additional, some advance in the sense or argument; implying, that the words following express something more, or express the same thing more fully, plainly, or forcibly. But to unite two clauses by such a particle, in such a manner, when there is nothing besides a flat repetition, with no superadded sense or force, but rather a greater uncertainty and obscurity, would be very unusual, and indeed very absurd.

I can see no reason why we should be dissatisfied with that explanation of this clause, which has more commonly been given, viz. That by them who have not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression, are meant infants; who, though they have indeed sinned in Adam, yet never sinned as Adam did, by actually transgressing in their own persons, unless it be, that this interpretation is too old, and too common. It was well understood by those to whom the apostle wrote, that vast numbers had died in infancy, within that period of which he speaks, particularly in the time of the deluge. And it would be strange, that the apostle should not have the case of such infants in his mind; even supposing his scope were what our author supposes, and he had only intended to prove that death did not come on mankind for their personal sin. How directly would it have served the purpose of proving this’ to have mentioned so great a part of mankind who are subject to death, and who, all know, never committed any sin in their own persons! How much more plain and easy the proof of the point by that, than to go round about, as Dr. T. supposes, and bring in a thing so dark and uncertain as this, that God never would bring death on all mankind for personal sin (though they had personal sin) without an express revealed constitution; and then to observe, that there was no revealed constitution of this nature from Adam to Moses-which also seems to be an assertion without any plain evidence-and then to infer, that

it must needs be so, that it could come only on occasion of Adam's sin, though not for his sin, or as any punishment of it; which inference also is very dark and unintelligible.

If the apostle in this place meant those who never sinned by their personal act, it is not strange that he should express this by their not sinning after the similitude of Adam's transgression. We read of two ways of men being like Adam, or in which a similitude to him is ascribed to men: one is, being begotten or born in his image or likeness, ^{OR} Genesis 5:3. Another is, transgressing: God's covenant or law, like him, Hosea 6 7. They, like Adam, (so, in the Hebrews and Vulg. Lat.) have transgressed the covenant. Infants have the former similitude, but not the latter. And it was very natural, when the apostle would infer that infants become sinners by that one act and offense of Adam to observe, that they had not renewed the act of sin themselves, by any second instance of a like sort. And such might be the state of language among Jews and Christians at that day, that the apostle might have no phrase more aptly to express this meaning. The manner in which the epithets, personal and actual, are used and applied now in this case, is probably of later date, and more modern use.

And the apostle having the case of infants in view, in this expression, makes it mole to his purpose to mention death reigning before the law of Moses was given. For the Jews looked on all nations besides themselves, as sinners, by virtue of their law; being made so especially by the law, of circumcision, given first to Abraham, and completed by Moses, making the want of circumcision a legal pollution, utterly disqualifying for the privileges of the sanctuary. This law, the Jews supposed, made the very infants of the Gentiles to be sinners, polluted and hateful to God; they being uncircumcised, and born of uncircumcised parents. But the apostle proves, against these notions of the Jews, that the nations of the world do not become sinners by nature, and sinners from infancy, by virtue of their law, in this manner, but by Adam's sin: inasmuch as infants were treated as sinners long before the law of circumcision was given, as well as before they had committed actual sin.

What has been said, may, as I humbly conceive, lead us to that which is the true scope and sense of the apostle in these three verses; which I will endeavor more briefly to represent in the following paraphrase.

“The things which I have largely insisted on, viz. the evil that is in the world, the general wickedness, guilt, and ruin of mankind, and the opposite good, even justification and life, as only by Christ, lead me to observe the, likeness of the manner in which they are each of them introduced. For it, was by one man that the general corruption and guilt which I have spoken of, came into the world, and condemnation and death by sin: and this dreadful punishment and ruin came on all mankind by the great law of works, originally established with mankind in their first father, and by his one offense, or breach of that law; all thereby becoming sinners in God’s sight, and exposed to final destruction.

“It is manifest that it was in this way the world became sinful and guilty; and not in that way which the Jews suppose, viz. That their law, given by Moses, is the grand universal rule of righteousness and judgment for mankind, and that it is by being Gentiles, uncircumcised, and aliens from that law, that the nations of the world are constituted sinners and unclean. For before the law of Moses was given, mankind were all looked upon by the great Judge as sinners, by corruption and guilt derived from Adam’s violation of the original law of works; which shows, that the original universal rule of righteousness is not the law of Moses; for if so, there would have been no sin imputed before that was given; because sin is not imputed, when there is no law.

“But that at that time sin was imputed, and men were by their judge reckoned as sinners, through guilt and corruption derived from Adam, and condemned for sin to death, the proper, punishment of sin, we have a plain proof; in that it appears in fact all mankind, during that whole time which preceded the law of Moses, were subjected to that temporal death, which is the visible introduction and image of that utter destruction which sin deserves, not excepting even infant, who could be sinners no other way then by virtue of Adam’s transgression, having never in their own persons actually sinned as Adam did; nor could at that time be made polluted by the law of Moses, as being uncircumcised, or born of uncircumcised parents.”

Now, by way of reflection on the whole, I would observe, that though there are two or three expressions in this paragraph, ^{ROM}Romans 5:12, etc. the design of which is attended with some difficulty and obscurity, as particularly in the 13th and 14th verses, yet the scope and sense of the discourse in general is not obscure, but on the contrary very clear and manifest; and so is the particular doctrine mainly taught in it. The apostle sets himself with great care to make it plain, and precisely to fix and settle the point he is upon. And the discourse is so framed, that one part of it greatly clears and fixes the meaning of other parts, and the whole is determined by the clear connection It stands in with other parts of the epistle, and by the manifest drift of all the preceding part of it.

The doctrine of original sin is not only here taught, but most plainly, explicitly, and abundantly taught. This doctrine is asserted, expressly or implicitly, in almost every verse, and in some of the verses several times. It is fully implied in that first expression in the 12th verse “By one man sin entered into the world.” The passage implies, that sin became universal in the world, as the apostle had before largely shown it was; and not merely (which would be a trifling observation) that one man, who was made first, sinned first, before other men sinned, or that it did not so happen that many men began to sin just together at the same moment. The latter part of the verse “and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that (or, if you will, unto which) all have sinned,” shows, that in the eye of the Judge of the world, in Adam’s first sin, all sinned; not only in some sort, but all sinned so as to be exposed to that death, and final destruction, which is the proper wages of sin. The same doctrine is taught again twice over in the 14th verse. It is there observed, as a proof of this doctrine, that “death reigned over them which had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression,” i. e. by their personal act, and therefore could be exposed to death, only by deriving, guilt and pollution from Adam, in consequence of his sin. And it IS taught again in those words, who is the figure of him that was to come. The resemblance lies very much in this circumstance, viz. our deriving sin guilt, and punishment by Adam’s sin, as we do righteousness, justification, and the reward of life, by Christ’s obedience; for so the apostle explains himself. The same doctrine is expressly taught again, verse 15. “Through the offense of one, many be dead.” And again twice in the 16th verse, “it was by one that

sinned:” i. e. It was by Adam’ that guilt and punishment (before spoken of) came on mankind: and in these words, “judgment was by one to condemnation.” It is again plainly and fully laid down in the 17th verse “By one man’s offense, death reigned by one.” So again in the 18th verse, “By the offense of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation.” Again very plainly in the 19th verse, “By one man’s disobedience, many were made sinners.”

Here is every thing to determine and fix the meaning of all the important terms used, as, the abundant use of them in all parts of the New Testament; and especially in this apostle’s writings, which make up a very great part of the New Testament, and his repeated use of them in this epistle in particular, and in the former part of this very chapter, and also the light that one sentence in this paragraph casts on another, which fully settles their meaning: as, with respect to the words justification, righteousness, and condemnation and above all, in regard of the word sin, which is the most important of all, with relation to the doctrine and controversy we are upon. Besides the constant use of this term every where else through the New Testament, through the epistles of this apostle, this epistle in particular, and even the former part of this chapter, it is often repeated in this very paragraph, and evidently used in the very sense that is denied to belong to it in the end of verse 12. and verse 19. though owned every where else: and its meaning is fully determined by the apostle varying the term; using together with it, to signify the same thing, such a variety of other synonymous words such as offense, transgression, disobedience. And further, to put the matter out of all controversy, it is particularly, expressly, and repeatedly distinguished from that which our opposers would explain it by, viz. condemnation and death. And what is meant by sin entering into the world, in verse 12. is determined by a like phrase of sin being in the world in the next verse. — And that by the offense of one, so often spoken of here, as bringing death and condemnation on all, the apostle means the sin of one derived in its guilt and pollution to mankind in general, (over and above all that has been already observed,) is determined by those words in the conclusion of this discourse, verse 20. “Moreover, the law entered, that the offense might abound: but where sin abounded, grace did much more abound.” These words plainly show, that the OFFENCE spoken of often, the offense of one

man, became the sin of all. For when he says, “The law entered, that the offense might abound” his meaning cannot be that the offense of Adam, merely as his personally should abound; but, as it exists in its derived guilt, corrupt influence, and evil fruits, in the sin of mankind in general, even as a tree in its root and branches.

What further confirms the certainty of the proof of original sin, which this place affords, in this, that the utmost art cannot pervert it to another sense. What a variety of the most artful methods have been used by the enemies of this doctrine, to wrest and darken this paragraph of Holy Writ, which stands so much in their way, as it were to force the Bible to speak a language agreeable to their mind! flow have expressions been strained, words and phrases racked! What strange figures of speech have been invented, and with violent hands thrust into the apostle’s mouth; and then with a bold countenance and magisterial airs obtruded on the world, as from him! — But blessed be God, we have his words as he delivered them, and the rest of the same epistle, and his other writings to compare with them, by which his meaning stands in too strong and glaring a light to be hid by any of the artificial mists which they labor to throw upon it.

It is really no less than abusing the Scripture and its readers, to represent this paragraph as the most obscure of all the places of Scripture, that speak of the consequences of Adam’s sin; and to treat it as if there was need first to consider other places as more plain. Whereas, it is most manifestly a piece in which these things are declared, the most plainly, particularly, precisely, and of set purpose, by that great apostle, who has most fully explained to us those doctrines in general which relate to the redemption by Christ, and the sin and misery we are redeemed from. And it must be now left to the reader’s judgment, whether the Christian church has not proceeded reasonably, in looking on this as a place of Scripture most clearly and fully treating of these things, and in using its determinate sense as a help to settle the meaning of many other passages of Sacred Writ.

As this place in general is very full and plain, so the doctrine of the corruption of nature, as derived from Adam, and also the imposition of his first sin, are both clearly taught in it. The imputation of Adam’s one transgression, is indeed most directly and frequently asserted. We are here

assured, that by one man's sin, death passed on all; all being adjudged to this punishment, as having sinned (so it is implied) in that one man's sin. And it is repeated, over and over, that all are condemned, many are dead, many made sinners, etc. by one man's offense, by the disobedience of one, and by one offense. And the doctrine of original depravity is also here taught, when the apostle says, "By one man sin entered into the world;" having a plain respects (as hath been shown) to that universal corruption and wickedness, as well as guilt, of which he had before largely treated.

PART 3

The Evidence Given Us, Relative to the Doctrine of Original Sin in What the Scriptures Reveal, Concerning the Redemption by Christ.

CHAPTER 1.

The Evidence of Original Sin, From the Nature; of Redemption, in the Procurement of it.

According to Dr. T.'s scheme, a very great part of mankind are the subjects of Christ's redemption, who live and die perfectly innocent, who never have had, and never will have, any sin charged to their account, and never are exposed to any punishment whatsoever, viz. all that die in infancy. They are the subjects of Christ redemption, as he redeems them from death, or as they by his righteousness have justification, and by his obedience are made righteous, in the resumption of the body, in the sense of ^{ROM}Romans 5:18, 19. And all mankind are thus the subjects of Christ's redemption, while they are perfectly guiltless, and exposed to no punishment, as by Christ they are entitled to a resurrection. Though, with respect to such persons as have sinned, he allows it is in some sort by Christ and his death, that they are saved from sin, and the punishment of it.

Now let us see whether such a scheme well consists with the scripture account of the redemption by Jesus Christ.

I. The representations of the redemption by Christ every where in Scripture, lead us to suppose, that all whom he came to redeem are sinners; that his salvation as to the term from which, (or the evil to be redeemed from,) in all, is sin, and the deserved punishment of sin. It is natural to suppose, that when he had his name Jesus, or Savior, given him by God's special and immediate appointment, the salvation meant by that name should be his salvation in general; and not only a part of his salvation, and with regard only to some of them whom he came to save. But this name was given him to signify "his saving his people from their

sins," ^{<102>}Matthew 1:21. And the great doctrine of Christ's salvation is, that "he came into the world to save sinners," ^{<105>}1 Timothy 1:15. And that "Christ hath once suffered, the just for the unjust" ^{<108>}1 Peter 3:18. "In this was manifested the love of God towards us, (towards such in general as have the benefit of God's love in giving Christ,) that God sent his only-begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, that he sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins," ^{<109>}1 John 4:9, 10. Many other texts might be mentioned, which seem evidently to suppose, that all who are redeemed by Christ are saved from SIN. We are led by what Christ himself said, to suppose, that if any are not sinners, they have no need of him as a Redeemer, any more than a man in health of a physician, ^{<117>}Mark 2:17. And that, in order to our being the proper subjects of the mercy of God through Christ, we must first be in a state of sin, is implied in ^{<122>}Galatians 3:22.

"But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe."

To the same effect is ^{<113>}Romans 11:32.

These things are greatly confirmed by the scripture doctrine of sacrifices. It is abundantly plain, both from the Old and New Testament that these were types of Christ's death, and were for sin, and supposed sin in those for whom they were offered. The apostle supposes, that in order to any having the benefit of the eternal inheritance by Christ, there must of necessity be the death of the testator; and gives that reason for it, "That without shedding, of blood there is no remission," ^{<105>}Hebrews 9:15, etc. And Christ himself, in representing the benefit of his blood, in the institution of the Lord's supper, under the notion of the blood of a testament, calls it, "The blood of the New Testament shed for the remission of sins," ^{<113>}Matthew 26:28. But according to the scheme of our author, many have the eternal inheritance by the death of the testator, who never had any need of remission.

II. The Scripture represents the redemption by Christ as a redemption from deserved destruction, and that, not merely as it respects some particulars, but as the fruit of God's love to mankind.

“God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life;” (^{<RB>}John 3:16)

implying, that otherwise they must perish or be destroyed. But what necessity of this, if they did not deserve to be destroyed? Now, that the destruction here spoken of, is deserved destruction, is manifest, because it is there compared to the perishing of such of the children of Israel as died by the bite of the fiery serpents, which God in his wrath, for their rebellion, sent amongst them. And the same thing clearly appears by the last verse of the same chapter, “He that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life, and he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him,” or, is left remaining on him: implying, that all in general are found under the wrath of God and that they only of all mankind who are interested in Christ, have this wrath removed and eternal life bestowed, the rest are left with the wrath of God still remaining on them. The same is clearly illustrated and confirmed by ^{<RB>}John 5:24.

“He that believeth, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death to life.”

in being passed from death to life is implied, that before, they were all in a state of death: and they are spoken of as being so by a sentence of condemnation; and if it be a just condemnation, it is a deserved condemnation.

III. It will follow on Dr. T.’s scheme, that Christ’s redemption, with regard to a great part of them who are the subjects of it, is not only a redemption from no sin, but from no calamity, and so from no evil of any kind. For as to death, which infants are redeemed from, they never were subjected to it as a calamity, but purely as a benefit. It came by no threatening or curse denounced upon or through Adam; the covenant with him being utterly abolished, as to all its force and power on mankind, (according to our author,) before the sentence of mortality. Therefore trouble and death could be appointed to innocent mankind no other way than on account of another covenant, the covenant of grace; and in this channel they come only as favors, not as evils. Therefore they could need no remedy, for they had no disease. Even death itself, which it is supposed Christ saves them from, is only a medicine; and one of the

greatest of benefits. It is ridiculous to talk of persons' needing a medicine, or a physician, to save them from an excellent medicine; or of a remedy from a happy remedy! If it be said, though death be a benefit, yet it is so because Christ changed it, and turns it into a benefit, by procuring a resurrection: I would ask, what can be meant by turning or changing it into a benefit, when it never was otherwise, nor could ever justly be otherwise? Infants could not at all be brought under death as a calamity, for they never deserved it. And it would be only an abuse (be it far from us, to ascribe such a thing to God) in any being, to offer any poor sufferers a Redeemer from a calamity which he had brought upon them, without the least desert of it on their part.

But it is plain, that mortality was not at first brought on mankind as a blessing, by the covenant of grace through Christ; and that Christ and grace do not bring mankind under death, but find them under it.

“We thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead.”

(~~2~~ 2 Corinthians 5:14)

“The Son of man is come to seek and save that which was lost.”

