Then the sufferer's head droops wearily upon his breast, and all is over. A moment's blank amazement and affright, and then the conscious earth shudders as if in the throes of dissolution, an unseen hand rends the veil of the temple from the top to the bottom; the rocks are cleft asunder; while from suddenly opened graves the sheeted dead come forth as though it were the day of doom. Quickly, with trembling limbs and beating hearts, the multitude hurry from the dreadful spot, and soon there remains by the cross of Jesus only the faithful women, the beloved disciple, and, forming an outer circle, the soldiers of the Roman guard.

(To be continued.)

HOW DID THE REV. J. WESLEY UNDERSTAND THE GENERAL RULES OF OUR UNITED SOCIETIES?

BY REV. J. S. EVANS.

THE reason for asking this question is this:—The common interpretation has been occasionally called in question; and recently this has been done in a more open and emphatic manner by Dr. Israel Chamberlayne, in a work called "Saving Faith."

The common interpretation affirms that the Rules do not make the possession of real Christianity a condition of Methodist Church membership. On this account Dr. C. opposes it, and supports his opposition by forcibly using "the *argumentum ad absurdum*,—that process of reasoning by which the truth of a proposition is established by proving the absurdity consequent upon its denial." This argument may be briefly presented thus:—Those who assert that the Rules do not refer to the possessors, but merely to the seekers of Christianity, make them teach, by necessary implication, that ceasing from evil of every kind, and doing good of every possible sort to the bodies and souls of men, especially to those who are of the household of faith, is not an evidence of real Christianity! That all truly good works may be done without the possession of the principle from which alone such works can proceed, namely, a regenerate heart! That the morality of the Gospel has no necessary connection with the saving faith of the Gospel! That the Christian privilege of partaking of the Lord's Supper may be rightly enjoyed without Christian faith; and, in short, that there may be a true Church of Christ without saving faith in Christ! These, assuredly, are pointed and weighty objections.

Dr. C. therefore rejects the common interpretation, but unhappily proposes in its stead one that is very objectionable for other reasons; and that, like the rejected one, fails to distinguish things that differ. The condition of "admission" on trial, mentioned in the introduction to those Rules, is not by either party distinguished from the condition of full and permanent member-