

the impassioned language which he employed in describing his conversation and life-conflicts. And his was the age when old and young of every sex, beneath the baptizing influence of the Holy Spirit, "saw visions," "dreamed dreams," "prophesied," and "spake with tongues;" Hebraistic phrases indicating the frequency and prevalence of religious conversation. But why multiply scriptural proofs? One passage, if explicit, is as good as a thousand. Here is one. The advocate of class-meetings may safely risk the whole controversy on it: "Whosoever, therefore, shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in Heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in Heaven." This Scripture enunciates, as its grand theme, compensation in kind. Men confess Christ: he repays in kind by confessing them. Or they deny him: and he still repays in kind by denying them. Now by ascertaining the meaning of the word confess, when Christ is the confessor, we determine also its sense when men are the confessors. How will Christ confess men? Will he not simply relate their earthly history, tell their doings and trials, and recount their conflicts and triumphs? Will not his confession furnish an experience meeting of which Methodist class-meetings are but a faint type or shadow? Now the doctrine of compensation in kind, announced in the Scripture under discussion, requires men to confess Christ in a precisely similar manner. This Scripture demands that they shall relate to others the story of his cross, and tell what he has done for them, and wrought within them. Such should be their confession. It is simply Christian conversation, a relation of religious experience, or a declaration of what Christ has done for the soul. This Scripture, then, authorizes, justifies, requires a relation of religious experience, and is a sufficient refutation of all assertions that such Christian conversation is wrong and without warrant of Scripture. It brings to light the duty of confessing Christ before men, and it enforces this duty by a sanction relating to the great rewards of heaven—Christ will confess such before his Father and the holy angels.

"We come now to ask, Can our disciplinary rule which makes attendance on Class-meetings a condition of membership in the Church be justly regarded as wrong and unscriptural? On what ground can it be so regarded? By what principles of interpretation? A relation of religious experience is, as we have just seen, a Bible duty, and enforced by the sanction of example, precept, and promise. Can it be wrong to make a Bible duty so clearly expressed, and with such sanctions appended, a condition of Church membership? Is it unscriptural? A non-relation of religious experience is but a negative evil—an absence of a commanded grace or virtue—and cannot rightly be classed in the same category with falsehood,