ADAM’S EATING THE FORBIDDEN FRUIT A VERY HEINOUS ACT

(Edited by R. Craig Woods)

This discourse of four preaching units, dated February 1738, treats the “heinousness” of Adam and Eve’s sin of eating the forbidden fruit in the Garden of Eden, and the consequences of that act. A powerful, tightly organized composition studded with Arguments, Reasons, Rules, and Inquiries, it defends, from a covenantal framework in which Adam was the first “surety” of humankind, orthodox views of the fall and imputation of original sin. But the effort is also an implicit critique of heterodox views that would deny Adam’s federal headship and the imputation of his sin to the whole human race.

Edwards argues that the heinousness of Adam’s act consists in the way it concerned Adam personally, in his “particular station,” and how it concerned his posterity. Relating to Adam himself, the act carried with it “particular aggravations,” but also made him guilty of the “murther of all his posterity.” Not all of the aggravations or circumstances of Adam’s sin are imputed, but only the sin of eating the forbidden fruit, which was expressly prohibited by God with specific threatenings, or the covenant of works, and in which Adam was the “head of the rest.” The covenant of works determined that the aggravations of that sin were indeed imputed, arising from the nature of God, the covenant itself, and humankind. Edwards provides a hefty list of twelve ways in which the first sin was heinous: it was not only contemplated in heart or thought but was an “outward act of sin”; it violated God’s command “fully and totally”; it was not a sin of ignorance because Adam and Eve knew God’s command, a command delivered “peremptorily,” deliberately and solemnly, and enforced with “terrible threatening” of the “first” and “second death” (here Edwards includes a scriptural gloss and arguments later used in Original Sin); it was committed against all
"encouragements" and "a glorious promise" of an eternal earthly paradise; it was committed in exercise of freedom of will, a freedom not found in humans after the fall; it ended the trial of obedience; it was an "easy" command, evidence of God’s goodness in making humankind the crown of creation, a little lower than the angels; it was committed against "great light" or knowledge of spiritual truths; and it was done with "deliberation." Edwards then poses an Inquiry as to how Adam and Eve, if created perfect, could "exercise lust"—the lust or desire to be like God—when they supposedly had none. His response: the sin was the result of a "process" in which it first lay in the inclination (will), which was then supported by deliberation (judgment), and then brought into act. The doctrinal section ends with another Inquiry, which somewhat repeats and amplifies the preceding major heads, namely, why was only Adam’s first sin imputed, and not his other sins? Looking first at Scripture, Edwards notes how it is explicit that only Adam’s original sin was imputed to his posterity. When he sinned, his time as “covenant probationer” was over. The obverse is true of Christ, the “second Adam,” in that his obedience during his time of trial is what is imputed.

Edwards begins his Application by stating the old truth: humans come guilty into the world, both because of Adam’s imputed sin and their own sin. All covenant transactions recorded in Scripture, such as the protoevangelium of Gen. 3:15, and the covenants made with Noah, Abraham, Phinehas and David, included posterity, and the teaching of imputation carries through to the New Testament as well. Reason dictates that if infants are not guilty of sin, or, more generally, if humankind is not included in Adam, then Christ is not the Savior. Experience, too, proves original sin and depravity, as history shows that people in all ages are sinful, and that children die by “multitudes” as well as people of other ages. The Doctrine also points forth the “dreadful consequences” of Adam’s act: the loss of original righteousness, and the “positive evils” that came upon humankind. Among the effects of the loss of
original righteousness, Edwards counts the loss of the Holy Spirit in the heart of humankind. This, he states, and not any "physical" or biological cause, explains inherited nature. "The derivation of the corruption of nature" cannot be "sought in a physical, but a moral cause." The "dreadfulness" of these consequences consisted in their nature and degree, their influence, their extent, and their duration. Yet, the Doctrine also teaches the grace of God in giving Christ, who, as second Adam, was more glorious than the first, could not fail, suffered for the original sin as well as all others committed, and advanced humanity to "a higher pitch of happiness." God revealed the second Adam immediately after the first Adam's fall, and began to save souls on the account of the second Adam before his incarnation. Believers must take warning to avoid corruption in their hearts, especially since they are so much weaker and blinder than their first parents were. They must avoid heeding Satan, the tempter, and becoming his "instruments." Seek, instead, to be "children of the second Adam," who has "performed perfect obedience."

* * * * *

The manuscript is forty-nine leaves. Some minor damage affects the edges of the first two leaves. There is no indication that Edwards repreached or revised this sermon.
ADAM’S EATING THE FORBIDDEN FRUIT A VERY HEINOUS ACT

Genesis 3:11.
Hast thou eaten of the tree, whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldst not eat?

Adam, in his state of innocency, enjoyed a blessed communion with God, and there was free intercourse maintained between God and him.

Adam had the knowledge of God, and a spiritual acquaintance with him, and there seems to have been an intimate converse between God and him. God came to him, and spoke to him and conversed with him, from time to time, in a friendly manner, probably in some external signal of his presence, conversing with him by an audible voice, whereby God spoke to him, and Adam made answer, as a man speaks with his friend.

’Tis said, in the 8th verse of the context, that our first parents "heard the voice of the Lord God, walking in the garden in the cool of the day." By which it appears that there was something external, that God was wont to manifest himself by, of whose approach they could have noticed the external sense. And Adam conversed with God so often, that he knew, and could easily distinguish, the voice or sound of his going, as men know the gait or the sound of the feet of those that we are well acquainted with, as they walk, when heard at a distance.

’Tis said that our first parents hid themselves, when they "heard the voice of the Lord God, walking in the garden in the cool of the day."

They were very guilty, and had a sense of their own guilt in their consciences, which made ‘em to fly and hide from God. How different is the case with ‘em now, from what it was before they sin: before, they were far from flying and hiding when they perceived God approaching, but, without doubt, used to rejoice greatly at every opportunity of conversing with God;
and we may suppose that nothing filled ‘em with greater gladness, than to hear the voice of God, walking in the garden and coming to them, and that at such times, they eagerly ran to meet him, to see and hear their glorious Creator. But now it is otherwise; now they have lost their love to God, and instead of love, there [is] a slavish fear and hatred. Instead of embracing opportunities of conversing with God as their best friend, they fly from him as an enemy.

In the text and foregoing verses, we have an account of what God first said to Adam after his fall: “God called unto Adam and said unto him, Where art thou? And he said, I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid because I was naked; and I hid myself. He said, Who told thee that thou wast naked? Hast thou eaten of the tree, whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldest not eat?”

The words of the text are in the form of an interrogation, but there are three things contained in this interrogation, in the manner in which it is expressed:

1. A calling him to an account, as his judge.

2. A charge of the act of eating the forbidden fruit: “Hast thou eaten of the tree?” Whereby God signifies that this appears manifest against him, that he had done it, and that he was convicted out of his own mouth, particularly by what he said about his nakedness: “Who told thee that thou wast naked?” I.e., “Thy complaining of thy nakedness and appearing ashamed, is an evidence against you, that you have {eaten of the tree whereof you were commanded not to eat},” intimating that it don’t use to be thus: "When I came to converse with thee heretofore, thou wast not wont to fly and hide from me, as being ashamed on any such account; certainly this great alteration is not for nothing, but thou [hast] broken my commandment, and therefore thou complainest of thy nakedness."

‘Tis no improbable conjecture, that the bodies of our first parents,
while in their state of innocency, appeared with such a beauty, and had such a luster and glory, from head to feet, that far more than supplied the want of garments; agreeable [to] the appearance of St. Stephen’s face at his martyrdom, when it was beheld as the face of angel [Acts 6:15]. And if their whole bodies were not as it were clothed with a robe of light, like that with which Moses’ face shone, when he had been with God in the mount; yet we may well suppose that they appeared most remote from that deformity in which a naked body now appears, and on the contrary appeared with a glorious beauty, which was lost, together with the image of God in the soul, when they sin, and their bodies appeared in nakedness and loathsome deformity, answerable to the nakedness and deformity of the soul. Thus our first parents saw themselves changed, in their eating the forbidden fruit. Instead of that glorious change, and being turned from men to gods, as they expected, this effect of their sin filled ‘em with shame, made ‘em sensible of their shameful folly in doing as they had. And in shame of the vile act they had committed, and that outward and inward deformity that was the consequence of it, they hid themselves. And hence, God charges this act upon them.

3. This interrogation, as here expressed, contained a severe reproof of this act, intimating the heinousness of it in God’s sight: “Hast thou eaten of the tree, whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldst not eat?” As much as to say, "Hast thou done so vile a thing; hast thou been guilty of so heinous an act; hast thou been so rebellious and presumptuous, as to eat of that tree that I commanded thee that thou shouldst not eat thereof?"

DOCTRINE.

The act of our first father, in eating the forbidden fruit, was a very heinous act.

It concerns us all to consider, and be sensible of, the nature of that
act of our first father, Adam, for we are all to look upon [it] as our act. It was the act of the surety in whom we fall, and that act by which we fell in our surety. It most nearly concerns us, to be well sensible of two things: viz., our sin by the first Adam, and the righteousness of the second. It is of infinite importance that we should know both: for the first is our own, by which we are undone; and the second must be our own, if ever we are saved: and we must know the former, in order to know the latter.

So that is of infinite moment to us, to be sensible of our sin and guilt by the first Adam, as much as to know our righteousness and recovery by the second.

Our sin and guilt, that comes by the first Adam, is twofold: it is either our guilt of that first act of sin, that the first Adam committed; or that which consists in, and arises from, the corruption of nature, that is the consequence of that act.

And it nearly concerns us, to be sensible of the guilt that comes by both these. And in order to a being sensible of the degree of guilt that comes by the first act of sin, we should consider how heinous that act was.

And there is a twofold heinousness in it, that we should very carefully distinguish:

I. There was a heinousness in that act, that concerns Adam personally, arising from the particular station that he stood in.

II. There is a heinousness in that act, that is equally imputed to him, and all his posterity.

I. There was a heinousness in that act of our first father, that concerns Adam personally, arising from the peculiar station that he stood in.