(~~290~~ Luke 19:10)

The grace which appears in providing a deliverer from any state, supposes the subject to be in that state prior to his deliverance. In our author's scheme, there never could be any sentence of death or condemnation, that requires a Savior from it; because the very sentence itself, according to the true meaning of it, implies and makes sure all that good, which is requisite to abolish and make void the seeming evil to the innocent subject. So that the sentence itself is in effect the deliverer; and there is no need of another to deliver from that sentence. Dr. T. insists upon it, that “nothing come upon us in consequence of Adam's sin, in any SENSE, KIND, or DEGREE, inconsistent with the original blessing pronounced on Adam at his creation; and nothing but what is perfectly consistent with God's blessing, love, and goodness, declared to Adam as soon as he came out of his Maker's hands.” If the case be so, it is certain there is no evil or calamity at all for Christ to redeem us from; unless things agreeable to the divine goodness, love, and blessing, are things from which we need redemption.”

IV. It will follow, on our author's principles, not only with respect to infants, but even adult persons, that redemption is needless, and Christ is dead in vain. Not only is there no need of Christ's redemption in order to deliverance from any consequences of Adam's sin, but also in order to perfect freedom from personal sin, and all its evil consequences. For God has made other sufficient provision for that, viz. a sufficient power and ability, in all mankind, to do, all their duty, and wholly to avoid sin. Yea, he insists upon it, that "when men have not sufficient power to do their duty, they have no duty to do. We may safely and assuredly conclude, (says he,) that mankind in all parts of the world have SUFFICIENT power to do the duty which God requires of them; and that he requires of them NO MORE than they have SUFFICIENT powers to do." And in another place, "God has given powers EQUAL to the duty which he expects." And he expresses a great dislike at R. R.'s supposing, that our propensities to evil, and temptation", are too strong to be EFFECTUALLY and CONSTANTLY resisted; or that we are unavoidably sinful IN A DEGREE; that our appetites and passions will be breaking out, notwithstanding our everlasting watchfulness. These things fully imply, that men have in their own natural ability sufficient means to avoid sin, and to be perfectly free from it, and so, from all the bad consequences of it. And if the means are sufficient, then there is no need of more; and therefore there is no need of Christ dying, in order to it. What Dr. T. says, (p. 72. S.) fully implies, that it would be unjust in God to give mankind being in such circumstances, as that they would be more likely to sin, so as to be exposed to final misery, than otherwise. Hence then, without Christ and his redemption, and without any grace at all, MERE JUSTICE makes sufficient provision for our being free from sin and misery by our own power.

If all mankind, in all parts of the world, have such sufficient power to do their whole duty, without being sinful in any degree, then they have sufficient power to obtain righteousness by the law: and then, according to the apostle Paul, Christ is dead in twin.

"If righteousness come by law, Christ is dead in vain;"

(←~~RED~~ Galatians 2:21)

To as without the article, by law, or the rule of right action, as our author explains the phrase. And according to the sense in which he explains this

very place, “it would have frustrated, or rendered useless, the grace of God, if Christ died to accomplish what was MIGHT have been effected by law itself, without his death.” So that it most clearly follows from his own doctrine, that Christ is dead in vain, and the grace of God is useless. The same apostle says, if there had been a law which COULD have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law, ^{<REF>}Galatians 3:21. i. e. (still according to Dr. T.’s own sense,) if there was a law, that man, in his present state, had sufficient power perfectly to fulfill. For Dr. T. supposes the reason why the law could not give life, to be “not because it was weak in itself, but through the weakness of our flesh, and the infirmity of the human nature in the present state.” But he says, “We are under a mild dispensation of GRACE, making allowance for our infirmities.” By our infirmities, we may upon good grounds suppose he means that infirmity of human nature, which he gives as the reason why the law cannot give life. But what grace is there in making that allowance for our infirmities, which justice itself (according to his doctrine) most absolutely requires, as he supposes divine justice exactly proportions our duty to our ability?

Again, if it be said, that although Christ’s redemption was not necessary to preserve men from beginning to sin and getting into a course of sin, because they have sufficient power in themselves to avoid it; yet it may be necessary to deliver men, after they have by their own folly brought themselves under the dominion of evil appetites and passions. I answer, if it be so, that men need deliverance from those habits and passions, which are become too strong for them, yet that deliverance, on our author’s principles, would be no salvation from sin. For the exercise of passions which are too strong for us, and which we cannot overcome, is necessary: and he strongly urges, that a necessary evil can be no moral evil. It is true, it is the effect of evil, as it is the effect of a bad practice, while the man had power to have avoided it. But then according to Dr. T. that evil cause alone is sin, for he says expressly, “The cause of every effect is alone chargeable with the effect it produceth, or which proceedeth from it.” And as to that sin which was the cause, the man needed no Savior from that, having had sufficient power in himself to have avoided it. So that it follows by our author’s scheme, that none of mankind, neither infants nor adult persons, neither the more nor less vicious, neither Jews nor Gentile,

neither heathens nor Christians, ever did or ever could stand in any need of a Savior: and that, with respect to all, the truth is, Christ is dead in vain.

If any should say, although all mankind in all ages have sufficient ability to do their whole duty, and so may by their own power enjoy perfect freedom from sin, yet God foresaw that they would sin, and that after they had sinned, they would need Christ's death. I answer, it is plain, by what the apostle says in those places which were just now mentioned, (⁴²²Galatians 2:21. and 3:21.) that God would have esteemed it needless to give his Son to die for men, unless there had been a prior impossibility of their having righteousness by any law; and that, if there had been a law which **COULD** have given life, this other way by the death of Christ would not have been provided. And this appears to be agreeable to our author's own sense of things, by his words which have been cited, wherein he says' "It would have **FRUSTRATED** or rendered **USELESS** the grace of God, if Christ died to accomplish what was or **MIGHT HAVE BEEN** effected by law itself, without his death."

V. It will follow on Dr. T.'s scheme, not only that Christ's redemption is needless or saving from sin, or its consequences, but also that it does no good that way, has no tendency to any diminution of sin in the world. For as to any infusion of virtue or holiness into the heart, by divine power through Christ or his redemption, it is altogether inconsistent with this author's notions. With him, in wrought virtue, if there were any such thing, would be no virtue; not being the effect of our own will, choice and design, but only of a sovereign act of God's power. And therefore, all that Christ does to increase virtue, is only increasing our talents, our light, advantages, means, and motives; as he often explains the matter. But sin is not at all diminished. For he says, our duty must be inmeasured by our talents; as, a child that has less talents, has less duty; and therefore must be no more exposed to commit sin, than he that has greater talents, because he that has greater talents has more duty required, in exact proportion. If so, he that has but one talent, has as much advantage to perform that one degree of duty which is required of him, as he that has five talents, to perform his five degrees of duty, and is no more exposed to fail of it. And that man's guilt, who sins against greater advantages, means, and motives, is greater in proportion of his talents. And therefore it will follow, on Dr. T.'s principles, that men stand no better chance, have no more eligible or

valuable probability of freedom from sin and punishment, or of contracting but little guilt, or of performing required duty, with the great advantages and talents implied in Christ's redemption, than without them when all things are computed, and put into the balances together, the numbers, degrees, and aggravations of sin exposed to, degrees of duty required, etc. So that men have no redemption from sin, and no new means of performing duty, that are valuable or worth any thing at all. And thus the great redemption by Christ in every respect comes to nothing, with regard both to infants and adult persons.

CHAPTER 2

The Evidence of the Doctrine of Original Sin From What the Scripture Teaches of the Application of Redemption.

THE truth of the doctrine of original sin is very clearly manifest from what the Scripture says of that change of state, which it represents as necessary to an actual interest in the spiritual and eternal blessings of the Redeemer's kingdom.

In order to this, it speaks of it as absolutely necessary for every one that he be regenerated, or born again.

“Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be begotten again, or born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.” (^{418B}John 3:3)

Dr. T. though he will not allow that this signifies any change from a state of natural propensity to sin, yet supposes that the new birth here spoken of, means a man's being brought to a divine life, in a right use and application of the natural powers, in a life, at true holiness: and that it is the attainment of those habits of virtue and religion, which gives, us the real character of true Christians, and the children of God, and that it is putting on the new nature of right action.

But in order to proceed in the most sure and safe manner, in understanding what is meant in Scripture by being born again, and so in the inferences we draw from what is said of the necessity of it, let us compare scripture with scripture, and consider what other terms or phrases are used, where respect is evidently had to the same change. And here I would observe the following things.

I. If we compare one scripture with another, it will be sufficiently manifest, that by regeneration, or being begotten or born again, the same change in the state of the mind is signified with that which the scripture speaks of as affected in true REPENTANCE and CONVERSION. I put repentance and conversion together, because the scripture puts them together, ^{418B}Acts 3:19. and because they plainly signify much the same thing. The word repentance, signifies a change of the mind, as the word

conversion, means a change or turning from sin to God. And that this is the same change with that which is called regeneration (excepting that this latter term especially signifies the change, as the mind is passive in it) the following things may show.

In the change which the mind undergoes in repentance and conversion, is attained that character of true Christians which is necessary to the eternal privileges of such.

“Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord.” (Acts 3:19)

And thus it is in regeneration; as is evident from what Christ says to Nicodemus, and as is allowed by Dr. T.

The change of the mind in repentance is that in which saving faith is attained. (Mark 1:15. The kingdom of God is at hand, repent ye, and believe the gospel.” And so it is in being born again, or born of God; as appears by (John 1:12,13. “But as many as received him, to them he gave power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name, which were born not of blood, etc. but of God.” Just as Christ says concerning conversion,

“Verily, verily, I say unto you except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter the kingdom of heaven.” (Matthew 18:3)

so does he say concerning being born again, in what he spake to Nicodemus.

By the change men undergo in conversion, they become as little children; which appears in the place last cited: and so they do by regeneration. (1 Peter 1:23. and 2:2.) “Being born again. — Wherefore as new-born babes, desire,” etc. It is no objection, that the disciples, to whom Christ spake in (Matthew 18:3. were converted already: this makes it not less proper for Christ to declare the necessity of conversion to them, leaving it with them to try themselves, and to make sure their conversion: in like manner as he declared to them the necessity of repentance, in (Luke 13:3, 5. “Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish.” The change effected by

repentance is expressed and exhibited by baptism. Hence it is called the baptism of repentance. (^{<481B>}Matthew 3:11. ^{<481B>}Luke 3:3. ^{<481B>}Acts 13:24. and ^{<481B>}19:4.) And so is regeneration, or being born again, expressed by baptism, as is evident by such representations of regeneration as those: ^{<481B>}John 3:5 “Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit.” ^{<500B>}Titus 3:5. “He saved us by the washing of regeneration.” — Many other things might be observed, to show that the change men pass under in their repentance and conversion, is the same with that of which they are the subjects in regeneration. — But these observations may be sufficient.

II. The change which a man undergoes when born again, and in his repentance and conversion, is the same that the scripture calls the CIRCUMCISION OF THE HEART. This may easily appear by considering, that as regeneration is that in which are attained the habits of true virtue and holiness, as has been shown, and as is confessed; so is circumcision of heart.

“And the Lord thy God will circumcise thy heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul.” (^{<500B>}Deuteronomy 30:6)

Regeneration is that whereby men come to have the character of true Christians; as is evident, and as is confessed; and so is circumcision of heart: for by this men become Jews inwardly, or Jews in the spiritual and christian sense (and that in the same as being true Christians,) as of old, proselytes were made Jews by circumcision of the flesh. ^{<481B>}Romans 2:28, 29. “For he is not a Jew which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men, but of God.”

That circumcision of the heart, is the same with conversion, or turning from sin to God, is evident by ^{<300B>}Jeremiah 4:1-4. “If thou wilt return, O Israel, return onto me. Circumcise yourselves to the Lord, and put away, the foreskins of your heart.” And ^{<500B>}Deuteronomy 10:16. “Circumcise therefore the foreskin of your heart, and be no more stiffnecked.” Circumcision of the heart is the same change of the heart that men experience in repentance, as is evident by ^{<481B>}Leviticus 26:41. “If their

uncircumcised hearts be humbled, and they accept the punishment of their iniquity.

The change effected in regeneration, repentance, and conversion, is signified by baptism, as has been shown, and so is circumcision of the heart signified by the same thing. None will deny, that it was this internal circumcision, which of old was signified by external circumcision; nor will any deny, now under the New Testament, that inward and spiritual baptism, or the cleansing of the hearts, is signified by external washing or baptism. But spiritual circumcision and spiritual baptism are the same thing; both being putting off the body of the sins of the flesh; as is very plain by ^{scd}Colossians 2:11-13. "In whom also ye are circumcised, with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ, buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him," etc.

III. This inward change, called regeneration, and circumcision of the heart, which is wrought in repentance and conversion, is the same with that spiritual RESURRECTION so openly spoken of, and represented as a dying unto sin, and a living unto righteousness. — This appends with great plainness in that last cited place, ^{scd}Colossians 2: "In whom also ye are circumcised, with the circumcision made without hands, — buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him, through the faith of the operation of God, etc. And you, being dead in your sins, and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him; having forgiven you all trespasses." The same appears by ^{scd}Romans 6:3-5. "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead, by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life," etc. verse 11. "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin but alive unto God, through Jesus Christ our Lord." In which place also it is evident, and by the whole context, that this spiritual resurrection is that change, in which persons are brought to habits of holiness and to the divine life, by which Dr. T. describes the thing obtained in being born again.

That a spiritual resurrection to a new, divine life, should be called a being born again, is agreeable to the language of Scripture. So those words in the 2nd Psalm, “Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee,” are applied to Christ’s resurrection, ^{<4133>}Acts 13:33. So in ^{<5018>}Colossians 1:18. Christ is called the first born from the dead; and in ^{<6005>}Revelation 1:5. The first BEGOTTEN of the dead; The saints, in their conversion or spiritual resurrection, are risen with Christ, and are begotten and born with him.

“Who hath begotten us again to a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible.”

(^{<1001>}1 Peter 1:3)

This inheritance is the same thing with that KINGDOM of HEAVEN, which men obtain by being born again, according to Christ’s words to Nicodemus; and that same inheritance of them that are sanctified, spoken of as what is obtained in true CONVERSION. ^{<4238>}Acts 26:18. “To turn them (or convert them) from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sin, and inheritance among them that are sanctified, through faith that is in me.” Dr. T.’s own words, in his note on ^{<6004>}Romans 1:4. speaking of that place in the 2nd Psalm, are very worthy to be here recited. He observes how this is applied to Christ’s resurrection and exaltation, in the New Testament, and then has this remark, “note, begetting is conferring a new and happy state: a son is a person put into it. Agreeably to this good men are said to be the sons of God, as they are the sons of the resurrection to eternal life, which is represented as a being BEGOTTEN or BORN AGAIN, REGENERATED. So that I think it is abundantly plain, that the spiritual resurrection spoken of in Scripture, by which the saints are brought to a new divine life, is the same with that being born again, which Christ says is necessary for every one, in order to his seeing the kingdom of God

IV. This change, of which men are the subjects, when they are born again, and circumcised in heart, when they repent, and are converted, and spiritually raised from the dead, is the same change which is meant when the Scripture speaks of making the HEART and SPIRIT NEW, or giving a new, heart and spirit.

It is almost needless to observe, how evidently this is spoken of as necessary to salvation, and as the change in which are attained the habits

of true virtue and holiness, and the character of a true saint, as has been observed of regeneration, conversion, etc. and how apparent it is, that the change is the same. Thus repentance, the change of the mind, is the same as being changed to a NEW mind, or a NEW heart and spirit. Conversion is the turning, of the heart; which is the same thing as changing it so, that there shall be another heart, or a new heart, or a new spirit. To be born again, is to be born anew; which implies a becoming NEW, and is represented as becoming new-born babes. But none supposes it is the body, that is immediately and properly new, but the mind, heart, or spirit. And so a spiritual resurrection is the resurrection of the spirit, or rising to begin a NEW existence and life, as to the mind, heart, or spirit. So that all these phrases imply, having a new heart, and being renewed in the spirits according to their plain signification.

When Nicodemus, expressed his wonder at Christ declaring it necessary, that a man should be born again in order to see the kingdom of God, or enjoy the privileges of the kingdom of the Messiah, Christ says to him, Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things? i. e. “Art thou one who is set to teach others the things written in the law and the prophets, and knowest not a doctrine so plainly taught in your Scriptures, that such a change is necessary to a partaking of the blessings of the Messiah’s kingdom?” But what can Christ refer to, unless such prophecies as that in ^{<382>}Ezekiel 36:25-27.? Where God, by the prophet, speaking of the days of the Messiah’s kingdom, says, “Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean. — A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you — and I will put my Spirit within you” Here God speaks of having a new heart and spirit, by being washed with water, and receiving the Spirit of God, as the qualification of God’s people, that shall enjoy the privileges of the Messiah’s kingdom. How much is this like the doctrine of Christ to Nicademas, of being born again of water, and of the Spirit! We have another like prophecy in ^{<381B>}Ezekiel 11:19. — Add to this, that regeneration, or a being born again, and the renewing (or making new) by the Holy Ghost, are spoken of as the same thing,

“By the washing of, generation and renewing of the Holy Ghost.”

(^{<381B>}Titus 3:5)

V. It is abundantly manifest, that being born again, spiritually rising from the dead to newness of life, receiving a new heart, and being renewed in the spirit of the mind, are the same thing with that which is called putting off the OLD MAN, and putting on the NEW MAN.

