

**THE GREAT CHRISTIAN
DOCTRINE OF
ORIGINAL SIN**

by

Jonathan Edwards

*“They that be whole, need not a physician;
but they that are sick.” - Matthew 9:12*

CONTENTS

Advertisement	3
The Author's Preface	7
PART ONE	
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 Opposers.	
Chapter One	8
Chapter Two	69
PART TWO	
Containing Observations on Particular Parts of the Holy Scripture Which Prove the Doctrine of Original Sin.	
Chapter One	78
Chapter Two	102
Chapter Three	110
Chapter Four	130
PART THREE	
The Evidence Given Us, Relative to the Doctrine of Original Sin, in What the Scriptures Reveal Concerning the Redemption by Christ.	
Chapter One	143
Chapter Two	148
PART FOUR	
Containing Answers to Objections.	
Chapter One	155
Chapter Two	158
Chapter Three	164
Chapter Four	177

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 decease, 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 anything 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, both 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 expressed 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 labours, 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 of 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 mien 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 gaieties 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 him 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 behaviour, 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 neighbour. 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 labour under in this remote corner of the world. He very early discovered a genius above the ordinary size; and 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 skilful 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, labouring 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 thought, 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 honour upon him, by crowning his labours with surprising successes, in the conversion of sinners, and the edification of saints, to the advancement of the kingdom and glory of God our Saviour 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 eulogy 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 the, 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 Writings, 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 endeavoured that no one thing there said, of any consequence in this controversy, should pass unnoticed, or that anything 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 everybody 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 both 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 everything 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 *prejudices* of many are in favour of what is said in *opposition* to this doctrine - and that it can not be expected, anything 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

PART ONE

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 opposers.

CHAPTER ONE

THE EVIDENCE OF ORIGINAL SIN FROM WHAT APPEARS IN FACT OF THE SINFULNESS OF MANKIND.

SECTION I

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 favour, 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 yet 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 specially 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 any 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 thing 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 seem 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, [Moral Philos. p. 289, 290] “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 number 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 rarity 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 innocence, good-nature, 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 villainies 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 lazarus-house, nor of our understanding from Bedlam, nor of our morals from a jail.” (p. 77. S)

With respect to the propriety and pertinence of such a representation of things, and its force as to the consequence designed, I 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 favour and compassion of the Most High may step in and oppose the tendency and prevent the sad effect. Particularly, if there be anything 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 deserved 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 reverse 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 Rom.* 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 *exposedness* 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, 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 what grace will do, but what justice *might* 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 *by 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 rectifications 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 *as they are in themselves*, abstracted from any consideration of that remedy the sovereign and infinite grace of God has provided. Having promised 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 *consequences* 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 of 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: *one* 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 everyone 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 everyone 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: 1 Kin. 8:46, “If any man sin against thee; for there is no man that sinneth not.” Ecc. 7:20, “There is not a just man upon earth that doeth good, and sinneth not.” 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 can not answer him one of a thousand.” To the like purpose, Psa. 143:2, “Enter not into judgment with thy servant; for in thy sight shall no man living be justified.” So the words of the apostle (in which he has apparent reference to those of the Psalmist), Rom. 3:19, 20, “That every mouth may be stopped, and all the world 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 sin.” So, Gal. 2:16; 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 guilty 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 everyone that was numbered in *Israel*, was directed to pay, to make atonement for his soul. Exo. 30:11-16. All are represented, not only as being sinful, but as having great and manifold iniquity. Job 9:2, 3; Jam. 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 Gal. 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 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.” Gal. 3:22. So that here we are plainly taught, both that everyone of mankind is a *sinner*, and that every sinner is under the *curse* of God.**

To the like purpose is Rom. 4:14, also 2 Cor. 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 Rom. 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 Mosaic constitution, or anywhere 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 Rom. 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 declared in what he says in his note on Rom. 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 LIFE, 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, Gal. 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, Rom. 8:3. The law, I conceive, is not a dispensation *suitable to the infirmity of the human nature* in our present state; or it doth 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 the law, because everyone 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 minutest branches*; again (*Note* on Rom. 7:6, p. 308). *To every sin, how 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, as binding us in everlasting chains*. In p. 120 S. he says, that death which is the wages of sin, is the *second death*; and this, p. 78, 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 Rom. 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 Rom. 5:20, p. 299: “The law or ministration of death, as it subject 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 Rom. 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 every sin is *in strict justice deserving* of wrath and punishment; and the law in its rigor 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 FAVOUR 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 God’s 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, who came to act in the 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 consonant to truth, and exhibits things in their true colours, 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 favour

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 effect, their utter and eternal ruin*, being cast wholly out of the favour of God, and subjected to his everlasting wrath and curse.

SECTION II

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 ruin.

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 even, which has been show 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, infallible 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 thing, but some stated prevalence or preponderation in the nature or state of causes or occasions, that is followed *by*, 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 sort 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 stated 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 stated 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 argues 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 consumption, or all run 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 him, which he had been the agent or subject of from year to year, and from age to age, continually 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 fact. 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 *prone 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, threatening 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 of sin, by any other means than God’s mercy. And that implies such an *aptness* to yield to temptation, as 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 *can not be*; as in the words before cited in the last *section*, from his note on Rom. 5:20, where he repeatedly speaks of the law, which subjects us to death for every transgression, as what CAN NOT GIVE LIFE; and states, that if God offered us no other way of salvation, *no man from the beginning of 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 endeavours 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, but 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 anything positive: and it is agreeable to the sentiments of the *best divines*, that *all sin originally comes from a DEFECTIVE or PRIVATIVE 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 educations; 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 states 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 *man's 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 everyone 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 any evil nature. That part of the system is not good, which is not good in its place in the system; and those 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 perfections 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 *connection* 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 supposing 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 III

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 favour with God; or a state of sin, guiltiness, and abhorrence in the sight of 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 his 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 its 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 can not 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 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 fulfilment 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 favour 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 can not 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 and 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 favour 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 be 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 of lay in the balance against the guilt, it would be agreeable to the nature of things, that he should find some favour, and not be altogether rejected, and made the subject of perfect and eternal destruction; and thus no account at all be made of his virtue, so much as to procure him the least relief or hope. How can such a constitution *represent sin in its proper colours*, 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 forever; 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 Mat. 18:21, to the end. There, on Peter's inquiring, *How often his brother should trespass against him, and he forgive him, whether 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 offences too many, and no degree of injury it is possible our neighbour 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 favour 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 innocence, 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 being a vast disproportion between the merit of the one, and the ill desert of the other: but infinitely less, than that between the demerit of our offences 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 shall take notice of in the following *sections*.

SECTION IV

The depravity of nature appears by a propensity in all to sin immediately, as soon as 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 *living*, are guilty of sin; that it must at least be understood, everyone 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 transgression, 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 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 long 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? 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 suffering 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 to 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. Heb. 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 Ecc. 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: Jam. 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 Pro. 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 Scriptures 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 V

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 in Mat. 25. The wicked are condemned as *cursed*, to *everlasting fire*, for their sin in defect and omission: *I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat, etc.* And the case is thus, not only when the defect is in word or behaviour, but in the inward temper and exercise of the mind. 1 Cor. 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 (Mat. 25:41, 46), says, p. 159: "It was manifestly for WANT to 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* of sin to *forbid* them, and to condemn to external destruction for them. And if so, it doubtless also extends to the inward principles of holiness, to *require* 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, honour, benevolence, gratitude, complacency, 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 irregularly 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 be 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, honour, 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 love 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 of 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 principals 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 can not 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 considerable-

ness 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, 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 fore-mentioned, 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 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, honourable, 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? How 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 favours 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 appear further, 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 everything 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 this 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 everyone to judge for himself, from his own opportunities of 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. But 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 predominance 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 realising 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 VI

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, *viz.* 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 anything 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 preserved 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 everywhere

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, Jer. 2:12, 13, "Be astonished, O 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." 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 Rom. 1:28. And the universality of the effect shows that the cause was universal, and not anything 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. Phil.* 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 (*Human Understanding* p. 4, chap. 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 anywhere 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 god-head." 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, Rom. 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. 1:19, 20, 21 affirms that the Gentiles had light sufficient to have seen God's eternal power and god-head, 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 Rom. 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; and Dr. Winder observes (*History Of Knowledge*, 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 the 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 disproportioned, incongruous systems, of which the most easy dictates of reason would have demonstrated the absurdity. They were contrary to all just calculations in moral 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 returned 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 corruption to the last. The pagan philosophers, and inquisitive men, made great improvements in many sciences, and even in morality itself; yet the inveterate absurdities of pagan idolatry remained without remedy. Every temple smoked with incense to the sun and moon, and other 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 altars 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 Caesars 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 everywhere 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 fact, 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 degree 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 gods 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 (Psa. 115:4-8 and 135:15-18).

