

himself for another, to see something paid or performed, to give security for another.”—Poole on Heb. vii. 22.

“A surety,” says Owen, “is one that undertaketh for another, wherein he is *defective*, really or in reputation. Whatever that undertaking be, whether in words of promise, or in depositing a real security in the hands of an arbitrator, or by any other personal engagement of life and body, it respects the defect of the person for whom any one becomes a surety. Such an one is *sponsor* or *fidejussor* in all good authors, and common use of speech.—The words of a surety in the behalf of another, whose ability or reputation is dubious are, (*ad me recipio faciet aut faciam*) ‘I take the matter upon me, he shall do it or I will.’” I will only add, some derive the greek word surety, from *εγγυς* *near*, because it is the office of a surety to draw near to the parties at variance; and this sense is strongly supported by Jer. xxx. 21.

The collective force of the above observations which regard the nature of suretyship, is thus concentrated. *He drew nigh, mixed himself with a multitude, was employed, engaged with another in contract, became implicated, pledged himself, and became responsible.* Take the following comment upon these particular features.

Draw near. He drew *near* to the offended party in a very astonishing manner, and hence his engagements are represented in language of surprise. ‘Who is, *הוֹדוּ* *this he,* *הַגִּבּוֹר* *this mighty,* *הַבְּרָאָה* *this intrepid,* *הַבְּרָאָה* *this signal,* *הַבְּרָאָה* *this determined he!* ‘that has engaged his heart to approach unto me? saith the Lord.’ This was no other than his shepherd, the man who is *near to him*, his neighbour or *near dweller*, the man that is his fellow, who is in *nearness* and *conjunction* with him, and is no other than his only begotten Son, who *dwelt* in his bosom from of old, even from everlasting. This renowned *He*, went near to his Father in the behalf of his church.

2. *Mixed himself with a multitude*—with the general assembly and church of the first-born, whose names are written in heaven. He mixed himself up with

their interests and welfare, and that in the most ready and willing manner. He mixed his love with the glory of his children, and while he was mixed in the affections of his Father, being his daily pleasure, he rejoiced in the habitable parts of the earth, and his delights were with the sons of men. And it must not be forgotten, that, as our surety, he possessed two natures, and though they never were nor never will be *mixed*, they are notwithstanding inseparably conjoined. In this character it was, he mixed or mingled with the family as the first-born of many brethren.

3. *Was engaged or employed*—in representing himself as their Surety—writing their names in his book of life and testament of grace—stipulating for their salvation—signing the bond of agreement—surveying his inheritance, &c.

4. *Became implicated*—in the transgressions of his people, and in the penal consequences thereof: and in the fulness of time he became implicated in a fiery law, like the threads thrown through the woof by the shuttle; or like the ram caught in the thicket by its horns. As his people were wove in his affections, and could not be separated, so he became entangled, caught and held by his own engagements, and kept under the unsparing hand of justice till he procured his discharge by fulfilling the contract, and wove in the loom of the law a garment for his church; when that was completed—when the last thread was drawn, he exclaimed, ‘it is finished!’ bowed his head, and justice divided the thread of life.

5. *Pledged, or pawned, or mortgaged*. Christ had a glory with his Father before the world was, which glory he prayed to enjoy, on the ground of his having finished his work, or fulfilled his contract. Vide John xvii. 7. Now it seems by no means inconsistent to suppose that he should *pawn*, or pledge his own glory—the glory of his human nature, to redeem, or bring back again Jacob unto God. He was made a priest with an *oath*, and having made the oath he gave the pledge. He placed his inheritance in the hands of justice, who held it as a security for debt; and the sins of believers were, or

might be considered as a *mortgage* upon it, which could be paid off only by suffering, blood, and death.

6. *He became responsible.* Justice looked to the sinner's surety for satisfaction. See this beautifully illustrated by Paul's engagements for Onesimus:—"If he hath wronged thee, or oweth *thee* ought, put that on *mine account*: *I Paul* have written it with mine own hand, *I will repay it*:" i. e. I will be responsible for him—make your claims on *me*. The case also of Jacob's taking the charge of his uncle Laban's flock, is much to the point—"That which was torn of beasts I brought not unto thee: I bore the loss of it; of my hand didst thou require it, whether stolen by day, or stolen by night." Gen. xxxi. 39. That is, you looked upon me as *responsible*—I took the charge of the flock, and you considered me as *answerable*, or *accountable*.

