

THE
BIBLICAL REPERTORY
AND
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

EDITED BY AN
ASSOCIATION OF GENTLEMEN IN PRINCETON,
AND ITS VICINITY.

JANUARY 1830

Philadelphia :

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
JAMES KAY, JUN & CO LIBRARY, NEAR FIFTH STREET.

SOLE AGENTS BY
TOWNE & D. W. HOLLAND, 253 MARKET ST.

Price \$3 a year, in advance.

1830.

THE
BIBLICAL REPERTORY, AND THEOLOGICAL
REVIEW.

FOR JANUARY 1830.

REVIEW ON THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF
THE SECOND ADVENT.

The Second Advent; or, the Glorious Epiphany of our Lord Jesus Christ. Being an attempt to elucidate, in Chronological Order, the Prophecies both of the Old and New Testament which relate to that Event. By the Rev. John Fry, B.A. Rector of Desford, in Leicestershire. London, 2 vols, 8vo, 1822.

[The conductors of the Biblical Repertory and Theological Review do not desire to make the work the vehicle exclusively of their own opinions, but are desirous of extending to their correspondents the liberty of advocating their own sentiments, reserving to themselves the right of deciding how far the opinions advanced can, with propriety, through their instrumentality, be presented to the public. They are, therefore, not to be considered as adopting the views presented by the author of the article on the Second Advent. As the subject, however, is one of interest, and has long been a matter of public discussion in England, it is probable our readers will be glad to see an exhibition of the

episcopal periodicals, and individuals attacked are called upon by name to come forth and speak in their own defence; when these things are done, we lament them; not because we have the slightest apprehension for the safety of presbyterianism; for we trust she will always have sons able and willing to come forward, in the name and strength of the King of Zion, to defend her; but because we are very sure that such conflicts among professing christians are not calculated to promote the best interests of vital piety in any denomination.

THE EARLY HISTORY OF PELAGIANISM.

With propriety the term militant has been applied to the church upon earth. No sooner was the light of truth sent down from heaven than it fell into interminable conflict with the darkness of error. And not only was it necessary to contend with the powers of darkness without the kingdom of Christ, but hideous forms of error were generated within the bosom of the church; according to the prophetic warning of our Saviour, "Beware of false prophets which come to you in sheep's clothing;" and that of the apostle Paul, in his solemn valedictory to the elders of Ephesus, "For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." Even while Paul lived the churches were exceedingly disturbed and distracted by false teachers, who brought in "another gospel," and endeavoured to overthrow from the foundation the doctrine of gratuitous justification by faith without works; and to substitute a legal system, according to which justification before God could be expected only from obedience to the ceremonial law of Moses. A large portion of the inspired writings of this apostle have direct reference to the opinions of these Judaizing heretics. Others arose in the church who denied the resurrection of the body, and maintained that all the resurrection to be expected was already past. They seem to

have explained all that our Lord had said respecting the resurrection spiritually, or as relating to the purification or revivification of the soul. As the former errorists manifestly came out from the sect of the Pharisees, the latter might have derived their origin from the Sadducees, or from some of the schools of heathen philosophy. From these facts in the history of the apostolic church we learn, that when converts were made to the society of christians, many of them retained something of the leaven of their old errors, and endeavoured to modify and corrupt the pure doctrines of the gospel by accommodating them to their preconceived opinions. And as all the first christians had been brought up in another religion, it is not wonderful that errors abounded among those professing christianity, even in the times of the apostles. This is, indeed, contrary to the vulgar opinion, which considers the primitive church as being in all respects near perfection. This opinion, however, is not founded on any information given to us in the apostolic writings; for in addition to what has already been observed, we may refer to the epistles of our Lord to the seven churches of Asia for further proof of the existence and prevalence of error in the days of the apostles. And towards the close of that age the impudence and licentiousness of the propagators of error may be learned from the catholic epistles of John, the second of Peter, and the epistle of Jude; all of which are filled with descriptions of false teachers, and warnings against their pestiferous influence.

Of the age immediately succeeding that of the apostles our information is very imperfect; either because there were few who had leisure or inclination for writing; or because their works have perished; which we know to have been the fact in regard to some important records. But from all the authentic history which has reached our times we learn that swarms of heretics infested the church, even while she was struggling under the direful strokes of sanguinary persecution. No age has produced more monstrous errors than the second century, of which Irenæus has given us a detailed account. And all this congeries of extravagant opinions originated in the false philosophy of those who professed to embrace christianity. The loathsome spawn of Gnosticism was cast upon the church from the corrupt but fertile source of the oriental philosophy. The original fountain of this extraordinary inundation of absurd heresy was

a fanciful doctrine of the nature of God. It would be interesting to pursue this subject, but we are admonished by the narrowness of our limits to forbear.

It does not appear, however, that, amidst the multifarious errors which were broached in the first four centuries, any controversy arose respecting the doctrines of *sin* and *grace*. In regard to the person of the Mediator, error had assumed almost every possible shape, both as it related to his humanity and divinity, and the nature and effects of the union between them. Council after council had been convened to discuss and decide on points connected with this important subject; and theologians of the first learning and highest reputation employed their pens in defence of the catholic doctrine.

But early in the fifth century a new doctrine began to be published by Pelagius, a British monk, on the subject of man's natural condition, and the connexion which subsisted between Adam and his posterity. That the doctrine of Pelagius was new, and different from the opinions which had commonly been received in the church, needs no other proof than the impression which it made on the minds of the great majority of learned theologians who lived at that time. And that the doctrine of original sin then received by the church was the same which had been always held from the times of the apostles, is exceedingly probable, from the fact that the subject never underwent any public discussion, and it is rarely the case that a doctrine entirely new can be introduced and propagated every where without giving rise to much controversy, and exciting much public attention. Pelagius did, indeed, in his controversy with Augustine, allege, that this father had invented the doctrine of original sin, which was unknown to preceding ages; but in answer to this charge Augustine appealed to many writers of the first ages, to show that they entertained the same views as those which he now advocated. These testimonies are not so explicit as could be collected from the writings of those who lived after the discussion of this subject took place. But this is always the case. When any point of doctrine is undisputed and received by all, while it is every where tacitly admitted or incidentally referred to, it is never made the subject of accurate definition; nor is it expounded with that fulness and caution which become necessary after it has been called in question or opposed. When Augustine was urged to bring

forward proofs from the fathers who preceded him, he answered the demand in the following sensible manner: "Quid igitur opus est ut eorum scrutemur opuscula, qui priusquam ipsa hæresis oriretur, non habuerunt necessitatem in hac difficili ad solvendum questione versari, quod procul dubio facerent si respondere talibus cogerentur." That is, "What occasion is there that we should search the works of those who, living before this heresy arose, had no necessity of handling this difficult question, which doubtless they would have done if they had been obliged to answer such men as we have to deal with."

Jerome, in several places in his works, ascribes the new opinions propagated by Pelagius to Rufin, who, he alleges, borrowed them from Origen: but as Jerome is known to have cherished an implacable hostility to Rufin, and also to the memory of Origen, his testimony on this subject ought to be received with caution. And we cannot find that he brings forward any passages from the writings of Rufin which are sufficient to gain credit to the allegation against him.

Pelagius is admitted, by his keenest opposers, to have been a man of learning, and of estimable character. And on other points, especially on the warmly contested doctrine of the trinity, he was not only orthodox, but wrote three books in defence of the catholic opinion, in which he gave deserved praise to Athenæsius for his great constancy and soundness in the faith, and did not hesitate to pronounce the opinions of Arius impious. He, moreover, published fourteen books containing an exposition of the epistles of Paul, which, in the opinion of several learned men, are still extant in the commentaries subjoined to those of Jerome on Paul's epistles. One thing is certain in relation to these commentaries; they do not contain the opinions of Jerome on the subject of original sin, but precisely those of Pelagius. Besides the books already mentioned, he wrote many letters to distinguished individuals, most of which are lost; and also a book, *DE NATURA*, in which he extols the powers and virtues of human nature; and a small book, addressed to pope Innocent, containing a confession of the catholic faith, as he had received it. But it was a complaint against him by some of his contemporaries, that he left it to his disciples, principally, to write; so that he might have the opportunity, when he judged it expedient, of denying that the opinions pub-

lished by them were his own. But, on the whole, it cannot be denied that the reputation of Pelagius stood high in the church before he began to propagate his heretical opinions. Jerome, who was never inclined to spare his adversaries, seems to have respected him, for in his first piece against his opinions, he refrains from mentioning his name; but speaks of himself under the fictitious name of Atticus, and of his adversary by the name of Clitobulus. Another writer of that age, who seemed solicitous to speak evil of Pelagius, found nothing to hold up to censure or ridicule but his bodily defects. Augustine acknowledges that he was a man of chaste and unblemished character: and Chrysostom laments that a man of so great probity should have fallen into heresy.

