

Zuox College Monthly.

Published in six numbers during the session by the Metaphysical and Literary Society.

STAFF.

Robert Haddow, B.A.	R. C. Tibb, B.A.	J. A. McDonald.
J. L. Campbell, B.A.	C. W. Gordon, B.A.	1 A. J. McLeod, B.A.
Manager-R. J. M.	Glassford. Treasur	er-C. A. Webster, B.A.

TERMS-Per session, sixty cents.

Matter for publication may be sent to A. J. McLeod, B.A.; business letters to C. A. Webster, B.A., Knox College, Toronto, Ont.

The name of the writer must accompany every article.

Contributed.

THE DESIGN ARGUMENT.

OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED.

A FORMER article dealt in a general way with the *scope* and *import* of the design argument. It was seen to be one of the most important lines of evidence in favor of the theistic position. The ambiguity of the terms *design* and *final cause* was alluded to. Design was taken to be a mark of adaptation involving intelligence. The reasoning leads up to this inductively, rather than begins with it deductively. Final cause is to be carefully distinguished from *efficient* cause. The former refers to end or purpose; the latter relates to power or efficiency. Finality is perhaps the best term to use in the discussion.

In surveying the subject matter of the argument, two aspects of order were carefully discriminated. One was called *general* order, where regularity, sequence and law prevail; the other was named