Lastly, Judah's becoming surety for Benjamin is a fine elucidation of suretyship engagements. "I will be *surety* for him; of my hand shalt thou require him; if I bring him not unto thee, and set him before thee, then let me bear the blame for ever." Gen. xliii. 9. "I will be surety for him," i. e. I will engage for his safety:—"of my hand shalt thou require him;" i. e. I will be *answerable* for him:—"if I bring him not unto thee, and set him before thee, then let me bear the blame for ever;"—if I do not fulfil my engagements, let me lay under the blame—let an everlasting stigma be fixed upon me. "Judah! thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise!"

The plain thoughts from these illustrations are—1. Christ became a surety for *debt* and *crime*. 2. He received his flock numbered and told into his hands. 3. He engaged to bring *back* his church from sin to glory, or all those for whom he became Surety. 4. He became amenable to law and justice for all their transgressions. 5. Satisfaction was demanded of the Shepherd, not the sheep—at the hand of the Surety, not at the hand of offending Onesimus's.

The only question which is of any further importance is this, in what did the satisfaction consist? It was

satisfaction to justice, no doubt; but in what character?—legislative or punitive? Was it a compensation to justice in the character of a legislator, a creditor, or an offended attribute?—or was it in all those characters? I think *all*, and am not forgetful that I am opposed in my views by men of talent and influence. Mr. Fuller thought the grand object of redemption was to place the government of God in as good a condition as it was before sin had impugned its authority. So thought Mr. Dwight, and so thinks Mr. Hinton, and those in whose behalf he wrote. Now it will not be denied, that a form of government may be satisfied with the infliction of punishment, disproportioned to the magnitude of the offence or offences; but then it will be denied that the perfection of the law would be preserved by such satisfaction. It is one thing to pacify a government, and another thing to satisfy the law in its claims. Now it seems to me, that though the moral government of God, might be represented to sinners, as a pure, firm, and efficacious administration, by requiring of substitutional suffering, less in its extent than was actually due to the offenders, yet neither himself nor his law could be *satisfied*.

I present my objections to such a scheme in the following form.

1. *It blends and confuses the nature of government, with the perfection of the law and the attribute of justice.* Now, in my view there is a manifest difference between a form of government, the law by which the government is administered, and the moral perfection of the Law-giver. I will grant that his government might be satisfied, if nothing more was necessary than to make moral agents believe, that God hated sin, and would punish severely for it; but then, would his *law* receive a compensation? Would the attribute of justice be satisfied?

2. *It is a severe reflection upon the HOLINESS of God.* If by holiness we understand his infinite rectitude, it must suppose, that he is not so averse to sin or moral obliquity, as the scriptures represent; and that a trifling acknowledgment will be deemed sufficient.—

Mr. Dwight says, 'Nor will it be believed that any created nature could in that short space of time, suffer what would be *equivalent to even a slight distress* extended through eternity.' According to this, Christ did not suffer half so much as due to the sins of one single individual. If this is not an unsparing reflection on the holiness of God, I am greatly mistaken.

3. *It would render retributive justice* EXCESSIVELY PARTIAL. If suffering is the penalty due to sin, ought it not to be inflicted on one as much as another? Admit of exemption by a substitute, must not the substitute undergo the same affliction, both in nature and degree, that must have been sustained by the offenders for whom he is a surety and substitute? If the substitute suffered but a small degree of what was due to the offenders, why might not the offenders have been excused in the same manner themselves? And how will God be just in punishing sinners in the bottomless pit till they have paid the last farthing? It must be confessed, that in these awful cases, justice is but partially administered, which is a *necessary* though an *insufferable* conclusion.

