man and and they red alive, prevailed =—19, 24.)

rpress the foregoing First, the sere is the high hills cen cubits nountains e earth."

y all, man 350 years, ession, for 'over the uckhouse) -bas thus

iat Judea ked with for if we etty near space of ous that ntries to e among ı: Africa, look into ough for d on the teeth of are the or other, nese are croscope, nted by o a coal,

The very learned Dr. Adam Clarke, in his celebrated commentary on the Scriptures, has also written on the same subject, in the following terms, on the words, "I do bring a flood." (Gen. 6, 17):—

"The original Hebrew word mabbul, for flood, is used only to designate the general debuge, being never applied to signify any other kind of inundation; and does not the Holy Spirit intend to show by this that no other flood was ever like this, and that it should continue to be the sole one of the kind."

Many other learned men have written on the subject, to the same effect; and that universality of the deluge has ever been the belief of both the Jewish and Christian Church. It could be no other, the repeated words of Scripture are so precise and plain on the point.

That one passage alone of the before-cited Scriptures, which says, "all the high hills that were under the whole heaven were covered," is conclusive in showing the universality of the deluge. Our globe, we know, is surrounded by a circle, as it were, at some vast distance, called the heaven, or expanse, as the Dr. rightly enough terms it. Now, can be point us to a hill of this globe that is not "under the whole heaven"? Surely be must either have not observed this passage, or wilfully disbelieved or disregarded it. His opinion, and that of the rest of his speculative brethren, is just what Mr. Stackhouse has called it, "a groundless and forced conceit."

As to this opinion, or rather *conceit*. "being now held by the best Bible expositors," as the Dr. has said, it is merely an unfounded assertion. He has given no proof to support it. No true Scriptural christian has given, or would give, such an exposition or opinion.

He says, "This exposition inflicts no violence on the terms of the record." It has just been shown by the record itself that its repeated terms are in direct opposition to that exposition. But this is of no moment with the Dr., for he either bends, ignores, or perverts Scripture, as his purpose or occasion requires. He proceeds as follows with his own fiction concerning the deluge:—

"It is also an important point to be noticed here, that the narrative of the deluge, in Genesis, is given as the testimony or record of an eye-witness, and is to be so understood. Bearing this in mind, and noticing that the writer tells of his own experience, as to the rise of the water, the drifting of the ark, the disappearance of all visible shore, and the sounding fifteen cubits where a hill had