

So great, indeed, that we fully expect that the great majority will enter into this temptation. Doubtless they started out in all honesty of intention to carry out their views. But now that there is pronounced failure, and, we add, necessary failure, can they retain their original simplicity and honesty, and continue? We trow not, and so we maintain that the degeneration will likely be more rapid with them than it was with the other sects which they have left. In short, it is impossible for man, either singly or combined, to escape the penalties of God. Shall not the judge of all the earth do right!

AGAIN THEY DIFFER.

REVs. McDonald and Steele are again exercising their critical gifts at each other's expense.

This time it is concerning different atonement theories; Mr. McDonald insisting on the theory advocated by Wesley and Watson, whatever that is, and Dr. Steele advocating that of more modern Methodist theologians.

The usual *tone* of theological discussion is observable in their respective writings, only a little more so in those of the first mentioned antagonist.

By the way, who can weigh in sufficiently fine balances the dogmatism of theological controversy? The only way to even approximate thereto is to consider what is implied by *differences in opinion on vital points in theology*. It is ever implied by your Sir Oracle theologian, especially when consciously backed by a church or association, that for one to differ from him on such a vital question as the atonement is to leave his everlasting salvation in doubt if not in utter hopelessness.

To accept this statement it is only necessary to consider the matter with a little care, mixed with definite thought.

Here is a Trinitarian controverting a Unitarian concerning Christ's divinity. Now, if the question is plumped upon the first disputant as to the chances of ultimate salvation for his opponent, whilst thus remaining his opponent, he will, especially whilst in the heat of controversy, say that he cannot see how the other can possibly be saved whilst he denies Christ's divinity, seeing he shuts out the possibility by such denial. For, he goes on to argue, Christ can only save us because of his divinity, and therefore when one refuses to accept this as a fact he virtually refuses to accept his, Christ's salvation, for, he adds, "there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved."

All, with a grain of honor, will admit that in this reasoning we are simply giving the true thoughts of Trinitarians in their attitude to Unitarians. That is, the former neither look upon them, the latter, as Christians nor even as *candidates* for heaven. That is—but they dare not mention the entertained thought seeing it would shock the innate sense of justice which they in common with all men possess—all Unitarians are as a matter of necessity on the road to hell, and the only chance of escape for them is to, first of all, become Trinitarians.

Take this extreme instance in theological discussion and by studying it in its bearings on all minor questions it will give a clue to the feelings of every dogmatist in the theological world, and, in every case, an explanation of the *tone* of his writings when criticising another of different belief concerning what he is disposed to consider a vital doctrine of Christianity. He really in his heart believes that the other jeopardizes his everlasting salvation by differing from him in belief.

One has truthfully remarked, that out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh, and so the theological critic, believing in his heart that the other cannot