

## **AN LSM MYTH DEBUNKED—NIMROD, MADONNA & THE TWO BABYLONS**

*“Don’t give heed to myths & genealogies...which promote speculations rather than God’s economy” (1 Tim. 1:4)*

Paul’s charge (above) is often sounded in the Local Churches affiliated with Living Stream Ministry (LSM). The warning, “Don’t teach myths and genealogies. Teach God’s economy,” frequently issues from LSM’s podium. Yet ironically Living Stream Ministry perpetuates certain myths. LSM’s mythology is exemplified by their teaching regarding Nimrod, the Madonna & Child and the Roman Catholic Church. Witness Lee asserts that the Roman Catholic icon of the Madonna and Child, while allegedly representing the Virgin Mary and the infant Jesus, actually symbolizes the first Anti-Christ,<sup>1</sup> Nimrod, and his promiscuous mother/wife. He claims Nimrod invented the Madonna and Child icon in primeval Babel. From ancient Babylon this image, allegedly,<sup>2</sup> “spread throughout the earth—to Egypt, India, Greece, pagan Rome, Tibet, China, and Japan,” finding expression in numerous pagan religions, before it “pervaded Roman Catholicism.” This argument constitutes a major plank in LSM’s condemnation of “demonic and apostate Catholicism.”<sup>3</sup> On the Internet LSM justifies this anti-Catholic rhetoric by citing the<sup>5</sup> “scholarly work entitled *The Two Babylons* by Alexander Hislop.”

Alexander Hislop’s 1857 book, *The Two Babylons* identifies the biblical Nimrod & his spouse with Ninus & Semiramis, characters of ancient lore who appear in the writings of Chaucer, Dante, and Shakespeare.<sup>6</sup> W. Lee cites Hislop’s *Two Babylons* repeatedly as a major authoritative source.<sup>7</sup> However research over the last 150 years has categorically refuted Hislop’s central tenets. Credible scholars reject the main thesis of *The Two Babylons* as fanciful speculation based on rabbinical and Hellenist myths and pseudo-etymology; they dismiss it as<sup>8</sup> “naïve history” fatally flawed by relying on the writings of a<sup>9</sup> “lying historian.” LSM calls<sup>10</sup> Hislop’s *Two Babylons*, “a scholarly work.” However, reputable scholars<sup>11</sup> repudiate it as nineteenth-century pseudo-science and anti-Catholic rhetoric. Nevertheless LSM still propounds the fables promoted by Alexander Hislop’s *Two Babylons*. Hence LSM perpetuates myths. The rest of this paper substantiates these statements.

### **Nimrod—an Enigma**

Nimrod is an enigma in the Old Testament record of antiquity. He appears fleetingly in the genealogies of Noah’s three sons. Genesis records “the sons of Ham: Cush and Mizraim and Put and Canaan...And Cush begot Nimrod: He began to be a mighty one on the earth. He was a mighty hunter before Jehovah; therefore it is said, Like Nimrod a mighty hunter before Jehovah. And the beginning of his kingdom was Babel and Erech and Accad and Calneh, in the land of Shinar. From that land he went into Assyria and built Nineveh and Rehoboth-Ir and Calah and Resen between Nineveh and Calah, that is, the great city.” (Genesis 10:6–12, RCV.) Scripture calls Nimrod “a mighty hunter before Jehovah.” His kingdom began with Babel (plus other cities) in Shinar (Mesopotamia). From Babylonia Nimrod’s influence extended into Assyria where he built Nineveh and other centers. Nimrod is a notable figure; his hunting exploits were renowned, he enlarged his kingdom from Babel and established cities in Assyria, like Nineveh.<sup>12</sup> Nimrod is linked with Babylon (Babel) and Assyria, both destined to become Israel’s enemies. Beyond this, Scripture says little about Nimrod; neither his wife and children, nor his influence on the government, religion and culture of later generations are enumerated in the Bible. Scripture’s tantalizing silence encouraged later Jewish writers (e.g., Josephus AD 37– circa AD 100) to embellish Nimrod’s biography. Hellenistic and European writers (like Alexander Hislop) also added to it.

### **Nimrod “invented...the Madonna with her child...[it] spread throughout the earth”—W. Lee**

The genealogies in Genesis are a “happy hunting ground” for extra-biblical elaborations. For example, Witness Lee taught that Noah’s curse on Ham was fulfilled by Black slavery.<sup>13</sup> Nimrod is also an attractive candidate for elaboration. Despite sparse biblical information, LSM publications contain dogmatic assertions about Nimrod’s influence. As an illustration, take LSM’s *Truth Lessons* (paraphrasing Witness Lee’s *Life-study*) which state,<sup>14</sup>

*“History tells us that at Babel, Nimrod brought in many idolatrous things. In that idolatrous worship he [Nimrod] invented a most evil emblem, the Madonna with her child. According to the book, *The Two Babylons*, the Madonna was the mother of Nimrod and was also his wife. This emblem, invented by the Babylonian worship, spread throughout the earth—to Egypt, India, Greece, pagan Rome, Tibet, China, and Japan. It even has pervaded Roman Catholicism. The emblem of a mother*

embracing her child is found in Roman Catholic cathedrals and in Buddhist idol temples. It has been utilized by Satan to deceive fallen people and rob them of their worship to God.”

The phrase “History tells us...” suggests scholars arrived at a definite conclusion. What is this consensus? LSM alleges historians have concluded that Nimrod assimilated idolatry and invented the Madonna and child icon. Society regards this as a Christian symbol, depicting the Virgin Mary and the infant Jesus. LSM asserts that its origins are much more sinister, dating back to 2200 BC.<sup>15</sup> LSM teaches that the original Madonna and child depicted Nimrod’s mother/wife. Thus LSM’s *Truth Lessons* says,<sup>16</sup> “the evil emblem that Nimrod invented was brought into the Catholic Church and appears as a picture of Mary and Jesus.” They allege that Catholicism’s Madonna is the modern manifestation of Nimrod’s wife, the pagan object of Babylonian worship dating back 4,000 years. Moreover, LSM asserts Nimrod was the starting point of human government and world culture.<sup>17</sup>

LSM claims Nimrod’s Babylon was the fountainhead of paganism. They assert that Nimrod’s innovation of “Babylonian worship spread throughout the earth” influencing pagan religions before it reached and “pervaded Roman Catholicism.” Allegedly the Madonna and child appear in heathen religions, e.g., Buddhism. As confirmation Witness Lee states that<sup>18</sup> “in some things, Catholicism and Buddhism are of the same source. The same emblem of a mother embracing her child is found in the Catholic cathedrals and in the Buddhist idol temples. This exposes the source of some of the things in today’s Catholicism,” i.e., Nimrod’s Babylon. W. Lee declares,<sup>19</sup> “although everything in Catholicism has a Christian appearance, its source is Babylonianism.” This theory is called,<sup>20</sup> “pan-Babylonianism.” In addition to Babylon, W. Lee adds Buddhism as an extra influence on Catholicism, stating<sup>21</sup> “Babylonianism entered into Buddhism, and Buddhism, a further development of Babylonianism, was assimilated into Catholicism.” We ask--Has Witness Lee’s version of pan-Babylonianism been verified or refuted by scholars? LSM also claims Nimrod’s Madonna reappeared at strategic points in the Old and New Testaments during the interval between ancient Babel and modern Catholicism.

### **Who Was Nimrod’s Wife?**

Scripture never mentions Nimrod’s wife or his mother. Nevertheless LSM asserts that these two figures are identical<sup>22</sup>—“the Madonna was the mother of Nimrod and was also his wife.” This implies the Madonna (whom Catholics revere as the perpetual Virgin Mary) is, in fact, a depiction of Nimrod’s promiscuous wife! But who was this depraved woman? LSM identifies her by name as Semiramis [e.g., Jer. 7:18 fn. 1, Rcv.]. Semiramis appears in legends dating from ancient Assyria and classical Greece down to Victorian England. This beautiful, yet immoral warrior-queen is the subject of operas, novels, and plays by Chaucer, Shakespeare and Dante.

LSM identifies Nimrod’s wife, Semiramis as the “Queen of heaven” in Jeremiah 7:18. While rebuking Israel, Jehovah says, “The children gather wood, and the fathers light the fire, and the women knead the dough, to make cakes for the queen of heaven and to pour out drink offerings to other gods to provoke Me to anger.” [Jer. 7:18, Rcv.] Expounding on this idolatry, Witness Lee says,<sup>23</sup> “Here the queen of heaven is Nimrod’s wife Semiramis...It is hard to believe that God’s elect...could degrade to such an extent that they would make cakes for the wife of Nimrod. This was a matter of both fornication and idolatry.” W. Lee asserts Nimrod’s wife, the “queen of heaven,” is Semiramis.<sup>24</sup> LSM ascribes an extensive history to her, alleging that, during Jeremiah’s era (600 BC), she was worshipped as the Queen of Heaven by idolatrous Israel (Jer. 7:18). She reappears six centuries later in the New Testament era. Witness Lee declares “Nimrod’s wife [was] Semiramis; later she was known as Artemis in Ephesus (Acts 19:27).” Hence the goddess Artemis, whom the apostle Paul encountered in Ephesus, (allegedly) also represents Nimrod’s wife Semiramis. After AD 500 the same symbol of Semiramis was revered by Roman Catholics worldwide as the Madonna with her child; in LSM’s view it continues today. This view traces the pagan icon of Nimrod’s wife, Semiramis (the original Madonna) in one unbroken thread beginning with Nimrod at Babel (2200 BC) down to Catholicism’s veneration of the Virgin Mary today.<sup>25, 26</sup>

### **LSM’s Authority—The Two Babylons**

LSM’s linkage of Catholicism’s Madonna to pagan worship at Nimrod’s Babel, relies on a single archaic source—Alexander Hislop’s 1857 book, *The Two Babylons*. This work is cited at least ten times in LSM-publications; it is the sole basis for LSM’s claims. W. Lee appeals to A. Hislop’s *Two Babylons* numerous times in his *Life-*

studies of Genesis, Matthew and Revelation. This source is also cited in *The Satanic Chaos* and *The God-Men*.<sup>27</sup> It is also referenced in LSM's *Truth Lessons*. Given Witness Lee's reluctance to cite other writers, the frequency with which he cites Hislop's *Two Babylons* is striking. The importance of Hislop's work is exemplified by Witness Lee's statement,<sup>28</sup> "Over the centuries some books have been written, including *The Two Babylons* by Alexander Hislop, to expose the heresies of Roman Catholicism. What I have told you is the truth concerning the Roman Catholic Church." Witness Lee appeals explicitly to Hislop's *Two Babylons* to support the veracity of his own denunciations of the Catholic Church. He equates "the truth concerning the Roman Catholic Church" with the book, "*The Two Babylons* by Alexander Hislop." LSM's Internet defense of their critique of Catholicism also appeals to the<sup>29</sup> "scholarly work entitled *The Two Babylons* by Alexander Hislop." But is this archaic source reliable? Has research over the last 150 years confirmed Hislop's sensational claims?

### **Hislop's Conspiracy Theory—"The Catholic Religion...a Millennia-old Conspiracy, dating from...Nimrod"**

*The Two Babylons* was initially published as a pamphlet in 1853, then revised and expanded as a book in 1857/8. Since then it has been reprinted and imitated many times. Dr. F. F. Bruce writes,<sup>30</sup> "Rev. Alexander Hislop, Free Church Minister at Arbroath, [Scotland] whose book, *The Two Babylons*, appeared in 1857, and speedily ran into several editions. This monument of study and erudition aimed at proving that the Papal system was identical with the worship of Nimrod (or Ninus) and his wife Semiramis." Hence the full title reads: *The Two Babylons: Or the Papal Worship Revealed to be the Worship of Nimrod and His Wife*.

Dr. Haynes summarizes Hislop's thesis, saying<sup>31</sup> "Hislop's goal...was to demonstrate the 'Babylonian character of the papal Church' by uncovering the 'common mysteries' uniting them. In Hislop's view, the Roman church had borrowed extensively from the 'ancient Babylonian mysteries,' and in their chief objects of worship—the Madonna and child—the two religions were virtually identical. On what basis does Hislop make this bizarre claim? First he identifies Nimrod's father Cush with Bel the founder of Babylon and Nimrod himself with... Ninus." Prof. L. Grabbe points out<sup>32</sup> "Hislop equated Nimrod with the Ninus of legend. This allowed him to introduce Semiramis...and make her 'mother of all harlots'." Hislop links Nimrod with Babylon and the Tower of Babel. <sup>33</sup>Having "gained the loyalty of his subjects...Nimrod...led them in abandoning the primeval faith...In the midst of a 'prosperous career of false religion and apostasy' [Hislop, p. 56] Nimrod died a violent death... slain by Noah's son Shem. With 'resolution and unbounded ambition' Nimrod's wife Semiramis elevated him to a place in the Babylonian pantheon, and when his mystery cult was forced underground he was worshipped alternatively as Osiris, Tammuz, or Adonis. [Thus] 'men were gradually led back to all the idolatry...' When Nimrod's mystery religion of idolatry, prostitution and human sacrifice emerged in the light of day centuries later, it took the form of Roman Catholicism." Hence, Hislop alleges that "the Catholic religion was the result of a millennia-old conspiracy, dating from the time of Nimrod," to quote Professor L. Grabbe.<sup>34</sup>

Where does Madonna appear? Hislop contends that Nimrod's wife, Semiramis, gave birth to a son, after her husband's death. He asserts<sup>35</sup> "In Scripture [this son] is referred to (Ezek. 8:14) under the name of Tammuz." Through propaganda the belief was established that<sup>36</sup> "Ninus (Nimrod) had reappeared in the person of a posthumous son [Tammuz]...super-naturally borne by his widowed wife." Hence Nimrod is identified both as the husband and child of Semiramis. Worship of Nimrod declined because he was black and "on account of his ugliness."<sup>37</sup> However "in Babylon itself, the posthumous child...came to be the favorite type of the Madonna's divine son...worshipped in his mother's arms," producing the prototypic Madonna and child. Hislop maintains that all mythical pairs, e.g., Isis/Osiris, Aphrodite/Cupid, and Asherah/Orion, reproduce the tale of Semiramis and Tammuz. Ultimately this same pair appears in Roman Catholicism as the Virgin Mary and child Jesus.

Prof. Haynes states that,<sup>38</sup> "Hislop's biography of Nimrod is distinctive in...[that he] pays considerable attention to Nimrod's consort Semiramis (associated with Diana [Artemis] among others) who he claims was deified in the Babylonian mysteries." The deified Semiramis is the first Madonna. Hislop's *Two Babylons* has enjoyed longevity and influence, being reprinted and imitated many times. Even today it is frequently cited as an authoritative source.<sup>39, 40</sup> But have 150 years of research only confirmed Alexander Hislop's startling claims?

### Where Did Hislop Get His Ideas about Nimrod?

Hislop tapped into a rich folklore concerning Nimrod. Jewish rabbis, elaborating on Genesis, portrayed Nimrod as a giant whose name meant “let us rebel,” a role he fulfilled building the Tower of Babel.<sup>41</sup> Rabbis called the tower “the house of Nimrod.”<sup>42</sup> They viewed Nimrod as the first imperial ruler<sup>43</sup> and the instigator of idolatry.<sup>44</sup> These ideas were adopted by early Christian writers. The “Pseudo-Clementine” writings, called the “Recognitions of Clement” (AD 140-160) refer to<sup>45</sup> “*Nimrod...whom the Greeks also called Ninus and from whom the city of Nineveh took its name.*” This statement is important; it indicates Hislop was not the first to identify Nimrod with the Assyrian king Ninus. This equation goes back at least to the second century AD.<sup>46-50</sup>

### Where Did Hislop Get His Ideas about Nimrod’s Wife?

Once Nimrod was designated as the Assyrian monarch called “King Ninus,” attention turned to his (alleged) spouse and successor, Queen Semiramis. Scripture says nothing about her; Greek legends say a lot. Eusebius summarized Greek versions of Assyrian history, saying<sup>51</sup> “Belus was the king of the Assyrians...[he] died and was regarded as a god. After him Ninus ruled the Assyrians...for 52 years. He married Semiramis. After [Ninus], Semiramis was the monarch for 42 years...” Eusebius alleges<sup>52</sup> “Semiramis...was killed by her son Ninyas, after a reign of 42 years. Then Ninyas assumed power.” Here queen Semiramis emerges. In folklore she is beautiful, yet immoral and ruthless. She appears in novels, plays, operas, and in film. In Hislop’s era the Semiramis saga was retold for children in, *True Stories from Ancient History* (1821).<sup>53</sup> As indicated Hislop was not the first to identify Nimrod with King Ninus, Nineveh’s legendary founder. This equation introduced the warrior-queen Semiramis as Nimrod’s wife. Nimrod’s bad reputation was enhanced by rabbinical myths. The fictional marriage of Nimrod with promiscuous Semiramis of Greek mythology was a fitting “match made in Hell.” Together they form the hook upon which Hislop hung his own elaborations in *The Two Babylons*.

