

Just

**SITCHIN
FICTION?**

Jonathan Gray

About the author

Jonathan Gray has travelled the world to gather data on ancient mysteries. A serious student of origins and pre-history, he has investigated numerous archaeological sites, and has also penetrated some largely un-explored areas, including parts of the Amazon headwaters. Between lecturing worldwide on archaeology, prehistory and the unexplained, the author is a regular guest on international radio shows. He has hosted newspaper columns, contributed to various magazines, and authored and produced more than 100 books and DVDs

First published 2010

Copyright © Jonathan Gray 2010

All rights reserved

Limited portions of this work may be copied for study or review purposes without written permission, provided that the source is duly credited.

OTHER BOOKS BY JONATHAN GRAY

Dead Men's Secrets
 More Dead Men's Secrets
 Sting of the Scorpion
 The Ark Conspiracy
 Curse of the Hatana Gods
 64 Secrets Ahead of Us
 Bizarre Origin of Egypt's Ancient Gods
 The Lost World of Giants
 Discoveries: Questions Answered
 Sinai's Exciting Secrets
 Ark of the Covenant
 The Killing of Paradise Planet
 Surprise Witness
 The Corpse Came Back
 The Discovery That's Toppling Evolution
 UFO Aliens: The Deadly Secret
 Stolen Identity: Jesus Christ – History or Hoax?
 Who's Playing Jesus Games?
 The Da Vinci Code Hoax
 The Sorcerers' Secret
 What Happened to the Tower of Babel?
 The 2012 Prophecy
 Welcome, Then Betrayal
 How Long Was Jesus in the Tomb?
 The Big Dating Blunder
 The Weapon the Globalists Fear
 Modern Religious Myths About Genesis
 Will You Survive?
 Solomon's Riches
 Lost Races: The Big Dating Shock
 Update International Volumes 1 to 6

E-BOOKS FROM

http://www.beforeus.com/shopcart_ebooks.html :

In Search of Lost Cities
 In a Coffin in Egypt
 The Magic of the Golden Proportion
 4 Major Discoveries

CONTENTS

	Why This Is Written.....	7
1	Sudden Appearance.....	10
2	I Write to the Nibiru Man.....	15
3	His “Translations”.....	28
4	The Anunnaki.....	32
5	DIN and GUR.....	42
6	The Nephilim.....	48
7	Elohim.....	56
8	Nibiru.....	62
9	12 Planets in Sumerian Thought?.....	71
10	Shu.Mu = Rocketships?.....	91
11	The “Alien” Elongated Skulls.....	98
12	Are UFOs Through the Bible?.....	101
13	Can the Bible Face Up to Science?.....	112
14	How Old Are the Sumerian Texts?.....	123
15	Did the Bible “Borrow” from the Sumerians?.....	129
16	Go For the Best.....	135
17	Did Someone Alter the Old Testament?.....	144
18	Did Someone Alter the New Testament?.....	157
19	Sumeria’s Sudden Appearance: How?.....	171
20	Sitchin Versus the Sumerians.....	186
21	How You Can Benefit From This.....	193
	Appendix A: Who Are the “Sons of God”?.....	202
	Appendix B: The Book of “Enoch”.....	222

WHY THIS IS WRITTEN

About 350 BC, the Greek philosopher Aristotle classified the spider as having six legs. And for the next 20 centuries everyone believed the spider had six legs. No one even bothered to count. After all, who would dare challenge the great Aristotle?

Well, along came Lamarck (1744-1829), the outstanding biologist and naturalist. He carefully counted the legs of the spider. And guess how many legs he counted? Exactly eight! The myth that had been taught for centuries was destroyed because Lamarck bothered to count.

Myths are easily accepted as truth if they have been around for a time.

We are about to shatter a myth. And I invite you along for the trip.

HERE'S SOME STARTLING NEWS FOR YOU

What you are about to discover may shock you. It may anger you. Or you may be relieved that you did not fall into the trap.

It was not easy for me to prepare this report and name names. Especially after endorsing something for so long.

Please tell me. If you suddenly discovered that something you were passing on to others was a hoax, what would be the honourable thing to do?

Yes, you know the answer to that. After all, you have to look at yourself in the mirror tomorrow, don't you?

Okay, I have some startling news for you.

And why do I bother? Because I don't like documents manipulated to promote false claims.

- * Suppose I was a lawyer. Wouldn't I be professionally obligated to inform you if someone was giving you bad legal advice?
- * If I were a building inspector, wouldn't I owe you the truth if I knew the house you were about to purchase had termite-weakened foundations?
- * If I was an accountant, wouldn't you expect me to advise you if a neighbor's tax advice could put you in jail?

Okay, I'm none of those things, but I'm trying to provide the same service in my areas of expertise.

Increasingly, people ask me about Planet X, the Anunnaki and the Nephilim. Did extraterrestrials from a distant planet called Nibiru (Planet X) come to earth and crossbreed with creatures here? And does Nibiru's orbit bring it into our solar system every 3,600 years? (It's coming soon, we're told!)

Among today's many confusing claims, how can one sift fact from fiction? That's an important question.

Here is my answer: Test everything. ***Demand solid evidence.*** Because many self-proclaimed scholars are out there, who either

- (a) don't understand their topic, or
- (b) are faking data.

Why is this occurring? Here are three reasons (but there are more):

1. Some writers know that if they can catch public attention with a sensational theory, they can become very rich. They are not necessarily malicious. It's just that their love for money or fame is greater than their love for truth. Just put out a sensational story and you get peoples' attention. Very simple.
2. Some others are just plain mischievous. These con men wish to confuse and deceive the public. It puts them on a high to successfully prey on unsuspecting, gullible persons.
3. Another may mull over an idea that takes his fancy, then toy with it until he becomes convinced it might be true. After some sloppy research, with half the truth in his hands, he reaches a wrong conclusion – and then goes public.

These may all be brilliant intellectuals. But the first two have an honesty problem. The third is simply naïve.

Now, what about this Planet X story? Here, now, is my answer: I shall not judge the motive of the man who invented this theory... but the truth is, WE'VE BEEN HAD!

1

SUDDEN APPEARANCE

It's the kind of story you might want to believe. A certain popular writer, describing himself as an expert on ancient texts, tells us that far out in our solar system, beyond the planet Pluto there is an outer planet called Nibiru.

The story goes that Nibiru was populated by a reptilian super race. Those extraterrestrials were known as Annunaki.

The Anunnakis' own planet was dying. So the Anunnaki came to Planet Earth to attempt a rescue of their planet. The gold on Planet Earth was needed to create a shield for preserving Nibiru's dwindling atmosphere.

One can actually feel sorry for the Anunnaki.

Fortunately, this Planet Nibiru, in its orbit, came close to Planet Earth.

A group of 50 astronauts from Nibiru, with their leader called Enki, splashed down in the waters of the Persian Gulf. Some Anunnaki were sent to mine gold in Africa. When the toil became unbearable, Enki 'created' 'primitive workers' by mixing the genes of male Anunnaki with the eggs of early female hominoids, to bring about *Homo sapiens* - you and me.

This sudden impetus given to our “evolution” explains how the Sumerian civilization sprang up suddenly, fully developed, with no evidence of a primitive beginning. You can credit these extraterrestrials for jump-starting it, says this popular writer.

And oh yes, there’s something else. The orbit of Nibiru (also labelled Planet X by some) brings it into our solar system every 3,600 years. It will return to Planet Earth very soon.

Well, doesn’t that awaken your interest?

In any case, this gentleman, whom we shall call Mr S, assures us that this is what the clay tablets say. And this topic has been heavily promoted by him.

In contrast to the airy speculation of von Danicken, Mr S claims to be a scholar. He graduated in economics. But he *claims to be an expert in ancient Sumerian texts and Hebrew*.

HE HAS THESE THINGS RIGHT

From my years of independent research, I knew for certain that Mr S did have some things correct – one of which was that the Sumerian culture began suddenly, fully developed, with no evidence of a primitive beginning.

As you know, we are told these days that our forebears were primitive. Talk of high technology in the ancient world is rare.

For this reason, I felt a measure of rapport with Mr S. So my customary cautious approach softened toward him. And I did enjoy reading his books. So I let down my guard just a little to give those “facts” in his books due respect – in particular, the claimed *fact* that certain ancient texts existed to back up his story. Accepting his

claim also to be a responsible scholar, I went as far as to quote him a couple of times in my book *Dead Men's Secrets*.

As I said, Mr S did have a number of things right:

1. That a Global Flood had devastated the world in the past.
(See the evidence for that event in my book *Surprise Witness*.)
2. That there was a civilization after the Flood that started in Mesopotamia, from descendants of the Flood survivors.
(See the archaeological evidence in my book *The Corpse Came Back*.)
3. That Sumerian civilization started at a high level. (See *Dead Men's Secrets*, chapter 2.)
4. And, of course, that such an advanced early civilization needs explaining.

Also, I had no problem with his belief in another planet beyond Pluto. In fact, on August 1, 2005, scientists announced they had discovered one, unofficially called 2003 UB313. At about 3,218 kilometers across, it is bigger than Pluto. But ***this is not*** the planet Nibiru Mr S is talking about. For one thing, it doesn't have the orbit he describes.

“SUDDEN” APPEARANCE

Now, getting back to the Sumerians: Yes, Sumerian civilization did appear suddenly, unexpected and out of nowhere. Sumeria sprang into existence already fully developed - that is, without transition from a primitive state, with a fantastic ready-made high society.

In the remotest period of which there are records, Sumeria shows a level of civilization which is, according to the popular view of history, inexplicable. It sounds crazy I know, but it's a fact!

H. Frankfort (Tell Uqair) called it “astonishing.” Pierre Amiet (Elam) termed it “extraordinary.” A. Parrot (Sumer) described it as “a flame which blazed up so suddenly.” Leo Oppenheim (*Ancient Mesopotamia*) stressed “the astonishingly short period” within which the civilization had arisen. Joseph Campbell (*The Masks of God*) summed it up this way: “With stunning abruptness. . . there appears in this little Sumerian mud garden. . . the whole cultural syndrome that has since constituted the germinal unit of all the high civilizations of the world.”

HOW WAS THIS POSSIBLE?

You ask, how could such a society suddenly spring up, at the top, not at the bottom ...just like that?

Mr S to the rescue. Citing the above authors in his book *The Twelfth Planet* (p.49), he proposed that the reason ancient Sumerian culture was able to spring up suddenly, out of nowhere – was because of aliens from outer space.

Ah, that's the secret! The advanced knowledge was given to the Sumerians by extraterrestrials, he says. And he identifies them as the Anunnaki gods spoken about in Sumero-Mesopotamian mythology.

You ask, how does Mr S know that? Well, *it's on the Sumerian ancient clay tablets*, he informs us.

MR S: “IT’S ON THE SUMERIAN TABLETS”

You have to admit, an argument appealing to ancient clay tablets does sound rather scholarly.

Oh well, by now you must have guessed who Mr S is, so I might as well name him.

But I shall make it absolutely clear that what follows is not about the man. It’s about the subject. I have no problem with Zecharia Sitchin as a person. He’s probably quite a nice guy.

For a number of years I assumed that his story was, as he claimed, in the Sumerian records. After all, you just don’t make up such things, do you?

But then something happened...

2

I WRITE TO THE NIBIRU MAN

Over a period of time I had been receiving emails asking about

- Planet Nibiru (Planet X)
- The Anunnaki
- The Nephilim
- The 3,600 year orbit of this planet, which is said to bring destruction each time its passes close the earth.

So I felt an increasing obligation to dig deeper.

Well, I was checking carefully through the story. And an irritating anomaly cropped up. Assuming this story were true, such a misfit piece made no sense. It should not exist!

Naturally, this bothered me. Shrug it off as an isolated problem? Perhaps. But it cried out to be resolved.

However, pursuing the matter was not so easy. You see, another inconsistency surfaced.... then another... and another. Bother! It was not just one, but a growing procession of them.

That's when it dawned on me that the problem might be not with the inconsistencies, but with Mr Sitchin's story.

1. The *Anunnaki* come from the planet Nibiru or a 12th planet (or any planet). How do we know? According to our friend, it's in the Sumerian texts.

PROBLEM: Search, search, and search, it was absolutely *impossible to find even one such Sumerian text!*

2. *Nibiru* is a planet beyond Pluto. How do we know? According to our friend, the Sumerian texts say so.

PROBLEM: Again, I could find *not one single Sumerian text that says so.*

3. This planet Nibiru cycles through our solar system *every 3600 years*. How do we know? According to Mr Sitchin, the Sumerian texts say this.

PROBLEM: But try as one might, *no such Sumerian texts* could be found! Not anywhere!

Search as one might, the Sumerian texts displayed a distressing habit of *not being there*. Was the problem with me?

As I scratched my head over this, a few more awkward questions began to nag at me:

- Why did Mr Sitchin claim that the biblical pre-Flood “sons of God” who married the “daughters of men” were called “*nephilim*” – when the Genesis text said *something very different?*

- Why did Mr Sitchin say that “*nephilim*” means “*people of the fiery rockets*” and also “*those who came down from heaven*”? – when, in the Hebrew language, the word “*nephilim*” meant nothing like this.
- Why did many of Mr Sitchin’s vital *translations* of Sumerian and Mesopotamian words, *differ so much* from Mesopotamian cuneiform bilingual dictionaries?

Why... why... why? Here was a whole mass of questions now crying out for an answer. Well, what would you do?

FACTS ABOVE THEORIES

You should understand something here. Experience in front line archaeology teaches one that facts must always override theories. If a theory says yes, but the discovered facts say no, then the theory is wrong. That is plain common sense.

In an investigation, there may be hundreds of information bits to consider. One starts out imagining a scenario, but when all the facts are in, the final picture may turn out to be quite different.

Let’s say you have hundreds of torn up bits of newspaper scattered over the table, and you want to fit them together to form a page. But after working for hours, you discover the pieces do not fit.

Well, that’s where I was with the many pieces to Sitchin’s theory. They just did not fit.

So what would you do? What better than to ask the man who gave us the pieces? So I sat down and wrote to Zecharia Sitchin, asking him to help me clarify these matters. Surely he would substantiate his story better than anyone. Perhaps he had sources not available to the rest of the world? Here is my letter:

Jonathan Gray
PO Box 785
Thames 3540
New Zealand
Email: info@archaeologyanswers.com
Phone +64 7 869 0405

Mr Zecharia Sitchen
PO Box 577
New York, NY 10185
USA
March 2, 2010

Dear Mr. Sitchin,

I have enjoyed reading your work and have quoted from you in a couple of my own books.

With respect, I would appreciate you helping me with some information. When I quote you, some people raise questions.


This is not intended to be critical, but rather stems from a desire to understand better the propositions which you raise.

Here are my questions.

1. I notice you translate "nephilim" as "people of the fiery rockets" and also "those who came down from heaven" (as closely as I remember the wording) Could you please explain how this is arrived at, using the rules of Hebrew morphology? Where do you get your understanding that "naphal" has to do with fire or rockets? In what ancient text does naphal have to do with fire or rockets?
2. Which Sumerian text says that the Anunnaki come from the planet Nibiru - or have a connection to Nibiru, a 12th planet, or some other planet? Also that Nibiru is a planet beyond Pluto?
3. Why do many of your important word meanings or translations of Sumerian and Mesopotamian words, differ so much from Mesopotamian cuneiform bilingual dictionaries?

Thank you for your patience. I am sure there are good answers, but I need to be able, as one who quotes from you, to answer others. I appreciate you taking the time to respond.

Sincerely,



Jonathan Gray

With Mr Sitchin's help, this bothersome matter could surely be resolved.

I waited... and waited...

Seven weeks passed...

I recall vividly that Tuesday morning at the Thames post office. My heart was thumping heavily as I tore open the envelope. And there, inside, was a photocopy of my letter, with Mr Sitchin's few brief notes scribbled over it.

Now all would be clarified. I read on:

MY QUESTION NUMBER 1 WAS: I notice you translate "*nephilim*" as "*people of the fiery rockets*" and also "*those who came down from heaven*" (as closely as I remember the wording) Could you please explain how this is arrived at, using the rules of Hebrew morphology? Where do you get your understanding that "*naphal*" has to do with fire or rockets? ***In what ancient text*** does *naphal* have to do with fire or rockets?

SITCHIN'S COMPLETE RESPONSE: The Sumerian terms DIN and GUR - "*people of the fiery rockets*"; Anunnaki - "*those who came down from heaven*". Full stop.

MY COMMENT: But, Mr S, did you see my question, ***which ancient text?***

MY QUESTION 2: ***Which Sumerian text*** says that the Anunnaki come from the planet Nibiru - or have a connection to Nibiru, a 12th planet, or some other planet? Also that Nibiru is a planet beyond Pluto?

SITCHIN'S RESPONSE: Have you not read my books?? Stop.

COMMENT: Indeed, I had read his books. But my question was, *where is the ancient text* that says these things?

Okay, I had to be totally fair, so I referred Sitchin's response to linguistic expert Michael S. Heiser, who earned his M.A. and Ph.D. in Hebrew Bible and Semitic Languages at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

DR HEISER'S RESPONSE: "Nice answer: 'it's in my books.' My point precisely. It's *in his books, but not in the Sumerian texts.*"

MY QUESTION 3 TO MR SITCHIN WAS: Why do many of your important word meanings or translations of Sumerian and Mesopotamian words, *differ so much* from Mesopotamian cuneiform bilingual dictionaries?

SITCHIN'S RESPONSE: They do? Give a couple of examples!

Our friend Mr S sounded surprised. But he had thrown down the challenge. So that was the direction now to go.

You ask, why must I pursue this? Two reasons:

1. Millions of well-meaning people had taken his theory on board. Whole lots of people were staking their lives – and even basing their whole world view - on Mr S's integrity.
2. I was responsible for having quoted this dear man as a source. In my book *Dead Men's Secrets* I had cited Sitchin as a knowledgeable authority concerning the Sumerians.

WHAT YOU SHOULD KNOW ABOUT THE SUMERIAN TEXTS

It was obvious, now, that my research must continue without the

requested help from Mr Sitchin.

So just where were those elusive Sumerian texts?

With the assistance of Dr Heiser, I was able to track down where the Sumerian texts could be found – ***all of them***. In fact, these texts are now readily available to us. (And I shall soon show you where to access them yourself – every single one of them.)

HIGHLY CIVILIZED CULTURES

Anyway, as you may already know (my book *Dead Men's Secrets* is full of it), the ancient races, including the Sumerians, had an advanced knowledge of astronomy, geography, medicine and virtually all the sciences.

BUT NOT CAREFUL WITH HISTORY

But did you know about the strange paradox in the Sumerian culture?

You see, the Sumerians were an entirely practical people, with ***no urge to search for truth for its own sake***. They sought for no underlying principles, and undertook no experiments for

verification. (Samuel M. Kramer, *From the Tablets of Sumer*. Indian Hills: Falcon's Wing Press, 1956, pp. xviii, 6, 32, 58, 59)

Their mathematics arose out of a ***practical need***, that is, business records and transactions. Their astronomy dealt ***only with the visible*** – that which, in their thinking, ***might have a practical effect*** on their everyday life.

(Please bear this last statement in mind, because this is

tremendously important. It will have a crucial bearing on what we shall discover in a later chapter about Nibiru.)

For the Sumerians, keeping a strict record of their beginnings was not a practical need. So when it comes to *history*, much in the Sumerian texts is what we might find to be *careless, clumsy and crude*.

In essence, they overlaid their history – rather, they reshaped it – with their religious speculations and teachings.

The truth for its own sake, as an intellectual treasure, was *not* of greatest priority. *It is important to understand this*, when considering the history that they handed down.

You don't believe me? Just ask the world's most careful and eminent archaeologists. They will confirm to you that, compared, for example, to the Hebrew, the Sumerian texts are a fragmented, ambiguous and grotesque version of events. They are *notoriously unreliable*.

In the face of this warning, a sneaking suspicion crept over me that similarly, Sitchin's Sumerian "Nibiru" text, if I could track it down, might turn out to be not much better than a "work of fiction." (See my book *UFO Aliens: The Deadly Secret*, p. 283)

However, even with this caveat, I was not prepared for the event about to explode in my face.

DISTURBING DISCOVERY

You will recall that one question I had asked Mr Sitchin was this:

Which Sumerian text says that the Anunnaki come from the planet Nibiru - or have a connection to Nibiru, a 12th planet,

or some other planet? Also that Nibiru is a planet beyond Pluto?

Mr Sitchin had already said this was in an ancient text.

But which one?

I must tell you, the answer that now exploded in my face caught me off guard. It came not from Mr Sitchin, but from competent Sumerian scholars.

Their findings knocked me over like a bolt of lightning.

Are you ready for this?

HERE IT COMES...

There are NO SUCH texts. Not anywhere!

- Did the Sumerians say the Anunnaki came from a planet Nibiru? **NOT AT ALL.**
- Did the Sumerians say the Anunnaki have a connection to Nibiru, a 12th planet or some other planet? **NO, THEY DID NOT.**
- Did the Sumerians say that Nibiru is a planet beyond Pluto? Again, the answer is **NO.**

Did you get that? In the entire cuneiform record there is ***not one single text*** that says any of these things. These texts do not exist. ***They are all made up!***

None of these things existed except in Mr Sitchin's head:

- That the Sumerians said there were twelve planets.
- That the Anunnaki were space travellers.
- That Nibiru was the 12th planet in our solar system.

- That the Anunnaki come from Nibiru.
- That Nibiru cycles through our solar system every 3,600 years.
- That all these things are in the Sumerian texts.
- That humans were the product of crossbreeding by visitors from Nibiru.
- That the “sons of God” who married the “daughters of men” were called “nephilim”.
- That "nephilim" means "people of the fiery rockets" and “those who came down from heaven”.
- That the Sumerian language goes back almost 6,000 years.
- And the good man was offering us “word meanings” that ***do not match*** the word meanings in the Sumerian ancient dictionaries.

MY 6-STEP INVESTIGATION

To review the events, then:

1. I was excited about some of Mr Sitchin’s claims.
2. I quoted Mr Sitchin in one of my key books.
3. Further study uncovered discrepancies in Mr Sitchin’s claims.
4. I threw myself into an in-depth investigation of these areas.
5. Then I wrote to Sitchin personally for help with specific “difficulties”.
6. Finally – and what a shock was this! - the Sumerian texts themselves revealed that Mr Sitchin had ***made it all up!***.

QUESTION TIME

MY FRIEND JASON: Jonathan, did you know that Anunnaki space men from Planet Nibiru mixed their genes with those of primates to produce the human race?

QUESTION: Where did you get that from?

ANSWER: I got it from Mr Sitchin.

QUESTION: Why do you believe it?

ANSWER: Because Mr Sitchin says so.

QUESTION: Do you know anything about Mr Sitchin?

ANSWER: He says he's an expert on ancient texts.

QUESTION: Has he ever given you evidence?

ANSWER: He says it's in the Sumerian texts.

QUESTION: What if you discovered there were no such Sumerian texts?

DID YOU GET THAT?

The moment of truth is now in session. Are you present?

When Mr Sitchin first spun his exciting story to us, how many of us had access to all the Sumerian texts? So how easy might it be to tell this tale without fear of exposure... and get away with it?

Well, you know the answer to that.

But isn't Mr Sitchin an intelligent person? Of course he is! Didn't this dear man realise that eventually someone might find out what he was up to?

Have you ever trusted someone... and then felt ashamed of yourself? Yes, I know, many well-meaning people are going to feel let down. No, you don't need to be ashamed. After all, it wasn't you that made things up.

If you love the TRUTH, then you will be thankful for what's now coming out.

HERE'S HOW TO PROVE ME WRONG

Yes, I understand. Someone will want to prove me wrong about this. So I'll help you. Here's all you need to do:

- **1. *Produce the texts*** that I say don't exist.
- **2. *Produce verification*** of Sitchin's *translations* by other experts. (That's called peer review.)

That's all.

LANGUAGES SCHOLAR EXCITED BY SITCHIN'S WORK

Dr Heiser recalls that he also was stirred with excitement about Mr Sitchin's claims:

The work of Zecharia Sitchin was brought to my attention in 2001, shortly after I completed my book, *The Facade*. As a trained scholar in ancient Semitic languages with a lifelong interest in UFOs and paranormal phenomena, I was

naturally enthused about Mr. Sitchin's studies, particularly since I had also heard he was a Sumerian scholar.

I thought I had found a kindred spirit. Unfortunately, I was wrong. Zecharia Sitchin is not a scholar of ancient languages. What he has written in his books could neither pass peer review nor is it informed by factual data from the primary sources.

I have yet to find anyone with credentials or demonstrable expertise in Sumerian, Akkadian, or any of the other ancient Semitic languages who has positively assessed Mr. Sitchin's academic work. (<http://www.sitchiniswrong.com>)

Dr Heiser also wrote a lengthy open letter to Zecharia Sitchin. He asked Zecharia:

Can you please provide transcripts of your academic language work, or an address to which I could write to obtain proof of your training in the ancient languages in which you claim expertise? I would like to post this information on my website, and would gladly do so. (Ibid.)

Heiser also asked Zecharia to clarify a list of questions regarding Nibiru, the Anunnaki, and so on.

The response? Pure silence!

To put your mind at rest, I have no malice toward Mr Sitchin and would even invite him to my home for a meal if he ever came this way. (Mr Sitchin, if you read this, my invitation is open to you.)

But I would ask him face to face, “Why on earth did you fabricate your ‘Sumerian’ document?”

3

HIS “TRANSLATIONS”

But it becomes more puzzling still...


CURIOUSER AND CURIOUSER

The more carefully the subject was canvassed, the more apparent did it become that Mr Sitchin’s “word meanings” did not match the word meanings in the Sumerian *ancient dictionaries*.

ANCIENT DICTIONARIES DISCOVERED

Ancient dictionaries? That’s right. Was Mr Sitchin not aware that the ancient Mesopotamian scribes compiled their own dictionaries? All the words they used are explained in those ancient dictionaries. And, what a wonderful discovery! We have them today.

Among the thousands of Sumerian and Akkadian cuneiform tablets that have been discovered by archaeologists, lists of words are a common feature. Many are just groupings of common words, while others represent an inventory of the word meanings of the languages used in Mesopotamia.



These ancient dictionaries from Sumer and Akkad have been used to compile modern dictionaries of these languages. They were indispensable to the 19th century scholars who deciphered the Sumerian and Akkadian texts. They form the core of the modern dictionaries used by scholars of today.

All these major lexical texts are now available in a multi-volume set, *Materials for the Sumerian Lexicon*, begun by Benno Landsberger in the 1930s and published since the mid-20th century.

What a great tragedy that Mr Sitchin neglected these resources! If he was aware of them, or used them, his Anunnaki-Nibiru- 3,600-year fly-by theory *would never have* got off the ground.

Please note that the issue is not “translation philosophy”, regarding possible translations of certain words. At stake here is the integrity of the ancient cuneiform dictionaries themselves. To repeat, the ancient Mesopotamians compiled their own dictionaries. We have them today.

GETTING NAME MEANINGS WRONG

Our friend Sitchin tells us that certain words have particular meanings. For example:

- SHU-MU refer to *rocket ships*;
- DIN and GIR refer to “*people of the fiery rockets*”;
- *Anunnaki* means “*those who came down from heaven*”.

But according to the ancient Mesopotamians themselves, those words have *no such meanings* at all. (Just so you can see this for yourself, we shall soon visit these words one by one.)

WRONG PLANET = GOD MEANINGS

Something else. The Sumerians also paired up the visible planets with the names of particular gods that they worshipped. But, again, Mr Sitchin’s *god=planet equivalencies* do not match the listings of such in cuneiform astronomical texts. Why don’t they?

HENCE MY QUESTION

So my third question to Mr Sitchin was, essentially:

Can you explain why many of your critical word meanings / translations of Sumerian and Mesopotamian words are not consistent with Mesopotamian cuneiform bilingual dictionaries?

Now, instead of taking my word about these *bogus translations* and understanding of the different words, why not do something much better?

Just go to the website of the Digital Corpus of Cuneiform Literature (DCCLT) maintained by the University of California at Berkeley. Then click on the cuneiform tablet. This will take you to the DCCLT’s explanation of lexical lists.

TWO THINGS AT STAKE

I hear someone asking, Is this really so important?

Absolutely.

Why?

This discrepancy is bigger than you may realise. It has nothing to do with “translation philosophy”, as though it was a mere disagreement over possible translations of certain words. What is at stake is this:

1. *Mr Sitchin's space visitors theory stands or falls on it.*
And that now affects millions of people.
2. *The integrity of the ancient cuneiform tablets is at stake,*
and that of the scribes.

Mike Heiser puts his finger on it:

To persist in embracing Mr. Sitchin's views on this matter (and a host of others) amounts to rejecting the legacy of the ancient Sumerian and Akkadian scribes whose labors have come down to us from the ages. Put bluntly, is it more coherent to believe a Mesopotamian scribe's definition of a word, or Mr. Sitchin's?
(<http://www.sitchiniswrong.com>)

Look, if Sitchin is right, then the bilingual Sumerian dictionaries compiled by the Mesopotamian scribes themselves are wrong.

Shall we get specific? Let's start with the Anunnaki...

4

THE ANUNNAKI

I don't have to tell you that the Anunnaki are a key part of Mr Sitchin's story.

IT IS CLAIMED: The *Anunnaki* came from a planet called Nibiru. They imparted their knowledge to the Sumerians. The word *Anunnaki* means “*those who came down from heaven*”.

IN REALITY: Firstly, it is almost startling to find that there is not one Sumerian text that says the *Anunnaki* come from a planet called Nibiru or a 12th planet (or any planet). There's ***not even one line*** of one cuneiform text that says this.

Secondly, the word *Anunnaki* does ***not*** mean “*those who came down from heaven*”, not at all!

WHO WERE THE ANUNNAKI?

The Anunnaki appear in the Babylonian creation myth, *Enuma Elish*.

Anunnaki was the name given to a group of Sumerian, Akkadian and Babylonian deities. The word in its various forms - *a-nuna*, *a-nuna-ke-ne* or *a-nun-na* - means “*of royal blood*” or “*princely offspring*”. (Gwendolyn Leick, *A Dictionary of Ancient Near Eastern Mythology*. NY: Routledge, 1998, p. 7; Jeremy Black and Anthony Green. *Gods, Demons and Symbols of Ancient Mesopotamia: An Illustrated Dictionary* University of Texas Press: Aug 1992, p.34)

THE GODS WERE DEIFIED HUMAN HEROES

Who, then, were these persons of royal blood or princely status?

Here's the first clue... they were ***dead people*** - deified men and women. The findings of archaeology have confirmed this.

That's right, among the early nations, the “gods” are described as having once reigned upon earth. The principle of ***deifying*** illustrious benefactors after death formed the basis of one part at least of their popular theology.

Hesiod (*Hesiodos*), an early Greek writer (c. BC 700) confirms that anciently it was the custom to venerate the departed spirits of heroes. These were individuals who had distinguished themselves above their fellows, or had rendered essential service to their country.

And eventually a grateful posterity came to worship them as gods.

