

shutting his eyes and feeling on it; for it is evident that neither the circulation of the blood, nor the motion of the muscles, nor the animal functions, can be explained by impulsion, nor other common laws of mechanics: it is as evident that nutrition, expansion, and reproduction, is made by other laws, why therefore not admit of acting and penetrating powers on the masses of bodies, since we have examples of it in gravity, in magnetical attractions, and in chemical affinities? And as we are now convinced by facts, and the multitude of constant and uniform observations, that there exists in nature powers which do not act by the mode of impulsion, why should we not make use of those powers as mechanical principles? Why should we exclude them from the explanations of effects, which we are convinced they produce? Why should we be confined to employ only the power of impulsion? Is not this like judging of a picture by the touch, and explaining the phenomena of the mass by those of the surface, and the penetrating power by superficial action? Is not this making use of one sense instead of another; and, on the whole, is it not confining the faculty of reasoning on a small number of mechanical