

**QUEST  
FOR  
DISCOVERY**



QUEST  
FOR  
DISCOVERY

THE REMARKABLE SEARCH FOR  
NOAH'S ARK

**richard carl bright**



**New Leaf Press**

*A Division of New Leaf Publishing Group*

First printing: September 2001

Copyright © 2000 by New Leaf Press. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations in articles and reviews. For information write:

New Leaf Press, P.O. Box 726, Green Forest, AR 72638

ISBN-13: 978-0-89221-505-8

ISBN-10: 0-89221-505-4

Library of Congress Catalog Number: 00-110208

Biblical references are from the King James Version unless otherwise stated.

Cover illustration by Bryan Miller

**Printed in the United States of America**

Please visit our website for other great titles:  
[www.newleafpress.net](http://www.newleafpress.net)

For information regarding author interviews, please contact the publicity department at (870) 438-5288.

# DEDICATION

Written for the skeptic, but dedicated  
to those of us who have trouble,  
yet have faith and hope  
in the Saving Grace of the Lord Jesus Christ.  
I am one of those.

These things I have spoken unto you, that in me  
ye might have peace.  
In this world ye shall have tribulation;  
but be of good cheer;  
I have overcome the world  
(John 16:33).



## SPECIAL THANKS

It is appropriate to render appreciation and special recognition to the government of Turkey for allowing the search for the existing remains of the ancient ocean-going vessel . . . NOAH'S ARK. We are thankful for their help to insure our safety through military protection provided us during times of trouble.

To the former astronaut Colonel James B. Irwin, who has passed on from this earthly life into God's eternity. As the president of the High Flight Foundation of Colorado Springs, Colorado, Irwin allowed me to join his team on three separate occasions. This was the beginning of what has been the greatest adventure of my life. I am thankful and deeply indebted. Also to Mary Irwin, whose belief has proven to be a tremendous support.

To the authors of the books whose material they graciously allowed me to quote.

To Eryl and Violet Cummings of Farmington, New Mexico, who have also passed on from this earthly life into God's eternity. Their writings and years of dedication in the search for Noah's ark provided inspiration for me.

To Ronald L. Lane of Ranger Associates, Inc., formerly of Longwood, Florida, who too has passed on from this earthly life to God's eternal kingdom. Ron not only devoted many personal hours assisting me in the advising, editing, and publishing of the original text of this book, but also left his own blood and sweat on the mountain in this search for truth. I can truly say that he was my friend. The original text was titled *The Ark, a Reality?* You may find references to this title within the text of this new book.

In addition to Jim Irwin and Ron Lane, to all the people I climbed with over the years, alphabetically: Ahmet Arslan, Dave Banks, John Christensen, Bob Cornuke, Ole Honnungdalanes, George Kralik, Dave Larsen, John McIntosh, Bob Stuplich, Paul Thomas, and the many others not mentioned, which include the Turkish and Kurdish

climbers who helped in this effort; to Ray Anderson, whose research and own work proves him to be a giant part of this search. I thank all of you for being there when you were needed.

To my parents, Ray and Louise Bright, who gave me their heartfelt support in this endeavor; they have my eternal appreciation. Ray Bright has since passed on into God's eternity.

To my daughter Courtney, who waited for me to return, I love you.

To Betsy McCreary of Littleton, Colorado, whose talent, skill, belief, and dedication to the work helped make the original printing possible. To Audrey Fitzgerald of Voorheesville, New York, for typing skills and assistance. To Sammie Brown of Humble, Texas, who worked with me on the report of the 1993 expedition. Sammie, too, has passed on to eternity.

To Mary Bielby of Aurora, Colorado, whose computer and office skills made possible much of the rewriting of the original draft, and the distribution of the first printing, and to Jim Bielby who proofread it.

To the staff of New Leaf Press for the work of this printing, and everyone who has helped in any way.

God bless you all!

