sentence ; for the power of inflicting puniſhment is esſential to ſociety, and ſociety is the ordinance of God, (see Society). The man who is called upon to re­nounce his religion ought to ſubmit to the cruelleſt death rather than comply with that requeſt, ſince reli­gion is his only ſecurity for future and permanent happineſs. But in every other ſituation, that which is abſolutely neceſſary to the preſervation of life is undoubt­edly lawful. Hence it is, that a perſon sinking in wa­ter is never thought to be guilty of any crime, though he drag his neighbour after him by his endeavours to ſave himſelf; and hence, too, a man in danger of periſhing by ſhipwreck may drive another from a plank which cannot carry them both, for ſince one of two lives muſt be lost, no law, human or divine, calls upon either of them to prefer his neighbour’s life to his own.

But though the rights of ſelf-defence authoriſe us to repel every attack made upon our life, and in cases of extremity to save ourſelves at the expence of the life of our innocent neighbour, it is not ſo evident that, rather than give to an unjuſt demand a few ſhillings or pounds, we may lawfully deprive a fellow creature of life, and the public of a citizen. A few pounds loſt may be eaſily re­gained ; but life wſhen loſt can never be recovered. If theſe pounds, indeed, be the whole of a man’s property; if they include his clothes, his food, and the houſe where he ſhelters his head—there cannot be a doubt but that, rather than part with them, he may lawfully kill the aggreſſor, for no man can exiſt without ſhelter, food, and raiment. But it is ſeldom that an attempt is made, or is indeed practicable, to rob a man at once of all that he poſſeſſes. The queſtion then of any importance is, May a man put a robber to death rather than part with a small part of his property ? Mr Paley doubts whether he could inno­cently do ſo in a ſtate of nature, “ becauſe it cannot be contended to be for the augmentation of human happineſs, that one man ſhould loſe his life or limb, rather than another a pennyworth of his property.” He al­lows, that in civil ſociety the life of the aggreſſor may be always taken away by the perſon aggrieved, or meant to be aggrieved, when the crime attempted is ſuch as

would ſubject its perpetrator to death by the laws oſ his country.

It is not often that we feel ourſelves diſpoſed to dif­fer in opinion from this moſt valuable and intelligent writer ; but on the preſent occaſion we cannot help thinking that he does not reaſon with his uſual preciſion. To us he even ſeems to loſe fight of his own prin­ciples. No legiſlature can have a right to take away life in civil ſociety, but in ſuch caſes as individuals have the same right in a ſtate of nature. If therefore a man, in the ſtate of nature, have not a right to protect his property by killing the aggreſſor, when it cannot be otherwiſe protected, it appears to us ſelf-evident that no legiſlature can have a right to inflict the puniſhment of death upon ſuch offences ; but if the laws inflicting death upon the crime oſ robbery be morally evil, it is certain that an individual cannot be innocent when he prevents robbery by the death of the robber, merely becauſe he knows that the laws of his country have de­creed that puniſhment againſt thoſe convicted of that crime. But we think that the protection of property by the death of the aggreſſor may be completely vindi­cated upon more general principles. It is neceſſary, in every ſtate, that property be protected, or mankind could not subſiſt ; but in a ſtate of nature every man muſt be the defender of his own property, which in that ſtate muſt neceſſarily be ſmall : and if he be not al­lowed to defend it by every mean in his power, he will not long be able to protect it at all. By giving him ſuch liberty, a few individuals may, indeed, occaſionally loſe their lives and limbs for the preſervation of a very ſmall portion of private property ; but we believe that the ſum of human happineſs will be more augmented by cutting off ſuch worthleſs wretches than by expoſing property to perpetual depredation ; and therefore, if general utility be the criterion of moral good, we muſt be of opinion that a man may in every case lawfully kill a robber rather than comply with his unjuſt demand.

But if a man may without guilt preſerve his property by the death of the aggressor, when it cannot be preſerved by any other means, much more may a woman have recourſe to the laſt extremity to protect her chaſtity from forcible violation. This, indeed, is admitted by Mr Paley himſelf, and will be controverted by no man who reflects on the importance of the female cha­racter, and the probable conſequences oſ the ſmalleſt deviation from the eſtabliſhed laws of female honour. See Seduction.

*SELF-Knowledge,* the knowledge of one’s own cha­racter, abilities, opinions, virtues, and vices. This has always been conſidered as a difficult though important aequiſition. It is difficult, becauſe it is diſagreeable to investigate our errors, our faults, and vices ; becauſe we are apt to be partial to ourſelves, even when we have done wrong ; and becauſe time and habitual attention are requiſite to enable us to diſcover our real character. But theſe difficulties are more than counterbalanced by the advantages of ſelf-knowledge.

By knowing the extent of our abilities, we ſhall never raſhly engage in enterpriſes where our ineffectual exertions may be productive of harm : by inveſtigating our opinions, we may diſcover thoſe which have no foundation, and thoſe alſo which lead us inſenſibly into vice. By examining our virtues and vices, we ſhall learn what principles ought to be strengthened, and what habits ought to be removed.

Man is a rational and intelligent being, capable of great improvement, and liable to great vices. If he acta without examining his principles, he may be hurried by blind passion into crimes. If he aſpires at noble and valuable acquiſitions, he muſt act upon a plan, with de­liberation and fore-thought ; for he is not like a vege­table, which attains perfection by the influence of ex­ternal causes : he has powers within himſelf which muſt be exerted, and exerted with judgment, in order to at­tain the perfection of his nature. To enable him to employ theſe powers aright, he muſt know, ſirſt, what is his duty; and, ſecondly, he muſt often review his principles and conduct, that he may diſcover whether he is performing his duty, or in what circumſtances he has failed. When he finds that he has fallen into er­ror and vice, he will naturally inquire what cauſes have produced this effect, that he may avoid the same for the time to come. This is the method by which every re­formation in religion and ſcience has been produced, and the method by which the arts have been improved. Before Lord Bacon introduced the new way of philoſophizing, he must firſt have conſidered wherein true philosophy conſisted ; ſecondly, he muſt have inquired