

are found in Euphratean tablets of about 600BC, which embody ideas of an even remoter age.<sup>2</sup>

She also points out that these 'Euphratean constellations' must have been from a much earlier time than the Greek Hipparchus, who compiled the earliest list of stars still in existence, since they began with Taurus 'the "Bull in Front"'. She writes:

*'If the sun was in Taurus at vernal equinox when the constellation was named, the date would have been about 2450BC. Virgil was echoing this tradition when he wrote: "The gleaming bull opens the year with golden horns, and the Dog sinks low, his star (Sirius) averted", but he was already more than two milleniums [sic] out of date.'*

2450BC is close to the biblical date for the Flood and the early post-Flood era, which is consistent with the speculation raised in my item. Payne-Gaposchkin also points out that the symbol of Capricornus is found on Babylonian gems. The usual symbol for Aquarius is in fact the Egyptian hieroglyph for 'water'. Although she points out that the 'Egyptian constellations were not the same as those of Babylonia and Greece', she also says that in the most famous Egyptian star map 'we can recognize the signs of our zodiac', thus surely supporting the thesis of a common origin.

A 1995 article in *Sky and Telescope*, which puts forward a theory for the origins of the various zodiacal constellations, points out that apart from the Ram, ancient Babylonia already had all the other zodiacal names. Also shown in that article is a second-century depiction of the Egyptian goddess Nuth, surrounded by all 12 signs of the zodiac, on the sarcophagus of Zoter of El-Kurne.<sup>3</sup>

One of the reasons for the confusion may be that some of the information known about star-names in antiquity is not necessarily shared between all authorities. Thus, despite Etz's list showing Sirius as being called 'Bow and Arrow' by the Babylonians,

Payne-Gaposchkin, a secular non-creationist authority, refers to

*'Sirius, the "Dog Star", in the constellation that the Babylonians called the "Dog of the Sun "'.*

Elsewhere in a list she features the same label as the 'Euphratean' name for this constellation.

While many of these matters of antiquity are too shrouded from clear view to permit excess dogmatism (which, I submit, features in much of Etz's attempted rebuttal), there would appear to be ample evidence to support the generalisation I made in the item, namely that the animals identified with

*'many of the constellations, including the well-known signs of the Zodiac, were and are shared in common with many cultures around the world'.*

In Job chapter 38, after referring to Pleiades and Orion, God asks Job (verse 32): 'Canst thou bring forth Mazzaroth in his season?' Modern Bible versions agree with the Jewish Targum in translating *Mazzaroth* as the zodiac. But then, I am not sure how Etz would view the testimony of Scripture in any case. Does his statement that *'Nimrod cannot be dated'* deny the validity of the biblical genealogies — or is it merely a comment on precision? Since I did not refer to any 'old Jewish legend', is he applying this label to the Bible's account of Nimrod/Babel itself — that is, Genesis?

Finally, concerning his assertion that it is unlikely that Nimrod was a 'pagan'.

Nimrod founded the first post-Flood city (and was presumably in charge of it at the time of the dispersion, since he retained the power and authority to found other cities thereafter — Genesis 18:10). The entire city he ruled was engaged in actions which so displeased God that He sent catastrophic judgment. That observation would scarcely lead one to deduce from it the intrinsic godliness of that society's *Führer*.

I have yet to come across any commentator, ancient or modern, who would think that Nimrod was anything

other than a great rebel against God. What does it mean, 'mighty hunter before the Lord'? It appears that the Hebrew word here translated *before* (which in any case, even in the English does not necessarily imply God's favour) is derived from the word 'face' (as in turning).<sup>4</sup> Thus, while it can be translated 'before', a better translation in context might be *'in the face of the Lord'*.

Carl Wieland,  
Brisbane,  
AUSTRALIA.

## REFERENCES

1. Schilling, G., 1995. Stars fell on Muggenburg. *New Scientist*, 148(2008):33-34.
2. Payne-Gaposchkin, C., 1961. *Introduction to Astronomy*, University Paperbacks, Methuen & Co., London.
3. Gurshtein, A., 1995. When the Zodiac climbed into the sky. *Sky and Telescope*, October 1995, pp. 28-33.
4. *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible with Hebrew, Chaldee and Greek Dictionaries*, MacDonald Publishing, USA.

## EARLY HISTORY OF MAN

Dear Editor,

I would like to draw the readers' attention to some matters supplementary to Bill Cooper's series 'The Early History of Man', particularly to Part 1.<sup>1</sup>

Some Middle Eastern traditions tie in with the pedigrees in Genesis 10. The Koran mentions a tribe Ad, 14 times, who had lived in the Hadramaut region, holding their ruined cities up as an example of God's wrath against idolatry — here expressed as fierce roaring wind which scoured the land some time between the Flood and the destruction of Sodom.

Ad was the son of Uz, son of Aram, son of Shem. He built a city and named it after himself, as well as the palatial Garden of Irem. His son Shedad reigned after him.<sup>2</sup>

One medieval Arabian tradition

identifies Amalek and Jordan as sons of Lud, indicating the area of Palestine as the haunt of his descendants rather than Lydia, Asia Minor, where Josephus placed them. Another gives Amalek Hamitic ancestry; there were alleged Amalekite Pharaohs.<sup>3</sup>

Although the destruction of Tilgarimanu wiped Togarmah's name from the Bible lands, the Armenians claim descent from Haik, son of Togarmah. Writing around 600BC Ezekiel mentioned Togarmah being in 'the uttermost parts of the north'. While to place his descendants in, say, the Baltic region on the strength of this would be far-fetched, it is worth noting that second century BC Greek and Latin writers referred to the Tochari living in the upper basin of the Amu Darya, which separates Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan before emptying into the Aral Sea.