# CONTENTS

Foreword .....	11
Introduction .....	13
1. What Has Been Found? .....	17
2. Russian Accounts .....	27
3. Early Sightings .....	43
4. Do the Locals Know? .....	69
5. World War II and Other Reports .....	79
6. Pieces of Wood on a Treeless Mountain .....	95
7. What Is Ararat? .....	105
8. Was There a Flood? .....	111
9. Was the Flood Local or Universal? .....	121
10. Where Is the Water? .....	143
11. When Was the Flood? .....	157
12. Evolution? Creation? .....	167
13. Evolution, Ancient Man, and the Ark .....	203
14. The Question of God .....	221
15. Expeditions .....	237
Endnotes .....	279



# FOREWORD

JOHN MORRIS

A survey was taken in the early 1970s by a Hollywood-based film company, to discern which subjects were of most interest to American viewers. What subject would they most like to see documented on film? The answer? The search for Noah's ark!

Several expeditions, including some of my own, had journeyed to that fabled mountain in the preceding years, and had received significant press coverage. The adventure had seemingly captured the imagination of the nation, and while the newness of the search has waned somewhat, the adventure continues.

I was captivated as a boy of nine, when my father showed me a newspaper clipping regarding Fernand Navarra's discovery of hand-tooled lumber high on the slopes of Mount Ararat in 1955. My interest was rekindled in 1969 by the tales of Dr. Clifford Burdick and an intriguing early manuscript by Violet Cummings, which was eventually to become her 1972 book *Noah's Ark: Fact or Fable?* I couldn't put that manuscript down. Such an adventure! This input led to my personal involvement in the search and to the addition of even more evidence to the already convincing case.

On several of my 13 trips to Mount Ararat, I had the distinct privilege of working with Mr. Dick Bright. While many were the distractions and roadblocks, I found him to be a man of unusual concentration and focus on the job at hand. He has now been to the mountain more often than I, cooperating with larger, more visible groups at times, and working quietly with little fanfare at others. This search has been his life's passion, and he has been involved at every turn. Thus, he is uniquely qualified to write this summary book.

Some might ask — why hasn't the ark already been discovered? Surely, it can't be that hard. Of course, that question has crossed all of our minds at times, but the ark, assuming its remains do exist,

seems well hidden and perhaps fortified. The hazards are many. The dangers on the treacherous mountain, from glacial crevasses, to rock avalanches, to wild animals, to violent storms, etc., are multiplied by continual threats from many other directions. And ever since the invasion of Kuwait by nearby Iraq, the mountain has been overrun by terrorists. This endeavor is not a simple search.

So why search at all? What good would it do? Briefly put, I think a successful search would change the world. It would rewrite archeology and refute uniformity (the principle upon which evolution is based). Furthermore, it would demonstrate the accuracy of the early chapters of Genesis. More could derive from this discovery than any other, and it deserves our attention and support.

God's blessings be upon you, Dick Bright. May He grant you success in your arduous search, and may eternal fruit abound from your selfless labors.

# INTRODUCTION

## WHY?

As I write this introduction, there are those of us who are convinced that Noah's ark is on Mount Ararat. There are also those who are skeptical, at best. If the ark is on the mountain, then as you read of the efforts to find it you may wonder just what the problem has been in locating the proof. You may even wonder why we keep at it if we seem to be continuously spinning our wheels. You may question our motives and wonder what scientific evidence exists in the earth's history for a biblical flood. By the end of this report, I trust you will have those questions answered. Up to the time of this writing, we've had a certain amount of trouble in our quest. You will read of it in this book. However, even though we have had trouble in our search to find the ark, there is a level of commitment to make every effort, every attempt to reach it and document the location for all to see. Why?

