

MISLEADING LIGHTS:

A REVIEW OF CURRENT ANTINOMIAN THEORIES OF THE ATONEMENT AND JUSTIFICATION.

BY THE REV. E. HARTLEY DEWART.

THE doctrine of the Atonement is the central truth in the Christian system. It stands intimately related to the personal salvation of sinners. An error here, like a mistake in an arithmetical problem, renders the conclusions built upon it wrong. Christ died for all men. His death was at once a glorious display of the love of God our Father, adapted to subdue the enmity of sinful and rebellious hearts, and a full satisfaction to the requirements of Divine administrative justice, by which the claims of God's law are harmonized with the exercise of His forgiving mercy to the guilty. Our views respecting the design and import of the death of Christ will necessarily determine our views of the extent of its benefits, the nature of saving faith, and the meaning of justification itself. For example: those who maintain that the death of Christ, from its nature and purpose, secured the eternal salvation of all for whom He died, are forced by this assumption, contrary to Scripture, to limit the Atonement to an elect portion of the race; because they know that all are not saved. As Christ says, "Wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat," they are compelled, by their theory, to conclude that the Atonement was not made for those who are lost. Other examples might be given of the way in which a false conception of the atoning work of Christ produces a false view of the nature of the Gospel salvation.

ERRONEOUS AND UNSCRIPTURAL THEORIES.

It has become well known to all thoughtful observers of the prevailing currents of thought in the religious world, that among the Plymouth Brethren, and many evangelists who disclaim this name, as well as among sections of the Protestant Churches which hold Calvinist views in Christian theology, great prominence is given to Calvinistic and Antinomian views of the Atonement and the way of salvation; which are in our judgment unscriptural and misleading. Some preachers may give more prominence to one part of this scheme than another; but the general characteristics are easily distinguished. They all agree in representing saving faith as the belief in the truth of the theory of a literal substitution of Christ for the sinner; and in disparaging, or ignoring those conditions of salvation on the human side, to which the Scriptures so constantly give prominence. We will give here a brief summary of the main points generally brought out in this teaching.

The teachers of whom I speak declare that the divine law was not given for the purpose of being obeyed by men; but to condemn and curse them. Man is wholly unable to fulfil its perfect demands; yet he is condemned to death for not doing so. The penalty of death is unalterably attached to the violation of the law, and must fall on some one. Christ took the sinner's place, as his substitute in all respects. The sinner's guilt was therefore imputed to Him, as if it were His own. As a sin-burdened and guilty being, He endured the wrath of God, and suffered the penalty due to the sins of those whom he represented, so that they are not exposed to the penalty of the law. He also obeyed the law perfectly in the sinner's stead; and this perfect righteousness of the substitute God imputes and credits to all who believe in Christ, as if it were their own personal righteousness. Hence, the law has no claim, for either penalty or obedience, against those whose substitute in suffering and obedience Christ became. Believers are so completely one with Christ, their "law-surety," that their sin may be said to be Christ's. They died on the Cross, and perfectly obeyed the

divine law, in the person of their substitute. This notion is frequently carried so far, as to actually confound the personality of the believer with that of Christ, as if anything which can be truthfully said of Christ may be said of the believer; and what is true of the believer may be affirmed of Christ. The faith that saves is declared to be the belief that Christ put away our sins, when he died upon the Cross. The ground of each believer's assurance of salvation is the testimony of the divine Word that his sins were put away by the death of Christ, and that he is saved in Christ.

The faith that brings the peace of salvation, and the atoning work of the Redeemer, are very frequently illustrated by the case of a debtor, who learns that the debt he was unable to pay has been paid in full by another; and that he has nothing whatever to do, but to believe the fact. This whole theory of the work of Christ and the way of salvation, though it may seem simple and plausible, I believe to be a human and artificial scheme, open to grave and unanswerable objections.

THE DUTY OF REJECTING AND CONDEMNING WHAT WE BELIEVE TO BE FALSE.

It may be admitted, that many who teach this scheme of the Atonement and Salvation are sincere Christians; and that along with what is questionable in their teaching many gospel truths may be clearly presented. This renders it difficult to say anything against these errors, without appearing to be opposing men who are, in their way, earnestly trying to lead sinners to Christ. Yet, true Christian charity and liberality do not require us to endorse teaching that we believe to be false; nor to be silent respecting interpretations of Scripture which we hold to be misleading and dangerous, however strong may be the gales of popular applause which fill the sails of their advocates. The sincerity of the teacher should not blind us to the unsoundness of his teaching. St. Paul says to the Galatians: "Though we, or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." Teaching, that has seemed not to hurt the character of the teacher,—probably

because it had been moulded by early training,—has sometimes brought forth evil fruit in his disciples.