4. *It depreciates the WORK AND MERIT of the gracious Redeemer.* It is certain that his chief work and merit consisted in his sufferings. But if he did not suffer what was the full due of my sin, I cannot conceive how his merit can be *equal* to my demerit: and if all he bore did not amount to half what a lost sinner must suffer, I am at a loss to conceive how he is able to save one *single* sinner, much more the whole world.

5. *It confuses the plan of salvation.* I have always thought that a sinner was saved by the merit of Christ, which was reckoned a *counterbalance* to the weight of his transgressions. When it is said, "the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all," I concluded in the simplicity of my mind, that he suffered what was due to their sin: and when it is said, "the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and by his stripes we are healed," I conceived the meaning to be, he suffered in the room and stead of certain individuals. But such simple thoughts and illogical conclusions, would destroy the system to which I am objecting.

I would here observe, as a fresh source of argument, that the nature of the Redeemer's suretyship assumes a substitutionary aspect. If he became our surety he must take our place and stand in our room or stead; and if he take our place he must sustain what would have fallen upon those whose place he has assumed; and if he honourably delivers any of the human race, it must be, by BEING ALL—DOING ALL—and SUFFERING ALL, that they should have, *been, done, and suffered*. Now this requires three important things, viz. the assumption of human nature in its *purity*, obedience to the law in its *perfection*, and suffering the *exact penalty for offences committed*. Let us see if the scriptures support these ideas.

First. With regard to *substitution*. In support of this, I alledge, 1. The meaning of the greek preposition, *ὑπερ*, *uper*, which signifies to be *instead of*, or in the *place of*. Thus, 2 Cor. v. 20. "We pray you in Christ's stead," *ὑπερ δεομεθα χριστου*. The preposition here evidently denotes substitution. Again, "that (*ὑπερ*) *in thy stead* he might have ministered unto me in the bonds of the gospel." Philem. 13.—that he might officiate in thy place or stead, as a *substitute*—that he might *be* all that Philemon was, *do* all that Philemon would have done, and suffer all the privations and insults connected with a state of imprisonment. Dr. Doddridge as quoted by Parkhurst, in his Greek Lexicon, observes, 'Raphaelus has abundantly demonstrated that *ὑπερ ημων απεθανε*, signifies he died *in our room and stead*: nor can I find that a *αποθανειν ὑπερ τινος* has ever any other signification than that of *rescuing the life of another at the expense of our own*, and the very next verse (Rom. v. 7.) shews independent of any other authority, how evidently it bears that sense here, as one can hardly imagine any one would die for a good man, unless it were to redeem his life by giving up his own.' How the former part of this quotation will agree with some other part of the Doctor's writings on the atonement, form no part of my present enquiry; it shews, that in his opinion, Christ died in the room, place, and *stead* of ungodly persons, and that the idea of substitution is involved, wherever

the above quoted language is used. The reader may consult those passages in which substitution is plainly implied or expressed. Thus, 1 Pet. iii. 18. "For Christ also has once suffered for sins, the just (*υπερ αδικων*) in *stead* of the unjust;" that is, he stood in their *place*, and suffered in their *stead*. Again, 2 Cor. v. 14, 15. "We thus judge, that if one died (*υπερ*) in the *stead* of all, then are all dead; and that he died (*υπερ*) in the *stead* of all, &c." Matt. xx. 28. "Even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom *for many*." He ministered his obedience and sacrifice to the law and justice of God, as the substitute of his people; paying into the hands of justice, what might be demanded by a slaveholder—an equivalent for the slave. He preserved the lives of all the many slaves, by allowing his own to be taken. He freely put his soul in their *soul's stead*. Again, Gal. iii. 13. "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse (*υπερ*) in our *stead*." Other passages are both numerous and plain, see Isaiah liii. No further comment can be necessary.