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

Mr. Locke observes (*Hum. 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 honour, 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 enforcement 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 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 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 entertainments of a convenient, beautiful, well-furnished habitation, and to partake of the provisions and produce of a plentiful estate for 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' forever. 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 quite 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 anything under the sun. In things which relate to men's temporal interest, they seem very sensible of the uncertainty of life, especially in 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 neighbour 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 can not 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-eyes is the merchant to improve opportunities to enrich himself! How apt are men to be alarmed at the appearance of danger to their world estate, or anything 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 anything, 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 neighbours 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 external, 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 neighbours' 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 everything 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 imminent 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! Psa. 49:11, etc.: "Their inward thought is, that their houses shall continue for ever. Nevertheless, man being in honour, 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: "The have eyes, and see not; ears, and hear not; neither do they understand: they are like the horse and mule, that have no understanding." Jer. 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, Pro. 8:36. Laying wait for their own blood, Pro. 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, tending 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 anything 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 show 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 attended with great uncertainty. 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 can not 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 VII

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 purpose, 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 favour 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 honour 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 his heart, till they become a vital principles, 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 favour to succour 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 everyone 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 myriad's 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 anything 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 anyone, 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 way*, 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. Mat. 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 those 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. Luke 13:23, 24, "Then said one unto him, Lord, are there few saved? And he said unto them, Strive to enter in at the strait gate: for many I 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, 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. Pro. 20:6, "Most men will proclaim every man his own goodness: but a faithful man who can find?" 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 Psa. 12:1, and 31:23, and 51:6, and other places. Again, Ecc. 7:25-29, "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 hearts 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 things in the world in general, but only *in his time*. But does Dr. T. or anybody 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 way 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, labours, 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, Pro. 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 the 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 neighbourhood, 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. Ecc. 4:1-3, “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 done under the sun.*” 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 neighbouring countries.

The same inspired writer says, Ecc. 9:3, “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.” 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 are such as lead us to suppose, that the greater part of his posterity in his lifetime, 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 she, hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel.* Which naturally suggests this 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 general, 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, Gen. 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 (Gen. 6:3, 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," (Gen. 6:12). And as 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 can not 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*, p. 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 behaviour of Reuben with his father's concubine, the behaviour of Judah with Tamar, the conduct of Joseph's ten brethren in their cruel treatment of him; we can not 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, often represents them as complying with the abominable idolatries of the country. [Lev. 17:7; Jos. 5:9, and 24:14, Eze. 20:7, 8 and 22:3, VOL. I.] 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 very express, that wickedness was the prevailing character in the nation, from age to age. So, it was till Samuel's time. 1 Sam. 8:7, 8, "The have rejected me, that I should not reign over them; according to all their works which they have done, since the day that I brought them out of Egypt, unto this day." Yea, so it was till Jeremiah's and Ezekiel's time. Jer. 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 this day.*” Compare Jer. 5:21, 23; and chap. 7:25, 26, 27. So Eze. 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, 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; Acts 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 One, 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? 1 John 5:19, “We know that we are of God, and the *whole world* lieth in wickedness.” 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. speaks 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 generality 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 anything 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 are 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 anywhere 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; Mat. 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, un-depraved, and perfectly free from all evil propensities.

SECTION VIII

The native 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 *various, 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 favour*; as a *benevolent father*, exercising an *unwholesome 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 have 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 them the utmost abhorrence of 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 ground 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 prevent and to cure the disease 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 severity 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 hearing 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 universally 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 has 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 ages; 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 that 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 Num. 25). Yea, and the far greater part even of Abraham's posterity, the children of Ishmael, Ziman, Joksham, 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 Gen. 41:56, 57. Agreeably to which, the name the Pharaoh gave to Joseph, Zaphnath-Paaneah, as is said, in the Egyptian language, signifies *Saviour 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 these things are expressly spoken of as one end of these great miracles; Exo. 9:14; Num. 14:21; Jos. 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 the vast army of the Midianites, Amalekites, and *all the children of the east*, consisting of about 135,000 men; Jdg. 7:12; 8:10. But no reformation followed this, or the other great works of God, wrought in the times of Deborah and Barak, Jeptha 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*; 1 Chr. 22:5. And we are told, that there came of all people to hear the wisdom of Solomon, from all kings of the earth; 1 Kin. 4:34; 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 outstretched 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*; 1 Kin. 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 Namaan, 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 Moab, Ammon, and Edom, at Jehoshaphat's prayer; 2 Chr. 20. Jonah's preaching at Nineveh, together with the miracles 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 Sennacherib'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 foundation 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 Abednego, 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; Isa. 45. Which prophecies were probably shown to him, whereby he was induced to publish his testimony concerning the God of Israel, as THE 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 induced 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 steadfast forever, etc.*

When, after the destruction of Babylon, some of the Jews returned to their own land multitudes never 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 everywhere, 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' 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 be got 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 Rom. 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 Rom. 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 favours 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, 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 him through the sea, *they sang his praise, but soon forgot his works*. Before they got to Mount Sinai, they openly manifested their perverseness from time to time; so that God says of them; Exo. 16:28, “How long refuse ye to keep my commandments, and my laws?” 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 a holy people unto him, with such astonishing manifestations of his power, majesty, and holiness, as were altogether unparalleled. God puts the people in mind; Deu. 4:32-34, “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 another nation?” 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; Exo. 19:9, “Lo, I come unto thee in a thick cloud, that the people may hear when I speak with thee, and believe thee for ever.” But what was the effect of all? It was not more than two or three months, before that people, under that very mountain, returned 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 neighbours, 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 honour of JEHOVAH, and the institutions of his worship, and to instruct the neighbour 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; Psa. 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 favours 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 apostasy, 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; 2 Kin. 17.

And as to the other two tribes; though their kings were always of the family of David, and they were favoured in many respects far beyond their brethren yet they were generally exceeding corrupt. Their kings were, most of them, wicked men, and their 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 cast off the ten tribes, instead of taking warning, they made themselves vastly more vile than ever the others had done. 2 Kin. 17:18, 19; Eze. 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: so that at last, as the prophets 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 has 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*: 2 Kin. 21:13; Eze. 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 providences; yet they corrupted themselves again, to so great a degree, that the transgressors were come to full again in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes; as the matter is represented in the prophecy of Daniel: Dan. 8:23. And then God made them the subjects of a dispensation, little, if anything, 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; Eze. 16:47, 48, etc. Also chapter 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 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 perfections, and particularly of the love of God as our Father, and as the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour 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 honour 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 forever to praise and magnify the rich grace of God in the Redeemer.” And he elsewhere says, [*Key*, § 167] “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 [*Note on Rom. 1:16.*] *admirably adapted to enlighten our minds, and sanctify our hearts. 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 the 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; 2 Thes. 2:7. The greater part of the ages now elapsed, have been spent in that grand and general apostasy, under

which the Christian world, as it is called, has been transformed into what has been vastly more dishonourable 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 Anti-Christ: 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 learning 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 perfection 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 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 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 being insufficient for the full reformation of the Christian world, by reason of its corruptions*: Note on Rom. 1:27. And yet all these things, according to him, without any natural bias to 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. (See p. 259. 63, 64, 72. S.)

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 allowing 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 to lead men to the knowledge of God, as 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." [Pref. To Par. On Rom. p. 146, 48.] 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 generality, agreed from age to age, so essentially to *misunderstand* that which is made so very plain?

Dr. T. says (p. 167 S) "It is my persuasion, that 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 teachers of the Christian church nothing but a parcel of *ignorant dreamers*? If so, this is very strange indeed, unless mankind naturally *loves 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 through 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 and 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 understanding*, 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, and 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 everything opposite to practical Christianity, has gone on to increase, with such a prodigious celerity, as to become like an overflowing deluge; threatening, 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 can not 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 new 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 endeavours, 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; medicine 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 god-head, to the eternal admiration of principalities and powers in heavenly places.

SECTION IX

Several evasions of the arguments for the depravity of nature, from trial and events 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. [Belsham] 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 fulfil 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.[See p. 81, note.] Sin doth not alter its nature, by its 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 endeavours 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 everyone 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 labour 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, ages, 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, can not in the least weaken the arguments brought to prove 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 [See p. 81 *note*].

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 can not 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 stately 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 [Page 257, 258. 52, 53. S. and many other places].

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 favour 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 Protestants; 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 palaces and in huts, wigwams, and cells under ground? Is it enough to reply, It happens so, that men everywhere, 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 everything 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 to do so, if he will, without any such disposition? Or if we see a nation, or people, that differ greatly from other nations, in such and such instances of their constant conduct - as though their tempers and inclinations were very diverse - and any should say, We can not judge at all of the temper or disposition of people, by anything observable in their constant practice or behavior, because they have all free will, and therefore may all choose to act so, if they please, without anything in their temper or inclination to bias them. Would such an account of such effects be satisfying to the reason of mankind? But infinitely further would it be from satisfying a considerate mind, to account for the constant and universal sinfulness of mankind, by saying, that their will is free, and therefore all may, if they please, make themselves wicked: they are free when 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, learned 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 everyone 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, unable 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 bad 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 to bad 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, everywhere, 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 behaviour 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 any 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 everywhere 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 Peleg'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 abode. Jer. 2:21. It is evident, that the generation which came with Joshua into Canaan was an excellent generation, by innumerable things said of them. (See Jer. 2:2, 3; Psa. 68:14; Jos. 22:2, 23:8; Deu. 4:3, 4; Hos. 11:1, 9:10; Jdg. 2:7, 17, 22, and many other places.) 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 incurable 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, and 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 centre, to which it naturally and constantly tends.

