

perty of matter, and willing to direct these chemical properties to a specific object, has contrived for that purpose an apparatus admirably fitted to attain His object. Such is the explanation—the only possible explanation, of the subserviency of mechanism to chemistry, in the processes of organic life. And what is this explanation, but our *argument of design*, in terms that seem absolutely irresistible?

Thirdly. The perpetual renovation and decay to which all organized beings are liable, may be considered as a part only of the great round of changes we witness in every thing that has been created. The world itself, as we have seen, appears to have been, at intervals, subjected to changes involving even the fundamental laws by which it is governed. Nothing, therefore, belonging to the world, can reasonably be expected to be permanent. Had there been even an approach to such permanence, the beautiful adaptations of organized beings to the pre-established laws of inanimate matter, and all the other wonderful arrangements we have described, could not have been manifested as they now are. Besides, to the changes we ourselves undergo, we are indebted for the greater part of the enjoyments of our life. If none died, none could be born; and the present arrangements of human society could have no existence. There would be none of the pleasing