

whether we can derive any light from our internal consciousness of thought, reason, power, will, motive, design—or not : whether, that is to say, nature is or is not *more interpretable* by supposing these things (be they what they may) to have had, or to have, to do with its arrangements. Constituted as the human mind is, if nature be *not* interpretable through these conceptions, it is not interpretable at all ; and the only reason we can have for troubling ourselves about it is either the utilitarian one of bettering our condition by “subduing nature” to our use through a more complete understanding of its “laws,” so as to throw ourselves into its grooves, and thereby reach our ends more readily and effectually ; or the satisfaction of that sort of aimless curiosity which can find its gratification in scrutinizing everything and comprehending nothing. But if these attributes of mind are not consentaneous, they are useless in the way of explanation. Will without Motive, Power without Design, Thought opposed to Reason, would be admirable in explaining a chaos, but would render little aid in accounting for anything else.