

# LECTURE XXVIII.

## ORIGINAL SIN.—Continued.

---

### SYLLABUS.

6. What is Original Sin? What is meant by total depravity? And does it affect the whole man, in all faculties and capacities?

Conf. of Faith, ch. 6, § 3. Cat. Qu. 18. Turretin, Loc. ix, Qu. 8, 10, 11. Dick, Lect. 46, 47. Hill, bk. iv, ch. 1. Watson, Theo. Inst., ch. 18. Thornwell, Lect. 17.

7. How is the existence of this total depravity proved, (a) from facts; (b) from Scripture? Are any of the secular virtues of the unrenewed genuine?

Turretin, Qu. 10. Dick and Hill as above. Edwards on Original Sin, pt. i, ch. 1, 2, pt. ii, ch. 2, 3, pt. iii, ch. 1, 2. Muller, Chr. Doc. of Sin, bk. iv, ch. 1, 2. Dorner's History of Protestant Theology, Vol. i, § 2, ch. 1.

8. Define and prove the imputation of the guilt of Adam's first sin to his posterity.

Turretin, Qu. 9, 12, 15. Dick and Hill as above. Edwards on Orig. Sin., pt. ii, ch. 1, 4, pt. iii, ch. 1, 3. Wines' "Adam and Christ." Dr. Wm. Cunningham's Hist. Theol., ch. 19, § 2. Knapp, § 76. Watson as above. Calvin and Hodge on Rom. 5th.

6. "THE sinfulness of that estate whereinto man fell, consists of the guilt of Adam's first sin, the want of original righteousness, and the corruption of his whole nature, which is commonly called original sin; together with all actual transgressions which proceed from it."

Here, as in the Larger Catechism, Original Sin (so called because native, and because the fountain of all other sin) is the general term, expressing both elements, of imputed guilt and total depravity. By many theologians it is often used for the latter specially. I discuss the latter first.

Turretin asserts that this total depravity is not merely or negatively a *carentia justitiæ originalis* but positively, an active principle of evil. But this does not contradict the definition which represented the essence of sin as discrepancy from law. The essential nature of virtue is, that it positively or affirmatively requires something; or makes a given state or act positively obligatory on the human heart. It admits no moral neutrality; so that the simply not being, or not doing what God requires, is Sin. But the soul is essentially active. Hence, it follows, that in a sinful state or act, the action or positivity of the sin is from the essential nature of the soul, its wrongness is from the mere absence of conformity to law. Depravity, as Pres. Edwards says, is a defective or privative quality; yet it assumes a positive form. I would prefer to say that depravity is active as opposed to simple negation. That it is active, is proved by Turretin from those texts which attribute effects to it, as binding, deceiving, and slaying &c. Yet it is also important to distinguish that it is, in its origin, privative, and not the infusion of some positive quality of evil into the soul; in order to acquit God of the charge of being author of sin. The Bible term, *ἀμαρτία*, suggests the arrow swerving from its proper target. The swerving is privative. But this arrow does not stand still, or lie in the quiver; it flies, and perhaps with as much momentum and velocity, as the arrow which hits the mark.

The same reason compels us to believe that native depravity is not a substantial corruption of the soul; i. e., does not change or destroy any part of its substance. For souls are, as to their substance, what God made them; and His perfections ensure His not making anything that was not good. Nor is there any loss of any of the capacities or faculties, which make up the *essentia* of the soul. Man is, in these respects, essentially what his Creator made him. Hence depravity is, in the language of metaphysics, not an attribute, but *accidens* of the human soul now. This is further proved by the fact that Jesus Christ assumed our very nature, at His incarnation, without which He would not be our Mediator. But surely, He did not assume moral corruption! Last: Scripture clearly distinguishes between sin and the soul, when they speak of it as defiling the soul, as easily besetting; Heb. xii: 1, 2, &c. If it be asked, what then, is native depravity: if it be neither a faculty, nor the privation of one, nor of the man's essence, nor a change of substance? I reply, it is a vicious *habitus* which qualifies man's

Original Sin a positive bent to wrong.

But not a corruption of the Soul's substance.

active powers, i. e., his capacities of feeling and will. Although we may not be able to fully describe, yet we all know this idea of bents which naturally qualify the powers of action in all things.