Hesiod informs us:

When the mortal remains of those who flourished during the golden age were hidden beneath the earth, their souls became beneficent Demons; still hovering over the world which they had once inhabited, and still watching as guardians over the affairs of

men. These, clothed in thin air and rapidly flitting through every region of the earth, possess the royal privilege of conferring wealth and of protecting the administration of justice. (Hesiod, *Oper. et dier.* lib. i. ver. 120, 125. Platon. *Cratyl.* p. 398. *de repub.* lib. v. p. 468)

This passage specifies two things:

1. that the gods were originally *mere men*, and
2. that the persons counted worthy of being venerated were those who flourished during the Golden Age of the founding fathers.

Hesiod, in harmony with the belief of virtually all the ancient nations, declares that there was formerly an “age of heroes” far better than the men of his time, “who are called demigods, the race preceding [our own race] over the boundless earth.” (Hesiod, *Works and Days*, Loeb Classical Library, edited by Hugh G. Evelyn-White. London, England, and Cambridge, Mass., 1954, pp. 12-14, lines 158-160)

Ancient records affirm that at the very beginning men possessed extraordinary mental abilities.

Beginning with the raw earth, they mastered a high level of civilization in just the first few generations of their existence. In that short time they were able to build cities, play complex musical instruments and smelt metals. Indeed, with their scientific complexes, these earliest men, it seems, were no fools.

This golden age is explained in considerable depth in two of my books, *Dead Men’s Secrets* and *Stolen Identity*.

In later times, certain men from this golden age came to be deified.

“ONE GOD” BELIEF AT FIRST

It is relevant to state that the number of “gods” grew, as time went on. At first this was not so. Only one God – the Creator of all things – was recognised.

Researchers on six continents have been discovering script in what is described as mankind’s **“First Tongue”** (*Stolen Identity*, chapter 4). The content of the translations, although not complete, suggests an original **single** culture and religious belief system, worldwide.

Would this surprise you? I know this goes against what some theorists have been suggesting. But the evidence indicates a monotheistic religious belief at that **early time** when there was still one global language. It hints at an original faith inherited from the earliest ancestors.

According to the evidence, MONOtheism lay at the root of all religions, until shortly after 2000 BC – after which monotheism began to degenerate into pantheism, polytheism and animism.

Archaeologists and historians who know their material best (Horn, Faber, Rawlinson, Waddell and Budge, to name a few) have shown beyond a whisper of doubt that **the earliest** Sumerians, Iranians, Phoenicians, Egyptians and Indians were **monotheists**.

They recognised supremely one only omnipotent God who had created everything. This Creator was an eternal Being outside of time and space.

EGYPT: In the early period of Egyptian history, the one God appears under the two aspects, Heru-ur and Set.

In the original Egyptian **monotheism**, Heru-ur was the eternally **beneficent** aspect of the Creator, and Set was the aspect associated with **judgment**, correction and death. The hieroglyphic

representation consisted of the face of Heru-ur, and the face of Set, being depicted as two aspects of one being. (Davidson and Aldersmith, *The Great Pyramid: Its Divine Message*. London: William and Norgate, Ltd, 1936, p. 451)

These two aspects were later separated to form the Egyptian pagan deities, the elder Horus and Set.

INDIA: It's the same story in Hinduism. Although modern Hinduism recognises a multitude of gods (possessing different influences on human affairs), yet the Indian sacred books show that originally it had been far otherwise.

Speaking of Brahm, the Supreme God:

- Of Him whose glory is so great, there is no image. (*Veda*)
- [He] illumines all, delights all, whence all proceeded; that by which they live when born, and that to which all must return. (*Veda*)
- He whom the mind alone can perceive; whose essence eludes the external organs, who has no visible parts, who exists from eternity.... The soul of all beings, whom no being can comprehend. (*Institutes of Menu*)

In these passages there is a trace of pantheism, but the very language employed bears testimony to the existence among the Hindus at one period of a far purer faith.

LATER: THE NUMBER OF "GODS" INCREASED

Ancient textual evidence shows that the trend was to **increase** the number of gods as time passed, rather than decrease them. (Siegfried H. Horn, *Records of the Past Illuminate the Bible* Washington, DC.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1975, p. 12. Emphasis added)

As an example of how far this trend has developed over the past 4,000 years, it is calculated that today the Hindu religion has 600,000 gods!

It was only the later nations who were POLYtheists (worshipping many gods).

Knowing this will help us to understand

- (a) the origin of the Sumerian “gods”
- (b) how these crept into Sumerian astronomy.

(This is relevant, because it is this very Sumerian astronomy which our friend Mr Sitchin is misunderstanding.)

APPLYING DIVINE QUALITIES TO MEN

As time passed, the Sumerians took the attributes that were ascribed to the one Creator of all, and began to apply those same qualities to various dead human heroes.

In this way, new “gods” *usurped* the honours normally ascribed to the Creator Himself. Then as mortals increasingly came to be worshipped as gods, the direct adoration of the Creator was ultimately discontinued.

Hesiod (quoted above) is confirmed by the Hebrew writers Moses and David: “And they called the people unto the sacrifices of *their gods*”, “the sacrifices of *the dead*”. (Numbers 25:1-3; Psalm 106:28)

Certain dead men were now called “gods”.

To sum up what we have just noted, the early “gods” of the nations, including Sumeria, have an interesting origin. They were actually historical persons – who in real life had been heroes.

At first they were simply respected as men or women of society. After their deaths, they continued to be honoured for their heroic deeds or social status, until ultimately they were elevated to the status of gods.

HOW THESE “GODS” CAME TO BE LINKED TO PARTICULAR STARS

The idea that their spirits had ascended to the sky led to the custom of identifying them with particular stars. From this arose the belief that the stars exercised a benign influence on the affairs of mankind – which, taken one step further, developed into astrology. (This history is traced in my book *Stolen Identity*. To order an e-book version you can go to <<http://www.beforeus.com/stolen-id.php>>. Or for the physical version please go to <http://www.beforeus.com/shopcart_hc.html> and scroll down to Item No. 36.)

And that brings us face to face with the Anunnaki. *Anunnaki* was the name given to a group of Sumerian, Akkadian and Babylonian gods. The word in its various forms - *a-nuna*, *a-nuna-ke-ne* or *a-nun-na* – means, simply, “*of royal blood*” or “*princely offspring*”. Nothing more.

SEE FOR YOURSELF ANUNNAKI IN THE ANCIENT TEXTS

Now, would you like to check this out? To study the occurrences of “*Anunnaki*” in the ancient texts, here is all you have to do:

I invite you – no, I challenge you – to

- * Go to <http://www.sitchiniswrong.com>
- * Then click “*Anunnaki*” on the left.
- * Then click the link which says “Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Literature search for *Anunnaki*”
- * Then watch the video, as Sumerian languages expert Dr Michael Heiser, searches the *Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Literature* right before your eyes, for this Sumerian word “*Anunnaki*.”

This is what you will find. There are 182 occurrences of the name *Anunnaki*, which was ***a collective term for deities in general***.

Dr Heiser generously supplies a PDF file of the search results, but it is better if YOU do the search, since you will be able to click through the search results and get to English translations of the hits.

The *Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Literature* (maintained by Oxford University) gives you the most up-to-date scholarly translations of Sumerian literature. It enables you to ***see for yourself*** whether Sitchin's “translations” are genuine or bogus.

MY CHALLENGE

So when our friend Sitchin tells us that:

- (a) the Sumerians believed there were twelve planets, and
- (b) the Anunnaki were space travelers, who came from the planet Nibiru

it is simply not so!

I don't know how to put this more gently, but he is *fabricating data*.

This is not a question of how he translates texts, It's simply that these ideas *don't exist in any cuneiform text* at all.

Please, Mr Sitchin, show me any evidence from the Sumerian texts themselves – even just one line of one cuneiform text - that says the Anunnaki come from a planet called Nibiru or a 12th planet (or any planet).

You will discover, when you search, that what I am now telling you is true. *There are no such texts*.

DOES SITCHIN HAVE A SECRET TEXT?

Could Mr Sitchin have a secret text unknown to everyone else?

The answer is NO.

As Dr Mike Heiser points out:

Literally every cuneiform text that has any astronomical comment has been translated, catalogued, indexed, and discussed in the available academic literature. The tablets are often quite detailed, even discussing mathematical calculations of the appearance of planetary bodies in the sky, on the horizon, and in relation to other stars. (<http://www.sitchiniswrong.com>)

If Mr Sitchin has a text that no one else on earth knows about, then why does he wriggle away when asked to produce such a text?

I have asked him. Dr Heiser has asked him.

We don't want to bash a person; we're dealing here with an important subject.

The truth is this. "*Anunnaki*" has nothing to do with aliens. That's just like someone watching the X-files and thinking it's real.

I don't doubt that Zecharia Sitchin is a nice guy; he's just wrong. Nothing personal. The truth is not that our friend is ignorant. It is that *he knows so much that isn't so*.

TO SUMMARISE

HERE'S THE FICTION: The *Anunnaki* came from a planet called Nibiru. They imparted their knowledge to the Sumerians. The word *Anunnaki* means "*those who came down from heaven*". So goes the story.

He tells us that this is found in the Sumerian texts. If so, then doubtless the Jolly Green Giant is too.

HERE'S THE FACT: No, the word *Anunnaki* does **not** mean "*those who came down from heaven*", at all!

The word *Anunnaki* in its various forms - *a-nuna*, *a-nuna-ke-ne* or *a-nun-na* - means "*of royal blood*" or "*princely offspring*". Just that. Nothing more.

Bang goes the Anunnaki theory!!!

5

DIN AND GUR

You may recall that I had asked Zecharia Sitchin to tell me in *what ancient Sumerian text* were the “rockets”? (See Chapter 2.)

He replied that the Sumerian terms DIN and GUR meant “*people of the fiery rockets*” and Anunnaki meant “*those who came down from heaven*”.

That was his brief response, hand scribbled over my letter.

Oddly enough, my request to identify the Sumerian text was again *sidestepped*.

Regarding those two terms DIN and GIR, Mike Heiser sent me a file from two online Sumerian lexicons. Halloran's is now in print. (You can find online reviews from academic journals.) The other is the (University of) *Pennsylvania Sumerian Dictionary* (PSD) project. I understand three volumes are in print so far, but the data are all online.

Because the information below is detailed, you may want to just skim over it quickly to catch an overview. And then, at the end of this chapter I shall summarise it for you.

1. *Halloran's Sumerian Lexicon* (online at <http://www.sumerian.org/>)

sumerlex.htm and in print now) informs us that a range of Sumerian signs are transliterated “GIR”:

dingir: god, deity; determinative for divine beings
(di, 'decision', + ġar, 'to deliver')

Notice that the two elements of DINGIR (the word for deity) are rendered from two signs that mean “*deliver a decision*.” This makes sense – it’s what gods do – they issue decrees. This has nothing to do with a flying projectile.

2. *Pennsylvania Sumerian Dictionary* gives us all the possible “GIR” signs:

GIR2

ġir [FLASH] wr. ġir2 "to flash"

ġir [SCORPION] wr. ġir2 "scorpion" Akk. *zuqaqīpu*

ġiri [DAGGER] wr. ġiri2; urudġiri2; me2-er; me-er; me-ri "razor; sword, dagger" Akk. *naglabu*; *patru*

GIR2.BU.HA

ġirgid [FISH] wr. ġir2-gid2

ku

6; ġir-gid2

ku

6 "a fish"

GIR2.ĠGA2×_U_&_U_.RA

ġiri'ura [KNIFE] wr. ġiri2-ur3-ra "a type of knife"

GIR2.GUL

ġirgul [~WOOL] wr. ġir2-gul "a qualification of wool"

GIR2.HA

ġir [FISH] wr. ġir2

ku

6; ġirku

6 "a fish"

GIR2.KAK

ġirizal [SCALPEL] wr. ġiri2-zal; ġiri2-KAK "scalpel"

GIR2.LAGAB.HA

ġirniġin [FISH] wr. ġir2-niġin2

ku

6 "a fish"

ġirrin [FISH] wr. gir2-rinku

6 "a fish"

GIR2.LAL

ġirila [BUTCHER] wr. ġiri2-la2 "butcher" Akk. *ṭābihu*

GIR2._I

ġirizal [SCALPEL] wr. ġiri2-zal; ġiri2-KAK "scalpel"

GIR2._U_.A.DU.RA.HA

ġirnunaDUra [FISH] wr. gir2-nun-na-DU-raku

6 "a fish"

GIR2.PA.A

ġiriPAa [KNIFE] wr. ġiri2-PA-a; ġiri-PA-na "a knife"

GIR2.TAB

ġirtab [SCORPION] wr. ġir2-tab "scorpion" Akk. *zuqaqīpu*

GIR2.U2

GIRU [FISH] wr. GIR2.U2 "type of fish"

GIR2@g

ad [BUSH] wr. ad5; ad2 "a thorn bush" Akk. *ašāgu; eddidu; eddittu*

kišig [ACACIA] wr. u

2kišig2; kišig2; ġeškišig2; ġeškišig; u

2kiši10; u

2kišig; u

2ki

ši5; kišix(IKI.SAG@nl) "an acacia" Akk. *ašāgu*

tab [BURN] wr. tab; tab2 "to burn, fire; to dye (red); to brand, mark"

Akk. *hamāṭu; šamāṭu; sarāpu*

ul [ANYTHING] wr. ul4 "anything, something" Akk. *mimma*

ul [BRIGHT] wr. ul4; ul6 "to become bright, shine" Akk. *namru; nabāṭu*

ul [FIRMAMENT] wr. ul4; ul5 "vault of heaven, firmament" Akk. *šupuk šame*

ul [GREATLY] wr. ul4 "greatly" Akk. *magal*

ul [GRIND] wr. ul4 "to grind" Akk. *qemu*

ul [HASTEN] wr. ul4 "to hasten, (be) quick; (to be) early"

Akk. *arāhu; hamāṭu; harāpu*

ul [TERROR] wr. ul4 "terror" Akk. *pirittu*

ul [UNMNG] wr. ul4; ul2; ulul; ulul2 "; " Akk. *qerbetu*

GIR2@G

GIRgunu [BIRD] wr. GIR2@g-GIR2@g; GIR2@gbi;

GIR2@g; IGIR2@gmušen "a bird"

GIR2@G.BI

GIRgunu [BIRD] wr. GIR2@g-GIR2@g; GIR2@gbi;
GIR2@g; |GIR2@g|mušen "a bird"

GIR2@g.GA_

ulhe [FIRMAMENT] wr. ul4-he2 "firmament, vault of the sky" Akk. *šupuk šame*

GIR2@G.GIR2@G

GIRgunu [BIRD] wr. GIR2@g-GIR2@g; GIR2@gbi;
GIR2@g; |GIR2@g|mušen "a bird"

GIR2@g.HU

GIRgunu [BIRD] wr. GIR2@g-GIR2@g; GIR2@gbi;
GIR2@g; |GIR2@g|mušen "a bird"

GIR2@g.IU.GUDI

addu [BIRD] wr. ad2-du7; ab2-dumušen "a bird"

GIR3

ġir [PRIDE] wr. ġir3 "to take pride in; to make splendid" Akk. *šarāhu*
ġiri [FOOT] wr. ġiri3; me-ri; ġiri16 "via, by means of, under the authority of
someone; foot; path" Akk. *šēpu*
huš [REDDISH] wr. huš; huš2 "furious, angry; (to be) reddish, ruddy"
Akk. *ezzu*

imeri [UNMNG] wr. imerix(GIR3) "?" Akk. ?

ir [MIGHTY] wr. ir9; ir3 "mighty" Akk. *gašru*

GIR3 BAD

ġiri bad [MOVE] wr. ġiri3 bad "to spread the legs, to move" Akk. ?

GIR3 DU

ġiri gub [STEP] wr. ġiri3 gub "to step in/on/out" Akk. *kabāsu*

ġiri gub [WAIT FOR] wr. ġiri3 gub "to wait for" Akk. *qu''u*

GIR3 GAR

ġiri ġar [TRAMPLE] wr. ġiri3 ġar "to trample" Akk. *rahāsu*

GIR3 GIR2@g

ġiri ul [RUSH] wr. ġiri3 ul4 "to rush" Akk. *hamātu*

GIR3 KI_

ġiri saga [TRAMPLE] wr. ġiri3 saga11; ġiri3 sa-ga; ġiri3 sag2 "to trample,
destroy"

GIR3 KU

ġiri dab [TAKE TO THE ROAD] wr. ġiri3 dab5 "to take to the road"
Akk. *girram/harrānam sabātu*

GIR3 |LAGAB.LAGAB|

ġiri niġin [CIRCLE] wr. ġiri3 niġin "to circle" Akk. ?

GIR3 |PA.GA_|

ġiri saga [TRAMPLE] wr. ġiri3 saga11; ġiri3 sa-ga; ġiri3 sag2 "to trample, destroy"

GIR3 PAP

ġiri kur [CHANGE] wr. ġiri3 kur2 "to change" Akk. ?

GIR3 PAP KU

ġiri kur dab [TAKE AN UNFAMILIAR PATH] wr. ġiri3 kur2 dab5 "to take an unfamiliar path" Akk. ?

GIR3 SA.GA

ġiri saga [TRAMPLE] wr. ġiri3 saga11; ġiri3 sa-ga; ġiri3 sag2 "to trample, destroy"

GIR3 SI

ġiri sig [PERFORM SERVICE] wr. ġiri3 sig9 "to serve someone/something, perform service"

GIR3 UŠ

ġiri us [STEP UPON] wr. ġiri3 us2 "to step upon" Akk. *kabāsu*

GIR3 ZE2.IR

ġiri zer [SLIP] wr. ġiri3 ze2-er "to slip" Akk. *nehelsu*

GIR3 |ZI&ZI.LAGAB|

ġiri zukum [TRAMPLE] wr. ġiri3 zukum "to trample" Akk. *kabāsu*

GIR3.lA_x3|

ġirisuhub [HOOF?] wr. ġiri3-suhub2 "hoof?"

GIR3.lA_x3|.HU

ġirmul [BIRD] wr. ġir3-mulmušen; ur5-mulmušen; ir3-mulmušen; kir4-mulmušen "a bird"

GIR3.BAL

ġiribal [FLOODING] wr. ġiri3-bal "flooding" Akk. *rihsu*

GIR3.BU.DA.HU

ġirigida [BIRD] wr. ġiri3-gid2-damušen "a bird" Akk. *saqātu; šēpšu arik*

GIR3.DU._A

ġiriġena [PATH] wr. ġiri3-ġen-na "path" Akk. *tallaktu*

GIR3.GA

ġiriGA [VESSEL] wr. ġiri3-GA "type of vessel"

GIR3.GI.LU.HU

ġirgilum [BIRD] wr. ġiri16-i-lumušen; ġur8-galmušen?; ġir-gi-lummušen; ġir-gi4-lumušen; ġir3-gi-lumušen; kir4-gi4-lummušen "a bird" Akk. *ġirgili; saku*

GIR3.LAM

ġirlam [BASKET] wr. ġir3-lam; gi-lam "a basket" Akk. ?

GIR3.MA.A_

ĝiriman [BASIN] wr. ĝiri3-ma-an "basin"

GIR3.PAD.DU

ĝiripadra [BONE] wr. ĝiri3-pad-ra2 "bone" Akk. *esemtu*

GIR3.PAP.HU

ĝirpap [BIRD] wr. ĝiri3-papmušen; ir3-papmušen "a bird"

GIR3.SI

ĝirisi [TOE] wr. ĝiri3-si "toe"

GIR3.SUM.GA

ĝirsiga [ATTENDANT] wr. ĝiri3-sig10-ga "an attendant" Akk. *gerseqqu*

GIR3.TAR

ĝirikud [CRIPPLE] wr. ĝiri3-kud "cripple"

GIR3.UD.HU

ĝirbabbar [BIRD] wr. ĝiri3-babbarmušen "a bird"

GIR3.UŠ

ĝiri'us [TRACK] wr. ĝiri3-us2 "track"

ĝiri'uš [QUALITY] wr. giri3-uš "a designation of quality"

SUMMARY

Mr Sitchin tells us that the Sumerian terms DIN and GUR mean “*people of the fiery rockets*”. But he could produce no text supporting his claim.

As it turns out, neither in *Halloran's Sumerian Lexicon* nor in *Pennsylvania Sumerian Dictionary* does DIN, GIR, or DIN+GIR have anything to do with a flying projectile.

The “DINGIR” combination is merely the Sumerian sign for deity. Nothing more.

Please, Mr Sitchin, don't shrug off this evidence. Don't you think we deserve an explanation?

6

THE “NEPHILIM”

Have you ever wondered who the *Nephilim* were? That term is bandied around quite a lot these days. It is a Hebrew word found in the book of Genesis, and referred to by Mr Sitchin.

The Genesis text says:

...the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose... There were giants [nephilim] in the earth in those days. (Genesis 6:2,4)

IT IS CLAIMED: The word "*nephilim*" means "*those who came down from above*" or "*those who descended to earth*" or "*people of the fiery rockets*" (Sitchin, *The Twelfth Planet*, pp. vii, 128ff.).

These translations, of course, serve Mr Sitchin's purpose - to persuade us that the *Nephilim* were ancient astronauts.

IN REALITY: This claim evaporates in the face of two simple facts:

1. It violates the Hebrew language.

2. The word “*Nephilim*” has no such meanings. Mr Sitchin’s translations are completely out of step with the Hebrew Bible.

Hebrew scholar Michael Heiser explains this quite clearly:

Sitchin assumes "nephilim" comes from the Hebrew word "naphal" which usually means "to fall." He then forces the meaning "to come down" onto the word, creating his "to come down from above" translation.

In the form we find it in the Hebrew Bible, if the word *nephilim* came from Hebrew *naphal*, it would not be spelled as we find it.

The form *nephilim* cannot mean "fallen ones" (the spelling would then be *nephulim*). Likewise *nephilim* does not mean "those who fall" or "those who fall away" (that would be *nophelim*).

The only way in Hebrew to get *nephilim* from *naphal* by the rules of Hebrew morphology (word formation) would be to presume a noun spelled *naphil* and then pluralize it. I say "presume" since this noun does not exist in biblical Hebrew – unless one counts Genesis 6:4 and Numbers 13:33, the two occurrences of *nephilim* - but that would then be assuming what one is trying to prove!

However, in Aramaic the noun *naphil(a)* does exist. It means "giant," making it easy to see why the Septuagint (the ancient Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible) translated *nephilim* as *gigantes* ("giant").

Why does Mr Sitchin want us to believe that *nephilim* means "those who CAME DOWN from heaven"? For no other reason than to make the *nephilim* sound like ancient astronauts.

CASE RESTS ON 4 REQUIRED ERRORS

And that is why our friend has to make these four necessary errors:

- (1) That the *nephilim* are the Genesis “*sons of God*”.
- (2) *Nephilim* means “*those who came down from heaven*”
- (3) The *nephilim* were *extraterrestrials*.
- (4) He confuses Aramaic with Hebrew.

But these errors are essential to his story. Without these four distortions of fact he would have no case.

It is necessary that we deal with these.

MISTAKE 1 – CONFUSING 2 GROUPS

Mr Sitchin tells us that *nephilim* is another name for the *sons of God*, and to prove this he quotes Genesis:

There were giants [*nephilim*] in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the *sons of God* came in unto the *daughters of men*, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown. (Genesis 6:4)

Mr Sitchin *confuses two separate characters* in the Genesis 6 story - the *sons of God* and the *nephilim*. But a careful reading shows that these two are NOT the same. They are different groups. (You can study my detailed report on this in Appendix A.)

You will notice that there are actually three separate and distinct entities in the above passage:

1. nephilim (giants, bullies)
2. sons of God
3. daughters of men

In agreement with Genesis is the Qumran Scrolls fragment of the book of Enoch (1 Enoch 6:4-8) known as 4Q201, fragment 1, col. iii (=4QEnoch^a aramaic).

It likewise shows the *giants* to be different from the "Watchers" (Enoch's "Watchers: are equivalent to the Genesis *"sons of God"*).

Sitchin equates the two different groups as though they were the same. But the ancient texts do not.

MISTAKE 2 - TRANSLATION IMPOSSIBILITY

Mr Sitchin says that "*nephilim*" means "*those who came down from above*" or "*those who descended to earth*" or "*people of the fiery rockets*".

But this is *a translation impossibility* with respect to biblical Hebrew grammar.

Sitchin's mistake is this:

1. First, he assumes that "*nephilim*" in the Hebrew Bible comes from the word "naphal" (*to fall*).
2. Then he forces the meaning "*to come down*".
3. Then he creates his "*to come down from above*" translation.

But the verb “*to go down*” in biblical Hebrew is **not** *naphal*; it is *yarad*.

The verb *naphal* can mean something close to “*came down*” **under one condition**: it must occur in the *Hiphil* (“causative”) stem in Hebrew grammar. If you know Hebrew, you will know this is because the *Hiphil* stem adds either a prefixed letter to the verb and an a-class vowel (or both) in the verb conjugations, and any such occurrences in the Hebrew Bible are therefore **not** spelled “*nephilim*.”

Sitchin’s translation of “*Nephilim*” (plural) as “*those who came down from Heaven to Earth*” is not even implied by the biblical Hebrew. The word “*Nephil*” (singular), while translated into English as “***giant***” (which is one correct meaning of the word), means, ***primarily***, “***bully***” or “***tyrant***”.

Please, Mr Sitchin, would you explain:

1. How is your interpretation of the word “*nephilim*” at all viable in light of the rules of Hebrew morphology?
2. Can you provide any evidence that “*naphal*” has anything to do with fire or rockets, since you translate “*nephilim*” as “*people of the fiery rockets*”? Can you please give us just one single ancient text where *naphal* has such meanings?

MISTAKE 3 - EXTRATERRESTRIALS

Mr Sitchin is also confused in his statements of fact about the “*Nephilim*”. He misapplies it to extraterrestrials or ancient astronauts.

According to Genesis, the “*nephilim*” were NOT from outer space, but were people born on earth. Genesis specifically tells us who they were. It says, “When *men* began to multiply on the earth”.
(Genesis 6:1)

Arguments using the Bible and ancient clay tablets may sound very scholarly to the unwary. But – with respect, Mr Sitchin’s use of the Bible to prove visits by aliens *contradicts the Bible’s own explanation*.

MISTAKE 4 - LANGUAGES IGNORANCE


Mr Sitchin demonstrates that he *cannot tell the difference between Hebrew and Aramaic*, which use the same alphabet.

In his book *Stairway to Heaven* (pp.110-112) Sitchin quotes from another Dead Sea scroll text which tells the same Genesis 6 story of the sons of God/Watchers and their offspring, the *nephilim*. It is called the *Genesis Apocryphon*.

In an effort to defend his idea that the *nephilim* and the *sons of God* are the same, he *mistranslates* this text and fails to notice it is written in Aramaic, not Hebrew.

He writes: “But as we examine the Hebrew original, we find it does not say ‘*watchers*’; it says ‘*Nephilim*’.” (Sitchin, *Stairway to Heaven*)

This statement shows that Mr Sitchin did not know the Qumran text was written in Aramaic, not Hebrew. Not only that, but he also mistranslated it - because the word “*Watcher*” is actually in the text he quotes - AND has pictured in his book!



Above is an image of the two-line Aramaic passage in Sitchin's book. And immediately below it is a translation provided by an Aramaic expert. (*The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* Vol. 1:Q1-4Q273 - Vol II: 4Q274-11Q31 CD , ed. by Florentino Garcia Martinez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, scrolls specialists. This text is in volume 1).

In line 1 of the above Aramaic text, the left-most word is the word for "*Watchers*". And in line 2 the left-most Aramaic word is "*nephilim*."

You see, they are *both* there. Contrary to Sitchin's claim, "*Watchers*" is not missing.

It appears that Mr Sitchin did not know the word "*Watchers*" was there in the text.

This is to me an amazing error on Sitchin's part.

It appears that Mr Sitchin ***does not know*** much about the ancient languages in which he claims expertise, but this error is especially shocking.

Why? Because it shows Sitchin ***cannot tell the difference*** between Hebrew and Aramaic - which both use the same alphabet.

TO SUMMARISE

- The *nephilim* and the *sons of God* were two different groups of people.
- Neither was from outer space. Both groups were earthlings – 100 percent human.
- The word "*nephilim*" does not mean "*those who came down from above*" or "*those who descended to earth*" or "*people of the fiery rockets*". That is a translation impossibility with respect to biblical Hebrew grammar.

I am sorry to say this, but with Mr Sitchin wrong on all these matters, we must surely wonder about the validity of his theory at large.

For more detailed information
on this topic, see Appendix A.

7

ELOHIM

As a newly wed, Bonnie May decided to invite her husband's parents for dinner and show them she was a good wife and taking excellent care of their son. So she decided to make all their favorite things to eat.

As she and her husband went shopping, she kept asking him, "Do they like this, do they like that?"

At one stage he quickly answered, "My dad loves coconut cream pie."

She practised for two days and combined many recipes until she finally came out with a winner.

She had 13 practice pies in front of her and decided to give everyone in the neighborhood a pie. She kept only the winner pies for the dinner.

She sat the gorgeous pie right in front of her father-in-law and sat down. "Will you cut it please," she asked?

"This looks wonderful," he said, "What kind is it?"

“Your favorite,” she proudly stated, “It’s Coconut Cream Pie”.

“Oh, Bonnie, I’m so sorry but that’s not my favorite, coconut custard is. I actually don’t like any kind of creamed pies,” he said, as her heart dropped to her knees.

Coconut cream and coconut custard, they sounded so close but so different.

Bonnie recalls, “Just one little word difference and it ruined my whole day!”

What a difference one word makes!

And now let’s consider that tricky word *Elohim*. Mr Sitchin uses it to prove that space travellers from another world created our human race.

Wow!

IT IS CLAIMED: Ancient astronauts created the human race. The Bible itself says so: “And God [= the gods] said, Let *us* make man.” (Genesis 1:26)

The word “God” is from the Hebrew *elohim*, which is *always plural* (meaning “gods”).

These “gods” were a group of Anunnaki from the planet Nibiru who mixed their genes with the eggs of early female hominoids, and created human beings.

IN REALITY: Firstly, according to Hebrew grammar, the word *elohim* is ***NOT always plural***. The word *elohim* often refers to a single person. Mr Sitchin is ignoring the rules of Hebrew grammar.

Secondly, the word's meaning is always determined by grammatical and contextual clues.

Grammar dictates:

- the formation of words,
- the relationship of words to each other, and
- the meaning of those words with respect to that arrangement.

Are you with me? If one does not pay attention to the rules of grammar that have governed the languages of ancient texts, one can make the texts say anything . . . And Sitchin does just that. He ***ignores basic rules of Hebrew grammar*** to press his viewpoint on *elohim*.

In the famous El-Amarna tablets, we see the ancient Akkadian language using the plural word for "gods" (*'ilanu*) to refer to a single person or god - just as in the case of Hebrew *elohim*. On his website, Semitic language scholar Michael Heiser posts examples of this and asks, "Why is Sitchin unaware of this material?" (<http://www.michaelsheiser.com/akkadianilanu57.pdf>)

The form of the word *elohim* is plural. But in its meaning, *elohim* can be either singular or plural, depending on context. If you have studied a language, you will know that ***meaning is determined by context***, not by a list of glosses in a dictionary (which are only OPTIONS – the translator must look to context for accuracy).

