

2. The very same law, as to the words used, has been employed by its divine author, according to the different relations in which he as the Law-giver, has been pleased to connect himself with intelligent creatures. It has no other fixed nature, that I am aware of, than that *it demands the just rights of its divine author, according to the relation and capacity of its subjects*, as in a state of nature by creation, or in a state of degeneracy through sin, or in a state of grace by supreme adoption and heavenly birth. In each relation the law is immutable; its language to its different subjects is invariably the same: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart—and with all thy strength:—and thy neighbour as thyself."* If, where much is given, much is required, and if the duty is measured by *the strength* of the agent commanded, and *the relation* in which he stands, doubtless, the obedience required of Immanuel, the representative of the elect family, must have been of a higher nature than that of Adam and Eve. Yet, if it were of a superior *kind*, then the same form of law must have required it to be so; according to the higher relation and more exalted capacity of the Son of God; which will, to say the least, strongly intimate that, the holy principle in Adam, and that in Christ were essentially different.

3. It may be admitted, that both Adam and Christ went to the end of the law for righteousness, without supposing that their obediences were equal; for the spring of obedience is not produced by the law commanding, but by the state of the agent commanded. As is the nature of the tree, such is the fruit growing upon it. Christ's being the end of the law for the endless justification of his seed, will not prove that he had no higher kind of principle in fulfilling it than innocent Adam had. For, though Christ did not go beyond the law, as it respected himself, he being in person and relation what he was; still it does not follow that, he did not go beyond what the law required of innocent man for an earthly state.

4. Christ's obedience to the moral law was a doing of the covenant will of God. For, although a great part of the work allotted him, was to obey the law and suffer its penalty in the room of his people, who were eternally chosen in him, yet, he kept his eye upon the supreme laws of settlement, in the covenant of redemption. The eternal,

* Mark xii. 30.

holy, and gracious will* of his God and Father, he ever viewed as the standing and supporting rule of his life and obedience. Nor had he any thing to do with the law as his rule, but as it was sovereignly connected with that covenant of salvation, in which covenant a higher and incomparably better obedience was required, than that which was demanded of innocent man; and a more exalted and glorious life was promised to Christ, and his elect in him, than that which Adam and all his natural seed had by the covenant of works, in his creation state.

9. Mr. F. refers us to the work of the Spirit in writing the law of God in the heart, and to the ultimate state of holiness, as being *no more* than a conformity to the law as it was given in Adam.

1. I reply in the words of J. Hussey: "The laws of Christ are distinct from the law of God in the *nature* of their hand-writing on the heart: consequently, not the law of God, that is, they are not *God's law* in a first acceptation, to *secure interest* in Christ; but, *Christ's laws*, in the second acceptation, as *means* to carry on *communion* in that *interest*. These laws of Christ being *supernatural* religion, under a continued and further work of the Holy Ghost, after conversion to the person and righteousness of Christ, none but true believers, without the deeds of the Sinai law, or without conformity in the true law sense, do find written on their hearts. They are not natural-moral, as Mount Sinai's law was."

2. When Christ's laws are spiritually *known* and *loved* the Holy Ghost has, by his saving authority and power in and through Christ, written them on the heart. But, this does not prove, nor give us any reason to suppose, that Adam was the subject of such an internal evangelical work: it rather proves that he could not possess the believer's principle *radically*, any more than *formally*; nor in the former sense, without the latter also.

3. Mr. F. says, "Adam's principle was exercised in contemplating and adoring God as the Creator and Preserver; and that this was no LESS than a perfect conformity to the law: also that the ultimate state of holiness to which saints shall arrive in heaven, will be NO MORE than a conformity to the same law; but that the believer's principle

* John xvii. 4. and v. 31. xii. 49, 50. and vi. 37—40. Heb. x. 9, 10.

(while he is on earth) is exercised in contemplating and adoring God, NOT ONLY in these characters, as Adam did, but as the God of salvation." Now, how the NO MORE, and the NOT ONLY, will or can be made to agree, I cannot imagine. It seems that the believer on earth goes quite beyond the believers in heaven, so that we, who are on earth, know a great deal more, and contemplate much more, than what we shall when we arrive in heaven; because, now we are chiefly taken up with sovereign saving grace: but, when we arrive in glory in the appointed state of ultimate holiness, that will be NO MORE than a conformity to the law as it was written originally in the heart of Adam; which nature-law-principle in innocent Adam was exercised (Mr. F. says) in contemplating and adoring God as the Creator and Preserver.* Thus, according to our author. it seems when we are brought to the state of ultimate holiness designed for us in heaven, we are to leave off contemplating and adoring God as the God of sovereign saving grace, and employ ourselves in the field of creation, as Adam did: for this we are told, was the spirit and conduct of Adam in his perfect state here below, and ultimate holiness (Mr. F. says) WILL BE NO MORE!