* Heb. ii. 9. ought not to be omitted, as it is one of the clearest texts for substitutionary and limited redemption of any in the bible. "We see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour, that he, by the grace of God, should taste death *υπερ παντος* in the *stead* of all." On this passage it may not be amiss to remark, 1. That the passage is defective in point of grammatical correctness. It is not *uper pantos anthropos*, in the *stead* of all *mankind*, or in the *stead* of *every man*, but *uper pantos*, in the *stead* of *all*. 2. That the noun must be sought for in the connection; this will be allowed. 3. The connection would necessarily furnish us with a noun of multitude, and not with a common noun. The scope of the apostle's argument is to point out the humiliation, suffering, and glory of Zion's Lord and Saviour. His *humiliation*, "thou madest him a little lower than the *angels*;" or a *little while inferior*. The hebrew *רסר*, and the greek *ελαττω*, signifies a change of condition, and such a change as supposes diminution, deprivation, &c. Such was the Redeemer's condition when he became incarnate. He was placed in this situation, to qualify him for suffering the curse of the law. But for whom did he suffer? Let the apostle tell his own tale, "For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing *many sons unto glory*, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings. For both he that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, are all of *one* (nature and family); for which cause he is not ashamed to call them *brethren*." From this it appears 1. God designed bringing many of the human race to glory. 2. That the moral fitness

Second. Let us now examine the scriptures with reference to the Redeemer's *person, work, and suffering.*

1. *His person.* As I am not directing my enquiry to meet the eye, nor engage the attention of professed Socinians, I shall assume the fact of his being GOD, in the most *unlimited, absolute, and unqualified* sense. I shall also further take it for granted, that he is *really, truly, and properly* MAN. I shall also assert without offering proof, that these two natures are not *mixed*, so as to lose their *identity*; nor *separated*, so as to introduce distinct *personality*; but so united as to render him *one perfect, powerful, precious, and all-sufficient* Saviour. I shall only observe, that his human nature was immaculate and perfect: there was no spot, stain, nor blemish in that *holy thing* which was born of a virgin; for it was a *clean thing* brought out of an unclean. The following scriptures, if examined, will shew the correctness of this observation. Jer. xxx. 21. Rom. v. 19. Eph. v. 2, 26, 27. Heb. ii. 14.—vii. 26.—ix. 14. 1 Pet. i. 19.

2. *His work.* By his work, I mean the whole of his obedience to the law, both for himself and people. For *himself*, that is, his human nature which was made *under* the law, and therefore a proper subject of legal and necessary obedience. For *his people*. His being made of a woman, and made under the law, was that

of things rendered substitutionary suffering necessary. "*It became him.*" 3. That by standing in the sinner's stead, he was constituted a perfect Saviour through suffering. 4. That those for whom he suffered are described as *sons, sanctified, brethren*, and in the succeeding verses *children* given him, whom by death he delivers from death, even all the seed of Abraham. Now by employing any one of these nouns, the passage stands corrected thus, he tasted death in the stead of all the *sons*, or all the children, or all the seed. This cannot be wrong, because it gives the true scope of the apostle's argument, and we may remark that it is perfectly analogous with other nouns of the same class; thus the *people, the sheep, the jewels, the chosen generation, the royal priesthood, &c.*—or if we construe *pantos, distributively*, the passage will stand thus, in the stead of *every son, every child, every one* of the seed of Abraham, &c. Let it not be forgotten, that while this destroys the impious notion of general redemption, it restores the passage to its original situation; by which its beauty is seen, and its force is felt. Can Mr. T.... deny this? And if not, can he escape the charge, of *endeavouring to deceive* the major part of his congregation?

he might redeem those that were under the law, that they might receive the adoption of sons. Gal. iv. 4, 5. He not only assumed human nature, but he came and stood in their place, that he might pay their debts, break their fetters, open the prison doors and command deliverances for Jacob; by saying, 'Go forth, ye prisoners of hope.' His taking on him the seed of Abraham, denotes his assumption of the elect, in order to deliver them. The greek, ἐπίλαμβανομαί, is from ἐπί, upon, and λαμβανω, to take, and signifies to take upon one's self, to save by catching, and to deliver by laying or taking hold. Thus Jesus stretched forth his hand, and ἐπελάβετο αὐτε, caught him, delivered him from a watery grave, by catching, laying, or taking hold of him. Matt. xvi. 31. Hosea xi. 3, 4. Now Christ did not catch hold of apostate angels when falling from their primeval abodes of bliss, but he stretched forth his hand, and by timely interposition saved the royal priesthood from sinking into eternal perdition. He stretched forth his hand in eternity, and by interposing his obedience and blood as a substitutionary offering, he delivered his church from guilt and bondage. Here let it be observed that his laying hold of them was not to place them in a salvable probationary situation, nor yet to make a general tender of *special gifts*, but to effect, or accomplish a *complete deliverance for them*. Nor did he catch or lay hold of all mankind, but the *seed of Abraham*. Now this cannot denote human nature as such, because that embrace Abraham's progenitors, as well as his posterity, and those who neither are nor never will be related to Abraham according to the flesh. It can only mean those who with faithful Abraham are blessed with all spiritual blessings in Christ, and who have Abraham for a parent and pattern. Rom. iv. 11. This makes general redemption rock to its centre, and subverts the flimsy notions of offered grace, general invitations, and possible salvation.