The meaning of *elohim* in an occurrence is discerned in one of these three ways:

1. Grammatical indications elsewhere in the text.
(These help us determine if a singular or plural meaning is meant.)
2. Grammatical rules in Hebrew that are true in the language as a whole.
3. Historical and logical context.

In our English language, similar rules apply. For example, consider words such as: "*deer*", "*sheep*", "*fish*". You cannot tell if one, or more than one, of these animals is meant. To help you tell whether "sheep", for instance, is plural or singular, you need other words to go with it. Sometimes these other words are verbs that help you tell.

Example 1: If the sentence says, "The sheep *is* lost", the verb "*is*" is singular. It goes with a singular subject. So you know that in this case "*sheep*" is singular.

Example 2: If the sentence says, "The sheep *are* lost", the word "*are*" is a plural verb, which always goes with a plural subject. So in this case "*sheep*" is plural.

Of course, this is just basic grammar - and every language has grammar. Biblical Hebrew has its own ways of telling us if *elohim* means ONE person or many gods. It matches the noun *elohim* to singular or plural verbs, or with singular or plural pronouns.

So does *elohim* in the biblical book of Genesis refer to a group of astronauts (plural), who were later referred to as "gods"?

In the beginning *God created* the heaven and the earth.
(Genesis 1:1)

It is Hebrew grammar: In this case *elohim* (God) is singular because the verb (“**created**”) is third masculine singular in its grammar.

And **God said**, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. They shall rule the fish of the sea, the birds of the sky, the cattle, the whole earth, and all the creeping things that creep on earth." (Genesis 1:26)

It is Hebrew grammar: *Elohim* (God) is singular because the verb (“**said**”) is third masculine singular.

But, I hear someone ask, “So why the plural pronouns ‘*us*’ and ‘*our*’?”

From related Scriptures there is reason to believe that “*us*” and “*our*” indicates the presence of the divine council here.

How can we know that “*us*” and “*our*” does not refer back to *elohim*? The very next verse tells us:

And God **created** man in **His** image, in the image of God **He created** him; male and female **He created** them. (Genesis 1:27)

Three times we have a singular Hebrew verb (Hebrew *bara* = *create*).

In verse 26 (“let US make mankind in OUR image”), if GOD were speaking (as though referring to himself as a plurality or to a group of the *elohim*, as though that’s what the word meant), we’d see PLURAL verbs here in v. 27, but we don’t.

Remember this rule: ***It is the surrounding grammar that determines whether a word is singular or plural.***

Oh, and something else. Contrary to the speculation of some well-known “alternative researchers” out there, like Laurence Gardner, William Henry, and Lloyd Pye, *elohim* does **not** mean “*shining ones*” or “*luminous ones*”. If you would like to investigate this further, there is some helpful information at:

<http://www.sitchiniswrong.com/Elohim/Elohim.htm>

TO SUMMARISE

Contrary to Mr Sitchin’s claim, the book of Genesis does not endorse his theory of astronaut “gods” creating human beings.

Genesis states quite plainly that the same Supreme Being that created the worlds in space (Genesis 1:1) is also the very One who created mankind (verses 26-27).

In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth....
And God created man in His image, in the image of God
He created him; male and female He created them. (Genesis
1:1, 27)

It is true also that the Creator possesses the plural of majesty, the plural of absoluteness – it is He who causes all things to be. There is no creative power apart from Him. In this sense, the word *elohim* refers to the divine in a comprehensive and absolute way.

Any attempt to squeeze ancient astronauts into this word *elohim* is cosmically silly. Is it necessary to say more?

8

NIBIRU

IT IS CLAIMED: The Sumerian texts speak of a planet beyond Pluto called Nibiru. Nibiru sweeps close to the earth every 3,600 years.

Have you heard that?

Again, this idea originated with self-proclaimed ancient languages scholar Zecharia Sitchin.

Some believers in Sitchin's theory also call Nibiru "Planet X".

Based on Mr Sitchin's claims, conflicting theories have arisen about the effects of a planet passing as close as 14,000,000 miles from Earth. These range from total catastrophe to no significant effect at all.

However, such a serious claim has some people quite frightened. So we need to look at it.

I remember some Sitchin believers setting a date for Nibiru's "return": May-June of 2003.

As that date approached, I received enquiries from worried readers. One lady in the USA wrote:

I am very concerned about Planet X. I would like to know what you have to say about it. I would trust your information much more than some of the websites out there. Have you seen it? I need to know if we need to expect this event or what. Please write me back soon. Thank you!

IMPOSSIBLE ORBIT SPEED

My response was a three-page report in *Update International* No. 42 (May to July 2003) in which I stated:

... Planet X would need an extremely elliptical orbit for it to come so close to the earth as theorised.

The distance table compiled by one pro “planet passby” website shows how the planet would speed up very rapidly when it neared the sun, which explains why we cannot see it yet.

But, according to such calculations, when it passes through the inner solar system it will have a speed of about 7.8 million miles per hour. However, there is a problem with this. At the surface of the sun the escape velocity for our solar system (the speed required for an object to stop orbiting the sun) is just 1.3 million miles per hour. This means that if Planet X passed through at the speed of 7.8 million miles per hour it would simply fly out, never to be seen again.

This means that for any planet in orbit around our sun – including Planet X – the calculations that bring it near Earth in June this year (and for it to remain in orbit) are impossible.

The fact is, there is still no sign of any planet approaching the orbit of our earth. And there is no sign of Planet X coming anywhere near us this year.

And, of course, no Planet Nibiru appeared.

To be fair, Sitchin himself did not call Nibiru Planet X, nor did he say it was returning in 2003.

But now the year 2012 is being linked to this theory. And I receive questions about it from more worried persons. So it is time to give this whole matter an honest answer.

IN REALITY:

Here are the five questions we need to ask:

- Is *Nibiru* a planet beyond Pluto?
- Is *Nibiru* connected with the Anunnaki?
- Is *Nibiru* a planet that passes through our solar system every 3,600 years?
- Did the Sumerians know this?
- Is there any single text in the entire cuneiform record that says any of these things?

Nibiru?

Okay, stop right there.

Nibiru?

Yes, says Mr Sitchin. Nibiru passes through our solar system every 3,600 years. It is in the Sumerian texts.

Well, I asked him, Which texts?

Response: deathly silence.


After all the searching, by now Sitchin's Sumerian texts should have been bobbling cheerily into view.

Then, where were these texts hiding? On the moon? On Planet X itself?

Here is the truth: There is ***not a single text*** in the entire cuneiform record that speaks of a planet called *Nibiru* that passes through our solar system every 3,600 years. Not one text.

Sadly for Sitchin and his followers, the answer to each of the five above questions is **NO. A deafening NO.**

And how can we be sure? From a study of all the cuneiform texts that exist.



After a painstaking investigation concerning Nibiru, it is now painfully clear that in the entire cuneiform record there *is not one single text* that:

- ...says *nibiru* is a planet beyond Pluto
- ...connects *nibiru* with the Anunnaki
- ...has *nibiru* cycling through our solar system every 3,600 years.

Have you ever seen such a text? Of course you haven't. And so the question must – must – be asked: WHY NOT? Indeed, we are forced to conclude that it is only in Mr Sitchin's head.

DO YOUR OWN SEARCH FOR “NIBIRU” IN CUNEIFORM TEXTS

Is there anyone still not convinced? I recommend that you go to the following website to view a video which will show you where to find the leading dictionary of cuneiform words online (for free).

<http://www.sitchiniswrong.com/nibiru/nibiru.html>

There you will be able to watch a Sumerian languages expert as he looks up the entry for *nibiru* (spelled *neberu* in scholarly transliteration) and check to see if any of Sitchin's ideas are found in any Akkadian or Sumerian texts that mention *nibiru*.

Now I realise that Sitchin comes across as though he were an expert. However, I regret to say this “expert” is not being truthful to you. There is *not even one such text*.

According to the texts, Nibiru is *NEVER identified as a planet beyond Pluto*.

But please don't take my word for it. Look it up yourself. On that same website you will find an exhaustive listing of the word "*nibiru*" in astronomical texts and/or astronomical contexts.

WHAT DO THE TEXTS SAY ABOUT NIBIRU?

In consulting the ancient Sumerian documents, we discover that Nibiru cannot refer to a planet beyond Pluto for these two reasons:

1. The documents say that Nibiru is *visible EVERY YEAR*. This demolishes Sitchin's theory of a 3,600 cycle for it.
2. The Sumerians linked each planet to one of their gods. *Their texts actually tell us which planets are which gods* in their mythology. And the Sumero-Akkadian planet-to-god correlations *disagree with Sitchin's*.

You see, there is a specific Sumero-Akkadian text that says *Nibiru* is the name of the Sumerian god Marduk. The text also indicates that Marduk was the name of a planet that was linked to that god – the *planet Jupiter*. Nibiru is declared to be either a star associated intimately with Jupiter or IS Jupiter. Nibiru can't be a planet beyond Pluto if it's Jupiter.

It is nearly always Jupiter-Marduk, but once Mercury. Nibiru is *NEVER ANYTHING BEYOND PLUTO or the visible planets*.

And here's another revelation from the Sumerian documents:

3. *Nibiru is never mentioned in any respect with the Anunnaki*; it is never said to have been or be inhabited.

Not only that, but contrary to what Mr Sitchin led us to believe, the Sumerian texts mention only five of the planets. Cuneiform astronomical texts never list any more than five planets (seven if one counts the sun and the moon).

HOW TO PROVE THIS FOR YOURSELF

Does anyone want to dispute any one of these points? Let me repeat, you can check it for yourself:

1. Consult the Sumero-Akkadian lexical lists (cuneiform bilingual dictionaries) prepared by the great Sumerian scholar Benno Landsberger This is in the scholarly journal of Near Eastern studies produced by the University of Chicago's Oriental Institute.. (B. Landsberger and J.V. Kinnier Wilson, "The Fifth Tablet of Enuma Elish," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 20 (1961): 172ff)

2. Simply look up the references to *Nibiru* in the *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary* and then go and look up the English translations in the sources. Fortunately the editors of the monumental *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary* have located and compiled all the places where the word *nibiru* and related forms of that word occur in all surviving tablets.

3. On his website (<<http://www.sitchiniswrong.com>>) Sumerian language scholar Michael Heiser provides an exhaustive list of the word "*nibiru*" in astronomical texts and/or astronomical contexts. He lists for you:

- (a) the Mesopotamian text where the word occurs;
- (b) a Sumero-Akkadian transliteration;
- (c) a brief translation;
- (d) the page references to English translations of the

Mesopotamian text in which the word occurs, so you can check the context and study further.

4. On that same website is a link to a video showing you where to find the leading dictionary of cuneiform words online (for free). You can find that source - and do what he does in the video: look up the entry for *nibiru* (spelled *neberu* in scholarly transliteration) and check for yourself.

Please don't take my word for this. Do it yourself.

WHICH ALTERNATIVE WOULD YOU PICK?

Now, would you give me some advice? If I were to choose one of these two alternatives, which should it be?:

- Let the texts tell me what Nibiru is? Or
- Ignore the Sumerian scribes and follow Mr Sitchin?

If someone's life depended on it, what advice would YOU give?

Are you getting a sinking feeling about Mr Sitchin's teaching? Oh, sure, some will say it's true. And pigs can fly.

Okay, now is my confession time. In *Dead Men's Secrets* (Chapter 11, Section 50) I noted that various ancient races knew of planets beyond Saturn (which remains true). However, I did naively cite Sitchin as an authority for the Sumerians. Now, in all honesty, I must discount that reference. But since the other nations mentioned in my book do not depend on Mr Sitchin as an authority, that small section within *Dead Men's Secrets* remains inviolate.

Nevertheless, my apology is offered. I am an archaeologist, not an expert in the Sumerian language . Moreover, I should have checked carefully the man's claim to be a Sumerian language scholar. Thankyou for your understanding.

9

12 PLANETS IN SUMERIAN THOUGHT?



The above seal is in the Vorderasiatische Museum in Berlin.

This seal is the centerpiece of Mr Sitchin's theory. His whole case about Nibiru (Planet X) pivots on this seal. It stands or falls on his interpretation of this seal.

In his book *The Twelfth Planet*, Zecharia Sitchin uses it to prove that the Sumerians spoke of a 12th planet in our solar system.

IT IS CLAIMED: In the upper left-hand corner of the seal is the sun, surrounded by eleven globes. These are the moon, plus our nine regular planets and the yet to be recognized “Planet X” - Nibiru. Add the sun and you have 12 planets.

IN REALITY: Is Sitchin correct? Unfortunately, this is not the case.

But doesn't this cylinder seal depict 12 planets in our solar system? No, it doesn't. As we shall soon demonstrate.

The cylinder seal pictured above goes by the number "VA243" (so named because it is number 243 in the collection of the Vorderasiatische Museum in Berlin).

To agree with Sitchin, we must

- (a) ignore what the rest of the seal says;
- (b) ignore what is known about Sumerian astronomy from cuneiform astronomical texts (all in scholarly published books); and
- (c) ignore standard Sumerian representations of stars.

But let's catch an overview of Sumerian astronomy first.

SUMERIAN ASTRONOMY

A key element of Sumero-Mesopotamian religion was a concern with heavenly bodies that could be observed with the naked eye - especially the sun, moon, and Venus, due to their ease of visibility.

We observed earlier that the Sumerian culture was a paradox. On

the one hand, the Sumerians, had an advanced knowledge of astronomy, geography, medicine and virtually all the sciences. On the other hand, they were an entirely practical people, with ***no urge to search for truth for its own sake***. They sought for no underlying principles, and undertook no experiments for verification. (Samuel M. Kramer, *From the Tablets of Sumer*. Indian Hills: Falcon's Wing Press, 1956, pp. xviii, 6, 32, 58, 59)

For this reason, their ***astronomy*** dealt only with the ***visible*** – that which might have a practical effect on their everyday life.

ASTRONOMY WAS RELIGIOUS

And they linked astronomy to their religion.

That is why Sumero-Mesopotamian ***religion*** had a key concern with heavenly bodies that could be observed with the naked eye - especially the sun, moon, and Venus, due to their ease of ***visibility***.

(Please note, this has a direct bearing on what we discovered in the previous chapter concerning Nibiru. The Sumerian documents say that Nibiru is ***visible EVERY YEAR***.)

It is important to realize that each visible heavenly body was artistically symbolized - and stood for a deity.


SYMBOLS FOR THE SUN

The sun god symbology was very clear. The sun god was called Shamash (or Utu in the Sumerian language).

One of the world's leading authorities on this subject is Dr Jeremy Black. A well known Sumerian scholar, he was formerly the

Director of the British School of Archaeology in Iraq and more recently a university lecturer in Akkadian and Sumerian at Wolfson College, Oxford.


He reveals that the symbol for the sun was generally a central circle with four extended “arms” with wavy lines (flames?) in between each “arm” (the most common), or sometimes a circle with only wavy lines (flames). The entire symbol was nearly always, if not always (we are not aware of any exceptions) inside a circle. (Jeremy Black, *Gods, Demons, and Symbols of Ancient Mesopotamia: An Illustrated Dictionary*. University of Texas Press, in conjunction with the British Museum, 1992, p. 168)



The sun god was also depicted as the god in flight upon a set of wings (similar to the Egyptian winged disc).

SYMBOL FOR A STAR

The solar disc stood in contrast to the symbol for a star.



This example has eight points. But often the star symbol had six or seven points. The points vary even within the same seal or carving. The number of points was not consistent, but *what the symbol stood for was consistent*. It represented either *a star, planet, or deity* – but NOT the sun. The *star* symbol was sometimes within a circle or, far more often, not within a circle. It is clearly *distinct from the sun symbol*.

The Sumerians came to believe that the spirits of their heroes had ascended to the stars and become gods. From this originated the notion that the stars, instead of being mere inert matter, were each animated by a divine spirit, and were each a wise and holy intelligence.

So the *worship of dead heroes* who were once mere mortals became inseparably blended with the *worship of the heavenly bodies* and the elemental powers of nature. (See my book *Stolen Identity*, chapter 15.)

The star design signified, therefore, a deity or a literal star or a planet.

Since stars were associated with (or considered to be) heavenly beings – gods, a star in Sumero-Mesopotamian artwork represents

either a god or an astronomical body. The same can be said of the sun symbol – it can refer either to the literal sun or to the sun god.

Here's an example of a cylinder seal with Ishtar signaled as the deity by a star:



(Source: Henri Frankfort, *Cylinder Seals: A Documentary Essay on the Art and Religion of the Ancient Near East*. London: Mac-Millan and Co., 1939: Plate XXVI-seal L)

In this example, the obvious star symbol has eight points, and is very similar in design to the star symbol of VA 243. We know it's a star and not the sun because the goddess depicted is Ishtar. (See the discussion in Frankfort, pp.177-178, 236, 254, and Black, p.168. See also the magisterial survey: E. Douglas van Buren, *Symbols of the Gods in Mesopotamian Art*, *Analecta Orientalia* 23, Pontificum Institutum Biblicum, 1945, pp.84-85.)

SUN AND STAR SYMBOLS WERE DEPICTED IN CONTRAST

The three different symbols, one for a star, one for the sun, and one for the moon, were frequently grouped as a threesome. You

will notice that the sun symbol and star symbol were distinguished from each other:




(Source: Ursula Seidl, *Die Babylonischen Kudurru Reliefs*, Tafel 11, Zweite Gruppe, stela "a" = *The Babylonian Kudurru Reliefs*, Plate 11, 2nd Group, stela "a". Note the wavy lines and encircled sun symbol on the right.




Ursula Seidl, *Die Babylonischen Kudurru Reliefs*, Tafel 19, Vierte Gruppe, stela "b" = *The Babylonian Kudurru Reliefs*, Plate 19, 4th Group, relief "b".

In the above stele is depicted the moon, and a star, and the sun. Note the wavy lines with the encircled sun symbol on the lower right.



Here's another zodiac example:



(Source: Ursula Seidl, *Die Babylonischen Kudurru Reliefs*, p. 60
= *The Babylonian Kudurru Reliefs*, p. 60)

The sun symbol (center) and star symbol (right of center) are next to each other under the snake's tail. Note the wavy lines of the sun symbol.

In the above example, note that: (a) the star has seven points, and (b) the stars below it have six points. Note also that these smaller stars are by comparison just dots.


This seven dot/circle arrangement is one of the most common motifs in Mesopotamian art, and denote the Pleiades. The point is that dots = stars in Mesopotamian art when in an astronomical

You will notice that the sun symbol is drawn in a manner consistent with the typical wavy lines, encircled. That unmistakably *distinguishes the sun from the star symbol*. The star symbol signifies the same astronomical body in each case, yet the number of points varies. This means that the *number of points is unimportant* for identifying the star symbol as a STAR or planet – in contrast to the sun.

These examples demonstrate that a *star symbol* can have 6, 7, or 8 points, and it DOES NOT HAVE wavy lines.

OTHER STAR SYMBOL EXAMPLES

Another star symbol of very similar design to VA 243 is shown below (Frankfort, Plate XXXIII – seal b):



The upper left-hand side of this seal contains the winged sun disk above the head of what scholars refer to as a “scorpion man” (note his tail). Just to the right of the winged disk is our star symbol. This time the star has seven points, and is quite similar to VA 243.

Note as well the far upper right corner – the seven stars grouped together are the Pleiades (which we shall see again in a moment).

Below are several examples of seals with six pointed stars: (Frankfort, Plate XXXIII – seal d):



Note the six-pointed stars in the upper left and upper right corners. In both cases, note the presence of accompanying “*dots*” in groups of seven – again, the *stars* of the Pleiades (the “extra dot” over the head of the smaller standing figure denotes a deity as it is a star). The seven dots = the seven stars of the Pleiades (the *dots were interchangeable with pointed stars* to denote stars). As E. Douglas van Buren, an expert on Sumerian and Mesopotamian art comments:

In the earliest representations of the 7 dots as yet known it can be seen that . . . they formed a ring or rosette around a central dot . . . [From] the early Babylonian period onwards it is increasingly common to find the *7 dots arranged like stars* in the constellation of the Pleiades, and in the last quarter of the second millennium the dots are shaped for the first time as stars. (E. Douglas van Buren, “The Seven Dots in Mesopotamian Art and Their Meaning,” *Archiv fur Orientforschung* XIII (1941): 277; see also E. Douglas van Buren, *Symbols of the Gods in Mesopotamian Art*, 74ff. and

E. Douglas van Buren, “The Rosette in Mesopotamian Art,” *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archaeologie*, new series, vol. 11 (1939, vol. 45 from old series): 104ff)

This observation is important because it demonstrates that the “pointed star + Pleiades” pattern does not require a certain number of points on the stars. Recall that the same situation was true with the zodiac – it does not matter how many points a star symbol has – *it’s a star, not the sun*.

Here’s another example (Frankfort, Plate XXXV – seal h):



In this seal the star has six points surrounding a central dot. Note again the “dot” symbol for each of the seven stars of the Pleiades constellation.

Before leaving the discussion of the star symbol, take note of the close similarity in style between the *star* on VA 243 that Sitchin says is the sun (the left-hand picture below) and the *star* symbols (center and right) we have noted above:



Now compare these with the actual sun symbol:



It should be clear, then, that Sitchin's "sun" in VA243 is not the sun. It is a *major star*. And *the dots are also stars*. We have seen this illustrated above several times by the Sumerian-Mesopotamian depiction of the Pleiades (seven dots representing its seven stars which are easily visible to the naked eye).

We also saw above (in the seal of Frankfort Plate XXXIII-d) that a single pointed star can be associated with dots which are also stars. It is almost that the "star + seven dots" symbology is saying, "constellation = Pleiades."

There is therefore abundant precedent for concluding that these *dots* in VA243 are *stars*.

But there is more to the seal than just that. If Mr Sitchin had not ignored the rest of the seal, he might have been more careful about

using this seal to support his claims. For your convenience, the picture of this seal, VA243, is shown again immediately below.

As we examine the symbology of the rest of the seal, it will help us catch the theme: that *these stars represent a deity and perhaps the divine council*.

WHAT DOES THE REST OF THE SEAL SAY?



Here is Sitchin's seal again (Sumerian seal VA243). On its extreme left and the right, you will notice that the seal has three lines of text ("line 1" is actually repeated on both sides of the seal).

The full inscription of VA243 reads:

Dubsiga [a personal name for a powerful person], Ili-illat, your/his servant.

Nothing in the inscription suggests anything remotely to do with astronomy or planets.

If we are to harmonise the inscription with the pictorial symbols, the meaning of the symbols becomes clear.

It appears that *the central star* stands for *a deity* that has some association with *fertility* (as in crops) since the inscription describes an offering made by a worshipper (who is named) to a seated god who is associated in the seal with fertile harvest. Since there are two other figures in the seal in addition to the seated god, and one is the offerer, the remaining figure is likely a deity also associated with the offering. In favor of this possibility are the “implements”.

Dr Rudi Mayr, an expert on cylinder seals, in an email to Dr Michael Heiser, commented on the inscriptions and the seal:

The seated figure is a god; the ‘flounced’ garment is normal for deities (though kings start wearing them a little later); deities also have the distinctive headdress. Most scholars call it a ‘horned’ headdress, but I’ve always thought it looked more like flames than horns.

SITCHIN’S THEORY IS UNSUPPORTED

It should be understood that the study of cylinder seals is a very specialized sub-discipline within Sumerology and Assyriology. An excellent general introduction is Dominique Collon’s *Cylinder Seals*.

The work of cylinder seal specialists, both past and current, proves decisively that Sitchin’s interpretation of this seal is deeply flawed. It lacks scholarly merit. In a word, his theory is false and is unsupported by the seal itself.

SITCHIN CLAIMS: The VA243 seal depicts the solar system. The central symbol is the sun, encircled by twelve planets.

IN REALITY:


Unfortunately, if the central figure is not the sun, then this interpretation collapses completely.

We have just seen from numerous examples of Sumerian seals that *the alleged “sun” symbol on the seal is not the sun*. That is not the way the Sumerians portrayed our sun. It does not conform to the consistent depiction of the sun in hundreds of other cylinder seals and examples of Sumerian artwork.

We know with certainty what Sumerian depictions of the sun look like, because *the standard sun symbol appears linked with texts about the sun god* (*Shamash* in Akkadian, or *Utu* in Sumerian).

HOW THE EVIDENCE NEGATES SITCHIN’S THEORY

1. As we have already found, the Sumerian *sun symbol was a circle with wavy lines*. The Sumerians consistently depicted the sun with four extended “arms” with wavy lines (flames?) in between each “arm” (most common), or a circle with only wavy lines.



But the central figure on Sitchin's VA243 seal does NOT show this. This symbol is NOT the sun. It lacks the wavy lines and is not set inside a circle.

2. Sitchin's "sun" symbol is actually a star (which in Sumerian-Mesopotamian art could have six or, more commonly, eight points). This symbol denotes a star, a god, or a single planet. Is this merely my opinion? No. It is the conventional Sumero-Mesopotamian art method.

But the question may arise, Isn't the sun a star? Well, you have already seen from the image examples above just how the Sumerians portray the difference, with the *star symbol* and the *sun symbol* side-by-side and *distinct from one another*.

3. The explanatory inscriptions on the left hand and right hand sides of the seal (which are ignored by Sitchin) say nothing about planets or any element of astronomy. (See a list of authorities on Sumerian seal inscriptions at the end of this chapter.)

The theme of the seal is defined by its inscription. Is the inscription educating us about the solar system? Not at all. The inscription describes *an offering* made by a worshipper (who is named) to a seated god who is associated in the seal with *fertile harvest*. That's all.

Among the *hundreds of similar* Sumerian "*offering seals*," many *have a star* in upper proximity to the figures' heads, signifying the figure is a deity.

4. As we noted earlier, in Sumerian thinking, *each symbol is also associated with a god*. Thus, in this VA243 seal we see two figures facing the seated god and the figure's headdress.

5. The *dots are stars, which represent deities*.

These things being so, Sitchin's sun and 12 planets interpretation of the seal collapses. The cylinder seal does not show 12 planets, as Sitchin claims.

To accept Sitchin's theory about Planet X and the Anunnaki, all one needs to do is this:

- (a) ignore what the seal says;
- (b) ignore what is known about Sumerian astronomy from cuneiform astronomical texts (all published, but in scholarly books); and
- (c) ignore standard Sumerian iconography -- artistic representations of stars. That's all.

THIS SEAL IS VITAL TO SITCHIN'S THEORY

Now I have been through much of Mr Sitchin's work. And I think that in this case he genuinely believed what he wrote (about the dots on this VA243 seal being 12 planets).

It is apparent, then, that our friend does not understand this subject he is dealing with. (The same lack is evident also in the writings of others who follow him.)

What he has written in his books could not pass peer review. Neither is it informed by factual data from the primary sources.

As we have just seen, in this VA243 seal there is *no depiction of the solar system*, at all.

Sadly for Mr Sitchin, although there are *many thousands* of available texts, his theory hinges upon *this one single seal*.

So, where now, Mr Sitchin?

Footnote:

For much of the information in this chapter I am indebted to Dr Michael Heiser. (<<http://www.sitchiniswrong.com/VA243seal.pdf> >)

Mike has appeared on *Coast to Coast AM*. twice a year since 2000, with Art Bell, George Noory and Barbara Simpson, answering questions pertaining to the Nephilim of Genesis 6 and his critiques of Zechariah Sitchin's errors.

Art Bell says “Mike is uniquely qualified to discuss the relationship between ancient texts and ufology...” Upon hearing only one of these shows, speaker and author Jim Marrs told Mike that he wished he’d heard Mike Heiser’s analysis before endorsing Zechariah Sitchin in his book, *Alien Agenda*.

General Sources:

Francesca Rochberg, “Astronomy and Calendars in Ancient Mesopotamia,” *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*, vol. III, pp. 1925-1940 (ed., Jack Sasson, 2000)

Bartel L. van der Waerden, *Science Awakening*, vol. 2: *The Birth of Astronomy* (1974)

Technical but Still Readable

Wayne Horowitz, *Mesopotamian Cosmic Geography* (1998)

N.M. Swerdlow, *Ancient Astronomy and Celestial Divination* (2000)

Scholarly (Technical) Resources:

Otto Neugebauer, *The Exact Sciences in Antiquity* (1953)

Otto Neugebauer, *Astronomical Cuneiform Texts* (1955)

Erica Reiner and David Pingree, *Enuma Elish Enlil Tablet 63, The Venus Tablet of Ammisaduqa* (1975)

Hermann Hunger and David Pingree, *MUL.APIN: An Astronomical Compendium in Cuneiform* (1989)

Hermann Hunger and David Pingree, *Astral Sciences in Mesopotamia* (1999)

N. Swerdlow, *The Babylonian Theory of the Planets* (1998)

David Brown, *Mesopotamian Planetary Astronomy-Astrology* (2000)

10

SHU.MU = ROCKETSHIPS?

THE CLAIM: There are rocket ships in the Sumerian texts. Mr Sitchin defines the Sumerian MU as "*an oval-topped, conical object,*" and "*that which rises straight.*" (Sitchin, *The 12th Planet*, pp. 140-143)

IN REALITY: Mr Sitchin cites no Sumerian dictionary for these meanings. A check of the dictionaries contained in Sumerian grammars and the online Sumerian dictionary reveals *no such word meanings.*

THE CLAIM: The Sumerian syllable MU was adopted into Semitic languages as "*SHU-MU*". (p. 143) Then Mr Sitchin translates "*SHU-MU*" to mean "*that which is a MU*" (by implication, "*that which is a rocket ship*").

"*SHU-MU*" then morphed into the Akkadian *shamu* and Biblical Hebrew *shem*.

IN REALITY: We shall consider both of these claims: (1) the Akkadian word, then (2) the Hebrew word.

1. THE AKKADIAN “SHAMU”

- * Does Akkadian *shamu* come from Sitchin’s “SHU-MU”?
- * Does Sumerian even have a word that means “*that which is a MU*”?

We are fortunate, because, as we discovered in Chapter 3, the ancient Mesopotamian scribes ***created their own dictionaries***. Lists of words are a common feature among the thousands of Sumerian and Akkadian cuneiform tablets which have been discovered by archaeologists.

The Mesopotamian scribes tell us what these words mean in their own dictionaries.

SUMERIAN SCRIBES TELL US

These “lexical lists” were used to compile modern dictionaries of these languages. It is rare indeed that ancient dictionaries of a dead language form the core of the modern dictionaries used by scholars of today. But such is the case for the ancient languages of Sumer and Akkad.

The great Sumerian scholar Benno Landsberger compiled these lists into a multi-volume set, *Materials for the Sumerian Lexicon*, which is now available through the University of Chicago’s Oriental Institute.

Also, in his exhaustive work, *Mesopotamian Cosmic Geography*, Mesopotamian scholar W. Horowitz has gathered all the lexical list data for the Akkadian word “*shamu*”.

On the next page is his layout for the meaning of the word. You will see that the word “MU” in the left-hand (Sumerian) was among the cuneiform dictionary entries for “*shamu*.” A discussion of the meanings follows the entries.

