

THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Report
of
Committee on Examination

This is to certify that we the undersigned, as a committee of the Graduate School, have given the Reverend Laurent Sjolinder final oral examination for the degree of Master of ARTS . We recommend that the degree of Master of ARTS be conferred upon the candidate.

Minneapolis, Minnesota

June

7th 19²¹

William Stearns Davis
Chairman

C. C. Swagg

Guy Pearson Ford

L. B. Shipper

THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Report

of

Committee on Thesis

UNIVERSITY OF
MINNESOTA
LIBRARY

The undersigned, acting as a Committee of the Graduate School, have read the accompanying thesis submitted by Laurent Erick Sjolinder for the degree of Master of Arts.

They approve it as a thesis meeting the requirements of the Graduate School of the University of Minnesota, and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

W. S. Davis

Chairman

C. L. Swamy

[Signature]

May 18th 1918

MCM
85j5

THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Report

of

Committee on Examination

This is to certify that we the undersigned, as a committee of the Graduate School, have given Laurent Erick Sjolinder final oral examination for the degree of Master of Arts . We recommend that the degree of Master of Arts be conferred upon the candidate.

Minneapolis, Minnesota

.....191

.....
Chairman
.....
.....

290236

OCT 6 '23 122 1.35

Babylonian and Assyrian Elements
in the Civilization and Cult
of the Hebrew Nation

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate School
of the University of Minnesota

by

Laurent Erick Sjolinder

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Arts

June

1920

Degree Granted 1921.

Of no nation has the history been of greater interest to all civilized peoples, than that of the Hebrews. This has been by reason of the fact, that that nation was the chosen means through which the divine revelation was given, which is acknowledged as a basis of the Christian civilization. It has until lately been held, that the Hebrews were among the most ancient peoples in the world, at least of which we have any distinct history, and that they stood with their civilization and cult isolated from all other peoples. * These views have been considerably modified in the last century by the light that has been thrown upon the peoples and events of antiquity in these parts of the world, where the Hebrews had their domicile, from the many monuments excavated in these countries. Since the discovery, in the former part of the last century, of the key to the deciphering of the cunei-form writings on these unearthed monuments from Babylonia, Assyria, Syria and Palestine, and of the hieroglyphics on those of Egypt, the silent stones thus being made to speak, a world of thousands of years ago has been laid bare to the view of the modern generation. Historical facts from early antiquity have been obtained, dating back to an age almost twice as remote as that of the founding of the Hebrew nation. From these monuments we learn that the Hebrews were not so much isolated from the other contemporary nations, as to be in no social connection with them, because of an unique religious cult, but were one among them, with features in common with them. We also find, that the civilization of the Hebrew people was not brought forth solely from innate development, but in a great degree by influences from strong neighboring peoples, particularly the Babylonians and the Assyrians. We will, in this treatise, attempt to set forth some of the elements of Babylonian and Assyrian origin detected in the civilization and cult of the

*" Ancient History", by Philip Smith. London (1868).

Hebrew nation.

Although the history of the Hebrews is better known to us, than that of any other people of equal antiquity, in that we are in possession of so large a portion of their literature, collected in our Bible, yet, it will be found difficult, in no small degree, to determine from that source of knowledge, the actual stages of progress of their civilization. Most of the passages in the Scriptural Writings, touching upon the social and religious development of the Hebrew people in the earlier part of their history, date from a period considerably later, than the events and conditions they are describing, thus presenting the facts from the point of view of an already developed theocracy*). This does not imply, that the early Biblical stories are not true, but that their purport, in their present form and arrangement, is to be considered dogmatical rather than historical. It is therefore obvious, that in a research with the view of detecting the foreign elements in the civilization and cult of the Hebrew people, the native documents of that nation cannot alone be of sufficient service, but that also other available sources, such as the monumental inscriptions, must be made use of. It will, thus, be from results acquired by the aid of these last mentioned sources in connection with statements from the Hebrew documents, that we here will endeavor to set forth some of the Babylonian and Assyrian elements in the civilization and cult of the Hebrew nation, as detected: 1. in the language of the Hebrews; 2. in their customs and laws; and 3. in their religion.

I. Babylonian and Assyrian Elements in the Language of the Hebrew Nation.

The Hebrew language has been classified as a member of the northern branch of the Semitic family of languages.*) It was the language of Palestine, Phoenicia, Moab, and some other small states, in the southern part of the territory lying along the eastern end of the Mediterranean. Hebrew has been reckoned

*) "The Students' Old Testament", by Charles F. Kent. (1904) Vol. I. Intrad.

