

case. But he does *not* teach that "every converted soul has backslidden and been reclaimed, it may be a thousand times a day." The inwardness of misrepresentation we do not presume to know, but we know that any one who misrepresents another deliberately in print is either mentally incapable or morally culpable.

(3) The writer says that the association were "obliged to expel some for their wickedness." Immoral acts performed and proved against members, and a vote of expulsion to put the perpetrators away, is the impression naturally received from his words. Nothing in the pamphlet justifies the holiness editor in the use of this misleading language. The word is, "weeded out," and the statement is that these persons had exhibited what in the eyes of *onlookers*, was "extravagant and unquestionable conduct." This is another misrepresentation of the record, and an assumption to know the facts independent of the record and an untrue version of what did take place, which is, that these persons separated themselves of their own free choice.

(4) No attempt is made to deny the charges made in the pamphlet or to invalidate its reasonings. That is the most commendable fact in the matter for there is nothing in the pamphlet that can be disproved, and that a veteran writer should betake himself to sneers and misrepresentations in order to relieve the mind of the uneasiness which the reading of the pamphlet must have produced, is the best proof of the truth of its matter, and of the ability with which that truth is set forth. He expects that the teaching of the association will "result in disaster." It has already resulted in sweeping disaster to the reign of unbelief and legalism over many lives. He turns us over to Boland & Co. Boland is in no sense our father; entirely unknown to most of the members of the association. What is to be thought of a holiness that does not keep its most prominent representative and exponent holy? Why should there be an association within a church for the professed purpose of promoting a distinctly higher type of religious life than what is common experience in that church; with its apparatus of camp meetings and distinctive literature, existing now for some twenty years or more, and as a result its President confesses himself a failure? For if this holiness that he makes his livelihood by promoting does not keep its possessors from doing what they ought not to do, it is not a whit better kind of religion than what may

be found in any of the churches or even outside of them.

B. SHERLOCK.

INBRED SIN.

A FRIEND has requested me to write my thoughts on the above subject for the *Expositor*. He says in his note to me, "I question if such a thing has any real existence in fact, only as in its connection with the creeds."

The words "inbred sin" are not found in the Bible. But in the seventh chapter of Romans, at the fifth verse, and also in the famous and hotly controverted passage beginning at the seventh and continuing to the end of the chapter, are several expressions which evidently mean the same thing or state which is intended to be described as inbred sin. Indeed, in the twentieth verse we find the expression, "sin which dwelleth in me." The Psalmist, Ps. 51-5, says, "Behold I was shapen in iniquity and in sin did my mother conceive me;" and Paul writing to the Ephesians says in the second chapter and the third verse, "We also all once lived in the lusts of our flesh, doing the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and were *by nature* children of wrath even as the rest." The fact that in order to be a true Christian Christ insists on the necessity of a new nature, a being born anew, born from above, born of God, born of the Spirit, shows that the first nature is so thoroughly wrong that mending or development will not remedy the mischief, nothing short of such a change as will not admit of any less radical an expression than "born again" to set forth, justifies the thought that human sinfulness is not superinduced by circumstances, the altering of which might produce holiness, but an innate tendency, something like the tendency of wolves and certain dogs to worry sheep, and of swine to do mischief.

We know that sin was not a part of the original make-up of the first pair in Eden, and that the evil nature of man is felt, as William Arthur put it, to be an unnatural nature, but that does not prove its non-existence, and does little if anything to expel the curse. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, for that all have sinned," expresses a fact that can only be ignored by one that resolutely shuts his eyes from the recognition of what is everywhere evident.

The history of our race as given in the Bible, shows that although there is in man's nature an element or elements that