So that evil example will in nowise 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, had 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 honourable; and this - though that of one in our nature, yet - was the example of one infinitely higher and more honourable 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 - can not 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 consistency 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 as to bad instructions, as he supposes that they all, yea every individual person, had 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 in, 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 [See *Mor. Phil.* p. 279 and *Chris. Phil.* p. 274], “Sensitive objects first affect us, and inasmuch as reason is a principle, which, in the nature of things, must be advanced to strength and vigour, 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 [*Chris. Phil.* p. 282, 283], “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 cast of mind; yet 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 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 froward 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 endeavoured 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. For 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. These 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 can not 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 passions 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 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 not sin, or blamable evil. It, 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. For this scheme supposes, 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 a-forehand 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 vigour no otherwise than by exercise and culture [*Mor. Phil.* p. 311]. But can there be any force in this? Is there anything 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 [Belsham]. 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 can not 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. Phil.* p. 310. “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 forever - 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 reverse 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 [*Chris. Phil.* p. 113, 114, 115]. 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 TWO

UNIVERSAL MORTALITY PROVES 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 creates, 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 elaborately 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, if 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 everywhere 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. (See Lev. 10:6; Num. 1:53, and 18:5; Jos. 9:20; 2 Chr. 24:18, and 19:2, 10, and 28:13, and 32:25; Ezra 7:23; Neh. 13:18; Zec. 7:12 and many other places.) 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 (1 Sam. 5:11). *Deadly sorrow*, as the most extreme sorrow (Isa. 17:11; Mat. 26:38). And *deadly enemies*, as the most bitter and terrible enemies (Psa. 17:9).

The extremity of Christ's sufferings is represented by his suffering *unto death* (Phil. 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 Hophni 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. Exo. 28:43, "That they bear not iniquity and *die*." Lev. 22:9, "Lest they bear sin for it and *die*" (so Num. 18:22, compared with Lev. 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 (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. Deu. 29:24, "All nations shall say, Wherefore hath the Lord done thus unto this land? what meaneth the heat of this great anger?" (Compare Deu. 32:30; 1 Kin. 9:8; and Jer. 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. Therefore 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! 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: (Psa. 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 thine anger, and by thy wrath are we troubled. Thou has 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 labour 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 they 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*. Gen. 20:4. By *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 - or 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. [P 21, 67, and other places.]

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 anything can be a proof of a perverse and vile disposition, this must 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*, Isa. 38:13, 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 still? What need of so vastly changing man’s state, depriving him of all those blessings, and instead of them allotting 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 be 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 mis-improvement of them. Such a temper of mind, as amounts to a disposition to make such a mis-improvement 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. Jer. 2:7, “I brought them into a plentiful country, to eat the fruit thereof, and the goodness thereof. But when ye entered, ye defiled my land,” etc. See the following verses, especially verse 12, “Be astonished, O ye heavens, at this.” So Isa. 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 Deu. 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 infants 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 *favour* 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. 1 Cor. 15:22, “For as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive” (with 1 Cor. 15:25, 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 p. 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 offence, 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 speaks 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 chastisements after this manner. It is true, 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 (1 Cor. 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 before mentioned. So Elihu (Job 33:16-20, etc.) speaks of the same *chastening* by sickness, as for men’s good; *to withdraw man from his sinful purpose, and to hide pride from man, and keep back his soul from the pit; that therefore God chastens man with pain on his bed, and the multitude of this bones with strong pain*. But these chastenings are for his sins, as appears by what follows (Job 33:28). 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* (Job 36:7-8, 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 (Psa. 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 (Psa. 30:5). *God’s anger endureth but for a moment*, etc. (Compare Psa. 119:67, 71, 75.) God’s fatherly chastisements are spoken of as being for sin. (2 Sam. 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*. (Lam. 3:25, etc.) But yet these chastisements are

spoken of as being for their sin (see especially verse 39-40). So Christ says, Rev. 3:19, "As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten." But the words following show, that these chastenings 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, Heb. 12. The apostle there speaking to the Christians concerning the persecutions which they suffered, calls their sufferings by the name of divine *rebukes*; 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 scourges 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. (See 1 Pet. 4:17, 18, compared with Pro. 11:31. See also Psa. 69:4-9.)

If divine chastisements 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, Psa. 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 (Psa. 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 Sam. 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. (As in Psa. 78:38, 39; Psa. 103:9, with verse 14, 15; Psa. 30:2, 3, 9, and Job 33:22-24.)

Especially may death be looked upon as the most extreme of all temporal sufferings, when attended with such dreadful circumstances, and extreme pains, as those with 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 sufferings infants now undergo in subserviency to his good providence." But there are no bounds to such a license, in evading evidences from fact. It might as well be said, that there is not and can not 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 sin - is, 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 than 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 favour - 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 comes 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 neighbouring 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. 18:23, 25), "Wilt thou destroy the righteous with the wicked? That be far from thee to do after this manner, to slay 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 (Gen. 20:4; Exo. 23:7; Deu. 25:1; 2 Sam. 4:11; 2 Chr. 6:23, and Pro. 18:5). Eliphaz says, Job 4:7, "Who ever perished, being *innocent*? or where were the *righteous* cut off?" 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. 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 then 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 (Job 4:7), "Who ever perished, being innocent? and when were the righteous cut off? Especially, since in the same discourse (Job 5:1) he appeals to the tradition of the ancients for a confirmation of this very point (also in Job 15:7-10, and 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, Job 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) were 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 (Num. 31:17); and that given to Saul to destroy all the infants of the Amalekites (1 Sam. 15:3); and what is said concerning Edom (Psa. 137:9), "Happy shall he be, that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones;" I proceed to take notice of something remarkable concerning the destruction of

Jerusalem, represented in Eze. 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 recompense of their sin (Eze. 9:9, 10). God, at the same time, was most particular and exact in his care, that such as had proved by their behaviour, 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 (Eze 9:5, 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 anything that ever had happened to any city, or people, from the beginning of the world to that time (agreeable to Mat. 24:21; and Luke 21:22, 23). At that time particular care was taken to distinguish and to deliver God's people; as foretold, Dan. 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 were 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 others in that great destruction. So heavily did the calamity fall upon them, that those words were verified, Luke 23:29, "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:" and that prophecy in Deu. 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 grey hairs." And, by the history of that destruction appears, that then it was a remarkable fulfilment of Deu. 28:53-57, concerning *parents eating their children in the siege - and the tender and delicate woman eating her new-born 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 TWO

*Containing observations on particular parts of the Holy
Scripture which prove the doctrine of original sin.*

CHAPTER ONE

OBSERVATIONS RELATING TO THINGS CONTAINED IN THE FIRST THREE CHAPTERS OF GENESIS, WITH REFERENCE TO THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN.

SECTION I

*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 concreated 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, implies the choice and consent of the moral agent, without which it can not 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. II. 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. (*Mor. Phil.* p. 112-115. p. 142 *et alibi passim.*)

If a virtuous disposition or affection is before 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.* sect. 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 - (Marginal note, annexed to - 356.) "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 *moral 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 can not 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 go 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 can not 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 produces. And by the same reasoning it will follow, that if, as 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 can not 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 in 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 have 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 consistency 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 *proofs* 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 there 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 agent; 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 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 Adam's 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 thought, 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 consideration to which he was obliged, was *right action*. Surely he was obliged to it no otherwise than as a thing that was *right*: and 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 those 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 resolved into that single principle*. There fore, if any morally right act at all, reflection, consideration, or anything 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 towards 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 something 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 complacency, 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 behaviour, 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 anything as agreeable or disagreeable. But 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, and 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 heart, 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 favours 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 favour. This is implicitly owned by Dr. T. when he says (p. 252), "That in all 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 innocence, 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 favour to them, does great

things to restrain them from sin, and excite them to virtue, which he never did for Adam in innocence, but laid him, in the highest degree, under contrary disadvantages. God, as an instance of his great favour, 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 labour, 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 favour 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 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 labour and toil, sweat and sorrow, briars and thorns, with a body gradually decaying and returning 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 to wean them from the world, but - in the midst of the most exquisite and alluring sensitive delights; the reverse 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 Moses' account. That represents a happy state of peculiar favours and blessings before the fall, and the curse coming afterwards; but according to this scheme, the curse was before the fall, and the great favours and testimonies of love followed the apostasy. And the curse before the fall must be a curse with a witness, being to so high a degree the reverse 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! There was indeed a great show of favour, 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 Ecc. 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 way 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 Deu. 4:32, “Since the day that God *created man* upon the earth.” Job 20:4, “Knowest thou not this of old, since *man* was placed upon the earth.” Isa. 45:12, “I have made the earth, and *created man* upon it: I, even my hands, have stretched out the heavens.” Jer. 27:5, “I *have made* the earth, the *man* and the beast that are upon the ground, by my great power.” 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; Mat. 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 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 word (Jashar) 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 express a character or property of moral agents. And it is beyond all controversy, that he uses it in this place (the 7th of Eccles) 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, inquiring 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 Pro. 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, Pro. 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 (Ecc. 7), Solomon means true moral goodness.

What our author urges concerning *many inventions*, whereas Adam’s eating of the forbidden fruit was but *one invention*, is of as little weight as the rest of what he says on this text. For the many lusts and corruptions 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 apostasy, 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 apostasy and corruption.

SECTION II

Concerning the kind of death, threatened to our first parents, if they should eat of 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 (Gen. 2:7). Anything besides this must be pure conjecture, without solid foundation.”

