Garkett 25 Claremont Square
London
June 95 — 28 May 95

My dear Sir,

Looking again at the letter
I quoted in the Athenæum Oct 1866
about "Geological Miracle Assumers", I find
that a few points therein were needlessly
exaggerated in my anxiety then to make
out a great seismic convulsion, which after
all is not required by either Scripture or
the facts extant. The mere downpour of
about 400 feet of rain universally would
account for all, without the levelling or re-
moulding of the crust that I inferred from
the phrase "the fountains of the great deep
were broken up."

In my sixth paragraph, p 437, the words,
"omitting all effects of the earth's attraction" were
quite needless, and should not have been used.
Nor in paragraph 11, the sentence numbered (6) about

"the Earth's Attraction". The Idea that the Earth's gravitation might modify the comet's Course, so as to gather it to her, independently of its regular orbitual course is exaggerated, and need not have been suggested.

You see I got the chance, for a comet falling in a Century, of one in 2308, by a distinct minimum of data. The frequency of comet falls must be above 4 per million years, instead of Babinet's one in 15,000,000 What I insisted on was that Lyell or Darwin could not get several million years of uninterrupted course of present operations without miracle. They might as well claim that a field in England has been untouched by atmospheric rain for a year or two.

Five of the points enumerated in paragraph 11 are fair enough. The sixth should be omitted. This one might be added. I have reckoned all the cometic orbits as parabolic. But they would be mostly elliptical, and that would make them cut the spherical film more obliquely than a parabolic one with the same perihelion distance. The "ellipses of danger" would be longer than I have

reckoned – In a parabolic orbit, the comet's
velocity (at our distance) would be $\sqrt{2}$ times the
earth's velocity of 18 or 19 miles per second. It
would exceed our velocity perhaps 7 miles per second
But in all ellipses it would be less, and might
exceed us by only 5 or 4 or 3 miles per second.
I assume it to overtake the earth in her own
direction, in a path of small inclination, and as
near the perihelion distance 1 as any has been.
The ellipticity of the cometic path would be most
likely that of one that had previously been
"captured by Jupiter," and turned into an orbit of
only 6 or 5 years' period. The comet itself might
be very large, approaching the size of that of
1811. If that overtook us with no greater excess
of velocity than 4 miles per second, it would
take days, three or four whole days, to pass over
us. But with so small a difference of speed, the earth
would gather the whole before it escaped

Now an universal downpour of rain surely does
satisfy the Bible Story better than any sea flood.
The sea is not once mentioned in the Genesis story,
if we admit that the "great abyss" is the same as
had been so called in Chap I. The sole cause that
God mentions in the predictions is rain.

Those predictions are the passage I most insist on, more than the narrative. Again Christ mentions a point perfectly new & absent from the Old Testament, namely that "the day Noe entered the ark" _ not the week nor the month _ but the day that Noe entered, the flood came & took them all away" _ It not only drowned, but took them bodily away _ One Talmudic tradition says it was hot water, and the Parsee account, that the water clad the ground everywhere to the height of a man. Even on the slopes of hills, I suppose it to have been five or six feet deep.

Of course "all important centres of civilized life," as you say, p 15, were permanently submerged and are now in the sea-beds that are less than 600 feet deep. Our present lands were all antediluvian high bleak table lands, only for the hunting classes.

Yours very truly

E.L. Garbett.