I imagine each person who gets involved in this quest has his own personal reasons for his desire to do so. Maybe it's the adventure. Maybe it's more than that. Could it be to do what we believe is the will of God in our lives? Maybe. Is it to do something to show where we stand in our belief? Maybe. I've heard it said that people may doubt what you say in your life, but they will believe what you do. Is it a leading by the Spirit of God? Is it because of the love for others as well as the love and belief in the Lord? Maybe, but the skeptic will have a tough time with that. He will probably think there is a selfish reason somewhere, or else we must be just a bunch of religious fanatics who happen to be scientifically ignorant. Well, skeptic, I may just understand where you get your point of view. I was once there. This book was written for you. If you have the courage, read it. Then perhaps you will be able to better decide.

So then, why? Why the commitment to this search? Is it to do a

good work, to get “points” from God? No. The Scripture tells us, “For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: Not of works, lest any man should boast” (Eph. 2:8–9). We can’t work our way into heaven. Still, is it to hope God will say, at the appointed time, “Well done, thou good and faithful servant”? Maybe. Is this being selfish? I don’t think so. I think the action taken demonstrates faith, even belief. Is it that in doing this we hope to reach the lives of other people? Is it to help get the word out? Is it to do our best to make a difference — a good, positive difference? Maybe. Is it just something we have to do for reasons we don’t really seem to fully understand? Maybe.

I think most of us have reasons that are similar, and those reasons are, for the most part, good, and hopefully acceptable to God. To my way of thinking, some of the people mentioned here are giants in this undertaking. Among them were such people as Eryl Cummings, who inspired and led people to seek the resting place of the ark. He climbed and felt the pain of injury in the efforts. In addition, Eryl researched the ark stories for over 40 years. We also remember Violet Cummings, who wrote two tremendous books on the subject. Colonel Jim Irwin, who was an astronaut, evangelist, and a great man of faith, belief, and accomplishment, led expeditions to Ararat. He left some of his blood on the mountain. These three passed on from this earthly life, but the example they set remains. Dr. John Morris, a creation geologist, author, and veteran of Ararat, was once struck by lightning while on a climb. He survived, and is a leader in this effort. Barry Setterfield of Australia has now taken a leadership role in the search for the ark and scientific truth. There are others not mentioned here, but their contributions and efforts, according to their own beliefs and reasons, I think will be accepted as gold.

I was taught in college that theories of evolution, particularly the Darwinian theory, natural selection, and chance, were responsible for my existence and the existence of every plant, person, and type of animal. In essence, life was an accident.

I was taught that the doctrine of uniformitarianism was the guiding geological principle in the history of the earth. There was no room for cataclysm. (These things are dealt with in this book.)

In college, I sat in anthropology classes and listened to the way anthropologists, paleontologists, and other scientists of one name or another could take a tooth, a jawbone, or a portion of a skull-cap determined to be of great age, and then build a model of some gigantic beast to fit the fragment. They even put fleshly and hairy

exteriors on the products of their imaginations and sold it to the student as part of our heritage. I didn't buy it.

I took the classes, passed the tests, giving the appropriate answers, and I graduated. But down deep I didn't believe that which I had been taught was, in fact, the complete truth.

Some things such as mathematical probabilities of chance, the laws of thermodynamics, the fossil record, and especially the possibility of creationism were not fairly or even at all discussed. I had trouble with that. Gradually a search for truth began in me. This report deals with that search for truth.

The bottom line is that I am of the belief that we are not here by random chance, having accidentally evolved from a simple form such as unicellular organism. Accidents and random chance cannot be the Creator. I believe there is a purpose to life. I believe each of us have a purpose and we can fulfill it if we choose to ask for God's guidance, believe, and take the appropriate action. Life was not built by accident, there is someone with a "blueprint." We were created by purposeful design. "Chance" is not my God.

Based on my study of earth's history, I have come to these conclusions: *Geology has not been uniform throughout history. The geologic column in its entirety does not exist outside of the textbook. The history of the earth has the signature of cataclysm all over it. The earth has the signature of cataclysm by water.* All of this is obvious as we open our eyes and do our own study apart from the college classroom. This is my opinion, and I was heading in this direction even before I opened page one of the Bible.

