

Animals in cold climates have been provided with a covering of fur. Men in such climates cover themselves with that fur. In both cases, whatever may have been the end, or intention; no one can deny that the *effect*, at least, is precisely the same: the animal and the man are alike protected from the cold. Now, since the animal did not clothe itself, but must have been clothed by another; it follows, that whoever clothed the animal, apparently knew what the man knows, and reasoned like the man; that is to say, the clother of the animal knew that the climate in which the animal is placed, is a cold climate; and that a covering of fur, is one of the best means of warding off the cold: he therefore clothed his creature in this very appropriate material.

The man who clothes himself in fur to keep off the cold, performs an act directed to a certain end; in short, an act of *design*. So, whoever, directly or indirectly, caused the animal to be clothed with fur, to keep off the cold, must likewise have performed an act of *design*.

But, under the circumstances, the clother of the animal, must be admitted to have been also the *Creator* of the animal; and, by extending the argument, the Creator of man himself—of the universe. Moreover, the intelligence the Creator has displayed in clothing the animal,