

Dear Ancient Astronaut Enthusiast:

The intent of this letter is in the interest of research, not confrontation. In no way do I intend to impugn anyone's character. What I ask is that you provide answers and data to support your theories. Here are my questions / requests.

1. Can you please provide transcripts of Zecharia Sitchin's academic ancient language work? I would like to post this information on my website, and would gladly do so.

Zecharia Sitchin never claimed to have had an academic scholarship, he was a self-taught linguist in akkadian and sumerian.

2. Can you explain why Sitchin's work on Genesis 1:26-27 overlooks so many obvious grammatical indications that the word *elohim* in that passage refers to a single deity (as demonstrated on this website)?

The issue that Zecharia 'overlooks so many indication' is an assumption of yours. Zecharia never enters the problem of whether there are indications for plural or singular, and NEVER says that Elohim must ALWAYS be seen as a plural. you think otherwise please provide the exact phrase in Sitchin's books where he tells it.

The point in Sitchin discussion is that when the writers of Genesis copied from the sumerian tablets, they had to rearrange the plural forms and acts to a single deity. But at the same time in the Genesis there are traces of a plurality of beings, and by the way it is the same thing YOU say in your website.

Let's compare an excerpt from Sitchin's "The 12th planet" with the content of you 'Elohim' webpage:

Sitchin:

In the Sumerian versions, the decision to create Man was adopted by the gods in their Assembly. Significantly Book of Genesis - purportedly exalting the achievements of a sole Deity - uses the plural Elohim (literally, "deities") to denote "God," and reports an astonishing remark:

And Elohim said: "Let us make Man in our image, after our likeness."

Whom did the sole but plural Deity address, and who were the "us" in whose plural image and plural likeness Man was to be made? The Book of Genesis does not provide the answer. [...]

Since the biblical story of Creation, like the other tales of beginnings in Genesis, stems from Sumerian origins, the answer is obvious. Condensing the many gods into a single Supreme Deity, the biblical tale is but an edited version of the Sumerian reports of the discussions in the Assembly of the Gods.

Heiser:

Genesis 1:26 And God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness."

[...]

So why the plural pronouns "us" and "our"? You know I hold that those speak of the presence of the divine council here.

You call it 'supreme council', Sitchin calls it 'assembly of the gods'.

You did a long analysis of the occurrences of the word Elohim, but it is useless since you are wrong on the main point. Nay, i believe you BY CHOICE decided to shift the focus on another matter, stating that Zecharia tends to affirm that Elohim is always plural, which he never wrote.

As for Genesis 1:26 itself, you should have taken time to read where Sitchin identifies this passage with the corresponding part of the Atra Hasis and the Enki & Ninmah myths. In the texts we have a perfect correspondence with the byble.

In both myths we have a single deity (Mami in the Atra Hasis, and Enki in the Enki & Ninmah) who talks to plurality of gods, exactly as in Genesis 1:26 where a single deity talks to a plurality of deities.

3. Can you explain why Zecharia Sitchin (or you in turn) have not included the comparative linguistic material from the Amarna texts that shows the Akkadian language also uses the plural word for "gods" to refer to a

single deity or person (which of course undermines the argument that *elohim* must refer to a plurality of gods)?

Again Sitchin never says anything about ILANU, he mentions the ILU term, and the ILANI term, used as 'god' and 'of the god'. You again shift the point creating a false argument. Provide the exact location where Sitchin says that ILANU is plural.

4. Can you explain how the interpretation of the word "nephilim" as referring to "people of the fiery rockets" is at all viable in light of the rules of Hebrew morphology? In other words, can you bring forth a single ancient text where naphal has such a meaning?

Sitchin never says that 'Nephilim' MEANS 'people of the fiery rockets', he says that the Nephilim WERE the people of the fiery rockets identifying them with the sumerian Dingirs. By the way, you make a mistake in your paper about the term Nephilim and its grammatical analysis. According to Prof. Ronald Hendel (Professor of Hebrew Bible Biblical Literature, Religion, and History, Northwest Semitic Philology, Comparative Mythology) of the University of Berkley, the NEPHILIM is the QATIL form of the hebrew verb NAPHAL (see his treatise: "of demigods and the Deluge" - image at the end of the document, note 46 of his treatise)

5. Can you produce a single text that says the Anunnaki come from the planet Nibiru - or that Nibiru is a planet beyond Pluto? I assert that there are no such texts, and challenge you and your readers to study the occurrences of "Anunnaki" right here on this website. [Here](#) is a video where I show readers how to conduct a search online at the Electronic Corpus of Sumerian Literature website. There are 182 occurrences of the divine name Anunnaki. Please show me any evidence from the Sumerian texts themselves that the Anunnaki have any connection to Nibiru or a 12th planet (or any planet).

As far as I know (but I have no access to all the sumerian material) there is no text saying exactly that the Anunnaki came from Nibiru, but there is reference in the Enuma Elish that Nibiru is a planet coming from the outer solar system. In Tablet I it is said that Marduk comes 'from the deep' and that it is an 'invader', in the VI and VII tablets it is said that Marduk is Nibiru. Two + Two = 4: Nibiru is a planet coming from the depths invading the solar system. For more about this matter you should see my article about the Enuma Elish (after you study italian) at: <http://gizidda.altervista.org/download/ENUMA-ELISH.pdf>

As for the provenience of the Anunnaki, it is said in the EE that they come from the sky, some of them came to earth and others stayed in the sky. There is also reference to Nibiru as the 'Star of Anu'.

