

be finally saved whilst holding his opposing views, lets this his honest belief color all his writings, even, at times, in spite of his expressed wishes to the contrary.

In the controversy alluded to, a little close consideration will easily account for the presence of this spirit, especially in the writings of the editor of the *Witness*. For, in defending his view of the atonement, he is defending the very foundation of his salvation. His personal salvation depends, according to him, on the truthfulness of the doctrines, or string of doctrines, which start from his atonement theory. It is because he believes in these doctrines about Christ that he assumes he is saved now and will be saved eternally. If then the doctrines, and especially the foundational one—the one next in importance to the one which divides the Unitarians from the Trinitarians—should not be true, his personal salvation would not only be jeopardized it would be foundationless. How can a person writing under these circumstances prevent them influencing the spirit of his utterances?

Glance again at the vast *imagined* importance of this atonement question. Familiarity with Mr. McDonald's writings and public teaching make evident the following facts. He believes that in Adam he died eternally, that God could not be just and take him to heaven no matter how penitent he might be, or how desirous of being in perfect harmony with God, or even how willing to do and dare all things to secure this end. In spite of all his efforts and desires he must go to hell, there to be tormented day and night for ever. Even as this thought is put in words familiar to all Methodists:

"Plunged in a gulf of dark despair,
We wretched sinners lay
Without one lingering beam of hope
Or spark of glimmering day."

This Mr. McDonald accepts and tells forth as literal truth. But he also believes that Christ, as possessing infinite qualities,

by voluntarily suffering a few hours on the cross, exactly measured up to the eternal doom of the human race, and so offered this equality in suffering as an offset against the other—making, in short, a perfect equation—and now God can, because of this equation, forgive and save him, provided always that he fully recognizes this equation and accepts salvation because of his faith in this evening up of factors. That is to say, that, after all, the evening up is not complete until he, having heard of this gospel of atonement, fully believes it, and shows his faith by asking God for pardon on the strength of this atonement and his full belief in its truthfulness and adequacy.

From this truthful representation of the whole subject it can easily be seen how Mr. McDonald is driven, from the necessities of the case, to try to make Dr. Steele believe in his theory of the atonement as an essential part of the process of salvation.

If Dr. Steele does not accept Mr. McDonald's theory about the atonement, how can he, Dr. Steele, be saved? If it should be replied to this that the atonement *has* been made, and cannot be affected by Dr. Steele's varying opinions concerning its nature, then it can be truthfully added that if there can be two differing doctrines there can as well be a thousand, and so we will be landed in the Antinomian ditch so much dreaded by both disputants. That is to say, this would be to affirm that the faith of the individual in the doctrine does not affect the fact of salvation. All then can be saved because of the death of Christ, no matter what may be their differing beliefs or theories concerning the atonement. But this conclusion would destroy Mr. McDonald's personal sense of salvation. And so he must dissent from it, *in toto*, and fall back upon the horn of the dilemma which he has grasped, viz, that belief in his view of the atonement is essential to personal salvation.

Dr. Steele is not only a better educated