

some objections may be answered, which, at the present day in certain quarters, are urged with much learning and not a little presumption against the validity of the argument we are considering.

In seeking to *refute* this argument, objectors have moved along two distinct lines in their attempts. All along the history of the controversy both paths have been well trodden, though sometimes one has been more popular than the other. In one case, the *logical form* of the argument is impugned ; in the other, its *subject matter* is questioned. Advocates of the former line of attack maintain that no possible correct logical process enables us to reach the conclusion which the design argument claims to establish. Every attempt, it is said, of both ancient and modern teleology to do this has either taken the conclusion for granted in the premisses, or has been guilty of manifest paralogisms. Those who call the subject matter of the argument in question, claim that the materials with which it deals do not require any such supposition as the argument makes, inasmuch as all the facts of adaptation and marks of purpose can be accounted for and explained without the hypothesis of an intelligence other than and above nature.

The objections to the *logical form* of the argument may be first considered. In looking at these it is proper to observe that the careful statement of the argument given in the previous article guards it against many attacks. Thus all criticisms and objections based on the supposition that the argument is merely analogical are warded off, when it is seen that it is strictly inductive in its form. Analogy cannot prove or solve anything ; it only illustrates, and answers objections. By the inductive process we can solve problems, and vindicate a well-grounded hypothesis so that it is transformed into well-reasoned truth.

Others have objected that the argument is useless since it does not prove an infinitely great, wise and good Creator. The reply is, that the design argument by itself is not to be taken to prove anything more than the reality of an extra-mundane intelligence. Marks of adaptation and purpose evident in the cosmos justify this conclusion, and then other lines of proof are available to further amplify the theistic position. We are not to reject teleology, however, because it does not itself prove everything involved in that position. The history of theism has often presented the spectacle