As I look back on that college experience, I appreciate the science instructors and their desire to teach what they believed to be the truth of history. However, what I did learn from those teachers, and throughout much of my college classroom experience, was to be skeptical. I was skeptical of what I was being taught in the classroom.

The science teachers were, and are, educated in evolutionary and uniformitarian theories first taught by only a few learned men. The teachers then teach that which they were taught. This is to be expected. However, it is my opinion, and I believe the opinion of many highly educated people today, that the evolutionary and uniformitarian theories being taught to students who become the new teachers, are highly inaccurate. The theories are based on old information and incorrect interpretation of the scientific data. Possibly, new scientific discoveries by such people as astronomer Barry Setterfield on the "speed of light" will shed a new light on the time

factor concerning the past, present, and future. His work is discussed in this book. So is work by Drs. Gentry, Brown, Morris, Macosko, and others.

The problem, I think, is also a spiritual problem. Because of the college curriculum, I was inevitably being taught to be skeptical about anything to do with religion. Obviously, if we had evolved, over a long period of time, we could not have been suddenly created. I carried this point of view for several years. Still, I had trouble with what I had been taught in the college classroom. I was quietly troubled over the conflict in my mind. Then, as the experiences of life began to fill the passing years, I admitted to myself that something was gently tugging at me from somewhere deep down inside. I had to deal with the conflict in my mind — which also seemed to be a conflict in my own spirit. I certainly did not understand that. At age 35, I asked Jesus Christ into my life. It was at that time that I started to read the Scripture. I believe that by this decision I found truth. It's hope and promise; it's a spiritual connection; it's God's grace; and it just

# WHAT HAS BEEN FOUND?

Sunday, August 26, 1984, Denver, Colorado, *Rocky Mountain News*

## NOAH'S ARK FOUND ON TURKISH PEAK, AMERICAN-SPONSORED TEAM CLAIMS

ANKARA, Turkey — Five Americans and one Turkish explorer believe they have discovered Noah's ark on the southwestern face of Mount Ararat, a team spokesman said Saturday.

Colorado Springs astronaut James Irwin, leader of a fundamental Christian group, has tried unsuccessfully to find the ark over the past two years.

"Members of the team arrived at the site of a boat-shaped formation clearly visible at the 5,200-foot level on Wednesday and Thursday," said Marvin Steffins, the president of International Expeditions, based in his hometown of Monroe, La., and the head of the team.

"We believe further archeological investigation and scientific evaluation will prove this to be the site of the remains of the ark of Noah," he told a news conference.

On the same day the *Indianapolis Star* reports:

## SITE OF NOAH'S ARK FOUND, EXPLORERS SAY

ANKARA, Turkey — U.S. explorers, including former astronaut James Irwin, have found a boat-shaped formation on Mount Ararat they believe is the site of the legendary wreck of Noah's ark, the group's leader said Saturday.

Marvin Steffins, president of International Expeditions, told reporters his group located the site Thursday 5,200 feet up the southern slopes of Mount Ararat in eastern Turkey.

“We cannot say that this is Noah’s ark, but we believe we have found the site of it,” Steffins said.

The news reports go on and on. Now to answer the question, “What has been found?”

Geologist Clifford Burdick, who in 1973 went to the site, believes the object is nothing more than a clay push-up in what some think is an old lava flow. After he saw it those many years ago, he wrote a report of his finding, some of which I will include here. I will show there are two opposing views, by at least three learned and scientifically educated professors. Each are highly influential men in their fields of expertise.

### THE INITIAL DISCOVERY

About 1959, aerial photographs of parts of the Tendurek Mountains of eastern Turkey were brought to public notice. The point of interest was an elliptical formation, having an outline roughly that of a ship, which appeared in the photographs. Captain Sevket Kurtis, a Turkish flier, had taken these photographs and he brought them to Ohio State University where he was doing advanced work in connection with aerial surveying.

