

regard to the opinion of those around him; he would be deprived of a principle, planted in his breast, by the hand of God, as a safeguard against what is base, and an incentive to what is great and good—The principle of honour may have been abused—may have led to much evil. But in that respect it shares but the common fate of all the principles of our wayward nature. All of them have been abused—Religion roots not out the elements of human nature, which are part of God's work: but she brings them under the law of obedience, and restores them to that place and office for which they were destined by the Author of our being.

In considering *the Law of the Land*, Paley points out, with great skill, some of its defects as a moral rule, but he overlooks a most important distinction. Laws are but expedients for the well governing of particular states. They are founded in utility, and limited in their application. But moral rules are not so limited, neither have they the same foundation. This distinction seems both certain and obvious. We may further remark, that the expediency of a law must ever be held subordinate to moral rules: otherwise we only raise our social fabric, by dragging away the stones from its foundations.

Of the Scriptures he remarks, that in them *Morality is taught by general rules, occasionally illustrated by fictitious examples or by such instances as actually presented themselves.* All this is true. The Bible is unquestionably not a formal book of casuistry: neither does it by any means supersede the importance of rules, founded in general expediency, for determining questions of social right