*) "Wilhelm Gesenius' Hebraisches Elementarbuch", Theil I, herausgegeben von Rödiger.

among the dead languages, from the circumstance that it ceased to be employed as a common colloquial language after the destruction of the Hebrew nation, but in reality, it has continued to be used in its genuineness as the literary and religious language in the Jewish rabbinical schools and in the synagogues. The Babylonian, or as it is also called, the Assyrian language - the two countries had with very slight dialectical differences the same language - has, on the other hand, been for many centuries, not only dead, but also a buried language. Its literary treasures were interred under the debris of the fallen cities, where it had been living, and it was so completely forgotten by the world, that nobody knew what it had been. With the awakened interest in scientific research, at the beginning of the 19th century, attention began also to be paid to a more particular search for hidden remains of antiquity. Before that date surveys had been made, and detailed descriptions given of sites in the countries of ancient civilization by eminent men, such as Niebuhr and Beauchamp. In 1811 to 1821 a valuable collection of ancient objects, such as fragments of sculpture, inscribed stones and tablets of clay, was made by the Englishman, C.J. Rich. But a systematic excavation of the ancient cities was begun in Assyria in the region near Nineveh in 1842 by Paul Emil Botta; at Nimrud (the ancient Calah), in 1845, by Sir Austen H. Layard^{†)}, and in Babylonia near Babylon in 1851 by Layard, and in 1854 by Sir Henry Rawlinson.^{‡)} This work, which since then has been continual, with some interruptions, at the different sites in these ancient countries by several exploring expeditions, has been productive of results brilliant^h beyond all expectation. Thousands upon thousands of inscribed tablets have been brought out from their lengthy recesses in the archives, libraries, business places and homes of the buried cities. Coinciding with this opening up to the view of the modern generation the world of thousands of years ago, another, no less important, discovery

^{†)}"Nineveh and its Remains, Exped. to Asyria," 1845-7, by Austen H. Layard.

^{‡)}"Explorations in Bible Lands during the 19th Century," by H.V. Hilprecht.

was made, that of the clew to the deciphering of the unearthed inscriptions. It is the merit of George Friedrich Grotefend to have successfully made the first translation of an inscription in cunei-form writing in 1815. Rudimentary as this first attempt must be considered, a foundation had, however, been laid for a methodical interpretation of the inscriptions, *) a study, which was later on pursued with the grandest results by geniuses in this line, such as Sir Henry Rawlinson, Edward Hincks, Jules Oppert, and Fox Talbot. And by the successful efforts of the eminent orientalist, François Lenormant, Eberhard Schrader, Friedrich Delitzsch, and others, to arrange in their proper line of philological science the results obtained, an almost complete knowledge of the Assyrian-Babylonian language has been made accessible. This language is no more a buried and forgotten one; it has been brought within the scope of modern scientific examination.

The Assyrian-Babylonian and the Hebrew languages show the greatest resemblance to each other. Their similarity, both in regard to grammar and in vocabulary, is so striking, that it must be considered beyond all doubt, that they are branches of one and the same language. In both the characteristic of trilateralism governs with almost artificial regularity. Both have only two genders: masculine and feminine, but for the substantives make use of three numbers: singular, plural and dual. In the formation of noun-stems there is a remarkable similarity, the forming of *segholtas*, several syllables-nouns, and those with reduplication, prefixes and affixes being in the two languages almost parallel in use and signification.†) Both languages make use of the so-called

*) A history of the decipherment will be found in "History of Babylonia and Assyria", by R.W. Rogers, I vol. Introd. (1915)

†) For the comparison of the languages, the following works are consulted:

Wilhelm Gesenius' "Hebraische Grammatik," herausgegeben von E. Rödiger.

"Elements of Hebrew", by William R. Harper. Chicago 1886

"An Assyrian Manual", by D.G. Lyon. New York (1892)

"Hebrew-English Lexicon", based on Gesenius and Leopold. Edited by S. Bagster, London.