The Confession states that the first man "became wholly defiled, in all the faculties and parts of soul and body." The seat of this vicious moral *habitus* is, of course, strictly speaking, in the moral propensities. But since these give active direction to all the faculties and parts of soul and body, in actions that have any moral quality, it may be said that, by accommodation of language, they are all morally defiled. The conscience (the highest department of rational intuitions) is not indeed destroyed; but its accuracy of verdict is greatly disturbed by evil desire, and the instinctive moral emotions which should accompany those verdicts, are so seared by neglect, as to seem practically feeble, or dead, for the time. The views of the understanding concerning all moral subjects are perverted by the wrong propensions of the heart, so as to call good evil, and evil good. Thus "blindness of mind" on all moral subjects results. The memory becomes a store of corrupt images and recollections, and thus furnishes material for the imagination; defiling both. The corporeal appetites, being stimulated by the lusts of the soul, by a defiled memory and imagination, and by unbridled indulgence, become tyrannical and inordinate. And the bodily limbs and organs of sense are made servants of unrighteousness. Thus, what cannot be literally unholy is put to unholy uses. But when we thus discriminate the faculties, we must not forget the unity and simplicity of the spirit of man. It is a monad. And, as we do not conceive of it as regenerated or sanctified by patches; so neither do we regard it as depraved by patches. Original corruption is not, specifically, the perversion of a faculty in the soul, but of the soul itself.

By saying that man's native depravity is total, we do not by any means intend that conscience is destroyed, for the man's guilt is evinced by this very thing, that his heart prefers what conscience condemns. Nor do we mean that all men are alike bad, and all as bad as they can be. Nor do we mean to impugn the genuineness and disinterestedness of the social virtues and charities in the ungodly. Far be it from us to assert that all the civic rectitude of an Aristides or Fabricius, all the charities of domestic love, all the nobleness of disinterested friendship among the worldly, are selfishness in disguise. But if it be allowed that many of these acts are of the true nature of virtue, how can man be called totally depraved? We mean, first, that as to the chief responsibility of the soul, to love God, every soul is totally recreant. No natural man has any true love for God as a spiritual, holy, true, good, and righteous Sovereign. But

In what sense total?  
And are all natural virtues spurious?

this being the pre-eminent duty over all others in the aggregate, utter dereliction here, throws all smaller, partial virtues wholly into the shade. Second: while there is something of true virtue in many secular acts and feelings of the unrenewed, which deserves the sincere approval and gratitude of fellow-men to them, as between man and man, there is in those same acts and feelings a fatal defect as to God, which places them on the wrong side of the moral dividing line. That defect is, that they are not prompted by any moral regard for God's will requiring them. "God is not in all their thoughts." Ps. x: 4. Let any worldly man analyze his motives, and he will find that this is true of his best secular acts. But the supreme regard ought to be, in every act, the desire to please God. Hence, although, these secular virtues are much less wrong than their opposite vices, they are still, in God's sight, short of right, and that in the most important particular. The deficiency of this carnal and social virtue receives a very practical illustration thus: The sphere of relation, in which the secular virtues of the unbelievers are practiced, is merely temporary. As children, husbands or wives, parents, neighbours, business men, they perform many disinterested acts of moral form; being prompted thereto by natural, social principles. In the other world, all these relations are abolished. Where then will be the rectitude of persons, who, with all their social excellencies, had no godliness, when God is the only good, and the immediate object of duty and intercourse?

But third, native depravity is total, in this sense; that it is, so far as man's self-recuperation is concerned, decisive and final. Original sin institutes a direct tendency to progressive, and at last, to utter depravity. In a word: it is spiritual death. Corporeal death may leave its victim more or less ghastly. A corpse may be little emaciated, still warm, still supple; it may still have a tinge of colour in the cheek and a smile on its lips: it may be still precious and beautiful in the eyes of those that loved it. But it is dead, and a loathsome putrefaction approaches, sooner or later. It is only a question of time.

7. The proofs of a native and total depravity toward God, are unfortunately, so numerous, that little more can be attempted in one Lecture, than a statement of their heads. They may be grouped under the two heads of experience, and Scripture statements and facts.

Adam's sin reduced him to a total depravity, as has been shown in a previous Lecture. But the great Race proved, 1st, by law, which seems to reign throughout the law of reproduction vegetable and sentient universe, wherever a law of reproduction reigns, is that like shall beget like. And this appears to be confirmed by Gen. v: 3; Job xiv: 4. Whence Adam's ruin would be *a priori*, a ground for expecting his posterity to be born depraved. There are indeed some, (as Dr.