But although Pelagius was the author of the system which has been denominated from him, yet some of his disciples were much more distinguished in the defence and propagation of these opinions. Among these, the most celebrated was Cœlestius. Augustine admits that he was a man of most penetrating genius. Before he became a follower of Pelagius, he published three small treatises, addressed to his parents, in the form of epistles, which contained nothing erroneous, but were full of incitements to a virtuous life. What he wrote afterwards, we know only from the citations and references of Augustine, and others of his opponents. When he was condemned by the council of Carthage, he travelled into Asia, where, it is said, he was ordained a presbyter, and afterwards took up his residence in Sicily, where he continued by his discourses and writings to propagate the doctrines of Pelagius.

Julian, an Italian bishop, the son of Memorius, bishop of Capua, was, however, the most zealous and able writer in favour of the opinions of Pelagius. When quite a young man he was known to Augustine, and greatly beloved by him, as appears from a letter which he addressed to the father of Julian. This young man was so rich in mental endowments, and possessed of an eloquence so commanding and persuasive, that he received the appellation of the Roman Demosthenes. And from what remains of his controversial works, it is manifest that he had a mind of uncommon vigour and penetration. The character given of him by Gennadius of Marseilles is, "That he was a man of a penetrating genius, learned in the Scriptures, and an accurate scholar, both

in the Greek and Latin languages." Before he embraced the impious doctrine of Pelagius, he was distinguished among the doctors of the church. Afterwards, he undertook the defence of the Pelagian errors, against Augustine; first, in a work consisting of four books, and then in another work of eight books. He is said also to have written a work in the form of dialogue, in which the parties in this controversy are introduced as defending their respective opinions. But Gennadius, and others who followed him, are entirely mistaken in ascribing this dialogue, or *disputation*, to Julian. It is the production of Augustine, who selects from the eight books of Julian the arguments which are there used in favour of Pelagianism, and then answers them in his own name. The title of this disputation is *Altercatio Amorum*. The occasion of writing this book Augustine himself has informed us of, in his own preface, where he says that an illustrious man sent him certain extracts which some person had made from the books of Julian, the Pelagian heretic, and requested that he would give an answer. "To these" says he "I now return an answer, first setting down the very words of Julian, and then subjoining my answers to each particular, in order.

Julian also edited two letters, which were published; the one addressed to Zosimus, bishop of Rome, the other, in the name of eighteen bishops who united with him, to Rufus, bishop of Thessalonica. The venerable Bede, in his Commentary on the Song of Solomon, mentions and refutes a work of Julian on the same subject. Julian prefixed to his exposition of the Canticles a work entitled *De Amore*, in which he labours to prove that there is implanted in all men, a natural principle of love, which continues from infancy to old age, and is preserved, without loss of vigour, by mere human exertion.

He wrote, moreover, a book concerning the virtue of constancy, and an epistle to Demetrius; in both of which, according to Bede, he defended the Pelagian doctrine of free-will.

Pelagius came to Rome about A.D. 410, when Innocent, the bishop, was absent, in consequence of the capture of the city by Alaric, and there began to scatter the seeds of his doctrine, under the specious veil of certain interrogatories, which he proposed for consideration and discussion. Cœlestius, in Sicily, pursued the same policy, and about the same time. Not long after this both Pelagius and Cœlestius passed

over to Africa, but Pelagius did not long continue there, but travelled on to Asia Minor. By this time, the rumour of his heresy was spread abroad; Jerome in the east, and Augustine in the west, had taken up their pens against what they considered a pestiferous doctrine. A council was therefore called at Diospolis or Lydda, in Palestine, and fourteen bishops met to investigate the doctrines of Pelagius. Every thing here was as favourable to him as he could have wished; for neither of the two bishops who were his accusers were present; and as the writings of Pelagius were in the Latin language, his judges were totally incompetent to form an accurate judgment of his doctrines, for want of a correct knowledge of the Latin tongue. Moreover, John, bishop of Jerusalem, warmly espoused the cause of Pelagius, and he was without difficulty acquitted of the charge of heresy, and received by the assembled bishops as an orthodox brother.

The presbyter Orosius coming to Carthage from Palestine, brought with him the accusation preferred against Pelagius by Herus and Lazarus, and communicated this document to a council then sitting at Carthage on the affairs of the church. The bishops there assembled, before they heard of the decision of the council of Diospolis, were much alarmed, and wrote to Innocent of Rome their view of the opinions of Pelagius; adding, that if he and his partisans did not unequivocally reject these errors, they ought to be immediately excommunicated. These resolutions were signed by sixty-eight bishops. Another synod met shortly afterwards at Milevum, in Numidia, and addressed letters on the same subject to the bishop of Rome. The result of the eastern council being now known in Africa, Augustine, Alypius and Aurelius, with two other bishops, wrote a more full and particular account of the whole controversy to Innocent, and explained how the council of Diospolis had most probably been imposed on by the subtilty of Pelagius. Innocent entered fully into the views of the African bishops, and in his answer expressed the same conditional condemnation of the authors of the heresy. But as Pelagius had diffused his doctrine extensively, and put on it a fair face, it was necessary that he should be met with argument, as well as decisions of councils: and no man in the church was so well qualified for this work as Augustine, who did not shrink from the arduous task, but entered into this field of controversy, in which he was occupied for twenty years.

Pelagius gloried greatly in his acquittal; on which occasion he wrote to a friend that fourteen bishops had agreed with him that man might live without sin, and easily keep the commandments of God, if he would. He also wrote to Augustine an account of his acquittal; and immediately proceeded to publish his opinions more boldly, in four books which he wrote on the subject of free-will, and in which he entirely denied the doctrine of original sin.

The first thing which Augustine wrote expressly against the opinions of Pelagius, was three books addressed to Marcellinus, *Concerning the demerit and remission of sins, and the baptism of children*. In these, Pelagius is treated very respectfully, because Augustine still believed him to be a pious man, and because his reputation in the church was very high. In these books, Augustine said that it was possible for a man, by the aids of divine grace, to live without sin, but that no one had ever yet attained to that perfection, or ever would in time to come. At this opinion Marcellinus expressed some surprise; which gave occasion to Augustine to write another book, *Concerning the letter and spirit*, in which he keenly contends with the opposers of the doctrine of grace.

As Pelagius had now, by means of his letter to Demetrius, made known his opinions, and spread them abroad, Augustine did not any longer consider it necessary to forbear mentioning his name; he therefore provided an antidote to the aforesaid letter, in an epistle addressed to Juliana, the mother of Demetrius, which is numbered 143 in the *Collection* of his epistles.

In the year 414 he seems to have written his famous work *De Natura et Gratia*, which he dedicated to two young gentlemen, Timasius and Jacobus, who had recently been converted, from being disciples of Pelagius, to the catholic faith. These two young men had been induced by the persuasions of Pelagius to devote themselves to a monastic life, and at the same time drank in his self-righteous spirit: but by the exertions of Augustine they were brought back to the acknowledgment of the truth.

In the following year, 415, Augustine wrote a particular account of the proceedings in relation to Pelagius which had taken place in the council of Palestine, and addressed it to Aurelius, bishop of Carthage.

In the year 416 the council of Carthage met, and address-

ed a letter to Innocent; and Augustine, in addition, wrote one in his own name and that of several of his friends, Aurelius, Alypius, Euodeus and Possidius. As Augustine had already commenced writing against Pelagius, a request was made by this council that he should go on with the controversy; in consequence of which he published this year two books; the one *Concerning the grace of Christ*, the other *Concerning original sin*.

About this time, also, it is supposed that his letter to Dardanus was written, which is numbered fifty-seven, in the collection of his epistles, and, moreover, his book against Cœlestius, addressed to the bishops Eutropius and Paulus, *Concerning the perfection of righteousness*.

In the year 417 Augustine, having heard that there were some persons at Nola who had imbibed the doctrine of Pelagius, wrote to Paulinus, bishop of that place, *Concerning the Pelagian heresy*, which letter is the one hundredth and sixth in the collection.

In 418 he wrote two epistles to the Roman presbyter Sixtus, one of which was intended as an express refutation of the Pelagian heresy.

Thus it appears how indefatigable this father was in opposing the heresy of Pelagius. Almost every one of the above works is particularly mentioned in *The retractions of Augustine*.

Innocent, bishop of Rome, dying about this time, was succeeded by Zosimus, to whom both Pelagius and Cœlestius addressed epistles, in which they gave such a complexion to their system, and spoke in language so plausible and ambiguous, that Zosimus was completely deceived by their fair speeches. He accordingly wrote to the bishops of Africa that he considered Pelagius an orthodox man. But they showed, in their answer, that it was not enough for these men to acknowledge the truth in general terms; but that they should explicitly confess that we need the grace of Jesus Christ in every act. Zosimus did not remain obstinate, but upon receiving accurate information from Augustine of the true nature of the opinions of these men, issued a sentence of condemnation against them.

