only examples after all of many similar movements, the expression of two conditions of spiritual life, conditions which express themselves in movements and results of various degrees of intensity and influence in the broad field lying between the extremes represented by these two prominent bodies which we have named.

The thing especially to be noticed is that while these bodies spring from the church they do not come into separate existence as branches or denominations of the church through issue taken upon some point of doctrine or practice.

They leave the church and find themselves, as they hold, separate from the church and unable to cooperate with her even upon the broad general lines of interdenominational comity.

Speaking generally, all such bodies justify their separate existence upon the ground that they find a want, a serious incompleteness in the church, not so much any positive doctrinal error to which exception is taken, as a lack of what is necessary to spiritual life and efficiency. And this they assert not only in words but in their continued separateness and in the peculiar phases of Christian life and activity which they continue to cultivate and develop.

Before dealing with the question from the standpoint of the church, it may be well to say a word about the danger to which these bodies are exposed within themselves.

It is clear that those who belong to them will be inclined to make a great deal of the features which are peculiar to themselves as separate organizations. These principles form the foundation beams of their house, the very ground upon which they justify their separate existence, self-preservation and loyalty to their cause, as well as an innate tendency to justify their own judgments and action in their decision; all these form powerful elements in a plea for the magnifying of that which is peculiarly their own, and at the same time they tend to bias the judgment in regard to the church. In this way two dangers arise: On one hand—a tendency to an unfairness; to a sort of impaired vision which cannot see what is good in the church, and which leads to misrepresentation of the church and her work.

The other danger lies in an exaggerated view of the relative importance of the peculiar doctrines or practice of the separate