Thornwell, Review of Breckinridge, January, 1858,) who deny that this law would naturally apply here, and attribute the result of Adam's producing a sinful posterity, exclusively to the positive, federal connection appointed for them. They urge, that the thing propagated by this natural law is the attributes of the species, not its accidents; that by this cause any other progenitor between us and our first father would be as much the source of our depravity as he; and that if the accident of Adam's fall is propagated, so ought to be the regenerate nature produced in him, and in other progenitors, by grace. This is clearly against the Confession, ch. 6, § 3, and, it seems to me, against the texts quoted. It confounds accidents in the popular sense with *accidens*, in the sense of the Logician. Very true: a man who loses an arm by accident, does not propagate one-armed children. But in the other sense of the word, it will hardly be asserted that the red colour of Devon cattle is an attribute, and not accidents of horned cattle, and the more refractory and savage temper of the wild boar an attribute of the species swine; yet both are propagated by this law of generation. As I have before said, the properties which define a species, whether attributes or accidents, are just those which are propagated in it; this is the very idea of *spécies*. And we may at least claim, that our progenitors, since Adam, have certainly been channels of transmission of depravity to us. Their agency herein was the same as Adam's toward Seth. Regenerate character does not define the species man, as a species; and hence, is not propagated, especially as it is a character only incipient in the parents in this life. Chiefly, regenerate character is not propagated by parents, because it is now not a natural, but a supernatural property.

We argue native depravity from the universal sinfulness of man, as exhibited in fact. Premise, that the strength of this argument ought to be judged according to the tendencies which this prevalent ungodliness would exert, not as it is in fact, but as it would be, if unrestrained by the grace and providence of God. What then is the fact? We see all men, under all circumstances, do much that is wrong. We see the world full of wickedness, much of it enormous. We behold parents, masters, magistrates and teachers busy with multitudes of rules and laws, and a vast apparatus of prisons, police, armies, and penalties, striving with very indifferent success, to repress wickedness. It is no alleviation to this picture to say, that there are also many virtues in the world, and more correct people who leave no history, because they quietly pursue a virtuous life, than of those who make a noise in the world by sin. For the majority of men are relatively wicked, taking the world over; and a truly honourable secular character, even, is the exception. Again: as we have seen, all these virtues contain a fatal defect, that of not being

2nd. By Universal Sin.

performed for God's honour and pleasure ; a defect so vital, that it throws any element of goodness as to man wholly into the shade. Take the standard : " Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart," and it will be seen that the best natural man in the world never comes up to it in any one act. How then can he claim any good acts to balance against his bad ones, when there are none at all wholly in the right scale ? None that are in the right scale as to the most weighty particular.

Again : the universal result of the growth of human beings is, that as soon as they are old enough to exhibit any moral qualities in intelligent action, they exhibit some wrong ones. And thenceforward, their doing some wrong things is a constant occurrence, not an occasional accident. Yea, more : infants, before they are old enough to understand their own evil tempers, show wicked tempers, selfishness, anger, spite, revenge. So testifies Scripture. Ps. lviii : 3 ; Gen. viii : 21.

Once more, we find universally, a most obdurate blindness, stupidity, and opposition concerning the things of God. Rom. viii : 7. So averse are men to the spiritual service of God, that they all, if left to themselves, postpone and refuse it, against the dictates of reason and conscience, which they partially obey in other things, against motives absolutely infinite ; and, such is the portentous power of this opposition, it overrides these motives and influences, usually, without a seeming struggle. This universal prevalence of sin has appeared in man's history, in spite of great means for its prevention : not only by the legislation, &c., mentioned : but by chastisements, the Flood, religious dispensations, miracles, theophanies, prophecies, and the incarnation of Christ Himself.

Such is a fair and moderate picture of human experience.

Scripture confirms it, asserting the universal and prevalent sinfulness of man. Gen. vi : 5 ; 1 Kings viii : 46 ; Eccl. vii : 20 ; Ps. cxliii : 2 ; Gal. iii : 22 ; Rom. iii : 10-18 ; Jas. iii : 1, 2 ; Eccl. ix : 3, &c., &c. : Ps. xiv : 2, 3 ; Jer. xvii : 9.

Now an effect requires a cause. Here is an effect, occurring under every variety of outward condition and influences, universal, constantly recurring, appearing immediately the time arrives in the human being's life which permits it. There must be a universal cause, and that, within the human being himself. We may not be able to comprehend exactly how a moral *habitus* subsists in an undeveloped reason and conscience ; but we are just as sure, that there is an innate germinal cause, in the human being's moral nature, for all these moral results, as we are that there is, in young apes, an innate cause why no nurture or outward circumstances will ever by any possibility

develope one of them into a Newton. This intuition is confirmed by Scripture. Luke vi: 43-45, &c.: Ps. lviii: 3, with verse 4.

