miſt ? That they were not meant to include all the men and women then living, far leſs all that have ever lived, is plain from the fifth verſe of the same Pſalm, where we are told that thoſe wicked perſons “ were in great fear, becauſe God was in the congregation of the *righteous."* There was then, it seems, a congregation of righteous persons, in oppoſition to thoſe called the *children of men,* of whom alone it is ſaid that there was none that did good, no not one. The truth is, that the perſons of whom David generally complains in the book of Psalms, conſtituted a ſtrong party diſaffected to his perſon and government. That faction he deſcribes as proud and oppreſſive, as deviſing miſchief againſt him, as violent men continually getting together for war. He ſtyles them his *enemies ;* and ſometimes characterizes them by the appellation which was given to the apoſtate deſcendants of Cain before the deluge. Thus in the 57th Pſalm, which was compoſed when he fled from Saul to the cave in which he spared that tyrant’s life, he complains, “ I lie among them that are ſet on fire, even the sons of men, whoſe teeth are spears,” &c. ; and again, in the 58th Pſalm, he ſays, “ Do ye indeed speak righteouſneſs, O congregation ? Do ye judge uprightly, O ye sons of men ?” By comparing theſe texts with I Sam. xxvi. 19. it will appear evident be­yond dispute, that by the sons of men mentioned in them, he meant to characterize thoſe enemies who exaſperated Saul againſt him. Now it is well known, that there was a party adhering to the intereſts of the houſe of Saul which con­tinued its enmity to David during the 40 years of his reign, and joined with Abſalom in rebellion againſt him only eight years before his death. But it is the opinion of the moſt ju­dicious commentators@@\*, that the 14th Pſalm was compoſed during the rebellion of Abſalom ; and therefore it is ſurely much more probable, that by *the children of men,* of whom it is ſaid there is “ none that doth good, no not one,” the inspired poet meant to characterize the rebels, than that he ſhould have directly contradicted himſelf in the compaſs of two ſentences ſucceeding each other. Had he indeed known that all the children of men, as deſcending from Adam, “ are utterly indiſpoſed, diſabled, and made oppoſite to all that is ſpiritually good, and wholly and continually inclined to all evil,” he could not, with the leaſt degree of conſiſtency, have repreſented the Lord as looking down from heaven upon them, to ſee if there were any that did underſtand and ſeek after God ;” but if by the children of men was meant only the rebel faction, this ſcenical repreſentation is perfect­ly confident, as it was natural to ſuppoſe that there might be in that faction ſome men of good principles miſled by the arts of the rebel chiefs.

Having thus aſcertained the ſenſe of the words as origi­nally uſed by the Pſalmiſt, the Arminian proceeds to inquire for what purpoſe they were quoted by the apoſtle ; and in this inquiry he ſeems to find nothing difficult. The averſion of the Jews from the admission of the Gentiles to the privileges of the goſpel, the high opinion which they enter­tained of their own worth and ſuperiority to all other na­tions, and the ſtrong perſuaſion which they had that a ſtrict obedience to their own law was ſufficient to juſtify them be­fore God, are facts univerſally known ; but it was the pur­poſe of the apoſtle to prove that all men ſtood in need of a Redeemer, that Jews as well as Gentiles had been under the dominion of sin, and that the one could not in that reſpect claim any ſuperiority over the other. He begins his epiſtle, therefore, with ſhowing the extreme depravity of the Hea­then world ; and having made good that point, he proceeds to prove, by quotations from the book of Pſalms, Proverbs, and Iſaiah, that the Jews were in nowiſe better than they, that every mouth might be stopped, and all the world be­come guilty, or inſufficient for their own juſtification before God.

The next proof brought by the Calvinists in ſupport of their opinion, that all men derive guilt from Adam by or­dinary generation, is that text in which St Paul ſays that the Epheſians “ were by *nature* children of wrath even as others.” To this their opponents reply, that the doctrine of original sin is in this verſe, as in the laſt quoted, counte­nanced only by our tranſlation, and not by the original Greek as underſtood by the ancient fathers of the Chriſtian church, who were greater maſters of that language than we. The words are ϰαι ήμεν τεϰνα φυσει *οργης; in* which it is ob­vious, that τεϰνα, though in its original ſenſe it ſignifies the genuine children of parents by natural generation, cannot be ſo underſtood here ; becauſe no man was ever begotten by, or born of, the abstract notion *wrath.* It muſt there­fore be uſed figuratively ; and in other places of ſcripture it often denotes a cloſe relation to any perſon or thing. Thus we read of the children of *God,* of the *kingdom,* the *reſurrection, wiſdom, light, obedience,* and *peace* ; whence it is con­cluded, that by the children of wrath are meant thoſe who are liable to puniſhment or rejection. And becauſe there were in thoſe days ſome children, in a lower and leſs pro­per ſenſe, by *adoption,* and others, in a higher and more proper ſenſe, by *natural generation,* of whom the relation of the latter to their parents was much cloſer than that of the former ; the apoſtle tells the Epheſians, that they were by *nature* children of wrath, to convince them that they were *really* liable to it by the strictest and cloſeſt rela­tion poſſible. That the word here is of the ſame im­port with *really* or *truly,* and that it does not ſignify what we mean by *nature* in the proper ſenſe of that word, the ancient fathers are generally agreed@@\* ; and that the mo­dern Greeks, who ſtill speak a dialect of the noble language of their ancestors, underſtand the word in the ſame ſenſe, is apparent from their verſion of the text before us. In the moſt correct and elegant edition of the New Teſtament in their vernacular tongue, the words under conſideration are thus rendered; ϰ*αι φυσιϰα* ημα σϬαν *τεϰνα οργης ώσαν ϰαι όι λοιποι,* where it is impoſſible that φυσιϰα can ſignify *natural,* otherwiſe the apoſtle will be made to ſay, not that we are by the nature derived from Adam liable to wrath, but that we were *naturally begotten* by *wrath* in the abstract ! For taking the word φυσει in the ſenſe of *really* or *truly,* both the ancient and modern Greeks appear indeed to have the authority of St Paul himſelf ; who, writing to Timothy, calls him γνησιον τεϰνον “ his true or genuine son ;” not to ſignify that he was the child of the apoſtle by natural gene­ration, but that he was cloſely related to him in the faith to which St Paul had converted him. That the words τεϰνα *φυσει οργης* can ſignify nothing but *truly* or *really relations to wrath,* is ſtill farther evident from the ground aſſigned of that relation. It is not the sin of Adam, or the impurity of natural generation, “ but the treſpaſſes and sins in which the Epheſians in time paſt *walked,* according to the course of the world, according to the prince of the power of the air,” the ſpirit that at the time of the apoſtle’s writing “worked in the children of diſobedience.” Surely no man can ſuppoſe that the Epheſians at any paſt time *walked* in Adam’s treſpaſs and ſin, or that the prince of the power of the air tempted *them* to eat the forbidden fruit.

Having thus commented on the principal texts which are cited from the New Teſtament to prove the doctrine of original ſin, the Arminians treat thoſe which are quoted from the Old Teſtament, in ſupport of the same doctrine, with much leſs ceremony. Thus, when Job ſays, “ who

@@@[m]\* Hammond, &c.

@@@[m]\* See Hammond and Whitby on the Text, and Suidas on the word φυοις.