### Hislop’s Methods—“Etymological Inventiveness”

In writing *The Two Babylons*, Hislop drew on rabbinical myths linking Nimrod with pagan idolatry and Greek legends associating Nimrod with king Ninus and queen Semiramis. Weaving these threads together with his own extrapolations Hislop supported his central thesis that Catholicism’s veneration of the Madonna and child was in reality the pagan worship of Nimrod and his wife, Semiramis, dating back to primeval Babel. Dr. F. F. Bruce pointed out Hislop’s methods, saying<sup>54</sup> “In defense of his thesis Hislop ranged the whole world from ancient days down, to his own [days], finding everywhere marks of the Babylonian origin of all pagan and Papal worship. To his wide reading he added an etymological inventiveness which traced words all over the globe to ‘Chaldee’ roots.” Bruce cites examples of Hislop’s etymological inventiveness, “For [Hislop] ‘cannibal’ (actually a variation from ‘Carib’) was Aramaic *kahnā Ba’al*, ‘priest of Baal.’”<sup>55</sup> “Hence, the priests of Nimrod or Baal were necessarily required to eat of the human sacrifices.” Hislop infers they were cannibals.<sup>56</sup> Yet this conclusion is based on naïve phonetics—the English word, ‘cannibal’ sounds like the Aramaic *kahnā Ba’al*.<sup>57-58</sup> Other examples could be added; Hislop claims<sup>59</sup> the English word “Easter” derives from “Ishtar,” an Assyrian goddess, because they sound similar. F. F. Bruce notes,<sup>60</sup> “This kind of argument, of course, has been invalid for something like three-quarters of a century. The science of philology no longer depends on fortuitous similarities. The laws of development and change in language have been observed and recorded, and etymologies must conform to these.” Professor Haynes also points out Hislop’s use of<sup>61</sup> “putative [speculative] linguistic affinities” to establish associations. R. Woodrow highlights Hislop’s “poor research methodology;” he says<sup>62</sup> “When I checked his...references, in numerous cases I discovered they do not support his claims.”

### Developments in Assyriology since Hislop

When Hislop wrote *The Two Babylons*, the study of Assyria and Babylonia was in its infancy. In the 1840s and 1850s, Sir Austen H. Layard (1817–1894) retrieved cuneiform tablets from the ruins of Nineveh. Sir Henry Rawlinson (1810–95), the “Father of Assyriology,” began deciphering these inscriptions. The study of ancient Mesopotamia was just beginning. “Great tracts of Babylonian life and history that were unknown in Hislop’s day have since been brought to light,” Professor Bruce writes.<sup>63</sup> “We now know that the original language of Babylonian religion, far from being what Hislop and his contemporaries called ‘Chaldee’ (which was really Aramaic), was not a Semitic language at all, not even the Semitic tongue now called Akkadian...but Sumerian, a

language with no certain affinity to any other known language.” Sumerian, not Chaldee, was the language of primeval Babylon. Hence Hislop’s “etymological inventiveness which traced words...to ‘Chaldee’ roots,” is irrelevant in establishing linguistic links to Nimrod’s Babylon and Assyria. They are pseudo-science not science. “Hislop’s argument stands in need of radical revision,” Dr. Bruce concludes.<sup>64</sup> It comes as no surprise then that modern Assyriology does not cite Hislop’s *Two Babylons*; it is a discredited source.

### **The Search for Nimrod**

Hislop identifies Nimrod & his wife with Ninus & Semiramis. These latter figures appear nowhere in Scripture; they emerge as monarchs of Assyria in Greek versions of Assyrian history. Hislop says<sup>65</sup> “Ninus, the most ancient of the Assyrian kings...was the *first who carried on war against his neighbors*.” Hislop deduces that “this Ninus...is so described as very clearly to identify him with Nimrod.”<sup>66</sup> But is this resemblance enough?

Hislop relied on early Greek historians, summarized by Eusebius (*circa.* AD 263–339). However the Greek historical record only becomes clear after the 1<sup>st</sup> Olympic Games, around 776 BC. The Trojan Wars (*circa.* 1183 --2 BC) formed a watershed. Prior eras belonged to myth, lacking definite chronology. As Dr. William Adler observes,<sup>67</sup> “By Eusebius’ time the inadequacies of Greek chronology were so familiar that chronographers generally preferred to commit large portions of the past to the domain of the prehistoric,” the undefined past. In terms of the biblical timeline that includes the entire period of Moses’ Pentateuch, especially Genesis.

If the Greeks were unclear about their own history, their knowledge of Assyrian and Babylonian history was sparse indeed.<sup>68</sup> “In Greek universal histories...of the 1<sup>st</sup> century BC, the Assyrian queen, Semiramis, Ninus’ consort and successor, was regarded as the most ancient sovereign in Asia.” Since,<sup>69</sup> Semiramis was said to predate the Trojan wars, historians generally assigned her to the 12<sup>th</sup> or 13<sup>th</sup> century BC. This places her (and Ninus) in the era of the Old Testament Judges. Clearly this disqualifies Ninus and Semiramis from matching Nimrod and his wife, who lived 1,000 years earlier! How did Hislop resolve this problem? He seized on the maverick dating of Eusebius. “I have discovered,” Eusebius wrote,<sup>70</sup> “that...Abraham...was a contemporary of Semiramis.” Eusebius dated Abraham’s birth in the 43<sup>rd</sup> year of the Assyrian King Ninus.<sup>71</sup> Following Eusebius, Hislop states “The age of Ninus...synchronized with that of Abraham, who was born BC 1996.”<sup>72</sup>

Hislop deduces that Ninus, aka Nimrod, ruled around 2000 BC, from 2039 BC to 1987 BC.<sup>73</sup> While early, this dating still presents serious problems. Ten generations separate Noah’s sons from Abraham (Gen. 11:10-26). Nimrod, the grandson of Ham, belongs to the 3<sup>rd</sup> generation. Peleg was the 5<sup>th</sup> generation; he was so named, because “in his days the earth was divided” (Gen. 10:25). Expositors link this “division” with the Tower of Babel. According to Ussher, Peleg was born in 2247 BC, around the time Babel’s tower was built. This implies three related events—Peleg’s birth, Babel’s Tower and the kingdom of Nimrod—*occurred 200 years before Ninus* reigned in Assyria (*circa* 2000 BC). Hislop adopted Eusebius’ claim that Ninus and Semiramis were Abraham’s contemporaries. Taken at face value this places them in the same millennium as Nimrod. Even so, Hislop’s numbers don’t add up; *a marked discrepancy of 200 years still separates king Ninus and Nimrod*. This vitiates against Hislop’s claim the biblical Nimrod is Ninus, the Assyrian king of Greek literature.<sup>74-80</sup>

When Hislop wrote *The Two Babylons* the prevailing view located Ninus & Semiramis long after Abraham. In asserting that Semiramis was Nimrod’s wife, Hislop contradicted scholars of his day. This is clear from Hislop’s own words:<sup>81</sup> “Sir H. Rawlinson having found evidence at Nineveh of the existence of a Semiramis about six or seven centuries before the Christian era, seems inclined to regard her as the *only* Semiramis that ever existed. But this is subversive of all history. The fact that there was a Semiramis in the primeval ages of the world is beyond all doubt...” Here Hislop contradicts Sir Henry Rawlinson, (1810–1895) the “Father of Assyriology,” by dogmatically asserting, “the fact that there was a Semiramis in the primeval ages of the world, is beyond all doubt.” It seems Hislop’s sole basis for this assertion was Eusebius’ allegation that Semiramis was Abraham’s contemporary. Yet, during the 1500 years from Eusebius to Hislop, no hard evidence has been produced to substantiate this claim; neither has any since. In fact, all the available evidence negates this assertion. To evaluate this evidence we must probe beyond Eusebius to the Greek historians whose works he summarized.

### **Hislop's Source—Ctesias of Cnidus, “one of the lying historians,” J. R. Morgan (Univ. of Wales)**

Eusebius summarized earlier Greek versions of Assyrian and Babylonian history. Yet Prof. Grabbe says<sup>82</sup> “The Greeks were infamous for their distortion of the culture and history of Near Eastern peoples.” The most influential writer on Mesopotamia was Ctesias of Cnidus (5<sup>th</sup> century BC). However, in terms of reliability, Prof. Grabbe tells us that,<sup>83</sup> “one of the most notorious writers among the Greeks was Ctesias of Cnidus...his history appears to have been mainly a collection of [Persian] court gossip, fairy tales and legend.” Dr. R. Bichler says,<sup>84</sup> “Ctesias’ name is widely associated with fantasy, invention, even lies.” Prof. Jan Stronk states that Ctesias’<sup>85</sup> “reliability as a historian has been seriously questioned...not only by [current] historians...but also by authors in antiquity....We should no longer regard Ctesias primarily as a historian, but as a forerunner of a new literary genre (...the classical novel) mixing historical fact with fictitious elements.” Among the “authors in antiquity,” “Aristotle thought very little of the reliability of Ctesias.”<sup>86</sup> Judith M. Richards reports there is<sup>87</sup> “a daunting collection of later authorities who had a low opinion of Ctesias’ veracity,” and there is “good reason for seeing Ctesias’ account of Semiramis as ‘extravagant romance.’” Prof. Bigwood says<sup>88</sup> “Few historians enjoyed in antiquity a lower reputation than...Ctesias of Cnidus. On the whole in modern time his 23-book history of Persia meets with only scorn.” Prof. J. R. Morgan declares,<sup>89</sup> “*Ctesias is one of the lying historians* fingered by Lucian’s *True Histories*.” Dr. R. Rollinger concurs, writing that,<sup>90</sup> “the current treatment of Ctesias...regards him as a ‘liar’” He concludes “maybe we should consider more seriously that Ctesias was not a historian at all.”

Yet it was Ctesias, the “lying historian,” who linked the Assyrian King Ninus with Semiramis. Dr. D. L. Gera reports,<sup>91</sup> “Ctesias seems to have been the first to have the Assyrian king Ninus marry Semiramis, the builder of Babylon, and link these two figures.” Prof. L. Grabbe concurs, saying,<sup>92</sup> “Ctesias seems to be the origin of a number of stories about oriental heroes and heroines, such as Ninus and Semiramis.” Ctesias also portrayed Ninus as a hunter, creating a likeness of biblical Nimrod. R. E. Gmirkin writes,<sup>93</sup> “Ctesias was the only classical source to describe Ninus as a hunter (alongside Semiramis)....All the available evidence is consistent with the description of Semiramis and Ninus as hunters having originated with Ctesias in the Persian period.”

These damning statements undermine the credibility of Ctesias, the source of the Ninus & Semiramis account, appropriated by Eusebius, on which Hislop’s entire thesis is built.<sup>94</sup> Moreover, challenges to the role claimed for Ninus and Semiramis are not just a modern phenomenon. The Babylonian historian, Berossus, writing in the third-century BC, complained that Greek historians were “getting it all wrong,” when recording his own country’s history. He<sup>95</sup> “censures the Greek historians for their deluded belief that Babylon was founded by the Assyrian Semiramis and their erroneous statement that its marvelous buildings were her creation.”

### **King Ninus of Nineveh—Fact or Fiction?**

Hislop identifies biblical Nimrod with king Ninus, Nineveh’s founder in Greek histories. Nimrod is a historical figure in Scripture. But is King Ninus of Nineveh a historical figure or merely a fictitious? Dr. R. E. Gmirkin concludes that<sup>96</sup> “all the evidence points to Ninus as a Classical era invention.” M. Vlaardingerbroek concurs, saying,<sup>97</sup> “Greek historians needed a founder for the city [Nineveh] and therefore they created a king after whom the city allegedly had been named. The story of Ninus is mainly a Greek invention based on the idea that a city needs a [founding hero].” These scholars conclude that Ninus was a classical Greek invention in the form of a “foundation myth.” As Dr. Deborah L. Gera explains,<sup>98</sup> “The Assyrian king Ninus was at first simply a name ...[a] hero invented by the Greeks to account for the founding of the city of Nineveh and the Assyrian empire. Ninus has no independent life and adventures other than being the...founder of Nineveh...He does not appear outside of Greek sources; there is no trace of him in Assyrian king lists.” No “concrete evidence”—inscriptions, monuments, etc.—has substantiated the notion that King Ninus ever existed. Hence Ninus of Nineveh remains on par with Romulus, the mythical founder of Rome. Both are strictly the stuff of legend; they are fictitious.

The realization that Ninus was purely a legendary figure is not merely a modern conclusion. As early as 1869, *The Student's Manual of Oriental History* declared<sup>99</sup> “Such personages as Ninus...belong in no way to real history; they never existed in fact. Ninus, as the name indicates, is only a personification of the city of Nineveh and all its power...” Skepticism about Ninus dates back to the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC when Berossus, the Babylonian

historian wrote his *History of Babylonia*.<sup>100</sup> The scholarly consensus that King Ninus is a fictitious character of Greek legend deals a mortal blow to Hislop's thesis equating Ninus with the biblical Nimrod. All the deductions *The Two Babylons* draws from this equation are invalid; they belong on the trash heap of Greek mythology.

### **Nimrod's Wife Was Semiramis—Fact or Fiction?**

What about Queen Semiramis, whom Hislop claims as the prototypical Madonna? In Greek sagas Queen Semiramis ruled Assyria for 42 years after King Ninus' death, her military campaigns rivaled Alexander the Great, she founded Babylon, and she built the "Hanging Gardens of Babylon." Modern scholars conclude that in the case<sup>101</sup> "of Semiramis...we have an example of myth ousting history." Dr. J. M. Richards says there is<sup>102</sup> "good reason for seeing Ctesias' account of Semiramis as 'extravagant romance'." G. Edward Foryan concludes that Greek historians'<sup>103</sup> "narratives of Semiramis are...based on historical legends colored with elaborations of thought and disguised fantasies, and therefore cannot be recognized as existential tangible truth or fact."

Within a few decades of Hislop's *Two Babylons*, scholars disputed its claims regarding Ninus and Semiramis. The 1869 *Student's Manual of Oriental History* declares<sup>104</sup> "The Greek writers introduce into history the fabulous names of Ninus and Semiramis. [However,] the direct study of the Assyrian monuments and inscriptions, enable us now to assert positively that neither Semiramis, nor her husband [Ninus] ever existed, that their history is entirely mythical—a fable with no real foundation."<sup>105</sup> Mythical Semiramis is anchored in historical fact only via her name.<sup>106</sup> "The name of Semiramis has been borrowed from a really historical queen."

### **A Kernel of Truth in the Legend of Semiramis**

A kernel of truth underlies the legend of Semiramis. Prof. S. Dalley argues that<sup>107</sup> "a background of genuine historical events lies behind legends of the Assyrian queen Semiramis...Semiramis was the name used for any powerful queen who represented the archetype," the ideal female monarch. The Greek historian<sup>107</sup> "Herodotus [c. 484-425 BC] recognized two great queens of Assyria [corresponding to Semiramis] the earlier...was...long recognized as Sammuamat, the wife of Shamshi-Adad V." This queen, the first candidate for 'Semiramis,' was born *circa* 850 BC and died c. 790 BC or 785 BC. The second candidate, "The later queen [was] Sennacherib's second wife Naqi'a, who lived some five generations later." Among modern scholars,<sup>108</sup> "C. F. Lehmann-Haupt [1950] was one of the first to recognize that at the basis of the Semiramis legend was a historical Assyrian queen, Sammuamat the wife of Shamshi-Adad V (823-811 BC). Sammuamat seems to have been an unusual person. It was once thought that she was co-regent with her son [King] Adad-Nirari III (810-783 BC), but this now seems not to have been the case...She was not a run-of-the-mill Assyrian queen." Dr. D. L. Gera says<sup>109</sup> "the historical Assyrian queen Sammuamat was an influential figure, but she certainly was less independent and powerful than Semiramis of [Ctesias]." Nevertheless she was a warrior queen who engaged in military campaigns alongside her son. The later queen, "Naqi'a, lived some five generations later."<sup>107</sup> She undertook building projects in Babylon. Semiramis' legend evidently conflated both characters into one mythical figure.

Contemporary scholars conclude that<sup>110</sup> "In contrast to Ninus, Semiramis may have existed. She is generally identified with Sammuamat, the consort of [king] Samshi-Adad V and the mother of [king] Adad-Nirari III. However, in reality there is little common ground between Semiramis and Sammuamat. The story of Ninus and Semiramis is mainly a Greek invention." If Sammuamat provides the "kernel of truth" behind Semiramis' saga, her husband fails to fit the Ninus legend. Prof. L. Grabbe concludes that<sup>111</sup> "*no clear historical figure lies behind [Ninus]*. Shamshi-Adad V, the husband of Sammuamat, was not a particularly distinguished ruler, with only a short rule, and little that one can see of his person in Ninus." Moreover both these historical figures violate *The Two Babylons'* timeline. The chronology simply does not jive; there is a yawning time gap. The leading candidate for Semiramis, the Assyrian queen Sammuamat was the wife of King Shamshi-Adad V who ruled Assyria from 823 BC to 811 BC. This makes her contemporary with the divided kingdoms of Israel and Judah, the era of Jeroboam II, king of Israel, Azariah/Uzziah, king of Judah and the prophets, Amos, Joel and Hosea (2 Kings 14:25-28; 15:1-7, 13). These dates are 1,400 years after the biblical Nimrod. A millennium plus 400 years separate biblical Nimrod from the historical figure underlying the legendary queen Semiramis. This "Semiramis," who lived *circa* 800 BC, couldn't possibly be the wife of Nimrod who lived around 2200 BC!

The second candidate for “Semiramis” fares even worse. King Sennacherib’s wife Naqi’a lived some five generations<sup>112</sup> (about a century) later than Queen Sammuamat. Sennacherib was contemporary with Hezekiah, king of Judah (2 Chron. 32; 2 Kings 17-18]. This Assyrian queen Naqi’a lived around 700 BC.; Nimrod lived approx. 2200 BC. Hence Queen Naqi’a is not qualified to be Nimrod’s wife; they are separated by 1500 years.