Upon this, the emperor Honorius also passed a sentence of banishment from Rome against the Pelagians. This was in the year 418. Cœlestius, on being condemned, went to Constantinople, where he met with determined opposition

from Atticus, the bishop of that city; so that his designs of propagating his opinions there were disappointed.

Pelagius still continued in Palestine, and complained grievously of the hard treatment which he received by the decisions and acts respecting him at Rome, and by the books written against him; and again succeeded in imposing on some respectable persons who held a conference with him, by leading them to think that his doctrine did not materially differ from the common belief. These persons on whom he made this impression, were so much interested in his favour, that they wrote to Augustine, stating their favourable views of the doctrine of Pelagius. This communication seems to have been the occasion of Augustine's writing his books *Concerning grace and original sin*.

Julian, of whom we have already spoken, having published severe animadversions on the conduct of Zosimus and his clergy, Boniface, the successor of Zosimus, sent them to Augustine, for the purpose of having them refuted; which he did in four books, inscribed to Boniface. And count Valerius, having received another of Julian's writings, in which he charges the catholics with condemning marriage, deriving this as an inference from their doctrine of original sin, caused this work to be sent to Augustine, who soon published an answer in his work *De Nuptiis et Concupiscentia*.

To this work Julian replied in four books. To these Augustine opposed six books; in the first three of which he answers what is contained in Julian's first book; but the fourth, fifth and sixth are employed in refuting the second, third and fourth of Julian; the one answering to the other in order. Julian was not a man to be easily silenced; for he now came out with eight books against the six of Augustine. These the venerable polemic was preparing to answer, when he was called away from all his earthly labours. Only two books of this last work were completed; these have come down to us with his other works.

The death of Augustine occurred, according to the testimony of Prosper in his *Chronicon*, A.D. 430; the latter was the friend and correspondent of Augustine, from whom this father received particular information of the progress of Pelagianism, or rather Semi-Pelagianism, at Marseilles, where these opinions took deep root, and continued long to flourish.

It may be satisfactory now to give a more particular ac-

count of the decisions of the several councils which met for the consideration of this subject, in their chronological order.

The first was the council of Carthage, convened, A.D. 407, on account of the dissemination by Cœlestius of the opinions of Pelagius, which also he pertinaciously defended. Of the proceedings of this council no fragment remains but one preserved in Augustine's work on original sin. Mention is made of this council, however, in the letter of the fathers of the second council of Carthage, addressed to Innocent. From the fragment preserved by Augustine, we learn that the accusation against Cœlestius was, that he had taught "that the sin of Adam hurt himself alone." Cœlestius acknowledged that he had doubted concerning the communication of sin by descent from Adam; but professed his willingness to be better instructed by those to whom God had given greater wisdom; yet observed that he had heard from presbyters of the church a doctrine different from that which was held by the council. And being called upon to name one from whom he had heard such an opinion, he mentioned Rufin, a holy presbyter of Rome. On being asked whether he had not asserted that infants are born in the same state in which Adam was before transgression, he would make no other reply but "that infants needed baptism, and ought to be baptized."

The council of Diospolis, in Palestine, consisted, as has been mentioned before, of only fourteen bishops. The accusers of Pelagius were not able to attend; one of them being prevented by sickness, and the other by some other cause.

Augustine mentions this council in several of his works, and ascribes the acquittal of Pelagius to his artful use of equivocal terms, by which his judges were deceived, and were induced to pronounce him innocent.

Jerome, in his seventy-ninth epistle, calls this "a miserable synod;" and says, that although they did not err in doctrine, they were deceived in the man; who deceitfully seemed to condemn his own opinions. Photius, in his *Bibliotheca*, gives a more particular account of this council; but his information seems to have been derived from the works of Augustine, already referred to.

A.D. 416. Another council met at Carthage, which has already been noticed; not convened, indeed, to attend to

this controversy; but Prosius having brought intelligence respecting the proceedings instituted against Pelagius in Palestine, the fathers of this council took up the business, and wrote a letter to Innocent, in which they expressed their opinion freely and fully, relative to the heresy of the opinions of which Pelagius was accused, and of the course which ought to be pursued in regard to him, if he did not explicitly abjure them. Sixty-seven pastors were present at this synod.

About the same time, or a little later, a synod met at Milevum, in Numidia, consisting of sixty bishops or pastors, who took up the subject of the errors of Pelagius and Cælestius, and, in imitation of the council of Carthage, addressed a letter to Innocent, bishop of Rome.

It appears from several notices in the writings of Augustine, that another full synod met in Africa, and addressed letters on this subject to Zosimus, the successor of Innocent; but all trace of the acts and proceedings of this council, except the short notices referred to above, have disappeared. This synod is said to have consisted of two hundred and twenty-four bishops, and is supposed to have been held A.D. 417 or 418. But great obscurity rests upon the whole matter.

A.D. 428. When Cælestinus was bishop of Rome, a council was held in Gaul, occasioned by a deputation from Britain, who represented that the poison of Pelagianism had been imported into that country by one Agricola, the son of Jenerianus, a bishop; and that they greatly needed aid to prevent its diffusion among the people. On this occasion a large council convened, and two eminent men, Germanus and Lupus, were sent on a mission to Britain to check the progress of Pelagianism. By their exertions the catholic doctrine appeared to be every where restored: but no sooner had they taken their departure than heresy began again to germinate; so that the request to the Gallican church for help was repeated, and Germanus was again sent, and was accompanied by Severus, a disciple of Lupus, his former colleague. The witnesses for these facts are Constantius, in his *Life of Germanus*, and Bede, in his *History of the British Churches*.

The next council in which the subject of Pelagianism was brought up for consideration, was that of Ephesus, A.D. 431. This is called an œcumenical council. It was convened

not on account of the heresy of Pelagius, but to condemn Nestorianism; but as the followers of Pelagius would not join in the censure of Nestorius, the council expressed their disapprobation of that heresy also, which they denominate *the wicked doctrine of Cœlestius*. And in their synodical epistle to Cœlestinus, bishop of Rome, they approve of the sentence of condemnation which had been passed on Pelagius, Cœlestius, Julian, and their abettors, whom they call impious men.

The Pelagian doctrine was next condemned in a council which met at Arles, in France; the exact year is not settled. This synod denounced an anathema against the impious doctrines of Pelagius; and especially against the opinion *that man was born without sin; and that he could be saved by his own exertions*. They considered it a presumption worthy to be condemned for any man to believe that he could be saved without grace.

The council of Lyons met soon after that of Arles, and approved its decrees; but some other doctrines were also brought under consideration, and subjected to censure.

A.D. 494. Gelasius, bishop of Rome, convened a council of seventy bishops in that city, by whom the writings of Augustine and Prosper were approved and recommended; while those of the semi-Pelagians, Cassian and Faustus, were censured.

Other councils were held in after ages, which condemned the Pelagian heresy; but our object now is to give a view of this controversy in its first rise, in the fifth century.

Before we proceed to give a view of the opinions entertained and propagated by Pelagius and his followers, it will be satisfactory to ascertain what were the opinions of the church on this subject.

The doctrine of the church, then, on the subject of original sin, may be thus stated. It has ever been the judgment of the catholic church, that the first sin of Adam was imputed to all his posterity by the righteous appointment of God; and that its effects are transmitted to all his children; which effects, the church always believed, were, that they were born destitute of original righteousness, subject to the sentence of death, and obnoxious to eternal separation from God.

Man being created in the image of God, and being fully endued with all powers necessary for obedience; and, more-

over, being blessed with every thing requisite for his comfort, did transgress the law of his Maker by disobeying that commandment which was given as a test of his whole obedience.

This first act of transgression, it is true, was the criminal act of Adam as an individual; but as he was the root and principle of our whole nature, it may be considered the sin of the human race: so that his voluntary act, in opposition to the will of his Creator, may be reckoned that of his descendants; not indeed strictly and properly, (for those not yet born could not perform an act), but interpretatively, or by imputation; for this act was not only imputed to Adam to condemnation, but to all his posterity.

That the above is a correct statement of the commonly received doctrine of the church, at the period of which we treat, will appear from many explicit declarations, not only of Augustine and other individuals, but from the decrees and letters of councils, consisting of numerous bishops, living in every region of the earth to which the universal church extended.

Augustine, in book xvi. of his work *De Civitate Dei*, has these words, "Nascuntur, non proprie, sed originaliter, peccatores." "Men are born, not properly, but originally, sinners." And in book i. c. 15 of his *Retractions*, he says, "Peccatum eos ex Adam dicimus originaliter trahere; id est, reatu eos implicatos, et ob hoc pœnæ obnoxios detineri." We affirm that they derive sin originally from Adam; that is, they are involved in guilt, and on this account are held liable to punishment.