3. *His sufferings*. He could not deliver his people by being all that the eternal law required with regard to their nature, nor by doing all that they ought to have

done, *namely*, obey the law of God in its perfection, because there were offences committed which required penal satisfaction. And if redemption is effected by substitutionary suffering, it must, in my mind, be by sustaining the punishment due to transgressors. Here I wish it to be remarked, that sin was *really* and *truly* imputed to Christ. This I take to be sufficiently illustrated and proved in the scriptures of truth. 2 Cor. v. 19. may serve for the present purpose—"God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not *imputing* their trespasses unto *them*." But surely they were imputed to him, through, and by whom the reconciliation was made. *Query*, can he *offer* to receive into his favour those towards whom he is not reconciled? If not how are offers of grace to be vindicated? And further, if God is reconciled to this world by imputing their trespasses to Christ, how can he damn them without hating them, and how can he hate them without changing, and how can his justice be preserved if his rectitude is destroyed? But if these cannot be answered, how can any man have the face to plead for general redemption? I freely confess that it is to me inexplicable?

By imputation I mean placing to the account of a person an action either good or bad, which action the said individual did not perform himself, and then judging, reckoning, accounting, and declaring that person to be either righteous or unrighteous, according to the merit or demerit of the action. This shews 1. That sin was not imputed to Christ simply as a *thing*. 2. That it was not imputed as an *inherent quality*. Nor 3. as *physical acts*. But 4. as *guilt* or *offences*. The first would have emancipated either all the devils and all mankind, or else none of them. The second would have required its *insertion* as well as its *imputation*, which would have made his heart and life unholy, and thus have rendered him incapable of redeeming *any*. The third would represent God, as reckoning and declaring things to be different to what they really are, which is an idea that no sober christian will entertain, and arminians have no reason to be *proud*

of it. The fourth gives the true idea, and shews how God can be just and yet the justifier of the ungodly. I am anxious that this point should be understood, because it is of primary importance. For if Christ sustained the guilt of every physical action, he must suffer for the guilt of *every* action; if at least his sufferings are complete and satisfactory, and if so, the absurdity of general redemption and offers of grace must both appear.

There is no shutting the eyes against this conclusion, because it is as evident as the father of day. I have my thoughts upon, the *sun in the firmament*.

That distinct offences were charged on Christ, I submit, 1. The meaning of the word *impute*, which is to *account*, or *reckon*, as well as to *transfer*. Now to count or reckon, is to look over things as they exist and give judgment accordingly, and this supposes that there exists a plurality of things, or there would be no counting or reckoning. Reckoning or counting, is bringing scattered items to meet in one sum total, and this seems exactly to correspond with the prophet's description in Isa. liii. the Lord hath laid, or *caused to meet* on him the iniquity of us all. All the sins of all the elect met on Christ, like different items in one sum total.

