

Every thing that tends in the direction of ignoring these should be watched. Mere professional preachers should find no home in a revivalist church. The candidate should be known to have some of the spirit of revival about him. His piety, zeal, and usefulness need to be of a definite kind. If he purposes the ministry, let him be a worker—yea, a successful worker now. If he is not a regular attendant at prayer-meeting and at class-meeting, and alive when he is there, he is to be doubted. If he never prays in a prayer-meeting, if he won't work in a protracted meeting, if he acts on the rule of doing only what he is asked to do, and then, as if he conferred a favor on the church by his service, in my opinion he has not much of the spirit of revival about him. He will not make a worthy successor of John Wesley till he changes. There is no one duty binding on the church more important than that of guarding that its ministers shall be soul-saving men. The right or wrong performance of this duty is very far-reaching in its effects. Disregard the presence of the awakening power in those who enter the ministry, and soon we are robbed of a ministry of revival power.

4. *Preaching that aims at, and is suited to, the production of this result.* It is not an easy matter to describe the kind of preaching that is best suited to keep up this high tone of spiritual life in the church. That which will at first secure awakening and the revival of religion may not, usually does not, possess all the elements necessary for the perpetuation of it. That healthy tone of spiritual life in the church where the revival spirit is operative, though no striking scenes of soul-saving occur, but where they are saved nevertheless, is the most difficult of all states to perpetuate. The kind of preaching, undoubtedly, has much to do with it. It is very certain that some kinds of preaching seldom or never produce a revival; and there are kinds which are as little calculated to foster the spirit of revival.

Allowing then that there is a good degree of this revival element retained among us, the question that concerns us is, What kind of preaching do we need to help to retain and to increase it? Will the type of preaching of the first fifty years of Methodism best serve that end? Undoubtedly it had in it some of the most important elements of successful preaching. It was pre-eminently plain and practical. It dealt largely, almost exclusively, in those great fundamental truths that surround the fact that Christ died for sinners. It presented Christian experience in its fullest and most attractive form. Whatever defects are seen in it when viewed with a philosophic eye, it cannot be denied that it was eminently calculated to produce awakening among sinners, and to lead them to God. It was suited to produce the results aimed at, and that did really follow. And I am strongly of opinion that similar preaching to-day would be attended with the same results. Its clear exhibition of truth, its earnestness, its unction, would make it effective anywhere, and at any time. I will not urge that the preaching of Wesley's day is just what is needed to-day. Times change; so that what was adapted to the circumstances of those times might not be suited to these. But the nature of man's need has not changed, nor has the truth which enlightens and saves; and if we are to keep our revival power, the preaching must be adapted to pro-