It is not everything that was in that act that Adam committed, whereby it was a heinous act in him, that is imputed to his posterity. But there was something peculiar in the act, an aggravation that concerned him alone, by
reason of the peculiar circumstances that he was in, as the father of mankind, that is not imputed; which, though it may not be so much observed as it ought to be, yet is most certainly true, as I shall presently demonstrate. And here, if it be inquired what heinousness of that act is it, that does only concern Adam only, and don’t concern his posterity as much as him, [I] answer in two things:

First [Answer]. There might be very particular aggravations, arising from particular circumstances of his person that ben't revealed.

Second Answ. That by which, in that act, he was guilty of the murther of all his posterity. This aggravation of that sin is peculiar to Adam, arising from his peculiar relation that he stood [in] to the rest of mankind, as the father of the rest, which relation never is imputed to the rest of mankind. And so the aggravation that arises from the relation is not imputed. Adam’s being guilty of murdering all his posterity by that act of sin, is often mentioned as a great aggravation of that act of his; but ‘tis not so carefully observed, as it should be, that this is something that peculiarly concerns Adam, an aggravation arising from his peculiar relation, and not concerning his posterity. But to clear up this matter, I shall first:

1. Prove, in the general, that all the aggravations of that act, as they concerned Adam, ben’t imputed to his posterity; and,

2. Shall prove in particular, that this aggravation, viz., of its being murderous to the rest of mankind, is not imputed to his posterity; and,

3. Give the reason of it, which will further demonstrate the truth of it.

1. I will prove, in the general, that there were some aggravations of that act that concerned Adam personally, that don’t concern his posterity, and that appears from this

Argument. That the guilt of that act, as it concerned Adam personally,
depends partly on innumerable circumstances that never were revealed to us.

The Scripture reveals some of the aggravations with which that act was committed, some of the circumstances that enhanced the crime, but it ben’t told us that they are all. In determining the precise measure of guilt of that act, as it concerned Adam, there must come many things into consideration, that we know nothing about, and therefore can’t be concerned in: as particularly, all the particular thoughts and considerations with which he did the fact. We don’t know precisely all the thoughts and workings of heart Adam had at times, which might greatly aggravate the sin in the sight of God, as it concerned him.

The Scripture has told us some of the views that Adam committed that act with, but it has not told us precisely what they were, what particular workings of heart he had. We don’t know how far Adam did it chiefly to gratify his wife, or out of pity to her, or how far it was because he thought the fruit was exceeding pleasing to the taste, and so did it to gratify his sensual appetite; or whether it was mainly because he thought his eyes should be enlightened; or whether it mainly was because he thought he should be like God. We don’t know precisely how far he was influenced by the representation that the devil made of God, as false and deceitful, and saying contrary to what he knew.

Now all these things must be known, in order to our determining precisely how great the guilt was, as the act concerned him personally.

And besides, there might be other aggravating circumstances that we don’t know of: as, for instance, we don’t know how soon it might be, after some particular manifestation that God had made of himself to him. God was wont to come to Adam, as was observed before, from time to time, and appear to him by some external symbol of his presence, and converse with him in a very friendly manner. And if Adam had committed this shameful act of rebellion just after such a time, it was an aggravation, as that act
concerned him in particular. Now seeing it is so, that all the particular 
aggravations of that act, as they concern Adam, are not revealed to us, and 
it is impossible for us to know them, it certainly follows that all the 
particular aggravations of that sin are not imputed to us: for God don’t 
impute that to us, and require us to lament that and be humbled for that, as 
what we are guilty of, that we don’t and can’t know anything of, because that 
implies a contradiction, for us to be humbled for that which it is impossible 
that we should know.

Hence it follows that there were some aggravations of that sin that 
concerned Adam personally, that ben’t imputed to us. And,

[2.] I would prove that this aggravation of that act of Adam, viz., 
that it was an act of murder of all his posterity, does only concern Adam, as 
arising from the peculiar relation he stood in. And this appears from this 

Argument. Viz., That to suppose that all Adam’s posterity have this 
aggravation imputed to ‘em, is to multiply the same guilt to the same 
persons, over and over again, without end.

If every [one] of Adam’s posterity is chargeable with that aggravation, 
in the same sense that Adam himself was, that would be to multiply the same 
aggravation to the same persons, over and over again, in infinitum. As I will 
show you how:

[(1)] In the first place, Adam’s sin in eating {of the forbidden 
fruit}, is aggravated by the circumstance of his murdering all his posterity 
by it, because his sin is imputed to them all. And,

(2) This sin [is] imputed to his posterity, and not only so, but with 
this aggravation of murdering all mankind, and so it was fallen.

(3) That Adam’s sin is still further aggravation, has this aggravation 
doubled, in that he herein murdered all his posterity, and not only [so], but 
made ‘em all guilty of murdering all his posterity. And,

(4).¹ That this act of Adam is imputed in like manner to all his
posterity, with this aggravation doubled, viz., making all guilty of that sin, and guilty of murdering all Adam’s posterity, and also guilty of making all Adam’s posterity guilty of murdering all his posterity. And now, if we look back to Adam, we shall find that he is guilty of this aggravation trebled; and so, in like manner, is imputed to all his posterity trebled, as ‘tis imputed. And so again, Adam will be yet further guilty, viz., of making his posterity guilty of his sin, but of murdering themselves trebly. And so this absurdly supposes this aggravation to be multiplied backwards and forwards, from Adam to his posterity, forever, or without any end.

To make Adam undo all mankind, makes him once guilty; but to make him undo mankind with this aggravation, of making them guilty of murdering all mankind too, as well as he, makes him twice guilty. And to make him guilty of undoing all mankind, and with this aggravation of undoing all mankind as well as he, and not only so, but guilty of undoing of them with this aggravation, makes him three times guilty: and so we may go on without end, to multiply the guilt of the same aggravation, an infinite number of times over.

I proceed now,

[3.] To give the reason why this aggravation of Adam’s sin—viz., his undoing all his posterity—concerns Adam only, and is not imputed to his posterity. And there is this plain

Reason to be given for it: viz., That those circumstances of Adam, whence this aggravation arises, are not imputed to his posterity.

Sins are aggravated from their aggravating circumstances, and therefore the aggravations of any sin can no further be reckoned to any, than the aggravating circumstances of any are reckoned to him.

This aggravation of Adam’s first sin—viz., his undoing his posterity—arises from this circumstance that he stood in: viz., that he was a head to the rest. But this circumstance is peculiar to him alone, and can’t be reckoned to his posterity. To suppose that the circumstance of Adam’s
standing as a covenant head for the rest of mankind, is reckoned to all the rest of mankind, is absurd: for that supposes that God reckons or constitutes 'em all covenant heads for all the rest, whereas this circumstance or relation was appointed to but one of them, viz., to Adam; and none of the rest communicate with him [in] it, and therefore can’t communicate in that aggravation that is the result of this aggravating circumstance.

And therefore, though Adam was guilty of murdering all his posterity, yet Adam’s posterity themselves ben’t guilty of murdering all Adam’s posterity, but this is peculiar to him that stood as their public head.

The covenant was made with Adam and all his posterity, and this agrees alike to Adam and his posterity. All agree in that, that the covenant of works is made with them all alike. But besides God’s making the covenant of works, there was another, additional constitution of God, appointing Adam to be a covenant head for the rest; and this don’t agree alike to Adam and his posterity, but agrees to Adam only: and therefore, the aggravation arising from it, agrees to him only.

In that respect that the covenant extends to them, in that respect the sin extends to them. And the covenant extends to them all alike in this respect: that they all alike are included in the covenant. But in another respect, the covenant don’t extend to the posterity as it does the first father, and that is, that he is made the covenant head to act for the rest, and not they.

All Adam’s posterity are just so guilty of Adam’s sin, as if all of them had stood for themselves, and had broken the covenant themselves, and no more; because so far the covenant extends to them, as if they had all been [in] covenant with [him] personally. But to suppose 'em guilty of murdering all Adam’s posterity, makes 'em much more guilty than if they had all stood for themselves and fell, and had broken the covenant themselves: for then only, one would only have been guilty of his own sin, and his own ruin.
I now proceed, in the

II. [Second place, to distinguish] that heinousness in the act of our first father, in eating the forbidden fruit, that equally belongs to him and all [his] posterity. Though there be some positive aggravations of this sin that belong to Adam only, yet there are many others that belong equally to all mankind, excepting the man Christ Jesus. But here, before I proceed to particulars, I will first lay down a

Rule, by which we may distinguish between those aggravations that are peculiar to Adam only, and those that are imputed to all his posterity. And the rule is this:

All aggravations that arise from circumstances that are, from the tenor of that covenant, reckoned to all mankind, those aggravations are imputed to all mankind.

As for instance, all that heinousness that arises from the nature of God, that is the author of the covenant, and his relation to mankind, such as being an infinitely great God, and man’s Creator and preserver, and the like: that heinousness that arises hence, belongs to all, for ‘tis the same God that makes the covenant with all.

Again, all the heinousness that arises from the nature of the covenant itself, as it was a just and right and good covenant, proposing reasonable and good terms of life, prescribing a reasonable and easy duty; those aggravations that arise from the nature of the duty required, and the nature of the threatening annexed, and the nature and excellency of the promise, which, in the covenant, was made to abide: those aggravations belong to all mankind, for they arise from the very nature of the covenant itself, which is made with all mankind alike.

Again, all those aggravations that arise from the nature of men, with whom the covenant is made, his being endued with such faculties, capable of knowing and doing the will of God, and of a superior nature to all other
creatures here below: such aggravations belong to all, for the human nature is common to all.

Again, all those aggravations that do arise from the holy and happy state that man was in before the fall, these circumstances are reckoned to all mankind, because the very nature of the covenant supposes that man, with whom it is made, is innocent, and han’t yet disobeyed. And it also supposes that he is happy before the fall, because the state {of probation man was in before the fall}, that by which the covenant is enforced, is that he shall lose his happiness. The threatening is that he shall die, which supposes that before, he is alive; and therefore, those circumstances are reckoned to us all, and we all ought to acknowledge that in our first estate we were made upright, and were placed in an happy circumstance, and that God was very good and bountiful to us in our first estate, and that we have been guilty of shameful ingratitude, and the like.