"construct state" of two nouns, when the one is a possessive modifier of the other. The personal pronouns are almost the same in the two languages, as can be seen from this comparative table:

| <u>Hebrew</u> | <u>Assyrian</u> | <u>Hebrew</u> | <u>Assyrian</u> |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 'ānōkhî ----- | anāku = I | 'ānāhnû ----- | anini = we |
| 'āttāh----- | atta = thou (m) | 'attem ----- | attuna = ye (m.) |
| 'ātt ----- | attî = thou (f) | 'atten ('attena') - | attina = ye (f.) |
| hû'----- | šû = he | Hēm (hemma') --- | šūnu = they (m.) |
| hî'----- | šî = she | hēn (hēnna') --- | šîna = they (f.) |

The relative pronoun is in Assyrian ša, in Hebrew 'āšēr, but a shorter form šē or šā is also used mostly in poetry and in the later historical writings. The relative pronoun is in both languages indeclinable. In the interrogative pronoun a resemblance can also be noticed between the Hebrew mī, māh, who? what? and the corresponding Assyrian mānu, minû.

There is also a noticeable similarity between the two languages in the formation and inflection of the verbal-stems. Both display a noticeable poverty in tenses, each having only two: the Hebrew Perfect and Imperfect, and the Assyrian Permansive and Imperfect, which forms, in reality, are not tenses in the sense of expressing relation of time; for they are equally applicable to the present, the past and the future, their only difference in function being that of indication an action either as complete or as in ingress. On the other hand, the languages have an abundance of stems of the verb, which serve not only as voices, but also partly as moods of the same. Thus, we have in the Hebrew language a Qāl, a Niphāl, a Pi'ēl, a Puāl, a Hiph'il, a Hoph'al, and a Hitpā'el stem, and in the Assyrian, as Primary, a Pe'al, a Pa'el, Shafel and Nifal-stem, as Secondary, an Ifte'al, an Ifta'al, Ishtafal and an Itta (or Inta-)fal stem, and as Tertiary, an Iftane'al and an Itta (or Inta-)nafal stem. These stems give to the action or state expressed by the verb the force of meaning as active,

passive, intensive, iterative, causative, reflexive, reciprocal, and so forth. The two languages show also a resemblance to each other in the aversion of compounds in verbs and nouns, but a predilection for them in proper names, and in the paucity of conjunctions with consequent simplicity of syntax and prevalence of parataxis of the sentences.

The striking similarity between the Assyrian and Hebrew languages can, perhaps, be best seen by a comparison of some of the most common and therefore most frequently used words in the vocabularies of the two languages. It is to be noticed, that the framework of these languages is their consonants, their vowels being subject to all possible changes: to be either lengthened or shortened, contracted, heightened, or attenuated, or even thrown away. As some of the consonants have no equivalent in our language, it will be necessary, in giving the roots, to transliterate them with Hebrew characters. Of the Hebrew and Assyrian words we will give the transliteration with our (Latin) letters as closely corresponding as possible.

| Root | Hebrew | Assyrian | Root | Hebrew | Assyrian |
|------|--------|----------|------|---------|------------------------------|
| אב | 'ābh | abu | אבד | 'abhadh | abātu --- to be lost |
| אהו | 'ābhāh | abātu | חדש | hadhas | adāsu --- to be new |
| אבן | 'ebhēn | abnu | יזק | 'āzaz | izizu --- to be strong |
| חבר | habher | ibru | אזן | 'ozen | uznu --- ear |
| עבר | 'ābhar | ibīru | אח | 'ah | ahu --- brother |
| הלך | hālāk | alāku | אם | 'ēm | ummu --- mother |
| עגל | 'eghēl | agalu | אחז | 'ahāz | ahāzu --- to seize |
| אגם | 'āghām | agamma | אויב | 'ōyebh | ābu --- enemy |
| חיל | hāyil | illatu | גמר | gāmār | gamāru --- to finish |
| עין | 'āyin | ēnu | דין | dāyan | dānu --- a judge |
| אכל | 'ākhāl | akālu | דין | dīn | dīnu --- judgment |
| אמץ | 'āmāq | imīku | דוש | dūsh | dīsh-dāsu --- to tread down. |