2. I alledge express passages of scripture where a *plurality* of sins are mentioned. Rom. iv. 25. "Who was delivered for our *offences*." Rom. v. "And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift; (imputed righteousness) for the judgment was by *one* (*offence*) to condemnation, but the free gift is of *many offences* unto justification." The plain meaning of which is, one single offence made man *guilty*, and judgment passed upon him accordingly, but the righteousness by which a sinner (an elect one of course) is justified before God, is not by *one act* of Immanuel's obedience, nor by his suffering for sin as a *thing*, or in the *gross*, but of *many offences: i. e.* the righteousness of Christ, consist in his having all the many distinct offences of his people imputed to him, for which offences he yielded a satisfaction of *right*. I am aware how these

remarks cut, but they are the plain words of soberness and truth. Again, "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their *trespasses* unto them." Here it is plain that reconciliation was effected for a world of believers, by the imputation of every sin to Christ, which was in that world. It is of no use to quibble and say, the word *all* is not in the text, and therefore *trespasses* might be imputed to Christ, and yet not *all trespasses*. *Answer*, My aim is to establish the distinct manner in which the sins of believers are imputed to Christ, the consequences will follow. In the mean time, will the objector inform us, how sins can be forgiven except they are expiated? — *Sins are viewed as debts, and called by that name*. I begin with Matt. vi. 12. "Forgive us our *debts*, as we forgive our *debtors*." It is plain that here is an allusion to commercial affairs, where every debt is a distinct *item*; and if sins are to be forgiven as distinct debts through the redemption of Christ, must it not prove in a conclusive manner, that redemption is of a mercantile character? or that there is something in it which is analogous thereto? Surely our Lord would never employ a mercantile figure to illustrate a subject, which bore no resemblance to it when compared therewith. But this prove, that sins are allusively called *debts*, and that as debts are distinctly charged either upon the debtor or the surety, so sins were distinctly charged upon Christ who was a surety for *debts*. Prov. xxii. 26. Another passage is Luke vii. 41. "A certain creditor had *two debtors*, the one owed him five hundred pence, and the other fifty." Allowing this to illustrate the nature of sin and its forgiveness it shews, 1. That the sum total of one man's sins, may differ exceedingly from that of another's. The case before us is as *one to ten*. 2. That sins must be distinctly charged on Christ, or else he must suffer as much punishment for one as another; and if so, he must either suffer too much or too little. If he only suffered enough to pay the debts of the last mentioned debtor, he could not suffer enough for the larger, and if he suffer enough

for the *largest*, he must suffer *more* than enough for the *smaller*. For instance, had the creditor in the case before us, have forgiven through a surety the debt of fifty pence, the same measure of favour would not be sufficient for him who owed ten times the amount. His surety must pay ten times as much for the one as the other, and of course the favour would be ten times as large; and so *vice versa*. Allow this to bear a resemblance to the subject of its application, and I request no more. The point is as conspicuous as it can be desired. The reader may consult Luke xiii. 4. "Think ye that they were sinners (*debtors*) above all men that dwelt in Jerusalem?" and Romans iv 4. — *Sins are distinctly charged upon the conscience of a quickened sinner.* Thus Psalm xl. 12. "Mine *iniquities* have taken hold of me." Job xiii. 23. "How *many* are mine *iniquities* and *sins*!" "Thou makest me to possess the *iniquities* of my youth." xxii. 5. "Is not thy wickedness great? and thy *sins* infinite? Now if they are charged distinctly upon the conscience, I imagine they were thus charged upon the sinner's surety, or else the charge is unfounded and deceptive. — *Jehovah regard sins in a distinct manner.* Thus Psalm xc. 8. "Thou hast set our *iniquities* before thee, our secret sins in the light of thy countenance." Now this denotes the *exact* and *distinct* knowledge the omniscient God has of all sins, however secretly they may be committed, and also the ground on which his judicial administrations are conducted. And if it is thus towards the sinner, I presume it must be so towards his surety. — *The petitioning penitent, and the praying saint, solicit the forgiveness of sins distinctly noticed by justice, the sad remembrance of which are impressed upon their minds.* "Hide thy face from my *sins*, and blot out all mine *iniquities*." "Remember not against me the *sins* of my *youth*." Here sins are regarded as distinct *items* by the petitioner, who conceives of them as distinct debts in the creditor's book; and as he is in a state of spiritual insolvency, he implores the creditor to cross out the debts, or rather to

