

depend on their own proper evidence, and not on an extrinsic authority.

---

NOTE (E), p. 81.

My object in this note is to bring forward, as briefly and distinctly as I can, though at the risk of repeating what has been stated before, some specific objections to Paley's *Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy*.

1. The first objection is to the title of the work. If we reject the moral sense, and overlook all the inherent capacities and active principles whereby man becomes a responsible being; we deprive moral speculation of all the essentials of philosophy. It may however be said, that the objection is of small moment, provided Paley's ethical rules be true, and of general application.

2. He first examines the rules of life by which men are ordinarily governed—the *Law of Honour*—the *Law of the Land*—and the *Scriptures*.

His account of the Law of Honour is both meagre and unphilosophical. It may be said, that he has a right to limit the meaning of his words as he thinks fit: but his definition partakes of the fault that taints all his system—It gives a rule, but overlooks the principle. The Law of Honour is not confined to rules of fashionable life. It is deep rooted in human nature—is felt by all beings from the savage to the monarch—and its power is implied in the very instinct which leads men to congregate in societies. Were man cut off from all