The universal prevalence of bodily death, with its premonitory ills, of bodily infirmity, a cursed ground, toil and hardship, show that man's depravity is total and native. These ills are a part of the great threatening made against Adam, and when inflicted on him, it was in immediate connection with spiritual death. Why suppose them severed, in any other case? It is vain to say that these things are not now the curse of sin, but a wholesome chastisement and restraint, and thus a blessing in disguise; for if man were not depraved, he would not need such a lesson. Why does not God see that Paradise is still man's most wholesome state, as it was Adam's? But from Gen. ii: 17, onward, death is always spoken of as a punishment for sin. Then, where death goes, sin must have gone. Rom. v: 12; 1 Cor. xv: 22. Especially the death of infants proves it; because they cannot understand the disciplinary effects of suffering and death. See especially the cases of the infants of Sodom, of Canaan, of Jerusalem, in Ezek. ix: 6. Nor can it be said that infants die only by the imputed guilt of Adam's sin; for imputed guilt and actual depravity are never found separated in the natural man.

The fact that all need, and some of all classes are interested in the redemption of Jesus Christ, proves that all have a sin of nature. For if they were not sinners, they would not be susceptible of redemption. Among the Redeemed are "elect infants dying in infancy," as is proved by Luke xviii: 16; Matt. xxi: 16. But infants have no actual transgressions to be redeemed from! Socinians and Pelagians talk of a redemption in their case, which consists neither in an actual regeneration nor forgiveness, but in their resurrection, and their being endowed with a gracious and assured blessedness. But this is a mere abuse of Scripture to speak of such a process as the redeeming work of Christ for any human being. For His very name and mission were from the fact that He was to save His people from their sins. Matt. i: 21; 1 Tim. i: 15; Mark ii: 17; Gal. ii: 21; iii: 21. Christ was sent to save men from perishing. Jno. iii: 16. His redemption is always by blood, because this typifies the atonement for sin. Sin is therefore co-extensive with redemption.

Again; the application of this redemption in effectual calling is evidence of native depravity. In order that Christ may become ours, it is most repeatedly declared that we must be born again. This regeneration is a radical and moral change, being not merely a change of purpose of life made by a volition, but a revolution

6th. Argument from prevalence of the curse.

7th. From need of Redemption.

8th. From Regeneration.

of the propensities which prompt our purposes. This is proved by the names used to describe the change, a new birth, a new creation, a quickening from death, a resurrection, and from the Agent, which is not the truth, or motive, but almighty God. See Jno. iii : 5; Eph. i : 19 to ii : 10. Now, if man needs this moral renovation of nature, he must be naturally sinful. We find our Saviour Himself, Jno. iii : 5, 6, stating this very argument. The context shows that Christ assigns the sixth verse as a ground or reason for the fifth, and not as an explanation of the difficulty suggested by Nicodemus in the fourth. Moreover, the word *σάρξ* means, by established Scripture usage, not the body, nor the natural human constitution considered merely as a nature, but man's nature as depraved morally. Compare Rom. vii : 14, 18; viii : 4, 7, 8, 9; Col. ii : 18; Gal. v : 16-24; Gen. vi : 3.

To this we may add, one of the meanings of circumcision and baptism was to symbolize this regeneration, (another, to represent cleansing from guilt by atonement.) Hence, sin is recognized in all to whom these sacraments are applied by divine command. And as both were given to infants, who had no intelligent acts of sin, it can only be explained by their having a sin of nature.

We have seen how the Bible asserts a universal sinfulness in practice, and how it sustained us in tracing that universal sin up to its source in a sin of nature. We close with a few specimens of other texts, which expressly assert original sin. Job xiv : 4; xv : 14-16; Prov. xxii : 15; Ps. li : 5; Eph. ii : 3.

The evasions to which the deniers of Original Sin are forced to resort, to escape these categorical assertions, are too numerous and contradictory to be recited or answered here. Let these texts be carefully studied in their scope and connection.

One of these I will notice: It has been objected that the innocence of children seems to be asserted in such places as Ps. cvi : 38; Jonah iv : 11; Jno. ix : 3; Rom. ix : 11. I explain, that this is only a relative innocence. The sacred writers here recognize their freedom from the guilt of all actual transgression, and their harmlessness towards their fellow men during this helpless age. This, together with their engaging simplicity, dependence, and infantile graces, has made them types of innocence in all languages. And this is all the Scriptures mean.

