

are could acquiesce in such an hypothesis : our own Scottish shores,—if to the term of the existing we add that of the ancient coast line,—must have formed the limits of the land from a time vastly more remote than the age of the Deluge. But even supposing, for the argument's sake, the hypothesis recognised as admissible, what, in the circumstances of the case, would be gained by the admission ? A continuous tract of land would have stretched,—when all the oceans were continents and all the continents oceans,—between the South American and the Asiatic coasts. And it is just possible that, during the hundred and twenty years in which the ark was in building, a pair of sloths might have crept by inches across this continuous tract, from where the skeletons of the great megatheria are buried, to where the great vessel stood. But after the flood had subsided, and the change in sea and land had taken place, there would remain for them no longer a roadway ; and so, though their journey outwards might, in all save the impulse which led to it, have been altogether a natural one, their voyage homewards could not be other than miraculous. Nor would the exertion of miracle have had to be restricted to the transport of the *remoter* travellers. How, we may well ask, had the Flood been universal, could even such islands as Great Britain and Ireland have ever been replenished with many of their original inhabitants ? Even supposing it possible that animals such as the red deer and the native ox *might* have swam across the Straits of Dover or the Irish Channel, to graze anew over deposits in which the bones and horns of their remote ancestors had been entombed long ages before, the feat would have been surely far beyond the power of such feeble natives of the soil as the mole, the hedge-hog, the shrew, the dormouse, and the field-vole.

Dr Pye Smith, in dealing with this subject, has emphatically said, that “all land animals having their geographical