To this I would say; it is true, *Death is 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 innocence, in the favour 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 anything 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 *reward 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, rewards, 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 words. 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 favour*, 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 given, 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 to 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 (Rom. 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, Rom. 7:5, and chap. 8:13; 2 Cor. 3:7; 1 Cor. 15:56. In all which places, Dr. T. himself supposes the apostle to intend *eternal* death. [See p. 78. note on Rom. 7:5, and note on verse 6. Note on Rom. 5:20. Note on Rom. 7:8.] And when the apostle James speaks of death, as the proper reward, fruit, and end of sin (Jam. 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. Rev. 2:11; 20:6, 14, and 21:8. In the same sense the apostle John uses the word in his first epistle, 1 John 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. John 5:24, “He that heareth my word, and believeth, etc. hath everlasting life; and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from *death* to life.” Where, according to Dr. T.’s own way of arguing, it can not be the death which we now die, that Christ speaks of, but *eternal* death, because it is set in opposition to everlasting life. John 6:50, “This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not *die*.” Chap. 8:51, “Verily, verily, I say unto you, if a man keep my saying, he shall never see *death*.” Chap. 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 Mat. 10:28, and 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 recompense of sin. So, abundantly by the prophet Ezekiel. Eze. 3:18, “When I say unto the wicked man, thou shalt surely *die*.” 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, Eze. 33:18. In chap. 18:4. it is said, “The soul that sinneth it shall *die*.” (To the like purpose are Eze. 3:19, 20, and 18:4, 9, 13, 17-21, 24, 26, 28; chap. 33:8, 9, 12-14, 19.) 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. Eze. 18:21, “He shall surely live, he shall not *die*.” (So Eze. 18:9, 17, 19, and 22; and chap. 3:21). And it is evident the prophet Jeremiah uses the word in the same sense. Jer. 31:30, “Every one shall *die* for his own iniquity.” And the same death is spoken of by the prophet Isa. Isa. 11:4, “With the breath of his lips shall he *slay* the wicked” (see also Isa. 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 recompense of sin, using the word only in this sense. Pro. 11:19, “As righteousness tendeth to *life*, so he that pursueth evil pursueth it to his own *death*.” (So Pro. 5:5, 6, 23; Pro. 7:27; 8:36; 9:18; 10:21; 11:19; 14:12; 15:10; 18:21; 19:16, 21, and Pro. 23:13, 14). He can not 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 Pro. 12:28, “In the way of righteousness is *life*, and in the path-way thereof is no *death*” (so in Pro. 10:2; 11:4; 13:14; 14:27, and many other places). But 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 (Ecc. 2:4-16; 8:14, and 9:2, 3). His words are remarkable in Ecc. 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 Psalms uses the word *death* in the same sense, when he speaks of it as the proper wages and issue of sin, Psa. 34:21, “Evil shall *slay* the wicked.” He speaks of it as a certain thin, Psa. 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, Psa. 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, Deu. 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 Lev. 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 Rom. 10:5, and Gal. 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 Rom. 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, which confirmeth 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. [Note on Rom. 5:20. Par. p. 291-299.] In this sense also *Job* and his friends spake 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 in 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 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 saw 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 foetus 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*, but yet more commonly signifies *soul*. So the word *Lébh*, *heart*, no less properly signifies the *soul*, especially with regard to the will and affections, 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, as 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 ruing and misery*.

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 can 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 argues 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 modern languages, to signify the great degree of a thing, the importance or certainty 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 everyone 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 III

Wherein it is inquired, whether there be anything in the history of the three first chapters of 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 design 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, Gen. 1:28, “Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it;” and as much in events, to lead us to suppose Adam’s posterity to be included. There is as much of *a word* of his posterity in that threatening, as in those words (Gen. 1:29), “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. 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. 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, as SILENCE 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 (Page 27. S).

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 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, Gen. 3:17, 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 labour, 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 returning to the dust, did include Adam’s posterity. So, p. 20, speaking there of that sentence, “Observe (says

he) that we their posterity are in fact subjected to the same affliction and mortality, here by sentence inflicted upon our first parents.” p. 42. Note, “But yet men 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 *favours* 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 often 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, Gen. 3:17-19. *Dust 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 fore-mentioned death; he means the *sentence of 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 sinner by a *judicial sentence*, or to *condemn*.” p. 178. Par. on Rom. 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 Pro. 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 men*, 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 of 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 threatening, 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; (Rom. 5:16) "The judgment was by one to condemnation." (Rom. 5:18) "By the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation;" and (Rom. 5:19) "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." (Page 95, 90, 91. S.) 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 hands of the Judge, to be disposed of as he should think fit.* But there was no need of any sin of Adam, or of anybody 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 numbers 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 have existed, than 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 existence. 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 fulfilment 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 failed of 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 turning 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, have 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 threatenings 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 denies: he denies that death comes as any punishment at all; but insists that it comes only as a favour 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, and is the ground of the condemnation of all men to death,

implies, that death by this sentence is appointed to mankind as 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 *a 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 lead us to such a conclusion.

Though the sentence, Gen. 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 this 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 favour to his posterity.

Indeed, sometimes our author seems to suppose, that God meant the thing denounced in this sentence, as a favour both to Adam and his posterity. (Page 25, 45, 46. S.) But to his posterity, or mankind in general, who are the main subject, he ever insists, that it was purely intended as a favour. And therefore, one would have thought, the sentence should have been delivered, with manifestations and appearances of favour, and not of anger. How could Adam understand it as a promise of great favour, 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 favour 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 favours: *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 us 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 doubtless understood, that God had respect to his posterity, as well as himself; though God spake wholly in the second person singular, *Because thou hast 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, *If thou eat, thou shalt die:* the sentence says, *Because thou hast eaten thou shalt 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 everything that God said to Adam and Eve, but even in what he said to the very *birds* and *fishes*, Gen. 1:22. And also in what he said afterwards to Noah, Gen. 9, to Shem, Ham, and Japheth, and Canaan, Gen. 9:25-27. 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 land. 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, Gen. 16:12, and 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 it 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! To understand this curse otherwise than as terminating upon man through 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, Deu. 28:17, "Cursed shall be thy basket, and thy store:" and would he not be thought to talk very ridiculously, who should say, "Here is a curse 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 God's 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 Exo. 23:25, it is said, "He shall bless thy bread and thy water." And I suppose, never anybody 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 *for 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 Deu. 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, Gen. 5:29, "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*."

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 thereby 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, by what God had 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, Gen. 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 honour, and the greatest honour, 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 honour. So it was with regard to the new names of Abraham, Sarah, and Israel. Dr. T. himself observes, [Note annexed to 287.] that they who are saved by Christ, are called (2 Cor. 4:11), *the living* or *they that live*. Thus we find in the Old Testament, the *righteous* are called by the name of *the living*, Psa. 69:28, "Let them be blotted out of the book of the *living*, and not be written with the righteous." 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*, 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 race*, all from generation to generation turning to dust, through her folly - he should change 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*. As in Gen. 1:21, 24, 28; chap. 2:19; chap. 6:19, 7:23, and 8:1, and many other places in the Bible. 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, Gen. 5:29, "Saying, this same shall comfort us concerning our work, and toil of our hands, because of the ground which the Lord hath cursed." Accordingly he gave her this new name, not at her first creation, but immediately after the promise of a Redeemer. See Gen. 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 overthrown 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 favour? 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 expectation that their death would be the consequence, *unless he knew that they were included in the* THREATENING?

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 Hebrews, 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 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 **Eze. 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*: but 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; 1 Kin. 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 offence, 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 favour 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. 10:17. "Entreat the Lord that he may take away this *death*." Not only was Adam's soul ruined that day, but his BODY was ruined; it lost its beauty and vigour, 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, 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 anything 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 intermeddled 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 honour 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 save by Christ. [Page 120, etc. S.] - 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 ought 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 honour 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 condignity, 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 can not but think, it must appear to every impartial person, that Moses' account does, with sufficient evidence, lead all mankind, to whom his account is communicated, to understand, that God, in his constitution with 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 TWO

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 Psa. 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 altogether become filthy: there is none that doeth good; no, not one.” The like we have again, Psa. 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 changed 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 Rom. 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 Psalms, as a thing that *belongs to men, as of the human race, as sons of men*. Thus, in Psa. 4:2, “O ye *sons of men*, how long will ye turn my glory into shame? How long will ye love vanity?” etc. Psa. 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.” Psa. 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 weight 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 he compellation of sons of men most properly 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, Psa. 58, “Do ye judge uprightly, O ye sons 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 is Pro. 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 Rev. 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 Jer. 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 its deceitfulness to the man himself, or to others. So Ecc. 9:3, “Madness is in the heart of the *sons of men*, while they live.” And those words of Christ of Peter, Mat. 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, 1 Cor. 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 Hos. 6:7, “But they, like *men*, have transgressed the covenant.” To these places may be added Mat. 7:11, “If *ye being evil*, know how to give good gifts.” Jam. 4:5, “Do ye think that the scripture saith in vain, the spirit that *dwelleth in us, lusteth to envy*?” - 1 Pet. 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 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 Ecc. 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, savours 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 John 7:7, “The *world* can not hate you; but me it hateth; because I testify of it, that the works thereof are evil.” Chap. 8:23, “Ye are of this *world*: I am not of this *world*.” John 14:17, “The spirit of truth, whom the *world*

can not receive; because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him.” Chap. 15:18, 19, “If the *world* hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you. If ye were of the *world*, the *world* would love its own: but because ye are not of the *world*, but I have chosen you out of the *world*, therefore the *world* hateth you.” Rev. 14:3, 4, “These are they which were redeemed for the *earth* - redeemed from among men.” 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*.” 1 John 3:13, “Marvel not, my brethren, if the *world* hate you.” Chap. 4:5, “They are of the *world*, therefore speak they of the *world*, and the *world* heareth them.” Chap. 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 the habitation, by 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, John 8:44, “When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his *own*: for he is a liar, and the father of it.”