A specialist at Ohio State University, Arthur Brendenberger, upon examining the photographs believed that the object could be none other than the ark of Noah.

A picture was published in several magazines and newspapers. It appeared in *Life* magazine. The *Stats Zeitung and Herald*, Woodside, New Jersey, 15 November 1959, published the picture, with a caption: “Stereo-airphotos at Mount Ararat show a petrified boat in a field of lava, possibly Noah’s ark of the Bible.” About the same time, a writer in a newspaper in Columbus, Ohio, commented in part:

Discovered with stereoplanograph, the air photos were taken a year and a half ago on behalf of the Geodetic Institute of Turkey. But a curious object was recently discovered in one of the photos. It was discovered when in Ankara. Captain Ilhan Duripinar used a stereoplanograph in order to prepare maps. The size corresponds with the description of the ark in the Bible and in the Koran. The object has the form of a boat, 450’ long and 160’ wide. . . . Kurtis said that the object is sunk in a field of lava. A member of the Geodetic Institute of Ohio State University [Arthur Brendenberger]

after he had seen the stereophotographs, said that he was convinced that the object could not be a product of nature, but was possibly “a petrified boat.”

“There is a ship on Ararat,” he declared positively, “and someone had better find out how it got there.”<sup>1</sup>

It must be noted that the measurements included in this observation give the object what appears to be a 3 to 1 ratio, length to width. Remember this point as we read further. This next opinion by Clifford Burdick gives another explanation for the object:

### THE ACTUAL FORMATION

The elevation of the formation in the Tendurek Mountains is about 6,000 feet. That seemed to us too low to agree with the reports of eyewitnesses, according to whom the ark is at an elevation of about 14,000 feet. . . .

The phenomenon in question lies along a broad, well-peneplaned contour. What had looked like a flow of lava in the aerial pictures turned out to be a deep deposit of clay, intermixed with small breccia, along the bed of a stream.

From a tectonic standpoint, apparently what had happened was that a small fault or fracture of about 450 feet (approximately the length of the ark) occurred along the bed of the stream. Actually, by pacing, I estimated 500 feet. The “prow” of the formation was uphill from the stern.

Apparently a granitic or rhyolitic type of intrusive lava had pushed up through the clay along the center of the formation, making an elevation ridge along the center. The ridge does look something like the keel of a ship — but upside-down. The outcrop of rock should have been an obvious clue to the nature of the phenomenon.

Apparently the extrusion widens a few feet below the surface. Along the center part of the formation, thus giving the whole thing the outline of a “ship.” Possibly as the molten or plastic rock mass rose through the clay bed of the wash, it raised the hardened clay with it. The hardened clay did actually simulate the sides of the ship, and from a distance one could easily accept such an interpretation.

Although in an aerial view [a] formation may look quite ship-like, it does not take a geologist on the site long to dismiss the notion that the strange phenomenon is an actual ship.<sup>2</sup>

William H. Shea, Professor of Old Testament, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan, has this to say about the object and refers to both Burdick and Brendenberger. Shea relates:

The expert in aerial photogrammetry (Brendenberger) from Ohio State University who read the film said of it before going to the field with the expedition, "I have no doubt at all that this object is a ship. In my entire career I have never seen an object like this on a stereo photo." This formation certainly does have the outline of a hull of a ship, which is a fact that no one has denied; and even Dr Burdick, who visited the site but does not relate it to the ark, was impressed with some of its ship-like characteristics, i.e., a prow "like the Queen Mary."

The logical question that stems from this is, if this is the place where the ark landed, then where is the ark? Aerial photographs of this area in 1959 show that this formation lies in a lava flow, and this interpretation has been confirmed by surface observation since that time. Burdick, however, said it was a clay push-up. The answer to this question seems rather evident, therefore, since a ship constructed of wood in such a situation would have burned.

In view of the hypothesis that wood may have burned where the soil lies within the confines of the walls of this "ship" is of some great interest. According to the color photograph of the outside of this clay wall above the crevasse, around its base shows a rather brown color mixed with the red of some iron oxides, as a geologist has pointed out to me.

