

by St. Paul's words: "In wickedness," *κακια*, "be ye children," (1 Cor. xiv. 20,)—untaught, unexperienced; or by those of David, "My soul is even as a weaned child." (Psalm cxxxi. 2.)

"But we discover in them also the noble principles of reason and understanding, with several tempers which are capable of improvement, whereby they may be trained up in a good way; and numbers in all ages of the world have risen to very considerable degrees of excellence." All this is true; but it is not at all inconsistent with the account of them given above; by which it clearly appears, that they are strongly inclined to evil, long before any ill habits can be contracted.

---

## SECTION V.

### A GENERAL ARGUMENT TAKEN FROM WHAT GOD HAS DECLARED CONCERNING MANKIND AT THE RESTORATION OF THE WORLD AFTER THE DELUGE.

"THERE are three passages from which Divines infer the excellency of Adam's state and nature above ours: 1. 'And God blessed them, and said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth.' (Gen. i. 28.)" (Page 84.) With this I have nothing to do; for I infer nothing from it, with regard to the present question. "2. 'Have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.' 3. 'God created man in his own image; in the image of God created he him.' (Verse 27.) From these three particulars they deduce the superiority of Adam's nature above ours. But the very same marks of excellence are more expressly pronounced by God upon the human nature, when the race of mankind was to be propagated anew from Noah and his sons." (Page 85.)

1. "And God blessed Noah and his sons." (Gen. ix. 1.) With regard to this whole passage, I must observe, that God did not pronounce any blessing at all, either on him or them, till Noah had "built an altar unto the Lord, and" had "offered burnt-offerings on the altar." Then it was that "the Lord smelled a sweet savour;" accepted the sacrifice which implied faith in the promised Seed; and for His sake restored, in some

measure, the blessing which he had given to Adam at his creation ; “ and said, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth.”—On this, I need only observe, had Adam stood, or had not his fall affected his posterity, there would have been no need of this ; for they would have “ multiplied and replenished the earth,” in virtue of the original blessing.

2. Verses 2, 3. “ The fear of you, and the dread of you, shall be upon every beast of the earth, and upon every fowl of the air, and upon all that moveth upon the earth ; into your hands they are delivered : Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you ; even as the green herb have I given you all things.” On this likewise I would observe, What need was there of any such power over the creatures to be given to man, if he had not forfeited his former power ? Had man remained subject to God, the creatures would have remained subject to him, by virtue of God’s original constitution. And why was it, but because man had lost this power, that God here in some degree restores it ?

But hence you “ infer that all that power is restored, yea, more than all ; that we have a more extensive dominion granted to us over the brutal world, than was originally given to Adam.” (Page 86.) It has been commonly thought, that Adam had full dominion over the creatures, subject to him by a kind of instinct ; whereas we have only so far power over them, that by labour and vigilance we may use or subdue them. But how do you prove that we have a fuller dominion than he had ? By those words : “ The fear and the dread of you shall be upon all : Into your hands they are delivered ; even as the green herb have I given you all things.” Nay, “ the fear and the dread of you shall be upon them,” does not imply any dominion at all. A wolf may fear me, who yet does not obey me. I dread a viper ; but I do not obey it. And those words, “ Into your hands they are delivered,” are plainly equivalent with, “ I have given you all things, even as the green herb ;” namely, “ for food ;” you may feed on any of them. So far therefore is the text from expressly pronouncing “ a more extensive dominion given to Noah over the brutal world than was originally given to Adam,” that it does not express any proper dominion at all.

3. Verse 6. “ Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed. For in the image of God made he man ;” namely, at the creation. And some remains of the natural



image of God, as we are spiritual and immortal beings, are even now to be found in every man, sufficient to justify the putting a murderer to death. St. James alludes to the same scripture, when he says, "Therewith bless we God, and curse men, who were made" (*τους γεγροντας*, not *are made*) "after the similitude of God." (iii. 9.) But what does all this prove? that the being "created in the image of God," "is more expressly pronounced upon Noah and his sons, than it was originally on Adam?" I think no man of sense will say this in cool blood.

Of "the three particulars," then, which you brought to prove the superiority of Noah over Adam in innocence, the First proves no more than that God gave to both the blessing of fruitfulness; the Second, far from proving that Noah had a more extensive dominion over the brute creation than Adam, hardly proves that he had any dominion over them at all; and the Third proves only this,—that the image of God, wherein man was made at first, is not totally lost now.

Yet you say, "These three particulars contain all the privileges conferred on Adam at first." And every one of these is "expressly repeated, and more emphatically and extensively pronounced upon man, after the judgment passed on Adam had come upon his posterity." (Page 87.) *Expressly, more emphatically, more extensively!* Where? I am sure, not in the Bible.

However, you pompously add, (*sicut tuus est mos,\**) "This is to me a clear and undoubted demonstration,—

"1. That 'the judgment which came upon all men to condemnation,' did noways alter the primary relation in which God stood to man, and man to God." Certainly it was altered thus far, God was a condemner, and man was condemned. And though "God is still the God and Father of mankind," yet it cannot be said that he is so to unregenerate men,—men who are as yet "dead in sin, and children of wrath,"—"as much," or in the same sense, "as he was to Adam in innocence." Adam then was surely "the son of God" as no other man is, till "born of the Spirit." The power to become the sons of God is now given to none till they "believe on his name."

"2. That the love, regards, and providence of God toward mankind in general are still the very same as to man at his first formation." (Page 88.)

\* After your usual manner.—EDIT.

His providence is still over all his works: But he cannot regard or delight in sinful man, in the very same manner wherein he delighted in him when innocent.

“3. That our nature, as derived from Noah, has just the same endowments, natural and moral, with which Adam was created.” This does not follow from anything that has yet been said. If it stands of itself, it may.

“4. That whatever came upon us from ‘the judgment to condemnation,’ came no farther than was consistent with that blessing, pronounced upon Noah as well as Adam, ‘Be fruitful and multiply.’” This is undoubtedly true; otherwise, the human species could not have been continued. “So that ‘the condemnation which came upon all men,’ cannot infer the ‘wrath’ of God upon mankind;” (it may, notwithstanding that they “increase and multiply;” it must, if they are “by nature children of wrath;”) “but only as subjecting us to such evils as were perfectly consistent with his blessing, declared to Adam as soon as he came out of his Maker’s hands;” (page 89;) (namely, with the blessing, “Increase and multiply;”) “and, consequently, to such evils as God might justly have subjected mankind to, before Adam sinned.” Whether God could justly have done this, or not, what a consequence is this!—“If God gave that blessing, ‘Increase and multiply,’ to men in general, as well as he did to Adam, then men in general are not ‘children of wrath’ now, any more than Adam was at his creation!”

“5. It is no less evident, that when St. Paul says, ‘By the disobedience of one many,’ or all, ‘were made sinners,’ he cannot mean they ‘were made sinners’ in any sense inconsistent with the blessing pronounced on man in innocence.” True; not in any sense inconsistent with that blessing, “Increase and multiply.” But this blessing is no way inconsistent with their being “by nature children of wrath.”

“From all which I conclude, that our state with regard to the blessing of God, and the dignity and faculties of our nature, unless debased by our own sins, is not inferior to that in which Adam was created.” (Pages 90–93.) Be this so or not, it cannot be concluded from anything that has gone before. But we may still believe, that men in general are “fallen short of the glory of God;” are deprived of that glorious image of God wherein man was originally created.