cimis and his followers to the other extreme of denying Chriſt’s ſatisfaction altogether, and conſidering his death as nothing more than that of an ordinary martyr, permitted for the purpoſe of atteſting the truth of his doctrine, and paving the way for his reſurrection, to confirm the great promise of im­mortality. According to theſe men, forgiveneſs is freely dispenſed to thoſe who repent, by the essential goodneſs of God, without regard to the merit or bufferings of any other being ; and the goſpel is ſaid to ſave from sin, becauſe it is the moſt perfect leſſon of righteouſneſs. The great objec­tion of *Crellius* to the doctrine of the ſatisfaction is, that it is a hinderance to piety ; for if Chriſt has paid the whole debt, he thinks that we muſt have nothing to do, as nothing more can be required of us. And if it were indeed true that our sins are imputed to Chriſt, and his righteouſneſs imputed to us, this objection would be inſurmountable ; for God could not juſtly exact a double puniſhment for the same sin, or inflict miſery upon thoſe to whom he imputes perfect righteouſ­neſs. But as to this imaginary transferring of virtues and vices from one perſon to another, the Chriſtian ſcriptures give no countenance ; ſo they nowhere call the death of Chriſt a *ſatisfaction* for the sins of men. The term has indeed been long in uſe among divines, and when properly explain­ed it may be retained without any danger ; but in treating of this ſubject, it would perhaps be more prudent to reſtrict ourſelves to the uſe of ſcripture language, as the word sa*tisfaction* carries in it the ideas of a debt paid and accepted ; whereas it is ſaid by St Paul, that “ eternal life is the *gift* of God through Jeſus Chriſt our Lord; and that we are juſtified *freely by his grace* through the redemption that is in Jeſus Chriſt, whom God hath ſet forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood.”

To clear up this matter, and attain adequate notions of redemption and juſtification, it will be necessary to look back to the fall of our first parents ; for the great purpoſe for which Chriſt was promiſed, and for which he came into the world, was, by bruiſing the head of the ſerpent, to reſtore mankind to the inheritance which they had loſt through the tranſgreſſion of Adam. This is apparent not only from the original promiſe made to the woman, but alſo from different paſſages in the epiſtles of St Paul, who expreſsly calls Chriſt the ſecond Adam, and says, that, “ as by the offence 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 ;” that “ as by one man’s disobedience many were made ſinners, ſo by the obedience of one ſhall many be made righteous ;” and that, “ as in Adam all die, even ſo in Chriſt ſhall all be made alive.” Hence it was that John the Baptiſt, when he ſaw Jeſus coming to him, ſaid to his diſciples@@\*, “ Be­hold the Lamb of God which taketh away, not the sins, but the *sin* of the world,” evidently alluding to Adam’s sin and its conſequences, ſince no other sin was ever com­mitted of which the conſequences extend to the whole world.

This being the case, it is undeniable, that whatever we loſt •in the first Adam is reſtored to us by the ſecond ; and therefore they who believe that the puniſhment denounced againſt eating the forbidden fruit was death *corporal, ſpiritual,* and *eternal,* muſt believe that we are redeemed from all theſe by Chriſt ; who having “ appeared once in the end of the world to put away ſin by the ſacrifice of himſelf, died for us, that whether we wake or ſleep we ſhould live to­gether with him@@\*.” If the image of God in which man was created was loſt by the breach of the first covenant, it is more than reſtored to us “ by the Mediator of a better covenant, which is eſtabliſhed upon better promiſes;” if by the ſin of Adam we were utterly indiſpoſed, diſabled, and made oppoſite to all that is ſpiritually good, and wholly inclined to all evil, and that continually, we are freed from that dreadful curſe by “ our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, who gave himſelf for us, that he might redeem us from all inquiry, and purify to himſelf a peculiar people zealous of good works @@\*;” and if for our ſhare in the first tranſgreſſion we be juſtly li­able to all punishments in this world and in that which is to come, the apoſtle aſſures us, that “ when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, becauſe that God was in Chriſt reconciling the world to himſelf, not imputing their treſpasses unto them@@\*.” As Jeſus is “ the Lamb ſlain in the divine decree from the foundation of the world,” theſe beneficial conſequences of his death have been extended by a retroſpective view to all in every age whoſe names are written in the book of life, though it is absurd to ſuppoſe that he literally took their sins upon him, and impious to imagine that he ſuffered under the im­putation of ſin.

Such is the general doctrine of redemption, as it is taught by the more moderate Calviniſts and more moderate Remonſtrants ; for moderate Chriſtians of all denominations, though they expreſs themſelves differently, have nearly the same views of the fundamental articles of their common faith. It muſt not, however, be concealed, that many divines of great learning and piety, though removed to an infinite diſtance from the school of Socinus, contend ſtrenuouſly againſt the doctrine of vicarious atonement for actual tranſgreſſions of the moral law. Theſe are the more zealous Arminians, who deny that we inherit any moral taint or in­tellectual weakneſs from our first parents, whom they be­lieve never to have been in a ſtate of greater perfection than many of their poſterity who are called *degenerate.* Accord­ing to them, we loſt nothing by the fall of Adam but our title to eternal life or perpetual exiſtence, together with thoſe graces of the Holy Spirit which were beſtowed under the first covenant to train mankind for the ſociety of hea­ven ; and as eternal life and ſupernatural grace conſtituted one free-gift, not due to the nature of man, or indeed of any created being, they might, when forfeited, be reſtored by any means or upon any condition which ſhould seem ex­pedient to the all-wise Donor. Theſe means, and that con­dition, human reaſon cannot indeed diſcover ; but it ſeems very fit that they ſhould be different from the means by which moral agents under the law of nature can ſecure to themſelves the favour of their Creator, or recover it when occaſionally loſt. The former depends on arbitrary will and pleasure, or at leaſt upon no other principles diſcoverable by us ; while the latter ariſeth out of the eſtabliſhed and well-known conſtitution of things. Thus moral virtue, comprehending piety, was the condition of that favour and protection which the creature man, in his original ſtate, could claim from his Maker ; but obedience to a positive command was the condition of the free gift of immortality conferred upon Adam on his introduction into paradiſe. The claim ariſing from the relation between the creature and the Creator is indissoluble, becauſe that relation cannot be diſsolved : so that the man who, by a tranſgreſſion of the moral law, or of any part of that ſyſtem which is called the *religion of nature,* has forfeited the favour of God, may reaſonably hope to recover it by ſincere repentance and a re­turn to his duty : and nothing but ſuch repentance and re­formation can recover it ; becauſe, in a moral agent, nothing can be agreeable to God but moral diſpoſitions, which can­not be transferred from one perſon to another, and for the want of which nothing can atone. Our virtues are not re­quired nor our vices prohibited, as if the one could profit and the other injure him who created us ; for “ is it any pleasure to the Almighty that we are righteous? or is it
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