4. If Adam was a spiritual man, as the believer is, in and through Christ, then he must have been *perfectly* so, as much as the saints ever will be after the resurrection, both in kind and degree; for, if the ultimate state of holiness is *no more* than a conformity to the law, and that of Adam's were *no less*, there can be no difference in any respect between them. But, if he was perfectly holy, in a holiness of the *same kind* as saints in ultimate holiness will be, in and through Christ, then he must have been perfectly *wise, righteous, and happy* (for holiness and happiness go together), and all without any knowledge of Christ or his fulness. Who can prove the congruity of all this? But if we view him as having been a perfect natural man, upright in spirit, serving and adoring his Creator, as his *chief good*, and as making the glory of his bounteous Maker, and just Law-giver, the *chief end* of his life and actions, then it will, I think, be consistent to say he was perfect in wisdom, righteousness, holiness, and happiness: according to the nature of his state in Eden, as the head of mankind, and the lord of the creation, having dominion over the

* Page 98.

works of God's hands.* Whereas, there appears no consistency in the supposition of his having been perfectly wise, holy, righteous, and happy, in a spiritual and evangelical sense.

5. If the perfection of Adam, and that of the saints in ultimate holiness, be both of the same *kind*, and according to the same standard; the former no *LESS than a perfect conformity to the moral law*, the latter *no MORE than a conformity to the same law*, why then there can be no room for a *circumstantial* difference. If both states are to be considered as perfect, then they must either differ in *kind*, or not at all; but, if they differ in nature or kind, as they certainly do, then Mr. F.'s reasoning is all invalid.

6. As the saints of the Lord are constituted truly and evangelically holy, through being eternally and influentially united to God, in Christ, the God-Man, their adorable head, I must think they will contemplate and adore God in such a way as the law never required of man in Eden; and praise him for such holiness and happiness that Adam never knew; and sing, in the virtue and enjoyment of *such a principle* as Adam never possessed, the high praises of him who maketh them kings and priests to himself for ever and ever! It is remarkable, that Christ never speaks of giving to his saints the glory which was given to Adam; but the glory which was given to himself before the world was.

7. If the ultimate holiness of the saints may be said to consist in a perfect deliverance from sin, and perfect hatred to it, with perfect knowledge of and delight in God, as their everlasting portion in Christ, and perfect adoration of the all-glorious Three in One, distinctly praising, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, according to their different acts *for* them, and *in* them, having a clear view of the glorious perfections of the great Elohim, as all perfectly harmonizing and shining forth in refulgent splendour in the immutable God-Man; if I say this is, for substance, a gospel representation of ultimate holiness and happiness, as I presume it must be admitted it is, then I aver, that Adam's principle could not be suited to this evangelical and heavenly employment.

8. The words which Mr. F. has cited from the Hebrews, and from John, are by no means sufficient to prove that the ultimate holiness of the saints is no more than a confor-

* Psalm viii.

mity to the moral law in Adam. It cannot be proved that Adam was the subject of that glorious likeness of which John speaks in the text referred to. And as to the other words, though they speak of men being made perfect, they are not suited to prove that for which they are produced; for, who ever thought of denying that the spirits of just men in glory are made perfect? And the words will not prove that their perfection is of the same nature as Adam's was in paradise.

III. Reason, "The terms used to describe the one imply that it is of the same nature as the other—Conversion is expressed by a *return* to God, which denotes a recovery to a right state of mind after a departure from him. Regeneration is called a *washing*, which expresses the restoring of the soul to purity, from which it had degenerated; and hence the same divine operation is in the same passage called the *renewing* of the Holy Ghost."* I reply:—

1. Conversion may doubtless be expressed by a *return* to God, without supposing at the same time that the elect are brought into the same state as they had in Adam. They are not brought into the same state, and the same kind of life and happiness, as Adam's was, though they are brought to the same God. They return to the same God, for there is but one; but then he appears to them in a new relation, in Christ Jesus; and they return by a *new* and living way, to which Adam was an entire stranger. Therefore, though they return to the same God, yet not to the same state.

