

1. This seems to be the case with those who maintain that purpose and design cannot be *inferred* or *deduced* from the arrangements which we see around us by any process of reasoning. We can reason from effects to causes, say such writers, only in cases where we know something of the nature of the cause. We can infer from the works of men, the existence of design and purpose, because we know, from past observation, what kind of works human design and purpose can produce. But the universe, considered as the work of God, cannot be compared with any corresponding work, or judged of by any analogy with known examples. How then can we, in this case, they ask, infer design and purpose in the artist of the universe? On what principles, on what axioms, can we proceed, which shall include this necessarily singular instance, and thus give legitimacy and validity to our reasonings?

What has already been said on the subject of the two different processes by which we obtain principles, and by which we reason from them, will suggest the reply to these questions. When we collect design and purpose from the arrangements of the universe, we do not arrive at our conclusion by a train of deductive reasoning, but by the conviction which such combinations as we perceive immediately and directly impress upon the mind. "Design must have had a designer." But such a principle can be of no avail to one whom the contemplation or the description of the world does not impress with the perception of design. It is not, therefore, at the end, but at the beginning of our syllogisms, not among remote conclusions, but among original principles, that we must place the truth, that such arrangements, manifestations, and proceedings as we behold about us imply a Being endowed with consciousness, design, and will, from whom they proceed.

This is inevitably the mode in which such a conviction is acquired; and that it is so, we may the more readily believe, when we consider that it is the