In his work concerning the demerit and remission of sins, he says, that *to impute* and *to remit* are opposites; therefore he asserts, *to impute* is to subject one to guilt; *to remit* is, *not to impute* to condemnation. Here it may be proper to remark, that by *imputation* Augustine meant, not a transfer of moral acts or moral character, but the opposite of remission; *to impute a sin*, therefore, according to him, is to hold the person bound to suffer its punishment. And by the word *reatus*, or *guilt*, he understood an obligation to suffer the punishment of sin, or a subjection to the penalty of the law. It is necessary to understand accurately the meaning of these terms, as used by theologians, or we shall be involved in perpetual perplexity in relation to their opinions. Most of the objections now made to the doctrine of

imputation, and to the transfer of guilt, proceed from a misapprehension of the true import of these terms. We, therefore, hear a great deal of declamation respecting the impossibility of making a transfer of moral character; and respecting the impossibility of ever removing the guilt of a sinner; but if the exact meaning of these terms was apprehended, the supposed difficulty or absurdity would vanish. For, although personal acts cannot be transferred, the consequences or legal penalties of those acts may be transferred; and although the ill-desert of one man cannot be transferred to another, the punishment due to one can be inflicted on another.

But to return, Augustine says again, book xiv. c. 11, *De Civitate Dei*, "A duobus primis transmissum est tam grande peccatum, ut in deterius eo natura mutaretur humana, etiam in posteris obligatione peccati, et mortis necessitate transmissa." Which may be thus rendered into English: "From the first pair so great a sin has been transmitted, that by it human nature is changed for the worse: also the bond of iniquity and the necessity of death are transmitted to their posterity."

And this manner of speaking of original sin was not peculiar to Augustine; for we find the same sort of language in Bernard. When speaking of the first sin, he has the following words: "Aliena est quia in Adam omnes nescientes peccavimus; nostra, quia, etsi in alio, nos tamen peccavimus, et nobis justo Dei judicio imputatur." The meaning of which is, "That this first sin, of which he is here treating, was *another's*, inasmuch as in Adam we sinned; being unconscious of it, *our own*, inasmuch as, although by another, yet we ourselves have sinned, and in the just judgment of God it is imputed to us."

Nicolas Lyra, who lived about four hundred years ago, speaks the same language when explaining the fifth of *Romans*. "Peccatum Adæ imputatur omnibus ab eo descendentibus, secundum vim generativam, quod sic sunt membra ejus, propter quod vacatur peccatum originale." A literal translation of which is, "The sin of Adam is imputed to all descending from him by natural generation, because they are his members, on which account it is called original sin."

And the later writers, until the council of Trent, do not deviate from this language of the ancient church. Cajetan, commenting on the same, (*Romans* v.) says, "The pun-

ishment of death is inflicted on him with his whole posterity ; by which it is proved, that the sin of which death is the punishment, is imputed to him and to his whole posterity."

And even Bellarmine uses as strong language on the subject of imputation as any who went before him. "Adam," says he, "alone committed that (sin) by actual volition, but it is communicated to us by generation, in that mode in which it was possible for that which is past to be communicated, viz. by imputation."

It is scarcely necessary to adduce testimonies from early protestant writers ; for it is known to all in the least acquainted with the opinions of the reformers, that with one consent they held that the sin of Adam was imputed to his posterity ; and that in consequence of this imputation a corrupt nature was communicated to all his natural descendants. We could fill volumes with citations in proof of this fact ; but it is unnecessary. Indeed, until Socinus arose, no one connected with the reformation ever intimated a doubt concerning the imputation of Adam's first sin to his posterity. This ingenious but heretical man utterly denied, as all his followers do, the whole doctrine of original sin. His words are, "Although all the posterity of Adam are liable to eternal death, this is not because the sin of Adam is imputed to them, but because they are his natural descendants ; so that their doom to death does not arise from imputation, but from the propagation of the human race."

It is now, by many who would be esteemed orthodox, and calvinistic too, considered so absurd to hold the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, that they will not even condescend to argue the point, and demonstrate its falsehood. If these be correct in their views of the subject, it must create some surprise that all theologians, from the days of Augustine, who were not acknowledged heretics, believed firmly in this doctrine, and considered it as fundamental in the christian system. Is it certainly the fact, that these modern impugners of the ancient doctrine of the church understand the Scriptures better than all who have gone before them ? Or is it undoubted that they are endowed with a perspicacity so much superior to that of Augustine, Calvin, Owen and Edwards, that what these thought, after profound consideration, might be defended as reasonable, is so absurd as not to merit a refutation ? Now we confess ourselves to be of the number of those who believe, whatever

reproach it may bring upon us from a certain quarter, that if the doctrine of imputation be given up, the whole doctrine of original sin must be abandoned. And if this doctrine be relinquished, then the whole doctrine of redemption must fall, and what may then be left of christianity they may contend for that will; but for ourselves, we shall be of opinion that what remains will not be worth a serious struggle.

But we must return to our proper subject. It will next be satisfactory to know, by what sort of arguments the ancient theologians defended the doctrine of original sin. And although we will not vouch for the soundness of every interpretation of Scripture which the ancient expositors gave, yet it cannot but be satisfactory to the advocates of this doctrine now, that as far back as we can trace the history of opinions, the same views were entertained of the meaning of the principal texts which bear on this point as are now maintained.

The fathers, then, supported the doctrine of original sin by such texts as *Gen. vi. 5.—xiii. 21.* “And God saw that the wickedness of man was great on the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. For the imagination of man’s heart is evil from his youth.” Ambrose, in his remarks on this text, does not confine it to the antediluvians, but considers it a description of human nature in every age, and extends it to persons in every period of human life: for he says, “Even the child of a day old is not without sin, for infancy cannot be exempt from sin, on account of the infirmity of the body.”

Another text which they adduced in proof of original sin was *Gen. xvii. 14.* “And the uncircumcised man child, whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people: he hath broken my covenant.” On this text Augustine remarks, “That the soul which is not regenerated shall perish, since he, with all others, sinned in Adam.” It seems that they interpreted the breach of the covenant to have reference to the covenant made with Adam, and not the covenant of circumcision. For thus we find Bede commenting on this text, “Not the covenant of circumcision, which an infant that could neither will good nor evil could not break, though his parents might; but that covenant is signified which God entered into with the first man, and which every one who has only lived a day upon earth has violated, and so stands in need of a saving remedy.”

Job, xiv. 4. "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one," is another text on which the ancient theologians relied for the proof of original sin. As they followed the Seventy, however, they found more to their purpose in this text than is contained in the Hebrew. For in the Greek version the text reads thus, *Τίς γὰρ καθαρὸς ἔσται ἀπο βύπτου; ἀλλ' οὐδεὶς, ἐὰν καὶ μία ἡμέρα ὁ βίος αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.* Which literally translated is, "For who is clean from filth? not one, if even his life has been but of one day on the earth." Hence, we find Augustine, in reference to this text, saying, "The stain of the vitiated root is diffused through the branches, being transmitted by natural generation; so that there is not an infant of one day old free from the guilt of sin, unless saved by unmerited grace. For he who has no sin properly of his own, has derived to him the sin of another, concerning which the apostle speaks where he says, by one man sin entered into the world, &c."

"The next argument the fathers derived from *Psalms* li. 5. "Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." It was left for modern critics to discover that David was here bewailing the sinfulness of his mother: such an idea never seems to have entered the mind of any of the ancient commentators. They argue thus from the text. If David, that most holy king, and born of pious parents, contracted pollution in his conception, then certainly the same must be true of all other men. Thus reasoned Origen, Basil the Great, Theodoret, Rufin, Cassiodorus, Euthymius and Remigius, in their scholia on this text. Likewise Hilary, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Faustus, Isychius, Grégory the Great, Alcuin, Bede, and every other orthodox commentator for seventeen centuries after Christ. They who still believe that the psalmist is here speaking of the sin of his birth, notwithstanding the learned criticisms which have recently appeared on this text, have the comfort of knowing that they are supported by the opinions of all the ancients and all the moderns whose opinions carry weight in matters of this kind.

Another text adduced by the ancient advocates of this doctrine is *Is.* xlvi. 3. "And wast called a transgressor from the womb." On which Cyrill, on *Hosea*, makes several remarks, tending to show the original depravity of man.

But let us now come to the New Testament; and here the first text which the fathers urge in proof of original sin is *John*, iii. 3. 6. "Verily, verily I say unto you, that which is

born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit." From which it was argued, that whatever was carnally propagated could only savour of carnal things, which in order to become spiritual must be born of the spirit; without spiritual regeneration it was impossible to enter into the kingdom of heaven. Augustine often makes use of this text in his controversy with the Pelagians; and it is used in the same manner by Prosper, and by Gregory the Great.