Equivalences of *šamû*

A number of equivalences of *šamû*⁷ are known from lexical lists and commentaries. In lexical lists, these terms appear in the left "Sumerian" column, indicating that they are non-Akkadian words. Because most of the equivalences only occur in lexical lists, it is not always possible to determine if they are names for heaven or equivalences of the homonym *šamû* meaning 'rain'.

The List K. 2035+ ii 17-33

K. 2035+ (2R 50+) contains a list of equivalences of *šamû*. At present, 17 of these equivalences are preserved:⁸

an = <i>šá-mu-ú</i>	si = <i>šá-mu-ú</i>
na = <i>šá-mu-ú</i>	u-de-zi-ša AŠ = <i>šá-mu-ú</i>
me = <i>šá-mu-ú</i>	zikuš ENCUR = <i>šá-mu-ú</i>
→ mu = <i>šá-mu-ú</i>	zika-ra (IM×IM) = <i>šá-mu-ú</i>
en-en = <i>šá-mu-ú</i>	enim NIM = <i>š[á-mu]-ú</i>
giš = <i>šá-mu-ú</i>	te-lam idim = <i>š[á-mu]-ú</i>
im = <i>šá-mu-ú</i>	ur ₅ .ra.aš = <i>š[á-mu]-ú</i>
si-rim si-r = <i>šá-mu-ú</i>	du ₁₀ = <i>š[á-mu]-ú</i>
	* [u]UR = <i>š[á-mu]-ú</i>

A much shorter list of equivalents is found in Nabnitu IV 371-73.⁹

an = <i>šá-mu-ú</i>
idim = MIN
ur ₅ .ra.aš = MIN

Materials for the Sumerian Lexicon #
MSL 16 92

The Equivalences

See below for the meaning of "MU" according to these lexical lists

me (K 2035+ ii 19). Sumerian me is also equated with *šamû* in Izi E i 1 (MSL 13 185), Proto-Aa 71:7 (MSL 14 91), and the commentary of *An Address of Marduk to the Demons* F: 8 (AfO 19 118). In the commentary, the syllable me of the word *melammu* is understood as a name for heaven while lam is equated with *eršetu* 'earth'. Additional examples occur in Kassite-period cylinder seals, where me me is used as a writing for *šamê u eršetim* in epithets (see W. G. Lambert, BiOr 32 222 4.16).

→ mu, giš (K 2035+ ii 20, 22). The name mu is also equated with *šamû* in Izi G i 9 (MSL 13 201) and the catchline to *Emesal II*, where mu is the Emesal equivalent of *šamû* and giš is the standard dialect word:

mu = giš = *šá-mu-ú*

MSL 4 10:116

Sumerian giš is also equated with *šamû* in Idu II 176 (CAD Š/1 339), and in *Syllabaire S⁹* from Emar (Emar 537:208) where giš occurs with a gloss *ní-eš* (for *giš*). Another example of *giš = šamû* is found in a commentary explaining the name of one of two horses of the flood: *giš.lam.šár.šár = muštabil šamê u eršetim* 'The One who understands Heaven and Earth' (E. Weidner, AfO 19 110:40).¹⁰ Both mu and giš also occur in the name for the sky or parts of the sky mu.ḫé and giš.ḫé (see pp. 239-38).

Well, what about Zecharia's idea that words like *shamu* refer to rocket ships?

Sadly for Mr Zecharia Sitchin, he has ignored these resources, which explains why his "translations" are so odd.

Briefly, "*shamu*" in Akkadian here means "*heaven*" (or part of the sky/heavens) or even "*rain*".

Contrary to what Mr Sitchin claims, the Akkadian *shamu* does NOT derive from *SHU-MU*, nor does *shamu* mean "*that which is a MU*." Not at all!

1. No relative pronouns in Sumerian grammar: Sitchin's translation of *shu-mu* presupposes that "*SHU-*" is what's called in grammar a "relative pronoun" (the classification of pronouns in all languages that mean: "that which").

It appears Mr Sitchin is unaware of Sumerian grammar at this point - because the Sumerian language **does not** have a class of pronouns that are relative pronouns! To check this for yourself, just consult a Sumerian grammar. (For example, John L. Hayes, *A Manual of Sumerian Grammar*, p.88)

2. NO "rocket" or "cone-shaped" in Sumerian: No texts in Sumerian and Akkadian have "*rocket*" or "*fiery rocket*" or "*cone shaped*" for *shumu*. Again, you can check this for yourself. Just go to the website of Sumerian language expert Michael Heiser (< <http://www.sitchiniswrong.com/shumu/shumu.html> >) to watch a video of Dr Heiser searching through the *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary* and the *Pennsylvania Sumerian Dictionary* for "*shumu*" to see if it is a rocket ship. These are the elite lexicons available to scholars today for the Akkadian and Sumerian languages — and they are free online.

So according to the ancient scribal tablets themselves, the meaning is NOT "*that which rises straight*," or "*conical object*" (i.e., "rocket ship"), at all! This is the verdict of the scribes

themselves, not of myself, nor of any modern writer.

THE WORD "ME"

Sitchin's claim that the Sumerian words ME and SHU.GAR.RA in other texts refer to a space helmet, used for space travel, is ***another fabrication.***

The word ME in Sumerian texts can refer to:

- (a) ***abstract ideas***, like rulership, godship, shepherdship, priestess-ship, the throne of kingship, dishonesty, kissing, extinguishing fire, and so on;
- (b) ***activities***, such as love-making, prostitution, slander, plunder, writing, leather-working, arguing, mat-weaving, and washing; and
- (c) ***concrete objects***, like a black dress, hair, a sheepfold, descendants, and so on.

Thus scholars define "ME" as either "***cultural norms*** (which can be stored like concrete objects) or ***banners that represent these objects or ideas***" (see "Inanna and Enki," pp. 518ff. in *The Context of Scripture*, vol 1: Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World, ed. W. Hallo and K. L. Younger; Brill, 2000).

What would love-making have to do with flying in a spaceship? Hair? Washing? The *Inanna and Enki text*, for example, uses ME 94 times, NONE of which have any clear connection to flight.

For more specific study of the word "ME", see:

Gertrud Farber, *Der Mythos "Inanna und Enki"* unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Liste der ME, *Studia Pohl* 10 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1973)

Gertrud Farber, "ME" in *Real-lexikon der Assyriologie*

Richard Averbeck, *The Cylinders of Gudea*, pp. 417-433 in *The Context of Scripture*, vol 2: *Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World*, ed. W. Hallo and K. L. Younger (Brill, 2000)

2. MEANING OF THE HEBREW WORD “SHEM”

The common Hebrew noun *shem* is *pronounced* exactly like our English word “*shame*”, but it *means* almost exactly the opposite. *Shem* is a Hebrew boy name. The meaning of the name is “*renown*”.

This name *Shem* is mainly used In the Bible. Shem is recorded as one of the sons of Noah and ancestor of the Semites. In particular, the Hebrews and Arabs claim descent from Shem.

The English Bible almost always translates the word *shem* as “*name*” – which it very often does mean, as in “the *shem* [*name*] of” Naomi's husband “was Elimelech.” (Ruth 1:2)

Like our English word “*name*”, *shem* has several related meanings. Shem sometimes means “*fame*”. To make a name for oneself means that one achieves fame. To damage someone's good *name* (*shem*) is to *defame* them.

A more common meaning of *shem* in the Bible is “the essential reality of who someone is”.

The plural form of *shem* is *shmot*. The Bible has many *shmot* (*identification words*) for God - which are royal titles and revelations of the reality of Who He is, but not strictly names as such.

In biblical Hebrew, to trust in someone's *shem* means to trust *the person* because of who he is. To bless someone's *shem* (*name*) means to bless him because of *who he is*.

A common Bible idiom is “in the *name* [*shem*] of....” For example, when Mordechai wrote letters and decrees in the *shem* (*name*) of King Ahasuerus, this indicated that the king was the source of that authority, so what Mordecai wrote could be received as from the king himself. Teaching *in someone's shem*

means either teaching *by his authority* or that the content of the teaching comes *from him*.

When the verb meaning “*know*” (*yada'*) appears with *shem* in the Bible (such as in “*knowing God’s shem*” - “*knowing God’s name*”), it has nothing to do with being smart enough to discover the right sequence of Hebrew consonants and vowels of His name. Rather, the reference is to an intimate friendship. To “know His *shem*” means to experience an acquaintance with Him as a person – in which one gets to know another better and better.

You see, therefore, that the meaning of *shem* is very clear. It means *name, fame (reputation), personage*. That’s it.

No, says Mr Sitchin, *shem* means *that which is a mu = that which is a rocket ship!*

Huh?

11

THE “ALIEN” ELONGATED SKULLS

Are the elongated skulls promoted on ancient astronaut sites “alien”? The answer is: No.

This picture of an elongated skull comes from a medical supply company. That alone should tell you something.



Real scientists are aware of these skulls and don't think they are anything alien at all. For the company's website and a couple of

scholarly articles from peer-reviewed journals about those "alien" elongated Peruvian skulls, go to:

<http://michaelheiser.com/PaleoBabble/2009/07/ancient-elongated-skulls-alien-remains/>

The results of extensive research on other related questions is available on Michael Heiser's website:

* Have alien fetuses been found in Tutankhamen's tomb?

Answer: No:

<http://michaelheiser.com/PaleoBabble/2009/07/alien-fetus-in-king-tuts-tomb/>

* Did aliens build Machu Picchu? Answer: No:

<http://michaelheiser.com/PaleoBabble/2009/07/stone-masonry-and-engineering-at-machu-picchu-no-aliens-needed/>

* Does Akhenaten's unusual physique prove he had alien DNA? Answer: No:

<http://michaelheiser.com/PaleoBabble/2009/05/pharaoh-akhenatens-unusual-physique-proof-of-alien-dna/>

* Did the Egyptians need aliens or alien technology to build the pyramids? Answer: No:

<http://michaelheiser.com/PaleoBabble/2009/01/did-the-egyptians-need-alien-technology-to-build-the-pyramids/>

<http://michaelheiser.com/PaleoBabble/2009/03/the-construction-of-the-pyramids/>

* Are UFOs in Medieval and Renaissance Art? Answer: No:

<http://michaelheiser.com/PaleoBabble/2008/05/ufos-in-religious-art-nope/>

ARE UFOs REAL?

First of all, let me make this absolutely clear. I have no doubt that there are other inhabited worlds out there. But there is no incontrovertible evidence that they are interacting with us.

Are UFOs real? Yes, there are real UFOs. But they are *not from other worlds*. They are all earth-related.

Although it appears virtually certain that modern technology is responsible for some sightings, there is strong evidence that, in general, UFOs are linked with spiritual forces.

There is abundant documented evidence in my book, *UFO Aliens: The Deadly Secret*. (<<http://www.beforeus.com/aliens.html>>) So we shall not go into that here.

When I first came to the conclusion that UFOs were a spiritual phenomenon, tied in with evil entities, I was somewhat reluctant to endorse that view publicly lest I be thought somewhat odd. But the para-physical conclusion accords well with the known facts.

The resulting picture may challenge the myths and prejudices of our time, but does no violence to the facts or to the cohesion of history.

To the objector may I issue this caution. Don't let your opinion sway your better judgment. Give the evidence for the para-physical its due respect. There is a danger that our opinions become fixed to the point where we stop thinking.

* * * * *

Taking our cue from Mr Sitchin, we shall, in the remaining chapters, peer closer into the Sumerian texts and the Bible texts. An overview of both is relevant to this subject.

12

ARE UFOS THROUGH THE BIBLE?

To many New Agers, Sitchin appears as a hero for attacking the historicity of the Bible, claiming it has been misread and is not to be taken literally.

And this stance enables him to see UFOs right through the Bible.

So was Sitchin correct about UFOs in the Bible? Let's look at two popular examples.

1. EZEKIEL'S REPORT

In the Bible, says Mr Sitchin, is recorded "one of the most remarkable records of a UFO witnessed in antiquity." (Sitchin, *Divine Encounters*, p. 204) Ezekiel had an encounter with an alien-operated flying machine from outer space.

Did he? Let's find out. Here is the passage:

Now it came to pass in the thirtieth year, in the fourth *month*, in the fifth *day* of the month, as I *was* among the captives by the river of Chebar, *that* the heavens were opened, and I saw visions of God. In the fifth *day* of the

month, which *was* the fifth year of king Jehoiachin's captivity, The word of the LORD came expressly unto Ezekiel the priest, the son of Buzi, in the land of the Chaldeans by the river Chebar; and the hand of the LORD was there upon him. And I looked, and, behold, a whirlwind came out of the north, a great cloud, and a fire infolding itself, and a brightness *was* about it, and out of the midst thereof as the colour of amber, out of the midst of the fire. Also out of the midst thereof *came* the likeness of four living creatures. And this *was* their appearance; they had the likeness of a man. And every one had four faces, and every one had four wings. And their feet *were* straight feet; and the sole of their feet *was* like the sole of a calf's foot: and they sparkled like the colour of burnished brass. And *they had* the hands of a man under their wings on their four sides; and they four had their faces and their wings. Their wings *were* joined one to another; they turned not when they went; they went every one straight forward. As for the likeness of their faces, they four had the face of a man, and the face of a lion, on the right side: and they four had the face of an ox on the left side; they four also had the face of an eagle. Thus *were* their faces: and their wings *were* stretched upward; two *wings* of every one *were* joined one to another, and two covered their bodies. And they went every one straight forward: whither the spirit was to go, they went; *and* they turned not when they went. As for the likeness of the living creatures, their appearance *was* like burning coals of fire, *and* like the appearance of lamps: it went up and down among the living creatures; and the fire was bright, and out of the fire went forth lightning. And the living creatures ran and returned as the appearance of a flash of lightning.

Now as I beheld the living creatures, behold one wheel upon the earth by the living creatures, with his four faces. The appearance of the wheels and their work *was* like unto the colour of a beryl: and they four had one likeness: and their appearance and their work was as it were a wheel in the middle of a wheel. When they went, they went upon their four sides: *and* they turned not when they went. As for their rings, they were so high that they were dreadful; and their rings *were* full of eyes round about them four. And when the living creatures went, the wheels went

by them: and when the living creatures were lifted up from the earth, the wheels were lifted up. Whithersoever the spirit was to go, they went, thither *was their* spirit to go; and the wheels were lifted up over against them: for the spirit of the living creature *was* in the wheels. When those went, *these* went; and when those stood, *these* stood; and when those were lifted up from the earth, the wheels were lifted up over against them: for the spirit of the living creature *was* in the wheels. And the likeness of the firmament upon the heads of the living creature *was* as the colour of the terrible crystal, stretched forth over their heads above. And under the firmament *were* their wings straight, the one toward the other: every one had two, which covered on this side, and every one had two, which covered on that side, their bodies. And when they went, I heard the noise of their wings, like the noise of great waters, as the voice of the Almighty, the voice of speech, as the noise of an host: when they stood, they let down their wings. And there was a voice from the firmament that *was* over their heads, when they stood, and had let down their wings.

And above the firmament that *was* over their heads *was* the likeness of a throne, as the appearance of a sapphire stone: and upon the likeness of the throne *was* the likeness as the appearance of a man above upon it. And I saw as the colour of amber, as the appearance of fire round about within it, from the appearance of his loins even upward, and from the appearance of his loins even downward, I saw as it were the appearance of fire, and it had brightness round about. As the appearance of the bow that is in the cloud in the day of rain, so *was* the appearance of the brightness round about. This *was* the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the LORD. And when I saw *it*, I fell upon my face, and I heard a voice of one that spake. (Ezekiel chapter 1)

Well... is Ezekiel talking about a space ship? Is that what he saw?

We have a choice. We can choose to inject our own prejudices

into a document, or we can be willing to learn, and let the text speak to us.

***THE CONTEXT IS
ALWAYS IMPORTANT***

To correctly understand any book, including the Bible, there are basic rules to follow:

1. Let the book interpret itself. Don't look for what you want to prove – look for what the book actually says.
2. Understand the context – the verses before and after, and the chapters before and after. Does your understanding of a particular statement harmonise with the rest of the book?
3. Ask what does it clearly say?
4. Ask what does it not say?
5. Do not allow personal assumptions or preconceived ideas to influence your understanding and conclusions.
6. Do not form conclusions based on partial facts, insufficient information, or the opinions and speculations of others.
7. Opinions – regardless of how strongly you feel about them – don't necessarily count. The text alone must be the standard and guide.

So what does Ezekiel himself tell us?

***(a) NOT AN ENCOUNTER
BUT A VISION***

Is Ezekiel talking about a space ship?

No, Ezekiel did not see an alien spaceship. Sitchin is misquoting Ezekiel.

He says that what he saw was “*visions*”, not a physical object. It was ***not an encounter, but a vision***. Indeed, he uses stereotyped visionary phrases like “the heavens were opened” (Ezekiel 1:1) and “the hand of the Lord was upon him” to make absolutely plain that what follows is to be seen in the sense of an ecstatic mental experience, rather than sober scientific description of an actual event.

If Mr Sitchin wants to interpret this as a UFO encounter, then what will he do with the rest of the description, which culminates not in a chariot, but in a great throne set above the chariot (Ezekiel 1:26), and God, in human likeness, enthroned there? If we take the chariot literally, then all of this, too, must be taken literally.

Visions are not by necessity literal phenomena. And, in fact, the descriptions that follow cannot all be taken literally in our physical sense.

(b) A SYMBOL OF GOD

Ezekiel clearly shows that the “vehicle” ***moves in all directions at once*** (Ezekiel 1:17). This is not one of Sitchin’s alien spaceships. It is in fact a symbolic presentation.

In reading chapter 1 of his vision, it becomes apparent that Ezekiel saw a “great cloud with raging fire engulfing itself” (verse 4), four living creatures from within the cloud (verse 5), a wheel beside each living creature (verse 15), and the rims of the wheels full of eyes (verse 18), all-seeing, all-knowing, among other things.

Ezekiel himself tells us that this is a vision of that Transcendent One who is not limited by space or gravity. He is not confined to a “space chariot”, but is in fact above it. (verse 25). It is a vision of God Himself and the way in which He works. “***I saw visions of God,***” reports Ezekiel. (verse 1)

Also out of the midst thereof came the likeness of four living creatures. And this was their appearance: they had the likeness of a man.... As for the likeness of their faces, they four had the face of a **man**, and the face of a **lion**, ...of an **ox**,... and... an **eagle**. (Ezekiel 1:5,10)

Compare this with a description in the book of Revelation. Here the apostle John records what he saw in a vision:

a throne was set in heaven... and in the midst of the throne, and round about the throne, were four living creatures full of eyes before and behind. And the first living creature was like a **lion**, and the second living creature like a **calf**, and the third living creature had a face as a **man**, and the fourth living creature was like a flying **eagle**. (Revelation 4:2,6-7)

You only have to compare Ezekiel's description of the living creatures with the description of the living creatures that surround the throne of God in Revelation 4 and you will quickly realise that the scenes witnessed by Ezekiel, John, Daniel, and other biblical writers were visions of God and His spiritual host of heaven.

As further evidence of this fact, at the end of Ezekiel 1, after describing "a likeness with the appearance of a man" on a throne, Ezekiel wrote: "***This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord***" (Ezekiel 1:28).

The qualities of **man**, **lion**, **ox**, and **eagle** are aspects of God Himself, the Supreme Ruler of the universe, and those of His heavenly host.

The face of a man speaks of mind, reason, affections - an **intelligent being**. The lion has **authority, power, and majesty**. The ox patiently **labours for others**, able to bear the burdens that they can't. The eagle flies above the storms, while below there are only sorrows, dangers, and distress - a **swift** bird strong and powerful, **never becoming weary**.

In His direction of affairs, there is at work a wheel within a wheel. The complication of machinery appears so intricate that man can see only a complete entanglement. In our limited understanding of the Mighty One's ways, we often question His love and His justice – His reasons for allowing certain things to happen. But the divine hand, as seen by Ezekiel, is placed upon the wheels, and every part moves in complete harmony, each doing its specified work, yet with individual freedom of action.

***(c) GOD'S THRONE IS
ABOVE IT - NOT IN IT***

But, if you are going to take what Ezekiel saw as a literal space vehicle, then you must also take these parts of his vision literally:

1. The vehicle can move in all directions at once. No vehicle could ever be constructed with all the wheels going in their own separate direction without turning.
2. God is above it – not in it, as would be the case with a UFO. If it's a literal space vehicle, then the throne of God is above it, literally.

All parts of the vision stand or fall together. No parts are irrelevant.

And what is the significance of these two features in the vision?

1. Able to move in all directions at once: This teaches the transcendence of the Eternal One.
2. God is above it – not in it: – He cannot be restricted spatially, as men are restricted.

**(d) *THE FIRST OF A
SERIES OF SYMBOLS***

The purpose of this first chapter in Ezekiel becomes clear as we examine the context. This first chapter sets the scene for the rest of the book.

A little research into the book's message shows that Ezekiel's writing and visions were apocalyptic in nature—very similar to the writings found in the biblical books of Daniel and Revelation. The visions Ezekiel described are of heavenly, spiritual beings, not “alien life forms.”

And the symbols continue.

- * He has a vision of a written scroll which he eats (Ezekiel 2:8 to 3:3);
- * He has detailed visions of what is taking place in Jerusalem, a thousand miles away (Ezekiel 8:3);
- * He sees angels marking the foreheads of those who are to be preserved during the destruction of Jerusalem, and slaughtering those who are to die (Ezekiel 9:1-7);
- * He sees a valley full of dry bones (Ezekiel 37:1-2). He explains that this experience was when “the hand of the Lord was upon me”, and that he was brought out “by the Spirit of the Lord” - so that we know he means us to understand it as a vision.

**(e) *THE MESSAGE IS:
FROM GOD'S THRONE,
JUSTICE IS COMING***

The chapters that follow speak of coming judgment upon the nation – that what it has sown it will now reap. And a considerable number of symbols are used to drive home that message.

Ezekiel himself is told to personally perform a symbolic demonstration in the street, before the people, using himself as a living symbol of what will befall the whole nation - that the people are to go into exile, a prophecy which was later literally fulfilled. (Ezekiel chapter 4; 12:11)

***SO WHO IS RIGHT:
EZEKIEL OR SITCHIN?***

Ezekiel records that he was told:

Son of man, I am sending you to the children of Israel, to a rebellious nation that has rebelled against Me. (Ezekiel 2:3)

Ezekiel fully understood this to be the Celestial Creator talking to Him, and that the vision was of spiritual beings.

It is ironic that Ezekiel recognized his vision to be a calling and message from God, yet over 2,500 years after this vision, a modern-day UFO hunter wants to “reinterpret” Ezekiel’s original understanding of what he saw.

A simple question should be asked: who would be in a better position to know what he saw—Ezekiel, or a modern-day “alien hunter”?

Ezekiel did not see a UFO! He was allowed the special privilege of being called by the Supreme One of the universe, through an amazing vision of the heavenly host. It was a God-given vision, teaching great truths about His own being.

Ezekiel himself says clearly at the very beginning of the description, “I saw visions of God.”

His description of the vision ties in perfectly with other apocalyptic writings such as Daniel and Revelation. It has nothing to do with UFOs.

No more need be said.

2. “ALIEN” CROSSBREEDING IN THE BOOK OF GENESIS?

Our friend Sitchin also quotes from the biblical book of *Genesis*.

IT IS CLAIMED: In Genesis, the “sons of God” who “intermarried” with “daughters of men” were really extraterrestrials. Primitive biblical authors used the term “sons of God” only because they did not understand the technology.

IN REALITY: Had Mr Sitchin dug deeper he would have discovered that:

1. The book of Genesis says that the “*sons of God*” were 100 percent *human*. (See Appendix A.)
2. It states that mankind was a direct creation of the Supreme God who created the universe (and *not the result of genetic juggling*).
3. The same book that he quotes *refutes his “primitive” idea*. It declares that the human race was fully intelligent from the start. (Genesis 1:27; 2:19-20) At an early time there were craftsmen and musicians (Genesis 4:21,22) and even schools of metallurgy. All these were flourishing *before* Sitchin’s alleged Genesis chapter 6 cross-breeding by humanoid space aliens took place.

So let’s not come up with any nonsense about the ancients’ scientific ignorance. The advanced science found through their writings does not allow us that option. They were in their own right, intelligent people. They should be fairly represented.

Their writings deserve to be portrayed accurately. They should not be regarded as ignorant simply because they lived long ago. Or because they disagree with our view.

Ezekiel is NOT saying what Sitchin interprets it to mean. But Sitchin is saying what he WANTS it to mean. At this point some might wonder, is this being honest?

Mr Sitchin thinks “primitive” biblical authors did not understand technology or science.

Huh?

Technology and science unknown? This is where it gets interesting...

13

CAN THE BIBLE FACE UP TO SCIENCE?

My friend Greg was returning home by train.

Next to him sat a blond. She was a biologist. They exchanged pleasantries. then with one eye Greg had resorted to his newspaper.

But not for long. His other eye was partly on her. And then, in astonishment, he stopped reading. This intelligent, chic woman was engrossed in – was this for real? – a Bible!

He looked her way again. Yes, she was really into it! He would just have to straighten her out!

“Excuse me,” he interrupted. “I don’t mean to be rude. But don’t you know that book is unscientific?”

“Oh?” she smiled. “Really?”

A pushover, Greg decided. “Well, you know, it speaks of the sun coming up and going down. In this enlightened age, you and I know it’s not the sun. It’s the earth’s rotation. How can you read a book containing such outdated errors?”

Unperturbed, she kept reading. Greg returned to his newspaper. A few minutes later, she half turned and said, “I wouldn’t read that paper if I were you.”

“I beg your pardon?”

“May I?” said she, taking his paper and quickly scanning through it. “Here,” she said, pointing, “read that.”

His eyes fell on the weather section. “Tomorrow: Sun rises 5.32 am. Sun sets 6.16 pm.”

“So?” she laughed, “how can you swallow such unscientific twaddle? You know the sun doesn’t rise and go down. It’s the earth’s rotation. Look, I know a little science. Suppose I could show you that proven science totally agrees with the Bible?”

“What!” he roared. “You’re pulling my leg!”

“The Bible is not a science text,” she responded, “but it does speak authoritatively in matters of science – and accurately.”

Dumb female! “Okay, I’ll humor you,” he consented.

But Greg was in for a surprise. That lady knew some intriguing facts. He had jotted down a few of them to check later. They were in his pocket note book.

To his amazement he had actually found these scientific truths in the Bible:

* Far from resting on the backs of turtles, elephants, Atlas, or whatever – the Bible says the earth is suspended in space. (Job 26:7)

* Also that the earth is not flat – but spherical. (Isaiah 40:22. The original Hebrew word “khug” used here denotes “sphericity” or “roundness”.)

* The earth turns on its axis, as clay to the seal. (Job 38:14)

* The stars cannot be numbered, but are as the sand upon the seashore. (Jeremiah 33:22; Genesis 22:17)

Greg thought about that. Not so long ago scientists were teaching that the stars could be counted. From both hemispheres the naked eye could count perhaps 4,000 stars. But astronomers now estimated that there were at least a hundred-million-billion-billion stars (that is 10^{26} stars). And yes, that would probably reflect the same order of magnitude as the number of grains of sand on the earth.

So that old book was indeed scientifically sound! That discovery had really thrown him. He found himself apologizing to the lady.

Since then Greg had, to some extent, acquired a respect for the old book.

21st CENTURY SCIENCE

Did you know

1. that experimentally confirmed science has now established every one of the following propositions as factually true? And
2. that these facts were already recorded in a book more than 3,500 years old?

Here's a quick list:

- The value of Pi
- That light must first exist before matter can exist. (Quantum mechanics)
- That the earth's molten foundation rocks solidified in less than 7 minutes (not millions of years). Now confirmed by

the discovery of short-life primordial polonium haloes “frozen” into the earth’s foundation granite rocks. You haven’t heard about that?

- That all living things were created by words (the genetic language). And that sound waves can create forms?
- That the very same mineral composition that makes up the human body is found in the soil.
- That a complete human being can be produced from a portion of another (hence cloning).
- That the whole human race stems from three main branches.
- That all races on earth are descended from the same original mother.
- That no life form evolves into a different life form, but reproduces “after its kind” (diversifying no further than the boundaries of its own basic type). This is true science and it runs counter to what we have been told.

Now, do you know which ancient book contains these scientific propositions?

Full marks if you guessed the book of Genesis, in the Bible.

But it contains much more:

SCIENTIFIC ACCURACY

Catch this:

1. THE DISCOVERY THAT BLOCKED HIS FUNDING: Did you know that an American scientist has lost funding because he dared make a discovery that vindicated Genesis? This discovery has been placed before the world’s leading scientists – and ***they are dumbfounded!*** And oh yes, displaying the liberal tolerance we have all come to love, they cut off his funding.

2. ANCIENT CLONING: Did you know that *the first "cloning" operation* was performed 6,000 years ago? Yes, it's right there, described in the book of Genesis.

3. THAT NEW GENETIC INFORMATION CANNOT EVOLVE: And that's exactly what modern genetic science has also proven. *Just think* of the implications of that!

AHEAD OF MODERN SCIENCE

Here's a trade secret for you. No scientist on this planet is in a position to refute any of the above facts. In fact, many scientists, confronted with this evidence, express shock at discovering they are only catching up with the ancient book of Genesis.

So here we have a book compiled 3,500 years ago from even earlier documents (see the next chapter) – yet it is as modern as tomorrow.

It not only contains *21st century scientific knowledge*, but also:

- Surprising secrets of the lost races
- Stimulating historical insights
- Prophecies concerning the New World Order, modern terrorism and other current global events – and where they are headed.

As I have watched the current world crisis unfold, it has become evident that we may have a front-row seat to events long foretold in this book.

This book is so crammed with advanced scientific data and inside information that I am now calling it the *Intelligence Report*.

JUST MYTH?

OBJECTION: But I've heard that its stories are not real history, but largely myth.

IN REALITY: I can empathise with the skeptic, having myself been one. And sometimes I was wrong. That's nothing to be ashamed of.

Now, since we are placing under the microscope a heavily-attacked document, it is well to bear in mind that good scholarship will follow Aristotle's Dictum:

The benefit of the doubt is to be given to the document itself, not arrogated by the critic to himself.

That is, one must listen to the claims of the document under analysis, and not assume ignorance, error or fraud unless the author disqualifies himself by contradictions or known factual inaccuracies. In other words, it is to be accepted that a document is genuine, unless there is compelling reason to believe otherwise. Would you say that is fair?

It is time now to redress a historical injustice. ***We are being lied to.*** The "Bible myth" charge is a fabrication.

It may be stated categorically that *not one* confirmed scientific discovery has ever controverted a biblical reference. Would you please read that again?

THE TESTIMONY OF ARCHAEOLOGY

Under the intense scrutiny of physical archaeology, there is only

one set of books in all the world that has maintained a **100 percent** credibility rating– and that is the Bible.

A sweeping statement? Yes, but one which I believe will stand up under investigation.

This may be new to you, but archaeological research has established the accuracy of the biblical data in **every** instance in which it can be tested. We're not talking about an odd reference or two. Nothing like that. This confirmation amounts to many **hundreds** of cases, with not one single failure. Read that again. Such an astonishingly **perfect track record** is unknown for any other document on earth.

