

geology" books. For example, (1) the problem of how there could have been enough water to actually submerge all the highest mountains of the world at once, or (alternately) why there are great amounts of valid evidence that most of the mountains of the world are very old (some proponents of "Flood geology" say the mountains were not formed until the Flood); and (2) the problem of the type of animal-distribution which we find on the earth at the present time. (If all the mammals in the most remote continents had been killed during the Flood, then nothing short of a supernatural distributive act of God would have been required to move the marsupials of Australia to their present location without having them also distributed in other areas of the world.)

A further question, related to the height of the mountains during the Flood, which might perplex some readers is the altitude of what is presently known as Mount Ararat. It is very unlikely that this mountain, of which the highest peak is about 17,000 feet in elevation, is what the Genesis account speaks of as "the mountains of Ararat" (8:4). By consulting a good Bible dictionary or encyclopedia one can easily learn that Ararat was a large district which was a very long distance from where Moses was when he wrote the Book of Genesis. The precise boundaries at the time of the writing of the Bible are not known--just as we do not know the exact location of the Garden of Eden, even though Genesis 2:10-14 gives specific names of rivers and districts by which the position of the Garden originally could be identified. So, there is no way to know even the approximate location of the place where the Ark came to rest, and likewise no reason for thinking that the 16,873-foot peak of the present region of Ararat in the country of Turkey was submerged by the Flood.