2. It is requisite and right to distinguish between the principle *in* our minds by regeneration, and those spiritual evangelical dispositions *of* our minds; all of which must ever flow from regeneration-life or principle. And the Apostle gives us warrant so to distinguish in this very text to Titus, referred to by Mr. F. The Apostle evidently distinguishes between regeneration and the effects, or washing of regeneration. By the former, he means a principle in the mind, born of the Holy Spirit, which is a vital and heavenly principle, or spring of holy operation in the mind, from which all spiritual acts arise. By the *washing* of regeneration, I understand him as meaning the dispositions of our minds, or that evangelical frame and temper of soul

* Page 100.

which is the consequence of that holy, and heavenly spirit of life in the mind, as aforesaid. And it is manifest, that all real evangelical order in the minds of God's people, arises from a vital and heavenly principle in their minds, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, as the cause thereof. This vital holy principle must first exist *in* the mind, as the root or spring of all spiritual dispositions and volitions *of* the mind, before any such dispositions can be felt. The begetting of a principle of life and light in the soul is an instantaneous act of the Holy Ghost; in which work, the soul is passive entirely.

3. When the Apostle speaks of persons being sanctified in and through believing the truth, we must, doubtless, understand him to mean the same thing as he does in this text to Titus, by the *washing of* regeneration; in which the person washed may be said to be *active*, because the good he then receives comes to him in a way of believing, and which certainly is an *act of the mind*, under the powerful operation of the Holy Ghost, in the new nature or life, disposing and enabling the soul to will and do according to the divine pleasure. New-born babes desire the sincere milk of the word, but such disposition or desire of the mind is the consequence of *the divine nature* being first begotten in their minds, as the spring or cause of all saving desire after God in Christ.

4. The believer is too frequently, to his great sorrow, the subject of very corrupt and rebellious dispositions of mind; but, it cannot be properly said, that he is the subject of very holy and Christ-like dispositions of mind at the same time, any other way than as he is possessed of them *radically*, or in the root of them, which root will again produce heavenly fruit under the reviving beams of the Sun of righteousness. Thus the believer has frequent cause to pray for the *washing of* regeneration, and the *renewing of* the Holy Ghost, though it be inconsistent for him to pray to be regenerated. "This renovation is spoken of the mind, and not of a principle in the mind."* For, "the sinner's *faculty* renewed, is not the sinner's *principle*: it is but the *instrument* of the use and motion of grace in the Spirit's hand. He himself, by *indwelling*, is the principle, without which, after he had become the *author* of sanctification, and had changed the faculty, the faculty would

* Brine.

relapse into a total deprivation of the habits and abilities of the new creature. Grace, as a habit or quality, could never subsist in the faculty of a man, *separate* from the Spirit as his principle, to maintain, by *in-being* and *indwelling*, what he had once created by *in-working*.*

VI. Reason. "Supreme love to God, which is acknowledged to be the principle of man in innocence, would necessarily lead a fallen creature to embrace the gospel way of salvation. This is clearly intimated in our Lord's reasonings with the Jews: I know you, that ye have not the love of God in you. I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not. This reasoning on the contrary hypothesis was invalid; for if receiving the Messiah was that to which a principle of supreme love to God was unequal a non-reception of him would afford no proof of its absence. They might have had the love of God in them, and yet not have received him."† I reply as follows:—

I. Our Lord's words in the place referred to, clearly intimate, that he was not speaking of such a reception of himself as stands connected with eternal life; for, he said to the Jews, if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive.‡ Now, he surely could not mean to say, that they would receive another in a spiritual way, for that must be impossible. But the words are to be understood as meaning no more than an open acknowledging and believing of him to be what he said he was, in his discourse unto them; namely, the Son of God and the Messiah promised: and because they would not honour him as such, their nation was destroyed.

II. It does not appear that the dispute between Christ and the Jews was about the nature of saving faith; or the necessity of an atonement; or the happiness of the gospel salvation; or any thing of that kind. Had they obeyed his words, or complied with the design of his reasonings, so as to have received him, it does not seem that eternal life would have been necessarily connected. Nor was it everlasting destruction in hell that they were threatened with, in a direct sense of speaking, as a punishment for not

* Hussey.

† Page 101.

‡ Barchochebas, an impostor, who pretended to be the Messiah, and stirred them up to rebellion against the Romans, in the reign of Adrian, in the year 134; having mustered an army of 200,000 men, it is said, there were more Jews slain in this war than came out of Egypt.

receiving him; but a destruction of their nation on this earth. Therefore, our Lord was not arguing to prove, that if the Jews had been the subjects of supreme love to God, as Adam was, they would necessarily have embraced the gospel way of salvation, as those do who are born of the Spirit. He is King over all the world, but not a Priest for all the world; therefore, natural homage is due unto him, as Lord of all, from creatures, distinct from any thing of a heavenly kind, or from any interest in his priesthood, by the sovereign will of God in the covenant of grace and redemption.