The Hebrew word *חָשַׁב* and the Greek, *λογίζομαι* both mean primarily to think, then to deem or judge, then to impute or attribute. In this sense the former occurs in Ps. xxxii : 2, and the latter in Rom. iv : 6-8, as its translation. See also 2 Sam.

8. Imputation defined.

xix : 19 ; 2 Cor. v : 19 ; Gal. iii : 6 ; Jas. ii : 23. Without going at this time into the vexed question, whether anything is ever said in Scripture to be imputed to any other than its own agent, I would define, that it is not Adam's sin which is imputed to us, but the guilt (obligation to punishment) of his first sin. This much misunderstood doctrine does not teach that Adam's act was actually made ours. This consciousness repudiates. We know that we personally did not will it. Nor does it mean that we are to feel personally defiled and blameworthy, with the vileness and demerit of Adam's sin. For us to undertake to repent of it in this sense, would be as preposterous as for us to feel self-complacency for the excellence of Christ's righteousness imputed to us. But we are so associated with Adam in the legal consequences of the sin which closed his probation, and ours in his, that we are treated as he is, on account of his act. The grounds of this legal union we hold to be two; 1st the natural union with him as the root of all mankind; 2d the federal relation instituted in him, by God's covenant with him. Now, we do not say that the Scriptures anywhere use the particular phrase, the guilt of Adam's sin was imputed to us; but we claim that the truth is clearly implied in the transactions as they actually occurred, and is substantially taught in other parts of Scripture.

If Adam came under the covenant of works as a public person, and acted there, not for himself alone, but for his posterity federally, this Imputation proved. implies the imputation of the legal consequences of his act to them. The proof that Adam was a federal head, in all these acts, is clear as can be, from so compendious a narrative. See Gen. i : 22, 28 ; iii : 15 to 19 ; ix : 3. In the dominion assigned man over the beasts, in the injunction to multiply, in the privilege of eating the fruits of the earth, in the hallowing of the Sabbath, God spoke seemingly only to the first pair; but His words indisputably applied as well to their posterity. So we infer, they are included in the threat of death for disobedience, and the implied promise of Ch. ii : 17. To see the force of this inference, remember that it is the established style of Genesis. See ix : 25 to 27 ; xv : 7 ; xvi : 12 ; xvii : 20 ; in each case the patriarch stands for himself and his posterity, in the meaning of the promise. But this is more manifest in Gen. iii : 15-19 where God proceeds to pass sentence according to the threat of the broken Covenant. The serpent is to be at war with the woman's seed. The ground is cursed for Adam's sin. Does not this curse affect his posterity, just as it did him? See Gen. v : 29. He is to eat his bread in the sweat of his face. Does not this pass over to his posterity? The woman has her peculiar punishment, shared equally by all her daughters. And in the closing sentence, death to death, we all read the doom of our mortality. So plain is all this, that even Pelagians have

allowed that God acted here judicially. But Adam's posterity is included in the judgment. No better description of imputation need be required.

A presumption in favour of this solution is raised by a number of facts in God's providence. He usually connects the people and their head, the children and parents, in the consequences of the representative's conduct. Wherever there is such a political union, this follows. Nor is the consent of the persons represented always obtained, to justify the proceeding. Instances may be found in the decalogue, Exod. xx : 5, the deliverance of Rahab's house by her faith, Josh. vi : 25; the destruction of Achan's by his sin, Josh. vii : 24, 25; of the posterity of Amalek for the sins of their forefathers, 1 Sam. xv : 2; of Saul's descendants for his breach of covenant with the Gibeonites, 2 Sam. xxi : 1-9; of the house of Jeroboam, 1 Kings xiv : 9, 10; and of the generation of Jews cotemporary with Christ, Matt. xxiii : 35. So, nations are chastised with their rulers, children with their parents. It is not asserted that the case of Adam and his posterity is exactly similar; but cases bearing some resemblance to its principles show that it is not unreasonable; and since God actually orders a multitude of such cases, and yet cannot do wrong, they cannot contain the natural injustice which has been charged upon Adam's case.