Again, all that heinousness which arises from the special prohibition that was contained in this covenant, of not eating of the tree of knowledge {of good and evil}, which was an easy command, and was a prohibition from something gratifying to sense, and something that tended to please and gratify an ambitious disposition: that heinousness that arises from the nature of that prohibition, belongs to all, because that prohibition belongs to the very covenant itself, which was made with all.

Again, all the aggravations {that arise} from the manner of revealing the covenant, as it was fully and clearly made known, established by God’s authority, [and the] threatening annexed in a very peremptory manner, “Thou shalt surely die”: [those aggravations belong to all].

And all the heinousness that arises from the nature of the breach of this covenant, in itself considered, as it was a direct, full and perfect breach of it, containing a direct act of rebellion against God, and casting off his authority; a contempt of his attributes; an act of treason, a turning
enemy, and the like: [all that heinousness belongs to all].

And in brief, all those aggravations, excepting such particular circumstances peculiar to Adam, that don’t pertain to the essence of the act, or a direct, full violation of God’s covenant, or such as arise from the peculiar circumstances he stood in, as father and head of the rest: [those aggravations belong to all].

All the evil of the act itself is imputed, that belongs to the essence of the act as a violation of that covenant, and also all those aggravations that are reckoned to all mankind, which would have been common to all mankind, if they then had been living in an unfallen state, and under the same covenant.

It was wisely ordered of God, that there should be some peculiar, dreadful aggravations, that should be peculiar to Adam if he sinned, more than to his posterity. And herein, the justice and goodness of God to mankind, in appointing one to be the head of the rest, to stand or fall for the rest, appears. For by this, it appears that it was better for the whole, for one to be appointed head of the rest, than for all to stand for themselves: for this one that was appointed head of the rest, who in himself must be supposed as likely to stand as any of them, has, by his peculiar circumstances, much more to induce him to be careful and watchful, and guard him against a breach of the covenant, than men would have had, if they had all stood only for themselves. And that, two ways:

One, is that he had natural affection to oblige him. We must suppose that nature would make it dreadful to him, to think of eternally destroying all his posterity, to all generations. How are men wont to lay out themselves, to lay up for posterity, to get estates to leave to their children; and how have men, from time to time of old, rejoiced in God’s promises of blessings to their posterity. On the contrary, therefore, how horrible must it be to man, to think of entailing such a curse on his
posterity.

And therefore, there was this thing, to be a greater guard against a breach of the covenant, in that way of one public head standing for all the rest, more than if every one had stood for themselves.

And another is, that if this public head broke covenant, he would bring on them the peculiar guilt of eternally undoing such a vast multitude as all mankind, throughout all generations, which must needs be very dreadful, and which awful and dreadful consideration there would not have been, to have deterred from a breach of the covenant, if every man had stood for themselves.

This does abundantly vindicate God’s justice in this covenant, in setting one man the father of the rest, to stand or fall for all, and imputing what he does to all. It appears not only to be a just, but a good constitution; and to be so far from being in itself injurious to mankind, that it was a constitution that, in its own nature, tended much more to the benefit of the whole, than if each one had been appointed to stand for himself.²

I now, therefore, proceed particularly to take notice of some of those things, wherein this heinousness of that first act of sin in our first parents arises.

And here, I shall pass by most of those things that are common to all acts of sin alike, such as its being committed by a rational creature, that was naturally capable of obeying, for there is no act of sin but what is committed by such; and also its being committed against an infinitely great and excellent Being, for all sin is committed against the same glorious God; being committed against [the] Author of our beings, and the like. But I shall confine myself chiefly to the more special aggravations of this sin.

First. This sin was not a sin of heart or thought only, but an overt act of sin. For our first parents only to have looked upon the fruit, with an
hankering after it, would have been very sinful in them.

For them to have given way to such hankerings, and to allow their mind to dwell upon the object of them, would have been yet more sinful. It would have been very evil, so much as at all to begin to listen to the temptations, or to stand to deliberate, or enter into any talk or parley with the serpent. But there was not only such sins of heart and thought, but the outward act was committed; there was all the progress of sin, from its conception, to its being fully brought forth. It was first begotten in the heart by the devil, the father of it, and was conceived in the beginning, of lust in the heart. And the conception was upheld and cherished, by a wicked giving way to it, and a listening to the temptation, till at last it came to a full compliance of the heart and will: and then, the sin that was conceived, was ready for the birth.

And lastly, it was brought forth in the overt act. There was dreadful sin of heart committed by our first parents, before it came to outward act. There was an entertaining ill thoughts of God, from the suggestions of the devil, and an entertaining and cherishing a lust after the forbidden fruit. But they did not stop here, but proceeded to act.

They, in this affair, sinned in thought, word and deed. They sinned in thought, as has been now shown; and they sinned in word, in that they stood parleying with the tempter, with whom they had no business, and from whom they should immediately have turned away with abhorrence; and they sinned in deed, in actually eating of that fruit.

Second. They herein did not only outwardly violate God’s command in part, but fully and totally. If they had only touched the forbidden fruit, they would have violated the command in part: for they were forbidden so much as to touch it, as being that which would expose ‘em to temptation, and might lead ‘em to go further, and actually eat of it. Gen. 3:3, “But of the fruit of the tree that is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not
eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.” But they did not only touch, but eat. What they did, was not a some part only of what was forbidden, but the whole of it.

Third. It was not a sin of ignorance, but what they knew to be directly contrary to God’s command. Sometimes men are guilty of sin, and are quite ignorant that it is sinful; and yet their ignorance don’t excuse ‘em, because they ought to have taken more care and pains to know. But this was not the case here: they fully knew what God’s command was, and they fully knew that this was directly contrary to it.

Sometimes men blind themselves, before they commit a sinful act that they are tempted to. They industriously study for arguments, to make themselves believe that ‘tis no sin, that God has not forbidden. But this was not the case here. They remembered, in the time of the temptation, that God had forbidden; it was then on their minds, and they spoke of it, as appears by Eve’s reply to the serpent, vv. 2-3 of the context: “And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.” There are some sins that ben’t such direct breaches of God’s commands as others, but violate the command more indirectly. Whence men often blind themselves and flatter themselves, that God has not forbidden them to do so and so, because he has not done it in the very tables of the Commands.¹ Hence the Pharisees of old accounted it not contrary to the Sixth Commandment, to speak angry and reproachful words against their brethren, to say “Raca,” and “Thou fool,” and the like, because it was not that gross act that [was] particularly specified in that command [Matt. 5:22].

But this was not the case here, for our first parents were guilty of that gross act, that was most directly forbidden in God’s command.

Sometimes men blind themselves, and make themselves believe that what
they are tempted to is not a sin, because it is not expressly forbidden, though indeed it be forbidden by plain implication. But that was not the case here, but our first parents were, in this act, guilty of that which was most expressly forbidden.

There are many acts of sin that God hasn’t expressly mentioned anywhere in the Word of God, and which the Scripture rather supposes men to know already, because they are contrary to the light of man’s reason and natural conscience. Whence men often take advantage, and, being left in some measure to their own reason and natural conscience, without an express prohibition, they find ways to deal with their consciences and to blind their reason. But this was not the case here. There were many other sins, besides this of eating the {forbidden fruit}, that Adam was forbidden by the light of nature and reason, that there was no express prohibition of by word: but this was not the case here, but it was a sin contrary to an express prohibition, explicitly declared in the Word. There was but one sin that was forbidden our first parents in this manner, and this was the sin. Oftentimes men flatter themselves in sinful ways, through some misconstruction of some command of [God]. As the Pharisees allowed of revenge from that, Ex. 21:24, “Eye for an eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot.” But there was no such thing here. Our first parents did not misconstrue the command of God; they knew that what they did was directly contrary to the plain and known meaning of the command, and did not pretend any other.

Fourth. The command of God that this was a violation of, was not only express, but very peremptory. It was delivered with great solemnity.

As Gen. 2:16-17, “And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.” And you may see further, in Eve’s repetition of it. Ch. 3:3-4, “But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the
garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die."

The command was delivered in so peremptory a manner, with such authority and solemnity, that it could not be violated without a direct libel cast at God’s authority. God seems to mention this expressness and peremptoriness of his command, as an aggravation of his act, in the text: "whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldest not eat."

Fifth. The command was enforced with a very terrible threatening, denounced in a most awful, peremptory manner. God said to Adam, "Thou shalt not eat thereof, for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." In the original it is, "Dying thou shalt die," as you may see in the margin. There is a repetition of the word, which don’t seem to be fully expressed in our translation: for the expression, "Dying thou shalt die," according to the idiom of the Hebrew tongue, denotes both the certainty and also the extremity of the death that should be inflicted. The certainty of it is one thing denoted, which is expressed in our translation, "Thou shalt surely die"; and it also denotes the extremity of it, or that the death that they should suffer, should be the most extreme, dreadful death, the highest degree of death, and the highest sort of death. Such a repetition in the Hebrew tongue, properly denotes a superlative. So in the repetition, the "holy of holies" signifies the most holy of all, as the Apostle construes it. Heb. 9:8, "The way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest."

So here, when God says to Adam, "Dying thou shalt die," it is as much as if he had said, "Thou shalt suffer the death of death," i.e., the most dreadful death of all, all manner of death, not only death temporally, but spiritual and eternal; the highest and most dreadful thing that can be signified by the word "death," even everlasting misery and destruction.

And the repetition of the expression, may intimate more deaths than one. God thereby threatens two deaths: even the temporal death of the body,
and the eternal death of the soul. So that when God says, "Dying thou shalt die," so much may be understood as if he had said, "In dying," or "in the death of your body, you shalt die in soul. One death shall be an entrance into another; your body's dying shall but be the beginning of your soul's eternal dying." So that in this repetition, "Dying thou shalt die," by the first dying may be especially meant, the death of the body; by the second, the eternal death of the soul.

Which, I humbly conceive, the apostle John alludes to, when he calls eternal death "the second death." Rev. 20:14, "And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death." "This is the second death": it seems to allude to something already known among those that he wrote [to], as though there was already a notion received among them, that there were two deaths, the first and the second. And therefore, he does not first say, there are two deaths; he takes that for granted, a thing known, but only tells 'em what the second death is, very probably having respect to a notion already received for this double expressing, "Dying thou shalt die," [that] there was two deaths. We have the same again, next chapter, 8th verse: [the damned] "shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death."