III. Adam's love was an *act of pure nature in innocent rectitude*; "but to love God in this manner supposes the absence of all evil propensity to rebel against him, and of every approach towards a spirit of contrariety to him," it must, therefore, be absurd to suppose any fallen creature possessed of such a disposition. But this has been noticed elsewhere already. No one having and exercising such a disposition has any need for a Saviour, and, therefore, it is supposing a thing to be, which is naturally impossible; and which God himself cannot cause to be. Innocence lost, is gone irrecoverably: all true love to God now springs from faith in Christ, and as this object of faith, as well as the act of faith, were entirely needless in Adam's love and obedience, it must remain impossible for any one to prove that, Adam's disposition and the believer's principle are essentially the same. It is asserted, that Adam's disposition of mind would necessarily lead a fallen creature to embrace the gospel way of salvation. But as no fallen creature ever possessed it, nor ever can, what evidence have we to prove to us the truth of such an assertion? The scriptures do not affirm any such thing, nor have we any precedent.

As to the disposition of standing angels, we may rather suppose, from their election, that they are in a supernatural state, answerable to the regenerate state of elect men. For they are confirmed by their election, while the rest never were so established. But as elect men are confirmed by the influence of electing grace, through a principle suited thereto, so it is thought the holy angels are upheld by an *incorruptible seed*, and are thus kept from apostatizing. And thus are all things in heaven and earth, gathered together in one family under Christ, the Lord of

Glory.* It is certain they are no proper example of our author's supposed creature, whom he imagines to be sinful, and yet led by such kind of love as Adam exercised in innocence, to embrace the gospel salvation for himself. The frame of Adam's mind was answerable to a covenant of justification, and peace by works. But, Mr. F. asserts that, "it is *of the nature of faith* to relinquish every thing of the kind."† The disposition of an innocent mind must essentially differ from that of a fallen mind, created in Christ Jesus unto good works. It hence appears that, the spirituality of innocent Adam has no real foundation, neither in the law, nor the gospel; neither in reason, nor revelation. Therefore the assertion, made by *Mr. Brine*, which affirmed that "the principle of innocent Adam, con-natural to him, was not suited to live unto God through a Mediator, that kind of life being above the extent of his powers, though perfect," remains unremoved by any thing Mr. F. has advanced, and therefore, still of force against the confounding system.

SECTION XIII.

MR. FULLER'S ANSWERS TO OBJECTIONS, REFUTED.

I. "A SUBJECT while he preserves his loyalty, needs no Mediator in approaching the throne; if he have offended, it is otherwise; but, a change of circumstances would not require a change of principles. On the contrary, the same principle of loyal affection that would induce him, while innocent, to approach the throne with modest confidence, would induce him, after having offended, to approach it with penitence: and, if a *Mediator were at hand*, with whose interposition *the Sovereign had declared himself well pleased*, it would, at the same time, lead him to implore forgiveness in his name."‡

Ans. This may appear pretty and plain to some; but, can have nothing to do with the great and marvellous work of God, in bringing his perishing *children* to himself, through the efficacious mediation of Jesus Christ, their Surety and Redeemer. It is not pleaded by any one, that

* Eph. i. 10. Col. i. 15—17. † Page 185. ‡ Page 94.

I know of, that a subject must be possessed of a different principle after he has offended, from that which he had while he preserved his loyalty, in order, to his seeking pardon at the hand of his sovereign through the fittest medium. Nature itself will teach him without any supernatural endowment; but, this is very wide of the case of condemned sinners before an offended God. For, if it be admitted that, a natural man so circumstanced, with respect to his sovereign, would act as Mr. F. has said he would; it will not prove any thing like what he wished to establish.