Scholars agree these two historical figures could provide a factual basis for Semiramis’ legend. They lived around 800 BC and 700 BC, respectively. In the 150 years since Hislop’s *Two Babylons* appeared, not one shred of evidence has substantiated an earlier Semiramis, contemporary with the biblical Nimrod. Alexander Hislop alleges,<sup>113</sup> “The fact that there was a Semiramis in the primeval ages of the world is beyond all doubt...” But Hislop’s assertion is based entirely on Greek fables; it has no basis in historical fact. The central figures in Hislop’s saga—Ninus and Semiramis—are fictional fabrications; *The Two Babylons*’ thesis collapses once they are removed. Today Hislop work is dismissed by all reputable scholars of Assyriology and Old Testament history. Prof. Grabbe calls it “naïve history.” He writes,<sup>114</sup> “Naïve history is history which takes the sources at face value...including ideological writings which take the sources at face value because they can be exploited in support of their ideology. A good example is the 19<sup>th</sup>-century anti-Catholic work of Alexander Hislop, *The Two Babylons*. Hislop attempted to demonstrate that the Catholic religion was the result of a millennia-old conspiracy, dating from the time of Nimrod. Hislop equated Nimrod with the Ninus of legend. This allowed him to introduce Semiramis, although no women are associated with Nimrod in the biblical text, and make her ‘mother of all harlots’—a role he also assigns to the Roman Catholic Church. Despite the fact that Assyriology has long since shown this picture to be absurd, Hislop’s book is still being reprinted and widely circulated.”<sup>115-121</sup>

### **Has Recent Research Found Nimrod?**

Over the last 150-years archaeologists and Assyriologists have scoured Iraq for remnants of its rich history. Have they found Nimrod? Van der Toorn and van der Horst indicate the plausibility, saying<sup>122</sup> “Since Nimrod is a Mesopotamian figure whose fame exceeded the bounds of his homeland, one expects to find him mentioned in the cuneiform records. Ever since the archaeological discoveries of the last century and the decipherment of the cuneiform script, scholars have attempted to spot the Mesopotamian prototype of the biblical Nimrod. The identifications they advance depend in part on...does Genesis 10 describe Nimrod as a god, a demigod, or as a sundry mortal?” Dr. E. A. Speiser reports that<sup>123</sup> “Among the diverse suggestions which have been offered, we find gods (Marduk, Ninurta), demigods (Gilgamesh, Lugalbanda), as well as sundry mortals (Amenophis III/*Nimmuria*, Ben-Hadad/*Bir-adda*.” The *Bible Background Commentary* suggests Bible-believers narrow their search to human heroes, saying<sup>124</sup> “Interpreters over the years have attempted to identify Nimrod...with Mesopotamian deities such as Ninurta, a warrior god...In Genesis, however, Nimrod is clearly a human hero rather than divine or even semi-divine.” C. Uehlinger concurs, saying<sup>125</sup> “the biblical texts...show no awareness of [Nimrod’s] ultimately divine identity...wherever the texts retain the name Nimrod, they have in mind a human hero of (post-diluvian) primeval times.” Dr. Speiser nominated the Assyrian king Tukulti-Ninurta I (1243-1207 BC) as the secular equivalent of biblical Nimrod. However, this king reigned in the 13<sup>th</sup> century BC, during the era of the Old Testament judges; hence he is disqualified by those accepting biblical chronology.<sup>126</sup> Other scholars nominate the earlier king, Sargon the great of Akkad and/or his grandson Naram-Sin.<sup>127</sup>

Based on past experience, contemporary scholars are pessimistic about positively identifying Nimrod with any historical figure. Dr. C. Uehlinger concludes<sup>128</sup> “It is not possible...to identify Nimrod with one single monarch of Mesopotamian history.” Similarly Israel’s Dr. Yigal Levin notes<sup>129</sup> “There is no ‘secular evidence’...about Nimrod at all, one way or another. He is not mentioned by name (or by any other name that we can readily identify) in any contemporary or near-contemporary source that we know about.” Perhaps the most prudent conclusion is that of S. Abramsky, who says,<sup>130</sup> “It is not possible or desirable to identify Nimrod with a specific king.” Given historians’ failure to positively identify Nimrod in secular history, the only reliable data regarding Nimrod is God’s infallible Word (Genesis 10). To go “beyond what has been written” (1 Cor. 4:6) is to leave the rock of God’s Word and venture onto the sinking sands of myths and fables. Contrary to LSM’s claims,<sup>131</sup> *history does not tell us* “at Babel, Nimrod brought in many idolatrous things.” *Neither does history tell us that* Nimrod “invented a most evil emblem, the Madonna with her child.” The Bible says nothing about Nimrod’s



wife. Again, contrary to LSM's claims, neither the Bible, nor history, tells us that<sup>132</sup> "Nimrod's wife [was] Semiramis," or that the first<sup>133</sup> "Madonna was the mother of Nimrod." All these assertions are fables.

### **Roman Catholics' Veneration of Mary**

Today scholars reject *The Two Babylons'* central thesis; it has been totally discredited. Credible scholars find no "hard data" supporting the notion that the Madonna & child icon was invented in Nimrod's Babel. What then is the origin of the Madonna and child? M. F. G. Parmentier states that<sup>134</sup> "Parallels between Mary and pre-Christian goddesses impose [i.e., suggest] themselves *but cannot be traced historically.*" Dana Kramer-Rolls acknowledges that<sup>135</sup> "it has long *been assumed* that the goddess veneration generated by the mystery cults of Late Antiquity were subsumed into the cult of the Virgin Mary." However, *assumption* is not proof; Kramer-Rolls notes it was only "with the establishment of Mary as the *Theotokos*, or God Bearer, at [the Council of] Ephesus in 431 CE, she was lifted in importance in both the mind of the church and the people." Scholars conclude that<sup>136</sup> "embellishments to [Mary's] legend seem to have taken form in the fifth century in Syria...The Council of Ephesus in 431 sanctioned the cult of the Virgin as Mother of God; the dissemination of images of the Virgin and Child, which came to embody church doctrine, soon followed." Hence veneration of the Virgin Mary gained momentum only in the fifth century AD, well into the Christian era.<sup>137</sup>

### **Imitation Is not Adoption**

Catholic elevation of the Virgin Mary does not prove an unbroken thread from pagan worship at Babel down to contemporary Catholicism. That is pan-Babylonianism<sup>138</sup>—the notion Babel/Babylon was the fountainhead of paganism. In contrast to that concept, Watchman Nee suggests Christians' desire to be "like the nations" led them to transform the Virgin Mary into a goddess. He says,<sup>139</sup> "Some think that at least Mary is of Christianity. But the fact is that Greece has a goddess, India has a goddess, Egypt has a goddess, and China has a goddess. Every religion in the world has a goddess, except Christianity. Since there must be a goddess, they bring forth Mary. Actually there is no goddess in Christianity—the origin of the concept of a goddess is the Gentiles." W. Nee suggests Christians imitated "the surrounding nations" in seeking a goddess. However, this doesn't mean they adopted pagan goddesses. Imitation is not adoption. Hislop alleges Catholics *adopted* a pagan goddess.

Alexander Hislop points to similarities between Catholicism's Madonna & child and various pagan idols as proof that Christianity adopted images from pagan religion. W. Lee states that,<sup>140</sup> "in some things, Catholicism and Buddhism are of the same source. The same emblem of a mother embracing her child is found in the Catholic cathedrals and in the Buddhist idol temples. This exposes the source of some of the things in today's Catholicism." But "correlation does not prove causation." M. F. G. Parmentier states,<sup>141</sup> "Iconographic parallels between the picture of Isis and Horus with that of Mary and the child Jesus have also been suggested, but these parallels are *more phenomenological than historically verifiable.*" Alexander Hislop also equates the Egyptian goddess, Isis with the Madonna.<sup>142</sup> However, Stephen Benko points out that the goddess Isis is typically represented as a nursing mother. But images of Mary *as a nursing mother* don't appear for many centuries into the Christian era. Benko writes,<sup>143</sup> "Representations of the Virgin Mary and the child Jesus...indeed resemble closely those of Isis nursing her son...[Yet there is a] large chronological gap between statues of Isis and Mary. In the West the first representations of Mary nursing her son date from the 12<sup>th</sup> century." Differences in time and place suggest the apparent resemblance between Isis/Horus and Mary/ infant Jesus is merely coincidental. Again correlation does not prove causation. Witness Lee follows Hislop in equating Nimrod's wife, Semiramis with the goddess Artemis of Ephesus.<sup>144</sup> However, the goddess Artemis is commonly depicted as anatomically deviant--she is "polymastic" (i.e., many-breasted).<sup>145</sup> In contrast, the Virgin Mary is always portrayed as an anatomically-normal woman. It is only by overlooking such differences and focusing on superficial similarities that the equation can be made. Drs. van der Toorn and van der Horst<sup>146</sup> critique studies where "a number of deities who shared certain characteristics were uncritically thought to be 'aspects'...of the same deity. Already in 1909 [scholars] warned against this lack of methodological stringency."

## Conclusion

Over 150 years have elapsed since Alexander Hislop's *Two Babylons* first appeared in print. This book's most sensational allegation is reflected in its subtitle—"Papal Worship Revealed to be the Worship of Nimrod and His Wife." Hislop equated the biblical Nimrod with Ninus, the legendary founder of Nineveh. He alleged that the Roman Catholic icon of the Madonna and child originated 4,000 years ago in primeval Babel as an image of Nimrod/Ninus and Semiramis. He claimed this aspect of "the Catholic religion was the result of a millennia-old conspiracy, dating from the time of Nimrod,"<sup>147</sup> Witness Lee adopted Hislop's thesis and cited *The Two Babylons* repeatedly as an authoritative source in his scathing critique of Catholicism. On the Internet LSM justifies this anti-Catholic rhetoric by citing the "scholarly work entitled *The Two Babylons* by Alexander Hislop." However a century-and-a-half of research has convincingly refuted Hislop's thesis. The Bible's Nimrod is an historical figure; in contrast, Hislop's King Ninus existed only in legend. *Ninus is not Nimrod*. The Bible says nothing about Nimrod's wife; Ctesias, the "lying historian," invented the myth that the wife of Ninus, aka. Nimrod was Semiramis. The small kernel of truth behind Semiramis' myth points to two Assyrian queens who reigned over a millennium after Nimrod. *The historical Semiramis was not Nimrod's wife*. Scholars reject Hislop's thesis that one unbroken thread links pagan goddesses from Nimrod's wife (Semiramis) in primeval Babel through the "Queen of Heaven" (Jer. 7:18, 600 BC), Artemis of the Ephesians (Acts 19:27, AD 50) to Catholics' veneration of the Virgin Mary today. Although Hislop's notions have been decisively refuted, W. Lee taught them as historical facts; they appear in LSM's publications—W. Lee's *Life-studies, Truth Lessons* and other books.<sup>148</sup> They are incorporated into LSM's Recovery Version,<sup>149</sup> and LSM's "High Peak" publications.<sup>150</sup> W. Lee asserts,<sup>151</sup> "Nimrod...invented...the Madonna with her child" and<sup>152</sup> "although everything in Catholicism has a Christian appearance, its source is Babylonianism." Thus LSM perpetuates Hislop's myths about Nimrod, Madonna and *The Two Babylons*. Roman Catholics are aware that such allegations have been discredited and refuted; they state correctly that<sup>153</sup> "Hislop's wild ideas cannot be substantiated historically," and his "idea that all world religions spring from a common source (especially one in Babylon) has been completely disproven."

Some may respond that the veracity of Hislop's *Two Babylons* is irrelevant since the Roman Catholic Church is indeed apostate "Babylon the Great, the mother of harlots"; others may assert that LSM's condemnation of Catholicism is justified, even if Hislop's main points are proved wrong. But such responses are unbecoming of Christians. It is equivalent to convicting someone based on fabricated evidence. The Lord Jesus charged the Jews to "judge righteous judgment" (John 7:24). It is unrighteous to charge Roman Catholics with paganism dating back to Nimrod's Babel when the only "evidence" consists of Jewish myths, Greek fables, and Hislop's pseudo-science. In making such charges LSM has borne false witness. The Roman Catholic Church has many faults, but this sensational charge—that Catholics' veneration of the Virgin Mary is actually the pagan worship of Nimrod and his wife, dating back to Babel—is not one of them. On this issue shouldn't LSM admit their past errors, apologize for their false accusations, repudiate A. Hislop's *Two Babylons* and set the record straight?

Nigel Tomes,

Toronto, CANADA

January, 2011.

## NOTES:

Thanks are again extended to those who commented on earlier drafts of this piece. As usual the author alone is responsible for the contents of this piece. The views expressed here are solely the author's and should *not* be attributed to any believers, elders, co-workers or churches with whom/which he is associated. I apologize for inflicting 150+ footnotes upon the reader. By way of explanation [1] I have tried to "get to the bottom" of the LSM/Hislop myth concerning Nimrod, the Madonna & *The Two Babylons*. This proved to be no easy task, as the 50 references cited at the end of this paper testify. [2] This is a shorter version of a longer piece—substantial material was moved from the main text to the footnotes, and [3] I have been charged (with reference to previous papers) with taking quotes out of context. The notes & references allow the objective reader to evaluate this issue for him/herself.

1. W. Lee says, “*The first type of Antichrist was Nimrod in Genesis; the second was Antiochus Epiphanes in Daniel; and the third was Titus, the prince of Rome who destroyed Jerusalem in A.D. 70.*” [W. Lee, *Life-study of Daniel*, Message 4, section 3, emphasis added]
2. W. Lee writes, “Nimrod was the first king of Babel who, according to history, brought in many idolatrous things (Gen. 10:10). That idolatrous worship invented a most demonic emblem, the Madonna with her child. According to the book, *The Two Babylons*, the Madonna was the mother of Nimrod and also his wife. This emblem, invented by the Babylonian worship, spread throughout the earth—to Egypt, India, Greece, pagan Rome, Tibet, China, and Japan. It even has pervaded Roman Catholicism.” [W. Lee, *Life-study of Genesis*, message 34, section 6, pp. 464-5, emphasis indicates quotation in the main text (above)] This quote is discussed in more detail below.
3. W. Lee declares, “Judaism is satanic, Catholicism is demonic, and Protestantism is without Christ.” [W. Lee, *The Stream Magazine*, vol. 14, no. 4 (Nov. 1976) p. 12. Emphasis added.] W. Lee also talked about “the three deformed religions—Judaism, Catholicism, and Protestantism.” [W. Lee, *The Satanic Chaos in the Old Creation and the Divine Economy for the New Creation*, chap. 4 (Messages given by W. Lee in Irving, Texas, May 23-25, 1992)] “In the eyes of the Lord,” he asserted, “these three ‘isms’ are more evil than sin, than the world, and than our self.” LSM’s Bible denounces,<sup>4</sup> “the apostate Roman Catholic Church.” The latter quote in context reads, “The Lord is not building His church in Christendom...composed of the apostate Roman Catholic Church and the Protestant denominations.” [W. Lee, *The New Testament Recovery Version*, Matthew 16:18, note 4, (Living Stream Ministry), p. 99, emphasis indicates quote in the main text.] We note also that, when he came to Revelation 17, W. Lee gave an emphatic interpretation of the great harlot, saying, “The prostitute is the apostate Roman Catholic Church. History reveals that only one figure, one character, matches the description of the female in this chapter, and that figure is the Roman Catholic Church...According to the Scriptures, the great prostitute...is the Roman Catholic Church. If the female in Revelation 17 is not the Roman Catholic Church, then who is she? Surely, according to history, only the Roman Catholic Church fits the description of the woman given here.” [W. Lee, *Life-study of Revelation*, message 51, p. 584, emphasis added] He also asserted that, “the prostitute denotes the religious Babylon, signifying the Roman Church.” [W. Lee, *Life-study of Revelation*, message 51, p. 598.] Here are categorical statements unequivocally identifying the great prostitute as the Roman Catholic Church.
4. [Blank]
5. Quote from the DCP website “contendingforthefait.com.” LSM “handles litigation through its affiliate the Defense and Confirmation Project [DCP].” The DCP website contendingforthefait.com refers to A. Hislop’s *The Two Babylons* in a section entitled, “Concerning Judaism, Catholicism, and Protestantism,” saying: “The Bible Answer Man continually quotes Witness Lee’s statement that “Judaism is satanic, Catholicism is demonic, and Protestantism is Christless.” In their response, the only authority (apart from scripture) cited by DCP-LSM’s “contendingforthefait.com” is Hislop’s book, *The Two Babylons*. This website, “contendingforthefait.com” says, “The identity of Roman Catholicism and the woman in Revelation 17 is the subject of a scholarly work entitled *The Two Babylons* by Alexander Hislop.” It then proceeds to quote Hislop’s work.
6. The quote from G. Chaucer’s *The Canterbury Tales* reads, “She is Semiramis, of whom one reads, who succeeded Ninus, and was his wife: She ruled the land over which the Sultan rules.” [J. Parr, *Chaucer’s Semiramis*, The Chaucer Review, 1970] The tomb of Semiramis’s husband, Ninus, is mentioned in W. Shakespeare’s *A Mid-summer Night’s Dream* (5.1.138). In *The Divine Comedy*, Dante sees Semiramis in the Second Circle of Hell. The character, Semiramis also appears in the films, *Queen of Babylon* (1954) & *I am Semiramis* (1963)
7. W. Lee refers to Alexander Hislop’s book, *The Two Babylons*, at least ten times. See, for example, *Life-study of Genesis*, message 34, p. 464; *Truth Lessons*, Level 2, Vol. 2, Lesson 18, p. 53, p. 56; *The Satanic Chaos in the Old Creation and the Divine Economy for the New Creation*, p. 97, *The God-Men*, p. 42; *Life-study of Revelation*, Message 51, pp. 585-6; *Life-study of Revelation*, Message 13, pp. 157-8; *Life-study of Matthew*, pp. 467-8. Several of these references contain multiple citations of Hislop’s *Two Babylons*.
8. “Naïve history is history which takes the sources at face value. There are all sorts of naïve history, including ideological writings which take the sources at face value because they can be exploited in support of their ideology. A good example is the nineteenth-century anti-Catholic work of Alexander Hislop, *The Two Babylons*.” [Lester L. Grabbe, *Can a 'history of Israel' be written?* p. 28] Lester L. Grabbe is Professor of Hebrew Bible and Early Judaism at the University of Hull, UK
9. We refer to the Greek historian, Ctesias of Cnidus (discussed in more detail below). Concerning his writings, J. R. Morgan says, “...fiction in the guise of historiography. A prime example is Ctesias of Cnidus....Ctesias was more interested in love and intrigue than in historical fact, and actually foreshadowed much of the thematic repertoire of the Greek novel itself. Ctesias is one of the lying historians fingered by Lucian’s *True Histories*.” [J. R. Morgan, “Fiction and History: Historiography and the Novel” in *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, edited by John Marincola, p. 560] J. R. Morgan is Professor of Classics at Swansea University, Wales, UK.
10. Quote from the website of LSM-affiliate, DCP, “contendingforthefait.com.”

