

escaped the observation of the Archdeacon—it is the *amazing varieties* exhibited in every species of these plants and animals. Had they been solely the offspring of a “blind conatus,” there would, probably, have been but one species of each of them: but their vast varieties show a master and designing hand to have directed their formation. The evidence of design which the earth exhibits, is not confined to its own formation; this evidence is much more strong, when we find and consider it as part of a system of planets revolving in known periods round a central sun, whose light and heat are evidently the *intended* sustainers of the life and enjoyments of the plants and inhabitants existing on this family of planets.

It is also stated in page 92 of the above work, that Buffon considers the Planets, to have been “shivered off the sun by some stroke of a comet.” Paley adds, “that he never could see the difference between the antiquated ‘System of Atoms,’ and Buffon’s ‘Organic Molecules:’” and that “this philosopher having made a planet, by knocking off from the sun a piece of melted glass, in consequence of the stroke of a comet, and having set it in motion by the same stroke, both round its own axis and the sun, finds his next difficulty to be how to bring plants and animals upon it,” &c.

Now, as to the solid parts of the earth; allowing glass to be composed of a variety of materials, yet I believe no part of the interior of the earth is discovered to be vitreous, except in the vicinity of volcanic mountains, or where these have previously existed. How then has this glass, of which Buffon supposes the earth to have been formed; how has