

continued rain would not give an amount of water forty times that which fell on the first or a subsequent day: for evaporation would be continually carrying up the water, to be condensed and to fall again: so that the same mass of water would return many times. If, then, in addition to the tremendous rain, we suppose an elevation of the bed of the Persian and Indian Seas, or a subsidence of the inhabited land towards the south, we shall have sufficient causes, in the hand of almighty justice, for submerging the district, covering its hills, and destroying all living beings within its limits, except those whom divine mercy preserved in the ark. The draining off of the waters would be effected, by a return of the bed of the sea to a lower level, or by the elevation of some tracts of land, which would leave channels and slopes for the larger part of the water to flow back into the Indian Ocean, while the lower part remained a great lake, or an inland sea, the Caspian.

I may now adduce citations from divines and sacred scholars whose eminence none will dispute, and who wrote without the least knowledge of geological arguments.

Few men possessed a more powerful understanding or a finer judgment than Bishop Stillingfleet. He makes the following remarks.

“I cannot see any urgent necessity from the Scripture, to assert that the Flood did spread itself over all the surface of the earth. That all mankind, those in the ark excepted, were destroyed by it, is most certain, according to the Scriptures.—The Flood was universal, *as to mankind*: but from thence follows no necessity at all of asserting the universality of it as to the globe of the earth, unless it be sufficiently proved that the whole earth was peopled before the Flood: which I despair of ever seeing proved. And what reason can there be to extend the Flood beyond the occasion of it, which was the *corruption of mankind*?—I grant, as far as the Flood extended, all these [the animals] were destroyed; but I see no