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 childhood, or from their childhood*. So Pro. 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 a moral nature. The word rendered *bound*, signifies (as observed in *Pool’s Synopsis*) a close and firm union. The same word is used in Pro. 6:21, “*Bind* them continually upon thine heart.” And chap. 7:3, “*Bind* them upon thy fingers, write them upon the table of thine heart.” [To the like purpose in Pro. 3:3; and Deu. 11:18, where this word is used.] The same verb is used, 1 Sam. 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, Gen. 8:21, “For the imagination of man’s heart is evil, *from his youth*.” 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 part 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 [Hebrew] word [meaning] *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. (A word of the same root is used to signify a *young child*, or a *little child*, in the following places; 1 Sam. 1:24, 25, 27; 1 Kin. 3:7, and 11:17; 2 Kin. 2:23; Job 33:25; Pro. 22:6; 23:13, and 29:21; Isa. 10:19; 11:6, and 65:20; Hos. 11:1. The same word is used to signify an *infant*, in Exo. 2:6, and 10:9; Jdg. 13:5, 7, 8, 24; 1 Sam. 1:22, and 4:21; 2 Kin. 5:14; Isa. 7:16, and 8:4.)

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 anything 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. 1 Sam. 12:2, “I am old and grey-headed - and I have walked before you from my *childhood* unto this day.” Psa. 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 my youth*; and hitherto have I declared thy wondrous works: now also, when I am old and grey-headed, forsake me not.” Psa. 129:1, 2, “Many a time have they afflicted me *from my youth*, may Israel now say: many a time have they afflicted me *from my youth*; yet have they not prevailed against me.” Isa. 47:12, “Stand now with the multitude of thy sorceries, wherein thou hast laboured *from thy youth*” (So also Isa. 47:15). 2 Sam. 19:7, “That will be worse unto thee, than all the evil that befell thee *from thy youth* until now.” Jer. 3:24, 25, “Shame hath devoured the labour of our fathers, *from our youth*. We have sinned against the Lord our God *from our youth*, even to this day.” [So Gen. 46:34; Job 31:18; Jer. 32:30, and 48:11; Eze. 4:14; Zec. 13:5.]

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 Jos. 6:21, “They utterly destroyed all, from the young to the old,” (so in the Hebrew), *i.e.* including both. (So Gen. 19:4, and Est. 3:13.)

And as mankind are represented in Scripture, as being of a wicked heart *from their youth*, so in other places they are spoken of as being thus *from the womb*. Psa. 58:3, “The wicked are estranged *from the womb*: they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies.” 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; 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 Isa. 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, Jer. 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. For 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, 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 emphatic 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 can not now recollect, where we have a sentence equal to it in the whole Bible, for an emphatic, lively, and strong representation of great wickedness of heart. Any one of the words, as such words are used in Scripture, would represent 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 drink 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, Psa. 14:4, “Have the workers of iniquity no knowledge, who eat up my people as they eat bread?” And the greatest eagerness of thirst is represented by thirsting as an animal thirsts after water, Psa. 42:1.

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, can not 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 endeavours 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 he 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 *born of a woman* is given as a reason of his not being clean; Job 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! 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 Job 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 *moral 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 he says, Psa. 51:5, “Behold, I was shaped in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me.” It alters not the case, as to the argument we are upon, whether the word *conceive me*, 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 sin*, it is not worth the while to dispute, whether it is expressly asserted, that he is *conceived 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 *Aeneid*, has here been produced, and made much of by some, as parallel with this, in what Dido says to Aeneas, in these lines:

Nec tibi diva parens, generis nec dardanus auctor,
Perfide: Sed duris genuit te cautibus horrens
Caucasus, hyrcanaeque admorunt ubera tygres.

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 how unlike and unparalleled 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 behaviour 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 anyone 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 (p. 142), "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 Saviour in his discourses, yet Adam's sin is not once expressly mentioned, after the three first chapters of *Genesis*, anywhere 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 Adam's 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 fit 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, in 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 humours 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 returning sinners! How many hundred times is God's special favour 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 *reason 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 THREE

OBSERVATIONS ON VARIOUS OTHER PLACES OF SCRIPTURE, PRINCIPALLY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, PROVING THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN.

SECTION I

*Observations on 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, 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. So Rom. 7:14. *The law is spiritual*, but I am *carnal*, sold under sin. He can not 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 powers 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 can not 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 can not mean, "there is no condemnation to them that walk not according to *the powers of a man*," etc. And when he says (Rom. 8:5, 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, Rom. 8:7 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*, can not please God;" he can not 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, can not please God. And when it is said, verse 9, "Ye are not in the flesh, but in the spirit;" the apostle can not mean, "ye are not in the *human nature, as constituted 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, John 3:6, “That which is born of the *flesh*, is *flesh*,” 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 man*, 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, dwelleth no good thing.* And it may be observed, that in the 8th chapter 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. Rom. 8:27, “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 *mind*. Col. 2:18, “Vainly puffed up by his *fleshly mind* by the mind of his flesh.” 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*, Rom. 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 Gal. 5 in the same manner as in the 8th of Romans. And there, assuredly, by *flesh* can not 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 Gal. 5:16 the apostle says, "Walk in the *spirit*, and ye shall not fulfil 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 Gal. 5:19, to the end), are plainly meant the same as 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 anything 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. 1 Cor. 5:5, "To deliver such an one to Satan, for the *destruction of the flesh*." We must have *no mercy on it*; we can not be *too cruel to it*; it must even *be crucified*. Gal. 5:24, "They that are Christ's, have *crucified the flesh* with the affections and lusts."

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. 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* that he hath given us. Chap. 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. Gal. 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. Rom. 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, Gal. 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*. Col. 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*, 1 Cor. 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, anybody 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. Mat. 24:22, "Except those days should be shortened, no *flesh* should be saved." Luke 3:6, "All *flesh* shall see the salvation of God." John 17:2, "Thou hast given him power over all *flesh*." [See also Acts 2:17; Rom 3:20; 1 Cor. 1:29; Gal. 2:16.] 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 *walk as men*, are the same thing. And so in other parts of Scripture, to *savour the things that be of man*, and to *savour 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 *savour the things 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 anything 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 everywhere 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 Rom 7:18. It is wholly opposite to God, and to subjection to his law, as appears by Rom. 8:7, 8. It is directly contrary to true holiness, and wholly opposes it, as appears by Gal. 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 Rom. 8:8. There is nothing in their nature, as they have it by the first birth, whence should arise any true subjection of God; as appears by Rom. 8:7. If there were anything 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 Cor. 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 1 Cor. 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 endeavoured 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, is meant 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 substitutes the word *carnal*. So the apostle Jude used the word in like manner, opposing it to *spiritual*, or *having the Spirit*, Jude 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, Jude 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, Jam. 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 1 Cor. 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 of 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 Saviour, John 14:16, 17, “He shall give you the Spirit of truth, whom the world can not receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.”

SECTION II

Observations on Romans 3:9-24

If the Scriptures represents 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 by 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. 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 (Rom. 1:16, 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 the 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 sepulchre; 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 ways, 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 sin. 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 Psalms, 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 there 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 of them righteous, of whom it is true,*

that they are not *righteous: no, not one; there is 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, but 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 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*, Mat. 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 (Acts 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 be spoken of their nation, by any such indirect argument as this, *Whatsoever things the law saith, it saith to them that are under the law.*

3. It would have been impertinent to the apostle's purpose, even as our author understands his purpose, for him to have gone about 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, that apostle's aim is to prove the great corruption of both Jews and Gentiles when Christ came into the world. (See Key, § 307, 310.)

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. (Page 102, 104, 117, 119, 120. and note on Rom. 3:10-19.) 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 - everyone - 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 is 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 every 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 can not 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 can not be justified by the works of the 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* (See note on Rom. 3:10-19; chap. 5:11, and chap. 9:30, 31). But the contrary is most manifest. The 26th and 28th verses of this third chapter, can not, 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 Rom. 4:5, "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 Psalms, 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 32d 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 (Rom. 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 Psa. 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 is further manifest, that the apostle is here speaking of personal justification, inasmuch as this place is evidently parallel with Gal. 3:10, 11, "For as many as are of the works of the law, are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is *everyone* 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 saying of the Old Testament is cited (Gal. 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 can not 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, can not 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 (Rom. 3:9-24) 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 everyone 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, herein 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, lips, and mouth, the organs of speech, in those words; "Their *throat* is an open sepulchre; 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 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 sepulchre*; to the tongue and lips, *deceit*, and *the poison of 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 everyone 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 III

Observations on Rom. 5:6-10 and Eph. 2:3 with the context, and Rom. 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 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 *sinner*s, 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 *sinner*s, *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 appellation, *sinner*s, *ungodly*, *enemies*, etc. were names by which the apostles in their writings were wont to dignify 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 [Page 114-120. See also Dr. T.'s Paraph. and notes on the place.]. 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 *sinner*s, *enemies*, *dogs*, etc. Themselves they accounted, in general (excepting the *publicans*, and the notoriously profligate), as the *friends*, the special *favourites* 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 everything 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, honour 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 *sinner*s 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 *sinner*s, 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 *sinner*s, and in what he said on those occasions (Mat. 8:5-13; Chap. 9:9-13; Chap. 11:19-24; Chap. 15:21-28; Luke 7:37 to the end; Chap. 17:12-19; Chap. 19:1-10; John 4:9, etc.; verse 39, etc. Compare Luke 10:29, etc.).