Being fully convinced, that these views are contrary to a true interpretation of the Scriptures, and to sound reason, I here offer a few words of warning against this current theology, in the form of reasons for rejecting it.

OBJECTIONS TO THIS CALVINISTIC ANTINOMIANISM.

1. *This teaching confounds the Atonement of Christ, the great provision of God's love, through which justification is freely offered on the condition of "repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ," with the alleged bestowment of forgiveness before the sins were committed.* The death of Christ, which, as we have seen, reveals the infinite love of the Father, and satisfies the claims of divine administrative justice, so that God may be just and the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus, they constantly declare to have forever delivered those for whom he died from the penalty of the law, so that God has nothing against them; all their sins being imputed to Christ, and put away ages before they were committed. So the sinner has nothing to do in order to know that he is saved, but to believe the fact that his sins were all put away by Christ's death.

But no one is acquitted until he repents and believes. "God is angry with the wicked every day." The wrath of God abideth on him who believes not the Son, notwithstanding the Atonement made for all. Christ's death did not cancel the claims of the law against those for whom He died. St. Peter speaks of false teachers, who bring upon themselves swift destruction, as "denying the Lord that bought them," clearly teaching that Christ died for those who perish. He gave Himself a ransom for all, and tasted death for every man; but the sinful world for which He died was as guilty after He died as before. Except they repent, they shall all perish. The penalty is executed on those who reject Christ; it is remitted only to those who repent and believe in Him.

2. *This teaching confounds "salvation," in the sense of justification, with complete eternal salvation; and unwarrantably*

assumes, because sinners are justified by faith in Christ alone, that no condition but faith is necessary to secure eternal life. But there is no warrant in Scripture for the assumption that there is no condition but believing in Christ required, in order to secure an inalienable title to eternal salvation. In the Scriptures, conditions to be fulfilled on man's part are clearly laid down. The whole blame of his perdition cannot be his, if he can do nothing towards obtaining salvation. Salvation is freely and graciously offered to all, without money and without price; but this does not prove that men have nothing to do but believe, in order to be eternally saved in heaven. Human works cannot merit salvation. We are saved by grace. But this is a very different thing from saying that we need to do nothing but believe, in order to be forever freed from condemnation. This is contrary to Christ's own declaration: "By thy words shalt thou be justified, or by thy words shalt thou be condemned." Numerous passages of Scripture plainly show that, although justification, or initial salvation, is by faith alone, final justification at the day of judgment will be by the evidence of the works which were produced by living faith. The Apostle Paul tells the Romans that God "will render unto every man according to his deeds: to them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory and honour and immortality, eternal life," &c. Christ himself says: "If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered." And again: "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven."

It surely does not dishonour God, nor rob Him of the glory of our free salvation, to put human works of faith, wrought through the aid of divine grace, in the conditional relationship to our ultimate salvation in which God's Word clearly places them. Not to do so is to obscure and pervert the truth, in order to maintain a theory which assumes that a sinner can do nothing, and is required to do nothing, in order to salvation. It is one of the marked defects of all teachers of Plymouthism, that they reject, or, at least, leave out of sight, a large proportion of

important truth, which is as clearly revealed in the Bible as those truths which they have distorted by an extreme and one-sided interpretation.

3. *This theory of the Atonement obscures the great truth that the Father is as merciful as the Son, and the Son as just as the Father.* It confounds and obscures the proper unity of the Godhead, by irrationally representing one of the persons of the Trinity as being the object of the wrath of the other. Christ was God manifest in the flesh. At every moment the Father was well pleased with the Son. When the holy Saviour was, by a display of infinite love, accomplishing the great purpose of His incarnation, it is unwarrantable to believe that He was the object of the Father's wrath. We know that He was not guilty or deserving of wrath. And the thoughts of God are according to truth, and not according to the fancies of men. There can be no legal fiction or make-believe with Him. He sees all things as they really are. If the Son was not guilty, the Father did not think of Him as guilty, nor feel wrath against Him. The theology which teaches that He did cannot be true. This theory practically, though not formally, runs counter to the Deity of Christ and the unity of God.

