

of an intellectual giant unsheathing Goliath's sword to slay a man of straw.

Objections based on the supposed imperfection or uselessness of certain organs, on the supposition that utility for man is the test of purpose or design, on the impossibility of understanding the divine purpose regarding nature, and on the adaptations to produce evil consequences which nature contains, may be passed over as obsolete or irrelevant. The conditions of the argument do not require us to explain everything in connection with the materials entering into it. It is enough if it justifies the hypothesis of intelligence to account for the facts so far as these can be understood or explained.

The objection pressed so hard by some recent writers, especially by Professor Hicks in his critique of the design argument, requires more careful consideration. The position taken is, that the design argument cannot be stated without assuming in the premisses the conclusion which it professes to establish. Teleology is necessarily illogical. Those who urge this objection give the design argument wider scope than the statement of this article allows. They embrace both the *order* or entaxiological, and the *purpose* or teleological arguments under the design argument. Design is the genus, order and purpose are species under it. Professor Hicks, in particular, asserts that the order argument has logical validity, but the purpose argument has not. The former does not take intelligence for granted in the premisses, but the latter does. From the facts of order abounding in the cosmos we are justified in asserting the reality of intelligence; from the facts of purpose, or design proper, we cannot reach intelligence without being illogical.

In reply to this reasoning several things may be noted. In the first place the design argument should be confined strictly to the teleological sphere, where alone marks of adaptation and purpose are found. The argument from the orderly arrangement of the cosmos should be termed either the cosmological or entaxiological argument, though there may have been little need to coin the latter word. This relieves the design argument of some of its difficulties, and enables the order argument and the design argument to range themselves side by side in the theistic proof, and to gather strength, as they both may, from the ætiological argument, or the argument from the necessity of a first cause of the contingent universe.