The apostle John seems to suppose that the repetition of the expression, "Dying thou shalt die," implies two distinct deaths, after the same manner as the repetition of the word "woe," in this same book, 8th chapter, 13th verse: "Woe, woe, woe to the inhabitants of the earth," signifying three distinct woes. And therefore we read, 12th verse of the next chapter, "One woe is past; and, behold, there come two more woes hereafter." So when God repeats the word "die," and said, "Dying thou shalt die," when temporal death is past, it may be said one death is past, and behold, there comes on the other death, which is the second death.

Again, another thing that adds to the awfulness of the threatening, are
those words wherein God declared that he should die, in the day that he eat thereof. These words do make the threatening more awful, two ways: viz., as they threaten swift destruction for disobedience, as they further show the inevitableness of their destruction; and also as they threaten swift destruction.

1. The words do further show the inevitableness of the destruction, that shall be annexed to that sin: for whether one must necessarily understand the words, that the punishment should be executed that very day, yet at least so much must be understood, that death should at once be made certain, on the commission of one act of sin; that God would not wait any longer to see whether he would transgress again a second [time], but that day that he eat, that day, death should be made certain as the consequence. In the same manner as Solomon’s words to Shimei are to be understood; I Kgs. 2:37, “For it shall be, on that day that thou goest out, [and] passest over the brook Kidron, that thou shalt know for certain that thou shalt surely die.”

Death was executed on Shimei many days after he had done that thing. But yet death was made certain to him by the threatening, from that day forward: for Solomon would signify by it, that he should die for one transgression, and that he would not wait to see whether he would go over the brook Kidron the second time. So here, God signifies to Adam, that for one transgression the punishment should follow, and so it is revealed that the condition of the covenant was perfect obedience, and that, for but one transgression, death should ensue.

2. It also signifies that God would bring swift destruction, which makes the threatening more awful. The swiftness of destruction is often mentioned in Scripture, as an awful circumstance of the punishment. II Pet. 2:1, “But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable
heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction." Deut. 32:35, "To me belongeth vengeance, and recompense; their foot shall slide in due time: for the day of their calamity is at hand, and the things that shall come upon them make haste."

And accordingly, Adam did, in a sense, die that very day that he sinned. He was ruined and undone that day; his nature was ruined, the nature of his soul, which ruin is called death in Scripture, Eph. 2:1-5, Col. 2:13. Matt. 8:22, "But Jesus said unto him, Follow me; and let the dead bury their dead." And the nature of his body also was ruined that day, and became mortal, began to die, as his whole man became subject to condemnation, as guilty of death.

But notwithstanding the awfulness of this threatening, and the awful manner in which it was denounced, with such peremptoriness as might well excite a terrible apprehension of God’s wrath against such sin; yet our first parents presumed to eat, and venture on a direct breach of this command, so casting contempt upon God’s awful threatening, and running as it were on the thick bosses of God’s buckler, as if they would dare God to do his worst.

Sixth. Adam violated this command, against exceeding great encouragements to obedience: for there was not only a terrible threatening to deter from disobedience, but a glorious promise, even a promise of eternal life, if he obeyed. Which must necessarily be understood from what is expressed in the covenant, for God’s threatening death as the consequence of disobedience, implied that if he did not disobey, he should not die but live forever. And the tree of life was a seal of this promise. As there was the tree of knowledge of good and evil, the fairness of whose fruit might tempt him to disobedience, so there was also the tree of life to encourage him to obedience, which he was to have eat of, if he had stood, and so live forever. And probably these two trees stood near the one to the other, or in sight one of the other: for we are told that they both stood in the midst of the
garden, as appears by Gen. 2:9, “And out of the ground made the Lord God to
grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of
life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and
evil”; and ch. 3:3, “But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of
the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it,
lest ye die.” So that whenever he came near the tree of knowledge {of good
and evil}, and so might be tempted to transgress, he had the tree of life
standing by to behold, to put him in mind of the glorious reward of
obedience, to encourage him to resist the temptation. But notwithstanding
God’s thus ordering things, yet Adam transgressed the command, and so as it
were threw away eternal life, that otherwise he might have had, and run upon
his own everlasting and most dreadful destruction.

Herein is one way that he was guilty of the most vile ingratitude to
God, for God was no way obliged to promise him eternal life on his obedience.
He was not obliged to give him any reward at all. No one is obliged to
another for paying a debt, but perfect obedience was an absolute debt that
Adam owed to God, on the account of his infinite perfections, and the
relation he stood in to him as his Creator.

Seventh. The heinousness of this act further appears, in that he
committed it in the perfect exercise of the freedom of his own will. In some
sense, all the sins that are ever committed, are committed with a free will;
i.e., they are done voluntarily. But Adam, before he committed the first act
of sin, was possessed of a freedom that we, in a fallen state, are not. His
soul was under no slavery or bondage to sin, as we now are servants to sin,
and are sold under sin, and cannot cease from sin. He was not dead in sins,
as we now are. He was the subject of no such moral impotency, as we now are,
whereby we are without strength, utterly unable to do anything that is good.

When God created Adam, he endowed him with an ability to do that which
was good, yea, an ability perfectly to obey God’s commands. He was not dead
in sin, but had original righteousness, had the Spirit of God dwelling in him. Though he had not so much assistance given him as to make him impeccable, or to render it impossible for him to sin, yet he had so much as was sufficient, with proper care and watchfulness, and a due improvement, forever to prevent his sinning.

So that this act of sin was free, in a manner that acts of sin that are committed by fallen man are not, which rendered it the more heinous and aggravated. The more voluntary any sin, the more freely man commits [it], the greater guilt are they chargeable with in the sight of God.

Eighth. Another aggravation of this act, was that it was a violation of that command that was especially to be the trial of his obedience. There were other commands that Adam was obliged by. He was bound by every precept of the law of nature. But God established this command as the especial manifestation of his authority and sovereignty over Adam, forbidding one tree among many, according as he pleased, to be a trial of his submission to God’s authority. Which might well have been a special and extraordinary enforcement of this command, and the consideration of it might well have excited Adam to extraordinary care and watchfulness, especially not to violate this command: but yet he violated it.

Ninth. The easiness of the precept, is another aggravation of the violation of it. How little a thing [it] was, only to abstain from the fruit of one tree. He was under no manner of need of eating of it; he had a fullness, and plenty, and a vast variety that he might freely eat of. He was rich, in a great affluence of good things on every side. God had provided a great variety of excellent and dainty food for him. Never was any prince feasted as Adam was before his fall, and of all the multitude of the trees, he was forbidden only this one. And yet he, contrary [to] God’s solemn prohibition, eat of this, and so foolishly cast off his God; forsook his allegiance to his Creator and turned rebel against him, and threw away
eternal life; threw away himself, ruined himself to all eternity, only for
the sake of so little a thing, as it were, for the taste of an apple: and
herein was guilty of [a] more fool[ish] act than Esau, who, for a morsel of
meat, sold his birthright.

Tenth. This is exceeding aggravated by the great goodness of God to
him, in the happy state he before was in. God had been very good and
bountiful to him, had made [him] but little lower than the angels and crowned
him with glory and honor, and had set him over the works of his hands, set
him as king over this lower world, having subjected all the inferior
creatures to him.

God's bounty had bestowed on him great outward felicity, had planted a
garden, a paradise, on purpose for his habitation and for his pleasure,
bringing forth abundantly for his delight. He was surrounded with nothing but
pleasant things, without anything to trouble him or molest him. And God also
bestowed upon [him] great spiritual felicity, gave him his Holy Spirit
dwelling richly in him, the fruit of which was God's perfect image in his
soul; and favored [him] with a free, friendly and pleasant communion and
conversation with him, often appearing to him and conversing with him by
external symbols of his presence, and smiled upon him many ways. The world
before the fall, was filled with nothing but God's smiles. What way soever
Adam turned his eye, they as it were pleasantly smiled upon him.

But yet notwithstanding all this goodness, he thus basely rebelled
against so bountiful a Creator, and that, even in the midst of a paradise,
that was the effect of that bounty.

Eleventh. This sin was committed against great light. I have before
shown that it was a known sin, but it was not only committed against
knowledge, but very great light. There was great light in Adam, to know God,
and know his obligations to him. The Apostle, speaking of the renovation of
the image of God in man, says, Col. 3:10, "Put on the new man, which is
renewed in knowledge after the image [of him that created him].” And as this image is renewed in knowledge in the second creation, so it was doubtless given in knowledge in the first creation. And this knowledge was not in Adam such a knowledge of God as the saints have now in this world, which is very imperfect, and mixed with abundance of spiritual ignorance and doubts, but it was perfect in its kind: he had light without any mixture of darkness, he had great knowledge of God’s perfections and excellency, his majesty and greatness, his holiness and his goodness, but yet he thus violated {God’s command}; he sinned against the light of paradise.

'Tis often mentioned as a very great aggravation of sin, that ‘tis committed against great light.

'Tis mentioned as one main aggravation of the sin against the Holy Ghost, Heb. 6, at the beginning: “For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance.”

Twelfth. It was committed with deliberation. Our first parents, before they eat, had time to deliberate, had time to consider the obligation they were under, to consider how peremptorily and positively God had forbidden {their eating from the tree}, and how horribly he had threatened {it with certain death}. [They] actually thought of these things, as after they spoke of them, as appears by Eve’s answer to the serpent: “God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.” And yet, they deliberately committed [this act].

This is a very great aggravation.

Much more guilt {ensued} when {our first parents} deliberately {disobeyed God}, than when suddenly surprised {by temptation}. {Their rebellion had} more horrid, daring presumption and contempt manifested in it.
From this sin’s being committed with these circumstances, it appears to be no less than a horrible rebellion against God, and to amount to a total apostasy from God, a casting off God, a withdrawing allegiance, a removing his authority and all subjection unto him. It appears to be no less than an high act of treason, and a turning enemy to his rightful king. It was a vile act of hostility against God.

There were the principles of every manner of wickedness exercised in it.

