can bring a clean thing out of an unclean ? Not one,” he is ſpeaking, ſay they, not of the pravity of our nature, but of its frailty and weakneſs, of the ſhortneſs and miſery of human life. The ſentence is proverbial ; and as it is uſed only to ſignify, that nothing can be more perfect than its original, it muſt, whenever it occurs, be understood accord­ing to the ſubject to which it is applied. That in the place under conſideration it refers to our mortality, they think plain From the context ; and Dr Taylor adds @@\*, with ſome plauſibility, that if the words refer to the guilt which we are suppoſed to derive from Adam, they will prove too much to ſerve the common ſcheme of original sin. They will prove that our natural and inherent pravity, ſo far from rendering us fit ſubjects of wrath, may be urged as a reaſon why God ſhould not even bring us into judge­ment ; for the patriarch’s whole expoſtulation runs thus, Doſt thou open thine eyes upon ſuch a one, and bringeſt me into judgment with thee ? Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?”

The other text, quoted from the ſame book, they think still leſs to the purpoſe ; for Eliphaz is evidently contracting the creature with the Creator; in compariſon with whom, he might well ſay, without alluding to original guilt, “ what is man that he ſhould be clean ? and he who 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, who drinketh iniquity like water ?” He does not ſay, who derives by birth an iniquitous nature ; for he knew well, that as we are born, we are the pure workmanſhip of God, “ whoſe hands have faſhioned and formed every one of us ;” but “ who drin*nketh* iniquity like water,” who maketh himſelf iniquitous by running headlong into every vicious practice.

Of the text quoted from the fifty-firſt pſalm in ſupport of the doctrine of original sin, Dr Taylor labours @@\*, by a long and ingenious criticiſm, to prove that our tranſlators have miſtaken the ſenſe. The word which they have ren­dered *ſhapen,* he (hews to be uſed once by Iſaiah, and twice in the book of Proverbs, to ſignify *brought forth* ; and that which is rendered *conceived me,* is never, he ſays, employed in ſcripture to denote human conception. In this laſt re­mark, however, he is contradicted by a great authority, no leſs indeed than that of Mr Parkhurſt@@\*, who ſays, that the LXX conſtantly render it by ϰισσαω or εγϰισσαω, and the Vulgate generally by *concipio.* Without taking upon us to decide between theſe two eminent Hebrew ſcholars, we ſhall only obſerve, that upon one occasion@@\* it certainly de­notes ideas much groffer than thoſe which the Pſalmist muſt have had of his mother’s conception ; and that there, at leaſt, Dr Taylor properly tranſlates it *incaleſcebant,* adding, “ de hoc vero incaleſcendi genere loqui Davidem nemo sanus exiſtimare poteſt. Matrem enim incaluiſſe, aut ipſum calesecisce eo modo quo incaleſcerent Jacobi pecudes Regem dicere, prorſus indecorum et abſurdum,” He contends, however, that the original force of the word is *to be hot,* and that it is applied to *conception,* to *resentment,* to *warmth* by which the body is nouriſhed, to *idolaters* in love with idols, and to the heat of metals. The heat of idolaters, of reſentment, and of metals, are evidently foreign to the Pſalmiſt’s purpoſe ; and the idea conveyed by the word *incalescere* being ſet aside for the reasons already aſſigned, there remains only the warmth by which the body is nouriſhed, and of that warmth our author is confident that David ſpoke.

If this criticiſm be admitted, the whole verſe will then run thus: “ Behold I was born in iniquity, and in sin did my mother nurſe me ;” which hath no reference to the ori­ginal formation of his conſtitution, but is a periphraſis of his being a *firmer from the womb,* and means nothing more than that he was a *great sinner,* or had contracted *early habits* of sin. He no more deſigned to ſignify in this verſe, that by ordinary generation he had a nature conveyed to him which was “ utterly indiſpoſed, diſabled, and oppoſite to all that is ſpiritually good, and wholly and continually inclined to evil,” than he meant in another@@\* to ſigniſy ſtrictly and properly that “ the wicked are eſtranged from the womb, and tell lies as ſoon as they are born ;” or than Job meant to ſignify @@\*, that from the moment he came from his mother’s womb he had been a guide to the widow and a ſuccour to the fatherlels. All theſe are hy­perbolical forms of expression ; which, though they appear ſtrained, and perhaps extravagant, to the phlegmatic inha­bitants of Europe, are perfectly ſuited to the warm imagi­nations of the orientals, and to the genius of eaſtern lan­guages. They mean not that Job was *bom* with *habits* of *virtue,* that the wicked actually *walked,* and *ſpoke,* and *ſpoke lies* from the irritant of their *birth,* or that the Pſalmiſt was really *ſhapen* in s*in* and *conceived in iniquity.* This laſt ſen­tence, if interpreted literally, would indeed be groſsly im­pious : it would make the inſpired penman throw the whole load of his iniquity and sin from off himſelf upon *him* who ſhaped and upon *her* who conceived him ; even upon that God “ whoſe hands had made him and faſhioned him, and whom he declares that he will praiſe for having made him fear­fully and wonderfully,” and upon that parent who conceived him with ſorrow, and brought him forth with pain, and to whom the divine law commanded him to render honour and gratitude. “ But if, after all (ſays Dr Taylor @@\*), you will adhere to the literal ſenſe of the text for the common doctrine of *original sin,* ſhew me any good reaſon why you ought not to admit the literal ſenſe of the text, *this is my body,* for *transubstantiation* ? If you ſay, it is abſurd to ſuppoſe that Chriſt ſpeaks of his real natural body; I ſay, it is likewise abſurd to ſuppoſe that the Pſalmiſt ſpeaks of his being really and properly ſhapen in iniquity, and conceived in sin. If you ſay, that the ſenſe of the words *this is my body* may be clearly explained by other texts of ſcripture where the like forms of ſpeech are uſed; I ſay, and have shewn, that the Pſalmiſt’s ſenſe may as clearly and evidently be made out by parallel texts, where you have the like kind of expression. If you ſay that tranſubſtantiation is attended with conſequences hurtful to piety, I ſay that the common doc­trine of original sin is attended with conſequences equally hurtful ; for it is a principle apparently leading to all man­ner of iniquity to believe that sin is natural to us, that it is interwoven and ingrafted into our very conſtitution from our conception and formation in the womb.”

The Arminians having thus, as they think, proved that the poſterity of Adam are not in any ſenſe rendered guilty by his sin, contend, that the death threatened againſt his eating of the forbidden fruit, and which, in conſequence of his tranſgression, came upon all men, can mean nothing more than the loſs of that vital principle which he received when God breathed into his noſtrils the breath of life, andhe became a living ſoul. Every thing beyond this is pure conjecture, which has no foundation in the ſcriptures of truth, and is directly contrary to all the notions of right and wrong which we have been able to acquire from the ſtudy of thoſe very ſcriptures. It is not conceivable from any thing in the hiſtory, that Adam could underſtand it of the loſs of any other life than that which he had lately received, for no other life is ſpoken of to which the threat­ened death can be oppoſed; and in ſuch circumſtances it was
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