

8. There is one way in which a theorist may take refuge from this conclusion. It is quite palpable, that a man often feels himself to be doing virtuously—when, to all sense, he is not thinking of the utilities which follow in its train. But then it may be affirmed, that he really is so thinking—although he is not sensible of it. There can be little doubt of such being the actual economy of the world, such the existing arrangement of its laws and its sequences—that virtue and happiness are very closely associated; and that, no less in those instances, where the resulting happiness is not at all thought of, than in those where happiness is the direct and declared object of the virtue. Who can doubt that truth and justice bear as manifold and as important a subserviency to the good of the species as beneficence does?—and yet it is only with the latter, that this good is the object of our immediate contemplation. But then it is affirmed, that, when two terms are constantly associated in nature, there must be as constant an association of them in the mind of the observer of nature—an association at length so habitual, and therefore so rapid, that we become utterly unconscious of it. Of this we have examples, in the

without our adverting to its utility—then though all that we hold to be morally right should be proved by observation to yield the maximum of utility, utility is not on that account the mind's criterion for the rightness of this particular thing. God hath given us the sense of what is right; and He hath besides so ordained the system of things, that what is right is generally that which is most useful—yet, in many instances, it is not the perceived usefulness, which makes us recognise it to be right. We agree too with Bishop Butler in not venturing to assume that God's sole end in creation was the production of the greatest happiness.