

instance of the tendency on the part of philosophers, if not to derive, at least to connect the emotions of which we have been made susceptible with certain anterior or higher principles of our nature. Dr. Reid tells us that the proper object of resentment is an injury; and that as "no man can have the notion of injustice, without having the notion of justice," then, "if resentment be natural to man, the notion of justice must be no less natural."\* And Dr. Brown defines anger to be "that emotion of instant displeasure, which arises from the feeling of injury done or the discovery of injury intended, or, in many cases, from the discovery of the mere omission of good offices to which we conceived ourselves entitled, though this very omission may, of itself, be regarded as a species of injury." Now the sense of injury implies a sense of its opposite—a sense of justice, therefore, or the conception of a moral standard from which the injury that has awakened the resentment, is felt to be a deviation. But as nothing ought to form part of a definition, which is not indispensable to the thing defined, it would appear, as if, in the judgment of both these philosophers, all who were capable of anger must also have, to a certain degree, a capacity of moral

\* In glaring contradiction to this, is Dr. Reid's own affirmation regarding the brutes. He says, "that conscience is peculiar to man, we see no vestige of it in the brute animals. It is one of those prerogatives by which we are raised above them." But animals are most abundantly capable of anger—even of that which, by a very general definition, is said to be the emotion that is awakened by a sense of injury, which sense of injury must imply in it the sense of its opposite, even of justice, and so land us in the conclusion that brutes are capable of moral conception, or that they have a conscience.