11. Hislop's work has been repeatedly reprinted and republished over the last 150 years. Its arguments have also been re-worked, re-written and re-published by a number of authors (in print and on the Internet), in most cases without adequate evaluation. Numerous articles can be found on the Internet supporting or reproducing Hislop's theories. This paper seeks to quote "reputable scholars" associated with universities and/or articles published in peer-reviewed academic journals and/or books published by reputable publishers (e.g. a university press). Where possible we indicate the author's academic affiliation.
12. "Old Testament (OT) scholars indicate a problem with the identity of the founder of Nineveh. The Hebrew OT text is ambiguous (Gen. 10:11). It is usually translated "from that land [Nimrod] went into Assyria," but "from that land Assur went forth" is also possible. Consequently, it is not clear in the Hebrew who founded Nineveh, Nimrod or Assur. The Greek Septuagint [LXX] is not ambiguous. Here Assur is the founder of the Assyrian cities." Menko Vlaardingerbroek, "*The Founding of Nineveh and Babylon in Greek Historiography*", in Collon, D., George, A., Hg., *Nineveh: Papers of the XLIXe Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, London 7–11 July 2003*, London, 2005, p. 236. Sir Walter Raleigh devoted several pages in his *History of the World (circa. 1616)* to reviewing past scholarship on the question of whether it was Nimrod or Assur who built the cities in Assyria. We also note that "Nimrod" is mentioned in Micah chap. 5 which says, "When Assyria comes into our land; and when he treads in our palaces, we will raise up against him seven shepherds And eight princes of men. And they will waste the land of Assyria with the sword; and *the land of Nimrod* at its entrances. And He will save us from Assyria. When he comes into our land; and when he treads in our border." [Micah 5:5-6, Rcv.] Here Assyria is referred to as "the land of Nimrod."
13. For more on this see my "BLACK SLAVERY AS 'THE CURSE OF HAM'—Bible Truth, Jewish Myth or Racist Apologetic?" (October, 2007) on [www.concernedbrothers.com](http://www.concernedbrothers.com)"
14. W. Lee, *Truth Lessons*, Level 2, Vol. 2, Lesson 18, p. 53. LSM's *Truth Lessons* are edited versions of W. Lee's teaching. In this instance it is a slightly edited version of W. Lee's *Life-study*, which states: "Nimrod was the first king of Babel who, according to history, brought in many idolatrous things (10:10). That idolatrous worship invented a most demonic emblem, the Madonna with her child. According to the book, *The Two Babylons*, the Madonna was the mother of Nimrod and also his wife. This emblem, invented by the Babylonian worship, spread throughout the earth—to Egypt, India, Greece, pagan Rome, Tibet, China, and Japan. It even has pervaded Roman Catholicism. When the Roman Catholic Church sent missionaries to China a few hundred years ago, those missionaries found the same emblem in the Buddhist idol temples and sent a report about this back to the Vatican. This is documented in *The Two Babylons*. Before I was saved, I went, as a child, to a Catholic cathedral in China and saw this emblem [the Madonna with her child]. In the same period of time, I visited a Chinese Buddhist temple and saw the same picture there. After I was saved, I told people in my preaching that, in some things, Catholicism and Buddhism are of the same source. The same emblem of a mother embracing her child is found in the Catholic cathedrals and in the Buddhist idol temples. This exposes the source of some of the things in today's Catholicism." [W. Lee, *Life-study of Genesis*, message 34, section 6, pp. 464-5] The first half of this paragraph forms the basis of LSM's *Truth Lessons* quoted in the main text. Note the two references to Hislop's *Two Babylons*.
15. The figure 2200 BC is based upon Bishop Ussher's famous chronology. To be precise, Ussher dates Nimrod at 2234 BC saying, "From these writings it appears that the Babylonians devoted themselves to the study of astronomy, even from the very days of Nimrod, from whom all that region took the name of the land of Nimrod. Micah 5:6 Nimrod built Babylon and was the instigator of the building of the tower of Babel according to Josephus (l. 1. Antiq. c. 4.)" [Ussher, *Annals of the World*] LSM adopts Ussher's chronology. For more on this see my, "DATING ADAM—A CRITIQUE OF LSM'S CHRONOLOGY: *LSM adopts Ussher's Outdated Chronology dating Mankind's Origin at 4004 BC*" on [www.concernedbrothers.com](http://www.concernedbrothers.com)" & "[www,LocalChurchDiscussions.com](http://www.LocalChurchDiscussions.com)"
16. W. Lee, *Truth Lessons* Level 2, Vol. 2, Lesson 18, p. 56
17. These latter claims are made by W. Lee in his *Life-study of Daniel*. He says, "*Human government began with Nimrod* in Genesis 10. Prior to Genesis 10 there were no human nations; instead, there was only mankind as a whole without established nations. Nations began to be established by Nimrod, who built Babel, a prefigure of Babylon (Gen. 10:8-10). Human government will conclude with the coming Antichrist, who will be the last Caesar of the Roman Empire. *All human government from Nimrod* to Antichrist has been and will continue to be under the ruling of the heavens by the God of the heavens....Daniel also covers human government from Nimrod to Antichrist." [W. Lee, *Life-study of Daniel*, Message 1, section 4, emphasis added.] LSM's Recovery Version says, "*The beginning of human government was at Babel (Babylon), which was built by Nimrod* (Gen. 10:8-10), and the ending of human government will be the revived Roman Empire under Antichrist...Thus the aggregate of *human empires that began with Nimrod* will consummate with Antichrist and his ten kings." [Rcv. Dan. 2:32, note 1, para. 2, emphasis added] Again W. Lee's *Life-study* says, "*The aggregate of human empires that began with Nimrod at Babel* will consummate with the last Caesar of the Roman Empire with his ten kings. Thus, according to the Bible, we are still in the Roman Empire today. *The culture of the world is an accumulation of culture from the time of Nimrod until the present. What began with Nimrod* will conclude with Antichrist." [W. Lee, *Life-study of Daniel*, Message 3, section 3, emphasis added]
18. W. Lee, *Life-study of Genesis*, message 34, section 6, pp. 464-5.
19. W. Lee, *Life-study of Revelation*, p. 484

20. It is the proposition that prehistoric Babylon is the source of global paganism. Pan-Babylonianism was championed by H. Winckler who “argued that all the world myths are reflections of Babylonian astral religion which had developed about 3000 BCE.” [Mark W. Chavalas, *Mesopotamia and the Bible*, p. 34] The pan-Babylonianism concept in Hislop’s book is addressed in the following quote: “Some of the ideas of panbabylonism appear in 19th century Protestant polemic against the Roman Catholic Church, notably in *The Two Babylons*, a pamphlet produced by Scottish theologian Alexander Hislop. Its central theme is its allegation that the Roman Catholic Church is a veiled continuation of the pagan religion of Babylon, the veiled paganism being the product of a millennia old conspiracy.” [“Panbabylonianism,” in Wikipedia] Hislop’s pan-Babylonianism is illustrated by his statement: “Babylon was the primal source from which all these systems of idolatry flowed” [A. Hislop, *The Two Babylons*, p. 17]
21. W. Lee, *Life-study of Revelation*, Message 51, pp. 584-5 Elsewhere, W. Lee says, “Alexander Hislop in his book *The Two Babylons* exposes the origin of the evil, demonic, pagan things that were brought into the apostate church.” [W. Lee, *The Satanic Chaos in the Old Creation and the Divine Economy for the New Creation* - p. 97] W. Lee also links Catholicism, Babylonianism, and Buddhism when he says, “To care for our happiness is a Babylonian concept. This is also the concept of Catholicism derived from Babylonianism, and resembling Buddhism.” [W. Lee, *Life-study of Revelation*, p. 449]
22. W. Lee, *Truth Lessons*, Level 2, Vol. 2, Lesson 18, p. 53. W. Lee also says, “According to the book, *The Two Babylons*, the Madonna was the mother of Nimrod and also his wife.” [W. Lee, *Life-study of Genesis*, message 34, section 6, pp. 464-5]
23. W. Lee, *Life-study of Jeremiah*, Message 10, section 3, p. 69. Alexander Hislop identifies Semiramis as the “queen of heaven,” as indicated in the following quote: “**Semiramis**, then, as Astarte, worshipped as the dove, was regarded as the incarnation of the Spirit of God. As Baal, Lord of Heaven, had his visible emblem, the sun, so she [i.e. Semiramis], as Beltis, **Queen of Heaven**, must have hers also--the moon, which in another sense was Asht-tart-e,” [A. Hislop, *The Two Babylons*, p. 100, emphasis added]
24. Both W. Lee’s *Life-study* and LSM’s Recovery Version identify Nimrod’s wife, the “queen of heaven,” as Semiramis. LSM’s *Recovery Version of the Bible*, Jeremiah 7:18 Rcv. footnote 1 says “Nimrod’s wife Semiramis, later known as Artemis of Ephesus (Acts 19:27). Israel’s making cakes to the wife of Nimrod was a matter of both spiritual fornication and idolatry.” It also appears in W. Lee’s *Life-study of Jeremiah* message 10, p. 69, [W. Lee’s *Life-study of Jeremiah* was conducted in the Winter of 1991 and constitutes part of the “High Peak of the Divine Revelation.”] This assertion—that Nimrod’s wife Semiramis, [was] later known as Artemis of Ephesus (Acts 19:27)--is made by Alexander Hislop in his book *The Two Babylons* pp. 32, 69. Note that neither W. Lee’s *Life-study of Jeremiah* [message 10, p. 69] nor LSM’s Recovery Version gives any citation of Hislop’s *Two Babylons* in their writings regarding this point.
25. LSM traces the pagan icon of Nimrod's wife, Semiramis (the original Madonna) in one unbroken thread beginning with Nimrod at Babel (2200 BC) down through apostate Israel’s worship at the Babylonian captivity (Jer. 7:18, 600 BC), the pagan worship of Artemis at Ephesus (Acts 19:27, 50 AD) to Catholicism’s veneration of the Virgin Mary today. Moreover allegedly this same icon appears worldwide in pagan religions. In their view the Madonna-like icons in various pagan religions are not independent incidents. Instead LSM asserts that the recurring Madonna & child icons are successive manifestations of Nimrod’s idolatrous invention. LSM’s teaching “connects the dots,” producing one unbroken thread of paganism across the centuries from Nimrod’s Babel in 2200 BC to modern Roman Catholicism. This concurs with A. Hislop, who says, “The Madonna of Rome, then, is just the Madonna of Babylon.” A. Hislop, *The Two Babylons* p. 75. The quote in context reads, “*The Madonna of Rome, then, is just the Madonna of Babylon.* The ‘Queen of Heaven’ in the one system is the same as the ‘Queen of Heaven’ in the other.” [Hislop, p. 75, emphasis added]
26. LSM’s *Truth Lessons* allege “at Babel, Nimrod...invented a most evil emblem, the Madonna with her child...[It was] invented by the Babylonian worship...[then] spread throughout the earth—to Egypt, India, Greece, pagan Rome, Tibet, China, and Japan. It even has pervaded Roman Catholicism.” [W. Lee, *Truth Lessons*, Level 2, Vol. 2, Lesson 18, p. 53.] W. Lee’s *Life-study*, says essentially the same thing when it states: “Nimrod was the first king of Babel who, according to history, brought in many idolatrous things (10:10). That idolatrous worship invented a most demonic emblem, the Madonna with her child. ...This emblem, invented by the Babylonian worship, spread throughout the earth—to Egypt, India, Greece, pagan Rome, Tibet, China, and Japan. It even has pervaded Roman Catholicism.” [W. Lee, *Life-study of Genesis*, message 34, section 6, pp. 464-5] Note that this is based upon Hislop’s *Two Babylons*, which says, "In those countries of Europe where the Papal system is most completely developed...the Mother and Child are the grand objects of worship. Exactly so, in this latter respect, also was it in ancient Babylon. The Babylonians, in their popular religion, supremely worshipped a Goddess Mother and a Son, who was represented in pictures and images as an infant or child in his mother's arms. From Babylon, this worship of the Mother and the Child spread to the ends of the earth. In **Egypt**, the Mother and the Child were worshipped under the names Isis and Osiris [called most frequently Horus]...**in Pagan Rome**, as Fortuna and Jupiter...the boy; in **Greece**, as Ceres the Great Mother, with the babe at her breast...and even in Thibet [**Tibet**], **China, and Japan**, the Jesuit missionaries were astonished to find the counterpart of Madonna and her child as devoutly worshipped as in Papal Rome itself.” [A. Hislop, *The Two Babylons*, pp. 14, 20, 21]. Emphasis added to identify the countries mentioned in LSM’s *Truth Lessons* and W. Lee’s *Life-study*. LSM asserts that “history tells us” all these things. But what is the basis for these bold assertions? Have LSM’s dogmatic statements with their damning critique of Catholicism been verified, confirmed beyond reasonable doubt, by historical research? Does history really tell us so?
27. W. Lee refers to Alexander Hislop’s book, *The Two Babylons*, at least ten times. See, for example, *Life-study of Genesis*, message 34, pp. 464-5; *Truth Lessons*, Level 2, Vol. 2, Lesson 18, p. 53, “The book, *The Two Babylons* points out that the

- evil emblem that Nimrod invented was brought into the Catholic Church and appears as a picture of Mary and Jesus [W. Lee, *Truth Lessons*, Level 2, Vol. 2, Lesson 18, p. 56]; “Alexander Hislop in his book *The Two Babylons* exposes the origin of the evil, demonic, pagan things that were brought into the apostate church.” [W. Lee, *The Satanic Chaos in the Old Creation and the Divine Economy for the New Creation*, p. 97], “Over the centuries some books have been written, including *The Two Babylons* by Alexander Hislop, to expose the heresies of Roman Catholicism. What I have told you is the truth concerning the Roman Catholic Church.” [W. Lee, *The God-Men* p. 42; Life-study of Revelation, Message 51, pp. 585-6; “The book, *The Two Babylons*, exposes the origin of the evil, demonic, pagan things that were brought into the apostate church.” [W. Lee, *Life-study of Revelation*, Message 13, pp. 157-8; “After the papal system had been established, the many pagan practices which had been brought in were confirmed by that system. This is documented in Alexander Hislop’s book, *The Two Babylons*.” [W. Lee, *Life-study of Matthew*, pp. 467-8] Several of these references contain multiple citations of Hislop’s *Two Babylons*. G. H. Pember’s *The Great Prophecies*, is the only other work cited on this subject. However, the latter is minor; the major reference is *The Two Babylons*.
28. W. Lee, *The God-Men*, p. 42. The quote, in context, reads: “Christ is true; Christmas is false. Christ is the truth; Christmas is a heresy and a mixture. Over the centuries some books have been written, including *The Two Babylons* by Alexander Hislop, to expose the heresies of Roman Catholicism. What I have told you is the truth concerning the Roman Catholic Church.”
  29. The website of LSM-affiliate, DCP “contendingforthefaith.com,” says, “The identity of Roman Catholicism and the woman in Revelation 17 is the subject of a scholarly work entitled *The Two Babylons* by Alexander Hislop.” It then proceeds to quote Hislop’s work. (emphasis added)
  30. F. F. Bruce, “Babylon and Rome,” *The Evangelical Quarterly* 13 (October 15, 1941): p. 243. Dr. F. F. Bruce (1910-90), a well-known evangelical scholar, was Professor of Biblical Exegesis at the University of Manchester.
  31. Stephen R. Haynes, *Noah’s Curse: the biblical justification of American Slavery*, (2002) chap. 3, p. 58. Dr. Stephen R. Haynes is Professor of Religious Studies at Rhodes College. The quote in context reads: “The strangest chapter in Nimrod’s unauthorized biography is also the longest and most intricate. Its author is Alexander Hislop (1807-1865), a Scottish divine who in 1858 published *The Two Babylons*...Hislop’s goal in this exceedingly convoluted anti-catholic tract was to demonstrate the ‘Babylonian character of the papal Church’ by uncovering the ‘common mysteries’ uniting them. In Hislop’s view, the Roman church had borrowed extensively from the ‘ancient Babylonian mysteries,’ and in their chief objects of worship—the Madonna and child—the two religions were virtually identical. On what basis does Hislop make this bizarre claim? First he identifies Nimrod’s father Cush with Bel the founder of Babylon and Nimrod himself with the Babylonian divine child Ninus.” [Stephen R. Haynes, *Noah’s Curse: the biblical justification of American Slavery*, (2002) chap. 3, p. 58.]
  32. Lester L. Grabbe, *Can a 'history of Israel' be written?* p. 28. Professor Lester L. Grabbe of Hull University, UK
  33. Stephen R. Haynes, *Noah’s Curse: the biblical justification of American Slavery*, (2002) chap. 3, p. 59. We give Dr. Haynes’ summary of Hislop’s thought. The interior quotations within Haynes’ paragraph are quotes from Hislop. The quote in context reads: Hislop “contends that Nimrod led a band of ‘mighty ones’...and links him with Babylon and the Tower of Babel. Nimrod gained the loyalty of his subjects by taming and ordering the post-[Flood] world. ‘Not content with delivering men from the fear of wild beasts he [Nimrod] set to work to emancipate them from the fear of the Lord...’(Hislop). Nimrod was an ‘Apostate’ who led them in abandoning the primeval faith. Hislop reports that in the midst of a ‘prosperous career of false religion and apostasy’ Nimrod died a violent death. He was...slain by Noah’s son Shem. With ‘resolution and unbounded ambition’ Nimrod’s wife Semiramis elevated him to a place in the Babylonian pantheon, and when his mystery cult was forced underground he was worshipped alternatively as Osiris, Tammuz, or Adonis. [Thus] ‘men were gradually led back to all the idolatry...’ When Nimrod’s mystery religion of idolatry, prostitution and human sacrifice emerged in the light of day centuries later, it took the form of Roman Catholicism.”
  34. The quote, in context, reads, “*Hislop attempted to demonstrate that the Catholic religion was the result of a **millennia-old conspiracy**, dating from the time of Nimrod.* Hislop equated Nimrod with the Ninus of legend. This allowed him to introduce Semiramis, although no women are associated with Nimrod in the biblical text, and make her ‘mother of all harlots’-a role he also assigns to the Roman Catholic Church. Despite the fact that Assyriology has long since shown this picture to be absurd, Hislop’s book is still being reprinted and widely circulated among fundamentalist Protestant Christians.” [Lester L. Grabbe, *Can a 'history of Israel' be written?* p. 28, emphasis added] Lester L. Grabbe, Professor of Hebrew Bible and Early Judaism at the University of Hull, UK. The term “conspiracy” is also used in relation to Hislop’s book in the following quote regarding “pan-Babylonianism” “Some of the ideas of panbabylonism appear in 19th century Protestant polemic against the Roman Catholic Church, notably in *The Two Babylons*, a pamphlet produced by Scottish theologian Alexander Hislop. *Its central theme is its allegation that the Roman Catholic Church is a veiled continuation of the pagan religion of Babylon, the veiled paganism being the product of a **millennia old conspiracy**.*” [Wikipedia, emphasis added]
  35. Alexander Hislop, *The Two Babylons*, p. 26 Ezekiel 8:14-14 (RcV) reads: “Then He brought me [Ezekiel] to the entrance of the gate of the house of Jehovah that was toward the north; and *women weeping for Tammuz* were sitting there. And He said to me, Do you see, son of man? You will yet again see greater abominations than these.” The RcV. footnote on “Tammuz” says, “A Mesopotamian deity”
  36. Alexander Hislop, *The Two Babylons*, p. 62