There was horrible unbelief, even so as directly to listen to the devil, when he suggested that God lied, when He said, “For in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.” See vv. 4-5: “And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.” There was sensuality, a giving way to an inordinate, sensual appetite, so that for the sake of gratifying that appetite, he would {listen to the devil}.

There was horrible pride in it, insomuch that our first parents manifested an ambition to be like God, and no longer to continue in the place of subjects; but what they aimed at, was to be his equals. An horrible, proud, contemptuous and treasonable act this, to their bountiful Creator, that they would not be content to be in a state of subjection, but must go about to cast off that state which God had made so easy and pleasant and delightful to ‘em, for the sake of being as he was. Man sided with the devil, God’s grand enemy, in it, forsook God and cleaved to Satan. What a horrid exchange was this, to cast off God, to receive the devil.

Here was direct enmity against God, for our first parents began to receive a prejudice against God from what Satan had told ‘em, intimating that He had deceived ‘em, and envied their happiness, and so from a grudging spirit towards ‘em had forbidden that good and excellent fruit. This our
first parents hearkened to and received.

There was horrible treachery, unfaithfulness and perfidiousness in that act, in breaking covenant after this manner, and turning enemies, after they had sworn allegiance.

There was the basest ingratitude, in so treating God, that had been so bountiful to 'em, in {giving them dominion over the earth}.

There was great contempt and presumption {in our first parents, who} no more regarded such [a] peremptory command, {with its} awful threatenings.

{There was} most egregious folly {in thus} casting away God and eternal life {and} themselves, {in thus} ruining themselves forever, {and doing it} so needlessly {and} for nothing.

If any inquire, how our first parents could exercise such lusts, when they had none, I

Answer. Lust began in the soul at the first conception of this sin in the heart. This sin was there before [it] was conceived in the heart, before it was perpetuated in outward act. There was first an hankering inclination, and then a deliberation. So the progress was from one step to another, till all was finished in outward act. So that, though no lust could be exercised before the first conscious act of the heart, yet it began with the heart's first inward act, and so was exercised thenceforwards in all the progress of the conceived sin, till it [was] brought forth and perfected in that external deed, whereby Adam ruined himself, and we were ruined in him.⁶

But before I proceed to the Application, I would answer to one

Inquiry. Viz., Why only that first act of sin in our father Adam, his eating the forbidden fruit, is imputed to his posterity, and not other sins that he committed afterwards? That was not the only sin that Adam committed, for after Adam had eaten the forbidden fruit, he became a sinful, corrupt creature, such as we all are; he lost his original righteousness, and was continually prone to sin. And as he lived many hundred years after the fall,
so, without doubt, he was guilty of many thousands and millions of acts of sin, besides his eating the forbidden fruit.

Neither was that the only sin that was forbidden, and threatened with death, in the covenant of works: for that required perfect obedience, and forbid all sin whatsoever. And therefore, all those other sins that Adam committed, were breaches of the covenant of works, in the keeping or breaking of which covenant, Adam was appointed to be the head of all his posterity.

And all the breaches of the covenant were threatened with death. That threatening, "Dying thou shalt die," was a threatening for any sin: for the wage of any sin is death, not only the first, but the second death.

And yet, 'tis certain that only that first transgression of Adam, his eating the forbidden fruit, is imputed to his posterity. If the other transgressions that Adam had committed in the course of his life were imputed to us, the Scripture would have revealed them to us, that we might have known what they were; whereas the Scripture is wholly silent concerning all the sins of Adam, but only those that he committed in paradise. And besides, the Scripture is express, that it was only that one offense that is imputed to Adam's posterity. Rom. 5:15-16, "But not as the offense, so also is the free gift. For if through the offense of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many. And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offenses unto justification." There it is said, by "the offense of one," and not, "the offenses of one," that many are said to be dead.' And a great difference between the just condemnation by Adam, and the free gift by Christ, is declared here to consist in this: that the judgment was by one offense to condemnation, but "the free gift is of many offenses, unto justification"; which implies that our condemnation in Adam is not by many offenses, but only by that one offense, of his eating {from the forbidden tree}. 
Now therefore, what can be the reason of this, why other sins of our common head and father Adam, other breaches of the covenant of works that he was guilty of, should not be imputed to us, as well as that first sin?

Answer. The reason of it is this: viz., That the time of Adam’s trial, as the covenant head of his posterity, was over, as soon as that act was completed. As I said before, the way to know what is imputed, and what not, is to look to the covenant or constitution of God, that God made with Adam. So much as by the tenor of that covenant was acted in the name and as the head of his posterity, so much is imputed to his posterity, and no more, whether that be one act or a thousand. But ‘tis plain that, by the tenor of that covenant, Adam acted no more for mankind in general, than what he acted while he stood probationer for mankind in general. When he ceased any longer to stand covenant probationer for mankind, then he ceased any longer to act as the covenant head of mankind. That covenant that God made with Adam, as the constitution of God, which appointed him to stand as covenant head of mankind, did not appoint him to act as the head of mankind forever, or to all eternity; but only during the time of his probation, which was to continue, either till he had persevered in obedience, till God was pleased to confirm him and reward him, or else till he fell. But either of these was to put an end to his probation. If he had stood till God had been pleased to admit him to eat of the tree of life, and so to confirm him, then his time of probation would have ceased, and he would no more have acted as the public head of mankind after that.

And seeing he did not stand, but fell, the time of his probation ceased in his fall, and so he ceased to act as the public head of mankind after that. Or you may take it in one word, thus: Adam, by the covenant, was to stand public probationer or public head for mankind, till sentence should be passed, and no longer. If he had stood, then he would have stood public probationer till the sentence of approbation and justification should have
been passed, by which he would have been confirmed. Or if he fell, then he was to stand probationer till the sentence of condemnation was passed, and no longer. Nothing can be plainer, than that judgment and sentence is not passed, till the probation is over.

The covenant made with Adam, appointing him the head of his posterity, could not respect more than the time of his trial, for the tenor of [it] must be this: viz., "If you sin during your time of trial, you and your posterity shall die; but if you perform perfect obedience during your time of trial, you and your posterity shall live."

If Adam had stood, and so had had a sentence of approbation and confirmation passed upon him, he would have been obedient to all eternity, as the angels are, who always do the will of our Father while in heaven. But his obedience, after the time of his trial was over, would not have been imputed to his posterity. It would be absurd to suppose it would, for if so, Adam would be to all eternity a-fulfilling the condition of the covenant, and never would have done. And so likewise, for the same reasons, the sins that Adam committed after the time of his trial was over, are not imputed to his posterity. As soon as that act of eating the forbidden fruit was completed, the time of Adam’s trial as public head and probationer for mankind was over: for God, immediately upon that, proceeded actually to judge him, and pass sentence upon him; and there is no trial after judgment is passed. That covenant was immediately acted upon, and the whole affair of trying mankind upon that covenant with Adam was determined. Judgment is the final issue of God’s transacting with man on a covenant established; when God has already acted upon it as a judge, ’tis absurd to suppose that God still treats with man as a probationer in that covenant. And though Adam was a probationer for eternal life for himself after this, yet it was not in that covenant that established him a covenant head for his posterity, but another, that was established in another head.
We may illustrate this by what comes to pass with respect to Jesus Christ, the second Adam, the other covenant head that God hath appointed. 'Tis not all the obedience of the man Christ Jesus, that is imputed to believers, but only that which he performed during the time of his trial. The man Christ Jesus now performs perfect obedience to the Father in heaven; and, as he is a creature, he is subject to the Father, and will be after the end of the world. I Cor. 15:28, “Then shall the Son himself be subject to the Father.” But the obedience that Christ performs, now he is in heaven, is not imputed to believers, but only that obedience which he performed here on earth.

The time of Christ's trial, as a public head and surety, continued no longer than till the resurrection: for in his resurrection, a sentence of justification was passed upon him, as having done all that was required. Then, his state of probation being over, he entered on his state of reward.

So Adam, as soon as he fell, ceased to act as probationer for mankind, for he then, immediately, was in a state of condemnation. He did as much cease to act any more as a public head of mankind, as if he had then been immediately cast into hell. If it had been so, his sins that he would have committed in hell, would not have been imputed to his posterity.  

APPLICATION.

[Inference] I. Hence we learn how guilty we all come into the world. For we all come into the world guilty of this heinous sin, with all its aggravations, excepting those that have been specified. [We] ought all to acknowledge that we were, in our first estate, in our first father Adam, in a state of innocency and righteousness, in an happy state and condition; and that to us, God gave that positive, peremptory command, that we should not eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, and denounced that awful threatening for disobedience; and that we were endowed with power, to have
kept that command of God, having sufficient assistance of the divine Spirit, to keep us far from any bondage to any lust; and that we were placed in that happy state, in the enjoyment of all the blessings of paradise and a blessed communion with God: but yet that we knowingly, willfully and deliberately, and directly and fully broke that great command of God, by an overt act of rebellion, though it was so easy and reasonable a command, and it was so needless for us to have eat of that tree, being in the enjoyment of such a rich variety of the richest and most dainty food, and all manner of pleasant enjoyments in the profusion of a paradise.

And we ought to acknowledge that we have violated this great command of God, in the exercise of a vile lust of sensuality, and a suspicion of the trust of God, being jealous whether or no he was not false, and did not speak contrary to what he knew, when he said, "Ye shall surely die"; and in the exercise of an horrible prejudice against him as an envious being, as though he forbid 'em to eat {of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil}, because he envied that knowledge and that happiness that would be the consequence.

And we are guilty of slighting those great encouragements God gave to obedience, and foolishly throwing away eternal life and ruining ourselves, for so little a thing as the taste of that fruit. We are guilty of sinning against that great light, that clear knowledge of God that we had in our first estate, and sinning after God had blessed us with such an happy acquaintance and communion with him.

We, as we are naturally, are all guilty of thus casting off God's authority, and thus apostatizing from God, and turning enemies to him. We are guilty of that horrid ingratitude, perfidiousness, presumption and folly that was in that act.

That that sin is imputed to all the posterity of Adam, by ordinary generation, is manifest by both Scripture, reason [and] experience.