One might suggest, therefore, that the gray color of the soil inside this formation may be significant and the color could be an indication that the soil contains considerable ash.<sup>3</sup>

Burdick said it was "clay intermixed with small breccia along a stream bed." Breccia is simply a conglomerate . . . pebbles of any type mixed and cemented together.

So we have diverse opinions and interpretations, and back and forth we go. We have an example that clearly shows us how the inaccurate science of geology in its findings is open to the individual interpretations of the geologist.

To further consider diversified opinions, let us investigate another possible explanation for the boat-shaped object and how it measures up.

Jim Irwin, while on one of his trips abroad, was told that the

Roman emperor Constantine was reported to have built a copy of the ark in approximately A.D. 300. Ron Wyatt had mentioned to me something to this effect, also. In his reading while on a trip to Jerusalem, Ron came across information indicating the Armenians may have built a copy of the ark also in approximately A.D. 300. An accurate source for this information cannot be pinpointed, but for the purpose of considering this possibility, let's assume an element of truth in this report.

Since Armenia was part of the Roman Empire in that time period,<sup>4</sup> I would imagine that both pieces of information could be based in fact, with Constantine in charge of, or giving the order that the Armenians do the labor. However, this possibility does bring about a question. Why would a Roman emperor be interested in Noah's ark? If even interested, why would he go so far as to build a copy of it?

Researching the answers to these questions came about almost unexpectedly when Bob Lambert, a well-read friend of mine, and at the time a flight dispatcher working for the same airline I do, loaned a book to me entitled *Caesar and Christ*. On page 662 of this brilliantly written history by Will Durant, it says, "Constantine was known as the first Christian emperor."<sup>5</sup> Let us for a moment, take a brief look at Constantine.

Constantine fought in the British campaigns and was proclaimed emperor in A.D. 306, but accepted the lesser title of Caesar because he felt his life would be safer with the army at his back. On October 27, 312, Constantine saw a flaming cross in the sky with the Greek words *en toa toinika* — "in this sign, conquer." Constantine dreamed that a voice commanded him to have his soldiers mark upon their shield the letter X, with a line down through it curled around the top — symbol of Christ. On arising he obeyed, and then advanced into the forefront of battle carrying the initials of Christ interwoven with a cross. Constantine cast his lot with the Christians, who were numerous in his army, against the Roman Emperor, Maxentius. Constantine won this battle, the battle of the Mulvian Bridge, and Maxentius and thousands of his troops perished in the Tiber River. Constantine entered Rome as the undisputed victor.<sup>6</sup>

Constantine became the sole emperor of Rome at the end of a period when Christians had suffered much persecution and death at the hands of the Romans. Constantine put an end to the persecution:

[Constantine] recalled the Christian exiles, and restored to all "confessors" their lost privileges and properties. While

still proclaiming liberty of worship for all, he now definitely declared himself a Christian, and invited his subjects to join him in celebrating his new faith.<sup>7</sup>

It was Constantine who ordered a church of the Holy Sepulcher to be built over the tomb of Christ in Jerusalem. At the time of his death at age 64 due to illness, Constantine called for a priest to administer to him the sacrament of baptism, which he had purposely deferred to this moment, hoping to be cleaned by it from all the sins of his crowded life. Then the tired ruler laid aside the purple robes of royalty, put on the white garb of a Christian neophyte, and passed away.<sup>8</sup>

Yes, I think this “defender of Christianity” could possibly have had an interest, and ordered a copy of the ark to be built. If in fact he did, and whether or not it was an exact copy, is another question to be dealt with. If, indeed, there was a copy built, then it should have been built in the exact measurements as the original ark.

