

times more sharp than ever issued from the cold armory of reason.

Another great fault in the Essay of Locke (involved I think in his very system, which looking only to the functions of the soul forgets its innate capacities), is its omission of the faculties of moral judgment. That such faculties exist, is proved by the sense of shame in a child, by the natural feelings of manhood, by the language of every country, and the code of every nation : and lastly, by the word of God, which speaks of conscience not as a word of convention—a mere creation of the social system ; but as something implanted in our bosoms by the hand of our Maker, to preside there and pass judgment on our actions. We read of men *convicted in their own conscience—living in all good conscience—we are told of the law written in the hearts (of the Gentiles), and of their conscience also bearing witness—we read of a conscience void of offence—of the answer of a good conscience towards God—of holding faith and a good conscience—and of a conscience seared with a hot iron* through long familiarity with sin. What meaning have words like these, if we may at our own will strip conscience of its sanction, and think of it no longer as a heaven-born rule of action ?

The faculties of moral judgment, combined to a certain degree with power of choice and liberty of action, not only distinguish us from the lower beings of creation, but constitute the very essence of our responsibility, both to God and man. Their omission, then, is a great blemish in any system of psychology.

Let it not be said that our moral sentiments are superinduced by seeing and tracing the con-