

in Jesus Christ: which life, God that cannot lie, promised before the world began. Otherwise, I cannot see how salvation can be connected with an enjoyment of the promise. That the promise as given in the word, and the same promise as received by the regenerate person through the power of the Holy Ghost, is not to be distinguished as Mr. F. would have it be, I assign the following reasons:—

1. The promise is in Christ as the head of the church, and the Saviour of the body: and, therefore, cannot belong to, nor possibly be enjoyed by, any but the elect, who are also in him, and were so, as well as the promise of life, before the world began.

2. The promise of life was given in Christ the head of the covenant before the world began, and to none but his seed, whom the Father appointed to obtain salvation with eternal glory. Therefore, it cannot now be given to all men, without God's changing his mind, and saying one thing at one time, and a contrary thing at another time. To suppose which would be blasphemy. "I am God, I change not."

3. It is plainly declared in the word of truth, that eternal life was given in Christ to the elect only; and that the rest are vessels of wrath, not written in the book of life: therefore, no other part of the same word can, when rightly understood, hold forth a promise of life to all.

4. The word of God contains no promise of life to any but such as wear the mark of election, or shall do, in a special work of the Holy Comforter, from the Father and Christ, in a powerful demonstration of the *great love* of God, and the *infinite merits* of the Redeemer. As all men do not possess this mark (regeneration), the promise as given in the word cannot, when properly understood, apply to one sinner *equally* as to another. Except it be considered as thus, that it applies to no sinner, as such, at all.

5. The Holy Ghost moved holy men of old to write the scriptures, and consequently he must be considered as the author of the promise of salvation as given therein, and as being of the same will with the Father and Son in covenant. Therefore, to represent him as speaking in the language of promise, in covenant, particularly; in the word, in a general way, as applying to all men; and then in the hearts of the saints particularly, and all by the same promise, is far enough from the truth which is established for ever.

How can the promise of life be *considered* as particular, by any man that has the Spirit of Christ, if he believe that the word of the same Spirit, at the same time, affirms it to be general, and applicable to one sinner equally as to another? Surely truth in the heart by the Holy Ghost, answereth to truth in the word, which was written by his inspiration.

6. The *nature* and *properties* of the promise of life, given first in Christ, and afterward in the scriptures, cannot be changed by any one taking hold of it. It is not my believing the promise that can make it particular. If the word of God proves it to be in its nature general, it must remain so, for the word of God, and the promise of life therein contained, are like himself, unchangeable. I believe, with Peter of old, that “the promise is to all that are afar off, **EVEN AS MANY as the Lord our God shall CALL.**”

7. Mr. F. says, “The promise as taken is *considered* as particular, and as insuring salvation.” But, was it not particular before the person who is supposed to take it considered it to be so? And does it not insure salvation before it is taken? Is the faithful promise of God of no certainty, till worms of dust and ashes, depraved throughout, set their seal to it? Does faith render salvation certain? or, the sure promise of Jehovah? Is nothing sure till the creature seals it? What misplacing of things, and turning them upside down is this! And all under the colour of being singularly dutiful! But whom will it please? Who are ready to applaud such doctrine? Can any Arminian in the world have cause to complain, where duty thus takes the lead and determines all?

8. I am persuaded that the scriptures never promise eternal life to any acts of the creature, as requirements of the law of his creation-state. It could not so be, without the covenant of eternal life in Christ being of equal extent, as to persons; and of like conditional quality, with the original covenant of nature in Adam, who was the legal head of all mankind. Eternal life is no where promised to the works of the law, under which the unconverted remain; but, to the obedience of faith. Those acts which spring from faith in Christ, and are performed through supernatural and gracious influence from Christ, stand connected with certain salvation: not, however, as requirements of the law of justification by works, but as evangelical graces,

and spiritual duties, produced and upheld by the Spirit of Jesus Christ, the Lord of life and glory. In this view, the promise is sure, the promisee is a new-born character, and the promiser is the God of all grace, in covenant with the promisee, through the precious blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. The promisee is so far from particularizing the promise in itself, by receiving it; that, the promise particularizes him, and denominates him a child of promise. Neither does God promise the unregenerate that, if they will of themselves become regenerate, he will show them mercy. Yet, without this can be proved fairly, the system of Mr. F. can never pass for more than a baseless fabric.

