all men to condemnation ;” and therefore the guilt of that offence muſt be reckoned to all men, or they could not be juſtly condemned for it. That Adam’s sin is imputed to his poſterity, appears not only from the words, “ by one man’s diſobedience many were made ſinners ;” but likewiſe from the oppoſite clauſe, “ ſo by the obedience of One ſhall many be made righteous ;” for the many ordained to eter­nal life, for whom Chriſt died, are made righteous, or juſtified, only through the imputation of his righteouſneſs to them; and therefore it follows, that all men are made ſinners only through the imputation of Adam’s diſobedience.

To this doctrine it is ſaid to be no objection that Adam’s poſterity were not in being when his sin was committed ; for though they had not then actual being, they had yet a virtual and repreſentative one. They were in him both *ſeminally* and *federally,* and sinned in him@@\* ; juſt as Levi was in the loins of Abraham, and paid in him tithes to Melchi- zedeck @@\*. From Adam, as their common parent, they de­rive a corrupt nature; but it is only from him, as their fe­deral head, that they derive a ſhare of his guilt, and are ſubjected to his puniſhment. That he was a federal head to all his poſterity, the divines of this ſchool think evident from his being called a figure of Chriſt@@\*; and the firſt Adam deſcribed as natural and earthly, in contradiſtinction to Chriſt the second Adam deſcribed as ſpiritual and the Lord from heaven ; and from the puniſhment threatened againſt his sin being inflicted not on himſelf only, but on all his ſucceeding offspring. He could not be a figure of Chriſt, ſay they, merely as a man ; for all the ſons of Adam have been men as well as he, and in that ſenſe were as much fi­gures of Chriſt as he ; yet Adam and Chriſt are conſtantly contrasted, as though they had been the only two men that ever exiſted, becauſe they were the only two heads of their reſpective offspring. He could not be a figure of Chriſt on account of his extraordinary production ; for though both were produced in ways uncommon, yet each was brought into the world in a way peculiar to himſelf. The firſt Adam was formed of the duſt of the ground ; the se­cond, though not begotten by a man, was born of a wo­man. They did not therefore reſemble each other in the manner of their formation, but in their office as covenant­heads ; and in that alone the compariſon between them is exact.

Nor have any of the poſterity of Adam, it is ſaid, reaſon to complain of ſuch a procedure. Had he ſtood in his in­tegrity, they would have been, by his ſtanding, partakers of all his happineſs ; and therefore ſhould not murmur at re­ceiving evil through his fall. If this do not ſatisfy, let it be conſidered, that ſince God, in his infinite wiſdom, thought proper that men ſhould have a head and repreſen­tative, in whoſe hands their good and happineſs ſhould be placed, none could be ſo fit for this high ſtation as the com­mon parent, made after the image of God, so wiſe, ſo holy, juſt, and good. Laſtly, to ſilence all objections, let it be remembered, that what God gave to Adam as a federal head, relating to himſelf and his poſterity, he gave as the Sovereign of the univerſe, to whom no created being has a right to aſk, “ What doſt thou@@\* ?”

Such are the conſequences of Adam’s fall, and ſuch the doctrine of original sin, as maintained by the more rigid followers of Calvin. That great reformer, however, was not the author of this doctrine. It had been taught, ſo early as in the beginning of the fifth century, by St Auguſtine, the celebrated biſhop of Hippo (see Augustine) ; and the authority of that father had made it more or leſs prevalent in both the Greek and Roman churches long be­fore the Reformation. Calvin was indeed the moſt eminent modern divine by whom it has been held in all its rigour ; and it conſtitutes one great part of that theological ſyſtem which, from being taught by him, is now known by the name of *Calvinism.* Thoſe by whom it is embraced main­tain it with zeal, as, in their opinion, forming, together with the other tenets of their maſter, the only pure ſyſtem of evangelical truths ; but it hath met with much oppoſition in some of the Lutheran churches, as well as from private divines in the church of England, and from the great bo­dy of Dutch remonſtrants (see Calvinism, Arminians, and Synod of Dort) ; and of their objections it is now our duty to give a candid view, as well as of the doctrine which they ſubſtitute in its ſtead.

They begin then with alleging, that if it was as ſovereign of the univerſe that God gave to Adam what he re­ceived in paradiſe relating to himſelf and his poſterity, Adam could in no ſenſe of the words be a federal head ; be­cauſe, upon this ſuppoſition, there was no covenant. The Sovereign of the Univerſe may unqueſtionably diſpenſe his benefits, or withhold them, as seems expedient to his infinite wiſdom ; and none of his ſubjects or creatures can have a right to ſay to him, What doſt thou ? But the diſpenſing or withholding of benefits is a transaction very different from the entering into covenants ; and a judgment is to be formed of it upon very different principles. Every thing around us proclaims that the Sovereign of the Univerſe is a being of perfect benevolence ; but, ſay the diſciples of the ſchool now under conſideration, the diſpenſation given to Adam in paradiſe was ſo far from being the offspring of benevolence, that, as it is underſtood by the followers of Calvin, it cannot possibly be reconciled with the eternal laws of equity. The ſelf-exiſtent and all-ſufficient God might or might not have created ſuch a being as man ; and in ei­ther case there would have been no reaſon for the queſtion “ What doſt thou ?” But as ſoon as he determined to create him capable of happineſs or miſery, he would not have been either benevolent or juſt, if he had not placed him in a ſtate where, by his own exertions, he might, if he choſe, have a greater ſhare of happineſs than of miſery, and find his exiſtence, upon the whole, a bleſſing. They readily acknow­ledge, that the exiſtence of any created being may be of longer or ſhorter duration, according to the good pleaſure of the Creator ; and therefore they have no objection to the apoſtolic doctrine, that “ in Adam all die :” for immortali­ty being not a debt, but a *free gift,* may be beſtowed upon any terms whatever, and with perfect juſtice withdrawn when theſe terms are not complied with. Between death, however, as it implies a loſs of conſciouſneſs, and the ex­treme miſery of eternal life in torments, there is an immenſe difference. To death all mankind might juſtly be ſubjected through the offence of one ; becauſe they had originally no claim of right to be exempted from it, though that one and they too had remained for ever innocent : but eternal life in torments is a puniſhment which a God of juſtice and benevolence can never inflict but upon perſonal guilt of the deepeſt die. That we can perſonally have incurred guilt from a crime committed ſome thousands of years before we were born, is impoſſible. It is indeed a notion, if ſuch a notion can be formed, as contrary to Scripture as to reaſon and common ſenſe: for the apoſtle expreſsly informs us @@\*, “ that sin is the tranſgreſſion of ſome law ;” and the sin of Adam was the tranſgreſſion of a law which it was never in our power either to observe or to break. Another apoſtle@@\* assures us, that “ where no law is, there is no tranſgreſſion;” but there is now no law, nor has been any theſe 5000 years, forbidding mankind to eat of a particular fruit; for, accord­ing to the Calviniſts themselves@@\*, Adam had no ſooner committed his firſt sin, by which the covenant with him was broken, than he ceaſed to be a covenant-head. The law
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