

we may not be able to understand their intimate nature.

Such is the state in which Paley has left the argument; and while we admit that, even in its most perfect form, it is less satisfactory than that founded upon mechanism; we have always thought that our excellent author has not made quite so much of his subject as he might have done; and that the very imperfections and difficulties of chemistry, and of the allied branches of knowledge, give them some advantages over mechanism itself. When a series of wheels or of levers are arranged in a certain order, they *must* move in a certain way, and produce a certain effect, which can be foretold exactly. In such a case, we may admire the skill and ingenuity of the Contriver, or perhaps feel astonished at his power; but we scarcely do more: for much of the effect is lost in the apparent necessity of the result; and the consciousness that, under the circumstances, nothing else could have happened. When the Deity, therefore, operates through the medium of mechanism, He appears almost too obviously to limit his powers within the trammels of necessity; but when He operates through the medium of chemistry, the laws of which are less obvious, and indeed for the most part unknown to us; his operations, partaking more of the character of those of a free agent, appear of a higher