They later moved into Sinkiang, from where Buddhist writings in their language, dated between AD500 and AD700 were discovered at the beginning of this century. Tochari is unrelated to the Iranian languages but is much closer to Celtic and Italic (which diverged more recently than other Indo-European groups), to Armenian, Phrygian and Thracian. Similarities to Balto-Slavonic and Finno-Ugrian tongues are generally considered to have been acquired over centuries of contact.

Reading Mr Cooper's articles on the early Britons and Saxons<sup>4-6</sup> reminded me of a book I read years ago, a commentary on a little-known old Frisian record. What struck me was the big event in the history of the Frisians (comparable to the Exodus for Israel), the sinking of Atland in 2193BC. This date would be around the time of the confusion of tongues at Babel, which was undoubtedly accompanied by great geological changes.<sup>7</sup>

Before 2193BC was the mythical era of Atland. As flooding has been frequent in the North Sea area in the past, the sinking of Atland could conceivably be a retrojection of memories of such events to the time when a bigger disaster took place,

details of which the Frisian ancestors did not recall. The book itself would have to be looked at for those interested; salt is recommended for the proverbial pinch or two!<sup>8</sup>

Interestingly, odd snippets match with some of Bill's findings. He links Ireland to the Phoenicians and the book has the Druids being founded by Phoenician priests — Roman writers charge the Druids with the same practices the Bible condemns the Canaanites for. Woden is also presented as an historical figure, prior to his deification. He was king of the Frisians in Denmark, and his cousin (*neef*, Frisian) Teunis was sea-king. When they parted company, Teunis led many of his people to the Mediterranean, and it was suggested in a paper read at a meeting of the Frisian Society in 1871, shortly after the Frisian book came to light, that 'Neef Teunis', cousin of Woden, was deified as Neptune (in a similar fashion to Tubalcain becoming Vulcan).

Derel Briarley,  
Newcastle upon Tyne,  
ENGLAND.

## REFERENCES

1. Cooper, W. R., 1990. The early history of man: Part 1. The table of nations. **EN Tech. J.**, 4:67-92.
2. Spence, L., 1926. **The Problem of Atlantis**. Doubleday, New York.
3. Velikovskiy, I., 1952. **Ages in Chaos**, Doubleday, New York.
4. Cooper, W. R., 1991. The early history of man — Part 2. The Irish-Celtic, British and Saxon chronologies. **CEN Tech. J.**, 5(1): 2-28.
5. Cooper, W. R., 1991. The early history of man — Part 3. The kings of the ancient Britons: a chronology. **CEN Tech. J.**, 5(2):139-142.
6. Cooper, W. R., 1993. The early history of man — Part 5. The early chronicles and their historicity. **CEN Tech. J.**, 7(2): 108-121.
7. *'In the Eddas the northlands are called Ataland (Thule 23.74) and the sea Atle's path (20.320). . . the name Atal or Atle is that of a sea king. . . Atland, Adalland, Oatland occur frequently in old records as names for districts in various countries around the North Sea.'* Spanuth, J., 1976. **Atlantis of the North**. Translated from German 1979.  
In this book he presents contemporary reports by geologists and archaeologists of catastrophic change in Europe C. 1000 BC. An expert on Nordic, Celtic and Tocharian

cultures is quoted equating the megalithic culture with the 'battleaxe people' and the Indo-Europeans.

And we can understand how he feels when he says in his introduction:

*'It is also something of a riddle that men who claim to value their professional integrity as scholars should produce falsifications of my statements, or those of others, or even of their own, and moreover refuse even to read my book and assert that they have no idea of the archaeological questions with which it deals.'*

8. Scrutton, R., 1977. **The Other Atlantis**, Spearman Publishing.

## PRECAMBRIAN GEOLOGY

Dear Editor,

Hunter<sup>1</sup> claims that, before 1991, creationists had fixed the Flood/post-Flood boundary at the base of the Cambrian. This is not quite correct. Back in 1983, I had taken account of Precambrian biotas as a whole,<sup>2</sup> and had included them within the Flood. I provided a map showing all of the then-known Precambrian fossil localities on Earth, listed some important Precambrian faunas, and then examined how often the Precambrian faunas are overlain by 'younger' fossils. The purpose of the overall study was to evaluate, in a systematic and detailed fashion, the age-old question of how fossils actually succeed each other in Earth's strata, and then provide a detailed explanation of it during the Flood. This article is now widely available, as it has subsequently been reprinted within my widely available book on Flood geology.<sup>3</sup>

Then and now I take a 'middle' road towards Precambrian rocks, rejecting both extremes of Precambrian being all pre-Flood and all forming during the Flood.<sup>4</sup> Those Precambrian strata which do contain fossils are undoubtedly Flood sediments, but the vast majority of Precambrian strata is unfossiliferous, and can still be assigned to the pre-Flood.

Many Precambrian fossils are stromatolites, and these have been invariably accepted as organic. Now a