Therefore we should not be surprised to hear men like Donald J. Wiseman, Professor Emeritus of Assyriology, University of London, testifying:

It has been my long experience that when the Bible is rightly understood and interpreted it is never contradicted by archaeological and historical evidence when that too has been subjected to strict scrutiny. (Forward to Victor Pearce's book *Evidence For Truth: Archaeology*, 2nd edition, 1998)

In Charles Darwin's day critics began dismissing hundreds of statements in the Bible as fables. Why? Because in the 1800s archaeology was in its infancy. Very little Middle East excavation had taken place. Many events, place names and names of people were found only in the Bible – nowhere else. And the Bible made some daring historical claims that, in our ignorance, were thought unlikely to be true...for example, claims like these:

- That over 4,000 years before New York's Empire State Building, **the first skyscraper** was built.
- That long **before the Iron Age**, iron was smelted.
- That a **clean break in history occurred in 2345 BC**, with a physical cataclysm that destroyed everything on earth. The

critic said no. But the physical evidence now available is more abundant than for any other ancient event. Bar none.

- That a mighty nation called ***Hittites really existed***. The critic said no. Until Hittite remains were discovered.
- That the Dead Sea valley of Israel was a ***lush, fertile land***, until its five great cities were ***suddenly destroyed by burning sulphur balls*** from the sky. The critic called this a fable. But not only is there now evidence for such a past climate, but also the remains of five cities turned to ash, and peppered with millions of balls of burnt sulphur, have been discovered. (Audiences enjoy watching me burn these sulphur balls.)
- That the ***Hebrew race was enslaved in Egypt*** for several centuries. The critic said there was no evidence of Hebrews ever in Egypt. But confirming Egyptian texts have since been discovered.
- That the Hebrews escaped from Egypt in ***a mighty, spectacular exodus***, in which the Red Sea parted for their escape, but the Egyptian army, caught in hot pursuit, were all drowned. The critic said “Impossible”! But we have now found scattered over the seabed, remains of chariot wheels and cabs intermingled with the skeletal remains of horses and men from this very period.
- That the Hebrew nation ***wandered for many years in the deserts*** south of Palestine. The critic said “no evidence” - until physical evidence was found.
- That the incoming ***Hebrews invaded and conquered all of Palestine***. The critic said no. Physical evidence and inscriptions echoing the story piece by piece have now been found.
- That in flood time ***the Jordan River suddenly stopped flowing***, enabling the Hebrews to cross it on foot. The critic said “Impossible!” Until this same phenomenon was witnessed in modern times.
- That they ***marched around the city of Jericho 7 times in one day***, after which the walls fell flat (outward) and city was burned. Seven circuits in a day? Preposterous, said the

critic. Until the ruins were excavated – which can be circled in half an hour. Excavation also shows that walls did fall outward as stated, and the city was burned.

- That ***King David reigned over an extensive empire***. No such dynasty existed, said the critic. Recently found inscriptions verify King David's dynasty.
- That ***King Solomon*** ruled over a kingdom greater than that of the surrounding nations and built a temple that was a wonder of the world. The critic said "rubbish". But remains and inscriptions parallel the biblical record in every particular.
- That Babylon's last king, on the night Babylon fell, was ***Belshazzar***. The critic said he never existed. A Belshazzar inscription has now been found.
- That the town of ***Nazareth*** existed in the time of Jesus Christ. The critic said no. But evidence of its 1st century settlement has since surfaced.
- That the book of Genesis was written progressively by contemporaries of the events, from as early as 3000 BC, then compiled into one book ***no later than 1500 BC***. The critic said it was just a patchwork of myths put together as late as the 6th century BC. But a solid chain of evidence now shows Genesis to be accurate contemporary reporting.

Okay, let's stop there. There are literally hundreds of examples like these, where the biblical writers have been vindicated. These are facts.

It would occupy too much room to go into details in this matter, without which, however, the strength of the argument cannot be felt, nor fully established. (This has been done in some of my more recent books).

In any case, why not let Nelson Glueck, one of the world's most eminent Middle Eastern archaeologists bear witness? He says:

It may be stated categorically that no archaeological discovery has ever controverted a Biblical reference. (Nelson

Glueck, *Rivers in the Desert: History of Negev*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publications Society of America, p.31)

Did you get that? Put to the test, the “myth” charge *always* fails.

The trend of new evidence is leading many archaeologists to align *even their dates* increasingly closer to those given in the biblical book of Genesis.

Here is Professor W.F. Albright, the well-known archaeologist of Johns Hopkins University, informing us that

...as a whole the picture in Genesis is historical, and there is **no reason to doubt the general accuracy** of the biographical details and the sketches of personality which make the Patriarchs come alive with a vividness unknown to a single extra-biblical character in the whole vast literature of the ancient Near East. (Albright, *The Biblical Period From Abraham to Ezra*, Rev. ed. New York, 1963, p.5)

Archaeologist Horn arrives at the same conclusion:

Archaeological discoveries show us that the historical setting is true to fact and that the events described **did really happen**. (Siegfried H. Horn, *Records of the Past Illuminate the Bible*. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, p.62)

In the 1800s the critics were having a field day.

Then the science of archaeology was born. And gradually the evidence came out. The settings as given in the biblical descriptions were found to agree completely with the known facts.

The critics were dumbfounded. They had jumped the gun, and they were wrong.

Archaeology uncovers things that you can see, touch, and even smell. Over some 25 expeditions, my teams have caught the

excitement of discovering *actual artefacts* that were *deposited at the very moment* certain biblical events were occurring.

Those events spring to life before your eyes! Do you wonder that sometimes I find it hard to sleep at night?

While the Bible is not primarily a history book, modern scholarship has found that when it does touch on history the Bible is remarkably accurate. Increasingly, its stories are seen as solid history, set in backgrounds as real as our own today.

And this is knowledge that evolution-minded “experts” are doing their best to hide from the public.

Only myths? Oddly enough, the old disinformation is still being rehashed by today’s pretenders to knowledge - and churned out as “new information”. How sad for them!

ANOTHER CLAIM OF THE CRITICS

However, the critics have come up with some other claims. (These are repeated by our friend Mr Sitchin – so they are relevant to the present discussion.)

So lest I be accused of ignoring these, why don’t we address another a couple of them now? You might have heard these...

1. The Sumerian texts are older – thus more reliable – than the Bible writings.
2. The biblical stories were only borrowed from the Sumerians.

Well? Here goes...

14

HOW OLD ARE THE SUMERIAN TEXTS?

A lady received her annual form from the Australian tax department, which they required her to fill in and return to them.

She faithfully did as asked, but inadvertently wrote in some of the required information in a wrong section of the form.

What happened after this turned into a nightmare. They sent her a summons. And locked her up in prison for 1½ years.

It turned out that she had provided the correct information as requested – even though it was on the wrong part of the form.

But the officials in the tax department did not notice it. Her lawyer did not notice it. Even the judge did not notice it.

Why didn't she sue them for wrongful imprisonment? Simple. It would have cost her \$50,000 to take the matter to court. She didn't have that kind of money.

I couldn't help feeling indignation for the injustice perpetrated against this innocent woman. But such injustices are common, as you probably know.

My heart cries out for injustices to be made right, don't you? It was the passion of correcting an injustice that got me started in Middle Eastern archaeology in the 1990s.

WHY I HAD TO CORRECT AN INJUSTICE

On November 25, 1978, during an earthquake, a mystery object suddenly popped out of the ground. And this led an amateur “detective” to start probing what was to soon become an archaeological sensation.

It wasn't long before he found himself caught in a cloak-and-dagger game of tomb robberies, betrayals and attempted murder. At every step, attacks were engineered on the man and his project.

Convinced that he had discovered what was left of the ancient Noah's Ark, this real-life “Indiana Jones” chose not to swipe at his critics or try to justify his work. He had one goal: to quietly gain the evidence needed to convince the world. Meanwhile his adversaries went on shouting, slandering and sabotaging.

In April, 1992, quite unexpectedly, I was drawn into this drama. It soon became apparent that attempts were being made to suppress the facts. A man and his noble cause were being wronged.

I never suspected that, by setting out to correct that particular injustice - and share some of the crucial facts that turned my skepticism into belief – that I would eventually find myself coming down the present road of writing this book.

What you will discover in this chapter may hopefully correct another widespread injustice.

Have you noticed that almost everywhere you turn these days there is a distinct anti-Bible bias? It's in the media, on the Internet, in the schools, in the scientific world, in politics...

Why is this? Is there something wrong with the book? If you believe in fair play, then you may want to get to the bottom of this... as I was determined to do.

TWO ASSUMPTIONS

Bless his heart, our friend Zecharia Sitchin is involved in it too. He takes two different documents:

- (a) the Sumerian texts
- (b) the Bible texts

and then makes a couple of assumptions:

1. That the *Sumerian texts are thousands of years older* than the “biblical tales”.
2. That the material of *Genesis 1-11* (and other parts of the Bible) are “*borrowed*” from the Sumerians and Akkadians.

Let's investigate first of all the antiquity of the Sumerian texts.

SUMERIAN TEXTS 6,000 YEARS OLD?

CLAIM: “Shumerian (or Sumerian) civilization had blossomed in what is now Iraq almost a millennium before the beginning of the Pharaonic age in Egypt.” And documents in the Sumerian language go “back almost six thousand years.” (Zecharia Sitchin, *The Earth Chronicles*)

IN REALITY: Historians and other scholars almost universally recognise that recorded human history began in Sumer, in the Middle East.

The dates given for Sumer's origin vary widely among scholars, although the recent trend has been toward later, rather than earlier, dates - typically ranging from about 3500 BC to about 2900 BC, with some scholars setting dates both earlier and later than these. At least one reputable source, *Encyclopedia Britannica, Book of Knowledge*, under "History", dates Sumeria as late as about 2350 BC.

This is very close to our date for the Great Flood, 2345 BC - which made a clean break in world history. It was only *after this event* that Sumeria arose. Any radically earlier dating is based on questionable assumptions and is highly speculative.

Helpful background information on this question of dating is available in my book *Lost Races: The Big Dating Shock*, which I am pleased to gift to you. (<http://www.beforeus.com/dating-civilizations.pdf>)

If Mr Sitchin, or anyone else, is determined to push everything back further, he cannot do so on the grounds of solid evidence. Keep in mind that our goal is to discover the FACTS. We want *verified* information.

Some scholars have assumed that the Sumerian King List (a list of 10 earlier kings) is a reference to the earliest origins of Sumer. Because of this assumption, taking 50-60 years per life of each king, these scholars would be adding about 500-600 years onto the history of the Mesopotamian peoples.

However, there is good reason to believe that this list of 10 kings is not part of the history of Babylonia or Sumer at all, but rather of the ten patriarchs before the Flood. (Jonathan Gray, *Lost Races: The Big Dating Shock*, Chapter 14)

So how old is Sumeria... really?

THE OLDEST FIRM HISTORICAL DATE

A firm historical date is one in which there are *sufficient links with other* historically known dates that it is accurate to a scientific certainty (or at least within a handful of years).

The oldest such firm historical date is of the Egyptian Pharaoh Sesostriis III (about 1878 BC).

Earlier than about 2000 BC, then, archaeologists must make an inordinate number of assumptions (which are largely subjective in nature).

Therefore if anyone tells you the Sumerian writings are almost 6,000 years old, you may rest assured that is only in his head. It is wishful thinking, and not fact.

It can be said with certainty that:

1. There are no firm historical dates before about 2000 to 2500 BC.
2. Carbon-14 is known to be unreliable in dating the Sumerian-Babylonian civilization, so we are left to estimate.
3. The Sumerian civilization was the first known in history. But not by much.

After Alexander the Great had defeated Darius in 331 BC at Gaugmela near Arbela, he journeyed to Babylon. While there he and his scholars learned about the 1903 years of astronomical observations from the Chaldeans of Babylon.

That placed the founding of Babylon at **2234 BC**. This matter was recorded in the sixth book of *De Caelo (About the Heavens)* by Simplicius, a Latin writer in the 6th century AD. Porphyry (a

Greek philosopher, 234–305 AD) stated the same thing.

Martin Anstey points out, regarding the Mesopotamian region:

The Era of the Chaldean dynasty of Berosus, the *earliest* which has any claim to be regarded as historical, is placed somewhere about the year **B.C. 2234**. (Martin Anstey, *The Romance of Bible Chronology*. London: Marshall Brothers Ltd., 1913, p.92)

This is close to the biblical date for the founding of the city of Babel (c. 2244 BC) from which sprouted the Sumerian culture and Babylon. The agreement is almost uncanny.

Almost 6,000 years? Our friend seems to have a cavalier way with dates.

There is absolutely no evidence of any *Sumerian document* dates earlier than about 2000 BC. Sumerian texts 6,000 years old? Er, yes... And I'm the Easter Bunny.

* * * * *

Now we shall address the question as to whether parts of the Bible are “borrowed” from the Sumerians and Akkadians, as our friend suggests.

15

DID THE BIBLE “BORROW” FROM THE SUMERIANS?

IT IS CLAIMED: The biblical tales of Creation, of Adam and Eve, the Garden of Eden, the Deluge, the Tower of Babel, were based on texts written down millennia earlier in Mesopotamia, especially by the Sumerians.

IN REALITY: This was the predominant view in biblical scholarship nearly 150 years ago, but the idea now has been abandoned.

Despite this, it is still peddled by some writers, including Sitchin, who appear to be unaware of discoveries since.

ASSUMPTION 1: BIBLE “COPIED” FROM THE SUMERIAN TEXTS

You ask, how did this idea get started? Well, when the various fragments of the *Babylonian* tablets were discovered, it was

noticed that the writers had recorded their “creation” series on *six tablets*.

Some critics observed that the biblical *book of Genesis* spoke of creation as having occurred over *six days*. So now they jumped at the Babylonian discovery and put out the rumour that these Babylonian tablets would prove to be the originals of the Bible story.

But *this was before* the Babylonian fragments (edited from *Sumerian* texts) were pieced together and deciphered.

Then it was discovered that nowhere in the Babylonian account is there any suggestion of the creation of the world in six days, or even in six periods.

The only valid similarity between the Bible and the Babylonian tablets is that the Genesis narrative is divided into six days, numbered 1 to 6, and that the Babylonian accounts of Creation are almost invariably written on six tablets – with a late appendix added as the seventh book, as a commentary on the 50 sacred Sumerian titles of Marduk.

Let’s compare the Babylonian Creation tablets with the biblical Genesis account:

Genesis	Babylonian Creation Tablets
Day 1. Light	Tablet 1. Birth of the gods, their rebellion and threatened destruction.
Day 2. Atmosphere and water	Tablet 2. Tiamat prepares for battle. Marduk agrees to fight her.
Day 3. Land and vegetation	Tablet 3. The gods are summoned and wail bitterly at their threatened destruction
Day 4. Sun, moon and stars visible	Tablet 4. Marduk promoted to rank of “god”. He receives his weapons for the fight (these are described at length). Defeats Tiamut, splits her in half like a fish and <i>thus makes heaven and earth</i> .

Day 5. Fish and birds
Day 6. Land animals
and man

Tablet 5. Astronomical poem.
Tablet 6. Kingu who made Tiamut to rebel is bound and as a punishment his arteries are severed and *man created from his blood*. The 600 gods are grouped. Marduk builds Babylon where all the gods assemble.

Do you notice the difference between the two accounts? A comparison shows clearly that Genesis owes nothing whatever to the Babylonian tablets.

It is not reasonable to imagine that such crude accounts of gods and goddesses plotting war amongst themselves, smashing skulls, getting drunk and similar activities, could be the basis of the first chapters of the Bible.

When George Smith discovered the first Babylonian fragment in the British Museum in 1872, he imagined that it referred to the creation of animals. Now we know that the animals referred to were the “monsters” created in order to fight Tiamut.

The old theory of the supposed similarities between the Bible and the Babylonian tablets was founded on the “*expectation*” that discoveries would provide the missing links. Excavation has proved this hope to be false.

More is known today about Sumerian and Akkadian. Scholars today have a deeper knowledge of the linguistic disconnections between those languages and material in Genesis than ever before.

The late 1920s saw the discovery of the Ugaritic cuneiform material. Ugaritic was found to be far closer to biblical Hebrew than Akkadian or Sumerian. Also, the literature of Ugarit had closer parallels to biblical material.

**ASSUMPTION 2:
SUMERIAN “BETTER”**

Another reason for the anti-Bible bias was that the scholarship of the late 19th century was predisposed by *anti-Semitism*, and this led scholars with anti-Semitic beliefs to contrive or exaggerate many parallels between the Sumerian and biblical documents – but in favour of the Sumerian.

They got away with it at that time, simply because archaeology was still in its infancy.

It has *yet to be shown* that there was borrowing, even indirectly. If judgment is to be passed as to the priority of one record over the other, the biblical book of Genesis inevitably wins for its probability in terms of meteorology, geophysics, and timing alone. In creation, its account is admired for its simplicity and grandeur. And its concept of mankind accords well with observable facts.

Of course there are similarities between the literature of Israel, Sumer, Akkad, Ugarit, Egypt, and the Hittite civilization. And that is simply because all these civilizations share a common beginning after the Great Flood.

Yet a close examination will reveal that the Sumerian tablets contain *grotesque and clumsy* accounts of events, and a clearly inferior version. It is true that they and the Hebrew Scriptures both contain some information handed down from the *common source*, but the difference between the two is *not* in favour of the Sumerian account.

IT IS CLAIMED: The writers of the Bible probably stripped the old Sumerian/Babylonian version of all its mythical and legendary elements.

IN REALITY: One would expect this idea to have died long before now, but it is still peddled by the uninformed.

You only have to compare the accounts. It should be obvious that if any such “stripping” had taken place there would be nothing left with which to construct a narrative of Creation.

Kenneth Kitchen of the University of Liverpool, gives us the verdict of archaeology:

The common assumption that the Hebrew account is simply a purged and simplified version of the Babylonian legend is fallacious on methodological grounds. In the Ancient Near East, the rule is that simple accounts or traditions may give rise (by accretion and embellishment) to elaborate legends, but not vice versa. In the Ancient Orient, legends were not simplified or turned into pseudo-history (historicized) as has been assumed for early Genesis. (Kenneth A. Kitchen, *Ancient Orient and the Old Testament*, p.89)

Millar Burrows of Yale University, points out that “Mere legend or fiction would inevitably betray itself by anachronisms and incongruities.” (M. Burrows, *What Mean These Stones?* New York: Meridian Books, 1956, p. 278) But this is not the case with the biblical records.

A scrutiny of the Babylonian/Sumerian texts reveals that they represent ***not an original source, but a hopeless corruption*** of an original source. They do demonstrate that at an early period dozens of contemporary gods were introduced into the Creation tablets.

On the other hand, the records preserved to us in Genesis have remained pure and free from all these corruptions which penetrated into the Babylonian copies.

The Trustees of the British Museum, in *The Babylonian Legends of the Creation and the Fight Between Bel and the Dragon*, declare that “the fundamental conceptions of the Babylonian and Hebrew accounts are ***essentially different***.”

From his hands on research, archaeologist Sir Ernest Budge agrees:

It must be pointed out that there is ***no evidence at all*** that the two accounts of the creation which are given in the early chapters of Genesis, are derived from the seven tablets.
(*Babylonian Life and History*)

Oriental scholar Alfred Jeremias, in *The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East*, comes to the same conclusion:

The prevailing assumption of a literary dependence of the Biblical records of creation upon Babylonian texts ***is very frail.***

To an impartial reader, the book of Genesis bears the hallmarks of an authentic, original and superior document.

What a pity that some people, instead of keeping abreast of modern archaeological research, continue to make clownish comments about Genesis “borrowings” from Sumerian/ Babylonian sources!

So Genesis was plagiarised from “6,000 year old” Babylonian/ Sumerian sources? Er, yes.... The evidence is all around us, of course. Just like the evidence for the Tooth Fairy!

16

GO FOR THE BEST

Suppose you are planning to build a house. Won't you want your builder to lay the best foundation? ...and to use the best materials – not rusty or rotten second-hand junk? And, of course, you will want the purest water possible to come through your pipes, right?

This has relevance to our subject... go for the BEST!

BIBLE VERSUS OTHER ANCIENT ACCOUNTS

Comparing the Sumerian tablets with Genesis, there are a number of important *differences*. Alexander Heidel has carefully analysed these. He concludes that even though there are definite similarities, these areas of agreement are apparently caused by the two stories having been based on the same *event*, NOT the same account. (Alexander Heidel, *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament*, pp.224-258)

In the following particulars the biblical books rise above virtually all of the others.

1. SIMPLER, MORE COHERENT

One thing becomes crystal clear as you place the Bible side by side with the records of any of the ancient nations. Its record is ***straightforward, connected and concise***. It stands in a class by itself when compared with other versions for ***meaningful*** transmission of information. It tells a simpler, ***more coherent*** story.

It does not bear the marks of the superstitious, the magical or the grotesque, which occur in other ancient texts.

2. MORE HISTORICALLY PRECISE THAN OTHER RECORDS

One obvious difference from other ancient documents is its ***objective, historical character***. The religions of the ancient world did not even postulate a historical basis. The greatest of Middle Eastern archaeologists, Professor William Albright, notes:

In Egypt and Babylonia, in Assyria and Phoenicia, in Greece and Rome, we look in vain for anything comparable. There is nothing like it in the tradition of the Germanic peoples. Neither India nor China can produce anything similar. (Louis Finklestein , ed. Wm. Albright, essay: "The Biblical period", *The Jews, Their History, Culture, and Religion*. Vol.1, 3rd ed. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960, p.3)

Because the basic theme of Genesis is so absolutely dependent on the facts of history, its chronology is in the ***strongest contrast*** with that of other nations.

Chronologies of the nations have ***no beginning***. They emerge from the unknown, and their earliest dates are ***hazy and uncertain***. But from the very beginning, Bible chronology is defined with the ***utmost precision***.

Egypt:	Beginning vague, hazy, uncertain..... later period KNOWN
Babylonia:	Beginning vague, hazy, uncertain..... later period KNOWN
Assyria:	Beginning vague, hazy, uncertain..... later period KNOWN
Phoenicia:	Beginning vague, hazy, uncertain..... later period KNOWN
Greece:	Beginning vague, hazy, uncertain..... later period KNOWN
India:	Beginning vague, hazy, uncertain..... later period KNOWN
GENESIS chronology:	DETAILED FROM BEGINNING.... later period KNOWN

I think Francis Hitching said it well:

The grand sweep of the Old Testament is the finest record of ancient history existing in the world today, the most readable and the most secure in its description of long-buried events....

Compared with it, the records from Egypt and Babylon are fragmented and ambiguous. (Francis Hitching, *The World Atlas of Mysteries*. London: Pan Books Ltd., 1978, p. 168)

The Genesis account is given in concise (and precise) language that bespeaks historical fact.

3. NOT SPOILT BY LOCAL COLOUR

It is interesting to note how *nations commonly 'beefed up' a story for impact*. Their various reports of the Great Flood illustrate this well. Many tribal versions 'relocated' the landing place of the survival vessel to *the nearest high mountain*, to add impact to their Flood story.

By contrast, the Genesis record does not. It simply states that the Ark landed "upon the mountains of Ararat." (Gen.8:14) This was *a*

distant land of which the Hebrews had no personal knowledge. This factor testifies to the Genesis account's *unbending fidelity to fact*.

4. MORE SCIENTIFIC

Would you like an example of true ancient science? Just look at the *specifications of Noah's Ark*.

Notice how the Babylonian/Assyrian Flood account describes the survival vessel. The *Gilgamesh Epic*, in lines 57 through 61, states that its floor space was one 'iku', a measurement which has been translated to mean 3,600 square metres or about one acre.

It reads:

One iku was its floor space, one hundred and twenty cubits each was the *height* of its walls; one hundred twenty cubits measured each *side* of its deck.

This leads to but one conclusion – *the boat was an exact cube!*

You only have to ask an engineer and he'll inform you that such a crudely designed cubic vessel would be a disaster. It would tend to keep turning with each gust of wind, as if caught in a gigantic whirlpool!

Now *compare that with* the description of the Ark in the book of Genesis:

The *length* of the ark shall be three hundred cubits, the *breadth* of it fifty cubits, and the *height* of it thirty cubits.
(Gen.6:15)

The survival vessel is described as having a ratio of six to one (300 cubits by 50 - Gen.6:15). From a point of stability and rolling, that is about as perfect as can be desired.

Some of today's giant tankers have a ratio of seven to one. In modern engineering terms, the specifications recorded in Genesis are *of perfect proportions*.

George Dickie, a Scottish architect, from specifications for Noah's Ark *taken out of the book of Genesis*, designed the well-known battleship *Oregon*.

As a flagship of the US navy, it led convoys, visited almost every notable port in the world and met every test of seaworthiness, including a fierce typhoon.

Here's what the editor of the *Los Angeles Times*, said of the *Oregon*:

One of the surprising facts of history is that it took 2,000 years for the science of marine engineering to develop the highest type of sea-going craft, when the secrets of the true dimensions for the greatest carrying power, combined with the least resistance of the waves, rested all that time in the book of Genesis.

Doesn't that lift Genesis out of the realm of a fanciful tale and into the category of an *up-to-date, reliable report*? (For some of the questions that skeptics raise concerning Noah's Ark, see my book *The Killing of Paradise Planet*, ch.13. <<http://www.beforeus.com/first.php>>)

If there is still a skeptic around, think again. It is apparent that the book of Genesis bears the stamp of a *sophisticated and accurate document*!

If the law of cause and effect has any meaning at all – that is, that the effect cannot be greater than its cause – then there can be no doubt that the confused and cumbersome writings of the Sumerians do not represent an original source, but have been corrupted from the simplicity of the original source.

5. **OLDER THAN OTHER DOCUMENTS**

Genesis is demonstrably **older** than any other Middle Eastern document. (For comprehensive evidence of this, see my book *The Weapon the Globalists Fear*, especially Chapter 19.)

Eminent archaeologist William F. Albright points out that the archaic features contained in the Genesis record **date it BEFORE any Mesopotamian version** that is “preserved in cuneiform sources” (such as the Babylonian Epic of Gilgamesh and the Assyrian Epic of Atrahasis). (W.F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*. London: Athlone Press, 1968, p.86. See also: Clifford Wilson, *Crash Go the Chariots*. New York: Lancer Books, 1972, pp.45-51. Wilson, *The Chariots Still Crash*. Old Tappan, N.J.: Fleming H. Revell and Co., 1976, pp.129-140)

6. **ITS DETAILS CONFIRMED BY ARCHAEOLOGY**

More recently, a wealth of **details** found within it have been **confirmed by archaeological discovery**. (The evidence on this would fill volumes.)

The earlier view that the biblical data were suspect and even likely to be false, unless corroborated by other independent facts, is more and more giving way to the view that, by and large, the biblical accounts are **more likely to be true than false**.

As Sir Isaac Newton discovered, “there are **more sure marks of authenticity** in the Bible than in any [secular] history.”

7. **ITS MORAL FORCE**

Here is something else worth considering. The moral force that emerges from the Bible account is almost completely missing in the Sumerian/Babylonian tradition.

The people who actually study the Bible systematically and live by it (not those who theorise about it) are coming forward and testifying as to what it is doing for them – turning wife-beating bullies into caring, loving spouses – ***mending broken homes and lives***. I ask you, what have the Sumerian texts done to mend broken homes?

Is this a stupid, irrelevant question? No. we are speaking of the practical moral quality of the texts.

It is easy to discover where the truth lies. All you have to do is to weigh the positives and the negatives. The weight of evidence speaks for itself.

You know that old saying: The proof of the pudding is in the eating. Of course, every good thing has its detractors. But ***the people to listen to*** are those who know about it by putting into practice its principles themselves.

7. ITS MODERN DAY RELEVANCE

It was British prime minister Sir Winston Churchill who observed that, despite its splendid virtues, science “does not meet any of the real needs of the human race.” What good is scientific development, he asked, if it cannot answer the “simple questions which man has asked since the earliest dawn of reason – ‘Why are we here? What is the purpose of life? Where are we going?’”

The biblical texts contain astonishing prophecies that answer these questions in a way that ***makes sense***.

It is not just *who* does *what*, and *where* and *when*. It is all about the ***why***. ***Why*** do people do the things they do? And ***why*** does our Creator do the things He does? ***Where*** do the things we do ultimately lead?

If an unbiased, clear-minded reader links the facts to the ground with the history of the past and the reality of prophecy for the future, he is forced to this conclusion: No book in this world even remotely compares with the Bible. It stands in a class by itself. Comparing other books to the Bible is like comparing man to God!

Is this the raving of some fanatic? No. I speak as a hard nosed scientist.

THE BOTTOM LINE

Whichever way you compare it, one is struck by the inferiority of the Babylonian to the biblical account.

In the above eight respects, the biblical record towers head and shoulders above every known document of the ancient world. It stands in a class by itself, for meaningful transmission of information. And this is not arguable. It is a fact.

CRITICS GIVE UP – BUT OTHERS REMAIN UNAWARE

It was not long ago that critical scholars thought that any who believed in the Bible account of history were beneath notice, from a scholarly standpoint, because they refused to accept the impressive findings of the critics!

These critics assumed they knew better 4,000 years after the event than writers who lived in the times immediately after the events. What utter absurdity!

It would be more realistic to question the historical reliability of some Sumerian records – and give due recognition to the Bible as *the standard* by which all else can be safely judged.

While many critics have admitted their mistake, yet others persist, always doubting, the one mechanically repeating the other – simply because they have not kept up with the discoveries. One suspects that many are too apathetic, bigoted and lazy to make the attempt, while others are tools of a well-oiled anti-Bible propaganda machine, that knows it can fool most of the people most of the time.

And this machine is run by the New World Order moguls, who know that knowledge is power. So their agenda includes keeping you from knowing that you are a child of the Creator, whose limitless power is available to you. If they can prevent you from knowing and believing this, they think their job will be easier when it comes to executing their planned wipe-out of most people alive on the earth.

No wonder the biblical book of Genesis bugs them so much!

BUT HAS THERE BEEN “TAMPERING”?

So, with almost limitless money at their disposal, they have been promulgating the rumor that the biblical books were tampered with over the centuries. Therefore toss away anything that’s in the Bible - and “trust us”.

Well, perhaps they’re right? Has it been altered? Let’s see...

17

DID SOMEONE ALTER THE OLD TESTAMENT?

Corey leaned back and stretched his feet along the couch. “Now, now, now,” he smiled, “you can’t be sure what’s true in the Bible. It’s been interfered with.”

“And why would anyone do that?”

“Oh, to make the heroes in the stories look good. Or to place their own race in a favourable light.”

“You have my attention,” said Jason. Tell me, what was changed – and when?”

“It was done after Moses died.”

“You have evidence of that?”

“Well, I was reading this new book recently.”

“Oh, do you mind if I see that?”

“Sure.” Corey eased himself off the couch and slipped out of the room. In a minute or two he was back. “Here.”

For a few minutes there was silence, as Jason pored carefully through the book. Presently, he spoke. “Corey, can you show me where the writer actually says that?”

