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The course hereinafter outlined will be of unusual interest and value to students and teachers of Philosophy.
gives us no idea at all what the law prescribes the period of $2\pi$, $\Psi$, and $\delta$ shall be. And I am sure I cannot guess. The numbers are

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Mars]</th>
<th>687</th>
<th>$\Delta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ast[eroids]</td>
<td>1467</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Psi$ [Jupiter]</td>
<td>4332 days</td>
<td>2865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta$ [Saturn]</td>
<td>10760 days</td>
<td>6428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Psi$ [Uranus]</td>
<td>30689</td>
<td>19999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Psi$ [Neptune]</td>
<td>60188</td>
<td>29499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am sure they are not in arithmetical progression. But as to Neptune whose period is 60188 he does tell us that $\Psi$, $\delta$, $\Psi$ are in arithmetical progression. I think he probably made some little slip, however, in saying that. After displaying this wonderful demonstration of the law, Dr. Carus [said] that instead of using the number 2, it would have been more exact to use 2.03. Now 2.03 is the square root of the cube of 1.61 which is $\frac{1}{2}(1 + \sqrt{5})$. The numbers are not quite right: $\frac{1}{2}(1 + \sqrt{5})$. But this will do as a model of bad induction.

Those who make causality one of the original uralt elements in the universe or one of the fundamental categories of thought, — of whom you will find that I am not one, — have one very awkward fact to explain away. It is that men's conceptions of a Cause are in different stages of scientific culture entirely different and inconsistent. The great principle of causation which we are told, it is absolutely impossible not to believe, has been one proposition at one period of history and an entirely disparate one at another and is still a third one for the modern physicist. The only thing about it which has stood, to use my friend Carus's word, a κτισία ἐν ἀπεικο, — semper eadem [always the same], — is the name of it. As Aristotle remarks, what the Ionian philosophers were trying to find out as the principle of things was what they were made of. Aristotle himself, as I need not remind you, recognizes four distinct kinds of cause, which go to determining a fact, the matter to which it owes its existence, the form to which it owes its nature, the efficient cause which acts upon it from past time, and the final cause which acts upon it from future time. Oh, but it is commonly said, these are merely verbal distinctions. This to my apprehension is one of those superficial explanations, which pass current till men examine them, and serve, like the elegant banker's memorandum, pour donner le change to the unwary [to sidetrack the unware]. They seem to me to mark different types of retroductively inferred facts, — facts which it was supposed furnished the universal process of Nature[,] the occasions from which different features of the [facts] were brought about. The conception is that Nature syllogizes from one grand major premise; and the causes are the different minor