

instance is the maximum of good. The permissive has a reference to the evil. It is by the productive and not the permissive that the character of God is to be estimated. "And the proper object of the permissive will is not that which is permitted, but the permission itself"—a permission, not for the sake of the evil but for the sake of its accompanying good. "Et permissivæ voluntatis objectum proprium non id est quod permittitur sed permissio ipsa."—*Leibnitz, Causa Dei asserta, &c.*, Art. 28.

9. Now all this is distinctly applicable to the vindication of the common theological system. The doctrine of that entire and universal sovereignty which is ascribed to God, would seem to make him more expressly chargeable with the evil both moral and physical which abounds in the universe. But ere this can be sustained as conclusive, our antagonists must prove that this evil is not essentially implicated in a universe of the best possible form. We do not affirm this as a truth. But we state it as a probability that, even in this humble and unpretending capacity, is altogether of force enough to silence the objection, and so leave theology to its own proper evidence. But there is another conception involved in the theory of Leibnitz, which we consider as still more fitted to do away all that is harsh or revolting from the aspect of our theological creed. We do not need, any more than in the former case, to vouch in positive terms for the opinion. Enough, as we have already said, that it is beyond the reach of any positive refutation. In which case, it will accomplish the only service that we require at its