obliterate the characters by covering the whole surface with thick ink, well knowing that the debt involves the obligation to payment. And if that is the case with the debtor, it must be the same with his substitute. — *The manner of forgiveness exhibits the same fact.* “I, even I, am he that *blotteth* out thy transgressions for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins.” Isa. xliii. 25. This invaluable passage, represents Jehovah forgiving the sins of his people as a tradesman crosses out the debts of his insolvent debtors, and promises not to think any more about them in a judicial manner, so as to cause the insolvents to be arrested or perplexed. And what adds to this incomparable favour, is, the unconditional manner in which the act is performed, and the promise made—“*for mine own sake.*” Not for any thing that the sinner has done, or will do—not for his improving the grace of God—his continuing faithful—his increasing perseverance, &c. which if not observed, would destroy the efficacy of the favour, cause the creditor to open his *debt-book*, and make out a fresh account of some sort or other, and in his rage take me by the throat and demand payment, or imprison me in hell for ever. I speak solemnly and deliberately when I say, I would not embrace the proud tenets of Arminianism or Wesleyanism, would it invest me with all the gold-mines in the globe. I wish to honour the divine perfections, in all the freedom of their exercise and grandeur of display. I am saved by grace, and there is no consideration on earth, which shall induce me to throw a veil over that by which I am everlastingly saved and honoured.

Resuming the argumentative part of the subject, I observe,—*The same thing is exemplified by the form of those exultations, which a sense, a feeling and blessed sense of divine forgiveness produce in the soul of a pardoned sinner.* Take as instances, Psalm ciii. 2, 3. “Bless the Lord, O my soul, and forget not all his benefits; who forgiveth *all* thine iniquities.” “And you being dead in your sins, and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you *all* trespasses.” Col. ii. 13. The

joy of a pardoned sinner arises from a spiritual persuasion, that *all* his sins are forgiven.—*The declarations of the gospel establish the same fact.* “All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men, but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost”—is the express declaration of Christ, in Matthew xii. 31. Whatever may be the sin of exception and privation, thus much is certain, that it is some *particular* sin, not more *distinct* than *others*, but a sin which God has determined *not* to forgive. Not I imagine, because he *could* not, but because he *would* not.—It seems not to be designed to shew his *imbecility*, but to display his *sovereignty*. With the pen of justice he has made a mark of sovereignty in the book of mercy; by which he arrests two extreme characters in their career—the licentious antinomian, and the self-righteous arminian. But while this sin is unpardonable, it plainly proves that there are other sins distinctly committed, and as distinctly noticed. Again, the phrase *all manner of sin and blasphemy*, forcibly points out the great *variety* and *multitude* of criminal acts, and the *distinct* and *exact* manner in which they are noticed, and entered by justice in the great debt book. Again, Eph. i. 7. “In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of *sins*, according to the riches of his grace.” And 1 John i. 7. “the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from *all* sin.” To the same import is Isaiah xl. 2. “She hath received at the Lord’s hand double for *all* her *sins*.” From these passages, to which many more might be added, it is evident from the gracious declarations of scripture, that sins are noticed and pardoned in a *distinctive manner*; and if so, it must involve the idea of their being *distinctly imputed and transferred to Christ*.—*Sins will be distinctly noticed and reckoned up at the judgment day.* In scenic vision, John said, “he saw the dead, small and great, stand before God: and the books were opened; and another book was opened, which was the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works.” Rev. xx. 12. It is sufficient

