

when these two had discoursed of many things, *Silenus*, above all, tells *Midas*, that *Europe*, *Asia* and *Lybia* ought to be considered as islands, which the ocean wholly surrounded; and that the part of the world, which lay beyond this, ought only to be esteemed the *continent*; as it was of an immense extent, and nourished very different, and vastly larger kinds of animals, than this side of the world." Then Mr. Catcott says, "from what has been offered, we may conclude, that *Africa* and *America* were once joined, or, at least, separated from each other, but by a very narrow gulph; and that, some time after the flood, the earth was divided, or parted asunder, probably by means of an earthquake, and then this middle land sunk beneath the ocean."

This hypothesis however is untenable on many grounds.

1. It is not a *natural* method of accounting for facts. We see nothing of the kind now occurring. It must have been a miraculous event. And when natural methods can be used to produce a given end miracles are not wrought.
2. It is unsupported by proper evidence. We have no authentic account of any such disruption. Two heathen sages *think it may have been so*. If it occurred, it must have been recorded both by revelation and tradition in the old and new worlds, but we find no such testimony.
3. Human life could not have survived the shock of such a convulsion, and it is therefore an unsatisfactory mode of accounting for the peopling of America.
4. On this hypothesis, there is no means of accounting for the strange distinction between the civilized and the savage aborigines of America.