

has so fully espoused and so ably defended the principles of modern geology, maintains that a deluge appears to have overflowed a great portion of our globe at a date comparatively recent; and that for anything science, in its present state, shows to the contrary, this may have been the deluge of Noah.* The position I have taken,

* 'If we mistake not, then, the deluges of Scripture and of geology, may, or may not, have been universal, in consistency with the language of the sacred history, and with the facts of science as they are at present understood. They agree, therefore, in having been very extensive, if not universal. And in view of such proofs of their identity, it should require decisive evidence to the contrary to disjoin them.' . . . Professor Hitchcock then mentions the principal objections to this identity, and adds:—'Upon the whole, the arguments against the identity of the two deluges appear to us rather to preponderate. "This important point, however," to use the language of Dr. Buckland, "cannot be considered as completely settled, till more detailed investigations of the newest members of the Pliocene, and of the diluvial and alluvial formations shall have taken place." We feel no great anxiety how this question is settled, as to its bearing upon revelation. But examined in the true spirit of the Baconian philosophy, it seems to us there is quite too much evidence of the identity of the two deluges, and quite too much ignorance of the whole subject of diluvium yet remaining, to permit an impartial geologist to decide preremptorily, as some have done, that they could not have been contemporaneous. We rather prefer that state of mind in which the judgment remains undecided, waiting for further light. Meanwhile, it is sufficient, so far