## SECTION XI.

### ON THE PRINCIPLE AND STATE OF ADAM BY CREATION.

THE sacred scriptures testify, that *God made man upright, and very good*; by which we must understand, that his holy qualities were natural to him, and *not personal and acquired*, by any exercise of his free will. He was the Son of God\* by his creation, and was honoured with the likeness of his adorable Father. He was such a creature as it became the holiness, wisdom, power, and goodness, of the eternal God to create. Perhaps, it is more easy to declare what he was not, than distinctly to shew what he was. Some have entertained notions concerning him, which must involve a supposition of such defection, as can never be admitted by any, who regulate their conclusions by the scriptures of truth. Others seem to have exalted him, in their conceptions, far above the state of existence pertaining to him, as a perfect natural man, whose strength was in himself. To this class of writers, our author chiefly united himself: he thought he saw herein a suitable support for that generalizing system to rest upon, for which he became so zealous an advocate; and almost all he has said, on the duty of natural and carnal men, to exercise supernatural and spiritual graces, is built upon the disputed ground of Adam's having been the subject of the same kind of principle, as that which the redeemed of the Lord receive by regeneration. His premises are disputed, and his conclusions are denied; for what reasons, will hereafter appear.

\* Luke iii. 38.

In order to prove that, the principle of holiness connected with Adam, was not essentially the same, as that which the elect receive in regeneration, and consequently, that it was not suited to live unto God, through a Mediator, the ensuing arguments are produced.

I. Adam was a public person, and represented all mankind, so that what he had, all men had in him. If he possessed the same holy principle of life in his primeval state, which regenerate believers do now, through Christ, the Head and Mediator of the everlasting covenant, then it must follow, that spiritual and eternal life was once the right of all mankind by the covenant of works: but, the word of God informs us, that all spiritual blessings were given in Christ to the elect, before the foundation of the world; therefore, to suppose that God *first* covenanted with Christ his Son, as the chosen head of the elect body, and in him, blessed the same chosen body with all spiritual blessings, and *excluded* all the rest, *by an act of sovereign will, from any share in the same blessings*; and, to suppose that after this, he gave the whole race of mankind in Adam, *an interest in the same blessings*, is making God to will and nill the same thing at different times, in the same sovereign way. This, however, must be withstood as utterly inadmissible. He is of one mind, not of many, and cannot deny himself. His gifts and calling are without repentance. The eternal Father never gave eternal life *out* of Christ, his first-begotten Son, nor *in* him, to any but his chosen seed: no, *not even radically*, though this is the idea for which Mr. F. pleads, and on which his system depends.

II. Precious faith is now obtained through the righteousness of God our Saviour; therefore, it certainly was not possessed in innocence through the obedience of the creature; nor, as an endowment of mere nature, according to the equitable law under which man at first was placed. It is pretended that Adam had faith *radically*, but not *formally*; but what is this, but telling us that, we merely obtain *the act* of faith through Christ, in difference from Adam, but *not the principle*? When Christ is styled the author of faith, it means, no doubt, that he is the author of it *radically*, as well as *formally*. Now, if he were the author of faith in Adam, how was it that he became not its object and end? Where he is the one, he is the other,

*nor can proof be given that these things can be separated.* The truth is, Adam was holy without Christ, and therefore, without that principle, which is Christ in the saint, the hope of glory, and which is the inseparable substance of things hoped for, and the infallible evidence of things invisible. But these celestial things made no part of the Eden settlement.

III. The Holy Spirit, by Paul, calls special and saving faith, *the faith of God's elect*. This intimates plainly, that faith is a consequent of election, and shows that the former is the effect of the latter; as also all other spiritual blessings are the certain effects of the same supreme, determining cause. Faith is peculiar to God's elect, and never has been possessed by any of the rest; otherwise, it would be no evidence of a state of grace and salvation. The holy principle of the spiritual church is an effect of sovereign grace, and must have required the same cause to produce it in Adam, the innocent head of mankind, as it now requires to produce it in many of his fallen posterity. For, as faith is the fruit of election-grace in the Son of God, as the chosen head of the church, and is peculiar to the elect, by the covenant will of God in Christ; I argue, that Adam, who was the head of all men, could not be the subject of it in innocence; because, that would be making faith no more the faith of God's elect, than of the non-elect, and also supposing it to exist, without its own proper causes, object, and end.

IV. I reason from the *nature, properties, and uses*, of the holy principle of life which is born of God, in the hearts of all his saved people; that Adam, the head of the covenant of works to all his seed, could not be endowed with it under that legal covenant. In discussing this argument, I will notice some of the terms and phrases, which the Holy Spirit has been pleased to make use of, in setting forth his own workmanship in the scriptures.

