

palpable and clear, and which are destined long to outlive all cavil and opposition.

With respect to the antiquity of our race, we have, as I have said, no good grounds to believe that man existed upon the earth during what in Britain, and that portion of the Continent which lies under the same lines of latitude, were the times of the boulder-clay and Drift gravels. None of the human remains yet found seem more ancient than the historic period, in at least the older nations: it is now held that the famous skeletons of Guadaloupe belonged to men and women who must have lived since the discovery of America by Columbus; and if in other parts of the world there have been detected fragments of the human frame associated with those of the long extinct animals, there is always reason to conclude that they owe such proximity to that burying propensity to which I have already adverted, or to accidents resulting from it, and not to any imaginary circumstance of contemporarity of existence. If man buries his dead in the Gault or the London Clay, human remains will of course be found mingled with those of the Gault or the London Clay; but the evidence furnished by any such mixture will merely serve to show, not that the existences to which the remains belonged had lived in the same age, but simply that they had been deposited in the same formation. Nor can I attach much value to the supposed historic records of countries such as Egypt, in which dynasties are represented as having flourished thousands of years ere the era of Abraham. The chronicles of all nations have their fabulous introductory portions. No one now attaches any value to the record of the eighty kings that are said to have reigned in Scotland between the times of Fergus the First and Constantine the Bold; or to that portion of old English history which treats of the dynasty of Brutus the Parricide, or his wars with the giants. All the ancient histories have, as Buchanan tells us, in disposing of the English