4. *This theology is self-contradictory ; for it really excludes faith as the condition of justification, and leaves no place for forgiveness of sin.* The Word of God teaches us that through Christ is preached unto men the forgiveness of sins, and that faith in Him is the condition of justification ; for " by Him all that believe are justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." But if God's claims against men were, as this scheme assumes, of the nature of a debt, and if Christ paid that debt in full, or suffered the deserved penalty for all, or for a part of the race, it follows that those for whom this has been done can never have to pay this debt, or to suffer this penalty, whether they believe or not. If what the sinner is told to believe be true, viz., that Christ suffered the penalty and obeyed the law as his substitute, so that the law has no claim upon him—then it is clear his not believing it cannot change the fact, or deprive him of its benefits. And if Christ has suffered the penalty due to

the sins of any sinner—so that it would be exacting the penalty twice, if God should inflict it upon the sinner—and also has obeyed the law as his accepted substitute, then it is certain the account is settled; there is nothing to be forgiven. It is positively absurd to speak of forgiving sins that were imputed to Christ, and put away by His death ages before they were committed.

5. *The conception of saving faith, which is drawn from this commercial and artificial theory of the Atonement, is not the true Scriptural idea of justifying faith.* To seekers of salvation, these teachers constantly represent saving faith as the belief that Christ obeyed the law and suffered its penalty in their stead; or, as Rev. Mr. Denovan expressed it, at the Toronto Christian Conference, “belief in Christ is the knowing on God’s authority that we are saved in Him.” We have no instance in the New Testament where justifying faith is represented as the belief of this, or any special theory of the Atonement. Those who do not clearly teach that Christ died for all men, have no right to tell any particular sinner that Christ died for him. Besides, a sinner may believe everything that the Scriptures tell about Christ’s life and death, and yet remain unsaved and unforgiven. I do not disparage the vital importance of accepting the great truths of the gospel respecting Christ’s character and work, especially the blessed truth that He “suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God.” These truths are the basis and inspiration of our faith in Christ. But saving faith is more than the assent of the understanding to certain truths about Christ. It is trusting in Christ Himself to receive and save us. It is not enough that the mind assent to the truth. There must be the practical trust of the heart in the person of Christ.

6. *This teaching, respecting the way in which the Redeemer’s death secures the salvation of men, logically and unavoidably involves either the universal salvation of all men, or the unconditional salvation of an elect number.* All for whom Christ has suffered the penalty, and wrought out “a finished salvation,” in the manner above described, must certainly be saved. If these

be the whole world, then all shall be saved. If they are only a select number, then these, and no others, shall be saved. For, if the way here described is God's appointed way of saving sinners, then those for whom Christ did not thus become a substitute in suffering and obedience cannot be saved. Now, as I am fully convinced that the dogma of a limited Atonement is dishonoring to God, and contrary to the Scriptures; and that the universal salvation of men is not supported by the teaching of the Bible, I am compelled to come to the conclusion, that a theory which involves either of these unscriptural alternatives must be contrary to truth.

No intelligent Christian can fail to see that this theory of the Atonement is a link in the Calvinistic chain; and must stand or fall with the Calvinistic scheme of Election and Reprobation, of which it is a part. When, therefore, such views are presented, as if no Christian could question their truth, every intelligent theologian at once recognizes the creed to which they belong,—knows where they fit into the system, and what other doctrines they logically imply, though these may be prudently left in the shade by the preacher or writer.

7. *This teaching, respecting the nature of the atoning work of Christ and Justification by faith, has led its advocates to maintain that the testimony of the Word of God is the only evidence a believer can have that he is justified.* Thus they exclude both the witness of the Holy Spirit to our spirit, of which St. Paul speaks in Rom. viii. 16, and the testimony of consciousness, to which St. John refers in John iii. 14. Dr. W. P. Mackay explains away the force of St. Paul's declaration respecting the witness of the Spirit, by arguing that this is something given at a later stage of Christian experience. He represents the saved believer as saying:—

“And now I believe my sins are not on me—not because I feel them gone, for I do not, but because God says they were laid on Christ.” But all the Scripture statements are general. They do not tell any person by name that he is saved. Their testimony was the same before he was saved as afterwards. They cannot, therefore, give any particular individual an assurance of

his personal relationship to God. The only assurance of being saved the Scriptures can be said to give a man, is what may be given by the inference that because, in his own judgment, he has believed and belongs to that class of whom salvation is predicated in the Scriptures, therefore he is saved. But, as thousands claim to be believers, whose life does not prove their claim, it is evident that many substitute a nominal for a living faith.* They regard themselves as true believers when they are not. It is a gross misrepresentation to call these inferences the direct testimony of the divine word to such a person's justification.