1. Faith is said to be the *substance, subsistence or confidence* of things hoped for, and the *evidence* of things not seen. These things hoped for, and made evident through faith, are *the things which God hath prepared for them that love him: things freely given to us of God: things which the natural man cannot know, because they are spiritually discerned: things that God reveals to them for whom they are prepared.* Special faith is described as the

subsistence and confidence of these heavenly things; therefore, as the Spirit of faith, which the regenerate all possess, is the substance, or subsistence of those things, which were freely and exclusively given to the elect in Christ, and a part of the salvation which is by him; it is concluded, that Adam, as the public head of mankind, under a covenant of works, could not be the subject of it.

2. Faith, considered radically, is *a new nature* derived from Christ into the souls of his redeemed people, through the Holy Spirit of life, and is an absolute gift, in the everlasting covenant, to the elect in distinction from all others. Nor can this supernatural principle be separated from Christ, neither can it either act, or even exist in any creature, apart from Christ as its author, object, and end. In full agreement herewith, Mr. F. has said, "It is of *the nature* of faith to overlook and relinquish every thing of the kind," or that pertains to justification by works. "Faith says he, implies contrition and self-annihilation *in its very nature.*"\* Now, what faith is, in its very nature, it is radically; therefore, if in its very nature it relinquishes all respect to justification by works, and even involves self-annihilation, it is evident that it could not be suited to live to God by a covenant of works, and that Adam could no more possess it radically, than formally. Here then the point is given up, and our author refutes himself conclusively.

3. The Apostle Paul called the internal life which he possessed, Christ: "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." Christ dwelt in Paul, as his life, by regeneration, before he exercised faith on Christ for salvation. But, if the holy nature, which the elect receive in regeneration, be properly named Christ, his headship and mediatorship being essential to its birth and subsistence; then Adam could not be the subject of it in innocence. If any man have the Spirit of Christ, he is one of his members. And if Adam had been endowed with the Spirit of Christ, radically, he must have been a member of Christ by virtue of the law of nature, and all his seed, whom he represented, must have been members also; than which nothing can be more inimical to the glorious gospel of the grace of God. It supposes Christ to have been the head of all

\* Page 185, 19, 6.

mankind, and introduces confusion, instead of the wise and orderly plan laid down in the Testament of our Lord. Either Paul has not rightly denominated the christian principle, by calling it *Christ living in him*; or, Mr. F. erred in supposing, the principle of innocent Adam was the same as that the christian enjoys. The reader will choose his leader, I shall continue with honest Paul.

4. Adam's principle was *corruptible*; the believer's is *incorruptible*, therefore, they must be essentially different. The children of God, by his first begotten-Son, are born again, not of corruptible seed: but of incorruptible: and their seed remaineth in them, and is not only an inward cause of holiness, but a preservative from apostacy. Such a principle as this, was not suited to a law of justification by works, and to a state of conditional happiness, subjected to the mutable will of man. This incorruptible principle of life eternal, and holiness immutable, is the inseparable *effect* of absolute election in Christ, as the root of the heavenly household, and undoubtedly partakes of the immutable nature of its own originating *cause*. It ever exists and acts in vital union with Christ its author, object, and end; without which union, it would not be the same principle it now is. But a principle of this sort was by no means suited to a covenant of works, nor to the nature of Adam's constitution.

5. The principle in the saints is called "*the earnest of our inheritance*, until the redemption of the purchased possession unto the praise of his glory." Hence, it appears that, the principle of life and motion, which the lost soul receives when it is first quickened, by the immediate power of God, is more than a disposition to embrace Christ in a spiritual manner; for it is an internal *living root*, from which all holy and evangelical inclinations and actions arise, through which, things supernatural are enjoyed. From the moment that life is infused into an unregenerate soul, *the earnest* of glory is given. But it is presumed, that no enlightened man will assert that, the moment the representative of all mankind was a perfect man, he was possessed of the spiritual nature of Christ, and of the *earnest* of everlasting glory: and, if not, then he was not a spiritual man according to the gospel word.

The word *earnest* also shews that, the holy principle in

the saints is of the same kind with that which the saints retain in heaven, who are singing of electing and redeeming grace, in the presence of God and the Lamb: saying, "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen." This song, Adam could not learn in his innocent condition; yet as he was made a perfect man in soul and body, had his perfection been spiritual in its kind, he must have been fully meet for glory, as the saints will be after the final resurrection of their bodies. But we perceive no evidence that this was the case, and we know by the gospel, that this could not be the case, by the law of justification by works. Such perfection and glory is peculiar to Christ, the second Adam, and to those who are chosen in him; but, the rest not being written in the Lamb's book of life, could no more possess the life of that book *before* the fall, than they could *after* it.

