

such as would destroy all distinctness. In the case of Noah, we may understand the animals preserved with him in the ark as having been those connected more or less with man, by domestication, and by other modes of subserviency to his present and future welfare. This idea answers to the enumeration given, which only comprises the four descriptions;—"wild animals," such as we now call game, serviceable to man but not tamed;—"cattle," the larger domesticated mammifers, such as the ox, the camel, the horse, the ass, the sheep, and several species of the deer and goat genera;—"the creeping things," the smaller quadrupeds;—and "birds," the peaceable, useful, and pleasing kinds.\*

But an important observation presses upon us. If, by the Ararat mentioned in Scripture, be understood the mountain of that name in Armenia, it would inevitably follow that a deluge capable of surmounting that, must have been, by the laws of the motion of fluids, universal with regard to the earth. Against that supposition, the impossibility of descent presents itself, as has been already mentioned. But St. Jerome says that the name Ararat was given generally to the mountains of Armenia: and Dr. Shuckford, a judicious writer who lived long before geological studies were awakened, adduces reasons against the common opinion, and supports the idea of the ark's having grounded much farther to the East.† This therefore might be on a mountain, or a mountainous range, but not so high and precipitous as to preclude an easy descent into the lower and more cultivable grounds.

Let us now take the seat of the antediluvian population to have been in Central Asia, in which a large district, even in the present day, lies considerably below the level of the sea. It must not be forgotten that six weeks of

\* Gen. viii. 14.

† Sacred and Prof. Hist. Connected; Vol. I. pp. 98—104; ed. 1731.