| Root | Hebrew | Assyrian | Root | Hebrew | Assyrian |
|------|---------|-----------------------|------|------------------|------------------------------|
| חמר | ḥamor | imīru ass | חלל | dālāh | dalḥu to disturb |
| עץ | 'ēṣ | iṣū tree, wood | דשא | dēshē | diṣū grass, herb |
| עצר | 'āṣar | iṣīru to enclose | זאב | ze'ebh | zību wolf |
| ארח | 'orah | urḥu, arḥu way, road | זבזב | zēbhuhh | zumbu(zubbu) a fly |
| ארך | 'ārākh | arāku to be long | זקן | zāḡān | ziḡnu beard |
| ארץ | 'ērēṣ | irṣitu earth, world | זקף | zāḡāph | zakāpu to erect |
| ארר | 'ārār | arāru to curse | זרע | zārā' | zirû to sow, scatter |
| אש | 'ēš | iṣātu fire | חבל | ḥābhāl | ḥabālu to injure |
| אשש | 'āsiš | uṣṣû foundation | חדה | ḥādhāh | ḥadû to rejoice |
| ערש | 'ērēs | irṣu bed, couch | חטא | ḥātā' | ḥaṭû to sin, err |
| בצל | ba'al | bīlu lord, husband | חיל | ḥāyil | ḥāltu army, strength |
| בוא | bō' | bā'u to come | טוב | ṭōbh | ṭābu to be good |
| בטל | bāṭāl | baṭālu to cease, fail | טיט | ṭiṭ | ṭiṭṭu clay, mire |
| בית | bāyith | bītu house | יד | yādh | idu hand |
| בכה | bākhāh | bakû weep | ידע | yādā' | idû to know |
| בנה | bānāh | banû to build, make | יום | yōm | ûmu day |
| בן | bēn | binu son | ישר | yāšār | iṣāru to be straight |
| בת | bāth | bintu daughter | יש | yēš (with suff.) | iṣû (with suff.) to be, have |
| ברה | birēyah | burû food | לב | kēlēbh | kalbu a dog |
| ברק | bārāḡ | birḡu lightning | כנף | kānāph | kappu a wing |
| בשל | bāshāl | bašālu to boil, cook | לבב | lēbhābh | libbu heart |
| בתק | bāthāḡ | batāḡu to cut, pierce | פנה | pānēh | panû face |
| גמל | gāmāl | gammalu camel | סוס | sūs | sisû horse. |

From this it can be clearly seen, that the two languages bear the greatest resemblance to each other in almost every part of their respective structures. It is true, there are many words in the Assyrian language, which

have no corresponding root in the Hebrew, as there also are Hebrew words, which are not found in the Assyrian. But it must be remembered, that what we now possess of Hebrew in our dictionary of that language, is scarcely one third of its stock of words when it once was a living language. The only literature extant in genuine Hebrew is the Old Testament writings in our Bible. But these contain many repetitions, and have in their latest parts several passages written in Aramaic. But that Hebrew once was a copious language, we can judge from the abundance of words used in the descriptions of certain subjects. For we find, for instance, eighteen words meaning to break to pieces; eight meaning darkness; seven meaning light; nine meaning labor; fourteen meaning sacrifice; nine meaning faith and twenty-four meaning law-abidance*). In regard to the Assyrian, although an enormous portion of its literature has been found and deciphered, yet, it must be assumed, that only a fraction of a full lexicographic knowledge of that language has been recovered. If we had the vocabularies of the two languages in a complete state, we might find very much more common to these languages, than what is now possible to discover.

Now, this great similarity between the two languages must naturally be considered as the effected result of the close ethnological relationship that existed between the peoples, who used these languages. The Babylonians and the Assyrians, whom we know from the monuments, and the Hebrews were originally one and the same people. They are members of that great branch of the white race, which has been designated Semitic. The evidences of the monuments seem to go to show, that the original home of that branch of the race was the northeastern part of the Central Arabia, between the two great deserts. Very early, about the first part of the fourth millennium before Christ, a first known great migration from this region took place**). From inferences drawn from the ancient monuments, it

*These and other examples can be found from the "Analytical Concordance to the Bible", by Robert Young. New York (1893).

**)"The History of Babylonia and Assyria", by Hugo Winckler (1907).

can be indicated how the stream of migration had taken its course northward along the river of Euphrates, entering, first into the northern part of Babylonia and thence spreading southwards into the Southern Babylonia, and northwards into Assyria, and continuing north- and westwards, had extended over the territory as far as to the Mediterranean and the borders of Egypt. Subsequently, at intervals of a millennium or more, other migrations from the same region followed. Four such Semitic migrations are known in history. The first of these, the Babylonian which, as we have said, began at about the beginning of the fourth millennium B.C., gave to Babylonia its first Semitic population, and probably also placed in Palestine some of the ancestors of the numerous Semitic tribes, we there at a later time are meeting with. But it was undoubtedly in the second migration, the Canaanitic or Amoritic, which took place, seemingly, at about the middle of the third millennium B.C. and which, at the same time as it augmented the Semitic population in Babylonia and Assyria, stirred the peoples to a multitudinous movement westwards, that the real ancestors of the Hebrew nation came to Palestine^{*)} This is in full agreement with the Hebrew records, which trace the descent of the nation from the country between the rivers. Abraham is said to have migrated from Ur in Chaldea (= Babylonia) and to have come first to Harran in Mesopotamia, and thence, after the death of his father, to have continued his journey into the land of Canaan. (Gen. XI. 31, 32). It appears from these records, as if the ancestors of the Hebrews had dwelled in Babylonia before their arrival in Palestine^{**)} This is not at all improbable, as it can reasonably be assumed, that portions of the migrating stream sojourned for longer and shorter periods at different localities in their north and westward move. Although, in view of this circumstance, a Babylonian extraction is attributable to the Hebrew nation, yet, it would be to go too far in an argumentation from this to say, that the Hebrews were Babylonians. The

