

better than utilitarian special pleading, may be seen in Book III. Chap. xxii. on *Subscription to Articles of Religion*. These Articles may be true or may be false—to demand our subscription to them may be wise or unwise—these are not the questions. But shall a man seek the emoluments of a sacred office, and pledge himself before God to perform the duties of it in conformity with the word and spirit of these Articles; and then forget them altogether, or try to blind his conscience by poring over the *inky blots and rotten parchment bonds* that are piled among the archives of our parliament? An act of parliament may give the legal sanction to these Articles; but it gives them not their meaning; which can be found only in the vulgar way of honest interpretation. The preceding instances are taken from the moral part of Paley's work—The following are derived from the political part; where the principle of utility may (for obvious reasons) be applied with much more safety, and sometimes with great advantage.

(3) Why is it our duty to obey the civil government? Paley replies, *because it is the will of God as collected from expediency . . . . . so long as the established government cannot be resisted or changed without public inconveniency, it is the will of God that the established government be obeyed—and no longer. This principle being admitted, the justice of every particular case of resistance is reduced to a computation of the quantity of danger and grievance on one side, and of the probability and expense of redressing it on the other. But who shall judge of this? We answer, every man for himself\**. A more loose and mischievous doc-

\* Moral and Political Philosophy, Book VI. Chap. iii.