

though we cannot pronounce his explanation to be perfect, yet we esteem it to be profitable—deferring, as we do, to the wisdom and soundness which lie in his following remarks: “ We have explained enough, when we have shown that there are cases, where some disorder in a part is necessary to the production of the greatest order on the whole. But M. Bayle, it appears, demands a little too much. He wishes that we should show him in detail, how evil is linked with the best possible plan of a universe. This would be a perfect explanation of the phenomenon. But we undertake not to give it—and what is more, we are not obliged to give it, a thing impossible in our present state. It is enough for us to make the observation that nothing hinders, but that a certain particular evil may be linked with that which viewed in its totality is the best. *This imperfect explanation, and which leaves something to be discovered in another life, is sufficient for a solution of objections, but not for a comprehension of the thing.*”

22. There is a striking illustration on this subject, which seems to be quite incidentally given by Leibnitz, as it is all contained within the limits of a parenthesis, or at most of a sentence. He is speaking of our disadvantage for observation from our seeing but a part and not the whole universe—whereas whenever admitted to see any individual piece of mechanism, not in separate parts but completely, we find a contrivance and a beauty which exceed imagination. There is experimental proof of this in organic bodies, as a bird, or a quadruped, or a vegetable. If restricted to the view of one