37. Concerning Nimrod's race (just mentioned) van der Toorn & van der Horst write, "Because Nimrod is a son of Cush, Philo calls him an Ethiopian, a black man. This characterization helped to blacken Nimrod in the development of the tradition, whereas the biblical text itself does not do anything of the sort." [K. van der Toorn & P. W. van der Horst, "Nimrod before and after the Bible" *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 83, No. 1. (Jan., 1990), p. 18] The quote in the text is from Alexander Hislop, *The Two Babylons*, p. 62
38. Stephen R. Haynes, *Noah's Curse: the biblical justification of American Slavery*, (2002) chap. 3, p. 59. The quote in context reads: "Hislop's biography of Nimrod is distinctive in several respects...Hislop links Nimrod with the giants [who] rebelled against heaven...Hislop's drama is also notable for its casting of members of Nimrod's family... Nimrod's father, Cush...is identified with Bel [Belus] the traditional founder of Babylon and is assigned responsibility for fabricating the Tower of Babel. Cush is characterized as 'a ringleader in the great apostasy'...leading mankind away from the worship of God.' Finally Hislop pays considerable attention to Nimrod's consort Semiramis (associated with Diana [Artemis] among others) who he claims was deified in the Babylonian mysteries."
39. The following list of books cite Hislop's *Two Babylons* as an authority: [1] *Nimrod-Darkness in the Cradle of Civilization* By Steven Merrill [2] *The Watchmen's Cry* By Obadiah Frank [3] *Shadow Forces* By Robert E. Herndon Sr. [4] *While Men Slept. A Biblical and Historical Account of the New Universal...* By Kerby F. Fannin [5] *Secrets of the Spiritual Matrix*, By M. D. Harrell [6] *Moneta's Veil* By Sarkar [7] *Studies in Revelation* By Hampton J. Keathley, III [8] *Babylon Religion* By David Daniels [9] *Jesus: God, Man Or Myth* By Herbert Cutner [10] *Disperse* By Nelo Dadd [11] *Santa-Tizing* By Robin Main [12] *She Who Restores the Roman Empire: The Biblical Prophecy of the Whore of Babylon* By David Criswell [13] *The Lifting of the Veil: By Avram Yehoshua* [14] *Revelation Unveiled*, by Tim F. LaHaye [15] *Recommendation 666: The Rise of the Beast from the Sea*, By Herbert Peters [17] *His Story in the Stars*, By C. Gary Hullquist [18] *What The World Is Coming To? A Commentary on the Book of Revelation* by Chuck Smith
40. The best-selling Christian author, Tim F. LaHaye [author of the *Left Behind* series] says "The greatest book ever written" on Babylon "is the masterpiece *The Two Babylons*...This book, containing quotations from 275 authors and to my knowledge never refuted, best describes the origin of religion in Babylon." [Tim F. LaHaye, *Revelation Unveiled*, p. 266]
41. "Various factors were at work in this process [of rabbinical elaboration]. Most probably the earliest factor was the circumstance that the [Greek] biblical text called Nimrod a *gibborl gigas*, using the same word as in Gen. 6:4 for the offspring of the rebelling sons of God. In addition was the fact that Nimrod's kingdom was in Babel in the land of Shinar according to Genesis 10, where also the tower was built according to Genesis 11, which seemed to leave no other possibility than that Nimrod built the tower....Finally, Nimrod's bad character was made clear by his own name, which indicated beyond any doubt that he was a rebel (*mrd*) against the Lord,...and for Greek-speaking Jews also by the expression "a hunter *before*=*enantion* [Greek LXX]=*against* the Lord." So we see that in the post-biblical exposition of these few biblical verses a wide range of haggadic potential is brought to fruition." [K. van der Toorn & P. W. van der Horst, "Nimrod before and after the Bible" *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 83, No. 1. (Jan., 1990), p. 29]
42. "Nimrod" in *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, reference: 'Ab. Zarah 53b'.
43. Allegedly Nimrod was "the first who introduced the eating of meat by man. He was also the first to make war on other peoples." ("Nimrod" in *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, reference: Midr. Agadah to Gen. x. 9)
44. "He [Nimrod] rose by cunning and force to be the sole ruler of the whole world. The first mortal to hold universal sway...His [Nimrod's] impiousness kept pace with his growing power. Since the flood there had been no such sinner as Nimrod. He fashioned idols of wood and stone, and paid worship to them. But not satisfied to lead a godless life himself, he did all he could to tempt his subjects into evil ways." (Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, Volume I, Bible Times and Characters from the Creation to Jacob, Philologos Religious Online Books Philologos.org, pp. 177-8] Ginzberg cites as original sources: Sanhedrin 98b, top. 8 \* Yashar Noah, 18a and 23a.)
45. Ante-Nicene Fathers/Volume VIII/Pseudo-Clementine Literature/ *The Recognitions of Clement*/Book IV/Chapter 29. "In the *Recognitions* (R 4.29), Nimrod is equated with the legendary Assyrian king Ninus, who first appears in the Greek historian Ctesias as the founder of Nineveh." M. Vlaardingerbroek says, "Why Nimrod, according to later Jewish tradition the founder of Babylon, was identified with Ninus, according to Greek tradition the founder of Nineveh, is not clear at first sight. It is likely that the similarity of the names Nimrod and Ninus and the fact that both were seen as the first great ruler (or tyrant) on earth played an important role in this identification." (Menko Vlaardingerbroek, "The Founding of Nineveh and Babylon in Greek Historiography", in Collon, D., George, A., Hg., *Nineveh: Papers of the XLIXe Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, London 7-11 July 2003*, London, 2005, p. 237)
46. The early Christian "Pseudo-Clementines" also equate Nimrod with Zoroaster, founder of Persian religion of Zoroastrianism, thereby linking Nimrod with paganism. Modern scholars explain this link, saying,<sup>47</sup> "there can be little doubt that the identification of Nimrod and Zoroaster had a Jewish origin...[It] must have seemed to the Jews of the Babylonian lowlands that [Zoroaster] was the creator of the pagan religion...Zoroaster also became for them a Babylonian...the leader of the Chaldeans. From there it was only a step to the identification Zoroaster-Nimrod. The figure of Nimrod, so familiar to Jewish legend, and [Zoroaster] the founder of the Persian religion...henceforth flow together." Some ancient scholars were aware that identifying Nimrod with Zoroaster posed serious chronological problems. The 4<sup>th</sup>-century writer, Epiphanius, stated<sup>48</sup> "The Greeks say that he [Nimrod] is Zoroaster... Every transgression in the world was disseminated at this time, for Nimrod was an originator of wrong teaching, astrology and magic...But in actual fact...the two, Nimrod and Zoroaster, are far apart in time." Ussher dates Nimrod around 2200 BC; Zoroaster lived around 1100 to 1000 BC—a 1,000 year gap. Yet Hislop asserts<sup>49</sup> "The voice of antiquity is clear...to the effect that the first...Zoroaster was

- an Assyrian or Chaldean, and that he was the founder of the idolatrous system of Babylon, and therefore Nimrod." He dogmatically declares<sup>50</sup> "Ninus and Nimrod and Zoroaster were one."
47. The "Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* say, "Of that [Ham-Cush] family there was born in due time somebody who took up with magical practices, called Nebrod, [Nimrod] who chose, giant-like, to devise things in opposition to God. *Him the Greeks have called Zoroaster*...Therefore the magician Nebrod [Nimrod]...had his name changed to Zoroaster." (Quote from a paper by Jan N. Bremner entitled "*Apion and Anoubion in the Pseudo-Clementines*") Ginzberg also reports that "In [Pseudo-]Clementine *Homilies*, 9. 4-6, *Nimrod is identified with Zoroaster*, and is designated as the one 'who chose, giant-like, to devise things in opposition to God, and who, after his death by fire, was worshipped by the ignorant populace. This was the beginning of the worship of idols.'" Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, Volume I, Bible Times and Characters from the Creation to Jacob, Philologos Religious Online Books Philologos.org, pp. 177-8] For more on the close association of Nimrod with Zoroaster see P.W. van der Horst, *Essays on the Jewish World of Early Christianity* (Fribourg and Göttingen, 1990) pp. 220-232
  48. K. van der Toorn & P. W. van der Horst, "Nimrod before and after the Bible" *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 83, No. 1. (Jan., 1990), p. 27 These authors are affiliated with Utrecht University.
  49. The quote, in context, reads: "Nimrod, the son of Cush...ruled as a king...The Greeks say that he [Nimrod] is Zoroaster... Every transgression in the world was disseminated at this time, for Nimrod was an originator of wrong teaching, astrology and magic...But in actual fact...the two, Nimrod and Zoroaster, are far apart in time." Epiphanius, *Panarion* 1.3, 2-3, F. Williams, trans., *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis, Book 1* [Leiden: Brill, 1987] pp. 16-17. [K. van der Toorn & P. W. van der Horst, "Nimrod before and after the Bible" *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 83, No. 1. (Jan., 1990), p. 27, footnote]
  50. The quote, in context, says, "The voice of antiquity is clear and distinct to the effect that the first and great Zoroaster was an Assyrian or Chaldean, and that he was the founder of the idolatrous system of Babylon, and therefore Nimrod." [A. Hislop, *The Two Babylons*, p. 54]. Concerning the dating of Zoroaster "It is generally thought that Zoroaster lived about the 11th or 10th century BC...[this] date is now widely accepted among Iranists." [Wikipedia]
  51. A. Hislop, *The Two Babylons*, p. 192 The quote in context reads: "The lines of evidence all converge, so as to demonstrate that *Ninus and Nimrod and Zoroaster were one*." [A. Hislop, *The Two Babylons*, p. 192 emphasis added] Thus Hislop adopted the folklore linking Nimrod with pagan religion, Zoroastrianism.
  52. Eusebius describes "how Semiramis mustered troops [and went] against India, her defeat and flight; how she killed her own sons and then was killed by her son Ninyas, after a reign of 42 years. Then Ninyas assumed power." This quote is from Eusebius' *Chronicle*, The Assyrian Chronicle, Eusebius' Summary of Castor concerning the kingdom of the Assyrians. In mythology she was the daughter of the fish-goddess and a mortal man. Abandoned at birth, she was fed by doves until found by a shepherd. King Ninus, Nineveh's founder, was struck by her bravery in battle and married her. When King Ninus was killed, queen Semiramis took over, finishing the military campaign. After Ninus' death, she retained the throne, ruling effectively, restoring Babylon and undertaking building projects. Eventually, Semiramis' son Ninyas killed her and reigned.
  53. Here Eusebius cites the historian Cephalion describing Semiramis' activities. Eusebius' *Chronicle*, The Assyrian Chronicle, Eusebius' Summary of Cephalion concerning the kingdom of the Assyrians.
  54. Maria Elizabeth Budden, *True stories from Ancient History, by the author of 'Always Happy'*, 1821, pp. 3-4. It says "Nimrod had a son named Ninus who married Semiramis. She became Ninus' queen. When Ninus died he left all his counties to her..." Although it differs slightly from the standard narrative in equating Ninus with Nimrod's son, this quotation establishes that a link existed between Nimrod, Ninus and Semiramis even within the realm of early 19<sup>th</sup> century children's literature.
  55. F. F. Bruce, "Babylon and Rome," *The Evangelical Quarterly* 13 (October 15, 1941): p. 244 Dr. F. F. Bruce was University of Manchester Professor of Biblical Exegesis.
  56. F. F. Bruce, "Babylon and Rome," *The Evangelical Quarterly* 13 (October 15, 1941): p. 244 see Hislop, p. 243
  57. Bruce gives a further example, "The old North European deity Zernebogus, whose name is pure Slavonic and means 'black god'...was Zer-nebo-Gus, which bears some likeness to the Aramaic equivalent of "Seed of the prophet Cush" (in other words, Nimrod, the son of Cush)." [A. Hislop, *The Two Babylons*, p. 183] Again based on naïve phonetics, Hislop deduced that the European deity Zernebogus was yet another incarnation of Nimrod.
  58. F. F. Bruce, "Babylon and Rome," *The Evangelical Quarterly* 13 (October 15, 1941) p. 244 see Hislop, p. 254 In fact, (contrary to Hislop) linguists trace Easter to Germanic roots, not Chaldean.
  59. A. Hislop, *The Two Babylons*, p. 34
  60. Hislop equates 'Easter' and 'Ishtar' based on the following logic: "Then look at Easter. What means the term Easter itself? It is not a Christian name. It bears its Chaldean origin on its very forehead. **Easter** is nothing else than Astarte, one of the titles of Beltis, the queen of heaven, whose name, as pronounced by the people Nineveh, was evidently identical with that now in common use in this country. That name, as found by Layard on the Assyrian monuments, **is Ishtar**." [Hislop, p. 93, emphasis added] Concerning the origin of the term "Easter" "The modern English term *Easter* developed from the Old English word *Ēastre* or *Ēostre* which itself developed prior to 899. The name refers to *Eostur-monath*, a month of the Germanic calendar attested by Bede, who writes that the month is named after the goddess *Ēostre* of Anglo-Saxon paganism. Bede notes that *Ēostur-monath* was the equivalent to the month of April...Using comparative linguistic



evidence from continental Germanic sources, the 19th century scholar Jacob Grimm proposed the existence of a cognate form of *Ēostre* among the pre-Christian beliefs of the continental Germanic peoples, whose name he reconstructed as *Ostara*. Linguists have identified the goddess as a Germanic form of the...goddess of the dawn, *Hausos*” Note that the term “Easter” is traced to Germanic roots, not Chaldean (to which Hislop appeals). Easter is related to *Ēostre* or *Hausos*, the goddess of the dawn, not Astarte or Ishtar, the ‘queen of heaven,” as Hislop alleges.