The expressions are equivalent, and the representations are plainly of the same thing. When Christ speaks of being born again, two births are supposed: a first and a second, an OLD birth and a NEW one: and the thing born is called man. So what is born in the first birth is the old man; and what is brought forth in the second birth, is the new man. That which is born in the first birth (says Christ) is flesh: it is the carnal man, wherein we have borne the image of the earthly Adam, whom the apostle calls the first man. That which is born in the new birth, is spirit, or the spiritual and heavenly man: wherein we proceed from Christ the second man, the new man, who is made a quickening Spirit, and is the Lord from heaven, and the Head of the new creation. — In the new birth, men are represented as becoming new-born babes, which is the same thing as becoming new men.

And how apparently is what the Scripture says of the spiritual resurrection of the Christian convert, equivalent and of the very same import with putting off the old man and putting on the new man. So in Romans 6 the convert is represented as dying,, and being buried with Christ; which is explained in the 6th verse by this, that the old man it crucified, that the body of sin might be destroyed. And in the 4th verse, converts in the change are spoken of as rising, to newness of life. Are not these things plain enough? The apostle in effect tells us, that when he speaks of spiritual death and resurrection, he means the same thing as crucifying and burying the old man, and rising as a new man.

And it is most apparent, that spiritual circumcision, and spiritual baptism, and the spiritual resurrection, are all the same with putting off the old man, and putting on the new man. This appears by ^{scrip}Colossians 2:11, 12. “In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ, buried with him in baptism wherein also ye are risen with him.” Here it is manifest, that the spiritual circumcision, baptism, and resurrection, all signify that change wherein men put off the body of the sin of the flesh: but that is the same thing, in this apostle’s language, a,

putting off the old man; as appears by ^{<B16>}Romans 6:6. “Our old man is crucified, that the body of sin may be destroyed.” And that putting off the old man is the same with putting off the body of sin, appears further by ^{<B2>}Ephesians 4:22-24. and ^{<B18>}Colossians 3:8-10. As Dr. T. confesses, “that to be born again, is that wherein are obtained the habits of virtue, religion, and true holiness;” so how evidently is the same thing predicated of that change, which is called putting off the old man, and putting on the new man! ^{<B2>}Ephesians 4:22-24. “That ye put off the old man, which is corrupt, etc and put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.”

And it is most plain, that this putting off the old man, etc. is the very same thing with making, the heart and spirit time. It is apparent in itself, the spirit is called the man, in the language of the apostle it is called the inward man, and the hidden man. (^{<B22>}Romans 7:22. ^{<B16>}2 Corinthians 4:16. ^{<B1>}1 Peter 3:4.) And therefore, putting off the old man, is the same thing with the removal of the old heart, and the putting on of the one man, is the receiving of a new heart, and a new Spirit. Yea. putting on the new man is expressly spoken of as the same thing with receiving a new spirit, or being, renewed in spirit ^{<B2>}Ephesians 4:22-24. “That ye put off the old man — and be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and that ye put on the new man.”

From these things it appears, how unreasonable, and contrary to the utmost degree of scriptural evidence, is Dr. T.’s way of explaining the old man, and the new man, as though thereby was meant nothing personal; but that by the old man was meant the heathen state, and by the new man the Christian dispensation, or state of professing Christians, or the whole collective body of professors of Christianity, made up of Jews and Gentiles; when all the color he has for it is, that the apostle once calls the christian church a new man. (^{<B15>}Ephesians 2:15.) It is very true, in the Scriptures often, both in the Old Testament and the New, collective bodies, nations, peoples, and cities, are figuratively represented by persons: particularly the church of Christ is represented as one holy person, and has the same appellatives as a particular saint or believer, and so is called a child, a son of God, (^{<B2>}Exodus 4:22. ^{<B16>}Galatians 4:1, 2) a servant of God, (^{<B18>}Isaiah 41:8, 9 and ^{<B16>}44:1.) The daughter of God; and spouse of Christ, (^{<B10>}Psalms 45:10, 13, 14. ^{<B16>}Revelation 19:7.)

Nevertheless, would it be reasonable to argue, that such appellations, as a servant at God, child of God, etc. are always or commonly to be taken as signifying only the church of God in general, or threat collective bodies, and not to be understood in a personal sense? But certainly this would not be more unreasonable than to urge, that by the old and the new man, as the phrases are mostly used in Scripture, is to be understood nothing but the great collective bodies of pagans and of Christians, or the heathen and the christian world, as to their outward profession, and the dispensation they are under. It might have been proper, in this case, to have considered the unreasonableness of that practice which our author charges on others, and finds so much fault with in them, “That they content themselves with a few scraps of Scripture which though wrong understood, they make the test of truth, and the ground of their principles, in contradiction to the whole tenor of revelation.”

VI. I observe once more, it is very apparent, that beings born again, and spiritually raised from death to a state of new existence and life, having a new heart coated in us, being renewed in the spirit of our mind, and being the subjects of that change by which we put off the old man, and put on the new men, is the same thing with that which in Scripture is called being **CREATED ANEW**, or made **NEW CREATURES**.

Here, to pass over many other evidences which might be mentioned, I would only observe, that the representations are exactly equivalent. These several phrases naturally and most plainly signify the same effect. In the first birth or generation, we are created, or brought into existence; it is then the whom man first receives being: the soul is then formed, and then our bodies are fearfully and wonderfully made, being curiously wrought by our Creator. So that a new-born child is a new creature. So, when a man is born again, be it created again, in that new birth, there is a new creation, and therein he becomes as a new-born babe. or a **NEW CREATURE**. So, in a resurrection, there is a new creation. When a man is dead, that which was made in the first creation is destroyed: when that which was dead is raised to life, the mighty power of the author of life is exerted the second time, and the subject restored to a new existence, and a new life, as by a new creation. So giving a new heart is called **CREATING** a clean heart, **Psalm 51:10**. where the word, translated create, is the same that is used in the first verse, in Genesis. And when we read in Scripture of the new creature,

the creature that is called NEW IS MAN; and therefore the phrase, new man, is evidently equipollent with new creature; and putting off the old man, and putting on the lieu' man, is spoken of expressly as brought to pass by a work of creation. ^{<STR>}Colossians 3:9, to. "Ye have put off the old man and have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge, after the image of him that created him." So ^{<STR>}Ephesians 4:22-24. "That ye put off the old man, which is corrupt, etc. and be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." These things absolutely fix the meaning of ^{<STR>}2 Corinthians 5:17.

"If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away behold, all things are become new."

On the whole, the following reflections may be made:

- 1.** That it is a truth of the utmost certainly, with respect to every man born of the race of Adam, by ordinary generation, that unless he be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. This is true, not only of the heathen, but of them that are born of the professing people of God, as Nicodemus, and the Jews, and every man born of the flesh. This is most manifest by Christ's discourse in ^{<STR>}John 3:3-11. So it is plain by ^{<STR>}2 Corinthians 5:17. That every man who is in Christ, is a NEW CREATURE.
- 2.** It appears from this, together with what has been proved above, that it is most certain with respect to every one of the human race, that he can never have any interest in Christ, or see the kingdom of God, unless be the subject of that CHANGE in the temper and disposition of his heart, which is made in repentance and conversion, circumcision of heart, spiritual baptism, dying to sin and rising to a new and holy life; and unless he has the old heart taken away, and a new heart and spirit given and puts off the old man, and puts on the new man, and old things are passed away, and all things made new.
- 3.** From what is plainly implied in these things, and from what the Scripture most clearly teaches of the nature of them, it is certain, that every man is born into the world in a state of moral pollution. For SPIRITUAL BAPTISM is a cleansing from moral filthiness. (^{<STR>}Ezekiel 36:25. compared with ^{<STR>}Acts 2:16. and ^{<STR>}John 3:5.) So the washing of

regeneration, or the NEW BIRTH, is a change from a state of wickedness. (^{<518B>}Titus 3:3-5.) Men are spoken of as purified in their regeneration. (^{<4102>}1 Peter 1:22, 23. See also ^{<4123>}1 John 2:29. and ^{<4103>}3:1, 3.) And it appears, that every man in his first or natural state is a sinner; for otherwise he would then need no REPENTANCE, no CONVERSION, no turning from sin to God. And it appears, that every man in his original state has a heart of stone, for thus the Scripture calls that old heart, which is taken away, when a NEW HEART and NEW SPIRIT is given. (^{<3119>}Ezekiel 11:19. and ^{<4103>}36:26.) And it appears, that man's nature, as in his native state, is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts, and of its own motion exerts itself in nothing but wicked deeds. For thus the Scripture characterizes the OLD MAN, which is put off, when men are renewed in the spirit of their minds, and put on the NEW MAN (^{<4022>}Ephesians 4:22-24. ^{<5103>}Colossians 3:8-10.) In a word, it appears, that man's nature, as in its native state, is a body of sin, which must be destroyed, must die, be buried, and never rise more. For thus the OLD MAN is represented, which is crucified, when men are the subjects of a spiritual RESURRECTION. ^{<4103>}Romans 6:4-6. Such a nature, such a body of sin as this, is put off in the spiritual RENOVATION, wherein we put on the NEW MAN and are the subjects of the spiritual CIRCUMCISION. ^{<4022>}Ephesians 4:21-23.

It must now be left with the reader to judge for himself, whether what the Scripture teaches of the APPLICATION of Christ's redemption, and the change of state and nature necessary to true and final happiness, does not afford clear and abundant evidence to the truth of the doctrine of original sin.

PART 4

Containing Answers To Objections

CHAPTER 1

Concerning The Objections, That To Suppose Men Born In Sin, Without Their Choice. Or Any Previous Act Of Their Own, Is To Suppose What Is Inconsistent With The Nature Of Sin.

SOME of the objections made against the doctrine of original sin, which have reference to particular arguments used in defense of it, have been already considered in the handling of those arguments. What I shall therefore now consider, are such objections as I have not yet had occasion to notice.

There is no argument Dr. T. insists more upon, than that which is taken from the Arminian and Pelagian notion of freedom of will, consisting in the will's self-determination, as necessary to the being of moral good or evil. He openly urges, that if we come into the world infected with sinful and depraved dispositions, then sin must be natural to us; and if natural, then necessity; and if necessary, then no sin, nor any thing we are blamable for, or that can in any respect be our fault, being what we cannot help and he urges, that sin must proceed from our own choice, etc.

Here I would observe in general, that the forementioned notion of freedom of will, as essential to moral agency, and necessary to the very existence of virtue and sin, seems to be a grand favourite point with Pelagians and Arminians and all divines of such characters, in their controversies with the orthodox. There is no one thing more fundamental in their schemes of religion: on the determination of this one leading point depends the issue of almost all controversies we have with such divines. Nevertheless it seems a needless task for me particularly to consider that matter in this place; having already largely discussed it, with all the main grounds of this notion, and the arguments used to defend it, in a late book on this subject, to which I ask leave to refer the reader. It is very necessary, that the

modern prevailing doctrine concerning this point, should be well understood, and therefore thoroughly considered and examined: for without it there is no hope of putting an end to the controversy about original sin, and innumerable other controversies that subsist, about many of the main points of religion. I stand ready to confect to the forementioned modern divines, if they can maintain their peculiar notion of freedom, consisting in the self-determining power of the will, as necessary to moral agency, and can thoroughly establish it in opposition to the arguments lying against it, then they have an impregnable castle, to which they may repair, and remain invincible, in all the controversies they have with the reformed divines, concerning original sin, the sovereignty of grace, election, recondemtion, conversion, the efficacious operation of the Holy Spirit, the nature of saving faith, perseverance of the saints and other principles of the like kind. However, at the same time, I think this will be as strong a fortress for the Deists, in common with them; as the great doctrines, subverted by their notion of freedom, are so plainly and abundantly taught in the Scripture. But I am under no apprehensions of any danger, which the cause of Christianity, or the religion of the reformed, is in, from any possibility of that notion being ever established, or of its being ever evinced that there is not proper, perfect, and manifold demonstration lying against it. But as I said, it would be needless for me to enter into a particular disquisition of this point here; from which I shall easily be excused by any reader who is willing to give himself the trouble of consulting what I have already written. And as to others, probably they will scarce be at the pains of reading the present discourse; or at least would not, if it should be enlarged by a full consideration of that controversy.

I shall at this time therefore only take notice of some gross inconsistencies that Dr. T. has been guilty of, in his handling this objection against the doctrine of original sin. In places which have been cited, he says, that sin must proceed from our own choice: and that if it does not, it being necessary to us, it cannot be sin, it cannot be our fault, or what we are to blame for: and therefore all our sin must be chargeable on our choice, which is the cause of sin: for he says, the cause of every effect is alone chargeable with the effect it product and which proceedeth from it. Now here are implied several gross contradictions. He greatly insists, that nothing can be

sinful, or have the nature of sin, but what proceeds from our choice. Nevertheless he says, "Not the effort, but the cause alone is chargeable with blame." Therefore the choice, which is the cause, is alone blamable, or has the nature of sin, and not the effect of that choice. Thus nothing can be sinful, but the effect of choice; and yet the effect of choice never can be sinful, but only the cause, which alone is chargeable with all the blame.

Again, the choice, from which sin proceeds, is itself sinful. Not only is this implied in his saying, "The cause alone is chargeable with all the blame;" but he expressly speaks of the choice as faulty, and calls that choice wicked, from which depravity and corruption proceeds. Now if the choice itself be sin, and there be no sin but what proceeds from a sinful choice, then the sinful choice must proceed from another antecedent choice; it must be chosen by a foregoing act of will, determining itself to that sinful choice, that so it may have that which he speaks of as absolutely essential to the nature of sin, namely, that it proceeds, from our choice, and does not happen to us necessarily. But if the sinful choice itself proceeds from a foregoing choice, then also that foregoing choice must be sinful, it being the cause of sin, and so alone chargeable with the blame. Yet if that foregoing choice be sinful, then neither must that happen to us necessarily. But must likewise proceed from choice, another act of choice preceding that: for we must remember, that "Nothing is sinful but what proceeds from our choices." And then, for the same reason, even this prior choice, last mentioned, must also be sinful, being chargeable with all the blame of that consequent evil choice, which was in effect. And so we must go back till we come to the very first volition, the prime or original act of choice in the whole chain. And this to be sure must be R.R.'s sinful choice, because this is the origin or primitive cause of all the train of evils which follow; and according to our author, must therefore be "alone chargeable with all the blame." And yet so it is, according to him, this "cannot be sinful," because it does not "proceed from our own choice," or any foregoing act of our will; it beings by the supposition, the very first act of will in the case. And therefore it must be necessary, as to us, having no choice of ours to be the cause of it.

In p. 232. he says, "Adam's sin was from his own disobedient will: and so must every man's sin, and all the sin in the world be, as well as his." By them, it seems, he must have a "disobedient will" before he sins; for the

cruise must be before the effect: and yet that disobedient will itself is sinful; otherwise it could not be called disobedient. But the question is, How do men come by the disobedient will, this cause of all the sin in the world? It must not come necessarily, without men's choice; for it so, it is not sin, nor is there any disobedience in it. Therefore that disobedient will must also come from a disobedient will; and so on, in infinitum. Otherwise it must be supposed, that there is some sin in the world, which does not come from a disobedient will: contrary to our author's dogmatical assertions.

In p. 166. S. he says, "Adam could not sin without a sinful inclination. "Here he calls that inclination itself sinful, which is the principle from whence sinful acts proceed; as elsewhere he speaks of the disobedient will from whence all sin comes: and he allows, that "the law reaches to all the latent principle of sin;" meaning plainly, that it forbids, and threatens punishment for, those latent principles. Now these latent principles of sin, these sinful inclinations, without which, according to our author, there can be no sinful act, cannot all proceed from a sinful choice; because that would imply great contradiction. For, by the supposition, they are the principles from whence a sinful choice comes, and whence all sinful acts of will proceed; and there can be no sinful act without them. So that the, first latent principles and inclinations, from whence all sinful acts proceed, are sinful; and yet they are not sinful, because they do not proceed from a wicked choice, without which, according to him, "nothing can be sinful."

Dr. T. speaking of that proposition of the Assembly of Divines, wherein they assert, that man is by nature utterly corrupt, etc. thinks himself well warranted, by the supposed great evidence of these his contradictory notions, to say "Therefore sin is not natural to us; and therefore I shall not scruple to say, this proposition in the Assembly of Divines is FALSE." But it may be worthy of consideration, whether it would not have greatly become him, before he had clothed himself with so much assurance, and proceeded, on the foundation of these his notions, so magisterially to charge the Assembly proposition with falsehood, to have taken care that his own propositions, which he has set in opposition to them, should be a little more consistent; that he might not have contradicted himself, while contradicting them; lest some impartial judges, observing his inconsistency,

should think they had warrant to declare with equal assurance, that “they should not scruple to say, Dr. T.’s doctrine is FALSE.”

CHAPTER 2

Concerning The Objection. Against The Doctrine Of Native Corruption, That To Suppose Men Receive Their First Existence In Sin, Is To Make Him Who Is The Author Of Their Being, The Author Of Their Depravity.

