given him was no more ; the promiſe of life by it ceaſed ; and its sanction, death, took place. But if this be ſo, how is it poſſible that his unborn poſterity ſhould be under a law which had no exiſtence, or that they ſhould be in a worſe ſtate in conſequence of the covenant being broken, and its promiſe having ceaſed, than he himſelf was before the cove­nant was firſt made ? He was originally a mortal being, and was promiſed the ſunernatural gift of immortality on the ſingle condition of his abſtaining from the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. From that fruit he did not abſtain ; but by eating it fell back into his natural ſtate of mortality. Thus far it is admitted that his poſterity fell with him ; for they have no claim to a ſupernatural gift which he had forfeited by his tranſgreſſion. But we cannot admit, ſay the divines of this ſchool, that they fell into his guilt ; for to render it poſſible for a man to incur guilt by the tranſgreſſion of a law, it is necessary not only that he have it in his power to keep the law, but alſo that he be capable of tranſgreſſing it by a *voluntary* deed. But ſurely no man could be capable of voluntarily eating the forbidden fruit 5000 years before he himſelf or his volitions exiſted. The followers of Calvin think it a ſufficient objection to the doctrine of tranſubſtantiation, that the same numerical body cannot be in different places at the ſame inſtant of time. But this ubiquity of body, ſay the remonſtrants, is not more palpably absurd, than the ſuppoſition that a man could ex­ert volitions before he or his will had any exiſtence. If in­deed there be any difference between the two caſes, it is in favour of the Catholic doctrine of the real preſence ; for we are by no means ſo intimately acquainted with the internal ſubſtance of body, and what can be predicated of it, as we are with the nature of guilt and the exerciſe of volition. Theſe we know thoroughly as they really are in themſelves ; the former only relatively as it is ſeen in its qualities.

Nor will the introduction of the word *imputation* into this important queſtion remove a ſingle difficulty. For what is *it* that we mean by saying that the sin of Adam is imputed to his poſterity? Is the guilt of that ſin transferred from him to them ? So ſurely thought Dr Gill, when he laid that it *is made over to them.* But this is the ſame abſurdity as the making over of the ſenſible qualities of bread and wine to the internal ſubſtance of our Saviour’s body and blood ! This imputation either found the poſterity of Adam guilty of his ſin, or it made them ſo. It could not find them guil­ty for the reaſon already aſſigned ; as well as becauſe the apoſtle says expreſsly, that for the offence of *one* judgment came upon *all* men, which would not be true had *all* offend­ed. It could not make them guilty ; for this reaſon, that if there be in phyſics or metaphyſics a finale truth ſelf-evident, it is, that the numerical powers, actions, or qualities, of one being cannot poſſibly be transferred to another, and be made its powers, actions, or qualities Different beings may in diſtant ages have qualities of the ſame kind ; but as eaſily may 4 and 3 be made equal to 9, as two beings be made to have the same identical quality. In Scripture we nowhere read of the actions of one man being imputed to another. “ Abraham (we are told) believed in God, and it was counted to him for righteouſneſs ;” but it was his *own* faith, and not the faith of another man, that was ſo counted “ To him that worketh not, but believeth, his faith (not another’s) is imputed for righteouſneſs.” And of our faith in him that raiſed Chriſt from the dead, it is said, that “ it ſhall be imputed, not to our fathers or our children, but to us for righteouſneſs.”

When this phraſe is uſed with a negative, not only is the man’s own perſonal ſin ſpoken of, but the non-imputation of that ſin means nothing more but that it brings not upon the ſinner condign puniſhment. Thus when Shemei “ said unto David, Let not my lord *impute* iniquity unto me it could not be his meaning that the king ſhould not think that he had offended ; for with the ſame breath he added, “ Neither do thou remember that which thy servant *did perverſely,* the day that my lord the king went out of Jeruſalem, that the king ſhould take it to his *heart.* For thy servant doth *know* that *I have sinned."* Here he plainly confeſſes his ſin, and declares, that by intreating the king not to *impute it to him,* he wiſhed only that it ſhould not be ſo remembered as that the king ſhould take it to heart, and puniſh him as his perverſeneſs deſerved. When therefore it is said@@\*, that “ God was in Chriſt reconciling the world to himſelf, not imputing to them their iniquities, the meaning is only that for Chriſt’s ſake he was pleaſed to exempt them from the puniſhment due to their sins. In like manner, when the prophet, foretelling the ſufferings of the Meſſiah, says, that “ the Lord laid on him the iniquity of us all," his meaning cannot be, that the Lord by *imputation* made his immaculate Son guilty of all the sins that men have ever committed ; for in that caſe it would not be true that the “ juſt ſuffered for the unjuſt,” as the apoſtle expreſsly teaches @@\*: but the ſenſe of the verſe must be as Biſhop Co­verdale translated it, “through him the Lord pardoneth all our sins.” This interpretation is countenanced by the an­cient version of the Seventy, ϰχι Κυριος παρεδωϰεν αυῚον τατς αμαρΊιαις ήμων; words which expreſs a notion very different from that of imputed guilt. The Meſſiah was, without a breach of juſtice, delivered for sins of which he had volunta­rily offered to pay the penalty ; and St Paul might have been juſtly charged by Philemon with the debts of Oneſimus, which he had deſired might be placed to his account. Had the apoſtle, however, expressed no ſuch desire, ſurely Philemon could by no deed of his have made him liable for debts contracted by another ; for leſs could he by *imputation,* whatever that word may mean, have made him virtually concur in the contracting of thoſe debts. Juſt ſo it ſeems to be with reſpect to the ſufferings of Chriſt for the sins of men : He could not have been juſtly ſubjected to suffering without his own content ; and he could not poſſibly have been made guilty of the sins of thoſe for whom he ſuf­fered.

The doctrine of imputed guilt therefore, as underſtood by the Calviniſts, is, in the opinion of their opponents, with­out foundation in Scripture, and contrary to the nature of things. It is an impious abſurdity (ſay they), to which the mind can never be reconciled by the hypotheſis, that all men were in Adam both seminally and federally, and sinned in him, as Levi paid tithes to Melchizedeck in the loins of Abraham. The apoſtle, when he employs that argument to lesſen in the minds of his countrymen the pride of birth and the lofty opinions entertained of their prieſthood, plainly in­timates, that he was using a bold figure, and that Levi’s paying tithes is not to be underſtood in a ſtrict and literal ſenſe. “ Now consider (says he) how great this man was, unto whom even the patriarch Abraham gave the tenth of the ſpoils. And, *as I may ſo ſay,* Levi alſo, who receiveth tithes, paid tithes in Abraham : for he was yet in the loins of his father when Melchizedeck met him.” This is a very good argument to prove that the Levitical prieſthood was inferior in dignity to that of Melchizedeck ; and by the apoſtle it is employed for no other purpoſe. Levi could not be greater than Abraham, and yet Abra­ham was inferior to Melchizedeck. This is the whole of St Paul’s reaſoning, which lends no ſupport to the doctrine of original ſin, unleſs it can be ſhown that Levi and all hie deſcendants contracted from this circumſtance ſuch a ſtrong propensity to the *paying* of tithes, as made it a matter of extreme difficulty for them, in every ſubſequent generation,

@@@[m]\* 2 Cor. v. 19.

@@@[m]\* I Peter iii. 18.