It may be further added, that seeing this *earnest-spirit* is a part of the inheritance reserved in heaven for the seed of Christ, and is given for ever to them, and never to be returned, and is to assure them of the love of God towards them in Christ their Lord, as also to meeten them for their heavenly home, it is fairly concluded, that it could not be a due by creation-law, and consequently, that Adam had it not in his legal state.

V. I argue that, Adam was not a perfect spiritual man, because he was not united to Christ, the ordained head of the spiritual world, from whom alone all spirituality must proceed. As Adam was perfect in his kind, without any interest in Christ, the chosen head of spiritual perfection, it is very evident that, his perfection was of a different kind, from that which the elect derive from their union with Christ. And to plead for the contrary, is to aim to bring down Christ to a level with Adam, and to exalt Adam at the expense of his peculiar honour, whose name is above every name, and in whose presence, the glory of innocent Adam would appear more disproportionate, than the light of the creeping glow-worm, when compared with the dazzling brightness of the divinely appointed ruler of the day.

VI. Were we to allow that Adam was a spiritual man, we must then, also grant that he was endowed with *an ability*, which was utterly useless to him all the time he

continued to possess it; yet, when lost by his disobedience, must have procured an addition of misery to many of his posterity for ever; and that, through the publication of the gospel of electing grace amongst them! Adam's principle was natural to him, but its continuance depended upon his obedience to the law of his Creator: if he transgressed, he was to lose his capacity for holy services and enjoyments, which has actually come to pass. Therefore, that spiritual ability to believe in Christ, which Mr. F. supposed Adam to possess radically, must have been useless; because, it was only given to man so long as he continued an innocent creature, and did not need it, and when he became a guilty sinner, it ceased to be his; and, hence it must follow, that mankind are doomed to suffer greater misery for losing that very principle, which never could have added any thing to their happiness had they continued to retain it. This is certainly inconsistent with the proclaimed character of the ever just and merciful God. We may, therefore, safely conclude that, Adam never had that spiritual principle, by which many of his fallen posterity believe in a Christ, to him unknown, in his perfect state.

VII. It is further argued, that Adam could not be a spiritual man, because he was perfect in his kind, both as it respected his soul and his body. Now, we know that his body was natural, like our own, sin excepted. As he could not be deemed a perfect man without a perfect body, so neither could he be considered a perfect spiritual man, without a proper spiritual body. The spirits of the just in glory will not be perfectly like Christ their head, to whose image they are predestinated to be conformed, until they appear in their immortal bodies, *fashioned like to his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able to subdue all things to himself*. Now, if God's nature required that Adam should be made a spiritual man, as to his soul; how was it that the same divine nature did not require that his body should be spiritual likewise? Why was man's soul to be perfectly spiritual, and his body perfectly natural? It is not easy to conceive how a sinless mind, perfectly spiritual, should know nothing of the ancient head of spirituality, nor how it could be contented and happy in an earthly state, amongst plants and animals, employed also, through a natural body, in dressing and keeping a garden. That a perfect natural world, should

be placed under the headship of a perfect natural man, seems consistent enough; as the perfect spiritual world is placed under the headship of a perfect spiritual man: who was the Lord in heaven, and became the Lord from heaven, and is now ascended up where he was before, that his redeemed may finally live together with him.\*

VIII. The subsequent positions are thought to carry evidence in them on the point in hand, and to prove that Adam was not a spiritual man, as is pleaded by our author.

1. All spiritual blessings and evangelical graces were eternally laid up in Christ, as the chosen head of the chosen world; and have ever been considered as his fulness, of which all his members receive, and grace for grace.

2. That these blessings ever did, do now, and ever will belong to God's elect *exclusively*: they being blessed with interest in them in a sovereign way, apart from any consideration of their doings, as any way entitling them to such favour above others of their fellow creatures, or as any way moving God to bestow them, upon them rather than others.

3. That he who is blessed *with one* of these blessings, is blessed *with all* of them, all being connected, and necessary to answer the end designed.

4. That they were all given to the elect in Christ distinctively, and were appointed to be enjoyed by them, through him as their chosen head and covenant surety, by faith. And this covenant which was confirmed, *before* the creation of the world, of God in Christ, the law of works given to Adam *after* the creation, could neither disannul, nor alter, that the blessings, so given in Christ, should ever become the right of any other persons than the elect, by any other dispensation whatsoever.

5. That it is God's immutable will, that all who ever did, who now do, or hereafter shall partake of this gracious fulness, shall assuredly be presented faultless before him, and be perfectly holy and perpetually happy in his glorious presence for ever.