Reaching out, Corey took back the book. “I was reading it this morning.” He turned some pages, then looked up with a smile. “Ah, here it is.” He passed it back.

Jason scanned the page. “Yes, it does say that some priests made changes after the death of Moses’ brother Aaron. Okay... let’s look at some evidence...” Jason continued reading in silence.

Corey looked on. “Well?”

“Yes, this writer does say as you told me. But...” Then Jason straightened up. “Corey, I can’t find this man’s evidence. Where is it?”

Corey stammered. “Er-er...well...”

“Tell me this,” said Jason, “if I want to learn about something that happened before the first century why would I believe this Johnny-come-lately twenty-first century book instead of a first century book?”

“What first century book?”

“Have you heard of Josephus, the eminent Jewish historian?”

While we leave Corey and Jason to continue their chat, why don’t we launch our own investigation?

If any of the Tanakh (the Hebrew Old Testament) has been altered, we should be able to discover some evidence. So let’s break up our investigation into five historical periods:

1. Adam to Moses (4000 to 1400 BC)
2. Moses to Josephus (1400 BC to 100 AD)
3. The Talmudists (100 to 500 AD)
4. The Masoretes (500 to 900 AD)
5. The intervening period (900 to 1947 AD)

1. ADAM TO MOSES (4000 to 1400 BC)

The first book of the Bible is Genesis (“*beginnings*”). There are some stunning clues, generally unnoticed, that Genesis contains the world’s oldest piece of writing.

I realise that such a daring statement calls for a substantial and lengthy explanation, with adequate proofs. However, since this is already covered extensively in my book *The Weapon the Globalists Fear*, we shall not repeat the evidence here.

Sufficient to state that among the certainties revealed in the book of Genesis are these:

1. A series of eleven tablets was recorded by scribes who left evidence that they were ***contemporary to the events*** reported. These scribes are named within the text, and their chronologies supplied.
2. Then, between 1486 and 1406 BC, these tablets were compiled by the Hebrew sage Moses into one book, today known as Genesis. The world’s oldest form of ***literary aids and cuneiform usages*** is still discernable in Genesis. These writing techniques, that later fell into disuse, clearly reveal
 - (a) the remote age of the text
 - (b) the unchanged purity of the text.

3. Internal evidence reveals that Moses, in compiling these original eleven tablets into a single book, handled them most reverently. The first thing that impresses us in reading them now, is that he regards the old wording as so *sacred* that usually he *avoids making unnecessary alterations to the text, even to modernise words*. He leaves the original outmoded expressions and place names just as he finds them, though they are no longer in current use.
4. It is evident that Moses held these tablets in such *high esteem* that he made *no attempt whatever to eliminate the original repetitions* which linked one tablet to the next.
5. Also, the *unchanged archaisms* within the structure of the text indicate that it has been carefully preserved since the autograph original was made. (See the detailed evidence in *The Weapon the Globalists Fear*.)

2. MOSES TO JOSEPHUS (1400 BC to 100 AD)

The subsequent Hebrew copyists were not just trustworthy, but uniquely so.

In case you were not aware, there are two important checks on the authenticity of the Tanakh, to which the critic, despite his awesome display of knowledge, appears to be blind.

(a) *UNFLINCHING HONESTY*

The first is its *honesty concerning the heroes*, whether it be the history of David... or that of Abraham... or of Moses. Or you name it.

Many of the facts recorded about these men are of a kind which mere adulators would not have reported, still less have invented. They stick out from the narrative by their sheer unflattering awkwardness, their uncompromising fidelity to truth.

For example, we read of Abraham's timidity and deception concerning his marriage to Sarah (Genesis 12:10-20), and later his impatience, lack of faith and bad judgment, which resulted in family turmoil (Genesis chapters 16 and 21). Also of Isaac's cheating (Genesis 26:7-10) and Jacob's lying and stealing (Genesis chapter 27).

And what do we discover about the writer's beloved nation of Israel? Contrary to what one might expect, Israel is repeatedly shown up to be a stiff-necked, ungrateful, rebellious group who keep forgetting the God who delivered them from their oppressors.

How can one explain this humiliating history, continuing on and on through the centuries, until "there was no remedy" and God's "servant", the heathen Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon, was sent to drag them into exile to be taught a lesson?

So the writings were altered, were they? - to show the nation of Israel and the revered heroes in a favourable light? Someone has to be joking!

If we need evidence of the high standard of veracity prevailing in the Bible writings we have it in the Bible itself in its most convincing form.

The record was not rewritten or tampered with, to make its cause look good. It tells it like it is, warts and all. That's evidence of honesty.

***(b) PASSIONATE REVERENCE
FOR THE WRITINGS***

The second check on the integrity of the Scripture is in the Israelites' extreme reverence for the sacred writings – an ***obsessive reverence for every letter and word***. For this reason, scribes made copies of the Old Testament manuscripts in a way which is ***quite unique***. They preserved them as no other manuscript in history has been preserved. Why? Because these documents played an important role in Israelite culture and government.

You see, religion was ***their ruling passion***. They believed that the Bible was not of human origin, but was directly inspired by God Himself. Therefore every letter and word had to be regarded with the highest reverence. And this could allow no changes.

And this reverence was reinforced by the most serious warnings in the text itself, forbidding any taking away or adding to, the words of God! Here are some of these warnings:

- * I know that, whatsoever God doeth, it shall be for ever: nothing can be PUT TO it, nor any thing TAKEN FROM it: and God doeth it, that men should fear before him. (Ecclesiastes 3:14)
- * YE SHALL NOT ADD unto the word which I command you, NEITHER SHALL YE DIMINISH ought from it... (Deuteronomy 4:2)
- * ADD THOU NOT unto his words . . . (Proverbs 30:6)

Ever since the time of Moses, the Hebrews have held the whole of the sacred texts in the highest reverence. They took the above warnings seriously. We have the testimony of the first century Jewish historian Flavius Josephus to this fact.

But first, lest anyone raise doubts concerning the integrity of Josephus' testimony, it may be helpful to hear what a scholar highly familiar with Josephus' work has to say.

Joseph Scaliger assures us:

Josephus is the most diligent and the greatest lover of truth of all writers: nor are we afraid to affirm of him, that it is more safe to believe him, not only as to the affairs of the Jews, but also as to those that are foreign to them, than all the Greek and Latin writers, and this, because his fidelity and his compass of learning are everywhere conspicuous. (Joseph Scaliger, in the Prolegomea to *De Emendations Temporum*, p.17)

Josephus testifies to the ***reverent attention to detail*** paid by Hebrew scribes in their faithful preservation of the biblical texts. He says:

We have given practical proof of our reverence for our own Scriptures. For, although such long ages have now passed, no one has ventured either to add, or to remove, or to alter a syllable; and it is an instinct with every Jew, from the day of his birth, to regard them as the decrees of God, to abide by them, and, if need be, cheerfully to die for them. (Flavius Josephus, "Flavius Josephus Against Apion" *Josephus, Complete Works*. Translated by William Whiston. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1960, pp.179,180)

Now notice how Josephus compares the Hebrew respect for Scripture with the Greek regard for their literature. Listen:

What Greek would endure as much for the same cause? Even to save the entire collection of his nation's writings from destruction he would not face the smallest personal injury. For to the Greeks [their own writings] are mere stories improvised according to the fancy of their authors. (*Ibid.*, p. 181)

But for a Hebrew to interfere with what he awesomely regarded as God's Word was unthinkable. NO Hebrew would dare try it.

Modern critics are so blissfully ***ignorant of this ancient Hebrew mind set*** – which is so different from their own. Or they can't comprehend it.

It seems to me that the skeptic is thinking with his funny bone and not with his head.

As surely as the sun will rise tomorrow, so certain is it that during the period of Moses to Josephus, the Hebrew Tanakh survived inviolate.

3. THE TALMUDISTS (100 to 500 AD)

Although such devoted regard for the text went right back to ancient times, we have *more specific* instructions preserved from the time of the Talmudists.

The Talmudists (AD 100-500) had quite an intricate system for transcribing the scrolls.

1. They had to be written on the skins of clean animals, and fastened together with strings from clean animals.
2. Every skin must contain a certain number of columns, equal throughout the entire manuscript.
3. The length and breadth of each column, together with the precise number of letters was specifically defined.
4. No word or letter, not even a yod, must be written from memory, without the scribe looking at the codex before him.
5. Between every consonant, new section, and book, a precisely-stipulated space must intervene.
6. The copyist had to wash his whole body, sit in full Jewish dress, and every time he wrote the name of God he must do so with a pen newly dipped in ink.

(Samuel Davidson, *Hebrew Text of the Old Testament*. 2nd edition. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1859, p. 89. Norman L. Geisler and William E. Nix, *A General Introduction to the Bible*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1968, p. 241)

And can you guess what they did to any rolls in which these rules were not observed? Such rolls were condemned to be buried in the ground or burned; or they were banished to the schools, to be used as reading-books.

This is such an interesting fact. Why do we never hear of it?

And do you know, the Talmudists, after copying a manuscript, were so convinced that they had an exact duplicate, that they would give the new copy equal authority.

4. THE MASORETES (500 to 900 AD)

The standard Hebrew text we have today is known as the Masoretic text.

Those Masoretes (AD 500-900) were amazing. They counted the number of times each letter of the alphabet occurs in each book. They pointed out the middle letter of the Pentateuch (the 5 books of Moses) and the middle letter of the entire Hebrew Bible. And they made even more detailed calculations than those. (F.F. Bruce, *The Books and the Parchments*. Rev. ed. Westwood: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1963, p. 117)

They numbered the verses, words and letters of every book. They calculated the middle word and middle letter of each book.

And as Sir Frederic Kenyon so rightly points out:

These trivialities had the effect of securing minute attention to the precise transmission of the text;... The Masoretes were indeed anxious that not one jot nor tittle, not one smallest letter nor one tiny part of a letter, of the Law should pass away or be lost. (Frederic G. Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941, p. 38)

There you have it. Tell me, whoever *counted the letters and*

syllables and words of Plato or Aristotle or Seneca...or of the now oft-touted Sumerian texts?

5. THE INTERVENING PERIOD (900 to 1947 AD)

The last Hebrew manuscripts of the Old Testament had been completed around 400 BC. But until 1947, the oldest complete surviving Hebrew manuscript dated back only to about AD 900. This made a time gap between the original and the oldest copy of 1,300 years.

And then, in 1947, just a simple thing happened. An Arab shepherd boy wandered the hills of Qumran near the Dead Sea, in search of a missing sheep.

He threw a stone into a cave, hoping to drive the lost animal outside. Instead, the sound of shattered pottery drew him inside the cave. And in the cave were dozens of pottery jars. Thinking that the cave was haunted, the boy ran away.

Later, a man returned with the boy and found more than 40 jars inside the cave, many of them broken. The jars contained no treasure in the ordinary sense, but dozens of leather and papyrus scrolls bearing ancient writing. Some of these scrolls were brought to experts, who declared that the scrolls contained copies of some books of the Old Testament.

These scrolls had been hidden by a sect of Jews called Essenes. At some time before the Christian era began, the Essenes had retired to this desert area.

Then in the year 68, when a Roman army entered the region, the Essenes fled, leaving their library of biblical scrolls hidden in a cave, where they remained unseen for almost 19 centuries! All of these books may not have been Essene. Many of them are believed to have come originally from other places, such as the Temple in Jerusalem.

In the years that followed, archaeologists found eleven caves and more than 900 documents here at Qumran.

These ancient writings became known as the Dead Sea Scrolls, which scholars date before the first century.

One of those scrolls was a complete Hebrew manuscript copy of the biblical book of Isaiah. Dated around 125 BC, it was more than 1,000 years older than any other.

The question naturally arose: Would these older scrolls reveal that discrepancies and changes had crept in during the intervening one thousand years? Scholars held their breath. Gradually, the Isaiah scroll of BC 125 was compared letter by letter with the Masoretic text of Isaiah of 1,000 years later.

And what was the result? It was found to be *in precise agreement* with the text of 1,000 years later.

Gleeson Archer reports on the results:

Even though the two copies of Isaiah discovered in Qumran Cave 1 near the Dead Sea in 1947 were a thousand years earlier than the oldest dated manuscript previously known (AD 980), they proved to be word for word identical with our standard Hebrew Bible in more than 95 percent of the text. The 5 percent of variation consisted chiefly of obvious slips of the pen and variations in spelling. (Gleason Archer, *A Survey of the Old Testament*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1964, p. 25)

A typical example is Isaiah chapter 53. Of its 166 *words*, only 17 *letters* are in question. Ten of these letters are simply in spelling. Four other letters are tiny stylistic changes, like conjunctions. And the remaining three letters comprise the word *light* (in verse 11), which is supported by other manuscripts.

So there you have it. In a chapter of 166 words, just *one* 3-letter word is in question after 1,000 years of transmission – and this

single word does not materially change the meaning of the passage.

Don't you think that's an amazing preservation? A manuscript from 125 BC virtually word for word identical with the text of a thousand years later!

The further you investigate, the more apparent does it become that the surviving manuscripts are indeed *trustworthy*.

METICULOUS PRESERVATION EVEN OF FOREIGN WORDS IN THE TEXT

The correct transmission of names is notoriously difficult. Copies of Manetho's list of 140 Egyptian kings when compared with Egyptian monuments, has 63 of them unrecognizable in any single syllable.

In contrast, the text in the Bible has been transmitted with *the minutest accuracy*. There are places where the biblical text transliterates from Egyptian, Babylonian, Assyrian and Moabite into Hebrew, and vice versa. And yet the evidence shows that for up to 3,900 years the text even of those foreign proper names in the Hebrew Bible was handed down with total accuracy. Those copyist scribes were something else!

UNIQUE IN WORLD LITERATURE

After investigating this feature, Robert Dick Wilson was able to testify:

That the original scribes should have written them with such close conformity to correct philological principles is a wonderful proof of their thorough care and scholarship; further, that the Hebrew text should have been transmitted

by copyists through so many centuries with the most minute accuracy is a phenomenon unequaled in the history of literature. (Robert Dick Wilson, *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1959, p. 71)

Yes, you CAN be certain that the Hebrew Bible text has been transmitted accurately. An Under-Librarian of the library at Cambridge University by the name of Atkinson calls this accuracy of transmission “little short of miraculous.” (Josh McDowell, *Evidence That Demands a Verdict*. San Bernardino, Cal.: Here’s Life Publishers, Inc., 1986, p. 56)

TO SUMMARISE

In view of these facts, it is somewhat startling to find that critics still drag out that tired old line that “someone” altered the text. No evidence. Just vague insinuations. Shouldn’t one feel sorry for them?

(We shall not shatter the critic’s imagined “editors” J and E and P and D here, because that is already done in my hard-hitting book, *The Weapon the Globalists Fear*.)

We have noted in this chapter that the original text of the Old Testament in Hebrew and Aramaic was carefully preserved until the time of Jesus. Then, after the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD, Jewish scribes in different countries continued to faithfully copy the traditional Old Testament text until printing took over. This is known as the Masoretic Text.

In the following chapter we shall address the same question of tampering concerning the New Testament – the set of books written as the Christian movement began to explode, and which reveals Jesus Christ as the fulfillment of the Old Testament Messianic expectation. Was it faked? Was it altered? Lets see.

18

DID SOMEONE ALTER THE NEW TESTAMENT?

Jack leaned over the table and smiled softly, “I’m a really good driver. In the past thirty years, I have gotten only four speeding tickets.”

Very true, Jack. But you didn’t tell us that you started driving only a week ago.

Every word that Jack spoke was true. But he left out something crucial, which could change the whole picture. Has someone ever told you a “half truth”, in order to give you a wrong impression of things?

Now here comes another half truth:

IT IS CLAIMED: The New Testament books used today (known as the canon) were decided upon by the Roman emperor Constantine and his corrupt bishops at the Council of Nicaea in the 4th century. This dubious history is being covered up.

IN REALITY: This may shock you. Yes, it is true that Constantine’s men *did* endorse a corrupted Bible. And, indeed, a

cover-up is in full swing. But the cover up is by the accuser. Here we see a classic example of a half truth... by the critic himself. Honest? No.

WHAT THE CRITIC HIDES FROM US

He won't tell you these two facts:

1. THE SAME BOOK-LIST ALREADY EXISTED

The New Testament books were not decided by the Roman emperor Constantine and his corrupt bishops, at all. The very same package of recognised books used today was accepted as early as the *first century*.

Can this be proved?

Sure can. Let's open this collection of books we're talking about. You'll see that there is internal evidence of this in the New Testament itself.

- In the first century, the New Testament “words of... prophecy” were already being read in public worship side by side with the Old Testament texts. This indicated they had canonical authority in the churches. (Colossians 4:16);
- The apostle Peter referred to the apostle Paul's writings as “Scriptures”. (2 Peter 3:16);
- Luke's Gospel was referred to as “Scripture” by Paul. (1 Timothy 5:18; see also Luke 10:7);
- Paul used the word *kanon* (“rule”) when referring to the apostles' fundamental teaching, which was to be followed and obeyed. (Galatians 6:16).

The question to ask is, what created the Christian movement in the first place? It was nothing less than the message found in

these very same first century books – the message that Jesus Christ was the Messiah and that having risen from the dead, he was seen by hundreds of eyewitnesses still living. That's what launched Christianity across the world.

Later, in the *fourth century*, Emperor Constantine's men did not create the list of recognised books (the canon). They merely recognized what was already there.

Away back in the *first century*, the canon of books was widely known and accepted throughout the Christian world. (See the compelling archaeological evidence for this in my recent book *Who's Playing Jesus Games?*)

Later councils, far from *giving* any authority to the books, rather *bowed* to their pre-existing authority.

2. **99% OF MANUSCRIPTS UNCHANGED**

Something else. When someone tells you that the writings were tampered with, he is referring to what Rome did to only 1% of all the manuscripts. (And I shall address that in a few minutes.)

Why only 1%? Here's why. The Christians were scattered across vast distances, separated by months of travel. And they were often forced underground by persecution.

Did they have telephones? Of course not. And no faxes... no radio... no Internet.

So consider this...

1. There were many thousands of Greek manuscripts, used in far-flung places, but all containing *the same identical books*.
2. The widely scattered Gospels that have survived from that time all show *the same titles*. German scholar Martin Hengel

presents a good case that these titles were appended when the Gospels were first completed and circulated together, ‘between 69 and 100.’ (Martin Hengel, “Titles of the Gospels,” *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1985, pp. 64-84)

It is known that by the second century scores and scores of copies of these Gospels already existed. And by the fourth century hundreds, perhaps thousands, of copies. So to change them, to make them ***all identical*** (as they are) at that late stage, would have been logistically impossible.

Think now. That ***list of books*** had to be assembled more or less at the beginning, ***before*** Christianity spread out. Later would have been too late, for them to have that same ***identical*** grouping.

Historically, there is ***an unbroken, straight line*** from the teaching of Jesus in the thirties to the writings of Paul and the other apostles in the mid to latter half of the ***first century***.
(Documented fully in my book *Who’s Playing Jesus Games?*)

And something else. Before Constantine’s fourth century ever dawned, there were masses of quotations from the New Testament already published by early Christian leaders. Dean Burgon in his research found, in all, **86,489** quotes of it from early Christian writers - all from ***before Constantine’s council of Nicaea*** in 325 AD. His index of these consists of 16 thick volumes now in the British Museum. (Norman L. Geisler and William E. Nix, *A General Introduction to the Bible*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1968, pp. 353-354)

So extensive are these quotations that the New Testament ***could virtually be reconstructed*** from them without the use of New Testament manuscripts.

Sir David Dalrymple sought to do this, and from the works of second and third century church writers he found the ***entire New Testament quoted except for eleven verses***. (Josh McDowell, *Evidence That Demands a Verdict*. San Bernardino, CA., Here’s Life Publishers, 1986, pp.50-51)

So you could throw the New Testament manuscripts away and still reconstruct it with the simple help of these letters.

SO WHAT DID CONSTANTINE DO IN THE 4TH CENTURY?

You ask: Very well, what did Constantine do to the New Testament?

Constantine *did* have something to do with a new Bible – he adopted a corrupted copy of the Bible that had been worked on by a scholar in Alexandria, Egypt, a man named Origen. Origen's motive was to make changes that would be acceptable to pagans.

And that suited Constantine fine, because, as a politician, he was trying to keep his empire united. And, with Christianity growing by leaps and bounds in his pagan empire, he foresaw difficulties between the two groups. So he looked around for a document that could weld the two closer together. And he ordered 50 copies of Origen's Bible to be made.

Someone will surely ask, But what about all the changes in the Bible that we keep hearing were made by that Council of Nicaea? Did Constantine's new Bible *omit* some gospels and *insert* other books?

Indeed not! The subject never came up at that Council. And today we still have all the Council rulings, in addition to reports by several attendees. These absolutely prove that the Council never issued any such rulings, nor even discussed such ideas as censoring or changing the Bible in any way.

On the contrary, the debate at that Council (known as the Arian debate) was over whether or not to add A SINGLE WORD to the Creed... not the Bible. And that one word was disputed

precisely because it was NOT found in the New Testament's vocabulary anywhere.

In other words, everyone agreed on the wording of the New Testament, as well as the Greek version of the Old Testament. The great Nicaean censorship we keep hearing about never happened. The story is a hoax.

So there it is. We're being "had" by a myth repeated so often it has taken on a life of its own, being repeated in books and articles as if it has some sort of academic "source" somewhere. Yet there's not a word of truth in it.

Does someone still want to dispute this? You can check up on this, if you wish. Details on this Council of Nicaea have been published by a Jewish historian who does not have any pro-Christian bias. (Richard E. Rubenstein, *When Jesus Became God*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company, 1999)

MOST MANUSCRIPTS PRESERVED PURE

Now here are two crucial facts that the critic conveniently leaves out...

1. The New Testament writings were so important to Christians everywhere that it was virtually impossible to mess them up and get away with it. Just ponder this. Just suppose I wanted to corrupt or forge them. How on earth could I call in from the very limits of the Roman Empire every last copy to make the necessary alterations? And change every single one so that there would be the uniformity which we find witnessed in these old manuscripts today? - along with countless memories (In case you didn't know, Scripture memorization was common).

2. Because Christianity was a missionary movement from the beginning (Matthew 28:19-21), its scriptures were immediately translated into the known languages of that period. And so many of these manuscripts have survived. The truth is that during the time when the Scriptures were suffering corruption in Alexandria and Rome, the *original* text was being *preserved* carefully *in numerous other places* which the corrupters could not reach. This uncorrupted text was known as the Peshitta, or Syriac Aramaic.

You don't hear many critics talk about this. And why not? I can think of two reasons. Either they don't know, or they are lying to us. Take your pick.

Only two centuries after Constantine's time, the church of Rome began to rule Europe. And Europe slipped into the Dark Ages.

However, in virtually every other part of the world, from Syria to China, and in the secluded Piedmontese valleys of Europe, the unchanged text was used and cherished. Today, the vast majority of surviving manuscripts are from this source. Hence it is termed the Majority, or Traditional, Text.

WHY DO MOST MANUSCRIPTS SO CLOSELY AGREE?

After the seeming endlessness of the Dark Ages, the long isolated Eastern and Western streams finally yielded their respective Bibles publicly. At this time the Italia in the West and the Peshitta from the East were brought together for the first time in over 1,400 years and when compared were found to be still virtually identical.

These furnish *an independent means of checking* what was in the earliest list of books, the canon.

Harvard Theological Review cites Kirsopp Lake's exhaustive examination of manuscripts which revealed this “***uniformity*** of the text exhibited by the vast majority of the New Testament manuscripts.”

Now think how amazing this is - that amid the overwhelming thousands of manuscripts - the copyists of different countries and different ages succeeded in preserving a virtually ***identical*** Bible.

So why is there substantial agreement seen among 99 percent of our surviving manuscripts? It is because of their general fidelity to the inspired originals.

The importance of the sheer number of manuscript copies and their 99 percent agreement with the Traditional Text cannot be overstated.

TWO WORLD RECORDS

Here are two amazing facts about the New Testament record – (a) the sheer number of preserved manuscripts, and (b) their closeness in time to the originals.

(a) NUMBER OF MANUSCRIPTS

More than 24,000 manuscript copies of portions of the New Testament are in existence today.

No other document from the ancient world even begins to approach such numbers. Homer's *Iliad* comes second with only 643 surviving manuscripts.

New Testament.....	24,970 manuscripts
<i>Iliad</i>	643 manuscripts

- For the Roman history of Livy (59 BC to AD 17), of the 142 books, only 35 survive. And only one (containing fragments of Books III-VI) is as old as the 4th century.
- Of the Histories of Tacitus (c. AD 100), of the 14 books, only 4½ survive.
- Of his Annals, of the 16 books, only 10 survive in full and 2 in part. All of this depends entirely on two manuscripts, one of the ninth century and one of the eleventh.

The *number* of available manuscripts of the New Testament is overwhelmingly *greater than those of any other work of* ancient literature. In fact, it has more ancient manuscripts to authenticate it than any other ten pieces of ancient literature put together. To be consistent, if I am skeptical of the New Testament text, I will be forced to reject all of the classical writings of antiquity.

(b) TIME PROXIMITY TO ORIGINALS

But what about the *gap in time* between the *originals* that no longer exist and the *oldest copies* we have?

A good question.

But first let's consider other ancient authors... for example, Homer. It is impossible to pin down with any certainty when Homer lived. Eratosthenes gives the traditional date of 1184 BC for the end of the Trojan War, the event which forms the basis for *Homer's Iliad*. The great Greek historian Herodotus put the date at 1250 BC. But Greek historians were far less certain about the dates for Homer's life. Some said he was a contemporary of the events of the *Iliad*, while others placed him sixty or a hundred or several hundred years afterward. Herodotus estimated that Homer lived and wrote in the 9th century BC.

The oldest complete preserved text of Homer dates only back to the 13th century. So there's a ***time gap*** between the oldest copy and the original of at least ***2,200 years***.

- For Caesar's Gallic Wars (composed between 58 and 50 BC) several manuscripts survive, but only 9 or 10 are good – and the oldest is some ***900 years later*** than his day.
- Of the History of Thucydides (c. 460-400 BC), only 8 manuscripts survive, the oldest dating from about AD 900, except for a few scraps dating from about the beginning of the Christian era. Time gap: at least ***1,300 years***.
- The same goes for the History of Herodotus (488-428 BC).

In point of time, the earliest surviving manuscripts of the New Testament are ***much closer*** to the originals than is the case with almost any other piece of ancient literature.

The oldest known manuscripts of most of the Greek classical authors are dated ***1,000 years or more after*** the author's death. Yet no classical scholar would doubt their authenticity. ***By comparison***, some virtually complete New Testament books date back to ***only one century*** from the original writings.

Why haven't we been told this?

What is the oldest piece of any New Testament manuscript? It is a fragment of Matthew's gospel (Matthew chapter 26 to be precise) – dated at AD 66. It is preserved in the Magdalen Library, Oxford.

HOW TO KNOW THE AGE OF A MANUSCRIPT

There are valid factors that help determine the age of a manuscript. These include (a) materials used; (b) letter size and form; (c) punctuation; (d) text divisions; (e) ornamentation; (f)

the color of the ink; (g) ; (h) the texture and color of parchment, to mention a few. (Norman L. Geisler and William E. Nix, *A General Introduction to the Bible*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1986, pp. 242-246)

The discoverer of the Magdalen manuscript, Professor Carsten Thiede, made a sophisticated analysis of the handwriting of the fragment.

Using a high-magnification device and the epifluorescent confocal laser scanning technique, it was possible to differentiate between 20 separate micrometer layers of the papyrus, measuring the height and depth of the ink as well as the angle of the stylus used by the scribe.

After this analysis Thiede was able to compare it with other papyri from that period. There were, for example, manuscripts found at Qumran (dated to 58 AD). There was another at Herculaneum (dated prior to 79 AD) a further one from the fortress of Masada (dated to between 73/74 AD), and finally a papyrus from the Egyptian town of Oxyrynchus.

Well, the Magdalen Manuscript fragment matches all four. In fact, it is almost a twin to the papyrus found in Oxyrynchus, which bears the date of 65 to 66 AD.

Thiede concludes that this papyrus fragment of St. Matthew's Gospel was written no later than this date, and probably earlier. ***Written in the lifetime*** of the events it describes!

As you know, scholars accept the writings of the ancient classics as generally trustworthy, right? Clearly, then, the reliability of the New Testament text is likewise assured.

So what have you? Two things:

- (1) the ***overwhelming number*** of manuscripts and
- (2) their ***proximity to the originals***.

Such a “mountain of evidence” gives the New Testament *great historical credibility*.

HOW MUCH IN DOUBT?

Let's compare the *Iliad* of Homer and the national epic of India, the *Mahabharata*, with the New Testament.

- * *Iliad* - has about 15,600 lines. Lines in doubt: 764.
5% textual corruption.
- * *Mahabharata* –250,000 lines. Lines in doubt: 26,000.
10% textual corruption.
- * *New Testament* – c. 20,000 lines. Lines in doubt: 40.
½% textual corruption.

A thorough investigation will show that of all the ancient works of substantial size, only one comes to us completely intact – the Bible. This is against all odds.

Compare this with William Shakespeare's plays, written only about 400 years ago. These plays are in much worse shape... original words have been lost in numerous sections. And scholars are left to fill in the blanks as best as they can. Were you aware of that?

It boils down to three things:

1. The New Testament's reliability is far greater than that of any other record of antiquity.
2. Most variants in New Testament manuscripts are merely in spelling or style.
3. We possess so many manuscripts, that, in removing any errors, we need never guess. The great majority of the New Testament has been transmitted to us with no, or

next to no, variation.

As Sir Frederic Kenyon puts it:

...no unbiased scholar would deny that the text that has come down to us is substantially sound. (Frederic G. Kenyon, *The Bible and Modern Scholarship*. London: John Murray, p.20)

So if anyone tells you that its original message has been changed, then you had better start questioning *other things* that person tells you. Because he/she is *either ignorant or lying*.

MYSTERY SEVENS CODE PROVES “NO CHANGES”

Even if the preceding evidence did not exist, there was also locked beneath the surface of the Bible a self-checking, self-verifying protection code, to ensure that nothing could be changed without us knowing.

It is a complex interlocking design of 7s which has been found embedded both *on and beneath the surface* of the Bible in its original languages. This sub-surface sevens pattern crosses over from one book to another and becomes complete only when all of the books of the Bible are placed together. This also indicates that there are no books missing and no books that shouldn't be there.

There is a pattern of rings within rings, wheels within wheels, yet each perfect in itself. Discovered only in modern times, and still not well known, this sevens code has staggered the cleverest brains in the world. Its complexity guarantees that no group of persons in the world could have forged the Bible writings, even had they wanted to.

This hidden arrangement of sevens codes contained in the text from the beginning to the end of each book, points strongly to a

non-human authorship. Why? Because it is a phenomenon *far beyond any human possibility* to deliberately structure.

If you want proof of this, just study my detailed report on this phenomenon in my book *The Weapon the Globalists Fear*, Chapter 21. (<<http://www.beforeus.com/weapon-ebook.html>>)

Oh, and in case you're wondering. Yes, attempts have been made to find a similar code in other ancient and modern works. The result: No other writings on earth possess this code. Not anywhere.

