

the centre of the earth, he thought he might suppose it was a solid matter, surrounded with a ring of heavy fluid, and afterwards with a ring of water, on which the external crust was sustained; in the latter the different parts of this crust were more or less sunk, in proportion to their relative weights, which produced mountains and inequalities on the surface of the earth. Here, however, this astronomer has committed a mechanical blunder; he did not recollect that the earth, according to this hypothesis, must be an uniform arch, and that consequently it could not be borne on the water it contains, and much less sunk therein. I do not know that there are any other physical errors; but he has made a great number of errors, both in metaphysics and theology. On the whole it cannot be denied absolutely that the earth meeting with the tail of a comet might not be inundated, especially allowing to the author that the tail of a comet may contain aqueous vapours; nor can it be denied as an absolute impossibility that the tail of a comet, in returning from its perihelium, might not burn the earth, if we suppose, with Mr. Whiston, that the comet passed very near the sun; it is the same with the rest of the system. But  
though