ONE argument against a supposed native, sinful depravity, which Dr. T. greatly insists upon, is, “that this does in effect charge him, who is the author of nature, who formed us in the scarab, with being the author of a sinful corruption of nature; and that it is highly unjust to the God of our nature, whose hands have formed and fashioned us, to believe our nature, to be originally corrupted, and that in the worst sense of corruption.

With respect to this, I would observe, in the first place, that this writer, in handling this grand objection, supposes something to belong to the doctrine objected against, as maintained by the divines whom he is opposing, which does not belong to it, nor follow from it. As particularly, he supposes the doctrine of original sin to imply, that nature must be corrupted by some positive influence; “something, by some means or other, infused into the human nature, some quality! or other, not from the choice of our minds, but like a taint, tincture, or infliction, altering the natural constitution, faculties. and dispositions of our souls. That sin and evil dispositions are **IMPLANTED** in the fetus in the womb.” Whereas truly our doctrine neither implies nor infers any such thing. In order to account for a sinful corruption of nature, yea, a total native depravity of the heart of man, there is not the least need of supposing any evil quality, infused, implanted, or wrought into the nature of man, by any positive cause, or influence whatsoever, either from God, or the creature; or of supposing, that man is conceived and born with a fountain of evil in his heart, such as is any thing properly positive. I think, a little attention to the nature of things will be sufficient to satisfy any impartial considerate inquirer, that the absence of positive good principles, and so the withholding of a special divine influence to impart and maintain those good principles — leaving the common natural principles of self-love, natural appetite, etc. to themselves, without the government of superior divine principles — will certainly be followed with the corruption; yea, the total corruption of the

heart, without occasion for any positive influence at all: and that it was thus in fact that corruption of nature came on Adam, immediately on his fall, and comes on all his posterity, as sinning in him, and falling with him.

The case with man was plainly this: When God made man at first he implanted in him two kinds of principles. There was an inferior kind, which maybe called NATURAL, being the principles of mere human nature; such as self love, with those natural appetites and passions, which belong to the nature of man, in which his love to his own liberty, honor, and pleasure, were exercised: these, when alone; and left to themselves, are what the Scriptures sometimes call FLESH. Besides these, there were superior principles, that were spiritual, holy, and divine, summarily comprehended in divine love; wherein consisted the spiritual image of God, and man's righteousness and true holiness; which are called in Scripture the divine nature. These principles may, in some sense, be called SUPERNATURAL, being (however concreated or connate, yet) with as are above those principles that me essentially implied in, or necessarily resulting from, and inseparably connected with, mere human nature, and being such as immediately depend on man's union and communion with God, or divine communications and influences of God's Spirit: which though withdrawn, and man's nature forsaken of these principles, human nature would be human nature still, man's nature, as such, being entire without these divine principles, which the Scripture sometimes calls SPIRIT, in contradistinction to flesh. These superior principles were given to possess the throne, and maintain an absolute dominion in the heart, the other to be wholly subordinate and subservient. And while things continued thus, all was in excellent order, peace, and beautiful harmony, and in a proper and perfect state. These divine principles thus reigning, were the dignity, life, happiness, and glory of man's nature. When man sinned and broke God's covenant and fell under his curse, these superior principles left his heart: for indeed God then left him; that communion with God on which these principles depended, entirely ceased; the Holy Spirit, that divine inhabitant, forsook the house. Because it would have been utterly improper in itself, and inconsistent with the constitution God had established, that he should still maintain communion with man, and continue by his friendly, gracious, vital influences, to dwell with him and in him, after he was become a rebel, and had incurred God's wrath and

curse. Therefore immediately the superior divine principles wholly ceased, so light ceases in a room when the candle is withdrawn; and thus man was left in a state of darkness, woful corruption, and ruin nothing but flesh without spirit. The inferior principles of self-love, and natural appetite, which were given only to serve, being alone, and left to themselves, of course became reigning principles; having no superior principles to regulate or control them, they became absolute masters of the heart. The immediate consequence of which was a fatal catastrophe, a turning of all things upside down, and the succession of a state of the most odious and dreadful confusion. Man immediately set up him-self, and the objects of his private affections and appetites, as supreme; and so they took the place of GOD. These inferior principles are like fire in a house; which, we say, is a good servant, but a bad master; very useful while kept in its place, but if left to take possession of the whole house, soon brings all to destruction. Man's love to his own honor, separate interest, and private pleasure, which before was wholly subordinate unto love to God, and regard to his authority and glory, now disposes and impels him to pursue those objects, without regard to God's honor, or law; because there is no true regard to these divine things left in him. In consequence of which, he seeks those objects as much when against God's honor and law as when agreeable to them. God still continuing strictly to require supreme regard to himself, and forbidding all undue gratifications of these inferior passions — but only in perfect subordination to the ends, and agreeableness to the rules and limits, which his holiness, honor, and law prescribe — hence immediately arises enmity in the heart, now wholly under the power of self-love; and nothing but war ensues, in a constant course, against God. As, when a subject has once renounced his lawful sovereign, and set up a pretender in his stead, a state of enmity and war against his rightful king necessarily ensues. It were easy to show, how every lust, and depraved disposition of man's heart, would naturally arise from this private original, if here were room for it. Thus it is easy to give an account, how total corruption of heart should follow on man's eating the forbidden fruit, though that was but one act of sin, without God putting any evil into his heart, or implanting any bad principle, or infusing any corrupt taint, and so becoming the author of depravity. Only God's withdrawing, as it was highly proper and necessary that he should, from rebel-man, and his

natural principles being left to themselves, is sufficient to account for his becoming entirely corrupt, and bent on sinning against God.

And as Adam's nature became corrupt, without God's implanting or infusing of any evil thing into it, so does the nature of his posterity. God dealing with Adam as the head of his posterity, (as has been shown,) and treating them as one, he deals with his posterity as having all sinned in him. And therefore, as God withdrew spiritual communion, and his vital gracious influence, from the common head, so he withholds the same from all the members, as they come into existence, whereby they come into the world mere flesh, and entirely under the government of natural and inferior principles; and so become wholly corrupt, as Adam did.

Now, for God so far to have the disposal of this affair as to withhold those influences, without which, nature will be corrupt, is not to be the author of sin. But, concerning this, I must refer the reader to what I have said of it in my discourse on the Freedom at the Will. Though, besides what I have there said, I may here observe, that if for God so far to order and dispose the being of sin, as to permit it, by withholding the gracious influences necessary to prevent it, is for him to be the author of sin then some things which Dr. T. himself lays down, will equally be attended with this very consequence. For, from time to time he speaks of God giving men up to the vilest lusts and affections, by permitting, or leaving them. Now, if the continuance of sin, and in increase and prevalence, may be in consequence of God's disposal, in withholding needful grace, without God being the author of that continuance and prevalence of sin, then, by parity of reason, may the being, of sin, in the race of Adam, be in consequence of Godly disposal, by his withholding that grace which is needful to prevent it, without his being the author of sin.

If here it should be said, that God is not the author of sin, in giving up to sin those who have already made themselves sinful, because when men have once made themselves sinful, their continuing so, and sin prevailing in them, and becoming more and more habitual, will follow in a course of nature: I answer, let that be remembered which this writer so greatly urges, in opposition to them who suppose original corruption comes in a course of nature, use. That the course of nature is nothing without God. He utterly rejects the notion of the "course of nature's being a proper active

cause, which will work, and go on by itself, without God, if he lets or permits it.

But affirms, “That the course of nature, separate from the agency of God, is no cause or nothing; and that the course of nature should continue itself, or go on to operate by itself, any more than at first produce itself, is absolutely impossible.” These strong expressions are his. Therefore, to explain the continuance of the habits of sin in the same person, when once introduced, yea, to explain the very being of any such habits, in consequence of repeated acts, our author must have recourse to those same principles, which he rejects as absurd to the utmost degree, when alleged to explain the corruption of nature in the posterity of Adam. For, that habits, either good or bad, should continue, after being once established, or that habits should be settled and have existence in consequence of repeated acts, can be owing only to a course of nature, and those laws of nature which God has established.

That the posterity of Adam should be born without holiness, and so with a depraved nature, comes to pass as much by the establish course of nature, as the continuance of a corrupt disposition in a particular person, after he once has it; or as much as Adam’s continuing unholy and corrupt, after he had once lost his holiness. For Adam’s posterity are from him, and as it were in him, and belonging to him, according to an established course of nature, as much as the branches of a tree are, according to a course of nature, from the tree, in the tree, and belonging to the tree; or, (to make use of the comparison which Dr. T. himself chooses from time to time, as proper to illustrate the matter,) just as the acorn is derived from the oak. And I think, the acorn is as much derived from the oak, according to the course of nature, as the buds and branches. It is true, that God, by his own almighty power, creates the soul of the infant; and it is also true, as Dr. T. often insists, that God, by his immediate power, forms and fashions the body of the infant in the womb; yet he does both according to that course of nature, which he has been pleased to establish. The course of nature is demonstrated, by late improvements in philosophy, to be indeed what our author himself says it is, viz. Nothing but the established order of the agency and operation of the author of nature. And though there be the immediate agency of God in bringing the soul into existence in generation, yet it is done according to the method and order established by

the author of nature, as much as his producing the bud, or the acorn of the oak; and as much as his continuing a particular person in being, after he once has existence. God's immediate agency in bringing the soul of a child into being, is as much according to an established order, as his immediate agency in any of the works of nature whatsoever. It is agreeable to the established order of nature that the good qualities wanting in the tree, should also be wanting in the branches and fruit. It is agreeable to the order of nature, that when a particular person is without good moral qualities in his heart, he should continue without them, till some new cause or efficiency produces them. And it is as much agreeable to an established course and order of nature, that since Adam, the head of mankind, the root of that great tree with many branches springing from it, was deprived of original righteousness, the branches should come forth without it. Or, if any dislike the word nature, as used in this last case and instead of it choose to call it a constitution, or established order of successive events, the alteration of the name will not in the least alter the state of the present argument. Where the name nature, is allowed without dispute, no more is meant than an established method and order of events, settled and limited by divine wisdom.

If any should object to this, that if the want of original righteousness be thus according to an established course of nature, then why are not principles of holiness, when restored by divine grace, also communicated to posterity; I answer, The divine law and establishments of the author of nature, are precisely settled by him as he pleaseth, and limited by his wisdom. Grace is introduced among the race of man by a new establishment; not on the ground of God's original establishment, as the head of the natural world, and author of the first creation; but by a constitution of a vastly higher kind; wherein Christ is made the root of the tree, whose branches are his spiritual seed, and is the head of the new creation; of which I need not stand now to speak particularly.

But here I desire it may be noted, that I do not suppose the natural depravity of the posterity of Adam is owing to the course of nature only; it is also owing to the just judgment of God. But yet I think, it is as truly and in the same manner owing to the course of nature, that Adam's posterity come into the world without original righteousness, as that Adam himself continued without it, after he had once lost it. That Adam

continued destitute of holiness, when he had lost it, and would always have so continued, had it not been restored by a Redeemer, was not only a natural consequence, according to the course of things established by God, as the author of nature; but it was also a penal consequence, or a punishment of his sin. God, in righteous judgment, continued to absent himself from Adam after he became a rebel; and withheld from him now those influences of the Holy Spirit, which he before had. And just thus I suppose it to be with every natural branch of mankind: all are looked upon as sinning in and with their common root; and God righteously withholds special influences and spiritual communications from all, for this sin. But of the manner and order of these things, more may be said in the next chapter.

On the whole, this grand objection against the doctrine of men being born corrupt, that it makes him who gave us our being, to be the cause of the king of corruption, can have no more force in it, than a like argument has to prove, that if men by a course of nature continue wicked, or remain without goodness, after they have by vicious acts contracted vicious habits, and so made themselves wicked, it makes him, who is the cause of their CONTINUANCE in being, and the came of the CONTINUANCE of the course of nature, to be the cause of their CONTINUED wickedness. Dr. T. say, "God would not take that thing that is hateful to him, because, by the very terms, he would hate to make such a thing." But if this be good arguing in the case to which it is applied, may I not as well say, God would not CONTINUE a thing in being that is HATEFUL to him; because, by the very, terms, he would HATE TO CONTINUE such a thing in being? I think, the very terms do as much (and no more) infer one of these propositions, as the other. In like manner, the rest that he says on that head may be shown to be unreasonable, by only substituting the word continue, in the place of male and propagate. I may fairly imitate his way of reasoning thus: to say, God continues us according to his own original decree, or law of continuation, which obliges him to continue us in a manner he abhors, is really to make bad worse: for it is supposing him to be defective in wisdom, or by his own decree or law to lay such a constraint upon his own actions, that he cannot do what he would, but is continually doing what he would not, what he hates to do, and what he condemns in us; viz. continuing us sinful when he condemns us for

continuing ourselves sinful.” If the reasoning be weak in the one case, it is no less so in the other.

If any shall still insist, that there is a difference between God so disposing things, as that depravity of heart shall be continued, according to the settled course of nature, in the same person, who has by his own fault introduced it; and his so disposing as that men, according to a course of nature, should be born with depravity, in consequence of Adam’s introducing of sin, by his act which we had no concern in, and cannot be justly charged with: on this I would observe, that it is quite going off the objection, which we have been upon, from God’s agency, and flying to another. It is then no longer insisted on, that simply for him, from whose agency the course of nature and our existence derive, so to dispose things as that we should have existence in a corrupt state, is for him to be the author of sin: but the plea now advanced is, that he is not proper and just for such an agent so to dispose, in this case, and only consequence of Adam’s sin; it not being just to charge Adam’s sin to his posterity. And this matter shall be particularly considered, in answer to the next objection; to which I now proceed.

CHAPTER 3

That Great Objection Against The Imputation Of Adam's Sin To His Posterity, Considered. That Such Imputation Is Unjust And Unreasonable, Inasmuch As Adam And His Posterity Are Not One And The Same. With A Brief Reflection Subjoined Of What Some Have Supposed. Of God Imputing The Guilt Of Adam's Sin To His Posterity, But In An Infinitely Less Degree Than To Adam Himself.

THAT we may proceed with the greater clearness in considering the man objections amidst supposing the guilt of Adam's sin to be imputed to his posterity; I would premise some observations with a view to the right stating of the doctrine; and then show its reasonableness, in opposition to the great clamor raised against it on this head.

I think, it would go far towards directing us to the more clear conception and right statement of this affair, were we steadily to bear this in mind: that God, in every step of his proceeding with Adam, in relation to the covenant or constitution established with him, looked on his posterity as being one with him. And though he dealt more immediately with Adam, it yet was as the head of the whom body, and the root of the whole tree, and in his proceedings with him, he dealt with all the branches, as if they had been then existing in their root.

From which it will follow, that both guilt, or exposedness to punishment, and also depravity of heart, came upon Adam's posterity just as they came upon him, as much as if be an they had all co-existed, like a tree with many branches; allowing only for the difference necessarily resulting from the place Adam stood in, as head or roof of the whole. Otherwise, it is as if, in every step of proceeding, every alteration in the root had been attended, at the same instant, with the same alterations throughout the whole tree, in each individual branch. I think, this will naturally follow on the supposition of there being a constituted oneness or identity of Adam and his posterity in this affair.

Therefore I am humbly of opinion, that if any have supposed the children of Adam to come into the world with a double guilt, one the guilt of Adam's sin, another the guilt arising from their having a corrupt heart,

they have not so well conceived of the maker. The guilt a man has upon his soul at first existence, is one and simple, viz. the guilt of the original apostacy, the guilt of the sin by which the special first rebelled against God. This, and the guilt arising from the depraved disposition of the heart, are not to be looked upon as two things, distinctly imputed and charged upon men in the sight of God. Indeed the guilt that arises from the corruption of the heart, as it remains a confirmed principle, and appears in its consequent operations, is a dissect and additional guilt: but the guilt arising from the first existing of a depraved disposition in Adam's posterity, I apprehend, is not distinct from their guilt of Adam's first sin. For so it was not in Adam himself. The first evil disposition or inclination of Adam to sin, was not gingerly distinct from his first act of sin, but was included in it. The external act he committed was no otherwise his, than as his heart was in it, or as that action proceeded from the wicked inclination of his heart. Nor was the guilt he had double, as for two distinct sins: one, the wickedness of his will in that affair; another, the wickedness of the external act, caused by it. His guilt was all truly from the act of his inward man; exclusive of which the motions of his body were no more than the motions of any lifeless instrument. His sin consisted in wickedness of heart, fully sufficient for and entirely amounting to, all that appeared in the act he committed.

The depraved disposition of Adam's heart is to be considered two ways.

- (1.) As the first rising of an evil inclination in his heart, exerted in his first act of sin, and the ground of the complete transgression.
- (2.) An evil disposition of heart continuing afterwards, as a confirmed principle that came by God's forsaking of him; which was a punishment of his first transgression. This confirmed corruption, by its remaining and continued operation, brought additional guilt on his soul.

