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 power of the prince 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 time past *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 arc quoted from the Old Testament, in support of the same doctrine, with much less ceremony. Thus, when Job says, “ who 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, (Scripture Doctrine, part ii.), 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 objects of wrath, may be urged as a reason why God should not even bring us into judgment; 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 contrast­ing 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 bom 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 *drinketh* 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 shows 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 Mr. Parkhurst, who says, (see his Lexicon on the word יתם,) 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, (Gen. xxx. 38, 39, 40, compared with xxxi. 10,) it certainly denotes ideas much grosser 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 calefecisse 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 ap­

plied 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 by which 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 has no reference to the ori­ginal formation of his constitution, but is a periphrasis of his being a *sinner from the womb,* and means nothing more than 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 (Ps. lviii.) to sig­nify strictly and properly that “ the wicked are estranged from the womb, and tell lies as soon as they are bom ;” or that Job meant to signify, (Job xxxi. 18), that from the moment he came from his mother's womb he had been a guide to the widow and a succour to the fatherless. 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 *born* with *habits of virtue,* that the wicked actually *walked,* and *spoke,* and *spoke lies* from the instant of their *birth,* or that the Psalmist was really *shαpen* in *sin* 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, (Scripture Doctrine, part ii.) « you will adhere to the literal sense of the text for the common doctrine of *ori­ginal sin,* show me any good reason why you ought not to admit the literal sense of the text, *this is my body,* for *tran- subslantiation?* 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 shown, 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.”

Thus far the Arminians of the present day are agreed in opposing the doctrine of the rigid Calvinists, and in stating their own notions of the consequences of Adam’s fall; but from that event their adversaries deduce one consequence, which some of them admit and others deny. It is said that though we cannot possibly be partakers in Adam’s guilt, we yet derive from him a moral taint and infection, by which we have a natural propensity to sin ; that having lost the image of God, in which he was created, Adam begat sons