He opposed these notions and manners of the Jews in his parables (Mat. 21:28-32; Chap. 22:1-10; Luke 14:16-24. Compare Luke 13:28, 29, 30), and in his instructions to his disciples how to treat the unbelieving Jews (Mat. 10:14, 15); 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 on their being the children of God, because the children of Abraham, but the Gentiles by nature *sinner*s 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, Acts 10:28, which was before any of the apostolic epistles were written.

4. Of all the apostles, none were more 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 everything of this kind. He endeavours by all means that there might no longer be in them any remains of these old notions, in which they had been educated, or 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, *sinner, unclean, enemies*, and the like. He makes it almost his whole business, from the beginning of the epistle, Rom. 5:6, etc. 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, Rom. 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 any 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 *sinner*, 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 *sinner and ungodly*, must not be understood according as he used these 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, and endeavouring 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 *sinner*, 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 from making them better, that it condemned them, and was an occasion of their being *sinner*, in a higher degree, and more aggravated manner, and more effectually and dreadfully *dead* in sin (See Rom. 7:4-13, agreeably to those words of Christ, John 5:45).

It can not be justly objected here, that this apostle did, in fact, use this language, and call the gentiles *sinner*, in contradistinction to the Jews, in what he said to Peter, Gal. 2:15, 16, "We who are *Jews* by nature, and not *sinner* 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 favour it; but on the contrary, so as plainly to show his disapprobation of it; *q.d.* “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, despising others, calling the Gentiles *sinner*s, 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 *sinner*s 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 *sinner*s, 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 *sinner*s and *righteous* is here expressed in plain terms. “Scarcely for a *righteous man* will one die; 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 *sinner*s, 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 anyone 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 labouring abundantly, in the preceding part of the epistle, to prove, that the Jews were *sinner*s 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 *sinner*s and *enemies* for whom Christ died, does not mean only the Gentiles, is, that he includes *himself* among them, saying, *while WE were sinner*s, 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 Rom. 3:9, "What then? are *we* better than they?" That is, are we Jews better than the Gentiles?

It can not justly be alleged in opposition to this, that the apostle Peter puts himself with the heathen, 1 Pet. 4:3, "For the time past 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." 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 of 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: Tit. 3:3, "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 natural. 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 king's American dominions, had universally apostatised 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 deists, 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 Eph. 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 *quicken*ed and *raised up* from such a state of death, in a most marvellous display of free *rich grace and love*, and *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*, in 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, offspring, 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*, 1 Cor. 4:15, "In Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel." To say, the apostle uses the word in Eph. 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. (The following are all the other places where the word is used, Rom. 1:26; 2:14, 27; 11:21, 24, thrice in that verse; 1 Cor. 11:14; Gal. 2:15, 4:8; Jam. 3:7, twice in that verse; and 2 Pet. 1:4.)

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 1 Cor. 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 anything. 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 comes from a root 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 used one Greek word, speaking of the *children* of disobedience; but here another, which is a word derived, as observed, from the Greek meaning, 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 is, Gal. 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 favour with God 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, Eph. 2:5, "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 of *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. Eph. 2:1, "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 everything 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 Eph. 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, of 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, *were 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 himself, 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, and 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 (Eph. 2:11), 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 of whom he wrote, or of whom he speaks, with reference to their distinction from the Jews? So everywhere in this same epistle; as in chap. 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 Eph. 2:11, 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” (See also the following chapters, Eph. 3:6 and 4:17. And not only in this epistle, but constantly in other epistles; as Rom. 1:12, 13; chap. 11:13, 14, 17-25, 28, 30, 31; chap. 15:15, 16; 1 Cor. 12:2; Gal. 4:8; Col. 1:27; chap. 2:13; 1 Thes. 1:5, 6, 9; chap. 2:13, 14, 15, 16.)

Though I am far from thinking our author’s exposition of the 7th chap. 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 everyone who is under the law, and with equal reason everyone 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 anyone whatsoever. This appears by what he says when he comes to draw his conclusion, in the continuation of this discourse, Rom. 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 can not give life, because it is weak through the flesh,” is true with respect to *every one of mankind* (See note on Rom. 5:20). 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*, Rom. 7:5, 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, Rom. 8:3. Which, in his last place, is given as a reason why the law can not 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 can not 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 FOUR

CONTAINING OBSERVATIONS ON ROMANS 5:12, TO THE END.

SECTION I

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, when this present life is extinguished, and the body returns to the dust. That no more is meant in the 12, 14, 15, and 17th verses (p. 27) he declares as *evidently, clearly, and infallibly so*, because the apostle is till 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 Rom. 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 this place is widely different from the death we 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 by Christ (in the last verse of the chapter), is *opposed 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, death 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 yet 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 on 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 more consistent with *himself*, in laying it down as certain and *infallible*, 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 infallible*, than that Christ meant by *perishing* - in 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 - Mat. 10:39, "He that findeth his *life*

shall lose *it*; and he that loseth his *life* for my sake, shall find *it*” - 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 he, and the Scripture everywhere, 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 Rom. 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 significations. 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 anyone 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 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 everybody 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 changed 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, drawing the attention of the more thinking part of mankind everywhere, 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 began transgression*" (Page 56). 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 anyone 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 being 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 Phoenicians 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, Gen. 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," Rom. 5:12, "If *through* the offence of one, many be dead," verse 15, "*by* one that sinned - judgment was *by* one to condemnation," verse 16, "By one man's offence, death reigned *by* one," verse 17, "By the offence of one, judgment came upon all," etc. verse 18, "By one man's disobedience," verse 19. These *causal* particles, so variously repeated, unless we make mere nonsense of the discourse, signify some connection and dependence, by some sort of influence of that sin of one 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 favour and kindness. Nor can there be any dependence of this effect on that transgression of Adam, by any *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, can not 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 can not be through any kind of *tendency* of that sin to such an effect; because the effect comes only as a benefit, and is the fruit of mere favour: but sin has no tendency, either *natural or moral*, to *benefits*, and divine favours. 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 favour upon us, than he did upon Adam in innocence, *after 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.

SECTION II

Some observations on the connections, scope, and sense of this remarkable paragraph, Rom. 5:12, etc. With some reflections on the evidence which we here have of the 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 *sinner*s, *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, because they were the children of Abraham; and with them the apostle had laboured 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 endeavouring 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 (Rom. 5:6-10). (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, verse 12, to the end, he still pursues the same design of magnifying the grace of God, in the favour, 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 thing observable in the apostle's grand scope from the beginning of the epistle, is, that he endeavours 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 swallowed up, and may be 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 *same* 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 saying; 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 rule 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 infinitely 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, 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 endeavours to convince them of its falseness, in chap. 2:12-16. And he has a manifest regard again to the same thing here. (Rom. 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 thing 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 reigned* 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 death and ruin*, came into the world by Adam's sin; as *righteousness*, *justification*, and a *title to eternal life* come by Christ. Which point he confirms by this consideration, that from the very 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 guilt 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) was the proper punishment of *sin*. This they were taught in Moses' history of Adam, 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, endeavours 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 Rom. 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.* by showing this to be of *older date* than that law, and that it was established with Adam. Now, these things tended to lead the Jews to right notions of their law, not as the intended method of *justification*, nor as the original and universal rule of *condemnation*, but something *super-added* to both; super-added to the *latter*, to illustrate and confirm it, that the *offence might abound*; and super-added 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*

once. He would illustrate the grand point he had been upon from the beginning, even *justification through Christ's righteousness alone*, by showing how we are originally in a sinful miserable state, how we derive this 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 *nation*, and their *law*, which were very inconsistent with these doctrines. And he here endeavours 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, then 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 true, 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 reigned before any *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 thing 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 *adds* 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 super-added 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 constitutions 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*, Gen. 5:3. Another is, transgressing God’s covenant or law, *like him*, Hos. 6:7. *They, like Adam* (so, in the *Hebrew* and *Vulgate Latin*) *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 offence 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 more to his purpose to mention death reigning before the law of Moses was given. For the Jews looked on all nations besides themselves, as *sinner*s, 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 endeavour more briefly to represent in the following *paraphrase*.

Rom. 5:12. *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.* "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 offence*, or breach of that law; *all* thereby becoming *sinner*s in God's sight, and exposed to final destruction.

Rom. 5:13. *For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed, when there is no law.* "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 sinner*s, 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.

Rom. 5:14. *Nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression.* "But that at that time sin was *imputed*, and men were by their judge reckoned as *sinner*s, 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 infants, who could be sinners no other way than 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. 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 verse 12, “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 the (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, Rom. 5:15, “Through the offence of one, many be dead.” And again twice in verse 16, “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 verse 17, “By one man’s offence, death reigned by one.” So again in verse 18, “By the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation.” Again very plainly in verse 19, “By one man’s disobedience, many were made sinners.”

