

Objection.
Answer.

X. Let no one say, that limited as we are, 'tis temerity to decide after this manner; and that we have too imperfect ideas of the divine nature and perfections, to be able to judge of his plan and designs with any certainty. This reflexion, which is in some measure true, and in some cases just, proves too much, if applied to our subject, and consequently has no weight. Let us but reflect a little, and we shall find that this thought leads us insensibly to a kind of pyrrhonism, which would be the subversion of human life, and of all social oeconomy. For in fine, there is no medium; we must chuse one of the two systems above explained. To reject the first is admitting the second with all its inconveniencies. This remark is of some importance, and alone is almost sufficient to shew us the force of fitness in this case; because not to acknowledge the solidity of this reason, is to lay one's self under a necessity of receiving a defective system; a system loaded with inconveniences, and whose consequences are very far from being reasonable.

Of the influence which those proofs ought to have over our conduct. We should act in this world on the foundation of the belief of a future state.

XI. Such is the nature and force of the fitness, on which the proofs of the sanction of natural laws are established. All that remains now, is to see what impression these proofs united, ought to have over our minds, and what influences they should have over our conduct. This is the capital point in which the whole ought to end.

1. In the first place I observe, that tho' all that can be said in favor of the sanction of natural laws, were still to leave the question undecided; yet it would