

veries. He has a vast deal more of eloquence and sentiment and generalization than Edwards; but he is more of an adventurous speculatist, and therefore not so safe to be trusted, and more especially when he proposes as *a positive dictum* what at best is an Hypothesis. But an Hypothesis might subserve a great logical purpose in Theology. And accordingly the one framed by Leibnitz respecting the Origin of Evil, even though admitted to no higher rank than a mere unsupported imagination, may yet be of force to nullify all the objections wherewith this topic is conceived to be pregnant, and so as to leave in their undiminished strength all those affirmative proofs on which the system of Theology is based.

2. It may be right to state the leading conceptions which enter into Leibnitz's theory. He is an optimist, and conceives the actual universe to be such as it is—because of all possible systems it works off the greatest amount of good. He imagines God to be not the author of evil as evil. Evil is not the terminating object of his Creation. That object was the production of the maximum of good—And evil has place in the existing economy of things—only because subservient to the perfectly benevolent and holy end which God had in view, and of which end alone he can be properly called the author.

3. He supposes all the possible forms of a universe to have been present to the Divine Mind from eternity. There must be an infinity of such forms, yet all of them must have been present to the infinite understanding of God. Only one of them