to observe from this passage,—1. That the great judgment day resembles a reckoning day in commercial affairs. 2. That sins will be distinctly observed and charged upon transgressors. 3. That they will be distressingly imprinted upon the memory, and fastened upon the conscience. 4. That an exact knowledge of every sin will guide the judicial administrations of the *great day of God's wrath*. 5. That their punishment will be proportioned to the multitude and magnitude of their sins:—“And they were judged every man according to his works,” verse 13. If then, sinners will have their sins distinctly charged to their account at the last day, and will have a distinct though distressing knowledge of them, it proves that such must be the case with him, to whom the transfer of accounts are made over. Now as the accounts of the elect were transferred to Christ, who is their surety for both debts and crimes, he must have had the very same accounts against him that his people had against them; and if they were accounts made up of *distinct items*, it must prove beyond controversy, that such was the true character of the accounts transferred. It seems to me as if this conclusion could not admit of a question.—*The scriptures represent Christ as suffering for sins in a distinctive manner.* 1. *Prophecy.* “He shall bear their iniquities.” Isaiah liii. “Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy.” Dan. x. 24. Here observe, that the word *transgression* preceded by the definite article *the*, plainly points out the sins of all God's people collected together; just as several debts united together make *one*, and may with the strictest propriety be called *the debt*. It is obvious to a demonstration, that sins are here regarded as being distinctly imputed to Christ. 2. *The language of Christ himself.* “*Innumerable evils* have compassed me about: mine iniquities have taken hold upon me, so that I am not able to look up; *they* are more in number than the

hairs of mine head: therefore my heart faileth me." Psalm xl. 12. Whatever relation this language might have to the writer's feelings, the psalm is certainly prophetic, and is the language of a greater than David; even the root and offspring of David, the bright and the Morning Star. But *how* innumerable evils could distinctively take hold of him, if not distinctively imputed and transferred, I believe no person will be able to render a reason. If innumerable evils laid hold of him, innumerable evils must have been distinctly marked and specified in their transfer: there is no evading this conclusion. Other passages might be selected of the same import. But 3. *The language of prophetic fulfilment confirm the same thing.* "He bore our *sins*, and carried our *griefs*." "Whom God hath *set forth* (or *ordained*) to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission (*passing over*) of *sins* that are past, through the forbearance of God." Rom. iii. 25.

From these quotations it is evident that he has borne our sins in all their distinctness and weight; and, that God ordained him to be the expiatory sacrifice, for the passing over the transgressions of his people,

I submit the following syllogisms grounded upon the foregoing remarks.

1. If the word *impute*, signifies to transfer an account composed of distinct counts, or items, the every sin of the whole church must be *distinctly*, and actually transferred to Christ. Now the word impute has that signification, and therefore every sin of every believer must be distinctly and actually transferred to Christ.

2. If sins are viewed as debts, and Christ became the great paymaster of his people's debts, then sins must be distinctly charged upon Christ; but sins are viewed as debts, and Christ is the great paymaster of his people's debts, therefore sins must be distinctly charged upon Christ.

3. If sins are distinctly charged upon the conscience of a quickened sinner, and Christ had that imputed to him which we have a sense of in our own conscience, then sins must be distinctly imputed to Christ; but

sins are distinctly charged upon the conscience of a quickened sinner, and Christ had that imputed to him which quickened sinners have a sense of in their consciences, Heb. x. 2. therefore, sins must be distinctly imputed to Christ.

4. If sins are forgiven as distinct offences, it must arise from their having been imputed to Christ as distinct offences: but sins are forgiven as distinct offences, and therefore they must have been distinctly imputed to Christ.

5. If the exultations of a pardoned penitent, arise from a conviction that *all* his sins are pardoned, and they can only be forgiven as distinct sins but by being distinctly imputed to Christ, then they must have been thus imputed to Christ; but the exultations of a pardoned sinner do arise from a conviction that *all* his sins are pardoned; therefore, they must have been distinctly imputed to Christ.

6. If the declarations of the gospel represent the same thing, then the same thing is proved by the declarations of the gospel: but the declarations of the gospel do represent the same thing, and therefore the same thing is proved by the declarations of the gospel.

7. If the sins of the ungodly will be distinctly charged upon them on the day of judgment, they must have been distinctly charged upon those who are saved, supposing that no surety had been provided. But the sins of the ungodly will be distinctly preferred against them, therefore it must have been distinctly preferred against those who are saved, supposing no surety had been provided. Assuming, however, that justice would be *impartially* administered.

8. If the sins of the elect would have been distinctly preferred against them, supposing them to have had no surety, then their sins must be distinctly preferred against their surety, supposing them to be saved by a surety. But the sins of the elect would have been distinctly preferred against them, had it not have been for their surety, therefore their sin must have been distinctly preferred against Christ, supposing them to be saved by him. This argument rests upon the same