Keep in mind, if we are to believe the accuracy of the facts as given to us in the Bible, then the Bible is the blueprint we must go by. Genesis 6:15 gives the measurement of Noah’s ark as 300 x 50 x 30 in terms of cubits. If the measurement of 300 cubits long is accounted for in the boat-shaped object, then the width of 50 cubits must also be accounted for when reading the measurements of the same blueprint. Professor Shea says this about the measurements of the boat-shaped object:

According to a second set of more accurate measurements taken from the aerial photographs, this formation is said to have measured 500 feet long and 160 feet at its widest point. Though the ground measurements have not been reported in detail, they were said to confirm the measurements made from the photographs. (Author: This set of measurements gives us approximately a 3 to 1 ratio.)

It is necessary to estimate the length of the cubit employed in the biblical record of the dimensions of the ark, in order to find any correlation in modern measurement.

The length of the cubit varied from place to place and time to time in the ancient world. While the use of an antediluvian (before the Flood) cubit cannot be ruled out, it is just as likely, if not more so, that these measurements were given in terms of postdiluvian (after the Flood) cubits. It is suggested by the very use of the Semitic word for cubit here,

since it derives from a particular postdiluvian language family. If one compares the Mesopotamian cubit of 19.6 inches for the ark's cubit with the original measurements of 150 meters for this formation, they are just about the same, at 490 feet.

In the times of the Israelite monarchy, the Hebrew cubit varied from the "old" cubit of 17.5 inches (2 Chron. 3:3) to the "long" cubit (Ezek. 40:5, 43:13) which was approximately equivalent to the Egyptian cubit of 20.6 inches. Moses has been credited with the authorship of this passage of Scripture and the cubit with which he was familiar during Egyptian education may well have been the standard by which he set down these figures.

The longer Egyptian cubit, as reported here, would give the ark a length measurement of 515 feet, and the shorter cubit a length of only 437.5 feet. The boat-shaped object measures 500 feet long. Understand this point — we do not actually know how large the cubit was at that time. Robert W. Faid, a nuclear scientist and author, tells us "The cubit was a measurement from a man's elbow to the tip of his middle finger."<sup>9</sup>

Genesis 6:4 tells us, "There were giants in the earth in those days" (before the Flood). This may indicate the cubit was much larger than the measurements of the postdiluvian cubit. Noah and his sons could have been physically big men, consequently, a bigger cubit, a bigger ark. We do not know. However, we do know the Bible gives us measurements of a 6 to 1 ratio in the ark's construction.

Dr. Shea continues the discussion of the cubit in terms of the width of the ark:

In the first place, we do not know precisely how this biblical measurement for the width of the ark was made. The ancients practiced mathematics differently than we do now in some respects. The use of inclusive reckoning whereby any fraction came to stand for the whole is one example (cf. 2 Kings 18:9–10). If some sort of averaging was employed to measure the width of an elliptical hull, then that figure must have come out differently than the way we now measure the widest points on this formation.

We also should allow for the possibility that this formation may now be wider than it was originally. It is interesting to note in this connection what marine archaeologists have

learned about shipwrecks that have rested on the bottom of the Mediterranean Sea for centuries and millennia. As ships have disintegrated, in some cases sections of their hulls have fallen outwards. While the conditions under which these ships fell apart were not identical to those obtained in the Tendurek Mountains, it is possible that any remains of the ark here could have suffered a similar fate.

Another possibility is that a geologic event(s) could have caused some spreading or fracturing. We now know that an earthquake damaged this formation between the summers of 1977 and 1979. Since this formation is located in a geologically active region, such damage could have also occurred in the more remote past.

Perhaps the most important point about this comparison of measurements is that its length corresponds quite closely with the measurements given in the Bible. Since the ark was only 1/6 as wide as it was long, however, destruction or disintegration could have altered its configuration and dimensions more significantly in width. The 160-foot width of the boat-shaped object gives it a 3 to 1 ratio. In other words, when compared with the biblical measurements of the ark, the length of this formation is of greatest significance, its width is of intermediate significance, and its height is of least significance. In the dimension that counts the most — the length — the fit between this formation and measurements of the ark in the Bible is most precise.<sup>10</sup>

Keeping in mind that the boat-shaped object in question has a length to width ratio of 3 to 1, a comparison should be made from another source.