8. *This doctrine of imputed guilt and imputed righteousness, consistently carried out to its logical results, leads to Antinomianism.* To say that believers are forever delivered from the law, as an instrument of condemnation and a rule of life, because its claims have been fully met and its penalties suffered by their substitute, and that God now looks not upon them as they really are, but sees them clothed with the spotless righteousness of their "law-surety," confounds moral distinctions, and assumes that God's approval is not influenced by character or loving obedience, but by Christ's obedience being imputed to them as their own. If this dogma be true, a man may be steeped in wickedness, and yet, if he is one of those to whom Christ's righteousness has been imputed, be complete in him and spotless in God's sight. Dr. W. P. Mackay says: "The standing of every believer before God in Christ Jesus, known only by faith here, is the same, and it is independent of his realizing it, or enjoying it." In other words, a believer has a double character—one determined by his actual experience and life, the other by the fiction of an imputed holiness.

But Christ does not save us in our sins, but from our sins. We are only saved from sin, in so far as we are delivered from its power and pollution, as well as from its guilt. I do not hesitate to affirm that any doctrine which, by fair inference, implies that any one living a wicked and selfish life may be accepted of God, and accounted holy, through having Christ's suffering and obedience imputed, or credited to him as his own,

dishonors God, contravenes the whole teaching of the Bible, and obscures the soul-destroying nature of sin. Yet, beyond contradiction, if a substitutional penalty and obedience have been fully accepted by God on the sinner's behalf, in the way described, the sinner's own personal obedience is superfluous, and can find no fitting place, or use, in this scheme of doctrine. If this be true, God's attitude toward the sinner cannot be changed by anything he can do; as Dr. Mackay expresses it, the true believer may say: "I am as eternally saved as Christ is safe." Hence, by these teachers, all human doings are disparaged as worse than useless; or at best only tokens for others to see, which are not in any sense conditions of salvation. I feel fully justified in applying the term "Antinomianism" to this theology; because this dogma of imputed righteousness has been the root and foundation of all the practical Antinomianism, and disparagement of human obedience, which disfigure much modern Christian teaching. We are far from insinuating that all those who hold these views are speculative or practical Antinomians. But if these dogmas have not led to this result, it is because the common sense and moral instincts of all Christians repudiate the conclusions to which they naturally lead—not because the conclusions do not fairly follow from their premises.

9. It is evident, from what has been already said, that this theory, respecting the way in which the life and death of Christ are related to the salvation of them that are saved, *implies as a necessary consequence the doctrine of the certain final perseverance of all true believers.* For they cannot possibly be lost, unless this alleged work of their substitute be cancelled or undone. Accordingly, we find that all who hold this theory of a literal substitution of Christ's suffering and obedience, in place of the sinner's, also consistently maintain that none of those for whom He has done this can possibly be lost. Indeed, they regard it as derogatory to Christ to admit that He could permit any who have believed upon Him to fall away and be lost. They profess, no doubt sincerely, to find great comfort in the assurance of their final salvation, derived from the belief that

the life of faith in the soul here is certain eternal life. It is well known that all those portions of Scripture, which declare the sufficiency of God to keep and save His people to the end, are constantly quoted to prove that the regenerate cannot finally fall away from the grace of salvation. But whatever may be the piety or learning of many who hold and teach this doctrine, a careful study of God's Word compels us to conclude that it is contrary to reason and Scripture. I can only briefly indicate the grounds of this conclusion.