First. 'Tis manifest from the Scripture, both of the Old and New
Testament. 'Tis manifest,

1. By the whole account that is given us there of this affair, in the first chapters of Genesis. 'Tis manifest that when God established the covenant with Adam, in what he said to him, Gen 2:17, "Thou shalt not eat thereof: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die": I say, 'tis manifest these words had not respect to Adam alone, but to mankind in general. God spoke to Adam as the head of the human race.

The style that is used throughout these chapters shows it. There is scarce anything that is said here to Adam, but what is plainly to be understood as having respect to his posterity, as well as him. Even when God was about to create Adam, what he said on that occasion had not respect to Adam alone, but also to his posterity. As 1st chapter, [v. 26, "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth." Here God plainly speaks not of Adam only, but of mankind. It was not Adam only, but mankind that was meant, that should have dominion {over the earth}.

So what God said to, or rather, said of, our first parents, 28th verse, is not to be understood only of them, but of mankind: "And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." Now 'tis plain that it was not only Adam and Eve that God, by this blessing, made fruitful, and caused to multiply and replenish the earth and subdue it. It was not Adam and Eve themselves, immediate, that did much towards replenishing the earth and subduing it; it was done a thousand times as much by their posterity, long after they were dead, as it was by themselves. The grant that is herein given of the earth, was not only to our first parents,
but to his posterity: and we still possess the earth by virtue of that grant.

And so the grant that is made, v. 29, of the fruits of the earth for food, don't only respect Adam and Eve, but their posterity. And what is said after the fall, on occasion of the fall, to the serpent, to the woman and to the man, was plainly not meant only of those individuals, but of the kind or race to which they appertained. Part of the curse that is denounced on the serpent, is to be understood not only of the devil that actuated the serpent, but of the serpent itself, that was made use of as the instrument. As particularly, that in the 14th verse [of ch. 3]: "And the Lord God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life." Now God, in this, had not only respect to that individual serpent that the devil made use of in tempting our first parents, but of the whole serpentine race or progeny, as it was to continue through all future ages of the world. And so what is said to the woman in the 16th verse, is not meant only of that individual woman that God then spoke to—viz., Eve—but of her female posterity, or womankind in all ages. For it is not only she that has her sorrow in her conception multiplied, and that brings forth children in sorrow, and who is put into such subjection to her husband, but her female posterity in all ages.

And so the curses denounced against the man in the 17th, 18th [and] 19th verses—"And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return”—plainly has respect not only to (Adam, but to his male
posterity}.

Seeing all that is said to, and of, our first parents in these chapters, is so plainly to be extended to their posterity, it would be very unreasonable to exempt those words only, in [the] 2nd chapter, 17th verse, "For in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," and to say that they refer only to Adam and Eve, and not to their posterity.

Yea, [it would be] more unreasonable [so] to interpret those words, for there is more in these chapters, to show that [in] them God had respect to mankind in general, than in any other. For all that is said, in what God says, when he comes to judge man and pronounce sentence on him for this crime, does show plainly that all his posterity were liable to the penalty, and therefore guilty of the sin. The things that [are] spoken, do plainly respect the human race, and not only Adam in particular.

But to suppose mankind in general, by God’s sentence pronounced for this sin, to be subjected to the penalty of the sin, and not to be supposed guilty of the sin, is absurd.

For the supposition of a punishment, without a fault punished, is a contradiction. For the very notion of a punishment, is an hurt inflicted, in compensation for a supposed fault.

The style and language used in these chapters, even concerning the very beasts, birds, fishes, and grass and trees, confirms what has been now supposed. As in [the 1st chapter], 11th verse: "And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth: and it was so." What is here said {by God, concerns not only the first creation, but their posterity. And} so what is said of the whales, and fishes in the sea, and fowls of the air, v. 22: "And God blessed them, saying, Be fruitful, and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let fowl multiply in the earth."
2. We have no account of any covenant transaction, in the whole Bible, with any of mankind, where the seed or posterity are not included. The covenant of grace, that was immediately revealed after the breach of the first covenant, was made not with a particular person, but with a posterity or race. It was those that were the seed or posterity of the woman, viz., Christ and his spiritual posterity. Gen. 3:15, “And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.”

   And so that covenant that was established with Noah, was with him and his posterity. Gen. 9:8-9, “And God spake unto Noah, and to his sons, saying, Behold, I will establish my covenant with you, and with your seed after you.”

   So the covenant that was afterward made with Abraham, was with him and his seed, Gen. 17:7-8.

   And so the covenant that was made with Phinehas, was with him and his seed. Num. 25:12-13, “Wherefore [say], Behold, I grant unto him my covenant of peace: and he shall have it, and his seed after him.”

   And so the covenant that God established with David, was with him and his seed. As you may see in the 7th chapter of the Second Book of Samuel.

3. The plain testimony of the Scripture is full in this matter. For besides such passages of the Old Testament, where we are said to be "conceived in sin, and shapen in iniquity" [Ps. 51:5], and that a clean thing cannot be taken out of an unclean [Job 14:4], the New Testament is very particular in this matter, in the latter part of the 5th chapter of Romans: "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned (For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come. But not as the offense, so also is the free gift. For if through the
offense of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by
grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many. And not as
it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one to
condemnation, but the free gift is of many offenses unto justification. For
if by one man’s offense death reigned by one; much more they which receive
abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by
one, Jesus Christ.): Therefore as by the offense of one judgment came upon
all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift
came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man’s
disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be
made righteous. Moreover the law entered, that the offense might abound. But
where sin abounded, grace did much more abound: that as sin hath reigned unto
death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by
Jesus Christ our Lord."

Second. ['Tis manifest from] reason.

1. It will follow that if infants ben’t guilty of sin, then Christ is
not the Savior of infants: he never satisfied for them; he did not die for
them, neither have they any need of him. And so it will follow that the whole
church is not saved by Christ: for none will deny, but that some infants are
of the church of Christ. Some infants have eternal life, and therefore will
appear to be of the church.

2. If we are not included in Adam as a covenant head, then mankind are
not naturally fallen creatures; we are merely, and simply, as God hath made
us: for we never, in any other respect than as we were in Adam, were in any
better state than we are in naturally. And so man can’t be said to be fallen
man, but only as particular persons may appear to fall, as Adam did. We ben’t
fallen at all, in being so disposed to sin as we are in our present state:
for if we were never reckoned as being in Adam, then we are in as innocent a
state now, as ever we were.
‘Tis ridiculous to talk of the fall of mankind. {If Adam was not our covenant head,} it was not “of mankind.”

3. Again, Christ certainly stood for others besides himself, [which is] why he is therein called the second Adam, I Cor. 15:45.

Third. Experience does as plainly show this truth, as any whatsoever. We see that the sin of Adam is imputed to his posterity, because we every day see ‘em punished for it. Little children, that are innocent as to any guilt contracted by any personal transgression, we see that they are liable to death {as older persons}.

Multitudes {of children die; there are} more frequent instances of death in such, than any other of mankind .

[And they suffer] often very terrible deaths, [and] dreadful diseases. [They suffer] sorrowful accidents, [such as being] burnt to death, {or} devoured by wild beasts.

[And some die by the] cruelty of men.

And it is in vain to dispute against fact, and plain and evident experience. The Scripture does expressly teach us, that death is the wages of sin [Rom. 6:23]. And we have no account of death, of any sort, coming but as a punishment of sin, the consequence of guilt. And unless the Apostle argued weakly in Rom. 5, "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned," any one’s being subject to death was a sure evidence of his being guilty of sin.

As to the justice of this imputation, the objections made against [it] don’t seem to be formed in reason, but in unreasonable prejudice against the doctrine of God’s sovereignty, which men are not willing to allow him, even in things wherein mankind suffers no injury. For it was before shown, that it was no ways injurious to mankind, for God to establish such a constitution.

So that we are, doubtless all of us, to look on ourselves, as most
justly chargeable.

[And we ought] deeply to humble and abase ourselves for it, lie in the
dust, acknowledging we come into the world guilty, condemned, undone
creatures, justly exposed to God’s eternal wrath and curse.

And [we] should look on our newborn children, as in themselves guilty,
miserable creatures, standing in need of the infinite mercy {of God, and in
need of the} atonement of infinite value of Jesus Christ the Savior.

[We ought to] carry ‘em to God, and offer ‘em to him as sinful, guilty
creatures, begging sovereign and infinite mercy through Christ for them.¹⁹

Inference II. This may help us to account for the dreadful
consequences of that act. The consequences of that act have been very
dreadful indeed, which we may be the better sensible of, by taking a
particular view of them. The consequences are of two kinds: consisting either
in the loss we have suffered, or in the positive evils mankind have been
plunged into by that act.

First. The consequences of that act have been very dreadful, in the
loss mankind has suffered by it. And this loss is of two sorts: ‘tis either
of what man had before the fall, or of what we might have had, if he had not
fallen. Both of them are very great.

1. The loss of what he had, before he fell. Man, as has been observed
before, was in a very happy state before he fell; but when he committed this
act, he lost all. He lost all his inherent good, all that which he possessed
within himself. He lost all that he possessed in his soul: he lost the image
of God, wherein his excellency and glory and life consisted; his soul was
immediately deprived of all that excellent beauty which it had before, was
stripped of its robe of original righteousness, and turned out naked. He lost
his inward peace and comfort. While his original righteousness remained, it
was a perpetual spring of comfort in his soul, but when this act was
committed, the fountain then was dried up. All that sweet calm and serenity
of his mind was gone, and now man hides himself among the trees of the
garden, being guilty and afraid.

When this act was committed, he lost all that inherent good, that he
before possessed in his body. He lost that beauty and glory that his body
before was endowed with, that was answerable to the perfect beauty and
brightness of his soul, in its original righteousness. Instead of a robe of
light, with which his body before shone, or at least an excellent appearance
of dignity and majesty, from head to foot, whereby his body appeared with a
kind of luster, now he runs away, naked and full of shame, and hides among
the bushes, and sews fig leaves to hide some of his deformity. So he lost the
former vigor, activity and strength of his body, and now his body became weak
and heavy-molded, with the principles of death begun in it, and began now to
approach to the nature of the dust: a sad presage that it was going to return
thither.