LaHaye and Morris state in their book *The Ark on Ararat*:

It is interesting to note that many modern-day vessels are built on design specifications similar to those of the ark. Modern-day mathematical studies have shown that the ark must have been a remarkably stable ship. Experienced designers will recognize that the ratio of length to width of 6 to 1 is considered to be the optimum design for stability, and is used in construction of many different types of ships, from warships to racing sailboats.

It would appear that in order to build a racing sailboat, which is much the same shape as the boat-shaped object, with a 6:1 ratio, then

as Dr. Shea previously indicated, some form of mathematical averaging may be used. This is to say that the racing sailboat is not a parallelogram barge. I believe the stability of the ship gives us a key to understanding the mystery.

Lahaye and Morris continue:

The length of the ark, 450 feet or so (using an 18-inch cubit), would tend to provide insurance that the ark would not be subjected to any wave of equal magnitude acting throughout its entire length. The ark's chances for capsizing were, therefore, lessened.

The cross section of 75 feet by 45 feet (18-inch cubit) is also significant. The center of gravity for such a section can be calculated as well as the buoyant forces of the water for any given degree of tilt, and conclusions drawn. It can be shown that for any degree of tilt up to 90 degrees, the ark would tend to right itself. Noah's ark was indeed optimally designed to perform under adverse conditions.<sup>11</sup>

The idea promoted here is that the ark is a parallel-sided barge-like construction.

Mrs. Violet Cummings, in her book *Has Anybody Really Seen Noah's Ark?* says this in reference to measurement of the ark:

Leading Bible scholars have come to some remarkable conclusions on their own regarding the appearance and construction of the ark. For instance, according to McClintock & Strong's Cyclopaedia, "The original Hebrew word for Noah's vessel, as used in the biblical account of the Deluge, is *tebah*, denoting a chest, or ark, which is differentiated from the term describing the sacred ark of the covenant, in that it denotes something designed to float upon the waters." Another source describes it like this: "If we examine the passage in Genesis 6:15-16 we can only draw from it the conclusion that this ark was not a boat or a ship; but . . . a 'building in the form of a parallelogram' . . . that it was not a 'regularly built vessel,' but merely intended to float at large upon the water. We may, therefore, probably with justice, regard it as a large, oblong, floating house, with a roof either flat or only slightly inclined. It was constructed with three stories and had a door on the side.

Alexander Heidel points out that the Hebrew word *tebah* is related to the Egyptian *db't*, which is sometimes

translated “coffin.” Heidel states, “Outside of the Flood account it is used only as Moses’ ark in the Nile . . . as evidenced by its dimensions and the names by which it was designated in Greek and Hebrew, (it) was a flat-bottomed, rectangular construction, square on both ends and straight up the sides.” However, since a coffin is usually designed with slightly sloping sides, this conclusion fits in very well with Lee’s drawing of the ark.<sup>12</sup>

I’ll let you come to your conclusions on this matter, but for me it seems as though the engineers have given ample reason for the size of the ark as reported in the Bible.

I suggest we stick to what is recorded in the Holy Bible, which is considered by most believers to be the true Word of God. I suggest we use the biblical blueprint, because we must have a place to start. For instance, if a 6 to 1 ratio is indeed considered by modern ship-builders to be the most stable of dimensions for ocean-going vessels, then one must wonder why the intelligence of God would choose any other than what would be the most suitable to withstand the turbulent waters during the cataclysmic event of the Genesis flood, especially in a ship with such an important cargo.

To answer the question of this chapter, “What has been found?” — possibly only a geological formation that looks like a ship; possibly only dirt. Excavation is needed to find the truth. Turkey has not allowed it. The next question is, “What is reported to have been seen?” Let’s start in Russia.