In like manner, depravity of heart is to be considered two ways in Adam's posterity. The first existing of a corrupt disposition, is not to be looked upon as sin distinct from their participation of Adam's first sin. It is as it were the extended pollution of that sin, through the whole tree, by virtue of the constituted taken of the branches with the root; or the inherence of the sin of that head of the species in the members, in their consent and

concurrence with the head in that first act. But the depravity of nature remaining as an established principle in a child of Adam, and as exhibited in after-operations, is a consequence and punishment of the first apostacy thus participated, and brings new guilt. The first being of an evil disposition in a child of Adam, whereby he is disposed to approve the sin of his first father, so far as to imply a full and perfect consent of heart to it, I think, is not to be looked upon as a consequence of the imputation of that first sin any more than the full consent of Adam's own heart in the act of sinning; which was not consequent on the imputation, but rather prior to it in the order of nature. Indeed the derivation of the evil disposition to Adam's posterity or rather, the co-existence of the evil disposition, implied in Adam's first rebellion, in the root and branches, is a consequence of the union that the wise Author of the world has established between Adam and his posterity; but not properly a consequence of the imputation of his sin; nay, is rather antecedent to it, as it was in Adam himself. The first depravity of hearts, and the imputation of that sin, ate both the consequences of that established union but yet in such order, that the evil disposition is first and the charge of guilt consequent, as it was in the case of Adam himself.

The first existence of an evil disposition, amounting to a full consent to Adam's sin, no more infers God being the author of that evil disposition in the child, than in the father. The first arising or existing of that evil disposition in the heart of Adam, was by God's permission; who could have prevented it, if he had pleased, by giving such influences of his Spirit, as would have been absolutely effectual to hinder it; which, it is plain in fact, he did withhold: and whatever mystery may be supposed in the affair, yet no Christian will presume to say, it was not in perfect consistence with God's holiness and righteousness notwithstanding Adam had been guilt of no offense before. So root and branches being one, according to God's wise constitution, the case in fact is, that by virtue of this oneness answerable chances or effects through all the all the branches co-exist with the changes in the root: consequently an evil disposition exists in the hearts of Adam's posterity, equivalent to that which was exerted in his own heart, when he eat the forbidden fruit. Which God has no hand in, any otherwise, than in not exerting such an influence, as might

be effectual to prevent it; as appears by what was observed in the former chapter.

But now the grand objection is against the reasonableness of such a constitution, by which Adam and his posterity should be looked upon as one, and dealt with accordingly, in an affair of such infinite consequence; so that if Adam sinned, they must necessarily be made sinner by his disobedience, and come into existence with the same depravity of disposition, and be looked upon and treated as though they were partakers with him in his act of sin. I have not room here to rehearse all Dr. T.'s vehement exclamations against the reasonableness and justice of this. The reader may at his leisure consult his book, and see them in the places referred to below. Whatever black colors and frightful representations are employed on this occasion, all may be summed up in this, That Adam and his posterity are not one, but entirely distinct agents. But with respect to this mighty outcry made against the reasonableness of any such constitution, by which God is supposed to treat Adam and his posterity as one, I would make the following observations.

I. It signifies nothing to exclaim against plain fact. Such is the fact, the most evident and acknowledged fact, with respect to the state of all mankind, without exception of one individual among all the natural descendants of Adam, as makes it apparent, that God actually deals with Adam and his posterity as one, in reference to his apostacy, and its infinitely terrible consequences. It has been demonstrated, and shewn to be in effect plainly acknowledged, that every individual of mankind comes into the world in such circumstances, as that there is no hope or possibility of any other than their violating God's holy law, (if they ever live to act at all as moral agents,) and being thereby justly exposed to eternal ruing. And God either thus deals with mankind, because he looks upon them as one with their first father, and so tread them as sinful and guilty by his apostacy; or (which will not mend the matter) he, without viewing them as at all concerned in that affair, but as in every respect perfectly innocent, subject them nevertheless to this infinitely dreadful calamity. Adam by his sin was exposed to the calamities and sorrows of this life, to temporal death and eternal ruin; as is confessed. And it is ad in effect confessed, that all his posterity come into the world in such a state, as that the certain consequence is their being exposed, and justly so,

to the sorrow of this life, to temporal death, and eternal ruin, unless saved by grace. So that we see, God in fact deals with them together, or as one. If God orders the consequences of Adam's sin, with regard to his posterity's welfare — even in those things which are most important, and which in the highest degree concern their eternal interest — to be the same with the consequences to Adam himself, then he treats Adam and his posterity as one in that affair. Hence, however the matter be attended with difficulty, fact obliges us to get over it, either by finding out some solution, or by shutting our mouths; and acknowledging the weakness and scantiness of our understandings; as we must in other innumerable cases, where apparent and undeniable fact, in God's works of creation and providence, is attended with events and circumstances, the manner and reason of which are difficult to our understandings. — But to proceed.

II. We will consider the difficulties themselves, insisted on in the objections of our opposers. They may be reduced to there two: First, That such a constitution is injurious to Adam's posterity. Secondly, That it is altogether improper, as it implies falsehood, viewing and treating those as one, which indeed are not one, but entirely distinct.

FIRST difficulty, That appointing Adam to stand, in this great affair, as the moral head of his posterity, and so treating them as one with him, as standing or falling with him, is injurious to them. To which I answer, it is demonstrably otherwise, that such a constitution was so far from being injurious to Adam's posterity, any more than if every one had been appointed to stand for himself personally, that it eras, in itself considered, attended with a more eligible probability of a happy issue than the latter would have been: and so a constitution that truly expresses the goodness of its Author. For,

1. It is reasonable to suppose, that Adam was as likely, on account of his capacity and natural talents, to preserve in obedience, as his posterity, (taking one with another,) if they had all been put on the trial singly for themselves. And supposing that there was a constituted union or oneness of him and his posterity, and that he stood as a public person, or common head, all by this constitution would have been as sure to partake of the benefit of his obedience, as of the ill consequence of his disobedience, in case of his fall.

2. There was a greater tendency to a happy issue, in such an appointment, than if every one had been appointed to stand for himself; especially on two accounts.

(1.) That Adam had stronger motives to watchfulness than his posterity would have had; in that not only his own eternal welfare lay at stake, but also that of all his posterity:

(2.) Adam was in a state of complete manhood when his trial began. It was a constitution very agreeable to the goodness of God, considering the state of mankind, which was to be propagated in the way of generation, that their first father should be appointed to stand for all. For by reason of the manner of their coming into existence in a state of infancy, and their coming so gradually to matured state, and so remaining for a great while in a state of childhood and comparative imperfection, after they were become moral agents, they would be to fit to stand for themselves, than their first father to stand for them.

If any man, notwithstanding these things, shall say, that for his own part, if the affair had been proposed to him, he should have chosen to have had his eternal interest trusted in his own hands: it is sufficient to answer, that no man's vain opinion of himself, as more fit to be trusted than others, alters the true nature and tendency of things, as they demonstrably are in themselves. Nor is it a just objection, that this constitution has in event proved for the start of mankind. For it does not follow, that no advantage was given for a happy event, in such an establishment, because it was not such as to make it utterly impossible there should be any other event.

3. The goodness of God in such a constitution with Adam appears in this: that if there had been no gracious establishment at all, but God had proceeded only on the basis of mere justice, and had gone no further than this required, he might have demanded of Adam and all his posterity, that they should perform perfect perpetual obedience, without ever failing in the least instance, on pain of eternal death, and might have made this demand without the promise of any positive reward for their obedience. For perfect obedience is a debt, that every one owes to his Creator; and therefore is what his Creator was not obliged to pay him for. None is obliged to pay his debtor for discharging his just debt. — But such was evidently the constitution with Adam, that an eternal happy life was to be

the consequence of his persevering fidelity, to all such as were included within that constitution, (of which the tree of life was a sign,) as well as eternal death to be the consequence of his disobedience. — I come now to consider the

SECOND difficulty, — It being thus manifest, that this constitution, by which Adam and his posterity are dealt with as one, is not unreasonable on account of its being injurious and hurtful to the interest of mankind, the only thing remaining in the objection, against such a constitution, is the impropriety of it, as implying falsehood, and contradiction to the true nature of thing; as hereby they are viewed and treated as one, who are not one, but wholly distinct; and no arbitrary constitution can ever make that to be true, which in itself considered is not true.

This objection, however specious, is really founded on a false hypothesis, and wrong notion of what we call sameness or oneness, among created things; and the seeming force of the objection arises from ignorance or inconsideration of the degree, in which created identity or oneness with past existence, in general, depends on the sovereign constitution and law of the supreme Author and Disposer of the universe.

Some things are entirely distinct, and very diverse, which yet are so united by the established law of the Creator that by virtue of that establishment, they are in a sense one. Thus a tree, grown great, and a hundred years old, is one plant with the little sprout, that first came out of the ground from whence it grew, and has been continued in constant succession; though it is now so exceeding diverse, many thousand times bigger, and of a very different form, and perhaps not one atom the very same: yet God, according to an established law of nature, has in a constant succession communicated to it many of the same qualities, and most important properties, as if it were one. It has been his pleasure, to constitute an union in these respects, and for these purposes, naturally leading us to look upon all as one. — So the body of man at forty years of age, is one with the infant body which first came into the world, from whence it grew; though now constituted of different substance, and the greater part of the substance probably changed scores (if not hundreds) of times: and though it be now in so many respects exceeding diverse, yet God, according to the course of nature, which he has been pleased to establish, has caused, that

in a certain method it should communicate with that infantile body, in the same life, the same senses, the same features, and many the same qualities, and in union with the same soul, and so, with regard to these purposes, it is dealt with by him as one body. Again, the body and soul of a man are one, in a very different manner, and for different purposes. Considered in themselves, they are exceeding different beings, of a nature as diverse as can be conceived, and yet, by a very peculiar divine constitution, or law of nature which God has been pleased to establish, they are strongly united and become one, in most important respects, a wonderful mutual communication is established, so that both become different parts of the same man. But the union and mutual communication they have, has existence, and is entirely regulated and limited, according to the sovereign pleasure of God, and the constitution he has been pleased to establish.

And if we come even to the personal identity of created intelligent beings, though this be not allowed to consist wholly in what Mr. Locke supposes, i. e. Same consciousness; yet I think it cannot be denied, that this is one thing essential to it. But it is evident, that the communication or continuance of the same consciousness and memory to any subject, through successive parts of duration, depends wholly on a divine establishment. There would be no necessity, that the remembrance and ideas of what is past should continue to exist, but by an arbitrary constitution of the Creator. — If any should here insist, the; there is no need of having recourse to any such constitution, in order to account for the continuance of the same consciousness; and should say that the very nature of the soul is such as will sufficiently; account for it, its ideas and consciousness being retained, according to the course of nature: then let it be remembered, who it is that gives the soul this nature; and let that be remembered, which Dr. T- says of the course of nature, before observed; denying, that the course of nature is a proper active cause, which will work and go on by itself without God, if he lets and permit it; saying that the course of nature, separate from the agency of God, is no came, or nothing; and affirming, that it is absolutely impossible, the course of nature should continue itself or go on to operate by itself any more than produce itself; and that God, the original of all being, is the ONLY CAUSE of all natural effects. Here it is worthy also to be observed, what Dr. Turnbull says of the laws of nature, as cited from Sir Isaac Newton. “It is

the will of the mind that is the first cause, that gives subsistence and efficacy to all those laws, who is the efficient cause that produces the phenomena, which appear in analogy, harmony, and agreement, according to these laws.” And, “the same principles must take place in things pertaining to moral as well as natural philosophy.”

From these things it will clearly follow, that identity of consciousness depends wholly on a law of nature; and so, on the sovereign will and agency of GOD. And therefore, that personal identity, and so the derivation of the pollution and guilt of past sins in the same person, depends on an arbitrary divine constitution; and this, even though we should allow the same consciousness not to be the only thing which constitutes oneness of person, but should, besides that, suppose sameness of substance requisite. For, if same consciousness be one thing necessary to personal identity, and this depends on God’s sovereign constitution, it will still follow that personal identity depends on God’s sovereign constitution.

And with respect to the identity of created substance itself, in the different moments of its duration, I think we shall greatly mistake, if we imagine it to be like that absolute, independent identity of the FIRST BEING, whereby he is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. Nay, on the contrary, it may be demonstrated, that even this oneness of created substance, existing at different times, is a merely dependent identity; dependent on the pleasure and sovereign constitution of him who worketh all in all. This will follow from who is generally allowed, and is certainly true, that God not only created all things, and gave them being at first, but continually preserves them and upholds them in being. This being a matter of considerable importance, it may be worthy here to be considered with a little attention. Let us inquire therefore, in the first place whether it be not evident that God does continually, by his immediate power, uphold every created substance in being; and then let us see the consequence.

That God does, by his immediate power, uphold every created substance in being, will be manifest, if we consider that their present existence is a dependent existence, and therefore is an effect and must have some cause; and the cause must be one of these two; either the antecedent existence of the same substance, or else the power of the Creator. But it cannot be the

antecedent existence of the same substance. For instance, the existence of the body of the moon, at this present moment, cannot be the effect of its existence at the last foregoing moment. For not only was what existed the last moment, no active cause, but wholly a passive thing, but this also is to be considered that no cause can produce effects in a time and place in which itself is not. It is plain, nothing can exert itself, or operate, when and where it is not existing. But the moon's past existence was neither where nor when its present existence is. In point of time, what is past entirely ceases, when present existence begins; otherwise it would not be past. The past moment has ceased, and is gone, when the present moment takes place; and no more can exist with it, than any other moment that had ceased, twenty years ago. Nor could the past existence of the particles of this moving body produce effects in any other place, than where it then was. But its existence at the present moment, in every point of it, is in a different place, from where its existence was at the last preceding moment. From these things, I suppose, it will certainly follow, that the present existence, either of this, or any other created substance, cannot be an effect of its past existence. The existences (so to speak) of an effect, or thing dependent, in different parts of space or duration, though ever so near one to another, do not at all co-exist one with the other; and therefore are as truly different effects, as if those parts of space and duration were ever so far asunder. And the prior existence can no more be the proper cause of the new existence, in the next moment, or next part of space, than if it had been in an age before, or at a thousand miles distance, without any existence to fill up the intermediate time or space. Therefore the existence of created substances, in each successive moment, must be the effect of the immediate agency, will, and power of GOD.

If any shall insist upon it, that their present existence is the effect or consequence of past existence, according to the nature of things, that the established course of nature is sufficient to continue existence once given, I allow it. But then it should be remembered, what nature is in created things, and what the established course of nature is, that as has been observed already, it is nothing, separate from the agency of God; and that, as Dr. T. says, GOD, the original of all being, is the ONLY cause of all natural effects. A father, according to the course of nature, begets a child an oak, according to the course of nature, produces an acorn, or a bud, so

according to the course of nature the former existence of the trunk of the tree is followed by its new or present existence. In one case, and the other, the new effect is consequent on the former, only by the established laws and settled course of nature; which is allowed to be nothing but the continued immediate efficiency of GOD, according to a constitution that he has been pleased to establish. Therefore, according to what our author urges as the child and the acorn which come into existence according to the course of nature, in consequence of the prior existence and state of the parent and the oak, am truly immediately created by God, so must the existence of each created person and thing, at each moment, be from the immediate continued creation of God. It will certainly follow from these things, that God's preserving of created things in being, is perfectly equivalent to a continued creation, or to his creating those things out of nothing at each moment of their existence. If the continued existence of created things be wholly dependent on God's perservation, then those things would drop into nothing upon the ceasing of the present moment, without a new exertion of the divine power to cause them to exist in the following moment. If there be any who own, that God precedes things in being, and yet hold that they would continue in being without any further help from him, after they once have existence, I think, it is hard to know what they mean.

To what purpose can it be, to talk of God preserving things in being, when there is no need of his preserving them? Or to talk of their being dependent on God for continued existence. When they would of themselves continue to exist, without his help; nay, though he should wholly withdraw his sustaining power and influence?

It will follow from what has been observed, that God's upholding of created substance, or causing of its existence in each successive moment, is altogether equivalent to an immediate production out of nothing, at each moment. Because its existence at this moment in not merely in part from God but wholly from him: and not in any part, or degree, from its antecedent or existence. For, to suppose that its antecedent existence concurs with God in efficiency to produce some part of the effect, is attended with all the very same absurdities, which have been shown to attend the supposition of its producing it wholly. Therefore the antecedent existence is nothing, as to any proper influence or assistance in

the affair: and consequently God produces the effect as much from nothing as if there had been nothing before. So that this effect differs not at all from the first creation, but only circumstantially; as, in the first creation there had been no such act and effect of God's power before: whereas, his giving existence afterwards, follows preceding acts and effects of the same kind, in an established order.

Now, in the next place, let us see how the consequence of these things is to my present purpose. If the existence of created substance, in each successive moment, be wholly the effect of God's immediate power, in that moment, without any dependence on prior existence, as much as the first creation out of nothing, then what exists at this moment, by this power, is a new effect; and simply and absolutely considered, not the same with any past existence, though it be like it, and follows it according to a certain established method. And there is no identity or oneness in the case. But what depends on the arbitrary constitution of the Creator; who by his wise sovereign establishment so unites these successive new effects, that he treats them as one, by communicating to them like properties, relations, and circumstances, and so, leads us to regard and treat them as one. When I call this an arbitrary constitution, I mean, that it is a constitution, which depends on nothing but the divine will, which divine will depends on nothing but the divine wisdom. In this sense, the whole course of nature, with all that belongs to it, all its laws and methods, constancy and regularity, continuance and proceeding, is an arbitrary constitution. In this sense, the continuance of the very being of the world and all its parts, as well as the manner of continued being, depends entirely on an arbitrary constitution. For it does not at all necessarily follow, that because there was sound, or light, or color, or resistance, or gravity, or thought, or consciousness, or any other dependent thing the last moment, that therefore there shall be the like at the next. All dependent existence whatsoever is in a constant flux, ever passing and resuming; renewed every moment, as the colors of bodies are every moment renewed by the right that shines upon them; and all is constantly proceeding from GOD, as light from the sun. In him we live, and move, and he our being.