61. F. F. Bruce, “Babylon and Rome,” *The Evangelical Quarterly* 13 (October 15th, 1941): p. 244
62. Stephen R. Haynes, *Noah’s Curse: the biblical justification of American Slavery*, (2002) chap. 3, p. 58 Haynes says, Hislop “identifies Nimrod’s father Cush with Bel the founder of Babylon and Nimrod himself with the Babylonian divine child Ninus. These associations are established on putative [speculative] linguistic affinities, as well as the penchant for conquest shared by Nimrod and Ninus.” [Stephen R. Haynes, *Noah’s Curse* chap. 3, p. 58]
63. Ralph Woodrow reports having “made considerable effort to...check Hislop’s references; books such as *Layard’s Nineveh and Its Remains*, *Kitto’s Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature*, *Wilkinson’s Ancient Egyptians*, as well as old editions of Pausanias, Pliny, Tacitus, Herodotus and many more.” What were his findings? Woodrow says, “When I checked [Hislop’s] footnote references, in numerous cases I discovered they do not support his claims.” Ralph Woodrow, *The Two Babylons: A Case Study in Poor Research Methodology*, Christian Research Journal, Vol. 22, Issue 2, 2000, Book Reviews pp. 54-56. Woodrow is not a “hostile witness” *viz-a-vi* Hislop’s *Two Babylons*. He wrote an earlier book based on Hislop’s, entitled *Babylon Mystery Religion* (Ralph Woodrow Evangelistic Assn., 1966). However, after investigating Hislop’s work more closely, Woodrow says, “I pulled my own book, *Babylon Mystery Religion*, out of print despite its popularity. This was not done because I was being threatened in any way or persecuted. This decision was made because of conviction, not compromise. While my original book did contain some valid information, I could not in good conscience continue to publish a book against pagan mixture knowing that it contained a mixture itself of misinformation about Babylonian origins.”
64. F. F. Bruce, “Babylon and Rome,” *The Evangelical Quarterly* 13 (Oct. 15, 1941): p. 244
65. F. F. Bruce, “Babylon and Rome,” *The Evangelical Quarterly* 13 (October 15, 1941): p. 244
66. A. Hislop, *The Two Babylons*, p. 27 The quote in context reads: “Ninus, the most ancient of the Assyrian kings mentioned in history, [who] performed great actions. Being naturally of a warlike disposition...he armed a considerable number of young men....”
67. A. Hislop, *The Two Babylons*, p. 27
68. William Adler, “Eusebius’ Chronicle and Its Legacy,” in *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, eds. Harold W. Attridge, Gōhei Hata, p. 475 Dr. William Adler is Professor of Religious Studies at North Carolina State University.
69. William Adler, “Eusebius’ Chronicle and Its Legacy,” in *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, Harold W. Attridge, Gōhei Hata, (eds.) p. 471
70. James Ussher *Annals of the World*, #364
71. William Adler, “Eusebius’ Chronicle and Its Legacy,” in *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, Harold W. Attridge, Gōhei Hata, p. 471
72. William Adler & Paul Tuffin, *The Chronology of George Synkellos*, p. 8, Table p. 47
73. A. Hislop, *The Two Babylons*, p. 10. The latter date for Abraham is derived from Ussher’s chronology.
74. In 1650 Bishop James Ussher produced his famous chronology of biblical and secular events. It begins with Adam’s creation (4004 BC) through Noah’s Flood (2348 BC), Abraham’s call (1921 BC), and Moses’ Exodus (1492 BC), until Christ’s incarnation (4 BC). Exactly 4,000 years separate Adam’s creation from Christ’s birth. LSM adopts Ussher’s chronology.<sup>74</sup> When Hislop wrote his *Two Babylons*, Ussher’s timeline was the “gold standard” for biblical chronology. S. W. Holloway says,<sup>75</sup> “Prior to 1847, scholars interested in establishing a history of Assyria were entirely dependent on the Old Testament and classical authors. Pre-19<sup>th</sup> century accounts of Assyria and Babylonia, routinely relying on Archbishop Ussher’s chronology, ‘found’ Assyria around 2783 *Anno Mundi* [i.e. 1221 BC] by Ninus and Semiramis.” Ussher says Assyria was founded 2783 years after Adam’s creation, i.e. in 1221 BC, placing Ninus and Semiramis during 13<sup>th</sup> century BC, the period of the Old Testament judges, long after Nimrod. He dates the monarchs like Ninus and Semiramis, as follows:
  - 1322 BC Belus the Assyrian reigned over the Assyrians in Babylon, for 55 years (1322-1267 BC).
  - 1267 BC Ninus, the son of Belus, founded the Assyrian Empire. He reigned 52 years to 1215 BC.
  - 1215 BC Semiramis, wife of Ninus, reigned for 42 years over all Asia except India and lived 62 years.
  - 1173 BC Semiramis’ son, Ninus or Ninyus killed her. Ninyus (Ninus) reigned from 1173 BC.
75. Hislop accepted Ussher’s chronology for bible characters, like Noah, Nimrod and Abraham, but he rejected Ussher’s dates for Assyrian monarchs like Ninus and Semiramis. Ussher and Hislop both assign the same durations to their monarchies. The crucial difference is the era. Ussher dates their monarchies 800 years later than Hislop. As we have seen Hislop claimed Ninus and Semiramis were contemporaries of Abraham. In contrast, Ussher assigns their reigns to the period of Israel’s judges. Ussher noted this disqualifies them as founders of Babylon; he asserts categorically,<sup>76</sup> “Babylon was built 1002 years before Semiramis was born.” [James Ussher, *Annals of the World*, point #364. Ussher supports his assigned date for Semiramis, saying “Eusebius spoke of Sancuniathon...Eusebius states further, that this Sancuniathon, lived in the days of Semiranis, Queen of the Assyrians who is said to have been before the Trojan wars at that time. This agrees with my account allowing her to have lived after the war of Troy by eleven years.” Ussher states that in “1184 BC Troy was destroyed by the Greeks 408 years before the first Olympiad [dated in 776 BC].” [If Ussher separates Semiramis from the

- founding of Babylon by 1,000 years, the Jewish philosopher, Philo (20 BC – 50 AD) is more extreme. He “separates Belus and the founding of Babylon from Semiramis by two thousand years.” [B. Garstad, “*Belus in the 'Sacred History' of Euhemerus*,” *Classical Philology*, 2004]
76. Clearly if Semiramis lived in the era of Israel’s judges, or later, she could not be Nimrod’s wife; neither could her husband, Ninus be the biblical Nimrod. Ussher is not alone in dating Semiramis much later than Abraham. Hislop’s near-contemporaries, historians, J. Gilmore and W. R. Smith,<sup>78</sup> writing in 1887, assign the date 800 BC to the Mesopotamian queen behind the Semiramis legend. Modern scholars concur; Dr. S. Dalley argues that<sup>79</sup> “a background of genuine historical events lies behind legends of the Assyrian queen Semiramis.” She says, “Semiramis was the name used for any powerful queen who represented the archetype,” the ideal female monarch of Mesopotamia. Dr. Dalley says the Greek historian “Herodotus [c. 484-425 BC] recognized two great queens of Assyria [corresponding to Semiramis] ‘the earlier...was... long recognized as Sammu-ramat, the wife of Shamshi-Adad V.’” This queen, the first ‘Semiramis,’ was born c. 850 BC and died c. 790 BC or 785 BC. The second ‘Semiramis’ lived five generations later.<sup>80</sup> The leading candidate for Semiramis, is dated around 800 BC. This places her in the era of the divided kingdoms of Israel and Judah. Modern scholars reject Hislop’s claim that Semiramis was Nimrod’s wife. They place her 1500 years after Nimrod. Hislop’s main thesis—that Nimrod’s spouse was the first Madonna—is predicated on Nimrod’s wife being the legendary Semiramis. *The Two Babylons*’ main thesis falls like a house of cards, once this crucial plank is negated. A. Hislop, *The Two Babylons*, p. 10 The quote reads, “the reign of Ninus must have terminated, according to the usual chronology, about BC 1987.” The “usual chronology” should refer to Ussher’s dating which Hislop employs for biblical figures. For more on this see my, “DATING ADAM—A CRITIQUE OF LSM’S CHRONOLOGY: *LSM adopts Ussher’s Outdated Chronology dating Mankind’s Origin at 4004 BC*” on [www.concernedbrothers.com](http://www.concernedbrothers.com)” & “[www,LocalChurchDiscussions.com](http://www.LocalChurchDiscussions.com)”
  77. Steven W. Holloway, “*The Quest for Sargon, Pul, and Tiglath-Pileser in the Nineteenth Century*,” in *Mesopotamia and the Bible* by Mark W. Chavalas, p. 68. S. W. Holloway is affiliated with the American Theological Library Association.
  78. J. Gilmore, *The Origin of the Semiramis Legend*, *English Historical Review*, 1887; W. R. Smith, *Ctesias and the Semiramis Legend*, *English Historical Review*, 1887
  79. Stephanie Dalley, “*Samiramis in History & in Legend*” by Stephanie Dalley, in a book: *Cultural borrowings and ethnic appropriations in antiquity* By Erich S. Gruen, p. 11. Dr. Stephanie Dalley was Senior Research Fellow in Assyriology, University of Oxford, UK.
  80. “The later queen [was] Sennacherib’s second wife Naq’ia, who lived some five generations later.” Stephanie Dalley, “*Samiramis in History & in Legend*” by Stephanie Dalley, in a book: *Cultural borrowings and ethnic appropriations in antiquity* By Erich S. Gruen. Stephanie Dalley is Senior Research Fellow in Assyriology, University of Oxford, UK.
  81. A. Hislop, *The Two Babylons*, p. 26
  82. Lester L. Grabbe, (ed.) ‘Like a bird in a cage’: the Invasion of Sennacherib in 701 BCE, p. 120
  83. Lester L. Grabbe, (ed.) ‘Like a bird in a cage’: the Invasion of Sennacherib in 701 BCE, p. 122. Ctesias’ unreliability is illustrated by the fact that he located the city of Nineveh on the Euphrates River, when in fact it is situated on the Tigris river.
  84. Reinhold Bichler, “*Some Observations on the Image of the Assyrian and Babylonian Kingdoms within the Greek Tradition*,” *Melammu Symposia V. Commerce and Monetary Systems in the Ancient World: Means of Transmission and Cultural Interaction*, R. Rollinger/Ch. Ulf (Hg.), Stuttgart, 2004, p. 9 Dr. Reinhold Bichler is affiliated with the University of Innsbruck.
  85. Jan P. Stronk, “*Ctesias of Cnidus, a Reappraisal*” *Mnemosyne*, Volume 60, Number 1, 2007, p. 25 Prof. Jan P. Stronk is affiliated with the University of Amsterdam.
  86. Andrew Nichols, *The Complete Fragments of Ctesias of Cnidus: Translation and Commentary with an Introduction*, Univ. of Florida PhD dissertation 2008, p. 152
  87. Judith M. Richards, “*To Promote a Woman to Bear Rule’: Talking of Queens in Mid-Tudor England*,” *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 1997 Judith M. Richards is affiliated with La Trobe University, Australia.
  88. J. M. Bigwood, “*Ctesias’ Account of the Revolt of Inarus*” *The Phoenix*, 1976, p.1 Dr. J. M. Bigwood has a Ph.D. from Harvard University
  89. J. R. Morgan, “*Fiction and History: Historiography and the Novel*” in *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, edited by John Marincola, p. 560. The Lucian referred to is Lucian of Samosata (circa. AD 125 – after AD 180), who wrote in ancient Greek. Prof. J. R. Morgan is affiliated with the University of Wales, UK.
  90. Robert Rollinger of Universität Innsbruck, in the *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 2007.02.46
  91. Deborah Levine Gera, *Warrior women: the anonymous Tractatus de mulieribus* (1997) p. 74. Dr. Deborah L. Gera is Professor & Chairperson, specializing in Greek Literature, Ancient Greek Thought and Attitudes in the Classics Department at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem
  92. Lester L. Grabbe, (ed.) ‘Like a bird in a cage’: the invasion of Sennacherib in 701 BCE, p. 122
  93. Russell E. Gmirkin, *Berosus and Genesis, Manetho and Exodus: Hellenistic histories and the date...* Note 182, p. 115
  94. A source contemporary with A. Hislop, *The student’s manual of oriental history*, by Charles François Lenormant & E. Chevallier (1869) refers to Ctesias twelve times in the course of 7 pages recounting the legend of Ninus & Semiramis (pp. 364-70). The sources summarized by Eusebius in his *Chronicles* are secondary sources based mainly upon Ctesias [sometimes rendered as “Ktesias”]. For example Professor Grabbe states that “Diodorus’ source is generally thought to be Ctesias of Cnidus.” (Lester L. Grabbe, (ed.) ‘Like a bird in a cage’: the invasion of Sennacherib in 701 BCE, pp. 121-22)

95. The quote is from Josephus, the Jewish historian in his, *Ag. Apion* 1.20 §142-4 quoted by Grabbe, 'Like a bird in a cage': the invasion of Sennacherib in 701 BCE, p. 121
96. Russell E. Gmirkin, *Berosus and Genesis, Manetho and Exodus: Hellenistic histories and the date of the Pentateuch*, p. 114, Footnote 180 [Note: The name Ctesias is sometimes rendered as "Ktesias of Knidus." In this article all occurrences are rationalized as "Ctesias of Cnidus."]
97. "Greek historians needed a founder for the city [Nineveh] they called Ninus and therefore they created a king after whom the city allegedly had been named. The story of Ninus is mainly a Greek invention based on the idea that a city needs a [founding hero]." [Menko Vlaardingerbroek, "The Founding of Nineveh and Babylon in Greek Historiography", in Collon, D., George, A., Hg., *Nineveh: Papers of the XLIXe Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, London 7–11 July 2003*, London, 2005, p. 234. Note that Hislop's "Ninus" is sometimes rendered "Ninos" by other scholars. For simplicity and consistency we render both as "Ninus."] Dr. M. Vlaardingerbroek is affiliated with the Department of Archaeology, Classics and Ancient Near Eastern Studies, University of Amsterdam.
98. Deborah Levine Gera, *Warrior women: the anonymous Tractatus de mulieribus* (1997) p. 73 Professor Lester L. Grabbe concurs, saying, "Ninus is...the name of the capital of Assyria, and it has often been assumed that *Ninus is only an eponymous founder of that city...his deeds look stereotyped.*" [Lester L. Grabbe, (ed.) 'Like a bird in a cage': the invasion of Sennacherib in 701 BCE, p. 124]
99. Charles François Lenormant, E. Chevallier, *The student's manual of oriental history. A manual of the ancient history of the East to the commencement of the Median Wars* (1869) p. 367
100. Dr. R. Bichler, writes, "Berosus certainly knew about...Ninus from his Greek sources and he was probably aware of the dubious character of this person who appeared as an eponymous hero corresponding to Greek ideas of mythological city-founders...In Berosus' dates for the Mesopotamian kings *there was evidently no room for king Ninus.*" [Reinhold Bichler, "Some Observations on the Image of the Assyrian and Babylonian Kingdoms within the Greek Tradition," Melammu Symposia V. Commerce and Monetary Systems in the Ancient World: Means of Transmission and Cultural Interaction, R. Rollinger/Ch. Ulf (Hg.), Stuttgart, 2004, pp. 13-14]
101. Richard Fowler, "Most Fortunate Roots..." in *Imaginary Kings: royal images in the ancient Near East, Greece and Rome*, edited by Olivier Hekster, Richard Fowler, *et. al.*
102. Judith M Richards, "To Promote a Woman to Beare Rule': *Talking of Queens in Mid-Tudor England*" - The Sixteenth Century Journal, 1997
103. G. Edward Foryan, Semiramis: Legendary Mysterious Great Queen of Assyria: A commentary
104. Charles François Lenormant, E. Chevallier, *The student's manual of oriental history. A manual of the ancient history of the East to the commencement of the Median Wars* (1869) p. 364
105. It further explains, "Just as the whole military exploits of the Assyrians have been grouped round the name Ninus...So all the useful and gigantic works executed by various Asiatic sovereigns have contributed to the glory of... Semiramis. To her have been attributed all the buildings of Babylon, from the Tower of Babel...to those in the age of Nebuchadnezzar and his successors..." [Charles François Lenormant, E. Chevallier, *The student's manual of oriental history. A manual of the ancient history of the East to the commencement of the Median Wars* (1869) pp. 367-8]
106. "The name of Semiramis has been borrowed from a really historical queen who lived five centuries after the period when the legend places the fabulous Semiramis...In point of fact, with all modern scholars, we must recognize in the famous Semiramis, one of the mythical personages...of the Euphrates Valley." [Charles François Lenormant, E. Chevallier, *The student's manual of oriental history. A manual of the ancient history of the East to the commencement of the Median Wars* (1869) p. 368]
107. Stephanie Dalley, "Samiramis in History & in Legend" by Stephanie Dalley, in *Cultural borrowings and ethnic appropriations in antiquity* By Erich S. Gruen. Prof. Stephanie Dalley is Senior Research Fellow in Assyriology at University of Oxford, UK. Dr. Hildegard Lewy refers to the same two monarchs when she says, "In contrast to other pertinent Greek writers, in particular Ctesias and Diodorus Siculus, Herodotus relates (i. 184) that twice in its long history Babylonia was ruled by a woman. The elder of the two queens was Semiramis [i.e., Sammuramat], while the younger is referred to as Nitocris/Nitokris. [Hildegard Lewy, "Nitokris-Naḳī'a," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 1952]
108. Lester L. Grabbe, (ed.) 'Like a bird in a cage': the invasion of Sennacherib in 701 BCE, p. 124
109. "There is no evidence that queens in Assyria ever ruled on their own or served as regents for their children and Sammuramat does not appear in Assyrian king lists. In other words, the historical Assyrian queen Sammuramat was an influential figure, but she certainly was less independent and powerful than Semiramis of [Ctesias]." Deborah Levine Gera, *Warrior women: the anonymous Tractatus de mulieribus* (1997) p. 69
110. Menko Vlaardingerbroek, "The Founding of Nineveh and Babylon in Greek Historiography", in Collon, D., George, A., Hg., *Nineveh: Papers of the XLIXe Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, London 7–11 July 2003*, London, 2005, p. 235
111. Lester L. Grabbe, (ed.) 'Like a bird in a cage': the invasion of Sennacherib in 701 BCE, p. 124 The quote, in context, reads, "The situation is different with Ninus...because no clear historical figure lies behind him. Shamshi-adad V, the husband of Sammuramat, was not a particularly distinguished ruler, with only a short rule, and little that one can see of his person in Ninus. Ninus is...the name of the capital of Assyria, and it has often been assumed that Ninus is only an eponymous founder of that city...his deeds look stereotyped." (p. 124) Nevertheless, it has been argued that an actual figure lies behind Ninus...none other than Sennacherib." [ref. Hildegard-Lewy, Lester L. Grabbe, (ed.) 'Like a bird in a cage': the invasion of Sennacherib in 701 BCE, p. 125] But notice that Hildegard Lewy's claim that Sennacherib corresponds to Ninus is an