But the passage of Scripture on which they depended, above all, for the support of the doctrine of original sin, was the fifth of *Romans*, from the twelfth verse to the end of the chapter. "As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, so death passed on all men, because that (or in whom) all have sinned."

Ver. 14. "Nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression."

Ver. 18. "Therefore, as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation."

Ver. 19. "For as by the disobedience of one many were made sinners."

From this passage they reasoned in the following manner: That sin which the apostle so describes as that which has brought death on all men;—that by it all men have sinned;—and by it have been constituted sinners, even those who have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, (that is, have not committed actual sin);—and in consequence of this sin all are become subject to death and condemnation: therefore, this sin, although committed by Adam alone, as it was a personal act, yet may be considered as the sin of human nature, since he stood as the representative of us all, who were then included in his loins; and are all therefore laid under an obligation to suffer the punishment of his sin.

The fathers also were particular in noticing that Adam is here called the type of Christ, whence they inferred, that as we are justified by the imputation and not the imitation of Christ's obedience, so the disobedience of Adam becomes ours, not by imitation but by imputation. They, moreover, remarked, that the particles *ἐν ᾧ* (in whom) teach us that the posterity of Adam sinned in him: or if you prefer rendering these words, *because that*, or *inasmuch as*, all have sinned, they must contain a sufficient reason for the death of all,

infants as well as others ; and therefore the word *all* must be considered as including infants ; when it is said, therefore, all have sinned, it will follow that infants also have sinned. This method of reasoning is pursued by Augustine in many different parts of his works : and the same method of reasoning from this passage is followed by Theodoret, by Prosper, by Faustus, by Gennadius, and also by the Carthaginian and Arausicanian councils.

Another passage of Scripture which the ancient theologians considered conclusive, on the subject of original sin, was *Rom. vii.* where Paul speaks of “ a law in his members warring against the law of his mind. For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, there dwelleth no good thing. For to will is present with me, but to perform that which is good I find not.” The necessity of the aids of divine grace is argued from this passage by Irenæus, Tertullian and Augustine, in more places than one. This father, indeed, gives us two distinct expositions of the apostle’s meaning in the aforecited words. According to the first of these, the conflict here described is between conscience and sinful desires drawing the soul to evil ; but according to the latter, the struggle is between the sinful nature which remains in the regenerate, and the new man or principal of grace, implanted by the Holy Spirit. But in either sense it furnishes strong proof of the natural proclivity of man to evil : but especially in the latter sense, in which a remaining leaven of iniquity is found in the regenerate, continually hindering his holy exercises, it furnishes an undoubted proof of the depravity of our nature.

They also appealed to *1 Cor. xv. 22*, “ For as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive.” On this text the writer of certain ancient commentaries, which have been ascribed to Ambrose, says, “ Paul says this, because as Adam by sinning found death, so he subjected all his posterity to the same punishment ; so also Christ, by not sinning, overcame death, and acquired life for all those who are of his body ; that is, the resurrection.” And again, “ As all die in Adam, whether they be just or unjust, so also all, whether believers or unbelievers, shall be raised from the dead by Christ ; but they who believe not, to punishment.”

Augustine expresses his views of the import of this passage thus, “ The opinion of the apostle is here clearly exhibited, that none are subject to death but through Adam, and

that none enter into eternal life unless by Christ. For by the word *all* repeated in this verse, we are to understand in the first instance, all who are naturally descended from Adam, and in the second, all who are united to Christ by a spiritual regeneration: so then it is declared that none die except by their connexion with Adam, and none are made alive but those who are quickened in Christ." The argument is simply this, as all are vivified in Christ, in like manner all die in Adam; but Christ vivifies those for whom he has merited the forgiveness of sin, and on whom he bestows a new life by regeneration: therefore Adam, in like manner, by his sin, has merited death for all his posterity, and transmitted to them a corrupt nature by ordinary generation.

The last text of Scripture which we will mention, as furnishing satisfactory proof to the fathers of the doctrine of original sin, is *Ephes. ii. 3.* "And were by nature the children of wrath, even as others." On this many ancient writers comment, and all agree in the opinion that it means, that when born we are under condemnation, from which Christ came to deliver us.

Four of the texts above cited, as teaching the doctrine of original sin, Jerome applies to the same purpose in a single paragraph of his commentary on *Ezekiel*. Of his remarks, however, we shall only cite that which relates to the famous text in the fifty-first *Psalms*. "David says, I was conceived in iniquity, and in sin did my mother bring me forth: not in the iniquity of his mother, or his own personal sin, but in the sin of human nature. Whence, the apostle says, death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression."

From this remark we learn, not only what Jerome thought was the meaning of being conceived in sin, but also that he understood the apostle to mean infants, where he speaks of those who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression. And we believe that in regard to both these texts he speaks the language of all antiquity.

Among the reasons by which the doctrine of original sin, as held by the ancients, was supported, the sufferings and death of infants was believed to hold the first place, because it was considered that it would be altogether unjust that they should be thus punished, unless they were charged with the guilt of some sin. Hence Augustine, in his fourth book against the two letters of Pelagius, says, "But how is it that the Pelagians

hold that death only is derived to us from Adam? According to them, we die because he died; but he died because he had sinned. They hold, therefore, that punishment passes upon us without any fault: innocent infants then are punished by an unjust sentence; suffering death without having merited this punishment." And again, in his sixth book against Julian, he says, "The sins of parents, in one respect, are not ours, but in another respect they are ours. They are not ours as it relates to the personal act, but they are ours by the contagion of our descent: which, if it were not true, a grievous yoke would be upon the children of Adam from the day of their birth, which could by no means be reconciled with justice." And in his last answer to Julian he says, "This judgment (viz. death) on infants would be altogether unjust if there were no original sin." And again, "Why are little children so grievously afflicted if they have no sin at all. Could not an omnipotent and just God prevent these unjust punishments from falling on infants."

The writer of the book entitled *Hypognosticon* argues in a similar manner. "If the sin of our first parents hurt no one but themselves, how does it happen that the punishment of their fault falls upon us? unless you maintain that God is unjust, who suffers those who are free from all sin to be held bound under the chain of punishment."

Prosper reasons in the same manner. In his book against Collator he says, "Unless you choose to affirm what is evidently false, that punishment, not sin, has been transmitted to the posterity of Adam; for it is too impious to think this of the justice of God, that it is his will to condemn those who are free from sin to the same punishment as the guilty. But wherever punishment is manifest, there is complete evidence of the existence of sin; for sin and punishment are indissolubly united; therefore human misery is not from the constitution of the Creator, but from the retribution of the Judge."

It must be confessed, however, that some among the orthodox of that age held that God, as a sovereign, might punish his creatures, and even doom them to eternal death, although they had never sinned. Of this opinion was Macarius the Egyptian. The opinion of Augustine and Prosper, however, has commonly been entertained by sound theologians in all ages. Some indeed think that the two opinions may be reconciled, by supposing that the one party speak of the pun-

ishment of loss merely; while the others speak of the punishment of sense. But this is not very satisfactory; and the opinion of Macarius, which has been received by some since the reformation, is dishonourable to God. And so it was esteemed by the council of Arausicanum; for in their second canon they declare, "That to say that God inflicts death, which is the punishment of sin, where no sin exists, is to charge him with injustice." The same opinion is given by Anselm, who says, "It is repugnant both to wisdom and justice, that they whom God hath fitted for eternal happiness should, without being chargeable with sin, be forced to suffer punishment."

The fathers also relied on this argument, "That if infants were not involved in the guilt of sin, Christ cannot be their Saviour. On this subject Augustine says, in his first book against the two letters of Pelagius, "They contend that infants are in a safe state already, so that they dare deny that they owe their salvation to the Saviour." And again, in book second, "The Pelagians assert that God is not the Purifier, Saviour, and Deliverer of men of all ages." And in his answer to Julian, ch. xxxi, "The multitude whom you despise, that acknowledge the catholic faith, confess that infants are redeemed by the Saviour; and therefore they detest the error of the Pelagians who deny this." The same sentiments are found in many other passages of the writings of this father.

But scarcely any argument was more frequently resorted to by the advocates of the doctrine of original sin, than that derived from the baptism of infants. This argument is handled by Augustine in the following manner: "The church borrows for them (infants) the feet of others that they may come, the heart of others that they may believe, the tongue of others that they may confess. For being sick, they are oppressed with the sin of another; so, when made whole, they are saved through the confession of another for them. This practice the church always had; always held. Let no one, therefore, whisper in your ears a contrary doctrine. The church received it from the faith of our ancestors, and perseveringly holds it fast, even to the end. For where there are none sick, there is no need of a physician. What need, therefore, can infants have of Christ if they are not sick. If they are well, why seek a physician to take care of them? If they are infected with no sin

when they are brought to Christ, why is it not said to those who bring them into the church, 'carry these innocents hence; they that be whole need not a physician, but the sick.' Christ came not to call the righteous, but sinners."

