

however—that the deluge was probably local, though extensive, and that such deluges have certainly happened—removes all objection to the Bible, and it is such as infidels themselves can scarcely call in question. In fact, some enemies to the Gospel have seen the historical proof of the deluge to be so strong, that they have confessed it to be irresistible. M. Boué, for example, an eminent writer and scoffer of the French school, has said, ‘ I shall be vexed to be thought stupid enough to deny that an inundation or catastrophe has taken place in the world, or rather in the region inhabited by the antediluvians. To me this seems to be as really a fact in history as the reign of Cæsar at Rome.’*

So safe are we with the simple narrative of Scripture. But where would we have been had the Bible contained some of the defences of it put forth by its misguided friends? What way of escape should we have had if any writer held

as revelation is concerned, to have shown that no presumption is derived from geology against the truth of Moses’ history of the deluge; but rather a presumption in its favour, even on the most unfavourable supposition.’—*Cabinet Library*, vol. iv., pp. 372-374.

* Quoted by Professor Hitchcock, *Cab. Lib.*, vol. iv., p. 299.