This doctrine is based upon a false psychology. It does not fairly recognize the power of alternative choice which is essential to human responsibility. The plea that it would be inconsistent with the Divine faithfulness and love to permit any one who had ever believed in Christ to perish, assumes that nothing is needed to make a believer's salvation sure, but the Divine willingness to exert upon the human machine the required power to make it go right. This is a serious misconception of man's free agency, and of God's manner of dealing with men. Holiness is not a production of power. Religion does not destroy man's freedom of choice. The believer is as much a free responsible agent in working out his salvation after he believes, as he was in choosing Christ at first. He stands by living faith in Christ. Men are not "passive engines, void of praise or blame," saved by the exercise of an irresistible external power, and lost because that power is not exercised upon them. If nothing was necessary to secure the salvation of men, but God's willingness to save them, none would ever be lost. For he has solemnly declared that He has "no pleasure in the death of the wicked." God our Saviour "will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." Men are lost, whom it is God's desire to save; because they choose the way of death. All Scripture texts, which appear to give a positive assurance of the believer's ultimate unconditional salvation, must be interpreted in harmony with man's mental nature, with God's mode of dealing with him as a free being, and with all those Scriptures which explicitly teach that we have a power to choose right or wrong, for which we are accountable to God.

Some of these promises of ultimate salvation may not formally express any human condition, except faith, but more is always implied. We must interpret Scripture by Scripture; and avoid forcing a meaning on one text that will contradict others. Those who quote as a proof of the certain eternal salvation of all believers, the words of John the Baptist, (John iii. 36,) "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life," should read this text in the light of the words of the Master, (John viii. 31,) "Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on Him, if ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed."

In complete harmony with the doctrine of human freedom and responsibility, the Holy Scriptures clearly indicate that believers may fall from a justified state and perish. God says: (Ezekiel xxxiii. 13,) "When I shall say to the righteous, that he shall surely live; if he trust to his own righteousness, and commit iniquity, all his righteousnesses shall not be remembered; but for his iniquity that he hath committed, he shall die for it." Is there any reason to believe that God deals differently with righteous persons who fall into iniquity now? When our Lord says, (John xv. 10,) "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love," does he not plainly imply that if they do not keep his commandments, they shall not abide in His love? When He declares, (John xv. 2,) that every branch of the True Vine that beareth not fruit shall be taken away, it is certainly assumed that some branches may be unfruitful and cast away. When St. Paul declared that he brought his body into complete subjection, lest, by any means, after having preached to others, he himself should be a castaway, does he not plainly teach the possibility of the fate he guards against? When in the 6th chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, he urges them to go on to perfection, because it is impossible to renew again to repentance those who fall away from the experience of salvation which he describes, does he not undoubtedly speak of such a falling away as a possible, though avoidable, danger? St. Peter says, (1 Pet. ii. 20,) "For if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world, through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein and overcome, the latter end is

worse with them than the beginning." The Apostle here speaks of a real and possible falling away from the faith. St. Paul and St. Peter evidently deem it a perilous thing for a believer to fall into sin; but, according to this theology, falling into sin can do the believer no serious harm, for he is complete in Christ, in spite of his fall. In addition to the examples of the Bible, we have all seen instances of persons, who at one time evinced true Christian faith, afterwards falling into sin and unbelief. It is futile to say that such persons were never true Christians, or they would not have fallen. This is assuming without proof the thing to be proved; rejecting the evidence of the facts, because they are not in harmony with a favorite theory. What a man's character is at any given time must be determined by his spirit and life at that time; and not by what he may become at some other time. As Methodists, we fully believe in the sufficiency of God's grace to keep to eternal life all who trust in Him. Those "who draw back into perdition" have none but themselves to blame. There is no failure or deficiency on God's part. Christ our Saviour is "mighty to save." But, common sense teaches us, that for any person to believe that his eternal salvation is infallibly secured, must naturally tend to lull him in an imaginary security and neglect of watchfulness. No doubt, many who hold this view are active in the performance of every duty. This is in spite of their belief—not in consequence of it. It is certainly against, rather than in favor of any creed, that those who hold it are in practice compelled to act as if it were not true.

10. *But our chief objection to this scheme of doctrine is that what the seeking sinner is told to believe as the essence of the gospel is not true.* We fully believe that Christ died for us, that we might be reconciled to God. He suffered that we might be delivered from suffering. His death was a vicarious sacrifice for the sins of the whole world. His sufferings were substitutional, in the sense of being a full legal equivalent for the infliction of the penalty on the guilty. The Atonement of Christ is a Divine provision, whereby every sinful soul of man may obtain salvation. But it does not, in its nature, secure the

salvation of all for whom it is made. It is not a literal substitution of Christ's obedience and suffering for the obedience and suffering of those for whom he died, so that they are delivered from the obligation of obeying the law, or suffering its penalty. All those portions of Scripture which make the benefits of the death of Christ conditional upon human acts, contradict this dogma. Neither personal guilt nor righteousness is in its nature transferable. One may suffer in another's stead; but cannot take another's guilt. God's claims against us were not of the nature of a debt, that some one else could pay. Christ taught His disciples to pray, "forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors"; which shows that sin was not regarded by our Redeemer as a debt already paid.

