

tion of the typical forms in nature to our minds is denied. On the contrary, that is not only recognised, but is held as demonstrating that man—intellectually as well as morally—was made in the image of God. The patterns according to which creation is fashioned, and which we may therefore regard as expressing what is pleasing in the Divine sight, are the very same with those which afford the highest gratification to a pure and cultivated human taste. God would thus appear—it is contended—to have constituted our understandings with as great a conformity to himself, as it was possibly for finite intellects to have to the infinite. In regard to this interpretation of the order of nature, our authors express themselves as follows: “We are indisposed to advance a single word against this view; possibly it may be as true, as it is certainly striking and sublime. It is certainly a doctrine which cannot be disproved; we may venture to doubt whether it admits of absolute proof. Do we know so much of the Divine nature as, *a priori*, to be able to affirm with certainty, how that nature must manifest itself in creation? There may even be presumption implied in declaring, in some cases, that the harmonies of nature are after the taste or character of God; for example, that complementary colors are more beautiful to His eye, as they are to ours, when seen in collocation, than non-complementary colors.”

The theory upon which Professors McCosh and Dickie here—somewhat hesitatingly—pass sentence of disapproval, is one which—striking and sublime as it undoubtedly is, and calculated, when first announced, to fill and carry away the mind—we cannot accept. Our authors, indeed, have said nothing tending to shew that it is erroneous. The only thing which they adduce in the shape of argument against it, is contained in the sentence about complementary colors above quoted—a sentence which, as it stands, is pointless. There may be presumption (we are told) in declaring that it is a character of the Divine mind to delight in certain arrangements of colors, rather than in others. Now, perhaps there *may*: but surely it is too slight a mode of dealing with the subject, to assert this without a word of explanation, and, having done so, to pass on. *Why* may there be presumption in making the declaration in question? In the absence of anything to evince that the declaration is presumptuous, those against whom the statement of our authors is directed, might answer—and it would be sufficient—that they cannot see where the presumption lies. The main objection which we feel to the theory under consideration, is, that the typical forms which we discern in nature depend upon our sensitive modes of perception, and therefore exist