Here is everything 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 everywhere 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 Rom. 5:12 and verse 19 though owned everywhere 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 *offence*, *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 *offence 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 offence might abound: but where sin abounded, grace did much more abound." These words plainly show, that the OFFENCE spoken of so often, the offence of *one* man, became the sin of *all*. For when he says, "The law entered, that the offence might abound," his meaning can not be, that the offence 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, is this, that the utmost art *can not* 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! How 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 labour 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 place 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 imputation 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 offence, by the disobedience of one, and by one offence*. 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 respect (as hath been shown) to that universal corruption and wickedness, as well as guilt, of which he had before largely treated.

PART THREE

The evidence given us, relative to the doctrine of original sin, in what the Scriptures reveal concerning the redemption by Christ.

CHAPTER ONE

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's redemption*, as he redeems them from *death*, or as they by his righteousness have *justification*, and by his obedience are *made righteous*, in the *resurrection* of the body, in the sense of Rom. 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, everywhere 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 Saviour, 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*," Mat. 1:21. And the great doctrine of Christ's salvation is, that "he came into the world to save *sinners*," 1 Tim. 1:15. And that "Christ hath once suffered, the just for the *unjust*," 1 Pet. 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*," 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, 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 Gal. 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 Rom. 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,” Heb. 9:15-18, 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*,” Mat. 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. John 3:16, “God so loved the *world*, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him *should not perish*, but have everlasting life;” 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 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 *favours*, 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 *changes* 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. 2 Cor. 5:14-15, “We thus judge, that if one died for all, then were *all dead*.” Luke 19:10, “The Son of man is come to seek and save that which was *lost*.” 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 Saviour 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 comes 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.” (Page 88, 89 S) 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” (page 111, 68, 64. S). And in another place (page 67. S), “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 temptations, 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” (page 68. S). 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 vain*. Gal. 2:21, “If righteousness come by law, Christ is dead in vain;” - äéá ïïïö, without the article, *by law*, or the rule of right action, as our author explains the phrase

[Pref. to Par. on Rom. p. 143, 38.]. 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 or MIGHT have been effected by law itself, without his death.” [Note on Rom. 5:20, p. 297.] 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*, Gal. 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 fulfil. 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.” (Ibid.) But he says, “We are under a mild dispensation of GRACE, making allowance for our infirmities” (page 92. S). 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 can not 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 can not 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 in; for he says expressly, “*The cause of every effect is alone from it.*” (Page 128) And as to that sin which was the *cause*, the man needed no Saviour 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 Gentiles, neither heathens nor Christians, ever did or ever could stand in any *need* of a Saviour; 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 (Gal. 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* for 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 in to the heart, by divine power through Christ or his redemption, it is altogether inconsistent with this author's notions. With him, *inwrought* 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 (See p. 180, 245, 250). 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 (In p. 44, 50 and innumerable other places). But *sin* is not at all diminished. For he says, *our duty must be measured 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 (See page 234, 61, 64-72 S). 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 to his talents (See Paraph. on Rom. 2:9, also on verse 12). 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 anything at all. And thus the great redemption by Christ in every respect comes to nothing, with regard both to infants and adult persons.

CHAPTER TWO

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 everyone, that he be regenerated, or *born again*. John 3:3, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be begotten again, or born again, he can not see the kingdom of God." 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 of true holiness* (Page 144): 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* (Page 246, 248); and that it is *putting on the new nature of right action* (Page 251).

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, 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. Acts 3:19, "*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.*" 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 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*, Mat. 18:3, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye be

converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter the kingdom of heaven:” 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 Pet. 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 Mat. 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* (Mat. 3:11; Luke 3:3; Acts 13:24, and 19:4). And so is *regeneration*, or being born again, expressed by *baptism*; as is evident by such representations of regeneration as those: John 3:5, “Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit.” Tit. 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*. Deu. 30:6, “And the Lord thy God will *circumcise thine heart*, and the *heart* of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul.”

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 is the same as being *true Christians*), as of old, *proselytes* were made Jews by circumcision of the flesh. Rom. 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 Jer. 4:1-4, “If thou wilt *return*, O Israel, *return unto me*. *Circumcise* yourselves to the Lord, and put away the fore-skins *of your heart*.” And Deu. 10:16, “*Circumcise* therefore the foreskin of your *heart*, and be no more stiff-necked.” *Circumcision of the heart* is the same change of the heart that men experience in *repentance*; as is evident by Lev. 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 show; 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 heart, 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 Col. 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 often spoken of, and represented as *a dying unto sin, and a living unto righteousness*. This appears with great plainness in that last cited place, Col. 2:11, "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 *quickeneth together with him*; having forgiven you all trespasses."

The same appears by Rom. 6:3-5, "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptised into Jesus Christ, were baptised 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 2d Psalm, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee," are applied to Christ's *resurrection*, Acts 13:33. So in Col. 1:18, Christ is called the *first BORN from the dead*; and in Rev. 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*. 1 Pet. 1:3, "Who hath *begotten us again* to a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible." 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. 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 Rom. 1:4 speaking of that place in the 2d 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*, 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 everyone, 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 *newborn 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 spirit*, 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 Eze. 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 *Nicodemus*, of being *born again of water, and of the Spirit!* We have another like prophecy in Eze. 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, Tit. 3:5, “By the washing of *regeneration* and *renewing* of the Holy Ghost.”

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 *newborn 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 Rom. 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 is crucified, that the body of sin might be destroyed*. And in the 4th verse, converts in this 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 Col. 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 sins of the flesh*: but that is the same thing, in this apostle's language, *as putting off the old man*; as appears by Rom. 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 Eph. 4:22-24 and Col. 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*! Eph. 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 new*. 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*. (Rom. 7:22; 2 Cor. 4:16; 1 Pet. 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 *new 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*, Eph. 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* (Page 149-153. S), as though thereby was meant nothing *personal*; but that by the *old man* was meant the *heathen state*, and by the *new man* like 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 colour he has for it is, that the apostle once calls the Christian church a *new man*. (Eph. 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* (Exo. 4:22; Gal. 4:1, 2) a *servant of God* (Isa. 41:8, 9 and 44:1). *The daughter of God, and spouse of Christ* (Psa. 45:10, 13, 14; Rev. 19:7). Nevertheless, would it be reasonable to argue, that such appellations, as a *servant of God, child of God*, etc. are *always* or *commonly* to be taken as signifying only the *church* of God in general, or great 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 [Page 224], “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 *being born again*, and *spiritually raised* from death to a state of new existence and life, having a *new heart created 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 man* 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 *whole 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 newborn child is a *new creature*. So, when a man is *born again*, *he is created again*; in that *new birth*, there is a *new creation*; and therein he becomes as a *newborn 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*, Psa. 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 *new man*, is spoken of expressly as brought to pass by a work of *creation*. Col. 3:9, 10, “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. Eph. 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 2 Cor. 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 certainty, with respect to *every* man born of the race of Adam, by ordinary generation, *that unless he be born again, he can not 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 John 3:3-11. So it is plain by 2 Cor. 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 he 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 (Eze. 36:25 compared with Acts 11:16 and John 3:5). So the washing of regeneration, or the NEW BIRTH, is a change from a state of wickedness. (Tit. 3:3-5) Men are spoken of as purified in their regeneration (1 Pet. 1:22, 23; see also 1 John 2:29 and 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. (Eze. 11:19 and 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 characterises the OLD MAN, which is put off, when men are renewed in the spirit of their minds, and put on the NEW MAN. (Eph. 4:22-24; Col. 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, Rom. 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, Eph. 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 FOUR

Containing answers to objections.

CHAPTER ONE

CONCERNING THE OBJECTION, 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 often 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 *necessary*; and if necessary, then *no* sin, nor anything we are blamable for, or that can in any respect be our fault, being what we can not help: and he urges, that sin must proceed from our own *choice*, etc.

Here I would observe in general, that the fore-mentioned 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 confess to the fore-mentioned 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*, *redemption*, *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 can not be sin, it can not 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 produceth, and which proceedeth from it* (Page 128). 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 *effect*, 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* (Page 190), and calls that choice *wicked*, from which depravity and *corruption proceeds* (Page 200. See also p. 216). 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 *choice*.” 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 its 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 a *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* “can not be sinful,” because it does not “proceed from our own choice,” or any foregoing act of our will; it being, 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 this, it seems, he must have a *disobedient will*” *before* he sins; for the cause 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 if 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 dogmatic 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 [Contents of Rom. chap. 7 in Notes on the epistle.], that "the *law* reaches to all the *latent principles 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, can not 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. (Page 125) 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's* 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 TWO

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 our nature, who formed us in the womb, with being the author of a sinful corruption of nature; and that it is highly injurious 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* [p. 137, 187-189, 256, 258, 260. 143. S. and other places.]

