

affixed to it some half century ago, as so utterly meagre and insipid, that one cannot without the slackening of all his mental energies, accomplish the continuous perusal of it—and therefore it really matters not what quarter he gives, in his pages of cold and feeble rationality, to the *a priori* argument. It is of more consequence to be told that it is an argument patronised by Wollaston, who, in his “Religion of Nature Delineated,” imitates Clarke in making our ignorance of the *Quomodo* the foundation of a positive argument. “If matter,” he says, “be self-existent, I do not see how it comes to be restrained to a place of certain capacity—how it comes to be limited in other respects—or why it should not exist in a manner that is in all respects perfect.” And just because *he sees not how*—therefore matter *must* derive its existence from some other being who causes it to be just what it is. Because we do not see the reason why matter should have been placed here and not there in immensity—because we cannot tell the specific cause of its various forms, and modifications, and movements—because of our inability to explore the hidden recesses of the past—and so to find out the necessary ground, if ought there is, for the being and the properties of every planet and of every particle—are we therefore to infer, that there is no such ground, and for no better reason than that just by us it is undiscoverable? The reasoning of Wollaston comes to this—Because we do not see how matter came to be restrained to a particular place—therefore, it must not have been so restrained by an eternal necessity.