The death of Christ did not appease the wrath of God, and cause Him to have nothing against sinners. The Incarnation and death of our Redeemer were the result and outcome of the Father's love, not the cause of it, as some seem to think. The death of the Son did not make the Father more merciful than He was before. All such theories are theological fictions. We have scriptural authority to tell any sinner that Christ died for him, that God's provision for his salvation through Christ is full and free; and that if he come to Christ He will in no wise cast him out. But to tell a sinner to believe that Christ has paid his debt; that God has no claim against him that has not been settled long ago; that his sins were put away forever when Christ died upon the cross; and that Christ obeyed the law for him, so that it has no claim upon him, is in our candid judgment to tell him to believe what is unscriptural, untrue, and misleading. Yet, it is not uncommon to hear those who cannot accept this unscriptural teaching denounced as self-righteous legalists, who do not hold justification by faith alone; but are putting their own righteousness in place of the finished work of Christ!

It is important that those who stand to teach sinful men the way of life should have right views of the great truths of the gospel. There may be much zeal, without correct knowledge. A theory may be simple and plausible, and yet not true. A teacher may be quite sincere, and yet be mistaken, or warped by prejudice. Agreeable falsehoods confidently believed may yield gladness, as well as truths. It may be asked, if the objections to this view of the Atonement are as forcible as we have claimed, how has the theory found such general acceptance? Mainly because it is a part of the compact Calvinian system, and cannot be renounced without giving up the whole scheme. It is plausible from its simplicity. It has also been made popular by putting a narrowly literal interpretation on those scriptures which, by a bold figure, represent Christ as bearing our sins without regarding the whole teaching of the Bible. This method is one of the most fruitful sources of theological errors. It is a common thing, for those who are riding a sectarian hobby, to quote the letter of some text or texts, importing into them a sense which seems to warrant their theory; and then, to allege that those who do not accept their interpretation are rejecting, not their opinions, but the Word of God. All sincere Christians believe their doctrinal views to be according to the teaching of Scripture, or they would not hold them. But doctrines should not be built upon selected figurative texts. Any doctrine that does not agree with the spirit and tenor of the whole teaching of Scripture cannot be worthy of acceptance and belief.

It is quite probable, that some who hold the views we have here examined, may deny that they accept the conclusions which have been drawn from them. This is a very common way of evading the unacceptable consequences of unsound principles; but it proves nothing to the point. The opinions of individuals are often inconsistent with themselves. We are dealing with the teaching and its tendencies; and not with the statements of the teachers as to what they believe. Each reader of this tract must form his own judgment of the soundness of our reasoning, and the force of the arguments presented. It has been written con-

scientifically, in the interest of truth. I firmly believe the theories here condemned, fairly carried out to their logical results, lead to the dogma of unconditional salvation; which if practically believed would lull souls in a false security. The same premises have in the past led many into practical Antinomianism. I regret that the limits and design of this tract have not given an opportunity to present fairly the positive side of the scriptural doctrine of the Atonement. Some of these points are more fully discussed in my "*Broken Reeds*;" and full practical directions to earnest seekers of salvation will be found in my little tract entitled "*Waymarks*."

THE END.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR:

BROKEN REEDS; or, The Heresies of the Plymouth Brethren.
Price 10 cents.

LIVING EPISTLES; or, Christ's Witnesses in the World. Price
\$1.00.

WAYMARKS; or, Counsel and Encouragement to Penitent Seekers
of Salvation. Price 5 cents.

HIGH CHURCH PRETENSIONS DISPROVED; or, Methodism
and the Church of England. Price 10 cents.

SPURIOUS CATHOLICITY: A reply to the Rev. James Roy.
Price 15 cents.

SONGS OF LIFE: A collection of Original Poems. Price 75 cents.

FOR SALE AT THE METHODIST BOOK-ROOM,
TORONTO, 80 KING STREET EAST.