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 minds, but like a *taint, tincture, or infection*, altering the natural constitution, faculties, and dispositions of our souls (Page 187). That sin and evil dispositions are **IMPLANTED** in the foetus in the womb” [Page 146, 148, 149. S. and the like in many other places.]. 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 anything 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 may be 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, honour, 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) such as are *above* those principles that are 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, woeful 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 *himself*, 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 honour, 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 honour, 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 honour 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, honour, 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 of the Will* [Part IV § 9.]. 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 [Key, § 388, note: and Par. on Rom. 1:24.]. Now, if the *continuance of sin*, and its 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 God's 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, *viz. 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." [Page 134. S. See also with what vehemence this is urged in p. 137. S.] 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 *established 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, page 146, 187) *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 he 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 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 *being 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 cause of the CONTINUANCE of the course of nature*, to be *the cause of their CONTINUED wickedness*. Dr. T. says (Page 136. S), "God would not *make* any 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 *make* 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 can not 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 from *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 can not 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 it is not proper and just for such an agent so to dispose, *in this case*, and only in 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 THREE

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 main objections against 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 clamour 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 whole 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 he and they had all coexisted, like a tree with many branches; allowing only for the difference necessarily resulting from the place Adam stood in, as head or root 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 matter. The *guilt* a man has upon his soul at first existence, is one and simple, *viz.* the guilt of the original apostasy, the guilt of the sin by which the species 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 *distinct 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 properly 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 *union* 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 apostasy 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 *coexistence* 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 heart, and the imputation of that sin, are 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 consistency with God's *holiness* and *righteousness*, notwithstanding Adam had been guilty of no offence 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 changes or effects through all the *branches* coexist 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 [See also p. 39, note, § 8, etc. 48 § 12, etc. 80 § 9, etc. 82 § 17, etc. 121 § 7, etc.].

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 *sinners* 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 [Page 13. 150, 151, 156, 261. 108, 109, 111. S.]. Whatever black colours 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 apostasy, and its infinitely terrible consequences. It has been demonstrated, and shown 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 ruin [Part I Chap. I, the three first sections.]. And God either thus deals with mankind, because he looks upon them as *one* with their first father, and so treats them as *sinful* and *guilty* by his apostasy; 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*, subjects 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 also 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 *sorrows 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 these 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 everyone had been appointed to stand for himself personally, that it was, 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 *persevere* 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 everyone 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 *mature* 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 *less 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 *hurt* 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 *sovereign 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 this 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 everyone 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 things; 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 can not 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, that 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 permits it*; saying, that *the course of nature, separate from the agency of God, is no cause, 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* (Page 134. S); and that *God, the original of all being, is the ONLY CAUSE of all natural effects* (Page 140. S). Here it is worthy also to be observed, what Dr. Turnbull says of the *laws of nature*, as cited from Sir Isaac Newton (Mor. Phil. p. 7). “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” (Mor. Phil. p. 9).

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. Or, if same consciousness be *one thing* necessary to personal identity, and this depends on God’s sovereign *constitution*, it will still follow that person 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, today, and forever*. 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 what 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 can not be the *antecedent existence* of the same substance. For instance, the existence of the body of the *moon*, at this present moment, can not 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 *coexists* 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, can not 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 *coexist* 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, are 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 preservation, 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 *preserves* 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 is not merely in part from *God*, but wholly from him; and not in any part, or degree, from its *antecedent existence*. For, to suppose that its antecedent existence *concurrs* 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* 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 colour, 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 returning; renewed every moment, as the colours of bodies are every moment renewed by the light that shines upon them; and all is constantly proceeding from God, as light from the sun. *In him we live, and move, and have 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 appears, 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 purposes*; 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 forever. 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 everything 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 these 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 *consequences* 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 fore-mentioned 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 that 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 *Saviour*, 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 united and blended in society, and to partake together in the natural and common goods and evils of this lower world.

Dr. T. urges (Page 14), 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 *words* 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 *unscriptural*; 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 apostasy, 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 apostasy. And therefore the sin of the apostasy is not

theirs, merely because God *imputes* it to them; but it is *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, Eze. 18:1-20 (which Dr. T. alleges, p. 10, 11. S). Where God reprove the Jews for the use they made of that proverb, "The fathers have eaten sour 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 *disapproves* 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 father, nor the father bear 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 plain sense, shows, that nothing is intended in the least degree *inconsistent* with what has been supposed concerning Adam's posterity sinning and falling in *his apostasy*. The *occasion* is, the people's murmuring at God's methods under the Mosaic dispensation; agreeable to that in Lev. 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 *carnal* 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 (Jer. 15:4) and agreeable to what is said in that confession, Lam. 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 Jer. 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 behaviour of their particular *ancestors*; but everyone 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 anything 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 can not 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, forever 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., 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 Adam's 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 on 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 can not 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 infants 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 neighbours, what was due to me from *another*, 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 can not 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 no 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 one* at all.

It seems to me pretty manifest, that none can, in good consistency 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 *sinner*s, 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 FOUR

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.* (See page 82, etc. S) - 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 beforehand, 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. Gen. 5:29, "And he called his name Noah (*i.e. rest*), 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 Gen. 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 favour* to mankind, which was in consequence of *smelling a sweet savour* in the sacrifice which Noah offered. And it is very evident by the epistle to the Hebrews, that the ancient sacrifices never obtained the favour 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 (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 *dominion 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 savour*, and by which it procured these blessings, have *dominion* over the creatures, through Christ, in a more excellent sense than Adam in innocence; 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 (1 Cor. 15:27 and Heb. 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 honourable and excellent dominion over the creatures, 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 favour 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 (Page 256, 357, 260. 71-74. S).

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 can not 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 case*, 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 last 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, page 72, 73. S) if *the whole world lies in wickedness*, and 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 can not 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 help 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. Accordingly 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 (Page 65, 66, 111. S).

But this objection will vanish, if we consider what is the *end* or *design* of that 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 seal 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 partakers 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 apostasy; 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 apostasy, as 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 apostasy, by a cordial adherence to Christ, the great restorer. The Judge will also make use of the *good works* 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 *degree* 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 apostasy 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*

one 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" (Page 3, etc. 105). 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; (Lev. 17:3, 4 and 2 Tim. 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 Lev. 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. 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, and

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 by 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 principles of iniquity, and seeds of sin, before they are capable of moral action* (Page 77, 78. S), viz. That *little children are made PATTERNS of humility, meekness, and innocence* (Mat. 18:3; 1 Cor. 14:20; and Psa. 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 *exercises* and *fruits* of sin, *harmlessness* as to the hurtful effects of it; and that *image* of meekness and humility arising from this, in conjunction with a natural tenderness of mind, fear, self-diffidence, yieldableness, and confidence in parents and others older than themselves. And so, they are recommended as patterns of virtue no more than *doves*, which are an harmless sort of creatures, and have an *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 so 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* (Page 74, 75. S).

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 *complaisant* 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 bear 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 *shame* 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 endeavours 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, 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 an ill opinion of our fellow creatures, and so 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 endeavouring to persuade ourselves that we are vastly *better* than in truth we are, tends 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 pity, 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 (Page 231, and some other places).

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* (Page 139 and 259).

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 sin, 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 disease, 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 (Page 145), "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 latter 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 resurrection 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, that 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 *ought 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* (Page 242, 243).

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* (Mat. 9:12); That *he came to seek and to save that which was lost* (Mat. 18:11; Luke 19:10). 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* (Mat. 18:3); and, that all were *sinners*, as well as those whose blood *Pilate* mingled with their sacrifices, etc. and that *everyone who did not repent, should perish* (Luke 13:1-5); Withal directing everyone to *pray* to God for *forgiveness of sin* (Mat. 6:12; Luke 11:4); Using our necessity of forgiveness from God, as an argument with all to forgive the injuries of their neighbours (Mat. 6:14, 15 and 18:35); Teaching, that earthly *parents*, though kind to their children, are in themselves *evil* (Mat. 7:11); And signifying, that things *carnal* and *corrupt* are properly *the things of men* (Mat. 16:23); Warning his disciples rather to beware of *men*, than of wild beasts (Mat. 10:16, 17); Often representing the WORLD as *evil*, as *wicked* in its works, at *enmity* with *truth* and *holiness*, and *hating him* (John 7:7, 8:23, 14:17 and 15:18, 19); Yea, and teaching plainly, that all men are extremely and inexpressibly sinful, owing *ten thousand talents* to their divine creditor (Mat. 18:21, to the end).

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 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 search 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 probably, 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 *Pharisees*, 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 doctrines 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 *favour*, 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 melancholy 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, truth, 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 *treasure on the nature of true VIRTUE*, lying by me prepared for the press, which may ere long be exhibited to public view (See Dissertation concerning the Nature of True Virtue, p. 122.).

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 [See his Preface, and p. 6. 237, 263, 267, 175. S.]; nor on his magisterial *assurance*, appearing on any 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 [Page 110, 125, 150, 151, 159, 161, 183, 188. 77. S.] - *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 favour 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, everywhere in his epistles, among 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 had 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 a 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 apostle's writings, which before seemed very *plain* to them. Thus they are prepared, by a prepossession in *favour* of these *new writers*, to entertain a favourable thought 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 agreed 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 Christians, 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 epistles. 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*, too 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 now at length, 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 cause; 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 uses, 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* these writers indulge. The plainest and most nervous discourse is analysed and criticised, till it either dissolves into nothing, or becomes a thing of little significance. The Holy Scripture is subtilised into a mere mist; or made to evaporate 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 mortals, 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 whereto he sends it.* Let GOD arise, and plead his own cause, and glorify his own great name. AMEN.