

subsistence, she still remains a nonentity; therefore, as defined by our author, she is *nothing*, and can *do* nothing.

But although nature, as defined by Lamarck, consists merely of abstract qualities, independent of any essence or being, and therefore can neither form anything, nor operate upon what is already formed; yet would I by no means be understood as contending that there are no *inter-agents* between God and the visible material world, by which he acts upon it, and as it were takes hold of it; by which he has commenced and still maintains motion in it and its parts; causing it to observe certain general and local laws; and upholds, in the whole and every part, those several powers and operations that have been thus produced; that action and counteraction everywhere observable, by which all things are maintained in their places; observe their regular motions and revolutions; and exhibit all those phenomena that are produced under certain circumstances. Whatever names philosophers have used to designate such powers, they have a real substance and being, and are a something that can act and operate, and impart a momentum.

Lord Verulam's two *hands* of nature, whereby she chiefly worketh,* *heat* and *cold*, synonymous, according to some, with positive and negative electricity;† the *plastic nature* of Cudworth, and some of the ancients; the *spirit of nature* of Dr. Henry More;‡ and the *ether* of Sir Isaac Newton; all seem to express or imply an agency between the Deity and the visible world, directed by him. *Attraction* and *repulsion*; *centripetal* and *centrifugal forces*, or *universal gravitation*, all imply a power or powers in action, that are something more than names and nonentities, that are moving in two directions, and consist of antagonist forces.

* Bacon's Works, iii. Nat. Hist. Cent. i. p. 69.

† See Lit. Gaz. January 7, 1835, p. 43.

‡ See Vol. II. p. 254.