^{*)} "The Early History of Syria and Palestine", by Lewis B. Paton. (1901).

^{***)} "The Races of the Old Testament", by A.H. Sayce.

marked tribal distinction, which exhibits itself in the ancestor of the Hebrews, does not vouchsafe such an allegation. Abraham, most probably, represents one of the migrating tribes, and when this one, as it seems, branched out into several others, as an Israel-, and Edomite; an Ammonite; a Moabite; etc. tribe, either this came to pass through a division of the one, or a parting of the several hitherto united tribes, all these held the integrity of distinct peoples.

Unlike the state of things existing in Babylonia, where the immigrating Semites found, at their settlement, a people (the Sumerians) with well organized and uniform governments and with a far advanced civilization and material improvements, all of which the new inhabitants acquired and let serve to a full naturalization, - Palestine seems to have been from the earliest times, a place, where different races met, and, making their habitations side by side with each other, often lived upon terms of good neighborhood, but also, ^{often} waged war against each other forcing each other out of some locality. This is the picture given us of the country in the earliest mentionings we have of it on the monuments*), and this is the picture given us in the Hebrew records. According to these latter, the ancestral Hebrew family met at its arrival in the country, the Canaanites, the Amorites the Philistines, the Hittites, the Horites, the Hivites and others. Some of these were probably Semites of an earlier migration. Some were, as in the case of the Hittites, clans of some other greater people, which held domain outside of Palestine. Whatever of culture, if any, the Hebrews acquired from the peoples with whom they had their habitation, like their relatives in the Tigris-Euphrates valley, they maintained their language.

It, thus being demonstrated, that, as the Semitic Babylonians and Assyrians and the Hebrews had a common ethnological origin, their languages also

*) "Ancient Records of Egypt", by James H. Breasted. U. of Chicago Press. (1906).
Inser. of Uni, Tale of Sinuhe, Annals of Thutmes III, etc.
"Records of the Past". New Series. Edited by A.H. Sayce. London (1888-1892).
Tablets of the Tel El-Amarna correspondence.

must originally have been one and the same language, it is easy to perceive, that the two languages, developed under natural and undisturbed conditions, must have preserved great many elements common to them both, which thus caused them to bear so great resemblance to each other. There are, however, instances in history, when cognate nations have come to use different languages, as also, when peoples of different race have used the same language or at least very similar ones^{*)} This has been effected by influences exercised by one people upon another. But in regard to the Babylonians and the Hebrews, it will be shown in this treatise, that there was no such influence prevailing, that tended to part the cognate peoples in their cultural development; on the contrary, the tendency of the circumstances was such as to unite them more closely. At the same time, it allowed a latitude sufficiently broad for independent development.

There are, therefore, strongly marked differences between the Assyrian and the Hebrew languages, proving, that the two languages developed in lines independent of each other. Thus, we have in Hebrew a definite article, which is not found in the Assyrian Language. The Assyrian has in the nouns, three case forms, represented by final u, i, a. (for nom. gen, accus.), but these are, as a general rule, lost in the Hebrew. The gutturals and the weak consonants found in the Hebrew have all, with the exception of $h=ch$, been lost in the Assyrian. This can also easily be seen from the comparative list of words of the two languages given above^{**)}. There are also some marked differences between the two languages in

*) As examples of this can be mentioned the Kelts of Cornwall and Wales, of whom some speak English and the others the Welsh language. The Scandinavians of the Orkneys and Shetlands no longer speak their old Scandinavian language. Latin was once spoken alike in Italy, Spain, France and Northern Africa, and the Arabic language has superseded the language of Egypt, and that of other countries, etc.