The point is this: If any passage did not fit the numeric pattern, we could determine precisely where the tampering had been done! Does that make sense?

WHY DO CRITICS PERSIST?

QUESTION: Then why do critics say that changes have been made in the Bible?

ANSWER: Most often it's because one writer simply parrots the words of an earlier critic, without checking. Sometimes we can let our prejudices get in the way.

And then there is the teenie-weenie matter of honesty, or lack of it.

19

SUMERIA'S SUDDEN APPEARANCE: HOW?

The question arises, If not from outer space, where did the Sumerian civilization get its high starting knowledge? How did the Sumerians know the relative sizes of our solar system planets, or that Saturn had rings, or that Jupiter had the greatest gravitational pull of all the planets?

Well, think now, how do **WE** know such things are true? By our telescopes and space probes. How did **THEY**? By similar human effort. No extraterrestrial help needed.

THE GOLDEN AGE

Should the reader turn to my book *Dead Men's Secrets* he will find abundant evidence for this. The weight of evidence grows daily – evidence that all the major secrets of modern technology were known, and forgotten, long ago. Evidence that early man did create a society that surpassed ours in all aspects of development. The evidence points to scientific knowledge that was worldwide at the same time.

And it appears that work stopped on a global scale, more or less overnight.

As you fit the pieces together, the question arises, what if something very big had happened on this planet in the past—something so big it wiped traces of just about everything from the face of the earth? Except for a few clues, upon which we were now stumbling?

I can imagine what you are thinking at this moment. You are probably intrigued. But a little skeptical that ancient man could never have produced such things as earth-orbiting satellites and spark plugs. Right?

Yes, I know. The 19th century evolution theory was hammered into us as schoolchildren and is still taught in all places of learning. The story goes that we ascended from savages to our present civilized state by a slow, uninterrupted development. The question now arises, Could this be a myth?

But hasn't evolution been proved? A good question. The truth is, evolution has always been only a theory. Yes, it is often presented as a fact, even though it is impossible of any really positive proof.

Would it surprise you to learn that not in one spot, but all over the world, "impossible" ancient inventions have been surfacing of late, and some of them from a technology as advanced as our own?

Did you know that nearly all writings of ancient peoples worldwide tell the same story, that of a decline from an original "Golden Age"? That a cataclysmic disaster wiped out the advanced world?

Now here is the crunch. Today diggings all over the globe show that these traditions tally with the facts. Enormous stone masses or metal fragments are there; they cannot be argued away. This

is tantalizing.

Actually, the concept of an original advanced world, which gave impetus to all succeeding civilizations, is well within the framework of scientific thinking. What is more, I believe this to be such a credible reality that no longer can we evade it. It's time the truth was out. So many theories have been foisted on so many people for so many years. We'll never know all the facts, but there's enough to ignite an explosion in conventional circles.

OUR ANCESTRAL MEMORY OF THE GOLDEN ERA

If we are to credit the collective testimony of all ancient races, man's early history was truly an incredible one. It was a Golden Age of advanced civilization, of original giants who had superior intelligence and technology.

This appears to have been a universal truth, known to everyone in ancient times.

Sacred records affirm that at the very beginning (soon after the fall from Paradise) men possessed extraordinary mental abilities. Beginning with the raw earth, they mastered a high level of civilization in just the first six generations of their existence. In that short time they were able to build cities, play complex musical instruments and smelt metals. Indeed, with their scientific complexes, these earliest men, it seems, were no fools.

We might well wonder to what degree they further developed and refined this technology in the final few centuries before the Flood struck. Were the miracles of science as common as they are now? A perfectly valid question, I think.

PHYSICAL REMAINS ALSO

Our quest is not based on ancient texts and reports, but on accepted scientific discoveries. There are recently discovered artefacts that cannot be dismissed, namely, objects of metal sitting in museums, unquestionably made in the ancient world, that would have required very advanced technology to produce. A technology not to be repeated until our day.

The entire world is really a 'dead man's tomb', a treasure hunter's paradise. As we prize open the coffin, suspense builds. Slowly we're lifting the lid on a lost technology which almost smacks of science fiction. We come face to face with such absurdities as brain transplants, colonies on Mars and invisible men. And we wonder, What next?

Admittedly, such concepts almost strain credibility. We are tempted to ask, Could the ancients have really advanced so far? It may help to consider our own age.

As recently as a hundred years ago, were not most of today's inventions totally unknown, even unbelievable? Since then the spawning has been sudden-and rapid. Do you grasp what that means?

How, then, can one possibly conceive of the state of knowledge attained by the antedeluvians before the Deluge struck?

THE GREAT FLOOD

Prodded by an outside force, the planet tilted on its axis, and amidst lightning and the worst thunder ever heard by man, the pristine vapour canopy began to disintegrate. A floodgate of rain was released upon the earth.

There could be no gentle rising of water. Cosmic forces of horrific violence came unleashed.

With a dreadful shock, large land masses with their populations slipped into the sea. The surface of the entire globe became as a giant maelstrom, in which continents and seas were churned up together.

Attended by a screaming hurricane, tidal waves of 6,000 feet swept toward the poles. A blanket of lava and asphyxiating gases extinguished all life.

This cataclysm wiped the Mother Civilization from the face of the earth and consigned its products to a watery grave forever. Not only were the antediluvian people buried, but their technological achievements were destroyed, including all form of machinery and construction.

It is quite possible that areas which were most densely populated were submerged by the sea or buried under thousands of feet of debris. It has been scientifically estimated that over 75 percent of the earth's surface is sedimentary in nature, extending, as in India, to 60,000 feet deep.

Indeed, the earth, torn and twisted and shaking, was not to quiet down for centuries. With no less than three thousand volcanoes in eruption, a dense cloud of dust enshrouded the earth, blocking out the sun and distorting the climate for hundreds of years.

Thus began the Ice Age. (Carefully documented evidence is available in my books *Surprise Witness* and *The Corpse Came Back*.)

Of the human race a mere handful remained; Indeed, their survival was in every sense a miracle.

Forewarned, they had salvaged what records they might: a compilation of knowledge which, in due course, would be imparted to their descendants.

Now for the sake of the reader who is unfamiliar with this event, it should be stressed that the global Flood catastrophe is one of

the key facts of all history. Not only is there a mass of geological evidence - it has left an indelible impression on the memory of the entire human race. (Sir John William Dawson, *The Historical Deluge in Relation to Scientific Discovery*, p. 4 ff.)

An analysis of some 600 individual Flood traditions reveals a widespread concurrence on essential points:

- the prior corruption of mankind,
- a Flood warning unheeded by the masses,
- a survival vessel,
- the preservation of up to eight people with representative animal life,
- the sending forth of a bird to determine the suitability of re-emerging land,
- significance in the rainbow,
- descent from a mountain,
- and the repopulation of the whole earth from a single group of survivors.

HOW DID THE SUMERIANS ARISE SO SUDDENLY?

Back, then, to that question, If not from outer space, where did the Sumerian civilization get its high starting knowledge?

There would be no need for this question, except for the evolution theory - that early man struggled for endless millions of years as a primitive dumb and stupid creature, unable to accomplish anything on his own. And that it was a slow but steady development to civilization.

Well naturally one might expect on-site investigation of the very first cultures to verify this 'fact.' But what has really emerged is something quite different. The fact is that Sumeria began suddenly—and fully developed! A long preliminary period is *not* supported by archaeology.

Before this, there was nothing but a clean slate.

That's right, the evidence points to *no transition whatsoever* between ancient Sumeria and any primitive forebears.

But then, quite suddenly, there is a technology so intricate, so sophisticated, that it suggests intellectual maturity from the start.

You don't have to be smart to sense there is something wrong here.

SITCHIN: HERE'S WHY

So, faced with the evidence that Sumeria appeared suddenly, fully developed, and realizing that man could not have obtained such advanced thinking capabilities and complex technology simply by evolving from nothing, Sitchin suggests that galactic visitors were responsible.

He contends that this knowledge was given to the Sumerians by extraterrestrials, whom he identifies as the Anunnaki gods of Sumero-Mesopotamian mythology (although this is not supported by the Sumerian texts).

BUT IT'S NOT JUST SUMERIA

Yes, we can agree that the appearance of Sumerian civilization was sudden, unexpected and out of nowhere. Their civilization did not rise to its peak. The Sumerians were at their peak *from the beginning*.

But it's not just Sumeria. It is Egypt too. And the Indus Valley.

In fact, there is a single pattern—the “*sudden*” *appearance of civilizations worldwide*.

About the same general time as Sumeria, ***Egypt*** sprang into existence ***suddenly***, fully developed—that is, without transition from a primitive state, with a fantastic ready-made high society.

Great cities, enormous temples, pyramids of overwhelming size. Colossal statues with tremendous expressive power. Luxurious tunnels and tombs. Splendid streets flanked by magnificent sculptures. Perfect drainage systems. A decimal system at the very start. A ready-made writing, already perfected. A well-established naming system (in which each Pharaoh had as many as five names). Society already divided into specialist classes. An army, civil service and hierarchy minutely organized. A court exhibiting all the indications of well-defined precedence and form.

In the remotest period of which there are records, I tell you Egypt shows a level of civilization which is inexplicable - unless Egypt received her heritage basically from somewhere else. Egypt came from a clearly established civilization.

So who was Egypt's invisible mother?

Then there was the ***Indus Valley civilization***. This also appears to have ***suddenly*** sprung up with no clear-cut traces of having evolved from primitive beginnings.

And the ***Maya*** of Central America are in it, too. And the megalith builders of ***northwest Europe*** appeared at precisely the same time. The achievements they demonstrated were identical.

A COMMON ORIGIN?

Could there be some ***connection between these sudden “instant” cultures***? In my research on this issue, eight clues emerged.

1. *Symbols and hieroglyphics*, identical worldwide, bore the marks of a common heritage. Everywhere the swastika,

snake and sun combinations, as well as numerous specialized and intricate glyphs were repeated with no chance of coincidence.

2. Likewise, similar *systems of writing* were in use—again all over the globe, even on isolated islands. This was striking.
3. And *languages* had similarities. The older these were, the more they resembled each other. Practically all languages have connections through both vocabulary and construction. In almost every language are many words containing similar root words or combinations beyond what mere chance would allow. (Take, for instance, the names of the constellations. I found these were substantially the same whether in Mexico, Africa or Polynesia.)
4. The *calendars* of Egypt and faraway Peru both had eighteen months of twenty days, with a five-day holiday at year's end.
5. I also took into account the great similarities in *buildings*, not only in construction but in astronomical alignment. Sphinxes in Egypt and Yucatan; pyramids on every continent and on remote islands; monoliths and stone circles also worldwide and often quarried elsewhere in the world. I was struck by similarity even as to original purpose. The Tower of Babel was built (according to Josephus, first-century Jewish historian) to provide shelter should another Deluge destroy the earth. And regarding the Toltec pyramids, the Mexican chronicler, Ixtlilxochitl, states: "After men had multiplied, they erected a very high 'zacuali,' which is today a tower of great height, in order to take refuge in it should the second world be destroyed." Now I ask you, without a common source, why should the purpose be identical in Babylon and Mexico?
6. *Customs* again were similar, as in burial, mummification, circumcision, or in binding babies' heads to produce an elongated skull. (The Maya, Incas, Celts, Egyptians and Basques did this.)

7. *Forms of religious observance* bore more striking similarities.
8. Finally I added to the list *worldwide traditions of early history*. Traditions of a Garden of Delight, a Golden Age, a global Flood, one original language, a tower where sudden language confusion resulted in a dispersal—clearly these bore the marks of a common source.

Of one thing you can be certain. The origins of these cultures cannot wholly be explained by borrowing and imitation.

The Russian poet Valeri Brussov expresses it well:

At the bases of the oldest cultures of mankind we must look for a single influence. . We must look back beyond antiquity for an X, for a still unknown cultural world that set the engine we know in motion.

The Egyptians, the Babylonians, the Greeks and Romans were all our teachers, but who were our teachers' teachers?
(Cited in Louis Pauwels, *The Eternal Man*, p.11)

So is it possible to track down the common source of any footprints leading to these cultures?

SOURCE OF THE FOOTPRINTS

Fortunately, even after more than 4,000 years, there are prints still visible enough to read.

The evidence fairly tumbles out.

Language is the first clue. Root words in almost every language had their origins in the Middle East.

Written signs you can add to the evidence. A single system of signs used over an extensive area of the earth by the Stone-writers originated likewise in the Middle East.

Anthropology provides another helpful clue. The best reconstructions by anthropologists located man's point of origin close to the center of the Europe-Asia-Africa land mass.

Archaeological finds clinch it. *Agriculture* has spread all over the world from, where else, but the Middle East highlands. In every instance plants, shrubs and fruit-bearing trees basic to survival and advancement came out of the Middle East first. *Botanical genetic studies* confirm the archaeological finds and leave no doubt.

There it is. Our beginnings were in the Middle East highlands.

But why would agriculture begin in the difficult arc of mountains and highlands? Doesn't it make you wonder? Why was it not begun on the fertile, easily cultivated plains and valleys?


And during my search I had found other scholars expressing surprise at this most odd discovery.

Why the surprise? Because most scholars have overlooked the worldwide Flood. Survivors of such a Deluge (an event most scholars have overlooked) would still be in the mountains. The lowlands were not yet dry enough following the global Flood.

And did you know, biblical sources not only point to Ararat (Armenia) as the landing place of the Flood survivors, but state that they landed "in the mountains". (Genesis 8:4)

Artefacts uncovered suggest that settled communities extended from the Americas in the west to Thailand in the east very soon after this same period. And overlaying that is a proven pattern of high cultures from Spain to Pakistan.

Unfold a world map. And you will find that *Armenia, the dispersion point, lies almost precisely in the middle.*



From central dispersion point (Ararat), descendants of the flood survivors took with them advanced knowledge that enabled new civilization centers to sprout suddenly.

Interestingly, other researchers have reached a similar conclusion. As says Howells: "If we look, first of all, for that part of the world which was the hothouse of the races, we can make only one choice. All the visible footsteps lead away from Asia. (William Howells, *Mankind So Far*, p. 295)

Now notice this succession of discoveries:

1. Each of the first civilizations appeared suddenly, already fully developed.
2. A connection existed between them.
3. Their footprints lead back to the Middle East mountains.

SUMERIA INHERITED PRE-FLOOD KNOWLEDGE

Back now to that question, If not from outer space, where did the Sumerian civilization get its high starting knowledge?

The answer is simple. And, as we have just seen, it wasn't just Sumeria. We see a global pattern. The high level of civilization

of Sumeria and all the other new nations which all sprang up so suddenly around the same time is because they got their heritage basically from the world that was wiped out in the Deluge. They continued where the generation of the biblical Noah left off!

For some good evidence of this, you might consult my book *The Corpse Came Back*, chapter 13. (<http://www.befores.com/third.php>)

Those Flood survivors must have carried sufficient knowledge of the pre-Flood era to give a rapid start to the new cultures that sprang up “out of nowhere” soon after. And the timing - just a few hundred years - all it needed. The oldest civilizations appear just long enough after the Deluge for a population density to support a culture.

Of course I could hardly claim to be first. Sir Leonard Woolley notched up a similar observation years before:

It was confidently expected that the widely held view of a gradual development would be proved, but the whole evidence has been to the contrary; indeed, it has grown to such proportions where we contact the most ancient civilizations that we find the peak was reached soon after the flood. (Sir Leonard Woolley, *The Sumerians*, p.27)

The *sudden* appearance of civilization is itself a memorial to history's one great catastrophe.

WORLD ORDER FROM THE RUINS

It goes without saying that the small group of bewildered survivors from the Deluge could hardly reproduce all of the aspects of the pre-Flood technology. Nevertheless they would have bequeathed to their migrating descendants the information of which they had personal or recorded knowledge.

We know that the very earliest grains show genetic evidence of sophisticated manipulation; that is, they were already uniform and highly specialized immediately after the Flood.

In an attempt to reconstruct the pre-Flood technology, the world was re-mapped and beachheads of settlement established. As a result, the semblance of an integrated global civilization emerged in various parts of the world. Its achievements were astonishing; in some spheres, penetrating knowledge which our science has scarcely begun to nudge.

All this without any need of extraterrestrial input.

FALLING FOR THE EVOLUTION FABLE

Man did not need a sudden injection of intelligence from superior extraterrestrials. Man was highly intelligent from the beginning. He was created that way.

I submit this with respect, that Mr Sitchin has, like so many in our day, fallen hard for the evolution fairytale – the myth that things evolved over painful multi millions of years - until the extraterrestrials came and jumped the gun on evolution through genetic engineering. Sitchin's extraterrestrial theory is based on this notion.

With whatever good intentions, the “space gods” theory was born in careless research; since then it has been perpetuated through the use of faulty reasoning and sensationalism.

Two halves are brought together to construct Sitchin's theory:

- * First evolution
- * Then crossbreeding

It's half hypothesis and half wishful thinking.

Oh, and I'm just thinking aloud: Why would beings with advanced space ships capable of collecting solar energy (solar panels) need to travel to Earth to mine gold, when, with

unlimited energy from the sun, elements could be transmuted into gold?

The promoters of the space-gods theory are correct, however, on one point: Human intelligence cannot be the product of chance evolution. Man did appear suddenly—at the top, not at the bottom. Man is a created artefact, far more wonderful than any computer. He was carefully planned and endowed with the gift of language and the most amazing intellect, as well as a feeling for handcrafts and technology.

And something else was implanted within man: both the capacity and the need to communicate with his Maker, the prime Intelligence. Consequently, there is a part of every person which is restless, seeking unattainable goals, yet experiencing futility and emptiness until it finds identity and peace with the Creator.

And that makes all the difference. Believe me, I've been on both sides of the fence.

20

SITCHIN VERSUS THE SUMERIANS

Let's place in a nutshell what we have discovered. It revolves around these two problems:

- 1, Sitchin's Sumerian *texts* don't exist.
- 2. Sitchin's *word meanings* don't exist.

1. ALLEGED SUMERIAN TEXTS DO NOT EXIST

Millions of us have been told there is a planet called Nibiru beyond Pluto. Nibiru sweeps close to the earth every 3,600 years. And how is that known? Because it's in the Sumerian texts, we're told.

This idea originated with self-proclaimed ancient languages scholar Zecharia Sitchin.

Well?...

- Is *Nibiru* a planet beyond Pluto?
- Is *Nibiru* connected with the Anunnaki?
- Is *Nibiru* a planet that passes through our solar system every 3,600 years?

You know the answer to that now. We went searching. And with the help of the world's best Sumerian scholars, we searched through every ancient Sumerian text.

With what result? In the entire cuneiform record there is not a single text that says any of these things. There is ***not a single text*** in the entire cuneiform record that speaks of a planet called *Nibiru* which passes through our solar system in 3,600 year cycles. Not one text.

Yes, there is one particular seal that contains an interesting picture - which, according to Mr Sitchin, shows a 12th planet in our solar system. It is the VA243 seal.

And I think Zecharia Sitchin genuinely believed this one, because on the surface it looks plausible. And I caught his enthusiasm about it – even to support him in my first book.

But closer examination reveals that in this VA243 seal there is no depiction of the solar system, at all. (See Chapter 9.)

Among all the many hundreds of texts that the Sumerians have left for us, Sitchin's theory hinges upon ***this one single seal***.

Without it now, his theory is in shambles.

One may continue to fantasise, but...

- There is no text that says *Nibiru* is a planet beyond Pluto.
- There is no text that says *Nibiru* is connected with the Anunnaki.
- There is no text that says the *Anunnaki* were space travellers.
- There is no text that says *Nibiru* is a planet that passes through our solar system every 3,600 years.

There is no Sumerian text – ***not even a single line*** of one cuneiform text - that says any of these things.

A NOBEL PRIZE FOR SITCHIN FICTION?

It requires no special sagacity to recognise that Mr Sitchin is simply *fabricating data*.

This is not a matter of how he translates texts. The issue is that these ideas *don't exist* in any cuneiform text at all.

These were invented by our friend. He deserves a Nobel Prize as the world's most successful modern fiction writer.

2. ALLEGED WORD MEANINGS DO NOT EXIST

Add to this the fact that Mr Sitchin's "word meanings" do not match the word meanings in the Sumerian ancient dictionaries.

He says:

- SHU-MU refers to *rocket ships*;
- DIN and GIR refer to "*people of the fiery rockets*";
- *Anunnaki* means "*those who came down from heaven*".

But according to the ancient Mesopotamians themselves, those words have *no such meanings* at all.

I have already shown you how to go online and check the truth about this for yourself.

When you do, you will see for yourself that what Sitchin has written:

- * about *Nibiru*
- * about the *Anunnaki*
- * about the book of *Genesis*
- * about the *Nephilim*,
- * and about a host of *other things*

has absolutely no basis in the real data of the ancient world.

At best it is sloppy scholarship... At worst, what can you call it but deceitful misinformation?

SUMMARY

Here again is a more complete list of Mr Sitchin's claims:

- That the Sumerians said there were twelve planets.
- That the Anunnaki were space travellers.
- That Nibiru was the 12th planet in our solar system.
- That the Anunnaki come from Nibiru.
- That Nibiru cycles through our solar system every 3,600 years.
- That all these things are in the Sumerian texts.
- That humans were the product of crossbreeding by visitors from Nibiru.
- That the "sons of God" who married the "daughters of men" were called "nephilim".
- That "nephilim" means "people of the fiery rockets" and "those who came down from heaven".
- That the Sumerian language goes back almost 6,000 years.
- That parts of the biblical book of Genesis are "borrowed" from the Sumerians and Akkadians.

All made up.

Remember, even instructions to a jury state clearly, "IF YOU FIND A WITNESS LIED IN A MATTER BEFORE US, THEN YOU MUST ASSUME HE LIED IN ALL MATTERS IN HIS TESTIMONY."

1		2
SITCHIN		SUMERIANS
Nibiru	Planet beyond Pluto	The god Marduk, associated with Jupiter
Nibiru	Passes every 3600 yrs	No such text
Nibiru	Invisible from earth	Visible every year
Nibiru	Connected to Anunnaki	No such text
Mu	“oval-topped conical object	“the sky”
Shu-Mu	“rocket ships”	“sky”, “rain”
Din, Gir	“people of the fiery rockets”	“deliver a decision”
Me	“space helmet”	a cultural object or idea (used in many ways)
Anunnaki	“those who came down down from heaven”	“of royal blood”; “princely offspring”
VA243 seal	Is a map of the solar system	describes a harvest offering from a worshipper to a god

1		2
SITCHIN		HEBREW LANGUAGE
Nephilim	“people of the fiery rockets” “those who came down down from heaven”	“Bully”; “tyrant”; “giant”
Shem	“that which is a rocket ship”	“name”; “reputation”; “personage”

“FACE ME”, SAID THE SUMERIAN SCHOLAR

It's sad, really. A man invents the above story (shown in Column 1) and his own definitions to go with it. Then, unexpectedly, the original texts that he claims to be using become public property on the Internet. He is now in danger of being exposed.

Then a scholar challenges him to come on nation-wide radio and defend his position.

How would you expect him to respond?

Sumerian scholar Michael Heiser reports: “I was invited to be a guest on *Coast to Coast AM*. Former host Art Bell asked me if I would debate Zecharia Sitchin live on the show and I accepted.

“Sitchin has never returned the favor. I was quickly attacked, though, by other ‘researchers’ who accused me of making piles of money off Sitchin's name. I answered by posting my income tax returns on the Internet. My accusers crawled back under their rocks and I went on to finish my dissertation in Hebrew and ancient Semitic languages (University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2004).” (<http://www.sitchiniswrong.com>)

May I ask you, if you had a strong case, wouldn't you be pleased for others to place it under the microscope?

Honesty does not fear disclosure.

MY CHALLENGE

Very well, if there's any breathing human being anywhere on earth who still wants to prove me wrong, all you need to do is this:

- **1. *Produce the texts*** that I say don't exist.
- **2. *Produce verification*** of Sitchin's *translations* by other experts. (That's called peer review.)

This is not personal. Zecharia Sitchin is probably a nice guy. He's just wrong.

But if you're like me, you don't like being lied to.

Now we know the truth about it, this must be stated: For anyone to persist in embracing Sitchin's views on these matters amounts to rejecting the legacy of the ancient Sumerian and Akkadian scribes whose work is now available to us.

Let common sense reign here. Are we to accept an ancient, contemporary scribe's definition of a word, or Mr Sitchin's?

21

HOW YOU CAN BENEFIT FROM THIS

Why have certain people gone to such absurd lengths to convince us that we are here by

- (a) evolutionary accident, or by
- (b) a juggling of genes from some reptilian planet?

The only thing more amazing than this phony game of DUPE THE PUBLIC is our ability to fall for it. What happened to our basic common sense? You know, the reflex in your brain that used to make you scream ***bolony!*** when confronted with such obvious nonsense?

We are so bombarded we can't distinguish any longer between the real and unreal.

Before tying this up, a word about how evolution fits into all this...

WHY WAS THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION ADOPTED?

Now here is a question to ponder seriously: Was the evolution theory adopted because it was scientifically justified, or was it deliberately taken on board – despite evidence against it - as the

excuse for an agenda?

On the surface, the theory has many apparently logical premises to support it.

The success of the evolution theory was largely a reaction against a hypocritical Church. Some people, blaming God for injustices done in His name by fake believers, wanted “God” out of their lives. Evolution theory was perceived as a convenient alternative.

(Such a reaction is understandable – even if illogical. But you don’t refuse genuine money simply because there are counterfeit bills around.)

Others asked, quite reasonably, How could a loving God allow evil (which is the source of pain and suffering) to exist? The bottom line here is free will. If God hadn’t given freedom of choice to all, then all would follow Him mechanically like robots.

Now, regarding evolution theory. This was devised in the mid-19th century when almost nothing was known about proteins, genetics, or microbiology. But modern research is now showing this theory to be fatally flawed.

This is not the place to go into that. You will find evidence well covered in my reports, *The Discovery That’s Toppling Evolution* (<<http://www.beforeus.com/evol.php>>), *Men in Embarrassing Places* (free download at <http://www.beforeus.com/man-in-carboniferous.pdf>) , and *Surprise Witness*. (<<http://www.beforeus.com/second.php>>)

Would it surprise you to learn that many leading scientists are finally questioning the validity of evolution? But the damage has been done. It has had a free hand and little or no opposition in the universities and colleges, and through the press and television, all these years. It has resulted in reasoning which has brought the most disastrous consequences.

The evolution brain-wash campaign was very early adopted by the Globalists as part of their weaponry. With virtually unlimited financial resources, they seized control of the scientific establishment, the education system and the media.

The astonishing thing is that many people continue to remain blissfully unaware of what has happened and continue to believe the litany of lies being poured upon them to perpetuate their ignorance.

THE SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES

And like it or not, its influence is largely responsible for our present-day social, political and moral problems.

It is true, you know. The models with which we identify strongly influence our behaviour. The man who believes he came from a beast may be more likely to behave like a beast. The image is not only degrading. It is dangerous.

The idea of man as simply an evolving result of mutational accidents, the highest of the animals, must inevitably lead to the devaluation of an individual's basic rights.

If the survival of the fittest results in improvement of the race, then *the use of force and cruelty* to crush the weak and unfit *is justified*.

We already see the result of this in many parts of the world, where the rights of the individual have come to be regarded as secondary to those of the State. They can indoctrinate your children against your beliefs, confiscate your property, vaccinate you forcibly, and so on.

HOW SITCHIN FITS INTO THIS PICTURE

Our friend Zecharia Sitchin, like the rest of us, grew up in this evolution-peddling society.

Sitchin, like others, assumed that early man struggled for endless millions of years as a primitive dumb and stupid creature, unable to accomplish anything on his own. Then we find man quite suddenly (in the last few thousand years) nurturing a technology so intricate, so sophisticated, that it suggests intellectual maturity from the start.

You don't have to be smart to sense there is something wrong here. So, faced with the new evidence of high technology in ancient times, and realizing that man could not have obtained such advanced thinking capabilities and complex technology simply by evolving from nothing, Sitchin suggested that maybe galactic visitors were responsible. These alien giants crossbred with primates to produce modern man

In a sense I feel sorry from Mr Sitchin. I see him, still enslaved by the evolution idea, but seeking to provide answers for man's development that evolution cannot.

He probably sincerely believes in what he is doing. He grew up drinking at that polluted fountain, and it moulded his thinking. So his theory is based on this very same notion that we were evolving over painful multi millions of years.

And from this, he has allowed his imagination to run amok about how the Anunnaki came and jumped the gun on evolution through genetic engineering.

This story owes more to fertile imagination than to historical research and accuracy.

Here is my open question to our friend Mr Sitchin:

Please tell me, where is your evidence for Nibiru-Anunnaki-extraterrestrials and their genetic creation of modern man? You told us all it was in the Sumerian texts.

No it's not!

So, please, will you now come clean? Where is it?

Fantasy in, fantasy out. It is only in your imagination. But that is no excuse for faking texts... and word meanings.

- The Nibiru-Anunnaki-extraterrestrials genetic theory turns out to be a farce.
- And also Darwin's evolution theory is in tatters.

So where else do we turn for our origins?

What source of information have we been ignoring? Could it be the same source that the Globalists hate so much - and that we have been brainwashed to reject?

THE DOCUMENT THE GLOBALISTS HATE

As the moneyed murder mongers who steer the New World Order agenda step up their pace, there is indeed a document that stands in their way... a document so powerful that, if it were to be re-awakened in the psyche of the masses, would seriously hamper their plans.

This document – the Bible - they intensely dislike, and its power they fear. So they are doing their best, as “professionally” as possible, to discredit it.

I cannot judge the motives of our friend Sitchin. But, caught up in the same mind wave, he rides with the current. Appearing as a hero, he attacks the historicity of the Bible, and claims it has

been misread and is not to be taken literally. It must be reinterpreted now, in the setting of evolution theory and Sitchin's Anunnaki theory.

And millions have fallen for this story line.

5 REASONS THEY WANT US TO DUMP GENESIS

Then what is so dangerous about the Bible – and in particular the book of Genesis?

Simply this: It is a missile that hits the New World Order agenda right between the eyes. They condemn it because it condemns them. Here is how:

- For one thing, they are in the act of setting up *a one world government*, and Genesis says that will fail.

The Genesis document is the voice of a totally opposite Power. It says, NO! You cannot silence, oppress, or eliminate your fellow human beings. This beautiful earth came from the mind of a loving Creator, which makes every person's life sacred, to be respected. You were created a dignified, free being, answerable firstly to your Maker, then to your family. The State is to serve you, not to oppress you.

- For another, this document also outlines principles by which you can survive both the impending financial crash, the coming tyranny and beyond. Did you know that?
- Thirdly, we might mention the insistence in Genesis that every living thing is to reproduce "*after its kind*". This rules out cross genetic manipulation, which is a favourite game of the globalist lackies like Monsanto. They are determined to force hybridisation and genetically modified food upon us, whether we like it or not. Again, the

Globalists and Genesis clash head on.

