

and the Negro, that now hold possession of our globe.\* I shall say something in controversion of each of these theories, beginning with the last.

This indeed furnishes a clue for its own refutation, since it admits *three* principal stems, which is in accordance with the Mosaic account, that from the families of the *three* sons of Noah, the nations were divided in the earth after the flood. The author of the above theory seems disposed to admit the truth of the Mosaic account, but insinuates that it may have been only intended to instruct the Israelites in the history of the race to which they belonged, while that of other races may have been passed over in silence. It is too much the fashion, in this sceptical age, to evade the facts that are most clearly revealed in scripture, by saying the language must not be taken strictly nor interpreted literally, even when it is concerning events in which there is no room for metaphor. One would think that the terms in which God foretold the deluge were of this description. "*And behold I, even I, do bring a flood of water upon the earth, to destroy all flesh wherein is the breath of life from under heaven; and everything that is in the earth shall die.*" And again—" *And the waters prevailed exceedingly upon the earth, and all the high hills that were under the whole heaven were covered: fifteen cubits upwards did the waters prevail, and the mountains were covered.*" It is also stated that every living substance, both man and cattle, &c., was destroyed from the earth, and that Noah only remained alive, and they that were with him in the ark. Can language be more definite and express?

What can be more absurd than that an ark should be necessary for the saving of Noah and his family, and a world of animals, to be stored with a vast supply of provision, when they might have escaped, according to this

\* Outlines of Hist. Cab. Cycl. ix. 4.