

meetings, since we can appeal to an authority so high as the Editor of the Guardian, at least as a partially plausible pretext.

It would seem that for some time past the general subject of revivals has been freely discussed in the columns of the Guardian by opposing correspondents, a number of whom, probably accustomed to the feelings and familiar with the spirit of protracted meeting scenes, appear to have become warmly engaged, not to say a little excited and somewhat alarmed in entering fully upon a theme so prolific of internal as well as external struggle.—Meantime, the Editor, according to his will, maintains a profound silence. Letter after letter is received, some on one side of the controversy, some on the other; some ranking the revivals among the 'essentials', and some denouncing them as human and injurious expedients; some placing them far up in the comparative scale of blessings, and some opposing them as the common degeneracies of popular evils. Brotherly love at last induces the Editor to express himself upon the subject. He does so in a lengthy article, from which we make a few extracts:—

"Mr. Wesley instituted some "prudential means" for the promotion of religion, which are included in the term Methodism—a name signifying not only a system of doctrine, but a certain ecclesiastical economy or regulations devised and appointed by Mr. Wesley. These "regulations" are termed by some "essentials of Methodism," just as the lineaments are termed the essentials of the countenance. Among the "regulations" or "essentials" of Methodism, is no mention of the means of which we are now speaking. The work of God flourished under Mr. Wesley and the first Methodist preachers without the use of this means, and has flourished since without its use. No one opposing the lately adopted means is thereby opposing the institutions of Methodism, much less the institutions of the Gospel."

Passing over the expediency and prudence of Mr. Wesley's 'prudential means', we claim the privilege of asking a single question upon the above text. If Methodism flourished under the ministry of Mr. Wesley and those who assisted him *without revivals or revival meetings*, and if the Editor of the Christian Guardian believes that opposition to 'prudential means' to convert, of a later stamp than those of Mr. Wesley's, *affects not the standing of any Methodist minister or member*, why should our opposition to these kind of 'means' be the cause of so much inveteracy?—But another extract is better still:—

"Next, we would correct a view of the subject which has been inconsiderately taken. "Are we to have revivals of Religion?" some have said, "then we must have Protracted Meetings." Before we proceed to correct this mode of presenting the subject, we have something to say on Revivals themselves. The term "Revival" has become a very popular word in the religious world. We must therefore be cautious neither to speak against the word or the thing; and we have no intention to do either. What does a revival of religion imply? To revive is to *re-live*. It supposes first living,