\* Zech. vi. 12, 13 and xiii. 7. 1 Cor. xv. 47—49. John vi. 62.

1. Col. i. 19. Eph. i. 3, and iii. 19, and iv. 7, 15. John i. 14, 16.

2. Titus i. 1, 2. Rom. viii. 29, 30, and ix. 11, and xi. 5, 6. 2 Tim. i. 9. Eph. ii. 3—9.

3. Rom. viii. 32. 1 Cor. iii. 21—23.

4. Heb. vii. 22. Gal. iii. 17. John vi. 37, and xvii. 9, 10, 26. 1 Pet. i. 2. 2 Thes. ii. 13, 14. Rom. xi. 7.

5. Rom. viii. 30. Eph. i. 4. John xvii. 24. Rev. xxi. 27, and xx. 15. Eph. v. 25—27.

6. That almighty God is ever of one mind: what was his will, *before time*, as to what persons should enjoy the fulness of Christ, is his will *now*, and will be found to be his will in the *last day* and for evermore.

7. That the non-elect never were related to Christ, as the head and root of the heavenly family, not being written in the book of the Lamb, not loved in Christ, nor chosen in him, the head of all spiritual life and influence: yet, not passed by, because of their foreseen wickedness; but, because it pleased not God to write them in his celestial register, but to leave them in their pure creatureship only, as he did certain angels that fell from their state by creation.

8. That God did, upon a foreknowledge of their sinfulness and rebellion against him, their good and just Creator and Law-giver, appoint them to suffer the wrath due to their unrighteousness; and they are accordingly spoken of as "vessels of wrath fitted to destruction;" and, as to their final state, are like the fallen angels, that are reserved in everlasting chains under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day. Now, whoever allows these positions will find, he must, to be consistent, give up the sentiment of Adam's spirituality, and therewith the duty of the dead in sin to act as though they were spiritually alive.

## SECTION XII.

A REPLY TO MR. F.'S FOUR REASONS, FOR BELIEVING THAT THE PRINCIPLE OF HOLINESS IN ADAM, AND THAT WHICH IS WROUGHT IN BELIEVERS, ARE ESSENTIALLY THE SAME.

I. He reasons thus: "These principles are both formed after the same likeness; the image of God—God created man in his own image; in the image of God created he him—Put ye on the new man, which, *after God*, is created in righteousness, and true holiness. If God be immutable in his nature, that which is created after him must be the

6. Job. xxiii. 13. Eph. i. 11. Dan. iv. 35. Isa. xlvi. 10. Psalm xxxiii. 11. Matt. xxv. 41, 46.

7. Rom. ix. 11, 21. Rev. xx. 15, and xiii. 8, and xvii. 8.

8. Matt. vii. 23. Jude 6. with 2 Pet. ii. 4. Rom. ix. 22, and xi. 1. 1 Thes. v. 9. 1 Pet. ii. 8. Jude 4. Prov. xvi. 4. Job. xxi. 30.

same for substance at all times, and in all circumstances. There cannot be two specifically different images of the same original."\*

*Reply.* This is an argument urged by the yea and nay gentlemen with lively hope, yea, with strong confidence. It was employed in the times of L. Weyman, J. Brine, and Doctor Gill, by the zealous advocates for general exhortations to the dead, to rise up and walk. Sound argument, however, is none the worse for keeping, it loses nothing by time. But, that the preceding is sound reasoning, and conclusive to the purpose intended by it, is at present denied.

1. God's nature is herein erroneously taken for the archetype of the ectype formed in believers. The divine nature is, indeed, "immutable," but it is not the divine image, as is here supposed, by Mr. F.

2. That Adam was made in the image of God is evident, but not in Mr. F.'s sense of the word here given; for the mutable state of Adam, was no similitude of the immutable nature of God.

3. A created holiness is no proper resemblance of infinite and self-existent holiness; but, the latter is what is proper to God, and is incommunicable to man.

4. God could not communicate to man his essential holiness, whereby he is differenced from all his intelligent creatures. The images that are made of a man, do not import a communication of his nature, but of his likeness; which is accidental and artificial, but not substantial. It is an image acquired, visible and possessive, standing in the person of the Son of God; called the image of the invisible God, and is imparted to the adopted family of God.

5. The God-Man is the image intended by God's own image. He was before Adam, and in him is comprehended the whole assemblage of excellence, natural and spiritual. The natural and moral image in which Adam was created, was drawn from him; as is the evangelical and heavenly one, to which the elect of God are predestinated to be conformed.

6. God is immutable in his nature, but it does not follow that, what is created after him, must be substantially the same at all times, and in all circumstances. What is

\* Page 99.