And he did not only lose his inherent good, or what he possessed within
himself, in his own body and soul, but he also lost all that he enjoyed
without himself. He lost God, that he before was united with; the union was
broken between God and himself. He lost his favor, that before he enjoyed,
and had so many testimonies of. He lost communication with him; there was an
end to that pleasant converse that Adam used to have with God, when God came
from time to time, and used to converse with Adam as his friend.

And he lost all his good things that were of an external nature. He
lost his paradise, and was driven out of the garden. ‘Tis said, “The Lord
sent him forth from the garden, and drove him out,” [in the] two last verses
of the chapter, wherein is the text: “Therefore the Lord God sent him forth
from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken. So he
drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden,
cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the
tree of life.” By tasting of that one forbidden fruit, he lost all that
plenty and variety of sweet fruits and pleasant things that paradise abounded with. He, in a great measure, lost his dominion over the creatures.

And this lower world that he lived in, lost its primitive, lovely and happy state. A kind of a darkness was introduced on all things here below. The ground was cursed for his sake, and everything was deprived of its former pleasantness; andnd there was an appearance of a curse everywhere, wheresoever man turned his eyes. The sum of all, was that the union between heaven and earth was now lost, and God was departed from the earth.

2. The other kind of loss man suffered by this act, was the loss of what he might have obtained, if he had stood. So he lost eternal life: he lost that happy opportunity that he had of being confirmed in a state of blessedness forevermore, and rewarded with unalterable happiness, out of the reach of Satan and all changes; which he would, in a little time, have obtained, if he had kept God’s laws. He would have had the fruit of the tree of life given him, as a token of his being confirmed in a state of unalterable and eternal happiness, and then all would have been safe: man would have been above all danger forever; Adam and all his posterity would have been {happy forever}. What a happy world then would this have been. But this act was committed; all was lost. There now was no hope that he could obtain eternal life by anything that he could do. The tree of life was not to be come at by him, for God placed cherubims and a flaming sword to keep him from it. Gen 3:24, “So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden, cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life.”

Such were the dreadful consequences of this act, consisting in the loss mankind suffered by it.

Second. The consequences are very dreadful, with respect to the positive evils that man plunged himself into by that act. These consequences are of two sorts: they are either of sin, or suffering, for they are both
punishments of that first act of sin.

1. Dreadful are the consequences of that act, if we consider the universal corruption of the nature of mankind, that is the consequence and punishment of it. When Adam had done that act, he lost his original righteousness; all his holiness was gone, nothing that was truly good was left; and there prevailed the principles of all evil. There was a depravation of all the faculties of the soul; the understanding was darkened, the judgment became erroneous and full of deceit, the will altogether corrupt and filthy. There was every lust, and every one in full dominion and power; and consequent on it, an aversion to all that is good, and proneness to all that is evil.

This corruption of nature was properly a punishment of that act, for though God was not the positive author [of] it, but man himself; yet it was God himself that took away his Holy Spirit from man, as a punishment of man’s sin, and the corruption of nature was a consequence of that. And yet God was not the blameable cause of the departing of the Holy Spirit from man, but man himself, for it was a just punishment of man for his rebellion.

Man had turned enemy to God, and had brought himself under guilt, and under the curse; and it would not have been suitable that God should yet continue, by his Holy Spirit, to dwell in the heart of one that was now become an enemy, and had brought the threatened curse of the law on him.

That would have been for God himself to have violated his own holy constitution and law, to have treated a rebel against it, and one that was under the curse of [it], so far as a friend, as still to have continued his holy, gracious presence with him, dwelling with him and in him by his blessed Spirit. That would have been to have owned an enemy as a friend; it would have been for God to have caressed a rebel against his own authority, and to have countenanced an enemy against his own infinite majesty, and to have been accessory to the dishonor of his own dominion over the creature.
If God had continued still, by his holy presence, to dwell in the heart of man, after man turned enemy, that would have been to have sided with his own enemy against himself.

Therefore, the necessary consequence of that act of sin, was God’s leaving man. ‘Tis leaving his heart, where He had formerly dwelt: for man, by his rebellion, did as it were drive the Holy Spirit away, out of his heart.

But then, as soon as God had left man, as soon as the Holy Spirit was gone out of his heart, the necessary and unavoidable consequence was the total corruption of his nature. There was nothing else needed to be done in Adam, to man’s becoming perfectly corrupt, but only God’s leaving of him. There was no need for anything positive to be done. For the principles of man’s nature, his self-love, his love of his gain and sensual pleasure and the like, will have all the effects that lust can have, when once God’s Spirit is gone, and ceases to sway and govern and guide those principles.

And thus it is, that all Adam’s posterity became corrupt. It has been a question, much disputed among many, how the corruption of nature comes to [be] transmitted from father to son: whether or no the soul of man did not some way proceed from the soul of the parents, and so derive corruption from them; or whether or no the body of man, by eating the forbidden fruit, was not corrupted and poisoned, and so bodily appetites depraved and made inordinate, and so thence the soul came to be defiled by dwelling in such a defiled body, and this poison transmitted from father to son through all generations.

And many such like disputes and controversies have been moved and long agitated, which all seem to be vain and frivolous. It helps not the controversy one way or the other, to dispute how far the human nature of the son is from the human nature of the father: for let it be more or less, it is not by any physical virtue and influence of such a derivation, that the corruption of nature is derived. The derivation of the corruption of nature,
is not [to] be sought in a physical, but a moral cause. And if we would see how 'tis derived, we must look to the covenant that God [made] with man. If it were not for that covenant, neither guilt nor corruption would have been derived from Adam.

Adam's posterity partakes of the guilt of that act {of our first parents}, because they are included in the covenant, the covenant being made not only with Adam, but with his posterity. Therefore not only Adam, but his posterity, are looked upon as having broken that covenant, as well as he. And so we have no need to look any further, to seek for the cause of the corruption of their nature, than the nature of Adam's posterity became corrupt the same way that his own became corrupt. Adam sinned, and so was deprived of the indwelling {of God's Holy Spirit} as a just punishment of his rebellion. And so it is with his posterity: they sin as well as Adam, and so are deprived of the Spirit of God as a just punishment of their sin, as Adam was, and so their natures both became corrupt the same way.

And then the world became full of wickedness, as a consequence of that heinous act of our first parents. Sin is become like a great universal deluge, that has overwhelmed this fallen world. How does this corruption of nature break out all over the world, and rage continually in all ages: in idolatry, sorcery, pride, blasphemy, injustice, malice, uncleanness, adultery, sodomy, bestiality, murder, robbery, cruelty. But the time would fail to stand to reckon up the innumerable kinds of horrid wickedness {in the world}, or to set forth to what a degree it has prevailed through all ages of the world.

All this is the consequence of that heinous act {of Adam}.

2. Suffering is another positive evil {of that act}. All sufferings, all natural evils, both in this world and that which is to come, that mankind are subject to, are the consequence {of that heinous act}.

How manifold and how various are the miseries that mankind is subject
to in all ages: in infancy, in youth, in old age, in both great and small, rich and poor. What personal miseries [is mankind subject to], what miseries in society, what grievous pains, sicknesses of body and distress of mind.

It would fill volumes, yea, whole libraries, to set forth the calamities that [mankind is subject to].

How has death reigned over the world of mankind, ever since the fall {of our first parents}, one generation after another, {with} thousands perpetually descending into the grave every day.

In what various terrible forms does death tyrannize over fallen man.

How full is the world of death by various terrible diseases: some sudden in their operation, some lingering, many very tormenting. {How full is the world of death by} various accidents.

How do mankind, from age to age, kill one another in the wars that are perpetually upheld among the nations of the earth: whole countries sometimes nearly deluged with blood, vast armies swept off at once, nations almost [made] extinct. How often [is] one kingdom and empire set up on the dreadful ruins of another.

And besides these, the infinitely more amazing torments of hell, {and the sufferings there,} are the consequence of this.

The bigger part of mankind from age to age {go down to hell}.

[They] descend {forever into eternal burnings}: and who can express and conceive [the eternal sufferings of that place]?

The world was once destroyed by water, as the consequence of this sin.

And there have, from age [to age], been awful destructions of particular countries, towns and cities, by conflagration or inundations of waters, {or some other means}. How did God overthrow Sodom {and Gomorrah}, and some other towns history gives account of. And how many places have been destroyed by earthquakes.

And at last, this whole lower world will be all be consumed {by fire}
II Pet. 3:7].

And all these things are the consequence [of that one heinous act].

The dreadfulness of these consequences appear especially in these four things:

(1) The nature and degree of them.

(2) In the influence of them, or he that has a main hand in them, even the devil. He is he, that is the main hand in them, as he is represented as the father of sin, John 8:44; and as having the power of death, Heb. 2:14; and these distinct evils are called, "the works of the devil," I John 3:8. As a consequence of this heinous act {of Adam}, mankind fell under the power of the devil. The tempter that has [a] hand {in mankind's fall, has} become "the god of this world" {and} "prince of the power of the air" [II Cor. 4:4, Eph. 2:2].

(3) The extent of them.

(4) The duration of them. [There is a] twofold duration, as continued in successions of generations, through all generations of men in this world, from the fall to the end of the world.

[The] connection to each individual {extends} to all eternity.

These are the consequences of that heinous act of our first parents, that we have heard of.

[Inference] III. Since the rebellion of our first surety was so heinous, what cause have we to admire the grace of God, in giving his own Son to be our second Adam. Seeing the rebellion of mankind was so great, how wonderful was it, that mankind were not left in the misery that they had brought on themselves by it. What mercy is this, that God should pity so vile a rebel, and go about to do great things for his deliverance, and appoint another surety in his stead.

I would here briefly mention some few things, that may serve to brighten an idea of the grace of God, in thus appointing another surety:
First. The glory of the person that was appointed to be our second Adam. The first Adam, in his first estate, was an excellent person: he was far above all other creatures here below in dignity; he was set in heaven honour {in the world}, made a little lower than angels, crowned with glory, {endowed with} noble faculties, {given} wisdom and knowledge, {made} innocent and perfectly holy {in nature}, bright in the image of God.

But when this, our first Adam, so heinously rebelled, so wonderfully did the grace of God appear towards this vile rebel, that he appointed a person infinitely more glorious to stand in his room, his only begotten, dearly beloved Son: {one} more glorious than the angels, {and} one the same in essence with the Father, {even} the King of heaven and Lord of angels.