So also the council of Milevum, or rather of Carthage, denounced such as denied that infants should be baptized for the remission of original sin. Can. 17. "For in no other sense can that be understood which was spoken by the apostle—that by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death hath passed upon all men, in whom all have sinned—than in that adopted by the universal church, every where diffused. For by reason of this rule of faith, even infants, who were never capable of committing any sin themselves, are nevertheless baptized according to truth for the remission of sins: so that the pollution contracted by them in their birth might be cleansed by their regeneration."

But that which was thought to give peculiar force to this argument was, that Cœlestius himself, in a book which he edited at Rome, was constrained to confess "That infants are baptized for the remission of sins, according to the rule of the universal church, and according to the doctrine of the gospel." It seems, then, that from this argument the Pelagians were never able to extricate themselves; but of this more hereafter.

The view which has been given of the opinions of the universal church, on the subject of original sin, relate only to the age of the Pelagian controversy. It may still be a matter of proper and important inquiry, what opinions were commonly entertained on this point before the commencement of the fifth century? From the almost universal concurrence of theologians in Africa, Asia and Europe, in the belief of this doctrine, we may infer that it did not originate in this age. We may be sure, from this consideration, that the doctrine of original sin was not invented by Augustine, as some have pretended. Jerome was more learned, and at this time much more known than Augustine, and he held the same doctrine, and commenced writing against the heresy of Pelagius before Augustine took up his pen; and these distinguished fathers lived in parts of the church widely separated from each other; the one in Africa, the other in Palestine. But in every council, except the little one of Diospolis, the doctrine of Pelagius was condemned, and the

doctrine of original sin affirmed; and commonly without a dissenting voice. And at some of these councils there were present several hundreds of theologians; and in the council of Diospolis, which acquitted Pelagius, there was nothing determined inconsistent with the catholic doctrines; but the case was, that Pelagius, by artfully concealing his true opinions under plausible but ambiguous terms, deceived the fathers who sat in that council, as Augustine has shown. Then, if it be a fact that at the commencement of the fifth century all the theologians in the world, except a few who were soon rejected as heretics, agreed in maintaining the doctrine of original sin, how shall we account for the universal prevalence of such a doctrine, but by supposing that it was handed down from the first planting of the christian church? For if it had been an error introduced by some particular doctor, or by some section of the church, it would not have been universal in its diffusion, nor would it have united the suffrages of all the faithful ministers of the gospel, as we see it did. And again, supposing that by extraordinary efforts this doctrine, so repugnant to the natural feelings of men, could have been every where propagated by the commencement of the fifth century, would there be no trace of such an universal change of opinion, and no record of the extraordinary efforts necessary to bring it about? Among all the writers who have touched on this subject, is it not strange that not one is found who gives the least hint of any such thing? Surely a change in relation to a doctrine so radical must have occasioned controversy. All would not have adopted a new and distasteful doctrine upon its first proposal. These are things which never can be cleared up on the hypothesis that the doctrine of original sin was not the doctrine of the apostolic churches.

Here we might gather up, from the writings of almost all the fathers who preceded Augustine, testimonies incidentally given, which would serve to show that they all believed in the same doctrine of original sin, which was so strenuously defended by the whole christian church in the beginning of the fifth century: and it would be easy to pursue this course, because Augustine has travelled over the same ground before us, and has adduced testimonies on this subject from Ignatius, from the work under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite, from Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Origen, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, and others, who, although they do

not enter into any discussion of this subject, (for it was not a matter of dispute), yet drop such expressions incidentally, when treating other subjects, as are sufficient to prove that there was from the beginning one uniform faith on this fundamental point. The reader who is desirous of further information on this subject is referred to the various treatises of Augustine on original sin. But our limits and our plan require that we should now exhibit a brief but impartial view of the real opinions of Pelagius and his followers, which shall, as far as possible, be given in their own words; which testimonies, however, are taken from the writings of Augustine and others, their own works having for the most part perished.

Pelagius, in his book *De Natura*, as quoted by Augustine, says*, "When it is declared that all have sinned in Adam, it should not be understood of any original sin contracted by their birth, but of imitation." Again†, "How can a man be considered guilty by God of that sin which he knows not to be his own? for if it is necessary, it is not his own; but if it is his own, it is voluntary; and if voluntary it can be avoided." In his exposition of the epistle to the *Romans* he says‡, "The opposers of the propagation of sin thus endeavour to impugn the doctrine. The sin of Adam has not injured those not sinning, just as the righteousness of Christ does not profit those not believing: for it is said, that in like manner, yea much more, is salvation by one, than perdition by one. And if baptism cleanses that ancient sin, then they

* "In Adamo peccasse omnes, non propter peccatum nascendi origine attractum, sed propter imitationem dictum est."

† "Quomodo Deo pro illius peccati reatu subditus esse poterit, quod suum non esse cognoverit? Suum enim non est, si necessarium est. Aut suum si est, voluntarium est. Et si voluntarium est, vitari potest."

‡ "Hi qui contra traducem peccati sunt, ita illum impugnare nituntur. Si Adæ, inquit, peccatum etiam non peccantibus nocuit, ergo et Christi iustitia etiam non credentibus prodest: quia similiter, imo et magis dicit, per unum salvari, quam per unum ante perierunt. Si baptismus mundat antiquum illud delictum, qui de duobus baptizatis nati fuerint, debent hoc carere peccato: non enim poterunt ad posteros transmittere, quod ipsi minime habuerunt. Illud quoque accedit, quia si anima non est ex traduce, sed sola caro, ipsa tantum habet traducem peccati, et ipsa sola pœnam meretur; injustum esse dicentes, ut hodie nata anima non ex massa Adæ, tam antiquum peccatum portet alienum. Dicunt etiam, nulla ratione concedi ut Deus qui propria peccata remittit, imputet aliena."

who are born of two baptized persons must be free from that sin; for they could not transmit that to posterity which they no longer possessed themselves. Moreover, they say that if the soul is not by traduction, but the flesh only, then the flesh only is concerned in the propagation of sin, and it alone deserves to be punished; for they allege that it would be altogether unjust that a soul just born should be obliged to bear that ancient sin of Adam, from whom it has not derived its origin. For they allege that it can by no means be conceded that God, who pardons our own sins, should impute to us the sin of another person." Pelāgius does not speak here in his own name, but as personating others, whose opinions and arguments he exhibits; for at this time he durst not openly declare his real sentiments. In like manner Cœlestius disseminated the same doctrine, as will be shown below, and also pursued the same insidious policy in propagating his opinions.

Julian, also, in his last work against Augustine, charges this father with holding, "that infants were oppressed with the guilt of no sin of their own, but only with that of another person." Again he says, "whoever is accused of a crime, the charge is made against his conduct, and not against his birth." And in the conclusion, where he recapitulates what he had written, he says, "Therefore we conclude that the triune God should be adored as most just; and it has been made to appear most irrefragably, that the sin of another never can be imputed by him to little children*." And a little afterwards, "Hence that is evident, which we defend as most reasonable, that no one is born in sin, and that God never judges men to be guilty on account of their birth†." Again, "Children, inasmuch as they are children, never can be guilty, until they have done something by their own proper will." And as the ground on which the doctrine of communicated guilt was held was a certain natural conjunction of the parties, by reason of which Paul declares that we sinned in Adam, therefore they used their utmost exertion to elude the force of this argument. Julian reasons

* "Conclusum est, nos Deum æquissimum in trinitate venerari; et irrefutabiliter apparuit, non posse ab eo peccatum alienum parvulis imputari."

† "Ex quibus necessariò conficitur, nos rectissime defendere, neminem cum peccato nasci, et Deum reos non posse judicare nascentes."

thus, "If there was no such thing as one man imitating another, and the apostle had declared that all had sinned in Adam, yet this mode of speaking might be defended by Scripture use : for Christ called the devil a father, although he is incapable of generation ; so the apostle, in describing how the first man was imitated by those who came after him, might without impropriety use such language as that before cited." And again, "The apostle Paul gave no occasion to error, and said nothing improper, when he declared that the first man was a sinner, and that his example was imitated by those who followed him." "By one man sin entered into the world ; but one man was sufficient to furnish an example which all might imitate." "He speaks of one, that he might teach that the communication of sin was by imitation, not by generation." "Which sin, although it did not become a part of our nature, was, however, the pattern of all sin ; and hence, although it is not chargeable on men in consequence of their birth, is by reason of their imitation of it." Prosper, in his epistle to Demetrius, expresses the opinion thus, "The sin of Adam hurts his posterity by its example, but not by natural communication."

