

these determinations of prudence or principle, he may look on the fruit thereof and not eat.

6. Dr. Brown and others would say, that there is nothing in this process, but the contest of opposite desires and the prevalence of the strongest one—and so identify will and desire with each other.* But though a volition should be the sure result of a desire, that is no more reason why they should

* Edwards, at the outset of his treatise on the Will, controverts Locke; but in such a way as reduces the difference between them very much to a question of nomenclature. On the one hand, the difference between a volition and a desire does not affect the main doctrine of Jonathan Edwards; for, though volitions be distinct from desires, they may nevertheless be the strict and unvarying results of them. Even Edwards himself seems to admit, that the mind has a different object in willing from what it has in desiring—an act of our own being the object of the one; the thing desired being the object of the other. It serves to mark more strikingly the distinction between willing and desiring, when even an act of our own is the proper object of each of them. There may be a great desire to inflict a blow on an offender; but this desire, restrained by considerations of prudence or principle, may not pass into a volition. Edwards would say that even here the volition does not run counter to the desire, but only marks the prevalence of the stronger desire over the weaker one. Now this is true; but without at all obliterating the distinction for which we contend. The volition does run counter to the weaker desire, though under the impulse of the stronger; and there are three distinct mental phenomena in this instance, the stronger desire, the weaker desire, and the volition, which ought no more to be confounded, than any movement with the motive forces that gave rise to it, or than the posterior with the prior term of any sequence.