1. *Adam's principle was the rectitude of his very nature*; it must, therefore, be naturally impossible for a fallen creature to possess it; and, to suppose such a thing in reasoning, as Mr. F. has done, is supposing that, God might be the author of an absurdity. The moment sin was conceived, the principle of innocence was excluded: it could not exist with moral evil. We may as well suppose a man to be violently sick, and ravenously hungry at the same time; or declare one to be absolutely dead, yet perfectly alive at the same moment. Mr. F. has said, "To love God as Adam did, supposes the absence of *all* evil propensity to rebel against him, and of *every* approach towards a spirit of contrariness to him."* Then it must be puerile to talk of a fallen creature's possessing such a principle: and it should be observed that, he has also said, that "the *disposition* of the mind amounts to the same thing as a *principle* in our minds." But, surely the *disposition* of an innocent mind must essentially differ from that of a fallen mind. The spiritual life of Christ exists in principle in many sinners, but, the life of Adam, our natural head, exists in none: nor can proof be given, that it is *possible* for it to be where *sin is connected*, or where *justification by works is excluded*. This paragraph alone proves Mr. F.'s system to be as a baseless fabric.

2. As Adam's principle supposed the absence of all evil, no man can be imagined to have it, without being as sinless as he was. But, such a person would not need a Saviour's cleansing blood any more than Adam did. The disposition of Adam's mind was that of working for acceptance with God; and had nothing in it to lead him

* Reply to Philanthropos, page 33.

to embrace the gospel way of justification by the works of another.

3. As the object, act, and ends, of faith, were not included in the religion of innocence, while they make an essential part of spiritual religion, it must remain impossible for any one to prove that Adam's principle, and the believer's are essentially the same: or, that Adam's disposition of mind would necessarily lead any one to embrace the gospel way of salvation for himself. Either a man is innocent, or guilty; if the *latter*, he has not the principle supposed; if the *former*, he needs not the salvation expressed.

4. It is certain, that we have no example of our author's imagined creature, whom he supposed to be fallen, and polluted throughout by sin, and yet to be led, by such a kind of love "as supposes the absence of all evil," to embrace the gospel way of salvation! But, the yea and nay system, by blending natural and revealed religion together, evidently retains neither distinctly. Still, as the major part of professors are taught to decry controversy, the jumble creed obtains many unsuspecting admirers.

5. In the above answer our author speaks of a *Mediator at hand*; but, if Christ did not atone for the sins of all men; if he did not interpose as a Mediator for all men alike; or, for all as really and effectually as for any one; it cannot be true, that all men have a Mediator at hand. Nor can punitive justice be satisfied for the sins of any in whose stead Jesus was not made a curse. Either he was made a curse for all men, or for some; if the *former*, the damnation of *any* must be unjust; if the *latter*, the salvation of *many* must be forever impossible; they can have no Mediator at hand.

6. All those on whose behalf Christ interposed, draw near unto God; and not only implore, but obtain forgiveness at his hand, at the time appointed for their conversion. Neither is there any reason to fear that, some of them may be forgotten of God the Holy Spirit, and so left to perish, though the Father had chosen them, and the Son had redeemed them from all iniquity, and from the wrath to come. As God hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and as Christ has assured us that, all the Father giveth him shall come to him, and shall in no wise be cast out; we may rest confidently persuaded that the Lord's people

shall be perfectly saved. And even Mr. F. says, "It is granted that none ever did, or will, believe in Christ, but those who are chosen of God from eternity."* Then, why are plain christians to be teased with the jumble creed, since Jacob was safe without it, and Esau is sure to remain lost with it?

His answer is thus obviated, and proved to be inapplicable; for it by no means maintains the point in hand, namely, that the principle of innocence was essentially the same with that we have now by the gospel: besides, the simile is very exceptionable, and more suited to darken, than to illustrate the glorious things of the kingdom of Christ, in which grace reigns.

II. "If the principle of Adam, in innocence, was not suited to live to God through a Mediator, and this be the standard of duty to his carnal descendants, it must, of course, be their duty either not to worship God at all, or to worship him as Cain did, without any respect to an atoning sacrifice."

Ans. 1. The scriptures no where say that Cain offered "without any respect to an atoning sacrifice." We cannot be certain that he did not profess faith in the promised seed, as many now do, whose religion like his, is only an external thing. What he offered is allowed to have been a sacrifice, and the fruits of the ground were afterwards ordered to be offered by the Israelites, and some have thought them typical of Christ.

2. It has been already shewn that, Adam's principle was not suited to live unto God through a Mediator, being directly adapted to an earthly state, necessarily supposing the absence of all evil, and that its subject was under a covenant of works.

3. "The standard of duty" to Adam, and all his carnal descendants, was the law of justification by works.

4. Many of Adam's carnal descendants have no means of knowing the only Mediator between God and men; therefore, they cannot all be bound to worship God through his name. Hence, it follows, that all who are so circumstanced, must be bound either not to worship God at all, or to worship without any respect to an atoning sacrifice. This clearly shews that, our author's system is exposed to

* Pref. page xii.