that being imputed to us by him as our sins were to Chriſt. The ſenſe (ſays our author) is, a charge of sin was brought againſt him as the surety of his people. He was numbered with the tranſgreſſors ; for bearing the sins of many, he was reckoned as if he had been a ſinner himſelf, sin being *impu­ted* to him ; and was dealt with as ſuch. Sin being found upon him by *imputation,* a demand of ſatisfaction for sin was made, and he anſwered it to the full. All this was with his own conſent. He *agreed* to have sin laid upon him, and *im­puted* to him, and a charge of it brought againſt him, to which he engaged to be reſponſible ; yea, he himſelf took the sins of his people upon him ; ſo the evangeliſt Mat­thew has it, ‘ Himſelf took our infirmities, and bore our ſicknesses @@\*’ As he took the nature of men, ſo he took their sins, which made his fleſh to have *the likeneſs of sinful flesh,* though it really was not sinful. What Chriſt bore be­ing laid upon him, and imputed to him, were si*ns* of all ſorts, original and actual ; sins of every kind, open and ſecret, of heart, lip, and life ; all acts of sin committed by his people, for he has redeemed them from all their iniquities ; and God, for Chriſt’s ſake, forgives all treſpaſſes, his blood cleanſes from all sin, and his righteousneſs justifies from all ; all being imputed to him as that is to them. Bearing sin ſuppoſes it to be a burden ; and indeed it is a burden too heavy to bear by a ſenſible ſinner @@(e), When sin is char­ged home upon the conſcience, and a ſaint groans, being burdened with it, what muſt that burden be, and how hea­vy the load which Chriſt bore, conſiſting of all the sins of all the elect from the beginning of the world to the end of it ? and yet he ſunk not, but stood up under it ; failed not, nor was he diſcouraged, being the mighty God, and the Man of God’s right-hand, made ſtrong for himſelf.”

To the Arminians or Remonſtrants, this doctrine of the imputation of the sins of men to the Son of God appears as abſurd as the ſimilar doctrine of the imputation of the sin of Adam to his unborn poſterity ; and it is certainly attend­ed with conſequences which have alarmed ſerious Chriſtians of other denominations.

Were it poſſible in the nature of things, ſays the Arminian, to transfer the guilt of one perſon to another, and to lay it upon him as a burden, it could not be done without violating thoſe laws of equity which are eſtabliſhed in the ſcripture and engraven on the human heart. But this is not poſſible. To talk of lifting lumps of sin or transferring them like burdens from the guilty to the innocent, is to utter jargon, ſays he, which has no meaning ; and we might with as much propriety ſpeak of lifting a ſcarlet colour from a piece of cloth and laying it on the sound of a trumpet, as of literally lifting the sins of the elect from them and laying them on Chriſt. Guilt is ſeated in the mind ; and no man can become a ſinner but by an act of volition. It Chriſt therefore *really* took upon him the sins of his people, he muſt have deliberately formed a wiſh to have actually *com­mitted* all thoſe sins ; but ſuch a wish, though it would have made him inherently guilty, and therefore incapable of ſatisfying for sin, could not have cancelled deeds that were done before he was born, or have made thoſe innocent who had really been ſinners. A deed once done cannot be undone ; a volition which has been formed cannot be annihilated. By ſincere repentance, the habitual diſpoſitions are indeed chan­ged, and thoſe who have been ſinners become objects of mercy; but no power can recal the hours that are paſt, or make thoſe actions which have been performed to have been not

performed. To remove guilt from the sinner and lay it upon the innocent may therefore be ſafely pronounced impoſſible even for Omnipotence itſelf, for it implies that a thing may be and not be at the same inſtant of time ; and the doctrine which teaches that this removal Was made from the elect to Chriſt, is an imagination of yeſterday, which has no countenance from ſcripture, and is contrary to the eſta­bliſhed conſtitution of things. Thoſe who imagine that guilt may be propagated from father to son, have something like: an argument to urge for the imputation of Adam’s sin to his numberleſs poſterity ; for all the men and women who have by ordinary generation been introduced into the world,have undoubtedly derived their nature from the primevail pair. But Chriſt did not derive his nature from the *elect,* that their sins ſhould be communicated to him ; nor, as he was miraculouſly conceived by the Holy Ghoſt, can we at­tribute to him any degree of that *taint* which is ſuppoſed to have been conveyed from Adam to all the other genera­tions of men.

Nothing more, therefore, can be meant by “ Chriſt’s be­ing made sin for us,” and “ bearing our sins in his own body on the tree,” or by God’s “ laying upon him the in­iquity of us all,” than that by his ſufferings we are freed from the puniſhment of our sins ; it being in ſcripture a com­mon figure of ſpeech, as even Dr Gill has somewhere ac­knowledged, to denote by the word sin the *conſequences* of sin. That this figure is uſed in thoſe texts from which he in­fers that Chriſt took the sins of the elect upon himſelf, is evident from the verſe which he quotes from the goſpel off St Matthew ; in which it is ſaid, that “ himſelf took our infirmities and bore our ſicknesses.” The ſicknesses and in­firmities there alluded to are the leproſy, the palsy, the fever, and demoniacal posseſſions : but when our bleſſed Lord cured theſe diſeaſes, ſurely he did not by his omnipotent word lift them off from the patients and take them on himſelf, ſo 23 actually to become a leper, a paralytic, and a dæmoniac, or even to be reckoned as ſuch either by the multitude, or by the prieſts whose duty it was to take cognizance of every legal uncleanneſs@@\*. And if his inveterate enemies did not *impute* to him the leproſy when he removed that plague from others, why ſhould it be ſuppoſed that his own Father, to whom he was at all times well-pleaſing, *imputed* to him thoſe sins of which, by his ſufferings, he removed the puniſhment from thoſe who were guilty ? To impute to a perſon any action, whether virtuous or vicious, which he did not perform, can proceed only from ignorance, or malice, or partiality ; but God is no reſpecter of persons, and from ignorance and malice he is removed to an infinite diſtance. It is indeed an undoubted truth, that “ the Lord Jeſus, by his perfect obedience and ſacrifice of hirmelf, which he through the eternal ſpirit once offered up unto God, hath fully satisfied the justice of his Father ; and purchased not only reconciliation, but an everlaſting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven for all thoſe whom the Father hath given him@@\*;” but that he actually took upon himſelf the sins of mankind, or that thoſe sins were imputed to him by God, who puniſhed him as a perſon whom he conſidered as guilty, is a doctrine equally injurious to the juſtice of the Father and to the immaculate purity of the Son.

The earneſtneſs with which this doctrine was inculcated by ſome of the earlieſt reformers, and the impossibility of ad­mitting it, which every reflecting and unprejudiced mind muſt feel, was probably one of the cauſes which drove So-

@@@[m]\* Chap. viii. 17.

@@@[m]\* Levit. xiii.

@@@[m]\* Confession of Faith, chap. viii.

@@@(e) By the phraſe a s*ensible sinner,* the learned author means a ſinner who is not paſt feeling, but has a conſcience alive to the ſenſe of remorſe.