

ledged that it was very difficult for the most cautious man (l'homme le plus réservé) never to have recourse to them in his explanations."*

3. It may be worth our while to consider for a moment the opinion here referred to by Cabanis, of the propriety of excluding the consideration of final causes from our natural philosophy. The great authority of Bacon is usually adduced on this subject. "The handling of final causes," says he, "mixed with the rest in physical inquiries, hath intercepted the severe and diligent inquiry of all real and physical causes, and given men the occasion to stay upon these satisfactory and specious causes, to the great arrest and prejudice of farther discovery."†

A moment's attention will show how well this representation agrees with that which we have urged, and how far it is from dissuading the reference to final causes in reasonings like those on which we are employed. Final causes are to be excluded *from physical inquiry*; that is, we are not to assume that we know the objects of the Creator's design, and put this assumed purpose in the place of a physical cause. We are not to think it a sufficient account of the clouds that they are for watering the earth, (to take Bacon's examples,) or "that the solidness of the earth is for the station and mansion of living creatures." The physical philosopher has it for his business to trace clouds to the laws of evaporation and condensation; to determine the magnitude and mode of action of the forces of cohesion and crystallization by which the materials of the earth are made solid and firm. This he does, making no use of the notion of final causes: and it is precisely because he has thus established his theories independently of any assumption of an end, that the end, when after all, it returns upon him and cannot be evaded, becomes an irresistible evidence of an intelligent legislator. He

* *Rapports du Physique et du Moral de l'Homme*, i. 299.

† *De Augment. Sc.* ii. 105.