- Fourthly, Genesis is a spiritual powerhouse. When people take it into their hearts, they become empowered, invincible and unafraid. That's exactly what the Globalist villains don't want - an informed, empowered and fearless population. They are obsessed with you becoming subdued, slumbering, and submissive to them, so that they can more easily execute their dark plans. Yes, Genesis is not on the side of the Globalists.
- Fifthly, the anti-Genesis attack is not based on evidence, but on mind-set. The intense spiritual opposition to the Genesis account of creation is in a large part because it demands a supernatural God – one with the power to judge wrong, a most detested Bible teaching in the minds of the New World Order criminals.

You don't have to guess how unacceptable these ideals are to the New World Order gangsters. Is it any wonder they want it out of the way?

This means, of course, that it has to be discredited. (Get up to date with *The Weapon The Globalists Fear*. <<http://www.beforeus.com/weapon-ebook.html>>)

So, whether you were aware of it or not, billions of dollars are being poured into institutions of learning to undermine the Bible, so that the unenlightened masses will simply acquiesce when the Globalists carry out their plan to cull (kill) two thirds of today's world population.

HOW CAN THIS BENEFIT YOU?

Now, for the sake of your loved ones, please sit up and take notice: For your own good you'd better forget what the half-informed critics have told you.

You can benefit because the Bible contains accurate, detailed prophecies of what is coming, as well as practical, everyday tips to help you survive the coming crisis. And that's what the Globalists don't want you to know.

To discover more about this, you might study the information in these two books:

1. The Weapon the Globalists Fear
([<http://www.beforeus.com/weapon-ebook.html>](http://www.beforeus.com/weapon-ebook.html))
2. Will You Survive?
([<http://www.beforeus.com/survive-ebook.html>](http://www.beforeus.com/survive-ebook.html))

The Bible is a book that is scientifically sound, historically reliable, and undented by the missiles of the critics. And it is still up there as the best selling and most widely read book on the planet.

Fact of interest: As of 2007, approximately 7.5 billion Bibles had been distributed throughout the world – with the vast majority still available for use! And these figures do not include the various digital versions being used today on millions of computers, Blackberries and iPhones – available to well over 90 percent of the world's population.

([<ipl.org.ar/ref/QUE/FARQ/bestsellerFARQ.html>](http://ipl.org.ar/ref/QUE/FARQ/bestsellerFARQ.html))

Why is it the best selling and most widely read book on the planet?

Few books can stand many readings. But, to put it bluntly, this book is inexhaustible. It will stand a thousand readings. And the man who has gone over it the most frequently and the most carefully is the surest of finding new wonders there.

I submit to you that this book is entitled to the first and highest place among the books that you read, believe and love.

You can listen to the misinformation put out by half informed skeptics... or you can listen to the people whose lives have been

directly changed by the Book (millions of them - and that now includes my wife Josephine and myself).

Every good thing usually has its detractors. But they themselves are the losers.

It is time to get back to reality – and help your family benefit from the greatest Book ever written – the standard by which all other records must be tested.

If you genuinely want to know the truth about our human origins, you don't go to Darwin... or Sitchin. The straight answer is in Genesis. It is backed up by evidence which will qualify as “scientific” in the sense that it can be reproduced in the laboratory. (See *The Weapon The Globalists Fear*, Chapters 2-4,21.)

Finally, many ordinary people realise that something is dreadfully wrong with society. Could it be that the problem is a deep, spiritual one – because we have turned our backs on our Maker? That we're not following our Maker's instructions?

Is our spiritual emptiness the result of having alienated ourselves from the One who created us?

So, as the Bible was saying...

APPENDIX A

WHO WERE THE “SONS OF GOD”?

...the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair, and they took them wives of all which they chose... There were giants in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown. And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. (Gen.6:2,4-5)

IT IS CLAIMED: The “sons of God” who intermarried with “daughters of men” in Genesis 6:1,2 were extraterrestrials.

Primitive Bible authors used the term “sons of God” only because they did not understand the technology.

The word “giants” is from the Hebrew word “*Nephilim*” (which means “*those who had come down from Heaven to Earth*”). These extraterrestrials mated with humans.

IN REALITY: We shall address each of these expressions – “*sons of God*” and “*nephilim*” in turn.

There are two ways to approach this. Either the reader can ask, What did the author mean by a particular word or phrase? Or the reader can inject his own theory upon a passage to make it “say” what the reader wants. Most of the conflicting opinions on TV and on the Internet forget this one basic principle – that we should allow a document to explain itself. To deny it this courtesy is bad scholarship.

Fortunately, the Bible does explain itself, which makes understanding a passage so much easier. A prominent Bible writer, Isaiah, outlines this principle. He opens it with a question:

Whom shall he teach knowledge? And whom shall he make to understand teaching? [Answer:] them that are weaned from the milk, and drawn from the breasts [those who, in eagerness to be taught, are as little children]. For precept must be upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, and there a little. (Isaiah 28:9,10)

A lovable quality of little children is their insatiable desire to learn, rather than teach. That is the key. A wise reader, instead of imposing his preconceived ideas onto a passage, will search “here a little, and there a little.” Staying with his chosen subject, he will compare all of the relevant Bible texts until he grasps the “big picture” on that subject. And how that can spare him from later embarrassment!

Because the Bible instruction on all subjects is so wonderfully unified, you can use this formula for any subject at all. It works beautifully. It is foolproof. Even a passage that on first reading appears contradictory makes sense once the big picture is taken in.

THE BIBLE EXPLAINS ITSELF

The Bible provides its own explanation as to *the identity of* the persons called “*sons of God*”. But before we go into that, we should note that:

Firstly, the Bible states that humans were NOT the product of genetic juggling, but were a special creation of the Supreme God of the universe.

Secondly, the same source book for the “*sons of God*” expression – i.e. the Bible (Genesis 6:2) - refutes the “primitive” idea. It declares that mankind was created fully intelligent from the start (Genesis 2:19-20). Adam’s descendants were craftsmen and musicians (Genesis 4:21,22). And civilization, with schools of metallurgy, was already flourishing several hundred years *before* the chapter 6 intermarriage of the “*sons of God*” and the “*daughters of men*”.

The “primitive Genesis authors” notion is impossible if we grant that these earlier descriptions in this same book of Genesis are also true.

Thirdly, the origin of human beings cannot be explained simply by the cross-species breeding of humanoid space aliens and primitive ape-like creatures. Such claims might sound scholarly, but they show a distinct lack of a basic knowledge of genetics. (See the “Genetic barrier” section, below.)

Fourthly, neither the context nor the syntax support an angels or extraterrestrials interpretation of Genesis 6. (See below.)

Fifthly, in the Bible, the term “*son/s of God*” is used in two ways: physically and spiritually. We shall address each of these usages, in turn.

“SONS OF GOD” – PHYSICAL MEANING

In Luke chapter 3, is recorded the legal genealogy of Jesus, *“being (as was supposed), the son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli, which was the son of Matthat, which was the son of Levi...”* and so on. (Luke 3: 23-38) Each man is called the “son of” his earthly father, and so on, back to Seth who is termed *“the son of Adam”*. Then in verse 38 Adam is called *“the son of God”*. That is because Adam had no earthly father. His only father was God, who created him and gave him dominion over this planet Earth.

The Bible says God created other worlds (Hebrews 1:2; 11:3). And astronomers have recently discovered it to be true that indeed there are other planets orbiting their own stars, or suns. The first men (or “Adams”) of those worlds, with no other father but their Creator, would likewise be *“sons of God”*.

When we ask the question, “Why did God create this world?” the Bible answers, *“He created it not in vain, he formed it to be inhabited”* (Isaiah 45:18).

If God created this earth “not in vain” but “to be inhabited”, does it make sense to you that God would create countless other worlds just to be DEAD worlds?

With this in mind, we note that the book of Job records a series of celestial council meetings in which the “sons of God” assembled (Job 1:6; 2:1) – and who turned up, but Satan, from planet Earth. Why was this?

The answer is that in the beginning, Adam, the first man, had been given dominion over planet Earth (Genesis 1:28), but when Satan overcame our first parents, the human race then fell under bondage to him. (*“Of whom a man is overcome, of the same is*

he brought in bondage.” 2 Peter 2:19) This enabled Satan to hijack Adam’s dominion.

This is why Satan, instead of Adam, could represent Planet Earth in these meetings. (Job 1:6,7; John 12:31; 2 Corinthians 4:4) And we are informed that Satan remained “prince of this world” until the Messiah entered this planet and overcame him. Since then, it is the Messiah who represents mankind before God. (However, Satan, as de facto ruler, controls world leaders, until his kingdom is abruptly ended at the coming judgment.)

To put it simply, one sees these meetings as a sort of “united nations assembly” of the whole universe, in which the “sons of God” in attendance were representatives of other worlds.

ANGELS ARE CALLED “STARS”

Again, we are informed that when our planet was created and added to the universe of God, that “...*the morning stars sang together, AND all the sons of God shouted for joy.*” (Job 38:7) Here we see ***two groups*** of beings – the “morning stars” AND the “sons of God”.

Symbolic use of the word “*stars*” is not something foreign to us. We speak today of football *stars*, film *stars*, and so on.

Biblical symbolism is to be approached in the same way. And when we ask, who are the “*stars*” spoken of in the Bible, we must allow the Bible itself to tell us: Symbolically speaking, “***stars are the angels***” (Revelation 1:20; 12:4,9). The Bible defines its own symbols. In fact, the name of the rebel angel Lucifer means “***day star***”. (See Isaiah 14:12, margin).

So the Scripture informs us that there were “*stars*” (angels) **AND** there were ***also “sons of God”***. (Job.38:7) So, since the angels are the “*stars*”, then who are these others, “*the sons of God*”? Who is this other group?

ANGELS ARE

(a) NOT CALLED “SONS”

(b) DO NOT MARRY

This second group, called “sons of God” are not angels. How do we know?

Firstly, the Bible itself says straight out that *angels are NOT* called “*sons of God*”. “*For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son... I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son?*” (Hebrews 1:5). The unspoken answer: none of them! You see, the Bible itself is emphatic that no angel is ever called a “son” of God.

Secondly, Jesus states that angels *do NOT marry* (Mark 12:25). This suggests that they were not created with the organs of propagation. In other words, angels are neither male nor female. So the “*sons of God*” who *married* “the daughters of men” in Genesis 6:2,4 were NOT angelic beings.

LET THE BIBLE EXPLAIN ITSELF

One of the best protections against error is to view the *broadest context* possible – the complete panorama across all the 66 books of the Bible. It is astonishing to discover how many difficulties seem to evaporate if one simply recognises *the unity of its 66 books*.

There are many evidences that the Bible is *an integrated message system*. Every number, *every symbol*, every detail, is part of an overall deliberate, detailed design. Each piece fits into a carefully designed whole. Every symbol is explained somewhere else within the Bible itself. You will discover that one text unlocks another, as a result of cross reference Bible study.

No part is trivial. Every piece impacts every other piece. And there are no contradictions.

“SONS OF GOD” AS A SPIRITUAL TERM

With that in mind, now read the passage in Hebrews again: “*For unto **which of the angels** said he at any time, Thou art my **Son**... I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a **Son**?*” (Hebrews 1:5). This statement, “*I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a **Son***” refers back to 1 Chronicles 22, where God speaks of King Solomon, a man of peace (verse 9) and adds, “*he shall be **my son**, and I will be his father.*” (verse 10). And again, “*I have chosen him to be **my son**, and I will be his father.*” (ch.28:6)

In both the Old and New Testaments of the Bible, the same symbolism carries over. *Faithful human beings are consistently called “sons” of God.*

1. God called His people, whom He was rescuing from Egyptian slavery, “**my son**” (Exodus 4:22.23). “*Israel is **my son**, even my firstborn. And I say unto thee, let **my son** go, that he may serve me.*”
2. Solomon, a man of peace, is called by God “**my son**” (1 Chronicles 22:9; 28:6)
3. God calls those who follow Him “sons of God”. “*Ye are my people...Ye are the **sons of the living God.***” (Hosea 1:10)
4. Those who, through the appointed Messiah, enter into a relationship with God receive “*power to become **sons of God**, even to them that believe on his name.*” (John 1:12).
5. Thus, reconciled back to God through the Messiah, they are adopted as “**sons of God.**” (Galatians 4:4-7).
6. Again, “*Now are we the **sons of God.***” (1 John 3:1,2).

So you see, both the Old Testament (points 1 and 2) and the New Testament (points 3 to 5) are in agreement. When the Bible speaks about the sons of God, it means the spiritual followers of God: “*For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God*” (Romans 8:14). That expression “*sons of God*” includes ***both men and women***.

From all this, it is evident that the expression “*sons of God*” in the Bible applies not to angels, but always to humans (or their counterparts on other worlds) who acknowledge God as their ultimate Father and live in faithful harmony with Him.

THE CONTEXT IN GENESIS IDENTIFIES THE “SONS OF GOD”

It is vital to read every passage in its context (the verses before and after, and the chapters before and after). Don’t just lift out a single statement to prove a point. I come across so many dear people making this mistake. If you do that, then don’t expect to get the truth.

Context is king. The meaning you accept for a passage ***must fit*** the flow of thought, discussion, or argument.

This same principle applies here. So let’s examine Genesis chapter 6 ***in its context***. This will help us to a correct identification of the “*sons of God*” found in Genesis.

What does the context tell us? It says plainly that there were two distinct lines of people descended from our first parents:

1. Those who followed the ways of men, and
2. Those who followed the ways of God.

And the context tells us how this came about.

After Cain murdered his brother Abel, and then Seth was born,

two distinct lines of humans developed – the line of Seth who worshipped God (the “sons of God”) and the line of Cain who served Satan.

Genesis chapter 4 gives us these two genealogies:

1. The line of Cain. After Cain murdered his brother Abel, the record follows Cain’s genealogy – and this describes how Cain’s descendants initiated city dwelling, technology and committed more murder. (Gen.4:16-24)
2. Then the record switches to a second line of descendants – “*And Adam knew his wife again; and she bare a son, and called his name Seth: For God, said she, hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel, whom Cain slew. And to Seth, to him also was born a son; and he called his name Enos: **then began men to call upon the name of the Lord.***” (Gen. 4:25-26)
This was a godly line of men.

This expression “*then began men to call upon the name of Lord*” – what does it mean? That they only *began* to “pray to God” after Enos was born? Or does it mean something else?

It cannot mean that the faithful began praying to God only after Enos was born. They would surely have been calling upon God from the start – and not wait till the third generation (Adam – Seth – Enos) to begin praying. So it does not mean “*pray*”.

So what does “*call upon the name of Lord*” mean?

You will find that the Hebrew preposition rendered here as “*upon*” is frequently rendered into English as “*by*”. The Hebrew of this verse more correctly reads, “*Then began men to call [themselves] by the name of the Lord.*”

The truth is that by this third generation, the line of Cain had become so entrenched in practising evil, that those in the faithful line of Seth began distinguishing themselves as separate, by stating, “***We are sons of the Lord.***” They ***called themselves by God’s name***. In loyalty to God, they classed themselves as the children of God, in contrast to the ungodly group, who walked in ***the rebellious way of men***, without God.

Thus, while Cain’s descendants were ***sons and daughters of “men”***, Seth’s descendants were “***sons and daughters of God***”.

This meaning is significant - not only because it is ***a legitimate rendering of the Hebrew***, but because of what follows it.

In the original books there were no chapter divisions. So, following straight after Genesis 4:26 (“*Then began men to call [themselves] by the name of the Lord*”), the very next verses recall that “*God created man, in the likeness of God made he him: male and female created he them: and blessed them, and called their name Adam.*” (Genesis 5:1,2)

Notice the context again:

- “*by the name of the Lord*”(end of chapter 4)
- “*in the likeness of God*” (start of chapter 5)

Once more, notice the context:

- “*God created man, in the likeness of God*” (5:1-2)
- “*Adam... begat a son in his own likeness*” (5:3)

You notice how one immediately follows the other: “*Adam [likewise]... begat a son in his own likeness, after his image, and called his name Seth.*” (verse 3)

So here is the lineage which is ***separate from the line of Cain***:

- Firstly, God
- Then, Adam in God's likeness
- Then, Seth in Adam's likeness
- Then follows the genealogy of Seth to Noah.

This lineage of the faithful right from Adam to Noah (verses 4-32) is catalogued *immediately after* the description of the other line, the line of Cain.

This is the rule: **Context is king.**

Do you see how the faithful are NOT merely the children of Adam: they are termed the *children of God*... made in HIS likeness, and HIS image.

These men, followers of the God of their fathers, called themselves by the name of God; they called themselves the sons of God.

Not only that, but each new son born in the family line, was so named that the meaning of each name progressively grew into a sentence. Here are the first ten generations with the meaning of each person's name:

Adam – “*Man*”
 Seth – “*Appointed*”
 Enos – “*Wretched*”
 Cainan – “*Mourner*”
 Mahalaleel – “*The Blessed God*”
 Jared – “*Shall come down*”
 Enoch – “*Consecrated*”
 Methuselah – “*By his death to bring*”
 Lamech – “*The oppressed*”
 Noah – “*Comfort*”

And if you examine this genealogy closely, you will notice that this sentence builds into a prophecy of the coming Messiah:

Man is Appointed a Wretched Mourner, (but) the Blessed God
Shall Come Down, Consecrated By His Death To Bring (to)
The Oppressed, Comfort.

This is one of many evidences that the Bible is *an integrated message system*, the product of supernatural engineering.

That sentence is a precise prophecy of the life, death and purpose of the promised Messiah. The divine plan for mankind's salvation was spelled out over the course of 1,656 years of this genealogy, the last word being added over 2,000 years BEFORE the Messiah was born, in the very names of those who had begun to *call themselves by HIS name*. It is the beginning of a divine love story that goes right through the Bible.

This was in striking contrast to the materialistic and violent anti-God line of Cain's descendants, described immediately before.

Then, immediately after listing this genealogy of the "sons of God" line, with no break in the narrative (remember, chapters did not exist) there follows this statement:

And it came to pass, when men began to multiply... That the *sons of God* saw the *daughters of men* that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose.(Genesis 6:1,2)

Again, notice the context:

- The unfaithful line (Genesis 4)
- The faithful line (Genesis 5)
- The two lines mix (Genesis 6)

IT'S ALL ABOUT "MEN"

You notice, it says, "*when men began to multiply.*" It is speaking about "men", not outer space visitors. In the course of *men multiplying*, these two groups (sons of God and daughters of men) were intermarrying, mixing their lines. Every little phrase in the context is telling us that the actors in this drama

were humans, nothing more.

**“ALIENS” OR “ANGELS”
VIOLATES THE CONTEXT**

Remember, context is king. You can’t inject extraterrestrials into this passage without *violating the context*. And to ignore the context is poor scholarship.

What happened was simply this: As time went on, the Sethite men, attracted and seduced by the ways of the Cainite women, intermarried with them. And the human race became so corrupted and violent that it appeared there would soon be no one left loyal to God. It was becoming evident that soon there would no longer exist a faithful lineage through whom the promised Deliverer would be born into the human race. A man-made global wipe-out was imminent. At this critical time God Himself stepped in and brought the Great Flood.

So here again is the natural sequence of events in Genesis:

- Gen.4:16-24 – The genealogical line of godless Cain, followed by
- Gen.4:25 to 5:32 – The line of faithful Seth ...followed by
- Gen.6:1,2 – Eventual intermarriage between them.

As you must be aware by now, in reading any passage the *surrounding context* is always important, because it helps us understand what a difficult sentence is really saying.

Let’s say it again. Context is king. The meaning you accept for a passage *must fit* the flow of thought, discussion, or argument.

THE “NEPHILIM”

Now, lets read the relevant Genesis 6 passage again:

...the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair, and they took them wives of all which they chose... There were giants in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown. And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. (Gen.6:2,4-5)

Now I am going to zero in on one word in the above passage – the word which appears as “*giants*” on Line 3.

Firstly, a word on the translation in the English Bible of *nephilim* as “*giants*”. This is likewise a correct rendering of the Hebrew. In the pre-Flood environment, all living things - human, animal, bird, insect, marine, plants and trees - were generally much larger in size than their counterparts today. In fact, a fresh look at the fossils led Weidenreich, of Manhattan’s American Museum of Natural History, to the belief that “gigantism and massiveness may have been a general or at least a widespread character of early mankind.” (*Time*, July 3, 1944)

Gigantism was natural. It did not require extraterrestrial input.

But that is not the primary meaning of the passage, as we shall see shortly.

A MAN WITH AN AGENDA LEAVES ONE HEBREW WORD UNTRANSLATED

How interesting! A man who wants us to believe that space aliens or angels were involved translates every original Hebrew

word of the passage into English except one. He leaves just one word untranslated – the Hebrew word *nephilim*. And then he blows up that one ordinary Hebrew word and tries to make it into something super-human.

He ultimately gives nephilim his own special meaning of “*those who had come down from Heaven to Earth*”

And so the word *nephilim* gets bandied about almost with awe as though it were some sort of title for a particular race of beings (and behold, they’re even extraterrestrials!).

However, the burden of proof is on the claimant to prove it. Where is his evidence that the *nephilim* were extraterrestrials? There is ***no evidence that they were not human.***

Let’s get real - *nephilim* is just an ordinary Hebrew word. Why not translate it into English like every other word? Why make it into something else?

Do you smell something fishy here?

Our friend defines “*nephilim*” as “*those who had come down from Heaven to Earth*”. The truth is that this is not even implied by the biblical Hebrew.

The word *nephilim* is nothing more than an ordinary noun in a sentence, which means, simply, *tyrants, bullies, or big people*. That’s all.

The English Bible correctly renders the word as “*giants*”. But the prime focus of Genesis is not on their physical size but on their behaviour. The context makes it clear that these men were ***giants, or champions, of violence.***

An honest treatment of this word requires that these *nephilim* were just what the word “*nef-eel*” means: primarily “a feller, that is, a ***bully*** or ***tyrant***.”

Let the context explain it. This very same passage goes on to state that the children born of these marriages “*became mighty men which were of old, men of renown.*” What kind of renown? The literal Hebrew reads “*were the mighty, who from old, **men of devastation.***” (Genesis 6:4)

“***Mighty***” and “***renowned***” for what? For their “***wickedness***”, and their thoughts were “***only evil continually.***” (verses.5,11)

Comparing this passage with another, we discover that Genesis speaks similarly concerning a post-Flood dictator named Nimrod. “*And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a **mighty one in the earth.***” (Gen.10:8) History shows Nimrod to have been a tyrant, who hunted down men. Genesis describes him as a “*mighty hunter*”. He was ***mighty to do evil.*** (Gen.10:9)

Neither here nor in our *nephilim* account is there any hint of extraterrestrial activity. It was all human.

GET THIS SEQUENCE RIGHT

Scene 1. There were giants [*nephilim* = ***tyrants, bullies***] in the earth in those days;

Scene 2. and also ***after that***, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare ***children to them***, the same ***became mighty men*** [mighty to do wickedness] which were of old, men of renown. (Genesis 6:4)

Did you notice?

1. First of all the ***nephilim*** (the tyrants, the bullies, the giants in evil) were already doing their thing in the earth. And this was

BEFORE the two groups already described started to fraternise and intermarry. There is no hint of extraterrestrials. The record simply tells us that “*There were **nephilim [tyrants, giants in evil]** in the earth in those days.*” These are the violent men in the line of Cain. Evil was already being perpetrated by these nephilim – ***before the intermarriage*** of the two groups.

2. Then “***after that***”, when the “sons of God” (of the faithful Seth line) began to intermarry with the daughters of these tyrants, their children also went the same way of Cain, becoming mighty and renowned for ***even worse evil***. Notice the vital connection between verses 4 and 5:

... the same became ***mighty*** men which were of old, men of ***renown***. And God saw that the ***wickedness*** of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was ***only evil continually***. (Genesis 6:4,5)

Again, what does the context tell us?:

- “There were giants [of evil] in the earth” (verse 4)
- “The wickedness ***of man*** was great” (verse 5)
- “The earth is filled with violence” (verses 12-13)
- “God said... I will destroy them with the earth” (verse 13)

There you have it. ***The reason for the Flood was MAN’S wickedness.*** Again, there is no hint of extraterrestrial wickedness. It is all about wayward mankind.

Although *nephilim* can be translated correctly as *giants*, and although it is true that all life forms before the Flood (flora and fauna, including mankind) were much larger than now, that is not the focus of this passage.

The primary issue under discussion is a moral one. The subject is the gross wickedness of mankind [the primary meaning of *nephilim* being *tyrant* or *bully*], and the threat of man’s extinction unless the Creator intervenes. To repeat, the issue

under discussion is a moral one.

And that is specifically stated to be the reason for the Great Flood (verse 13).

In all honesty, we cannot twist this into proving a pre-Flood mating of extraterrestrials with mankind. Such a notion can only be forced into the passage from the head of the reader. It is not in the text itself. Not anywhere. Sorry, but attractive as it might be to some, this extraterrestrial *Nephilim* theory cannot count on Genesis for support.

An honest treatment of this word requires that these *nephilim* were just what the word means: primarily “a *feller*, that is, a *bully* or *tyrant*.”

GENETIC BARRIER

Something else to consider. Successful interbreeding between angels and humans to procreate fertile offspring would have been – we must face it – a virtual impossibility.

Firstly, the fact that angels were not created to marry and produce offspring strongly suggests that they are *neither male nor female*. they were ***NOT created with the organs of propagation***. Thus, angels do not produce fertile offspring. And secondly, chromosomes and genes must BOTH match up, which is extremely unlikely – and does not occur even between animals and humans of the same planet!

Thus, an unbridgeable barrier exists between sexless spirit beings such as angels and human beings. It is ***genetically impossible for angels and humans to produce fertile offspring*** (or cats with rabbits, for that matter). It could ***not even*** occur by ***artificial insemination***.

Simply put, each separate type has a distinct set of chromosomes which holds its genetic makeup. For example, cats have 19 pairs, rabbits have 22 pairs. Each parent donates a chromosome to make each pair. With most species, after fertilization, when the cell starts to divide, there would be an uneven number of chromosomes that needed to 'pair up.' The cell would die.

There are some rare exceptions. Domesticated horses have 32 pairs, and donkeys 31 pairs. Their offspring (mules) have 31.5. Mules are infertile. They cannot produce offspring. Like zedonks and tigons, it appears their chromosomes match up just enough to allow for interbreeding between similar species. And then full stop.

However, the location of a gene is not in the same place on the same chromosome between species. Chromosome A on a rabbit might hold the genetic codes for ear size, *hair colour* and bone configuration, but chromosome A on a cat might hold the genetic codes for vision, tail length and brain size. They could never match up.

There is, however, good reason to believe that genetic manipulation was going on in the pre-Flood world, just as occurs today. Genesis refers to the fact that “*all flesh*” was “*corrupted*” (Genesis 6:12). What God had created, both man and beast, was now corrupted by man. But to achieve this no extraterrestrial input was necessary. Neither does Genesis lend any support to such a theory.

THREE FINAL QUESTIONS

QUESTION 1: What about the New Testament statements that mention the fall of Satan and his angels? (Jude 6. Rev.12:9-11)

ANSWER: That was a totally separate event, which occurred in heaven. (Revelation 12:9-11) There is no Scripture linking this to the Genesis event.

QUESTION 2: Doesn't the book of Enoch say angels mated with humans before the Flood? And since one biblical writer quotes from the book of Enoch, doesn't this give it credibility?

ANSWER: A so-called book of Enoch which we have today does speak of interbreeding. There is good reason to believe, however, that this is not a genuine copy of the original, but a subsequent pious forgery. (See Appendix B.) Any argument based on it stands on shaky ground.

QUESTION 3: Haven't many Jewish scribes and early church Fathers taught that angels mated with humans before the Flood? And haven't many respected modern leaders done likewise?

ANSWER: The best answer to that is the biblical one: *"But you have planted wickedness, you have reaped evil, you have eaten the fruit of deception. Because you have depended on your own strength and on your many mighty men"* (Hosea 10:13) *"Don't put your confidence in powerful people; there is no help for you there."* (Psalm 146:3)

What is that saying? Simply this: Don't put your confidence in what prominent people might say.

A car has its own printed manual, instructing the owner how to use and care for the car, but if he fails to follow the rules he can be in trouble.

Likewise, to understand a Bible passage, don't expect to get the answers right if you bypass this rule.

Here is the rule: “...***not in the words which man's wisdom teaches, but which the Holy Spirit teaches; comparing spiritual things with spiritual [comparing one Bible passage with another]***”(1 Corinth. 2:13,14)

Man's “wisdom” can mislead you. The Bible alone is the authority for interpreting the Bible. The Bible is not "subject to interpretation". It interprets itself.

APPENDIX B

THE BOOK OF “ENOCH”

The Book of Enoch is sometimes cited in support of the idea that the expression “sons of God” intermarrying with “daughters of men” really means “fallen angels interbreeding with humans”.

It is true that some Jewish occult, mystic, kabalistic writers interpret the phrase “sons of God” to mean angels or demons. There is good reason to believe that the Book of Enoch originated from such a source.

The Book of Enoch circulating today is believed to have been written around 200 BC to 100 AD. It is a non-biblical book. No early book written by the prophet Enoch (3379 to 3014 BC) is known to have survived. However, Enoch’s name has been appended to this later book.

The value of the Book of Enoch is simply that it acquaints us with some ideas that were floating around at the time it was written. Nothing more. Does it provide us with incontestable data from the time of Enoch? We have to say no.

One should be extremely careful about accepting this book as an authority, since it also contains some gross absurdities.

For example, it states that ancient giants were “300 cubits” (**525 feet**) *tall*.

And the women conceiving brought forth giants, Whose stature was each three hundred cubits. (Enoch 7:11,12)

While one agrees that gigantism was once a common or widespread feature of mankind (see Jonathan Gray, *The Lost World of Giants*. <[http://www. beforeus.com/giants.php](http://www.beforeus.com/giants.php)>), can you force yourself to believe that ***men were the height of a 52 story building?*** On this account alone, the Book of Enoch must be rejected.

A different translation of the Book of Enoch says those giants were even taller – “3,000 ells” (7:1-6) (R.H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudeipgrapha of the Old Testament*, vol. II. Oxford Press, 1997 ed.)

At one ell to 45 inches or 114 centimetres (Random House *Webster’s College Dictionary*), 3,000 ells would be 133,000 inches or 11,250 feet – that is, ***over 2 miles high!***

Numerous other problems exist concerning this book:

- Parts of it contradict other parts
- It contains scientific errors
- It also contradicts the Bible

There is no doubt that some sayings of Enoch (who lived around 3000 BC) were passed down over the centuries. The first century apostle Jude quoted a statement by the prophet Enoch.

It is possible that the real Enoch may have penned a book. But the exhibit we have today has uncertain origins. Even though it may contain some excerpts from an original book, the origin of the present work is extremely doubtful.

The points discussed above cast doubt on its authenticity. Over the years, many a pious fraud has gained acceptance by a credulous public simply because its author appended to it the name of some prominent biblical figure.

No matter that we have a book tagged with Enoch's name, and perhaps even sprinkled with some original sayings of Enoch, the evidence suggests that

- This is not the original book of Enoch
- It reflects the ideas of its 200 BC to 100 AD author.

Don't stake your life or your reputation on its authenticity.