no equal, and to whom nothing can be compared ; and therefore he will employ these terms with caution. When he speaks of his mercy and compassion, he will not consi­der them as feelings wringing the heart like the mercy and compassion experienced by man, but as rays of pure and disinterested benevolence. When he thinks of the stupen­dous system of nature, and hears it perhaps said that God formed it for his own glory, he will reflect that God is so infinitely exalted above all his creatures, and so perfect in himself, that he can neither take pleasure in their applause, nor receive any accession of any kind from the existence of ten thousand worlds. The immense fabric of nature, there­fore, only displays the glory or perfections of its Author to *us,* and to other *creatures* who have not faculties to compre­hend him in himself.

When the contemplative man talks of *serving* God, he does not dream that his services can increase the divine fe­licity ; but means only that it is his duty to obey the divine laws. Even the pronoun *He,* when it refers to God, cannot be of the same import as when it refers to man ; and by the philosophical divine it will seldom be used but with a men­tal allusion to this obvious distinction.

As the man who daily venerates the Author of his being will not speak of him on trivial occasions, so will he be still further from calling upon him to witness impertinences and falsenood. (See Oath). He will never mention his name but with a *pause,* that be may have time to reflect in silence on his numberless perfections, and on the immense distance between himself and the Being of whom he is speaking. The slightest reflection will convince him that the world, with all that it contains, depends every moment on that God who formed it ; and this conviction will compel him to wish for the divine protection of himself and his friends from all dangers and misfortunes. Such a wish is in effect a prayer, and will always be accompanied with adoration, confession, and thanksgiving. (See Prayer). But adora­tion, confessions, supplications, and thanksgiving constitute what is called *worship,* and therefore the worship of God is a natural duty. It is the addressing of ourselves as his de­pendants to him as the supreme cause and governor of the world, with acknowledgments of what we enjoy, and petitions for what we really want, or he knows to be convenient for us.

***Obs.*** See Wollaston's Religion of Nature delineated.

Part II.—Doctrines concerning Μαν.

Sect. I—*Of the Original State of Man.*

Ιν the Mosaic account of the creation we are told that “ God created man in his own image ; in the image of God created he him ; male and female created he them,” Gen. i. 27. In these words we have a description of the nature of man as he came at first from the hands of his Creator, into the proper meaning of which it is of great importance that we should inquire.

The answer to this inquiry depends upon the meaning we attach to the words “ in the image of God;” for it is by that phrase, that the peculiarity of man's nature, and his pre-eminence over the brutes, is marked. Now, this image or likeness must have been found either in his body alone, his soul alone, or in both united. That it could not be in his body alone, is obvious ; for the infinite and omnipotent God is allowed by all men to be without body, parts, or passions, and therefore to be such as nothing corporeal can possibly resemble.

If this likeness is to be found in the human soul, it comes to be a question in what faculty or power of the soul it con­sists. Some have contended, that man is the only creature on this earth who is animated by a principle essentially dif­ferent from matter ; and hence they have inferred, that he is said to have been formed in the Divine image, on account of the immateriality of that vital principle which was in­fused into his body when “ the Lord God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul,” (Gen. ii. 7.) That this account of the animation of the body of man indicates a superiority of the human soul to the vital principle of all other animals, cannot, we think, be questioned ; but it does not therefore follow, that the hu­man soul is the only immaterial principle of life which ani­mates any terrestrial creature. It has been shewn else­where (see Metaphysics), that the power of sensation, at­tended with individual consciousness, as it appears to be in all the higher species of animals, cannot result from any organical structure, or be the quality of a compound extend­ed being. The vital principle in such animals, therefore, must be immaterial as well as the human soul ; but as the word *immaterial* denotes only a negative notion, the souls of men and brutes, though both immaterial, may yet be sub­stances essentially different. This being the case, it is plain that the Divine image in which man was formed, and by which he is distinguished from the brute creation, cannot consist in the mere circumstance of his mind being a substance different from matter, but in some positive quality which distinguishes him from every other creature on this globe.

About this characteristic quality various opinions have been formed. By Calvinists it is generally supposed, “ that the image of God in Adam appeared in that rectitude, righteousness, and holiness, in which he was made ; for God made man upright (Eccles, vii. 2), a holy and right­eous creature ; which holiness and righteousness were in their kind perfect ; bis understanding was free from all error and mistakes ; his will biased to that which is good ; his affections flowed in a right channel towards their pro­per objects ; there were no sinful notions and evil thoughts in his heart, nor any propensity or inclination to that which is evil ; and the whole of his conduct and behaviour was according to the will of God. And this righteousness (say they) was *natural,* and not personal and acquired. It was not obtained by the exercise of his free-will, but was creat­ed with him, and belonged to his mind, as a natural faculty or instinct.” Gill’s Body of Divinity, b. iii. ch. 3. They, therefore, call it *original righteousness,* and suppose that it was lost in the fall.

To this doctrine many objections have been made. It has been said that righteousness consisting in right actions proceeding from proper principles, could not be created with Adam and make a part of his nature; because nothing which is produced in a man, without his knowledge and con­sent, can be in him either virtue or vice. Adam, it is add­ed, was unquestionably placed in a state of trial, which proves that be had righteous habits to *acquire;* whereas the doctrine under consideration, affirming his original righte­ousness to have been perfect, and therefore incapable of im­provement, is inconsistent with a state of trial. That his understanding was free from all errors and mistakes, has been thought a blasphemous position, as it attributes to man one of the incommunicable perfections of the Deity. It is likewise believed to be contrary to fact ; for either his un­derstanding was bewildered in error, or his affections flow­ed towards an improper object, when he suffered himself, at the persuasion of his wife, to transgress the express law of his Creator. The objector expresses his wonder at its hav­ing ever been supposcd that the *whole* of Adam’s conduct and behaviour was according to the will of God, when it is so notorious that he yielded to the first temptation with which, as far as we know, he was assailed in Paradise.

Convinced by these and other arguments, that the image of God, in which man was created, could not consist in original righteousness, or in exemption from all possibility of error, many learned men, and Bishop Bull (English Works, vol. iii.) among others, have supposed, that by the