Thus it appears, if we consider matters strictly, there is no such thing as any identity or oneness in created objects, existing at different times, but what depends on God's sovereign constitution. And so it appear, that the

objection we are upon, made against a supposed divine constitution, whereby Adam and his posterity are viewed and treated as one, in the manner and for the purposes supposed — as if it were not consistent with truth, because no constitution can make those to be one, which are not one — is built on a false hypothesis: for it appears, that a divine constitution is what makes truth, in affairs of this nature. The objection supposes, there is a oneness in created beings, whence qualities and relations are derived down from past existence, distinct from, and prior to, any oneness that can be supposed to be founded on divine constitution. Which is demonstrably false, and sufficiently appears so from things conceded by the adversaries themselves: and therefore the objection wholly falls to the ground.

There are various kinds of identity and oneness, found among created things, by which they become one in different manners, respects, and degrees, and to various purpose; several of which differences have been observed; and every kind is ordered, regulated, and limited, in every respect, by divine constitution. Some things, existing in different times and places, are treated by their Creator as one in one respect, and others in another; some are united for this communication, and others for that; but all according to the sovereign pleasure of the fountain of all being and operation.

It appears, particularly, from what has been said, that all oneness, by virtue whereof pollution and guilt from past wickedness are derived, depends entirely on a divine establishment. It is this, and this only, that must account for guilt and an evil taint on any individual soul, in consequence of a crime committed twenty or forty years ago, remaining still, and even to the end of the world, and for ever. It is this that must account for the continuance of any such thing, and where, as consciousness of acts that are past; and for the continuance of all habits, either good or bad: and on this depends every thing that can belong to personal identity. And all communications, derivations, or continuation of qualities, properties, or relations, natural or moral, from what is past, as if the subject were one, depends on no other foundation.

And I am persuaded, that no solid reason can be given, why God — who constitutes all other created union or oneness according to his pleasure,

and for what purposes, communications, and effects he pleases — may not establish a constitution whereby the natural posterity of Adam, proceeding from him, much as the buds and branches from the stock or root of a tree, should be treated as one with him, for the derivation, either of righteousness, and communion in rewards, or of the loss of righteousness, and consequent corruption and guilt.

As I said before, all oneness in created things, whence qualities and relations are derived, depends on a divine constitution that is arbitrary, in every other respect, excepting that it is regulated by divine wisdom. The wisdom which is exercised in these constitutions, appears in there two things. First, in a beautiful analogy and harmony with other laws or constitutions, especially, relating to the same subject, and secondly, in the good ends obtained, or useful consequence, of such a constitution. If therefore there be any objection still lying against this constitution with Adam and his posterity, it must be, that it is not sufficiently wise in these respects. But what extreme arrogance would it be in us, to take upon us to act as judges of the beauty and wisdom of the laws and established constitutions of the supreme Lord and Creator of the universe! And not only so, but if this constitution, in particular, be well considered, its wisdom, in the two forementioned respects, may easily be made evident. There is an apparent manifold analogy, to other constitutions and laws, established and maintained through the whole system of vital nature in this lower world; all parts of which, in all successions, are derived from the first of the kind, as from their root, or fountain; each deriving from thence all properties and qualities, that are proper to the nature and capacity of the species: no derivative having any one perfection, unless it be what is merely circumstantial, but what was in its primitive. And that Adam's posterity should be without that original righteousness which Adam had lost, is also analogous to other laws and establishments, relating to the nature of mankind; according to which, Adam's posterity have no one perfection of nature, in any kind, superior to what was in him, when the human race began to be propagated from him.

And as such a constitution was fit and wise in other respects, so it was in this follows. Seeing the divine constitution concerning the manner of mankind coming into existence, was such as did so naturally unite them and make them in so many respects one, naturally leading them to a close

union in society, and manifold intercourse, and mutual dependence — things were wisely so established, that all should naturally be in one and the same moral state, and not in such exceeding different states, as that some should be perfectly innocent and holy, but others corrupt and wicked; some needing a Savior, but others needing none; some in a confirmed state of perfect happiness, but others in a state of public condemnation to perfect and eternal misery; some justly exposed to great calamities in this world, but others by their innocence raised above all suffering. Such a vast diversity of state would by no means have agreed with the natural and necessary constitution and unavoidable situation and circumstances of the world of mankind, all made of one blood, to dwell on all the face of the earth, to be unwed and blended in society, and to partake together in the natural and common goods and ends of this lower world.

Dr. T. urges, that sorrow and shame are only for personal sin; and it has often been urged, that repentance can be for no other sin. To which I would say, that the use of wards is very arbitrary; but that men's hearts should be deeply affected with grief and humiliation before God, for the pollution and guilt which they bring into the world with them, I think, is not in the least unreasonable. Nor is it a thing strange and unheard of, that men should be ashamed of things done by others, in whom they are nearly concerned. I am sure, it is not unspiritual; especially when they are justly looked upon in the sight of God, who sees the disposition of their hearts, as fully consenting, and concurring.

From what has been observed it may appear, there is no sure ground to conclude, that it must be an absurd and impossible thing, for the race of mankind truly to partake of the sin of the first apostacy, so as that this, in reality and propriety, shall become their sin; by virtue of a real union between the root and branches of mankind, (truly and properly availing to such a consequence,) established by the author of the whole system of the universe; to whose establishments are owing all propriety and reality of union, in any part of that system; and by virtue of the full consent of the hearts of Adam's posterity to that first apostacy. And therefore the sin of the apostacy is not theirs, merely because God imputes it to them; but it, truly and properly theirs, and on that ground God imputes it to them.

By reason of the established union between Adam and his posterity, the case is far otherwise between him and them, than it is between distinct parts or individuals of Adam's race; betwixt whom is no such constituted union: as, between children and other ancestors. Concerning whom is apparently to be understood that place, ^{
}Ezekiel 18:1-20. Where God reproves the Jews, for the use they made of that proverb, "The fathers have eaten your grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge;" and tells them, that hereafter they shall no more have occasion to use this proverb; and that if a son sees the wickedness of his father, and sincerely disapprove it and avoids it, and he himself is righteous; he shall not die for the iniquity of his father; that all souls, both the soul of the father and the son are his, and that therefore the son shall not bear the iniquity of his fathers nor the father hear the iniquity of the son; but the soul that sinneth, it shall die, that the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him. The thing denied, is communion in the guilt and punishment of the sins of others, that are distinct parts of Adam's race; and expressly, in that case, where there is no consent and concurrence, but a sincere disapprobation of the wickedness of ancestors. It is declared, that children who are adult and come to act for themselves, who are righteous, and do not approve of, but sincerely condemn, the wickedness of their fathers, shall not be punished for their disapproved and avoided iniquities. The occasion of what is here said, as well as the design and plan sense, shows, that nothing is intended in the lead degree inconsistent with what has been supposed concerning Adam's posterity sinning and falling in his apostacy. The occasion is, the people's murmuring at God's methods under the Mosaic dispensation, agreeable to that in ^{
}Leviticus 26:39. "And they that are left of you, shall pine away in their iniquity in their enemies' land, and also in the iniquities of their fathers shall they pine away with them:" and other parallel places, respecting external judgments, which were the punishments most plainly threatened, and chiefly insisted on, under that dispensation, (which was, as it were, an external and radial covenant,) and particularly the people suffering such terrible judgments in Ezekiel's time, for the sins of Manasseh according to what God says by Jeremiah. (^{
}Jeremiah 15:4.) and agreeable to what is said in that confession, ^{
}Lamentations 5:7. "Our fathers have sinned and are not, and we have borne their iniquities." In what is said here, there is a special respect to the gospel-dispensation; as

is greatly confirmed by comparing this place with ^{<BIB>}Jeremiah 31:29-31. Under which dispensation, the righteousness of God's dealings with mankind would be more fully manifested, in the clear revelation then to be made of the method of God's judgment, by which the final state of wicked men is determined, which is not according to the behavior of their particular ancestors; but every one is dealt with according to the sin of his own wicked heart, or sinful nature and practice. The affair of derivation of the natural corruption of mankind in general, and of their consent to, and participation of, the primitive and common apostasy, is not in the least intermeddled with, by any thing meant in the true scope and design of this place in Ezekiel.

On the whole, if any do not like the philosophy or the metaphysics (as some perhaps may choose to call it) made use of in the foregoing reasonings; yet I cannot doubt, but that a proper consideration of what is apparent and undeniable in fact, with respect to the dependence of the state and course of things in the universe on the sovereign constitutions of the supreme Author and Lord of all — who gives account to none of any of his matters, and whose ways are past finding out will be sufficient, with persons of common modesty and sobriety, to stop their mouths from making peremptory decisions against the justice of God respecting what is so plainly and fully taught in his holy word, concerning the derivation of depravity and guilt from Adam to his posterity.

This is enough, one would think, for ever to silence such bold expressions as these — “If this be just, — if the Scriptures teach such doctrine, etc. then the Scriptures are of no use — understanding is no understanding, — and, what a GOD must he be, that can thus curse innocent creatures! — Is this thy GOD. O Christian!” — etc. It may not be improper here to add something (by way of supplement to this chapter, in which we have had occasion to say so much about the imputation of Adam's sin) concerning the opinions of two divines, of no inconsiderable note among the dissenters in England, relating to a partial imputation, of Adam's first sin.

One of them supposes, that this sin, though truly imputed to INFANTS, so that thereby they are exposed to a proper punishment, yet is not imputed to them in such a degree as that upon this account they should be liable to eternal punishment, as Adam himself was, but only to temporal death, or

annihilation: Adam himself, the immediate actor, being made infinitely more guilty by it, than his posterity. On which I would observe, that to suppose, God imputes not all the guilt of Adams sin, but only some little part of it, relieves nothing but one's imagination. To think of poor little infants, bearing such torments for Adam's sin, as they sometimes do in this world, and these torments ending in death and annihilation, may sit easier the imagination, than to conceive of their suffering eternal misery for it. But it does not at all relieve one's reason. There is no rule of reason, that can be supposed to lie against imputing a sin in the whole of it, which was committed by one, to another who did not personally commit it, but what will also lie against its being so imputed and punished in part. For all the reasons (if there be any) lie against the imputation; not the quantity or degree of what is imputed. If there be any rule of reason, that is strong and good, lying against a proper derivation or communication of guilt, from one that acted, to another that did not act then it lies against all that is of this nature. The force of the reasons brought against imputing Adam's sin to his posterity (if there be any force in them) lies in this, That Adam and his posterity are not one. But this lies as properly against charging a part of the guilt, as the whole. For Adam's posterity, by not being the same with him, had no more hand in a little of what was done, than the whole. They were as absolutely free from being concerned in that act partly, as they were wholly. And there is no reason to be brought, why one man's sin cannot be justly reckoned to another's account, who was not then in being, in the whole of it, but what will as properly lie against its being reckoned to him in any part so as that he should be subject to any condemnation or punishment on that account. If those reasons are good, all the difference is this; that to bring a great punishment on infant for Adam's sin, is a great act of injustice, and to bring a comparatively smaller punishment, is a smaller act of injustice; but not, that this is not as truly and demonstrably an act of injustice, as the other.

To illustrate this by an instance something parallel. It is used as an argument why I may not exact from one of my neighbors, what was due to me from Luther, that he and my debtor are not the same; and that their concerns, interests, and properties are entirely distinct. Now if this argument be good, it lies as truly against my demanding from him a part of the debt, as the whole. Indeed it is a greater act of injustice for me to take

from him the whole of it, than a part; but not more truly and certainly an act of injustice.

The other divine thinks, there is truly an imputation of Adam's sin, so that infants cannot be looked upon as innocent creatures; yet seems to think it not agreeable to the perfections of God, to make the state of infants in another world worse than a state of non-existence. But this to me appears plainly a giving up of that grand point of imputation, both in whole and in part. For it supposes it to be not right, for God to bring any evil on a child of Adam which is innocent as to personal sin, without paying for it, or balancing it with good; so that still the state of the child shall be as good as could be demanded in justice, in case of mere innocence. Which plainly supposes, that the child is not exposed to any proper punishment at all, or is not at all in debt to divine justice, on account of Adam's sin. For if the child were truly in debt, then surely justice might take something from him, without paying for it, or without giving that which makes its state as good, as mere innocence could in justice require. If he owes the suffering of some punishment, then there is no need that justice should requite the infant for suffering that punishment, or make up for it, by conferring some good, that shall countervail it, and in effect remove and disannul it; so that, on the whole, good and evil shall be at even balance, yea, so that the scale of good shall preponderate. If it is unjust in a judge, to order any quantity of money to be taken from another, without paying him again, and fully making it up to him, it must be because he had justly forfeited none at all.

It seems to me pretty manifest, that none can, in good consistence with themselves, own a real imputation of the guilt of Adam's first sin to his posterity, without owning that they are justly treated as sinners, truly guilty, and children of wrath, on that account; nor unless they allow a just imputation of the whole of the evil of that transgression; at least, all that pertains to the essence of that act, as a full and complete violation of the covenant, which God had established; even as much as if each one of mankind had the like covenant established with him singly, and had by the like direct and full act of rebellion, violated it for himself.

CHAPTER 4

Wherein Several Other Objections Are Considered.

DR. T. objects against Adam's posterity being supposed to come into the world under a forfeiture of God's blessing, and subject to his curse through his sin, — That at the RESTORATION of the world after the flood, God pronounced equivalent or greater BLESSINGS on Noah and his sons, than he did on Adam at his creation, when he said, be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth, and have dominion over the fish of the sea, etc. — To this I answer, in the following remarks.

1. As has been already shown, that in the threatening denounced for Adam's sin, there was nothing which appears inconsistent with the continuance of this present life for a season, or with propagating his kind; so for the like reason, there appears nothing in that threatening, upon the supposition that it reached Adam's posterity, inconsistent with enjoying the temporal blessings, of the present life, as long as this is continued, even those temporal blessings which God pronounced on Adam at his first creation. For it must be observed, that the blessings which God pronounced on Adam when he created him, and before the trial of his obedience, were not the same with the blessings which were suspended on his obedience. The blessings thus suspended, were the blessings of eternal life; which, if he had maintained his integrity through his trial, would have been pronounced upon him afterwards; when God, as his judge, should have given him his reward. God might indeed, if he had pleased, immediately have deprived him of life, and of all temporal blessings, given him before. But those blessings pronounced on him before-hand, were not the things for the obtaining of which his trial was appointed. These were reserved till the issue of his trial should be seen, and then to be pronounced in the blessed sentence, which would have been passed upon him by his judge, when God came to decree to him his reward for his approved fidelity. The pronouncing of these latter blessings on a degenerate race, that had fallen under the threatening denounced, would indeed (without a redemption) have been inconsistent with the constitution which had been established. But giving them the former kind of blessings, which were not the things suspended on the trial, or

dependent on his, fidelity, (and these to be continued for a season,) was not at all inconsistent therewith.

2. It is no more an evidence of Adam's posterity being not included in the threatening denounced for his eating the forbidden fruit, that they still have the temporal blessings of fruitfulness, and a dominion over the creatures, continued to them; than it is an evidence of Adam being not included in that threatening himself, That he had these blessings continued to him, was fruitful, and had dominion over the creatures, after his fall equally with his posterity.

3. There is good evidence, that the benedictions God pronounced on Noah and his posterity, were granted on a new foundation; a dispensation diverse from any grant, promise, or revelation, which God gave to Adam, antecedently to his fall; even on the foundation of the covenant of grace, established in Christ Jesus; a dispensation, the design of which is to deliver men from the curse that came upon them by Adam's sin, and to bring them to greater blessings than ever he had. These blessings were pronounced on Noah and his seed, on the same foundation whereon afterwards the blessing was pronounced on Abraham and his seed, which included both spiritual and temporal benefits. — Noah had his name prophetically given him by his father Lamech, because by him and his seed deliverance should be obtained from the curse, which came by Adam's fall. ^{<0169>}Genesis 5:29. "And he called his name Noah, (i. e. rests) saying, this same shall comfort us concerning our work, and toil of our hands, because of the ground which the Lord hath cursed. Pursuant to the scope and intent of this prophecy (which indeed seems to respect the same thing with the prophecy in ^{<0169>}Genesis 3:15) are the blessings pronounced on Noah after the flood. There is this evidence of these blessings being conveyed through the channel of the covenant of grace, and by the redemption through Jesus Christ, that they were obtained by sacrifice; or were bestowed as the effect of God's favor to mankind, which was in consequence of smelling a sweet savor in the sacrifice which Noah offered. And it is very evident by the epistle to the Hebrews, that the ancient sacrifices never obtained the favor of God, but only by virtue of the relation they had to the sacrifice of Christ. — Now that Noah and his family had been so wonderfully saved from the wrath of God, which had destroyed the rest of the world, and the world was as it were restored

from a ruined state, there was a proper occasion to point to the great salvation to come by Christ: as it was a common thing for God, on occasion of some great temporal salvation of his people, or restoration from a low and miserable state, to renew the intimations of the great spiritual restoration of the world by Christ's redemption. God deals with the generality of mankind, in their present state, far differently on occasion of the redemption by Jesus Christ, from what he otherwise would do, for, being capable subjects of saving mercy, they have a day of patience and grace, and innumerable temporal blessings bestowed on them, which, as the apostle signifies, (⁴⁴⁴⁷ Acts 14:17.) are testimonies of God's reconcilableness to sinful men, to put them upon seeking after God.

