

refutation of the five great lines of argument employed by the Christian Church to establish the fundamental truth of religion; nor can we consider his misrepresentations of the teachings of the Bible, or his attacks upon its historical unity. We shall confine ourselves to a single point, especially as that point lies at the very heart of the controversy. How does he deal with the *argument from design*?

This argument is not as he seems to suppose the invention of Catwell and Paley. It was stated by Socrates 2,200 years before their day, as recorded in the first book of the *Memorabilia*, with a clearness and force seldom since equalled and its fundamental principles are as old as the days of David and Job.

The argument in syllogistic form is this:—"Whatever manifests design must have had a designer. The world manifests design; therefore, the world must have had a designer."

We may accept his definition of design as an adaptation, or the fitness of one thing to another, with the single limitation that it is the fitness of means to an end, and that both means and end must be *produced* or *have had a beginning*. The theist in contending with the materialist could not fairly adduce the matter of the universe as designed for the production of the universe: unless he could first prove that that matter had a *beginning*. But where one or more facts *come to be*, containing in themselves the elements of fitness to produce another fact which lies beyond them, this peculiar kind of fitness we call design. That this peculiar kind of adaptation exists in vast numbers of phenomena of nature, few intelligent persons will deny; and the fact has been admitted, directly or indirectly, by the most eminent modern materialists. The whole theory of Darwin is based upon it in his doctrine of "the survival of the *fittest*." The fact of this adaptation must be accounted for. The theist calls it the design, *i.e.*, the intelligent purpose, of the Supreme Power. This is a simple account of the matter, and one that perfectly satisfies the demands of the problem: but it implies what the materialist is above all other things unwilling to admit, *i.e.*, free, conscious intelligence—or in other words a personal God. Hence we are told that by the incisive logic of the modern materialist, this old notion of a designer has been driven from the field, and has been "abandoned by the most astute theologians," and we are referred to Hæckel and Darwin for a more rational account of the matter. The men of this school a century ago disposed of these wonderful phenomena as *chance*. It is at least satisfactory to find that they have abandoned this position, and that they now acknowledge that the adaptation of nature must be accounted for. The first method which they propose is the substitution of efficient for final cause; in other words, that the end provides its own means. We select an example from Tyndall. The eye is a wonderful optical instrument, adapted to the light. The theory of the materialist is, not that the laws of light furnish the plan on which an intelligent Creator