Second. When our first surety had failed, God appointed one that could not fail. {The} first was a mere man, a mere creature, and therefore fallible.

But the second was infinitely more glorious and infallible, and accordingly he did not fail, {though he underwent a} greater trial by far than the first Adam.

[The] first Adam [had] easy commands, {but the commands of} the second [were] exceeding difficult. {Yet, he} conquered Satan.

Third. The second surety that was appointed, had not only to obey the law that the first had broken, but to suffer the punishment of the breach, instead of those that were guilty {of the sin of their first surety}. He was put in the stead of men, not under those advantages that the first Adam was, who stood a surety when as yet there had been no breach of covenant to answer for. All that he had to do, was only to obey the easy commands of God. But when he failed of this, infinitely more was needful to be done, in order to the happiness of this rebel. The rebellion must be satisfied for, the punishment that he deserved must be undergone. That death, the first and the second death, must be endured.
If there be another surety appointed, a punishment must be endured, that shall be equivalent to man’s eternal burning in hellfire.

This the second Adam, in himself perfectly innocent, and perfectly and infinitely holy, so much [more] glorious and excellent than the first Adam, yea, infinitely more excellent than the highest angel, and more dear to God, was given for. And this he suffered, and so procured liberty for such rebels, from the punishment that they deserved.

Fourth. This second Adam was given not only to satisfy for that sin, but for all other sins that lead the way to.

The condemnation came by one transgression, but the free grace of God appeared exceeding abundant in giving the second surety, who both satisfied, not only for that sin, but for many thousands and millions of heinous and aggravated transgressions, all sorts of sins: {even} murders, {and} adulteries, {and the like}.

O! how vast would the catalog of sins appear to be {if we could reckon them all}.

How much sin is committed oftentimes by one elect soul!

See Rom. 5:16, “And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one, to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offenses, to justification of life.”

Fifth. The second Adam is given, not only perfectly to restore the ruining, occasioned by the ruins of the first, but to advance him to a much higher pitch of happiness. Which seems to be intimated in Rom. 5:15, “But not as the offense, so also is the free gift. For if through the offense of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, hath abounded unto many.”

The second Adam don’t only deliver man from all the punishment due to the sin of the first Adam, as has been said, but now the punishment of all other sins {as well}. And not only so, but he perfectly restores to the
blessedness that man had before he fell, in his innocent, paradisiacal state. And not only so, but he procures that confirmed and eternal life, that the {first Adam lost}.

And not only [so], but [the second Adam] procures a far more glorious happiness, an eternal, confirmed happiness, in a vastly higher degree of glory.

Whereas if Adam had stood, every man would have been made happy, as it were separately and by himself. {But through the second Adam they are} now in an espousal to the glorious, only begotten {Son of God}, as partaking of his glory.

Eternal life in [an] earthly paradise would have been all that Adam’s obedience would have procured a right to. But {the second Adam procured a right to the} heavenly paradise, the habitation of angels, of Christ, who is the Lord {of} heaven, {who sits at the right hand} of God himself. I can’t say that the happiness purchased by Christ will be a thousand times greater than {what the first Adam would have obtained}, as the surety, and his obedience, is unspeakably more excellent {than that of Adam}.

How wonderful that God should take occasion, from such wickedness, so to glorify his grace and love, instead of executing justice.

Sixth. It tends to brighten our thoughts of the grace of God, in appointing a second Adam, that this appointment was so soon revealed {after the first Adam’s fall into sin}. {It} shows the freeness of God’s grace, {and} how ready to pity {fallen mankind God is}. It was revealed immediately, even at the first time that God met with Adam {after his sin}, and even before he pronounced sentence on the first Adam.

Seventh. It was not only revealed, but God soon began to save men on the account of that second Adam.

God appeared ready to pardon and forgive {fallen mankind}, and saved men many ages before that second Adam.
A church was soon erected in the world, and probably our first parents themselves, that were the immediate actors of that {heinous sin}, and thereby had been guilty of murdering and ruining {all their posterity} to all eternity: I say, 'tis probable that they were the subjects {of that church}, that were convinced of their sin and guilt, when they heard the voice of God {calling to them in the garden}; and further convinced by those things that God {said to them}, but gleaned hope from the promise of God, though obscurely revealed {in God's promise}, and did lay hold on that promise by faith. Eve seems to express her faith in that promise, from time to time. Gen. 4:1, "And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from the Lord"; [v.] 25, "And Adam knew his wife again; and she bare a son, and called his name Seth: For God, said she, hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel, whom Cain slew." And probably God's clothing them with the skins of sacrifices, was a token of their being clothed with the righteousness of Christ. God had a church in the days of Abel, and had established his ordinances and worship, as appears by what is said of his sacrificing. Gen. 4:4, "And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. And the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering." The Apostle says, Heb. 11:4, "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts: and by it he being dead yet speaketh."

This church has been continued from that day to this, and the gates of hell have never {prevailed against it} [Matt. 16:18].

Use IV may be of Warning. Let all take warning from our first parents' falling into so heinous {an act}, to take heed to themselves, lest they fall into sin and ruin. If they were seduced, who were endowed with such knowledge, strength and perfections, and fell into so foul {a sin}, and ruined themselves, when they had so much to restrain them, and it was so
needless: what heed had we need to take, [that are] weak {and} so blind, {having} so much corruption in our hearts.

This should be a warning to us to beware, lest we are drawn away by that same tempter. II Cor. 11:3, “Take heed lest, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ.” He manifested a great deal of subtilty then, but doubtless has gained vastly greater subtilty now, {and has gained} so much experience, {after many} thousands of years, {and has} had to do {with} persons of all tempers {and} in all circumstances, {and} has found by abundant trial which is the most advantageous ways to ply man with his temptations.

Let us stop all communication with the tempter, and when tempted, not enter into a parley with him. {Let us not do} as Eve did.

{Instead,} follow the example of the second Adam when he was tempted, {and} resist him immediately by the Word of God, {saying,} “Get thee hence, Satan” [Matt. 4:10].

Avoid the occasions of sin, whence Satan may take advantage. Satan probably took advantage when Eve was near the forbidden tree.

[Let us] watch over ourselves. Eve’s eyes betrayed [her].

[Let us] watch over our appetites.

Take heed of pride, being drawn into sin through an ambition after a better state {in this world}.

Let us beware of the devil’s instruments, though our companions or best friends {may be his instruments}. Adam [was] tempted by Eve, {his own wife}.

Let us not trust in ourselves, but look to God, and depend on his strength.

For if the strength of our first parents did not serve them, {how much less will ours serve us}.

What shall we be, and what will become of us, if we go forth in our own
strength, who are but the ruins of what they were; are without strength, and have a body of sin and death that we carry about with us?

Use [V.] Let all earnestly seek that we may be the children of the second Adam, seeing we are all guilty of so heinous {an act} in the first Adam, and seeing a second Adam is provided, a glorious surety, {and} one that has satisfied for all sin, has performed perfect obedience.

Let us rejoice at the offer, and let it be our great business to gain an interest in him, to become his posterity.

Believers are represented as the spiritual seed of Christ. Gal. 3:29, “And if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.” Heb. 2:13-14, “And again, I will put my trust in him. And again, Behold I and the children which God hath given me. Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.”

The obedience of the second Adam is as glorious and meritorious, as the disobedience of the first Adam was heinous. God is as much honored by it, {and more, than if Adam had stood}.

They that are in him are, {through his obedience,} delivered.

There is encouragement may be taken from the consideration of this Doctrine, even the heinousness of {Adam's act}, to seek an interest {in Christ}: for if God stood ready to pardon so heinous an act of rebellion, {which was} against such goodness {and against} such light, {and was} so deliberate; {yet,} as he pardons everyone that is saved, there is great encouragement to all, to seek the pardon of their sins, though they are very heinous: though you have been guilty of known sins, {of} overt acts {of disobedience} against great light, {against} convictions of conscience, {with} deliberation, {however} presumptuous {and} after great spiritual mercies.
Seeing, therefore, that your necessities are so great, that you must certainly perish eternally if {you stand with Adam}, and seeing you are offered another surety, and the encouragement is so great to seek an interest {in Christ}: let it stir up everyone to seek this, above all things. Whatever becomes of other things, seek first the righteousness of the second Adam.
Notes

1 MS: “3dly.”
2 End of the first preaching unit. At the beginning of the second unit, JE repeats the text and Doctrine, and provides a brief summary of the two main heads covered thus far, all of which is here omitted.
3 I.e., the Ten Commandments.
4 I.e., the margin of the King James Bible. See also “Blank Bible” on Gen. 2:17, WJE 24:133-34.
5 MS: “That.”
6 End of the second preaching unit. At the beginning of the third unit, JE repeats the text, the Doctrine, and the two main heads, which are here omitted.
7 Ed. italics.
8 JE deletes the following: “No covenant whatever stands in force for the imputing anything, either obedience or disobedience, either to the actors themselves or the persons they act for, any longer than the time of trial under that covenant remains, or till that covenant is judicially acted upon, and final sentence passed by it. Indeed Adam, after the fall, still received a probation for himself under the covenant of works, established in Christ: for the covenant of works still is as much in force as before, but only under another head, and therefore his sins were imputed to him personally, after the fall, by virtue of the covenant of works. But besides the covenant of works, the great and everlasting rule of righteousness that always remains through all generations, there was another particular covenant, or divine constitution, appointing Adam to stand as head with respect to this particular constitution. Final judgment was passed, and things were issued upon it, as soon as Adam fell; and so he ceased to remain a probationer as to that constitution. But as to the covenant of works in general, he did not cease to remain a probationer for himself, till final judgment was passed at his death. And so all mankind remain probationers for themselves till death, and then final judgment is passed, as to the covenant of works itself, after which no more will be imputed upon that covenant. The sins of men, their blasphemies and the like, won’t be imputed to ‘em after the final judgment, so as to require any further judgment, and a new sentence and execution: for this would be to suppose no last judgment at all, but judgment upon judgment, sentence upon sentence, to all eternity.”
9 End of the third preaching unit.