

*special* order, where adaptation, adjustment and design exist. By some writers both are included under the design argument. Professor Hicks in his recent able work takes the argument from general order, which he calls the entaxiological argument, as the main form of the design argument. It is better to confine the meaning of the design argument to the teleological sphere, where marks of adaptation and purpose in the special order of the cosmos are observed. The *order* argument is the cosmological or the entaxiological; the *design* argument is the teleological.

It was further shown that the design argument was *inductive* in its form. It proceeds *a posteriori*, and its real task is to establish the validity of the premisses, from which the conclusion at once follows deductively. It was also pointed out that the argument is not merely *analogical* in its nature, and that some of its advocates, and critics, too, have erred in regarding it as nothing more than an analogy between the mechanism of man and that of nature.

The rest of the article was occupied chiefly with a statement of the argument in syllogistic form, and with an exposition of its import. The truth of the minor premiss is generally admitted, so that it affords little difficulty. Nature presents finality, or marks of the adaptation of means to ends. The real difficulty was seen to be connected with the major premiss. It states that these marks of adaptation can only be adequately explained by the hypothesis of intelligence. The line along which a careful induction leads us in establishing the validity of the major premiss was very briefly indicated.

The content of the conclusion was also carefully defined. This conclusion neither contains an explanation of *creation*, nor the notion of *infinite* intelligence. It only announces an extra-mundane and supra-mundane intelligence, which at the same time works *in* and *through* nature to definite ends.

The article concluded with a promise that some of the chief objections to the design argument would be considered at some future time. That promise this article seeks to fulfil. It cannot, however, undertake to consider carefully all the objections that have from time to time been made to teleology. It will not be able to make very close scrutiny of even the main objections to the design argument. Only brief outlines can be given of the manner in which