

25 Claremont Square

London N.

Gublett

May 1895

24 April 1895

Dear Sir, I have been reading your Present Day Tract on the Historical Deluge, and was in hopes you would have taken some hint from a little pamphlet I had sent you some years ago, and now send again, with a new title-page and date 1893. I had at first entitled it "Hurley's Nemo-city, and the Bible's and Darwin's Veracity on Noah's Flood," some years earlier. The theory I had held since about 1838, when I was 14 years old, and happened to hear, in some astronomical lecture that Sir Isaac Newton had accounted for the Deluge by the fall of a Comet on the Earth. But the exact theory as here set forth. I had not held more than some 25 years, having been misled till 1866 by the same sentence in our version of Genesis VII. 11 that I think still misleads you, that the fountains of the great deep were broken up. If the "great deep" meant either the sea or the earth's interior of lava, this would imply great seismic activity; but I am convinced the "great deep" or the "boundless" does not, either in that text, or in the second verse of Genesis, refer to waters or to anything but boundless celestial space, which the late Professor Challis held, in a little work called Creation in Plan & Progress. see foot of my Page 7. By all the fountains thereof breaking up, we are to understand that from every celestial quarter, at once, from Aries, from Cancer, from Libra, from Capricorn, from the North Pole, & the south, 12 cataracts, fell simultaneously on the Earth.

That is what the Earth's immersion in a small comet of aqueous vapour would imply, and would not add anything to God's prediction VII. 4 "I will cause it to rain upon the Earth 40 days and 40 nights", or as it may be read, "I will cause it to rain fortyfold by day & by night." - I cannot now think any triple causes of the physical catastrophe are implied, but simply the single cause predicted, the rain.

Though a mere mention of Sir I Newton was the origin of my holding this theory, he really has not left a word about it, and it was Halley's theory stated to the Royal Society in 1694, and first printed in their Transactions in 1724. Newton seems to have at first thought it accounted for pre-Adamic catastrophes, but was too violent for Noah's Flood. We have only a statement by Whiston, that Newton afterward accepted it. This may account for your never mentioning Newton's name, and though Halley was very near his equal, he was at no time the greatest mathematician living on earth, and so you seem to have missed the theory entirely.

Since 1870 or thereabout, I have not modified this theory in the least. The whole quantity of water added to our planet, I take at between 15 000 000 and 16 000 000 cubic miles. I suppose it to have fallen in a few days, perhaps six as the Chaldean tablet stated. The 40 days predicted to Noah were the utmost atmospheric disturbance he might expect before calm weather. I cannot see the least evidence anywhere of invading sea-drift.

If there was any submergence, it was a perpetual submergence of all the civilized antediluvian lands.

Armenia may have been always, till then, a sea-bed, & then have emerged for the first time.

All antediluvian civilized countries I suppose to

be now seabeds, as you imply at p. 32. The Scriptures nowhere imply total submergence, as you say at p. 22; but they certainly imply universal flood & drowning. I cannot see a question of reversibility to be "useless logomachy" (p. 23). If the drowning (or floating) of "every living substance from the face of the earth" never took place, it seems to make God a liar. VII. 4, 23.

Then you have one very strange sentence at p. 5 that "no historical event ancient or modern can be more firmly established as a matter of fact." Now surely if Sir John Maundeville's story, 5 centuries ago, that Noah's Ship is still upon that mountain, and men may see it afar in clear weather, were true, that would make it far better established as a matter of fact.

Now I enclose herewith an account by some oriental named Nour to exactly that same statement 3 years ago. This Nour we are told, is now mad and in a Lunatic Asylum in America. You will see in his account many indications of a kind of madness, but that is no reason for rejecting & laughing at his story of seeing the Ark. You will observe he never claimed to have gone close to it, or touched it, (as some did whom Sir J. Maundeville mentioned). It may be on some inaccessible shelf of the mountain. But why may not others see it? I would have started last summer to seek it, if anyone that I knew had a single word of Russ or Turkish, or any knowledge of the East. Now here are these Armenian troubles in the way. But one might get Russian and Turkish passports, and need not be two days perhaps in Turkey, though the Ark must be in Turkey. If it were in Russia, the surveyors would long ago have observed it and marked it on their maps. If you know of anyone with the least knowledge of Russ who would go, I would pay for my own fare & expenses, and provide a sleeping tent for 2 or 3, and a telescope & stand. I should only go

hence by steamer to Batoum. I can afford no land travel
or needless sightseeing. From Batoum or Poti, we should
go by rail to Tiflis. There would be some public coaching
conveyance thence to Etchmiadzin or Erivan. After that
we must trust to some camel-driver, being then within
sight of Ararat, though in Russian territory to Aralyk.
Whence there seems a road to Bayazid about 20 miles.
I expect that from some part of that road, or from
Bayazid itself, the Ark may be seen, in clear weather.
We must have a tent, because small Turkish towns
have no decent lodging whatever. I fancy you
may know someone, because everyone here
utterly derides the attempt as absurd. If we get
to Batoum by the longest day, we need hardly
stay a week perhaps in Armenia, Russian
& Turkish together. I remain, Dear Sir

Yours very respectfully

E. L. Garrett