But beside the sense in which the posterity of Noah in general partake of these blessings of domination over the creatures, etc. Noah himself, and all such of his posterity as have obtained like precious faith with that exercised by him in offering his sacrifice, which made it a sweet savor, and by which it procured these blessings, have dominion over the creatures, through Christ, in a more excellent sense than Adam in innocency, as they are made kings and priests unto God, and reign with Christ, and all things are theirs, by a covenant of grace. They partake with Christ in that dominion over the beasts of the earth, the fowls of the air, and fishes of the sea, spoken of in the 8th Psalm; which is by the apostle interpreted of Christ's dominion over the world, (⁴⁶⁵⁷ 1 Corinthians 15:27. and ⁵⁰⁰⁷ Hebrews 2:7.) And the time is coming, when the greater part of the posterity of Noah, and each of his sons, shall partake of this more honorable and excellent dominion over the creature, through him in whom all the families of the earth shall be blessed. Neither is there any need of supposing that these blessings have their most complete accomplishment, till many ages after they were granted, any more than the blessing on Japhet, expressed in those words, God shall enlarge Japhet, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem.

But that Noah's posterity have such blessings given them through the great Redeemer, who suspends and removes the curse which came through Adam's sin, surely is no argument, that they originally, as in their natural state, are not under the curse. That men have blessings through grace, is no evidence of their being not justly exposed to the curse by nature; but it rather argues the contrary. For if they did not deserve the curse, they

would not depend on grace and redemption for the removal of it, and for bringing them into a state of favor with God.

Another objection, which our author strenuously urges against the doctrine of original sin, is, that it disparages the divine goodness in giving us our being; which we ought to receive with thankfulness, as a great gift of God's beneficence, and look upon as the first, original, and fundamental fruit of the divine liberality.

To this I answer, in the following observations:

1. This argument is built on the supposed truth of a thing in dispute; and so is a begging of the question. It is built on this supposition, that we are not properly looked upon as one with our first father, in the state wherein God at first created him, and in his fall from that state. If we are so, it becomes the whole race to acknowledge God's great goodness to them, in the state wherein mankind was made at first; in the happy state they were then in, and the fair opportunity they then had of obtaining confirmed and eternal happiness; and to acknowledge it as an aggravation of their apostasy, and to humble themselves, that they were so ungrateful as to rebel against their good Creator. Certainly, we may all do this with as much reason, as the people of Israel in Daniel's and Nehemiah's times who did with thankfulness acknowledge God's great goodness to their fathers, many ages before; and in their confessions they bewailed, and took shame to themselves, for the sins committed by their fathers, notwithstanding such great goodness. (See the 9th chapter of Daniel, and the 9th of Nehemiah.)

2. If Dr. T. would imply in his objection, that it doth not consist with the goodness of God, to give mankind being in a state of misery, what ever was done before by Adam, whether he sinned or did not sin. I reply, if it be justly so ordered, that there should be a posterity of Adam, which must be looked upon as one with him; then it is no more contrary to God's attribute of goodness to give being to his posterity in a state of punishment, than to continue the being of the same wicked and guilty person, who has made himself guilty, in a state of punishment. The giving of being, and the continuing of being, are both alike the work of God's power and will, and both are alike fundamental to all blessings of man's present and future existence. And if it be said, it cannot be justly so

ordered, that there should be a posterity of Adam, which should be looked upon as one with him, this is begging the question.

3. If our author would have us to suppose, that it is contrary to the attribute of goodness for God, in any ease by an immediate act of his power, to cause existence, and to cause new existence, which shall be an exceeding miserable existence, by reason of exposedness to eternal ruin, then his own scheme must be supposed contrary to the attribute of God's goodness: for he supposes that God will raise multitudes from the dead at the fast day (which will be giving new existence to their bodies, and to bodily life and sense) in order only to their suffering eternal destruction.

4. Notwithstanding we are so sinful and miserable, as we are by nature, yet we may have great reason to bless God, that he has given us our being under so glorious a dispensation of grace through Jesus Christ: by which we have a happy opportunity to be delivered from this sin and misery, and to obtain unspeakable eternal happiness. And because, through our own wicked inclinations, we are disposed so to neglect and abuse this mercy, as to fail of final benefit by it, this is no reason why we ought not to be thankful for it, even according to our author's own sentiments. What (says he.) if the whole world lies in wickedness, an few therefore shall be saved? Have men no reason to be thankful, because they are wicked and ungrateful, and abuse their being and God's bounty? Suppose our own evil inclinations do withhold us, viz. from seeking after happiness, of which under the light of the gospel we are placed within the nearer and easier reach, suppose, the whole Christian world should lie in wickedness, and but few Christians should be saved, is it therefore certainly true that we cannot reasonably thank God for the gospel? Well and though the evil inclinations, which hinder our seeking and obtaining happiness by so glorious an advantage, are what we are born with, yet if those inclinations are our fault or sin, that alters not the case: and to say, they are not our sin, is still begging the question. Yea, it will follow from several things asserted by our author, that notwithstanding men are born in such circumstances, as that they are under a very great improbability of ever becoming righteous, yet they may have reason to be thankful for their being. Thus particularly, Dr. T. asserts, that all men have reason of thankfulness for their being; and yet he supposes that the heathen world, taken as a collective body, were dead in sin, and could not deliver or held

themselves, and therefore stood in necessity of the christian dispensation. And not only so, but he supposes, that the christian world is now at length brought to the like deplorable and helpless circumstances, and needs a new dispensation for its relief.

According to these things, the world in general, not only formerly but even at this day, are dead in sin, and helpless as to their salvation; and therefore the generality of them that are born into it, are much more likely to perish, than otherwise, till the new dispensation comes: and yet he supposes, we all have reason to be thankful for our being. Yea, further still, I think, according to our author's doctrine, men may have great reason to be thankful to God for bringing them into a state, which yet, as the case is, is attended with misery, as its certain consequence. As, with respect to God's raising the wicked to life, at the last day: which, he supposes, is in itself a great benefit, procured by Christ, and the wonderful grace of God through him: and if it be the fruit of God's wonderful grace, surely men ought to be thankful for that grace, and praise God for it. Our doctrine of original sin, therefore, no more disparages God's goodness in man's formation in the womb, than his doctrine disparages God's goodness in their resurrection from the grave.

Another argument, which Dr. T. makes use of, against the doctrine of original sin, is what the Scripture reveals of the process of the day of judgment, which represents the judge as dealing with men singly and separately, rendering to every man according to his deeds, and according to the improvement he has made of the particular powers and talents God has given him personally.

But this objection will vanish, if we consider what is the end or design of the public judgment. Now this will not be, that God may find out what men are, or what punishment or reward is proper for them, or in order to the passing of a right judgment of these things within himself, which is the end of human trials; but it is to manifest what men are to their own consciences. and to the world. As the day of judgment is called the day of the revelation of the righteous judgment of God; in order to this, God will make use of evidences, or proofs. But the proper evidences of the wickedness of men's hearts (the true seat of all wickedness) both as to corruption of nature, and additional pollution and guilt, are men's works.

The special end of God's public judgment will be, to make a proper, perfect, open distinction among men, rightly to state and manifest their difference one from another, in order to that separation and difference in the eternal retribution that is to follow: and this difference will be made to appear, by their personal works.

There are two things, with regard to which men will be tried, and openly distinguished, by the perfect judgment of God at the last day; according to the twofold real distinction subsisting among mankind: viz. (1.) The difference of STATE; that primary, and grand distinction, whereby all mankind are divided into two sorts the righteous and the wicked. (2.) That secondary distinction, whereby both sorts differ from others in the same general state, in DEGREES of additional fruits of righteousness and wickedness. Now the Judge, in order to manifest both these, will judge men according to their personal works. But to inquire at the day of judgment, whether Adam sinned or no, or whether men are to be looked upon as one with him, and so partaken in his sin, is what in no respect tends to manifest either of these distinctions.

1. The first thing to be manifest, will be the state, that each man is in, with respect to the grand distinction of the whole world of mankind into righteous and wicked or, in metaphorical language, wheat and tares, or, the children of the kingdom of Christ, and the children of the wicked one: the latter, the head of the apostacy, but the former the head of the restoration and recovery. The Judge, in manifesting this, will prove men's hearts by their works in such as have had opportunity to perform any works in the body. The evil works of the children of the wicked one will be the proper manifestation and evidence or proof of whatever belongs to the general state of such; and particularly they will prove, that they belong to the kingdom of the great deceiver, and head of the apostacy, a they will demonstrate the exceeding corruption of their nature, and full consent of their hearts to the common apostasy, and also that their hearts never relinquished the apostacy, by a cordial adherence to Christ, the great restorer. The Judge will also make use of the good work of the righteous to show their interest in the redemption of Christ; as thereby will be manifested the sincerity of their hearts in their acceptance of, and adherence to, the Redeemer and his righteousness. And in thus proving the state of men's hearts by their actions, the circumstances of those actions

must necessarily come into consideration, to manifest the true quality of their actions; as, each one's talents, opportunities, advantages, light, motives, etc.

2. The other thing to be manifested, will be that secondary distinction, wherein particular persons, both righteous and wicked, differ from one another, in the degree of secondary good or evil; the degree of evil fruit which is additional to the guilt and corruption of the whole body of apostates and enemies; and the denture of personal goodness and good fruit, which is a secondary goodness with respect to the righteousness and merits of Christ which belong to all by that sincere faith manifested in all. Of this also each one's works, with their circumstances, opportunities, talents, etc. will be the proper evidence.

As to the nature and aggravations of the general apostacy by Adam's sin, and also the nature and sufficiency of the redemption by Jesus Christ, the great restorer, though both these will have vast influence on the eternal state, which men shall be adjudged to, yet neither of them will properly belong to the trial men will be the subjects of at that day in order to the manifestation of their state, wherein they are distinguished and from another. They will belong to the business of that day no otherwise, than the manifestation of the great truths of religion in general, as the nature and perfections of God, the dependence of mankind on God, as their creator and preserver, etc. Such truths as these will also have great influence on the eternal state, to which men will then be adjudged, as they aggravate the guilt of man's wickedness, and must be considered in order to a due estimate of Christ's righteousness, and men's personal virtue; yet being of general and equal concernment, will not properly belong to the trial of particular persons.

Another thing urged by our author particularly against the imputation of Adam's sin, is this: "Though, in Scripture, action is frequently said to be imputed, reckoned, accounted to a person, it is no other than his own act and deed. In the same place he cites a number of places of Scripture, where these words are used, which he says are all that he can find in the Bible.

But we are no way concerned with this argument at present, any further than it relates to imputation of sin or sinful action. Therefore all that is in the argument, which relates to the present purpose, is this: that the word

is so often applied in Scripture to signify God's imputing of personal sin, but never once to his imputing of Adam's sin.-So often!-How often?-But twice. There are but two of all those places which he reckons up, that have any reference to God imputing sin to any person, where there is any evidence that only personal sin is meant; (^{GEN} Leviticus 17:3, 4. and ² Timothy 4:16. All therefore that the argument comes to, is this: that the word impute, is applied twice in Scripture to the case of God imputing sin, and neither of those times to signify the imputing of Adam's sin, but both times it has reference to personal sin, therefore Adam's sin is not imputed to his posterity. And this is to be noted, that one of these two places, even that in ^{GEN} Leviticus 17:3, 4. does not speak of imputing the act committed, but another not committed. The words are, "what man soever there be of the house of Israel, that killeth an ox or lamb or goat in the camp, or that killeth it out of the camp, and bringeth it not unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, to offer an offering unto the Lord, before the tabernacle of the Lord, blood shall be imputed unto that man, he hath shed blood that man shall be cut off from among his people," i. e. plainly murder shall be imputed to him: he shall be put to death for it, and therein punished with the same severity as if he had slain a man. It is plain by ^{ISA} Isaiah 66:3. that, in some cases, shedding the blood of beasts, in an unlawful manner, was imputed to them, as if they slew a man.

But whether it be so or not, although in both these places the word impute, be applied to personal sin, and to the very act, or although this could be said of all the places which our author reckons up, yet that the word impute, is never expressly applied to Adam's sin, does no more argue, that It is not imputed to his posterity, than it argues that pride, unbelief, lying, theft, oppression, persecution, fornication, adultery, sodomy, perjury, idolatry, and innumerable other particular moral evils, are never imputed to the persons that committed them, or in whom they are because the word impute, though so often used in Scripture, is never applied to any of these kinds of wickedness.

I know not what can be said here, except one of these two things: that though these sins are not expressly said to be imputed, yet other words are used that do as plainly and certainly imply that they are imputed, as if it were said so expressly. Very well, find so I say with respect to the imputation of Adam's sin. The thing meant by the word impute, may be

as plainly and certainly expressed by using other words, as if that word were expressly used; and more certainly, because the words used instead of it, may amount to an explanation of this word. And this, I think, is the very case here. Though the word, impute, is not used with respect to Adam's sin, yet it is said, all have sinned; which, respecting infants, can be true only of their sinning by his sin. And, it is said, by his disobedience many were made sinners; and, judgment and condemnation came upon all by that sin, and that he this means death the wages of sin, passed on all men, etc. Which phrases amount to full and precise explanations of the word, impute; and therefore do more certainly determine the point really insisted on.

Or, perhaps it will be said, with respect to those personal sins before-mentioned, pride, unbelief, etc it is no argument they are not imputed to those who are guilty of them, that the very word impute, is not applied to them; for the word itself is rarely used; not one time in a hundred, and perhaps five hundred, of those wherein the thing meant is plainly implied, or may be certainly inferred. Well, and the same also may be applied likewise, with respect to Adam's sin.

It is probable, Dr. T. intends an argument against original sin, by that which he says in opposition to what R. R. suggests of children discovering the principle of iniquity, and seeds of sin, before they are capable of moral action, viz. That little children are made PATTERN of humility meekness, and innocence, (~~OR~~ Matthew 18:3. ~~AND~~ 1 Corinthians 14:20. and ~~AND~~ Psalm 131:2.)

But when the utmost is made of this, there can be no shadow of reason, to understand more by these texts, than that little children are recommended as patterns in regard of a negative virtue, innocence with respect to the exercise and fruits of sin, harmlessness as to the hurtful effects of it; find that image of meekness and humility arising from this, in conjunct with a natural tenderness of mind, fear, self-diffidence, yieldableness, and confidence in parents and others older than themselves. And so they are commended as patterns of virtue no more than doves, which are an harmless sort of creatures, and have on image of the virtues of meekness and love. Even according to Dr. T.'s own doctrine, no more can be made of it than this: for his scheme will not admit of any such thing as positive

virtue or virtuous disposition, in infants; he insisting (as was observed before) that virtue must be the fruit of thought and reflection. But there can be no thought and reflection, that produces positive virtue, in children not yet capable of moral action; and it is such children he speaks of. And that little children have a negative virtue or innocence, in relation to the positive acts and hurtful effects of vice, is no argument that they have not a corrupt nature within them: for let their nature be ever to corrupt, yet surely it is no wonder that they be not guilty of positive wicked action before they are capable of any moral action at all. A young viper has a malignant nature, though incapable of doing a malignant action, and at present appearing a harmless creature.

Another objection, which Dr. T. and some others offer against this doctrine, is, That it pours contempt upon the human nature. But their declaiming on this topic is like addressing the affections and conceits of children, rather than rational arguing with men. It seems this doctrine is not compliment enough. I am sensible, it is not suited to the taste of some, who are so very delicate (to say no worse) that they can hear nothing but compliment and flattery. No contempt is by this doctrine cast upon the noble faculties and capacities of man's nature, or the exalted business, and divine and immortal happiness, of which he is made capable. And as to speaking ill of man's present moral state, I presume, it will not be denied, that please belongs to them who are truly sinful; and to suppose, that this is not the native character of mankind, is still but meanly begging the question. If we, as we come into the world, are truly sinful, and consequently miserable, he acts but a friendly part to us, who endeavors fully to discover and manifest our disease. Whereas, on the contrary, he acts an unfriendly part, who to his utmost hides it from us: and so, I in effect, does what in him lies to prevent our seeking a remedy from that, which if not remedied in time, must bring us finally to shame and everlasting contempt, and end in perfect and remediless destruction hereafter.

Another objection, which some have made against this doctrine much like the former, is, that it tends to beget in us on ill opinion of our, fellow-ship and to promote ill-nature and mutual hatred.

