and, the

ent meet

e, so that

moval of

purity of

d? We

correctly

justified

of hear.

There is

y day to

he high

ity snff.

to a fall.

st-away.

emoved

ty does

exist in

dadults to have done, through ignorance, unratchfulness and neglect to seek divine aid.

And, it may be here remarked, that Fletcher's riews, which are, in substance those of this Essay, refound in his "Appeal;" a work which Arminans have always properly regarded as presenting the Scriptural idea of human depravity most unaswerably, the coincidence proving that in his opinion, there is no want of harmony between the two doctrines.

It will be observed, by a comparison of quotations, already given, that Dr. Fisk agrees precisely with Watson, so far as these quoted statements But, as the statement of the formare concerned. er has been strangely construed into a denial of depravity, except such as is one's own making, we refer to it again, "Guilt is not imputed, until by a voluntary rejection of the Gospel-remedy, man makes the depravity of his nature, the object of his own choice." So far is this language from denying human depravity, that it most clearly implies the very opposite conclusion. For, how can it be said that "man makes the depravity of his nature the object of his own choice," if his nature be not depraved. And, the fact that this depravity is "of his own nature" no more proves it to be of his own making, than the fact that his offections are a part of his nature, proves them to be of his own making. And, as a man may choose to be guided by his malevolent affections, so he

ence of ers are enemy, they t coner, by eater may ared, stifi-