6. Can you explain why the alleged sun symbol on cylinder seal VA 243 is not the normal sun symbol or the symbol for the sun god Shamash?

Your biggest mistake. There are at least 5 different depictions of the Sun, depending on the period and place. The most known sigil of Shamash is this (at the Louvre Museum in Paris):



Here is another famous seal:



7. Can you explain why your god = planet equivalencies do not match the listings of such matching in cuneiform astronomical texts? I recently [blogged](#) on this issue and provided a recent scholarly article on the planets in Mesopotamian literature by experts in cuneiform as proof that Sitchin erred in this regard.



You must provide evidence for this unmatching. All you did in your blog is linking to a pdf and writing this phrase:

*“the list of planets and their deity names. Notice anything? Count them. According to Sumerian sources, the Sumerians did **not** know twelve planets, contra Sitchin.”*



If you would have read Sitchin's books, you should know that the problem with the planetary lists is that they have been translated by our assirologists in the frame of mind that the ancient peoples only knew a certain number of planets. So they rearranged the names of planets/gods to the planets they though the sumerians would know.

This method resulted in two or more planets sharing the same akkadian or sumerian name and being associated to the same god. A typical example is MUL.BABBAR that is attributed both to the Sun (as BABBAR was a name for Shamash) and to JUPITER (bevause Jupiter was supposed to be Marduk, and Marduk was supposed to be called MUL2.BABBAR).



Another example is the NIBIRU, that the scholars explain to be a name for both Mercury and Jupiter, preferring to not say why it would be so.

8. Can you explain why many of Sitchin's word meanings / translations of Sumerian and Mesopotamian words are not consistent with Mesopotamian cuneiform bilingual dictionaries, produced by Akkadian scribes?

This is a false claim. No answer can be given unless you give a list. I challenge to write a list of 20 sumerian terms with sitchin's translation against the scholars' one.



Thank you for taking the time to respond. I will of course post any responses on this site.

Sincerely,

Michael S. Heiser, Ph.D., Hebrew and Semitic Studies, University of Wisconsin-Madison

You're welcome.
Alessandro Demontis
Rome, Italy

author of:

- Nibiru e gli Anunnaki
- Testi sumeri tradotti e commentati (con dizionario essenziale)
- Il fenomeno Nibiru vol.1 – le conferme

<http://gizidda.altervista.org/>

They lie⁴³ with the warriors,
The Nephilim of old,⁴⁴
who descended to Sheol
with their weapons of war.
They placed their swords
beneath their heads
and their shields⁴⁵
upon their bones,
for the terror of the warriors
was upon the land of the living.

Nephilim literally means “the fallen ones,”⁴⁶ indicating, apparently, the ones fallen in death. Similar usages of the verb *nāpal* and its derivatives are found elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, as in David’s lament over the death of Saul and Jonathan, *’ēk nāpēlū gibbōrīm* (“how the warriors are fallen,” 2 Sam 1:19, 25, 27), or Jeremiah’s warning to the false prophets and priests: “they will fall among the fallen,” *lākēn yippēlū bannōpēlīm* (Jer 6:15; 8:12). It appears relevant to a discussion of the Nephilim that the generic term Rephaim has a double meaning: (1) the giant aboriginal inhabitants of Canaan and (2) the shades of the dead.⁴⁷ The connection between death and the Nephilim appears to be basic to the several forms of the tradition.

I submit that the Nephilim, the warriors of old in Gen 6:1–4, are intended to be destroyed by the flood and that the destruction of these demigods was an authentic motive for the flood in early Israelite oral

⁴² See W. Burkert, *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth* (trans. P. Bing; Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California, 1983) 35–48, esp. 39; Nagy, *Achaeans*, 9–10, 174–209.

⁴³ Omit *lō’* with the Greek and the Syriac.

⁴⁴ The Greek reads τῶν γιγάντων τῶν πεπρωκότων ἀπὸ αἰῶνος (“the fallen giants of old”), which obviously refers to οἱ γίγαντες οἱ ἀπ’ αἰῶνος (“the giants of old”) of Gen 6:4. The Hebrew text is best read: *yiskēbū ’et-gibbōrīm / nēpīlīm mē’ōlām*. The MT *mē’ārēlīm* is an obvious mistake, triggered by a confusion between *resh* and *waw*. For the reading *nēpīlīm* rather than MT *nōpēlīm*, see W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2* (trans. J. D. Martin; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983) 168, 176.

⁴⁵ Read *šinnōtām* instead of MT *’āwōnōtām*. The mistake of MT was likely triggered by the cluster of *’ayins* and *šades* in the following two words.

⁴⁶ It is a *qaṭīl* passive adjectival formation of the root $\sqrt{np\ell}$ (“to fall”).

⁴⁷ On the difficult problem of the *rpūim* in Ugaritic literature, see M. H. Pope, “The Cult of the Dead at Ugarit,” in *Ugarit in Retrospect* (ed. G. D. Young; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1981) 159–79; C. E. L’Heureux, *Rank Among the Canaanite Gods: El, Baal and the Rephaim* (HSM; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979); idem, “The Ugaritic and Biblical