

which we
liberty, of
institutions

estimate of
end for our
part of what
coloured and
the English
year 2000,
Times cor-
ld imagine
business cou-
stance, sup-
exposer of
as the ex-
our Courts
will avoid
as we wish
a discrimin-
stitutions by
e subject is

to be cen-
much to be
wise in the
ould study,
produce it.
we seek to
the detail.
ple is en-

ongue by a
elegant term,
which I
actions of
rom which
he knows
aste either
nd foolish
wn praise,
an the vir-
Macedon,
Alexander's

the *utility*,
h we have

to do; we are satisfied of their *utility*, for the purpose for which we seek to employ them: of their *beauty*, from their form and design, or from indications of pains and thought bestowed on their construction: of their *propriety*, as befitting the station and circumstances in which we are severally placed.

If I were speaking chiefly of religious matters, I should certainly add their *truth*; but as I am dealing at present with less sacred subjects, I shall be able to include under the three first named heads, all that is necessary for me to say.

I. Good Taste, in its selection of objects will consider their *utility*. The term utilitarian is sometimes used as a term of reproach, when it applies to those who dwell solely on the common, and reject the highest use of things, as when a man considers only how many persons a church will hold, without reference to the objects of worship, or what is the capacity of a building, without reference to lectures to be delivered or to the nature of sound; or when he prefers to have six cheap and bad pair of gloves, rather than to buy one good pair. It is, however, an abuse of the word. Real utility includes all uses, the highest, as well as the lowest, and so implies continuance as well as possession. But if we apply the test of utility to common life, we see that good taste would save us a multitude of unnecessary expenses, which fashion, caprice or apishness, (for it is nothing better,) imposes on us. How many groan under the yoke of fashions which they have not the manliness to resist! How many articles, and expensive articles of dress are useless, except to make people appear in forms for which nature never intended them! How many dishes regularly appear at dinners which only burden the stomach, clog the appetite, and (will the faculty forgive my impertinence?) fee the doctor!

But suppose we were to apply this test of utility to men's *speech, written words and general behaviour* to each other.

Might not many common errors be easily avoided by a consideration of *utility* only? One should not, I presume, do any dishonour to the prolific faculty of speech, if one were to say, that the stories which are often 'spun of interminable length and not very certain accuracy, might be usefully abridged, that mankind would be as charitable, and almost as wise, if they did not retail so freely all the absurdities which gossiping inventors put into circulation respecting the private business, religious views, supposed intentions of others, especially of persons with whom they are not well acquainted, and if they allowed themselves to measure their words rather by the cup than by the bucket, with a more direct view to utility than to talk. I need not say much of that celebrated but justly abhorred dictum, (if indeed it were not invented for its