- argument from association—since queen Naqî'a/Nitokris-is Semiramis, then her husband (Sennacherib) ought to be Ninus. Moreover chronology makes this irrelevant for Hislop's thesis, since Sennacherib & Naqî'a/Nitokris are dated around 700 BC they cannot be the fulfillment of Nimrod & his wife. (See the following paragraphs in the main text.)
112. One can arrive at five generations of Assyrian monarchs by counting as follows: (1) Shamsi-Adad V married to Shammurammât [Semiramis] (2) Adad-Nirari III (3) Shalmaneser IV/Assur-dan III/Ashur-nirari V/Tiglath-pileser III (4) Shalmaneser V/Sargon II (5) Sennacherib married to Naqî'a [Nitokris]. Ussher dates the reign of Sennacherib from 717 BC to 710 BC; modern scholars assign a later date—705 to 681 BC.
113. "Sir H. Rawlinson having found evidence at Nineveh, of the existence of a Semiramis about six or seven centuries before the Christian era, seems inclined to regard her as the *only* Semiramis that ever existed. But this is subversive of all history. The fact that there was a Semiramis in the primeval ages of the world is beyond all doubt..." [Alexander Hislop, *The Two Babylons*, p. 26]
114. Lester L. Grabbe, Can a 'history of Israel' be written? p. 28
115. LSM follows Hislop in asserting that the "Queen of Heaven" worshipped by apostate Israel (Jer. 7:17-18; 44:15-20) was Semiramis, Nimrod's wife. LSM's *Recovery Version of the Bible*, Jeremiah 7:18 ReV. footnote 1 says "Nimrod's wife Semiramis, later known as Artemis of Ephesus (Acts 19:27). Israel's making cakes to the wife of Nimrod was a matter of both spiritual fornication and idolatry." This assertion—that Nimrod's wife Semiramis, [was] later known as Artemis of Ephesus (Acts 19:27)—is made by Alexander Hislop in his book *The Two Babylons* pp. 32, 69. Hislop identifies Semiramis, the "Queen of Heaven" with a number of goddesses revered by various nations. This can be seen from the following quotes: "Astarte, one of the titles of Beltis, the queen of heaven, whose name, as pronounced by the people Nineveh, was evidently identical with that now in common use in this country. That name, as found by Layard on the Assyrian monuments, is *Ishtar*." [Hislop, p. 93] "That *Semiramis*, under the name of *Astarte*, was worshipped not only as an incarnation of the Spirit of God, but as the mother of mankind, we have very clear and satisfactory evidence." [p. 98] "the Greek *Diana*, who at Ephesus bore a turreted crown on her head, and was identified with *Semiramis*," [p. 99] "*Semiramis*, then, as *Astarte*, worshipped as the dove, was regarded as the incarnation of the Spirit of God. As Baal, Lord of Heaven, had his visible emblem, the sun, so she, as Beltis, *Queen of Heaven*, must have hers also—the moon, which in another sense was Asht-tart-e," [p. 100] "Isis, [is] the Egyptian title for the queen of heaven." [Hislop, p. 87] "The moon...was also the symbol of the goddess *Isis*, the queen of heaven." [Hislop, p. 92] Hence, Hislop identifies the "Queen of Heaven" as Semiramis, Astarte, Ishtar, Isis, Diana, Ishtar, plus others! Modern scholars reject this notion as folklore. Who was this goddess addressed as the "Queen of Heaven"? Dr. J. H. Stuckey responds,<sup>116</sup> "Who was this "Queen of Heaven"? Perhaps she was Anat, Astarte, Asherah, or a new goddess who incorporated two or all three of them." Reviewing the evidence, C. Houtman says,<sup>117</sup> "As for the identity of the Queen of Heaven [in Jeremiah], it is difficult to make a choice between Anat...Asherah and... Astarte." "Semiramis" doesn't even make the list of candidates. John Day rejects Asherah, concluding<sup>118</sup> "the best case can be made for the Queen of Heaven being Astarte," a local Canaanite deity. Others suggest the Jewish refugees in Egypt whom Jeremiah addressed (Jer. 44) worshipped the goddess Anat.<sup>119</sup> Scholars have studied documents from Jeremiah's era written by Jews at Elephantine, Upper Egypt. Van der Toorn reports<sup>120</sup> "the evidence is unequivocal: the Jews of Elephantine worshipped Anat as the consort of Yahu (Yahweh)," i.e., Jehovah's supposed spouse.<sup>121</sup> The "queen of heaven" in Jeremiah was not Semiramis
116. Johanna H. Stuckey, *The Great Goddesses of the Levant*, JSSEA, vol. 30 (2003) p. 140. Johanna H. Stuckey is Professor Emerita at York University, Toronto, Canada
117. Cornelius Houtman, "Anat" in the *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* DDD (2<sup>nd</sup> extensively rev. ed.) K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, & P. W. van der Horst, (1999), Leiden; Boston; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Brill; Eerdmans, pp. 678-9. Cornelius Houtman is affiliated with the University of Kampen. Along the same line, Othmar Keel & Christoph Uehlinger say, "Identifying the 'Queen of Heaven' is especially problematic, since on the one hand, the epithet is very general...On the other hand, not a single inscription from 7<sup>th</sup>- or 6<sup>th</sup>-century [BC] Judah has been found on which the goddess is mentioned by name." [Othmar Keel, Christoph Uehlinger, *Gods, goddesses, and images of God in ancient Israel*, p. 338]
118. John Day rejects the identification of Asherah as 'Queen of Heaven'; he says, "there is nothing in first-millennium BC texts that singles out Asherah as 'Queen of Heaven' or associates her particularly with the heavens at all." [John Day, *Yahweh and the Gods and Goddesses of Canaan*, p. 146] In his view "the best case can be made for the Queen of Heaven being Astarte," Reviewing John Day's monograph, *Yahweh and the Gods and Goddesses of Canaan*, David Elton Gay University remarks on the identity of Jeremiah's Queen of Heaven. "John Day favors the Canaanite goddess Astarte because 'she has the advantage of being a native Canaanite deity, such as the deep-seated, folk nature of the cult depicted in Jeremiah [chap.] 44 suggests' (Day, p. 150)." David Elton Gay, *Review of Bible Literature*, 02/2003 David Elton Gay of the School of Continuing Studies, Indiana University
119. Referring to "Anat, the Queen of Heaven," the Jewish scholar, Herbert Cohn says, "her name occurs in documents found at Elephantine, an island called 'the Southern Gate,' situated north of the first [river] Nile rapids, opposite Aswan. In the fifth century BCE, Jewish mercenaries were stationed at Elephantine. They brought with them the venerable religion of their ancestors, paid dues to the Temple in Jerusalem, and built in Elephantine a spacious temple that had seven porches and a roof of cedar wood. Documents dated to around 400 BCE, unearthed in excavations at Elephantine, reveal that three deities were worshipped in the temple there: Yahoo, 'the Master of Heaven,' and the goddesses Ashima and Anat Bet-El, "the Queens of Heaven." [Herbert Cohn, *Is the 'Queen of Heaven' in Jeremiah the Goddess Anat?* In the Jewish Bible Quarterly. Note: Herbert Cohn, Ph.D., is the translator into Hebrew of the classical book *Die Lehren des Judentums nach den Quellen* (The Teachings of Judaism according to the Sources)]

120. Karel van der Toorn, *Goddesses in the Early Israelite Religion*, p. 85
121. Based upon historical data, van der Toorn concludes that the goddess “Anat-Yahu is none other than the Queen of Heaven whose cult was denounced by Jeremiah (Jer. 7:17-18). The cult of this goddess...flourished in the Jewish diaspora in Upper Egypt.” K. van der Toorn, *Recent Trends in the Study of Israelite Religion*, in *Modern Societies & the Science of Religions: studies in honour of Lammert ...* Edited by Lammert Leertouwer, Gerard Albert Wiegers, Jan Platvoet, p. 231]
122. K. van der Toorn and P. W. van der Horst, "Nimrod before and after the Bible" *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 83, No. 1. (Jan., 1990), p. 7. The quote in full, reads: “Since Nimrod is a Mesopotamian figure whose fame exceeded the bounds of his homeland, one expects to find him mentioned in the cuneiform records. Ever since the archaeological discoveries of the last century and the decipherment of the cuneiform script, scholars have attempted to spot the Mesopotamian prototype of the biblical Nimrod. The identifications they advance depend in part on their appreciation of the biblical data. Does Genesis 10 describe Nimrod as a god, a demigod, or as a sundry mortal?”
123. E. A. Speiser, “*In Search of Nimrod*,” (1958) reprinted in I studied inscriptions from before the flood: ancient Near Eastern ..., Volume 4, edited by Richard S. Hess, David Toshio Tsumura, p. 270, Ephraim Avigdor Speiser (Jan. 24, 1902 – June 15, 1965) was a Polish-born American Assyriologist. He was Chairman of the Department of Oriental Studies at the University of Pennsylvania 1947 to 1965. He was also appointed Ellis Professor of Hebrew and Semitic Languages and Literatures at the University of Pennsylvania in 1954. The list of scholars cited by Speiser (augmented by later suggestions) and their suggestions for identifying Nimrod is: [A] **under gods:** (identified as “Nimrod”) [1] **Marduk** (biblical Merodach or Bel, Belus). The (8<sup>th</sup> century) Armenian Christian scholar Moses of Khorene, Josef Grivel (1871), J. Wellhausen (1878), T. G. Pinches (1909), [2] **Ninurta** (main deity of the capital city Kalah). P. Jensen & A Ungnad), van der Toorn, & P. W. van der Horst [B] **demigods** (identified as “Nimrod”) [1] Gilgamesh G. Smith, P. Haupt, [2] Lugalbanda [A. Deimel, E. G. Kaeling]), [C] **Mortal Men:** (identified as “Nimrod”) [1] Sargon the Great of Akkad; Sargon reigned from 2270 to 2215 BC (short chronology) [Yigal Levin, "Nimrod the Mighty, King of Kish, King of Sumer and Akkad." *Vetus Testamentum* 52 (2002), Joseph Poplicha, "The Biblical Nimrod and the Kingdom of Eanna", *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 49, (1929), pp. 303-317]. [2] Nazimaruttaš (a Kassite king of ca. 1300 BC), [3] Tukulti-Ninurta I (Assyrian king reigned ca. 1246 BC to 1206 BC) [E. A. Speiser(1958)] [4] Amenophis III/ *Nimmuria* [Kurt Sethe, G. von Rad], [5] Ben-Hadad/*Bir-adda* [T. K. Cheyne]] E. A. Speiser proposes the Assyrian king Tukulti-Ninurta I
124. John H. Walton, Victor H. Matthews, *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: Genesis to Deuteronomy*, p. 32
125. C. Uehlinger, NIMROD נִמְרוֹד from the *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible DDD* (2<sup>nd</sup> extensively rev. ed.) K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, & P. W. van der Horst, (1999). Leiden; Boston; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Brill; Eerdmans. pp. 627-630. Christoph Uehlinger is affiliated with the University of Fribourg
126. Moreover, “the historical range of the dominion ascribed to Nimrod does not fit this ruler.” [K. van der Toorn and P. W. van der Horst, "Nimrod before and after the Bible" *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 83, No. 1. (Jan., 1990), p. 7]
127. Dr. Yigal Levin suggests “the Nimrod of Genesis was a compound literary recollection of the deeds of the great Sargon of Akkad and of his grandson Naram-Sin.” He writes, “In an article that I published some years ago (Yigal Levin "Nimrod the Mighty, King of Kish, King of Sumer and Akkad", *Vetus Testamentum* 52 (2002), 350-366), I suggested that the Nimrod of Genesis was a compound literary recollection of the deeds of the great Sargon of Akkad and of his grandson Naram-Sin, with the name ‘Nimrod’ being a shortened form of the latter.” [Dr. Yigal Levin, PhD., Bar-Ilan University, Israel, Email: Mon., March 24, 2008 11:43 PM] This monarch belongs to the right era; Sargon the Great of Akkad reigned from 2310 to 2278 BC [Joan Goodnick Westenholz, *Legends of the kings of Akkade: the texts, dates the dynasty of Akkad from ca. 2310 BC to 2160 BC*. She writes, “The feats and deeds of the entire dynasty were telescoped and assigned to the two most prominent of its five members—Sargon the founder of the empire (ca. 2310 BC to 2278 BC) and his grandson and third successor, Naram-Sin (ca. 2246 BC to 2190 BC)” (Joan Goodnick Westenholz, *Legends of the kings of Akkade: the texts*, p. 1)] [Yigal Levin, "Nimrod the Mighty, King of Kish, King of Sumer and Akkad." *Vetus Testamentum* 52 (2002), Joseph Poplicha, "The Biblical Nimrod and the Kingdom of Eanna", *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 49, (1929), pp. 303-317]. Ussher dates Peleg’s birth in 2247 BC, around the time Babel’s Tower was built in the land of Nimrod. In view of this] *The Bible Background Commentary* says, “The extension of [Nimrod’s] kingdom from southern Mesopotamia to northern Mesopotamia corresponds to the growth of the first known empire in history, the dynasty of Agade [Akkad] ruled by Sargon and Naram-Sin (about 2300 BC) among the greatest of the heroic kings of old.” [John H. Walton, Victor H. Matthews, *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: Genesis to Deuteronomy*, p. 32.] Data from monuments and inscriptions indicate that Sargon and Naram-Sin undertook military campaigns to expand the Akkad empire hence both appear to represent real historical figures. [Allan Millard, “*History and Legend in Early Babylonia*” in *Windows into Old Testament history: evidence, argument, and the crisis of...* edited by V. Phillips Long, Gordon J. Wenham, David Weston Baker, et. al. pp. 103-110). However they also appear in epic poems in which supernatural creatures and events are described. Once again unwary readers are tempted to leave the solid foundation of God’s Word and to venture out upon the sinking sands of human myths and fables.
128. C. Uehlinger, NIMROD נִמְרוֹד from the *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible DDD* (2<sup>nd</sup> extensively rev. ed.) K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, & P. W. van der Horst, (1999). Leiden; Boston; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Brill; Eerdmans. pp. 627-630.
129. Dr. Yigal Levin, PhD., Bar-Ilan University, Israel, Email: Tue., Mar. 25 17:35:45 EDT 2008 Dr. Levin continues by saying “The fact that Josephus, the various rabbinic sources and the much later Arabic traditions record stories about him [Nimrod] is neither here nor there, since as far as anyone can prove, they all go back, directly or indirectly, to the same few

verses in Genesis.” That is, Josephus’ and rabbinical references to Nimrod are merely elaborations, myths based upon the biblical text.

130. Samuel Abramsky, (1980) "Nimrod and the Land of Nimrod," *Beth Mikra* 25 (82) pp. 237–255. Israel.
131. LSM’s *Truth Lessons* assert that “History tells us that at Babel, Nimrod brought in many idolatrous things. In that idolatrous worship he [Nimrod] invented a most evil emblem, the Madonna with her child.” [W. Lee, *Truth Lessons*, Level 2, Vol. 2, Lesson 18, p. 53.] LSM’s *Truth Lessons* are edited versions of W. Lee’s teaching. W. Lee’s *Life-study*, states: “Nimrod was the first king of Babel who, *according to history*, brought in many idolatrous things (10:10). That idolatrous worship invented a most demonic emblem, the Madonna with her child.” [W. Lee, *Life-study of Genesis*, message 34, section 6, pp. 464-5] LSM’s Recovery Version of the Bible says, “*According to history*, Nimrod brought in many idolatrous things...” [Gen. 10:8 (note 1) Rcv. p. 35] Neither does historical or archaeological research support LSM’s notion that “according to historical records and archeological evidence, the city and tower of Babel were full of the names of idols.” [Gen. 11:4 (note 2) Rcv. p. 37] Very little remains of the earliest settlements at Babel/Babylon for a number of reasons. Archaeologist Andre Parrot explains “It is, then, at Babylon that we must expect to find the Tower of Babel. The site of the tower was indeed there,...but the discovery was disappointing in the extreme...Xerxes had at one time set about demolishing it (475 BC). Alexander the Great...had ordered the site cleared of debris. The Arabs had found it an exceptionally useful source of building material... The place was nothing more than a quarry.” [Andre Parrot, *The Tower of Babel*, Studies in Biblical Archaeology #2, 1955, pp. 45-6] Perhaps W. Lee was misled by reports like the following: Karsten “Niebuhr (1733-1815) also equated Bâbil [Babel] with Babylon about 1765...In 1761, Niebuhr had been sent out by the King of Denmark, Frederick V, on a scientific mission to gather as much information as possible on various subjects, including archaeology (Niebuhr was a mathematician by profession). When Niebuhr found numerous inscribed bricks lying around the great mounds at Hillah on the Euphrates, he deduced that the site was probably Babylon itself. Klengel-Brandt notes, however, that Niebuhr mistakenly believed the ruins in Borsippa were those of the Babylonian tower (Evelyn Klengel-Brandt, "Babylon," OEANE vol. 1, p. 251).” [J. Paul Tanner, *Ancient Babylon: From Gradual Demise To Archaeological Rediscovery*, p. 6] The close proximity of Babel/Babylon to the River Euphrates poses serious problems for archaeology. Dr. J. Paul Tanner, says, “Because of the near proximity to the river [Euphrates], excavators encountered serious limitations to their diggings. Campdor notes that at forty feet down lay ruins dating to the time of Hammurabi and the First Dynasty of Babylon. Because of the rise in the water level, however, it was impossible to investigate below these.” [J. Paul Tanner, *Ancient Babylon: From Gradual Demise To Archaeological Rediscovery* p. 11] John H. Walton concurs, saying, “It is difficult to bring archaeological or historical information to bear on the question of whether the city Babylon was actually the site of [the Tower of Babel]...Excavation at Babylon cannot inform us of its history prior to the second millennium, because the shifting water table of the Euphrates has obliterated the strata. (H. W. F. Saggs, "Babylon," *Archaeology and Old Testament Study* (ed. D. Winton Thomas; Oxford: Clarendon, 1967, pp. 41-42).” [John H. Walton, “The Mesopotamian Background of the Tower of Babel Account and Its Implications,” *Bulletin for Biblical Research*, vol. 5 (1995) pp. 173-4]
132. Both W. Lee’s *Life-study* [*Life-study of Jeremiah*, Message , section 3, p. 69] and LSM’s Recovery Version identify Nimrod’s wife as Semiramis. LSM’s *Recovery Version of the Bible*, Jeremiah 7:18 Rcv. (note 1) says “Nimrod’s wife Semiramis, later known as Artemis of Ephesus (Acts 19:27). Israel’s making cakes to the wife of Nimrod was a matter of both spiritual fornication and idolatry.”
133. LSM’s *Truth Lessons* follow Hislop in asserting that the first “Madonna was the mother of Nimrod and was also his wife.” [W. Lee, *Truth Lessons*, Level 2, Vol. 2, Lesson 18, p. 53.] W. Lee also does this, saying, “According to the book, *The Two Babylons*, the Madonna was the mother of Nimrod and also his wife.” [W. Lee, *Life-study of Genesis*, message 34, section 6, pp. 464-5]
134. M. F. G. Parmentier, “Mary,” in *Dictionary of Deities & Demons in the Bible*, (2nd extensively rev. ed.) K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, & P. W. van der Horst, (1999). Leiden; Boston; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Brill; Eerdmans. p. 552 emphasis added. M. F. G. Parmentier is affiliated with the University of Utrecht.
135. Dana Kramer-Rolls, *The Emergence of the Goddess Mary: from Late Antiquity to the Middle Ages*, Pomegranate: The International Journal of Pagan Studies, Vol. 6, No. 1 (2004), emphasis added
136. Source: The Cult of the Virgin Mary in the Middle Ages, Heilbrunn Timeline of Art History, The Metropolitan Museum of Art
137. Dana Kramer-Rolls traces the evolution of a myth about Venus into an English fable starring the Virgin Mary. She traces “the evolution of...[the Virgin] ‘Mary and the Bridegroom’ from its origins as a legend concerning Venus to its Medieval form,” into a late 14th-century fable about *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. Thus a myth concerning the Roman god, Venus evolved into an English fable starring the Virgin Mary. [Dana Kramer-Rolls, *The Emergence of the Goddess Mary: from Late Antiquity to the Middle Ages*, Pomegranate: The International Journal of Pagan Studies, Vol. 6, No. 1 (2004)] Note, however, that this case-study relates to the late-Middle ages up to the 1300s, when the Roman Catholic Church was well-established. It also tells us more about English literature—especially the late 14th-century fable, *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*—than about the Roman Catholic Church.