These opinions were rejected and firmly opposed by the orthodox. Jerome, at the close of his third book against the Pelagians, writes thus, "If it be objected that it is said there are some who have not sinned, it is to be understood that they did not actually commit the sin of which Adam was guilty by transgressing the commandment of God in Paradise, but all men are held to be guilty, either in consequence of the sin of Adam, their ancient progenitor, or by their own personal act. The infant, by the engagement of his parent in baptism, is released : and he who has arrived at years of understanding is delivered, both by another's engagement and his own, namely, by the blood of Christ. And let it not be supposed that I understand this in a heretical sense, for the blessed martyr Cyprian, in the letter which he wrote to Todus the bishop concerning the baptism of infants, says, 'how much more ought infants not to be debarred from baptism, who being recently born have committed no sin, unless that by their carnal birth from Adam they have contracted the contagion of that ancient death in their first nativity. They ought, therefore, more readily to be admitted to receive the remission of sins, since that which is for-

given them is not their own sin, but that of another." Augustine also strenuously opposed this opinion of the Pelagians in all his writings, "For" says he, "we were all in that one man, when he, being one, corrupted us all." *De Civ. Dei.* lib. xiii. c. 14. And in lib. i. c. 10 of his Retractions, he says, "The opinion which I delivered, that sin injures no nature but that in which it is committed, the Pelagians apply to the support of their own doctrine, that little children cannot be hurt by the sin of another, but only by their own; not considering that, as they belong to human nature, which has contracted original sin, for human nature sinned in our first parents, it is true, therefore, that no sins hurt human nature but its own." Orosius, in his apology for free will, says, "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God, either in Adam or in their own proper persons: the universal mass, therefore, is obnoxious to punishment. And if the punishment of condemnation due to all should be inflicted, certainly it is not unjustly inflicted." In like manner, the writer of the book entitled *Hypognosticon* says, "Truly then the sin of Adam hurt him alone while he was alone, and Eve his wife: but in them we were all included, because they were the nature of the whole human race, which is one in all of us, for we partake of their nature."

What has been brought forward relates to the imputation of the first sin; let us next inquire what was the Pelagian doctrine respecting the communication of its stain or pollution. Pelagius, in his book *De Natura*, says, "First it is disputed concerning this, whether our nature is debilitated and deteriorated by sin. And here, in my opinion, the first inquiry ought to be, what is sin? Is it a substance, or is it a mere name devoid of substance; not a thing, not an existence, not a body, nor any thing else (which has a separate existence) but an act; and if this is its nature, as I believe it is, how could that which is devoid of substance debilitate or change human nature?" And in his book *Concerning Free Will*, "Every thing, good or evil, praise-worthy or censurable which we possess, did not originate with us, but is done by us; for we are born capable both of good and evil, but not in possession of these qualities; for in our birth we are equally destitute of virtue and vice; and previously to moral agency, there is nothing in man but that which God created in him."

Cælestius held precisely the same doctrine. Augustine

testifies that he held and taught "That the sin of Adam hurt himself alone, and that infants are born in that state in which Adam was before he sinned." Julian maintained the same doctrine, which he repeatedly expresses and pertinaciously defends: "Human nature," says he, "in the time of our being born, is rich in the gift of innocence." Again, "Even if the devil should create men, they would be free from all evil in their origin; and so now they cannot be born in sin, because no one can help being born, nor can it be just to demand from any one, what is to him altogether impossible." The same says, "There is no sin in the condition of our nature." And, "Nobody is born with sin; but our free will is so entirely unimpaired, that before the exercise of our own proper will, nature in every one is free from every taint." Hence Prosper, in his *Chronicon* for the year 414, has this remark, "About this time Pelagius the Briton published his doctrine, that the sin of Adam injured himself alone, and did not affect his posterity; and that all infants are born as free from sin as Adam was before his transgression." It cannot be a matter of surprise that the Pelagians held that Adam's posterity inherited from him a corrupt nature, when they did not believe that his own nature was deteriorated by sinning. Julian, therefore, says, "A man's natural state is not changed by sinning, but he becomes guilty and the subject of demerit; for it is of the very essence of free will that the man should have it in his power as much to cease from sinning as to deviate from the path of rectitude."

In opposition to these opinions, the doctors of the catholic church held, that all the posterity of Adam were now destitute of original righteousness, with which he was endowed, and hence proceeds an inordinate exercise of all the powers of the mind, which is called the fuel of sin, the law in the members, concupiscence, &c.

Augustine is full and explicit on this subject. Lib. xxi. c. 3, *De Civitate Dei*, he says, "On account of the greatness of the crime, the nature of man was changed in its punishment; so that what was inflicted as a punishment on our sinning first parents, comes naturally on others born of them." Again, lib. xiv. c. 12, "Human nature was changed by the sin of the first pair; so that a silent corruption pervades it, such as we see and feel, and by reason of which we are subjected to death, and to so many and great evils, and are disturbed and agitated with so many contrary and

conflicting passions, such as had no existence in paradise before man sinned, although he was there invested with an animal body." Also, "How else shall we account for that horrible depth of ignorance, from which all error originates, by which all the sons of Adam are involved in a certain dark gulf, from which they cannot be delivered without labour, sorrow and fear." Speaking again of the many kinds of vices to which men are subject, he adds, "All these sins of wicked men proceed from the same root of error and perverse love with which every child of Adam is born."

Prosper also expresses himself strongly on this subject. "By the wound of original sin the nature of all men is corrupted and mortified in Adam, whence the disease of all manner of concupiscence hath sprung up." The same writer says, in another place, "Whence is it, that if what Adam lost his posterity did not lose; he himself is not alone the sufferer by his sin, and not his posterity? but the truth is all have sinned in one, and every branch from this corrupt root is justly condemned. What Adam lost, then, by the fall, all have likewise lost."

The writer concerning the Vocation of the Gentiles, lib. i. c. 6, has these words, "Human nature was vitiated by the transgression of the first man; so that even in the reception of blessings, and in the midst of helps and divine precepts, there is a continual proclivity of the will to evil; in which, as often as we confide, we are deceived." Again, "All men were created in the first man without fault; and we all have lost the integrity of our nature by his transgression." "Adam was by nature free from sin, but by the disobedience of his will he contracted many evils, and transmitted them to be multiplied more and more by his posterity."

Vincentius Lyra asks, "Who, before Cœlestius, that monstrous disciple of Pelagius, ever denied that the whole human race was held guilty of Adam's sin?"

Peter, the deacon, in his book concerning the Incarnation, says, "Therefore, seduced by the cunning of the serpent, of his own accord he became a transgressor of the divine law; and so, agreeably to the threatening, he was in the just judgment of God condemned to the punishment of death; that is, both body and mind were changed for the worse, and having lost liberty, he was enslaved under the servitude of sin; hence it is that no man is born who is not

bound by the bond of this sin, with the exception of Him who was born by a new mode of generation, that he might loose the bond of sin; even the Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus."

It was also a doctrine of the Pelagians, that temporal death was by the necessity of nature, and did not fall on the human race in consequence of the sin of our first parents. They alleged that Adam would have died, although he had never sinned. Very far then were they from acknowledging that we had incurred eternal death by the sin of Adam. Augustine relates, that it was one of the charges against Pelagius, in Palestine, that he held the doctrine of Cœlestius, "that neither by the death nor transgression of Adam do the whole human race die, nor do the whole human race rise from the dead in virtue of Christ's resurrection." "Death," said he, "passed to the posterity of Adam by imitation of his sin, not by generation." Augustine, in his last answer to Julian, addresses him thus, "You will not agree that by reason of original sin death passes on the human race, for then you would be forced to acknowledge that sin had been propagated through all our race. For you cannot but perceive how unjust it would be to inflict punishment where there is no guilt."

Orosius, against Pelagius, has these words, "Your followers, who have sucked the poison abundantly from your breast, assert, that man was made mortal, and that he incurred no loss from the transgression of the precept." And the writer of the *Hypognosticon* says, speaking of the Pelagians, "They tell us, that whether Adam had sinned or not, he would have died."

On the other hand, the orthodox maintained "That death, temporal and eternal, together with all pains and diseases connected with the death of the body, flow from the first sin; and that unless Adam had sinned he never would have died."

Augustine fully expresses the opinion of the church catholic in his book *De Peccat. Mer. et Remiss.* "Although, as to his body, he was of the earth, and partook of an animal nature, yet if he had not sinned, his body would have been changed into a spiritual body, and into that incorruptibility which is promised to the saints at the resurrection." Again, "If Adam had not sinned he never would have been divested of his body, but would have been clothed with immortality and incorruption; so that mortality would have

been swallowed up of life; that is, there would have been a transition from animal to spiritual life." "According to my judgment, he had a resource in the fruits of the trees of the garden against the decays of nature, and in the tree of life against old age." "So great a sin was committed by the first two of our race, that human nature underwent a change for the worse: also the obligation of their sin and the necessity of dying have been transmitted to posterity. And the reign of death over men will prevail until due punishment shall precipitate into the second death which has no end, all except those whom the unmerited grace of God shall bring into a state of salvation."

