

generate an equal exaggeration on the other side. Because one side seems to neglect, on the other, the excess will be increased, and the gulf widened between those who claim the same eternal Father, the same redeeming Saviour, and the same sanctifying Spirit. And so there was need for another teaching, though not another party, to uphold the principle of charity,—that new commandment, “that we love one another.” No doubt the abhorrence of controversy, of mere verbal orthodoxy, or of mere machine-like correctness of ritual, has caused on this side also errors as regrettable as in the others. The knowledge that empty phrases had been substituted for God’s truth has led some of them to neglect the due exposition of fundamental doctrines; and the consciousness that Church order has sometimes been made the cloak for sacerdotal tyranny, has led at times to neglect of organization divinely approved. But still there was need for the counterbalancing force, and among these last, as among the others, the children of wisdom have been found.

In our own century, among the worthy representatives of the first movement I have described, who has not heard of the character and work of CHARLES SIMEON at Cambridge. Coming there when all religious life seemed dead, when theological learning was at its lowest ebb, he strove against an opposition which would have daunted the stoutest heart. Actual violence, bitter attacks, then contempt, nicknames—the easy substitute for arguments—fell to his lot, but he pressed on, gathering around him