138. Pan-Babylonianism is implied by the statement in LSM's *Truth Lessons* (paraphrasing W. Lee's *Life-study*) which says Nimrod "invented a most evil emblem, the Madonna with her child. According to the Book, *The Two Babylons*, the Madonna was the mother of Nimrod and was also his wife. This emblem, invented by the Babylonian worship, spread throughout the earth—to Egypt, India, Greece, pagan Rome, Tibet, China, and Japan. It even has pervaded Roman Catholicism." [W. Lee, *Truth Lessons*, Level 2, Vol. 2, Lesson 18, p. 53.] The fact that Hislop's *Two Babylons* taught pan-Babylonianism is well-illustrated by the following quote from the book, *For His Name* by Esther Lee Ackley, which says, "Please read *The Two Babylons* by Alexander Hislop. This book is said to be the definitive work on pagan religions. *All religions of the world, every single one of them, can be traced back to Nimrod and the tower of Babel*. Only the truth can be traced back to Yahweh." [Esther Lee Ackley, *For His Name* p. 133, emphasis added]
139. Watchman Nee, *The Orthodoxy of the Church*, p. 46
140. W. Lee, *Life-study of Genesis*, message 34, section 6, pp. 464-5
141. M. F. G. Parmentier "Mary," in *Dictionary of Deities & Demons in the Bible*, (2nd extensively rev. ed.) K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, & P. W. van der Horst, (1999). Leiden; Boston; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Brill; Eerdmans. p. 552
142. Hislop says, "From Babylon, this worship of the Mother and the Child spread to the ends of the earth. In Egypt, *the Mother and the Child were worshipped under the names of Isis and Osiris*. In India, even to this day, as Isi and Iswara; in Asia, as Cybele and Deoius; in Pagan Rome, as Fortuna and Jupiter-puer, or Jupiter, the boy; in Greece, as Ceres, the Great Mother, with the babe at her breast, or as Irene, the goddess of Peace, with the boy Plutus in her arms; and even in Thibet [Tibet], in China, and Japan, the Jesuit missionaries were astonished to find the counterpart of Madonna." [A. Hislop, *The Two Babylons*, Chap. 2, Section 2, p. 22, emphasis added]
143. "Representations of the Virgin Mary and the child Jesus... indeed resemble closely those of Isis nursing her son...[Yet there is a] large chronological gap between statues of Isis and Mary. In the West the first representations of Mary nursing her son date from the 12<sup>th</sup> century. [Moreover] the roots of Mariology were very probably in Asia Minor rather than North Africa [home of the Isis cult]." [Stephen Benko, *The Virgin Goddess: Studies in the Pagan and Christian Roots of Mariology*, p. 52]
144. LSM's *Recovery Version of the Bible*, Jeremiah 7:18 Rv. (note 1) says "*Nimrod's wife Semiramis, later known as Artemis of Ephesus (Acts 19:27)*. Israel's making cakes to the wife of Nimrod was a matter of both spiritual fornication and idolatry." This assertion—that Nimrod's wife Semiramis, [was] later known as Artemis of Ephesus (Acts 19:27)—is made by Alexander Hislop in his book, *The Two Babylons* pp. 32, 69.
145. For a discussion of this phenomenon see Andrew E. Hill, "Ancient Art and Artemis: Toward Explaining the Polymastic Nature of the Figurine," *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society*, 1992
146. "In the studies mentioned above [Langdon (1914), Witzel (1935) etc.] a number of deities who shared certain characteristics were uncritically thought to be 'aspects'...of the same deity. Already in 1909 Zimmern has warned against this lack of methodological stringency." [ "Tammuz," in *Dictionary of Deities & Demons in the Bible* (1990), K van der Toorn, B. Becking, & P. W. van der Horst (eds.), p. 829] Note that the earlier study of F. F. Bruce (1941 cited above) relied extensively upon Langdon (1914) in an attempt to salvage some of Hislop's thesis. In 1941 F. F. Bruce wrote, "Hislop's argument stands in need of radical revision in order to be brought up to date...It may well be asked how far Hislop's conclusions would stand the test of such a revision. It is the object of this paper to select, out of the mass of available evidence, a few points which, when joined, seem to form a line connecting Babylonian religion with the ritual carried out to-day throughout great sections of Christendom. These and related facts must be taken into consideration by any writer who would do for readers of the twentieth century what Hislop did for those of the nineteenth." [F. F. Bruce, "Babylon and Rome," *The Evangelical Quarterly* 13 (October 15th, 1941): p. 244] The present author suggests that F. F. Bruce would have abandoned his attempt to salvage some remnants of Hislop's notion in the light of 70-years of subsequent research available today. York University Prof. Johanna H. Stuckey also criticizes the assumption "*that [various] goddesses are all aspects of a single great goddess, 'the Many in the One, the One in the Many'*." She writes: "Another assumption is that goddesses are all aspects of a single great goddess, 'the Many in the One, the One in the Many'. This position seems to be *the result of their examining...polytheistic traditions through monotheistic lenses and overlooking the...diversity that polytheism offers. Ancient goddesses were all very different one from the other, while still, occasionally, overlapping in functions and powers and even blending into one another.*" [Johanna H. Stuckey, *The Great Goddesses of the Levant*, JSSEA, vol. 30 (2003) pp. 128-9, emphasis added]
147. Lester L. Grabbe, Can a 'history of Israel' be written? p. 28
148. W. Lee refers to Alexander Hislop's book, *The Two Babylons*, at least ten times. See, for example, *Life-study of Genesis*, message 34, pp. 464-5; *Truth Lessons*, Level 2, Vol. 2, Lesson 18, p. 53, p. 56; *The Satanic Chaos in the Old Creation and the Divine Economy for the New Creation*, p. 97, *The God-Men*, p. 42; *Life-study of Revelation*, Message 51, pp. 585-6; *Life-study of Revelation*, Message 13, pp. 157-8; *Life-study of Matthew*, pp. 467-8. Several of these references contain multiple citations of Hislop's *Two Babylons*.
149. LSM's *Recovery Version of the Bible*, Jeremiah 7:18 Rv. footnote 1 says "*Nimrod's wife Semiramis, later known as Artemis of Ephesus (Acts 19:27)*. Israel's making cakes to the wife of Nimrod was a matter of both spiritual fornication and idolatry." This assertion—that Nimrod's wife Semiramis, [was] later known as Artemis of Ephesus (Acts 19:27)—is

made by Alexander Hislop in his book *The Two Babylons* pp. 32, 69. Note that neither W. Lee's *Life-study of Jeremiah* [message 10, p. 69] nor LSM's Recovery Version [Jeremiah 7:18 Rcv. footnote 1] gives any citation of Hislop's *Two Babylons* in their writings regarding this point.

150. According to LSM, their "High Peak Books" include W. Lee's publications "Beginning from the 1991 Winter Training on the *Life-study of Jeremiah*, Brother Lee's remaining years of ministry focused on what he called the high peak of the divine revelation: *that God became man in order that man might become God in life and nature but not in the Godhead.*" [Living Stream Ministry Online Publications website] The "High Peak" Books include W. Lee's *Life-study of Jeremiah*, which declares, "In [Jeremiah 7] verse 18 Jehovah says, 'The children gather wood, and the fathers light the fire, and the women knead the dough, to make cakes for the queen of heaven and to pour out drink offerings to other gods to provoke Me to anger.' Here *the queen of heaven is Nimrod's wife Semiramis; later she was known as Artemis in Ephesus* (Acts 19:27). It is hard to believe that God's elect, His chosen people, could degrade to such an extent that they would make cakes for the wife of Nimrod. This was a matter of both fornication and idolatry." [W. Lee, *Life-study of Jeremiah*, Message 10, section 3, p. 69, emphasis added] LSM's "High Peak Books" also include W. Lee's *The Satanic Chaos...* which says, "Alexander Hislop in his book *The Two Babylons* exposes the origin of the evil, demonic, pagan things that were brought into the apostate church." [W. Lee, *The Satanic Chaos in the Old Creation and the Divine Economy for the New Creation*, p. 97]
151. LSM's *Truth Lessons* (paraphrasing Witness Lee's *Life-study*) say, "History tells us that at Babel, *Nimrod* brought in many idolatrous things. In that idolatrous worship *he [Nimrod] invented* a most evil emblem, *the Madonna with her child.*" [W. Lee, *Truth Lessons*, Level 2, Vol. 2, Lesson 18, p. 53; emphasis indicates quote in main text] The corresponding *Life-study* says, "Nimrod was the first king of Babel who, according to history, brought in many idolatrous things (10:10). That idolatrous worship invented a most demonic emblem, the Madonna with her child. According to the book, *The Two Babylons*, the Madonna was the mother of Nimrod and also his wife. This emblem, invented by the Babylonian worship..." [W. Lee, *Life-study of Genesis*, message 34]
152. W. Lee, *Life-study of Revelation*, p. 484
153. These quotes are taken from the Roman Catholic Internet website [www.catholicanswers.com](http://www.catholicanswers.com) under the title: *Catholic Answers: Special Report on Chick Tracts* [www.catholic.com/library/sr\\_chick\\_tracts](http://www.catholic.com/library/sr_chick_tracts). This portion refutes allegations made in various "Chick Tracts" which are based on Hislop's *Two Babylons*. The site says: "The source [Jack] Chick depends on for his mythological ideas is *The Two Babylons* by Alexander Hislop, an eccentric nineteenth-century Anglican clergyman. Chick essentially recycles Hislop's central thesis of Catholicism being a revival of Babylonian paganism. This allows him to identify the Catholic Church with the Whore of Babylon."

## REFERENCES:

- Samuel Abramsky, (1980) "Nimrod and the Land of Nimrod" Beth Mikra 25 (82) pp. 237–255.
- William Adler, "Eusebius' Chronicle and Its Legacy," in *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, Harold W. Attridge, Gōhei Hata, (eds.)
- William Adler & Paul Tuffin, "The Chronology of George Synkellos"
- Stephen Benko, *The Virgin Goddess: Studies in the Pagan and Christian Roots of Mariology*
- Reinhold Bichler, "Some Observations on the Image of the Assyrian and Babylonian Kingdoms within the Greek Tradition," *Melammu Symposia V. Commerce and Monetary Systems in the Ancient World: Means of Transmission and Cultural Interaction*, R. Rollinger/Ch. Ulf (Hg.), Stuttgart, 2004.
- J. M. Bigwood, "Ctesias' Account of the Revolt of Inarus" *The Phoenix*, 1976
- Jan N. Bremner, "Apion and Anoubion in the Pseudo-Clementines"
- F. F. Bruce, "Babylon and Rome," *The Evangelical Quarterly* 13 (October 15, 1941)
- Herbert Cohn, *Is the 'Queen of Heaven' in Jeremiah the Goddess Anat?* *Jewish Bible Quarterly*.
- Mark W. Chavalas, *Mesopotamia and the Bible*,
- Stephanie Dalley, "Samiramis in History and in Legend" in *Cultural borrowings and Ethnic Appropriations in Antiquity* by Erich S. Gruen (ed.)
- John Day, *Yahweh and the Gods and Goddesses of Canaan*,
- Edward Foryan, *Semiramis: Legendary Mysterious Great Queen of Assyria: A commentary*
- Richard Fowler, "Most Fortunate Roots..." in *Imaginary Kings: royal images in the ancient Near East, Greece and Rome*, edited by Olivier Hekster, Richard Fowler, et. al.
- B. Garstad, "Belus in the 'Sacred History' of Euhemerus," *Classical Philology*, 2004
- Deborah Levine Gera, *Warrior women: the anonymous Tractatus de mulieribus* (1997)
- J. Gilmore, *The Origin of the Semiramis Legend*, *English Historical Review*, 1887
- Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews, Volume I, Bible Times and Characters from the Creation to Jacob*, Philologos Religious Online Books Philologos.org,



- Russell E. Gmirkin, Berosus and Genesis, Manetho and Exodus: Hellenistic histories and the date...
- Lester L. Grabbe, Can a 'history of Israel' be written?
- Lester L. Grabbe, (ed.) 'Like a bird in a cage': the Invasion of Sennacherib in 701 BCE
- Stephen R. Haynes, Noah's Curse: the biblical justification of American Slavery, (2002)
- Andrew E. Hill, "Ancient Art and Artemis: Toward Explaining the Polymastic Nature of the Figurine," *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society*, 1992
- Steven W. Holloway, "The Quest for Sargon, Pul, and Tiglath-Pileser in the Nineteenth Century," in Mesopotamia and the Bible by Mark W. Chavalas
- P.W. van der Horst, Essays on the Jewish World of Early Christianity (Fribourg and Göttingen, 1990)
- Cornelius Houtman, "Anat" in the Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible DDD (2<sup>nd</sup> extensively rev. ed.) K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, & P. W. van der Horst, (1999), Leiden; Boston; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Brill; Eerdmans, pp. 678-9.
- Othmar Keel, Christoph Uehlinger, Gods, goddesses, and images of God in ancient Israel,
- Dana Kramer-Rolls, The Emergence of the Goddess Mary: from Late Antiquity to the Middle Ages, Pomegranate: The International Journal of Pagan Studies, Vol. 6, No. 1 (2004)
- Charles François Lenormant & E. Chevallier, The student's manual of oriental history (1869)
- Yigal Levin, "Nimrod the Mighty, King of Kish, King of Sumer and Akkad." *Vetus Testamentum*, vol. 52 (2002),
- Hildegard Lewy, "Nitokris-Naḳī'a," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 1952
- Allan Millard, "History and Legend in Early Babylonia" in Windows into Old Testament History: evidence, argument, and... edited by V. Philips Long, Gordon J. Wenham, David Weston Baker, *et. al.* pp. 103-110
- J. R. Morgan, "Fiction and History: Historiography and the Novel" in A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography, edited by John Marincola,
- Andrew Nichols, The Complete Fragments of Ctesias of Cnidus: Translation and Commentary with an Introduction, Univ. of Florida PhD dissertation, 2008
- M. F. G. Parmentier, "Mary," in the Dictionary of Deities & Demons in the Bible, (2<sup>nd</sup> extensively rev. ed.) K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, & P. W. van der Horst, (1999). Leiden; Boston; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Brill; Eerdmans
- J. Parr, Chaucer's Semiramis, *The Chaucer Review*, 1970
- Joseph Poplicha, "The Biblical Nimrod and the Kingdom of Eanna", *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 49, (1929), pp. 303-317
- Judith M. Richards, "To Promote a Woman to Beare Rule': Talking of Queens in Mid-Tudor England," *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 1997
- W. R. Smith, Ctesias and the Semiramis Legend, *English Historical Review*, 1887
- E. A. Speiser, "In Search of Nimrod," (1958) reprinted in I Studied Inscriptions from before the Flood: Ancient Near Eastern ..., Volume 4, edited by Richard S. Hess, David Toshio Tsumura
- Jan P. Stronk, "Ctesias of Cnidus, a Reappraisal," *Mnemosyne*, Volume 60, Number 1, 2007
- Johanna H. Stuckey, The Great Goddesses of the Levant, *JSSEA*, vol. 30 (2003)
- Karel van der Toorn, Goddesses in the Early Israelite Religion
- K. van der Toorn, Recent Trends in the Study of Israelite Religion, in Modern Societies & the Science of Religions: studies in honor of Lammert ... Edited by Lammert Leertouwer, Gerard Albert Wieggers, Jan Platvoet
- K. van der Toorn & P. W. van der Horst, "Nimrod before and after the Bible," *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 83, No. 1. (Jan., 1990)
- C. Uehlinger, "Nimrod" in the Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible DDD (2<sup>nd</sup> extensively rev. ed.) K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, & P. W. van der Horst, (1999). Leiden; Boston; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Brill; Eerdmans. pp. 627-630.
- Menko Vlaardingerbroek, "The Founding of Nineveh and Babylon in Greek Historiography", in Collon, D., George, A., Hg., Nineveh: Papers of the XLIXe Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, London 7–11 July 2003, London, 2005
- John H. Walton, "The Mesopotamian Background of the Tower of Babel Account and Its Implications," *Bulletin for Biblical Research*, vol. 5 (1995) pp. 173-4
- John H. Walton, Victor H. Matthews, The IVP Bible Background Commentary: Genesis to Deuteronomy,
- Joan Goodnick Westenholz, Legends of the kings of Akkade: the texts,
- Ralph Woodrow, The Two Babylons: A Case Study in Poor Research Methodology, *Christian Research Journal*, Vol. 22, Issue 2, 2000, Book Reviews pp. 54-56.