Art. 18. The process of deriving a boundary from its normal archetype will be evidently guided and ruled by this consideration ; *to shun mis-regulation, perplexity, and toil, by directing this boundary, so as, first, to render it self-adjusted, whereby the normal archetype will be its coequator ; and secondly, so as, if possible, to have perfect affinity with its normal archetype, or else to diverge from that archetype in the smallest possible degree.* A familiar illustration of this case may be drawn from that of a *traveller*, who, being led by another person through an unknown country, *will deviate from the track of his guide as little as possible.*

Art. 19. Hence we obtain a satisfactory test whereby we may discover, at least in extreme cases, *whether any boundary has been derived from a normal archetype, or fabricated on some other principles.* For if we can discover that such boundary *diverges extravagantly* from each of all its possible coequators, we have clearly a strong presumption that such boundary *was not obtained from any normal archetype ;* and, on the other hand, if we discover that such boundary has *one* coequator to which it has *perfect affinity*, or from which it *very slightly diverges*, we have an equally valid presumption of the opposite kind.

Art. 20. But a question may occur, of the same general nature, but under a different form, wherein the preceding test may be safely applied, not only in *extreme* cases, but in *any* case. For if *two boundaries* be placed, from the peculiar cause, which gave them origin, or from any other circumstance, under such conflicting conditions and relations, one to the other, that *one* of these boundaries *must* have been *derived from a normal archetype*, and the *other* must have been *fabricated on other principles ;* and if we ascertain that we can draw to one of these boundaries a coequator to which it has *perfect affinity*, whereas none such can be drawn to the other; or else, if we draw to each boundary that coequator from which it has least divergence; and then discover the divergence of the former boundary from such coequator to be less than that of the latter from its own coequator; we obtain thus, for the *former* boundary, a *cause of preference* before the *latter*, which decides the question.