To which I would say, if it be truly so, that we all come sinful into the world, then our heartily acknowledging it tends to promote humility: but our disowning that sin and guilt which truly belongs to us, and endeavoring to persuade ourselves that we are vastly better than in truth we are, leads to a foolish self-exaltation and pride. And it is manifest, by reason, experience, and the word of God, that pride is the chief source of all the contention, mutual hatred, and ill-will which are so prevalent in the world; and that nothing so effectually promotes the contrary tempers and deportments, as humility. This doctrine teaches us to think no worse of others, than of ourselves: it teaches us, that we are all, as we are by nature, companions in a miserable helpless condition; which under a revelation of the divine mercy, tends to promote mutual compassion. And nothing has a greater tendency to promote those amiable dispositions of mercy, forbearance, long-suffering, gentleness, and forgiveness, than a sense of our own extreme unworthiness and misery, and the infinite need we have of the divine mercy, forbearance, and forgiveness, together with a hope of obtaining mercy. If the doctrine which teaches that mankind are corrupt by nature, tends to promote ill-will, why should not Dr. T.'s doctrine tend to it as much? For he teaches us, that the generality of mankind are very wicked having made themselves so by their own free choice, without any necessity: which is a way of becoming wicked, that renders men truly worthy of resentment; but the other, not at all, even according to his own doctrine.

Another exclamation against this doctrine is, that it tends to hinder comfort and joy, and to promote melancholy and gloominess of mind. To which I shall briefly say, doubtless, supposing men are really become sinful, and so exposed to the displeasure of God, by whatever means, if they once come to have their eyes opened, and are not very stupid, the reflection, on their case will tend to make them sorrowful; and it is fit it should. Men, with whom this is the case, may well be filled with sorrow, till they are sincerely willing to forsake their sins, and turn to God. But there is nothing in this doctrine, that in the least stands in the way of comfort and exceeding joy, to such as find in their hearts a sincere willingness wholly to forsake all sin, and give their hearts and whole selves to Christ, and comply with the gospel method of salvation by him.

Another thing objected, is, that to make men believe that wickedness belongs to their very nature, tends to encourage them in sin, and plainly to lead them to all manner of iniquity; because they are taught, that sin is natural, and therefore necessary and unavoidable. But if this doctrine, which teaches that sin is natural to us, does also at the same time teach us, that it is never the better, or less to be condemned, for its being natural, then it does not at all encourage sin, any more than Dr. T.'s doctrine encourages wickedness when it is become inveterate; who teaches that such as by custom have contracted strong habits of sins are unable to help themselves. And is it reasonable, to represent it as encouraging a man in boldly neglecting and wilfully continuing in his disease, without seeking a cure, to tell him of his diseases to show him that it is real and very fatal, and what he can never cure himself of; yet withal directing him to a great Physician, who is sufficient for his restoration? But for a more particular answer to what is objected against the doctrine of our natural impotence and inability, as being an encouragement to go on in sin, and a discouragement to the use of all means for our help, I must for brevity refer the reader to what has been largely written on this head in my discourse on the Freedom of the Will.

Our author is pleased to advance another notion, among others by way of objection against the doctrine of original sin: That if this doctrine be true, it would be unlawful to beget children. He says, "If natural generation be the means of unavoidably conveying, all sin and wickedness into the world, it must itself be a sinful and unlawful thing." Now, if there be any force of argument here, it lies in this proposition whatsoever is a means or occasion of the certain infallible existence of sin and wickedness, must itself be sinful. But I imagine Dr. T. had not thoroughly weighed this proposition, nor considered where it would carry him. For, God continuing in being the devil, and others that are finally given up to wickedness, will be attended, most certainly and infallibly, with an eternal series of the most hateful and horrid wickedness. But will any be guilty of such vile blasphemy, as to say, therefore God's upholding of them in being is itself a sinful thing? In the same place our author says, "so far as we are generated in sin, it must be a sin to generate." But there is no appearance of evidence in that position, any more than in this: "So far as any is upheld in existence in sin, it is a sin to uphold them in existence;" Yea, if there were any reason in the

case, it would be strongest in the larger position: for parents, as Dr. T. himself observes, are not the authors of the beginning of existence: whereas, God is truly the author of the continuance of existence. As it is the known will of God, to continue Satan and millions of others in being, though the most sure consequence is the continuance of a vast infernal world, full of everlasting hellish wickedness: so it is part of the revealed will of God, that this world of mankind should be continued and the species propagated, for his own wise and holy purposes, which will is complied with by the parents joined in lawful marriage. Their children, though they come into the world in sin, yet are capable subjects of eternal holiness and happiness; which infinite benefits for their children, parents have great reason to expect, in the way of giving up their children to God in faith, through a Redeemer, and bringing them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. I think, this may be answer enough to such a cavil.

Another objection is, That the doctrine of original sin is no oftener, and no more plainly, spoken of in Scripture; it being, if true, a very important doctrine. Dr. T. in many parts of his book suggests to his readers, that there are very few texts, in the whole Bible, wherein there is the least appearance of their teaching any such doctrine.

Of this I took notice before, but would here say further: That the reader who has perused the preceding defense of this doctrine, must now be left to judge for himself, whether there be any ground for such an allegation; whether there be not texts in sufficient number, both in the Old Testament and New, that exhibit undeniable evidence of this great article of Christian divinity, and whether it be not a doctrine taught in the Scripture with great plainness. I think there are few, if any, doctrines of revelation, taught more plainly and expressly. Indeed it is taught in an explicit manner more in the New Testament than in the Old. Which is not to be wondered at; it being thus with respect to all the most important doctrines of revealed religion.

But if it had been so, that this doctrine were but rarely taught in Scripture; yet if we find that it is indeed declared to us by God, if held forth to us by any word of his; then what belongs to us, is, to believe his word, and receive the doctrine which he teaches us, and not to prescribe to him how often he shall speak of it, and to insist upon knowing what reasons he has for speaking of it no oftener, before we will receive what he teaches us; or

to pretend that he should give us an account, why he did not speak of it so plainly as we think he ought to have done, sooner than he did. In this way of proceeding, if it be reasonable, the Sadducees of old, who denied any resumption or future state, might have maintained their cause against Christ, when he blamed them for not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God; and for not understanding by the Scripture text there would be a resurrection to spiritual enjoyment, and not to animal life, and sensual gratifications, and they might have insisted, that these doctrines, if true, were very important, and therefore ought to have been spoken of in the Scriptures oftener and more explicitly, and not that the church of God should be left, till that time, with only a few obscure intimations of that which so infinitely concerned them. And they might with disdain have rejected Christ's argument, by way of inference from God calling himself in the books of Moses, the GOD of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. For answer, they might have said, that Moses was sent on purpose to teach the people the mind and will of God: and therefore, if these doctrines were true, he might in reason and in truth to have taught them plainly and frequently, and not have left the people to spell out so important a doctrine, only from God's saying, that he was the God of Abraham, etc.

One great end of the Scripture is; to teach the world what manner of being GOD is, about which the world without revelation, has been so woefully in the dark: and that God is an infinite being, is a doctrine of great importance, and a doctrine sufficiently taught in the Scripture. But yet, it appears to me, this doctrine is not taught there, in any measure, with such explicitness and precision, as the doctrine of original sin: and the Socinians, who denied God's omnipresence and omniscience, had as much room left them for cavil, as the Pelagians who deny original sin.

Dr. T. particularly urges, that Christ says not one word of this doctrine throughout the four Gospels; which doctrine, if true, being so important, and what so nearly concerned the great work of redemption, which he came to work out, (as is supposed,) one would think, it should have been emphatically spoken of in every page of the Gospels.

In reply to this, it may be observed, that by the account given in the four Gospels, Christ was continually saying those things which plainly implied, that all men in their original state are sinful and miserable. As,

when he declared, that they which are whole, need not a physician, but they which, are sick; That he came to seek and to save that which was lost. That it was necessary for all to be born again, and to be converted, and that otherwise they could not enter into the kingdom of heaven; — and, that all were sinners, as well as those whose blood Pilate mingled with their sacrifices, etc. and that every one who did not repent, should perish; — Withal directing every one to pray to God for forgiveness of sin; — Using our necessity of forgiveness from God, as an argument with all to forgive the injuries of their neighbors; — Teaching, that earthly parents, though kind to their children, are in themselves evil; — And signifying, that things carnal and corrupt are properly the things of men; — Warning his disciples rather to beware of men, than of wild beasts; — Often representing the WORLD as evil, as wicked in its works, at enmity with truth and holiness, and hating him; — Yea and teaching plainly, that all men are extremely and inexpressibly sinful, owing ten thousand talents to their divine creditor.

And whether Christ did not plainly teach Nicodemus the doctrine of original total depravity, when he came to him to know what his doctrine was, must be left to the reader to judge, from what has been already observed on ^{BBB}John 3:1-11. And besides, Christ in the course of his preaching took the most proper method to convince men of the corruption of their nature, and to give them an effectual and practical knowledge of it, in application to themselves in particular, by teaching and urging the holy and strict law of God, in its extent, and spirituality, and dreadful threatenings: which, above all things, tends to seach the hearts of men, and to teach them their inbred exceeding depravity; not merely as a matter of speculation, but by proper conviction of conscience, which is the only knowledge of original sin, that can avail to prepare the mind for receiving Christ's redemption; as a man's sense of his own sickness prepares him to apply in good earnest to the physician.

And as to Christ being no more frequent and particular in mentioning and inculcating this point in a doctrinal manner, it is probable, one reason to be given for it, is the same that is to be given for his speaking no oftener of God's creating of the world: which, though so important a doctrine, is scarce ever spoken of in any of Christ's discourses, and no wonder, seeing this was a matter which the Jews, to whom he confined his personal

ministry, had all been instructed in from their forefathers, and never was called in question among them. And there is a great deal of reason, from the ancient Jewish writers, to suppose, that the doctrine of original sin had ever been allowed in the open profession of that people; though they were generally, in that corrupt time, very far from a practical conviction of it, and many notions were then prevalent especially among the Pharisee, which were indeed inconsistent with it. And though on account of these prejudices they might need to have this doctrine explained and applied to them, yet it is well known, by all acquainted with their Bibles, that Christ, for wise reasons, spake more sparingly and obscurely of several of the most important doctrine's of revealed religion, relating to the necessity, grounds, nature, and way of his redemption, and the method of the justification of sinners, while he lived here in the flesh, and left these doctrines to be more plainly and fully opened and inculcated by the Holy Spirit after his ascension.

But if, after all, Christ did not speak of this doctrine often enough to suit Dr. T. he might be asked, Why he supposes Christ did no oftener and no more plainly teach some of his, Dr. T.'s, doctrines, which he so much insists on? As, that temporal death comes on all mankind by Adam, and that it comes on them by him, not as a punishment or calamity, but as a great favor, being made a rich benefit, and a fruit of God's abundant grace, by Christ's redemption, who came into the world as a second Adam for this end. Surely, if this were so, it was of vast importance, that it should be known to the church of God in all ages, who saw death reigning over infants, as well as others. If infants were indeed perfectly innocent, was it not needful, that the design of that which was such a meloncholy and awful dispensation towards so many millions of innocent creatures, should be known, in order to prevent the worst thoughts of God from arising in the minds of the constant spectators of so mysterious and gloomy a dispensation? But why then such a total silence about it, for four thousand years together, and not one word of it in all the Old Testament, nor one word of it in all the four Gospels: and indeed not one word of it in the whole Bible, but only as forced and wrung out by Dr. T.'s arts of criticism and deduction, against the plainest and strongest evidence?

As to the arguments, made use of by many late writers from the universal moral sense, and the reasons they offer from experience, and observation

of the nature of mankind, to show that we are born into the world with principles of virtue; with a natural prevailing relish, approbation, and love of righteousness, tenth, and goodness, and of whatever tends to the public welfare, with a prevailing natural disposition to dislike, to resent, and condemn what is selfish, unjust, and immoral, and a native bent in mankind to mutual benevolence, tender compassion, etc. those who have had such objections against the doctrine of original sin thrown in their way, and desire to see them particularly considered, I ask leave to refer them to a treatise on the nature of true VIRTUE, lying by me prepared for the press, which may ere long be exhibited to public view.

CONCLUSION.

ON the whole, I observe, there are some other things, besides arguments, in Dr. T.'s book which are calculated to influence the minds, and bias the judgment, of some sorts of readers. Here, not to insist on the profession he makes, in many places, of sincerity, humility, meekness, modesty, charity, etc. in searching after truth, and freely proposing his thoughts, with the reasons of them, to others it nor on his magisterial assurance, appearing on many occasions, and the high contempt he sometimes expresses of the opinions and arguments of very excellent divines and fathers in the church of God, who have thought differently from him — both of which, it is not unlikely, may have a degree of influence on some of his readers — I would take some notice of another thing, observable in the writings of Dr. T. and many of the late opposers of the more peculiar doctrines of Christianity, tending (especially with juvenile and unwary readers) not a little to abate the force, and prevent the due effect, of the clearest scripture-evidences in favor of those important doctrines; and particularly to make void the arguments taken from the writings of the apostle Paul, in which those doctrines are more plainly and fully revealed, than in any other part of the Bible. What I mean, is this: These gentlemen express a high opinion of this apostle, and that very justly, for his eminent genius, his admirable sagacity, strong powers of reasoning, acquired learning, etc. They speak of him as a writer of masterly address, of extensive reach, and deep design, every where in his epistles, almost in every word he says. This looks exceedingly specious: it carries a plausible appearance of christian zeal and

attachment to the Holy Scriptures, to bear such a testimony of high veneration for that great apostle, who was not only the principal instrument of propagating Christianity, but with his own hand wrote so considerable a part of the New Testament. And I am far from determining, with respect at least to some of these writers, that they are not sincere in their declarations; or, that all is mere artifice, only to make way for the reception of their own peculiar sentiments. However, it tends greatly to subserve such purpose; as much as if it were designedly contrived, with the utmost subtlety, for that end. Hereby their incautious readers are prepared the more easily to be drawn into a belief, that they, and others in their way of thinking, have not rightly understood many of those things in this apostles writings, which before seemed very plain to them. Thus they are prepared, by a prepossession in favor of these new writers, to entertain a favorable thoughts of the interpretations put by them upon the words and phrases of this apostle; and to admit in many passages a meaning which before lay entirely out of sight; quite foreign to all that in the view of a common reader seems to be their obvious sense; and most remote from the expositions agree in by those who used to be esteemed the greatest divines and best commentators. As to this apostle, being a man of no vulgar understanding, it is nothing strange if his meaning lies very deep; and no wonder then, if the superficial observation of vulgar Christian, or indeed of the herd of common divines, such as the Westminster Assembly, etc. falls vastly short of the apostle's reach, and frequently does not enter into the true spirit and design of his episode. They must understand, that the first reformers, and indeed preachers and expositors in general, for fifteen or sixteen hundred years past, were too unlearned and short-sighted, to be capable of penetrating into the sense, or fit to make comments on the writings, of so great a man as this apostle; or else had dwelt in a cave of bigotry and superstition, to gloomy to allow them to use their own understandings with freedom, in reading the Scripture. But at the same time it must be understood, that there is risen up how at lengths in this happy age of light and liberty, a set of men of a more free and generous turn of mind, of a more inquisitive genius, and of better discernment. By such insinuations, they seek advantage to their caused; and thus the most unreasonable and extravagant interpretations of Scripture are palliated and recommended: so that, if the simple reader is not very much on his guard, if he does not clearly see with his own eyes,

or has too much indolence, or too little leisure, thoroughly to examine for himself, he is in danger of being imposed on with delusive appearances.

But I humbly conceive, that their interpretations — particularly of the apostle Paul's writings, though in some things ingenious — are in many things extremely absurd, and demonstrably disagreeable, in the highest degree, to his real design, to the language he commonly used, and to the doctrines currently taught in his epistles. Their criticisms, when examined, appear far more subtle, than solid: and it seems as if nothing can possibly be strong enough, nothing perspicuous enough, in any composure whatever, to stand before such liberties as these writers indulge. The plainest and most nervous discourse is analyzed and criticized, till it either dissolves into nothing, or becomes a thing of little significance. The Holy Scriptures is subtle-lized into a mere mist; or made into a thin cloud, that easily puts on any shape, and is moved in any direction, with a puff of wind, just as the manager pleases. It is not in the nature and power of language, to afford sufficient defense against such an art, so abused; as, I imagine, a due consideration of some things I have had occasion in the preceding discourse to observe, may abundantly convince us.

But this, with the rest of what I have offered on the subject, must be left with every candid reader's judgment; and the success of the whole must now be left with God, who knows what is agreeable to his own mind, and is able to make his own truths prevail; however mysterious they may seem to the poor, partial, narrow, and extremely imperfect views of morals, while looking through a cloudy and delusory medium; and however disagreeable they may be to the innumerable prejudices of men's hearts; — and who has promised, that the gospel of CHRIST, such as is really his, shall finally be victorious; and has assured us, that the word which goes out of his mouth, shall not return to him void, but shall accomplish that which he pleaseth, and shall prosper in the thing where too he sends it. — Let GOD arise, and plead his own cause, and glorify his own great name. AMEN.