The explanation presented by the doctrine of imputation is demanded by the mere facts of the case, as they are admitted by all except Pelagians and Socinians. Man's is a spiritually dead and a condemned race. See Eph. ii : 1-5, *et passim*. He is obviously under a curse for something, from the beginning of his life. Witness the native depravity of infants, and their inheritance of woe and death. Now, either man was tried and fell in Adam, or he has been condemned without a trial. He is either under the curse (as it rests on him at the beginning of his existence) for Adam's guilt, or for no guilt at all. Judge which is most honorable to God, a doctrine which, although a profound mystery, represents Him as giving man an equitable and most favoured probation in His federal head; or that which makes God condemn him untried, and even before he exists.

Note here, that the lower Arminian view, in making man's fallen state by nature a mere result of the law: "Like must beget like," does not relieve the case. For who ordained that law? Who placed the human race under it, as to their spirits as well as their body? Was not God able to endue a race with a law of generation which should be different in this particular, or to continue the race of man by some other plan, as successive creations? The very act of God, in ordaining this law for man

Imputation confirmed by Experience.

Imputation implied in man's estate.

Not to be accounted for by mere law of reproduction.

whom He purposed to permit to fall, was virtually to ordain a federal connection between Adam and his race, and to decide beforehand the virtual imputation of his guilt to them. For man is not a vegetable, nor a mere animal; but a rational, responsible person. The results of this law of reproduction prove to be, in the case of Adam and his posterity, just such as, when applied to rational agents, are penal. Now, the question is: Why does God subject souls, which have a personal liberty and destiny, to the dominion of a law which we see, in its other instances, merely vegetative and animal? This is the moral problem. It is no solution to say, that the case is such. To say this is only to obtrude the difficulty as the solution. If then, this extension of the law of reproduction was not a righteous, judicial one and based on the guilt of Adam, it was an arbitrary one, having no foundation in justice.

But the great Bible argument for the imputation of Adam's sin, is the parallel drawn between Adam and Christ, in 1 Cor. xv : 21, 22, 45-49, and Rom. v : 12-19. The latter of these passages, especially has been the peculiar subject of exegetical tortures. See, for scheme of immediate imputationists, Hodge on Rom.; of moderate Calvinists, Baird, Elohim Rev., Chap. xiv., and Calvin *in loco*. I shall not go over the expository arguments, for time forbids; and they are rather the appropriate business of another department; but shall content myself with stating the doctrinal results, which, as I conceive, are clearly established. In 1 Cor. xv : Adam and Christ are compared, as the first and the second Adam. In almost every thing they are contrasted; the one earthy, the other heavenly; the one source of death, the other of life; yet they have something in common. What can this be, except their representative characters? In verse 22, Adam is somehow connected with the death of his confederated body; and Christ is similarly (*ὡσπερ . . . οὕτως*) connected with the life of his. But Christ redeems His people by the imputation to them of His righteousness. Must not Adam have ruined his, by the imputation to them of his guilt?

In Rom. v : 12-19, it is agreed by all Calvinistic interpreters that the thing illustrated is justification through faith, which is the great doctrine of the Epistle to Romans, denied at that time by Jews. The thing used for illustration is Adam's federal headship and our sin and death in him, more generally admitted by Jews. The passage is founded on the idea of verse 14, that Adam is the figure (*τύπος*) of Christ. And obviously, a comparison is begun in verse 12, which is suspended by parenthetical matter until verse 18, and there resumed and completed. The amount of this comparison is indisputably this: that like as we fell in Adam, we are justified in Christ. Hence our gen-

Argument of Rom.  
5th and 1 Cor. 15th.

Exposition of Rom.  
5th.

eral argument for imputation of Adam's sin; because justification is notoriously by imputation.

2. It is asserted verse 12, and proved vs. 13, 14, that all men sinned and were condemned in Adam; death, the established penalty of sin, passing upon them through his sin, as is proved, verse 14, by the death of those who had no actual transgression of their own.

3. The very exceptions of vs. 15-17, where the points are stated in which the resemblance does not hold, show that Adam's sin is imputed. Our federal union with Adam, says the Apostle, resulted in condemnation and death with Christ in abounding grace. In the former case, one sin condemned all; in the latter, one man's righteousness justifies all. The very exceptions show that men are condemned for Adam's sin.

4. In vs. 18, 19, the comparison is resumed and completed; and it is most emphatically stated that, as in Christ many are constituted righteous, so in Adam many were constituted sinners. Scriptural usage of the phrase *καθίστηναι δίκαιοι*, and what is taught of the nature of our justification in Christ, together with the usage of the phrase *δικαίωσιν ζωῆς*, verse 18, by which it is defined, prove that it is a forensic change which is implied. Then it follows that likewise our legal relations were determined by Adam. This is imputation.