From this last question arose another. Why are infants baptized; and if they should depart without baptism, in what state do they deserve to be placed? Pelagius, lest he should be obliged to confess that they were under the bond of original sin, and by their birth exposed to eternal death, denied that they received baptism for the remission of the guilt of the first sin, or that they might be translated from the power of darkness into the kingdom of God. Thus Augustine declares "That the Pelagians will not believe that original sin is removed by baptism, for they contend that no such thing exists in those just born." Hence many inferred that they did not believe that infants were redeemed by Christ; and some affirmed that they denied the propriety of the baptism of infants altogether. But Pelagius, in the book which he addressed to Innocent, bishop of Rome, clears himself from imputations of this kind. "Who was ever so impious," says he, "as to wish to interdict infants from a share in the common redemption of the human race?" And the council of Carthage acknowledges that Cœlestius admitted the redemption of infants. Augustine also, in his 89th epistle, addressed to Hilary, among other things says, "He was forced to confess, on account of the baptism of infants, that redemption was necessary for them also. Where, although he was unwilling to speak explicitly concerning original sin, yet by the very naming of redemption he involved himself in difficulty; for from what should they be redeemed but from the power of the devil, under which they could not be unless they were under the guilt of original sin? Or with what price are they redeemed, unless with the blood of Christ, concerning which it is most manifestly declared, that it was shed for the remission of sins?" But Pelagius put

another meaning on the word redemption, concerning which Augustine speaks in another place. Hilary expresses their opinion thus, "That an infant dying unbaptized cannot justly perish, since it is born without sin." And Augustine describes it in these words, "Nor do little children need the grace of the Saviour by which, through baptism, they may be delivered from perdition, because they have contracted no guilt from their connexion with Adam." The Pelagians, however inconsistent it may appear, not only retained the baptism of infants, but also the very form which had been long in use, according to which it was said to be for the remission of sins. On which subject Augustine remarks, "Of what advantage is it that you make use of the same words in the baptism of infants as adults, when you take away the thing signified in this sacrament?" And the author of the *Hypognosticon* addresses them with severity respecting the same thing: "Who is not shocked at the mere naming of your practice, in which you make the faithful word of God in part true, and in part a lie; that is, true as it relates to adults, for you admit that they are indeed baptized for the remission of sins; but false as it relates to infants, who are not, according to you, baptized for the remission of sins, although you use in their baptism this very form of words." To these things the Pelagians had nothing to reply, except that although infants were free from sin, they were the subjects of the same sacrament which, when applied to adults, was for the remission of sins. But when urged to state why they were at all baptized, they offered two reasons; the one was, that by baptism they were adopted into the number of sons; the other, that by it they received the promise of the kingdom of heaven. This made it necessary for Pelagius to feign some intermediate place between heaven and hell, to which unbaptized infants might be sent after death. But he was cautious about what he said on this point. We learn from Augustine that he was wont to say, "Whither infants do not go I know, but whither they do go, I know not." This same father, therefore, in writing against Julian, adverts to this opinion in the following words: "You make two places of everlasting happiness; the one within, and the other without the kingdom of God." From what has been said, it is evident what were the opinions of the Pelagians respecting the future state of infants, and the reasons of their baptism. The opinions of the orthodox on these points were far

different, for although they disputed among themselves what kind of punishment was due to infants, on account of original sin, whether of loss or of sense, yet there was an almost universal consent among them, that in consequence of original sin, we are children of wrath, and obnoxious to eternal punishment; and, moreover, that baptism was for the remission of sins; and that by baptism infants were regenerated, and thus made partakers of life and eternal felicity.

Augustine often brings up this subject, and may be considered as speaking the sentiments of the whole church in his time. "I do not affirm" says he "that infants dying without baptism will be in a worse condition than if they had never been born, for our Lord uses this expression respecting sinners of the most abandoned character: for from what he says about Sodom, and does not restrict to the wicked inhabitants of that city, that it will be more tolerable for them than some others in the day of judgment, the inference is clear that there will be a difference in the future punishment of men; who then can doubt but that unbaptized infants, who are chargeable with the guilt of original sin only, which has not been aggravated by any actual transgressions of their own, will fall under the lightest punishment of all? But what will be the nature or the degree of their punishment, although we cannot define, yet I should not dare say, that it would have been better for them never to have been born, than to exist in the state which will be allotted to them." Again, "It may be truly said, that unbaptized infants, leaving the body without baptism, will suffer the very mildest punishment; yet he who says that they will fall under no degree of condemnation, both deceives others and is deceived himself; for the apostle has said that the condemnation is of one sin; and that by one offence condemnation hath come upon all men." "We say that little children should be baptized; and of this no one doubts, for even they who differ from us in other points, all concur in this; we maintain, however, that this is that they may be saved, and may inherit eternal life, which they cannot possess unless they are baptized in Christ; but they say, it is not for salvation, not for eternal life, but for the kingdom of God."

Jerome also, in book iii. against the Pelagians, says "This one thing I say, and will then conclude: either you should have another creed, which after the words Father, Son, and

Holy Spirit, should contain a clause, that ye shall baptize infants for the kingdom of heaven; or if you use the same baptism for infants and adults, you should confess that the former as well as the latter are baptized for the remission of sins."

Paullinus, in his book addressed to Zosimus, after the condemnation of Pelagius and Cœlestius, says, "They strive against the apostolical doctrine of original sin, which hath passed on all men, for our race will possess that inheritance received from Adam, even unto the end of the world, and which is only by the sacrament of baptism removed from infants; who cannot inherit eternal life nor obtain the kingdom of God by any other means." A multitude of testimonies might be adduced of the same import, but it is unnecessary. The reader will perceive from those above cited, what is exceedingly evident to every one in the least conversant with ecclesiastical history, that the fathers of this period seem universally to have fallen into the mistake of confounding baptism with regeneration. From an erroneous interpretation of *John*, iii. 5, they concluded that there was no salvation without external baptism; and the next step was that the internal grace of regeneration uniformly accompanied the external rite; and this notion had taken such full possession of their minds, that they commonly gave the name *regeneration* to baptism. We have not kept back the evidence of this fact, whatever may be its operation; for we now have to act the part of faithful historians, and to exhibit fairly to the view of our readers the opinions of the ancient church on an important point of doctrine, which may be considered as lying at the foundation of the Christian system.

The cardinal point of the Pelagian system was the denial of original sin; this was their *πρωτον λειδος*, their radical error, from which all the rest naturally germinated. The controversy did, however, include many other distinct points of no small interest, concerning which our limits do not permit us to say any thing at present. Probably, in some future number we shall resume the subject, and exhibit a view of other controversies which have arisen in the church respecting original sin. It is attended with many advantages to bring into view ancient heresies; for often what modern innovators consider a new discovery, and wish to pass off as a scheme suited to remove all difficulties, is found upon ex-

amination to be nothing else than some ancient heresy clothed in a new dress. That the doctrine of original sin is involved in many difficulties, which no mortal has the wisdom to explain, we are ready to admit: but the question with us is,—is it taught in the Bible? And if any one choose to move a previous question, it will be,—can that book be divinely inspired which contains such a doctrine? And here, if we could get clear of the thing by rejecting the Scriptures, something would be gained; but the evidence of original sin is deeply recorded in the acknowledged depravity of our race, and in the dispensations of God towards us. To account for the facts which experience teaches beyond all possibility of contradiction, we need the testimony which the Bible contains, which if we reject we may escape one set of difficulties, but shall assuredly plunge into others more formidable and unmanageable, although they may be more out of sight.

It is our opinion, therefore, after looking on all sides, and contemplating the bearing and consequences of all theories on this subject, that no one is on the whole so consistent with facts, with the Scriptures, and with itself, as the old doctrine of the ancient church, which traces all the sins and evils in the world to the *IMPUTATION* of the first sin of Adam; and that no other theory of original sin is capable of standing the test of an impartial scrutiny.

THE MEANS OF REPENTANCE.

The hearers of the gospel are often disposed to ask, when the obligation to immediate repentance is urged upon them, *how are we to repent?* a question which we ought not to be unprepared to meet. The prophet Hosea, chap. v. 4, has, we think, clearly shown the true answer to that question. He there teaches that the way of repenting or turning to God, is *to frame one's doings to that end*: an expression of which an explanation seems needless. Universally, when men would accomplish any thing requiring the use of means, they frame their doings, or direct and order their conduct to