

ample time may be had to arrange matters satisfactorily. However, when time's notice cannot be given, we would not advise non-attendance because thereof, as we will do our best to meet any emergency.

To the ministers and members of the various city and neighboring churches, we would say in all frankness, as you are likely to be called on to take action concerning this holiness revival, by coming, sooner or later, in contact with the propagators of it, can you better prepare yourselves for such eventualities than by attending, when possible, all the sessions of this Convention, in order to obtain as correct an idea as possible of the true character of the work of the Association?

Would not such a course be very much better than acting on the uncertain knowledge of second-hand testimony?

To all such we can promise immunity from any compromising public tests. They will find themselves free to come and go, to take part or refrain, without being turned into an object-lesson by ungenerously devised tests, prayers, or exhortations, provided always that they do not, either by public word or act, adversely criticise.

Hence, we extend a cordial invitation to all brethren in active sympathy with the work of the Association or holding any other attitude towards it.

### INBRED SIN.

In this article we propose to discuss this subject in its relation to Calvinistic teaching.

As we apprehend this teaching, it differs from the Arminian only in the denial that inbred sin can ever be eliminated from the believer one moment before his demise.

The Arminian maintains that it *may* be completely eradicated any time before death, but is not an absolute necessity, God having arranged that if this work of cleansing from inbred sin has not taken place, and the party concerned is a true believer, he will be treated like the Calvinist, and the work be attended to *in articulo mortis*.

It follows, then, that regenerate individuals of these differing creeds, who may have clashed in their teaching during life, are made practically one at the point of death, and suggests the thought that Calvinists and Arminians are sure to harmonize in their creeds if they continue to argue long enough, that is, till death.

But pleasantry aside, does not the mere statement of the doctrine, after this dry, ununctious manner, rob the whole subject of the transcendent importance which both parties strive to throw into it? And, further, we hesitate not to say to either party that just so soon as they learn to walk in the Spirit in the Pauline sense, that is, according to the apostle's description, as given in the eighth chapter of Romans—the righteousness of the law being fulfilled by so doing—they will, with us, smile at their former fervor in maintaining the fantastic doctrines connected with this simple subject; simple, but made intricate by theological definition.

For as it is the failure to walk after, that is, to be led by the Spirit, that gives this fictitious value to the subject of inbred sin, so soon as failure here gives place to success the true value is restored, and at once the whole subject sinks down to a matter of secondary importance, which can be discussed as such without the fear of any *sectic* divisions being the outcome of divergent opinions arrived at by differing minds, seeing all will continue to admit that, at best, their differing views are but speculations.

In our study of this question, from the Calvinistic standpoint, we have been impressed with the thought that inbred sin is a kind of a thermometric measure of the temperature of the writer as to Christian experience, and swells in size or contracts, just as love for Christ kindles or cools off.

We do not here have reference to the importance attached to the subject, but its capacity to swallow up and so hide away various forms of sin. The really conscientious, saintly Christian only expects it to cover over such sins as wandering thoughts or want of intensity in love; whilst the luke-warm Christian with easy conscience, relegates to this