

agination, or the cruelties of the Gunpowder Plot against the love of one's country. I have always felt that the school of thinkers of whom we hear most to-day, are far more apt at making sweeping generalizations than at perceiving distinctions. They exaggerate a remote resemblance into identity. Belief is, with them, motion in the direction of least resistance; they call the wriggling of an eel, and the heroism of a patriot, by the common name of 'conduct,' and it results from the same defect of discrimination that they lump together all forms of the religious life, so as to see no difference between an Indian faker or an African rain maker, and the grandest figure in history—Jesus Christ.

The impulse to good morals which the Gospel provides, is correlative in importance with the basis and type. It is impossible to over-estimate the influence of the motive indicated in the words 'the love of Christ constraineth us.' And mark, it is impulse above all things that we want. Moral philosophers, those of Mr. Le Sueur's school quite as much as others, are always crying out about the lack of available motives to virtue. Reason, they say, is so weak, or passion is so strong. I do not find them holding that 'the domestic or simpler social virtues are a natural result of the very conditions of existence;' on the contrary, they tell us that existence is compatible with a vast number of vices, both simple and complicated. Mr. Bain mourns that 'Nature has done so little for virtue.' Mr. Mill thinks that almost the whole stress of education needs to be centered upon the formation of character. Mr. Spencer is not of a widely different mind, if we may judge from his many and singularly valuable writings on the training of the young. Plato and Paul unite in the cry, 'Who shall deliver me from this body of death?' No one will deny what every clergyman knows, and many beside can testify, that rogues turn honest, the impure

chaste, and the intemperate sober under the impulse of love to Christ. A man who says that virtue owes little to the Gospel takes a position in which it is not rude to say that he does not know what he is talking about. We can only save his truthfulness at the expense of affirming his ignorance. Moral corruption is so far from being incompatible with the conditions of existence that some of its saddest forms are the direct results of an elaborate civilization. What was Rome when the Gospel was first preached in its by-places? And what but love to Christ has scourged away that revel of lust and blood? The same is true in modern times. Those who have seen it know.

But anyone may see that it must be so. To deny that love to Christ is a motive to goodness, is to deny that our characters are affected by the characters of those we admire and love. It is to deny, in other words, that admiration and affection are elements in our moral training. Every teacher knows the contrary. I will not insult Mr. Le Sueur by charging him with so much absurdity. And yet, to this position he must be content to be chained if he denies the moral value of the Gospel. 'To love her was a liberal education,' said Steele of a noble woman. Can we say less of Christ?

Mr. Le Sueur seems to me to contradict himself, or to surrender his whole argument, when he talks as he does of the 'strained or artificial' character of the motives or influences involved in the words 'delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification' Those motives are simply gratitude for a vast moral benefit and love for a character surpassingly noble. Of this Mr. Le Sueur says, first, that it does not tend to make us any better, and, secondly, that it sets before us, and impels us towards, a moral ideal of unnecessary elevation. Now, these constitute two horns of a dilemma; take which you will, but