***) If we take, as an example of this, the Hebrew word "nâhâr", which in Assyrian is "nâru", meaning "a stream", we notice that the weak consonant "h" is left out in the Assyrian, and likewise, if we take the Hebrew "âyin" = Assyrian "înu" = "an eye", we notice, that both the aspiration of "a" represented in the Hebrew by the consonant y, and the other weak consonant "y" are both thrown out in the Assyrian, the two vowels being then in both words contracted. We also notice in these words, the presence in the Assyrian of the case-termination "u", which is not found in the Hebrew.

the formation of the verbal stems. In the Hebrew, certain sets of derived stems are formed from the simple one, some by doubling one of the radicals, and some by prefixes, but in all of the stems, the radical consonants of the verb are found, except when any weak consonant is thrown out, without alteration or any syllabic insertion. In the Assyrian language, on the other hand, there are besides four primary verb stems, which with some exception have their formation similar to the Hebrew stems, also four secondary stems, which are formed by inserting into the primary stems the syllable ta, and two tertiary stems, formed by the insertion of the syllable tan. There is a noticeable difference between the two languages in the formation of the causative stem (shafel = Hebr. hiphil), where in the Assyrian an "infix"-syllable sh is introduced, but of which the Hebrew has no trace. The Assyrian language also differs from the Hebrew in having two forms of the imperfect tense: one, the longer, expressing continuous action, whether in past, present or future time, and one, the shorter, being, as the ordinary narrative tense, chiefly used to mark an action as occurring at a point of time. In the Hebrew, then, with only one form of the imperfect, some of the functions of the Assyrian imperfects are given to the perfect. An element of dissimilarity between the two languages is also the idiomatic use in the Hebrew of the construction known as "Waw consecutive", which construction is to the effect, that, when several sentences follow each other, connected by "waw" = "and", and expressing simultaneous actions, a different tense must be used in the sequential sentences from that used in the introductory sentence. In Hebrew the simplest form of the verb is the third person, masculine singular, perfect of the stem "Qāl", which, therefore, is given by lexicographers as the principal form of the verb, while in the Assyrian it has been found most convenient to give as the principal form the infinitive of the stem Pe'al.

Also in the use of words we notice a difference in the development of the two languages. Thus, for instance, the stem ܐܗܠ (āhal) meant originally a

"tent", as the dwelling house of the migrating tribes. In Hebrew this word 'ōhēl maintained its original meaning of a "tent" or a "home", while in the Assyrian on account of higher culture and refinement, the word alu received the signification of a "city". Šarru (from Šararu = to be bright, brilliant) means in the Assyrian "a king", which word in the Hebrew, with the unaspirated s, sār denotes a "subordinate official, a governor or captain", while the word for king in Hebrew is mēlēk, which word in the Assyrian malku has retained the original meaning of its root (𐤌𐤍 mālāk = to advise), designating thus a "royal counsellor". With many words a certain shade of meaning has been adopted in the one language, which differs from that used in the other. Thus, for instance, the Hebrew hāghār means "to gird", "to attire", while the corresponding Assyrian igiru means "to enclose" and the Hebrew 'āthāg means "to remove quickly, hasten", while the Assyrian itiku has the meaning ~~to~~ "to march, walk".

Now, in considering the position which the two languages occupied relative to each other, it would be very erroneous to conclude, that all in Hebrew bearing resemblance to the Assyrian language is Babylonian and Assyrian elements in the language. We have seen, that many elements are similar in the two languages because of their being inherited from a common mother language, and, as remnants of this, having in the development of the languages been equally preserved in both in an original form. These elements, then, when no influence has been active in effecting their similarity, must, although being common to both, be considered as belonging to each language independently. In solving our problem to find the Babylonian and Assyrian elements in the Hebrew language, it will therefore be necessary to seek for such elements, that being similar in the two languages, their similarity can be traced from the agency of influence.

It must, however, be admitted, that it is connected with no small difficulty to determine, how far the influence from the Assyrian language has been active in the formation of elements in the Hebrew language, because of the too

fragmentary knowledge that it has, as yet, been possible to acquire in a comparative philology of the two languages. Hebrew has very little of literature extant, and in the Assyrian the reading and meaning of many words has not yet been satisfactorily determined. It is possible to trace the agency of influence in a word or a form, in regard to which the historical circumstances are known. In most cases conclusion must be drawn from analogies. Only when expressions of things or circumstances existing in Babylonia or Assyria, but not having their origin in Palestine, are found in the Hebrew language, do we know, that these are Babylonian or Assyrian elements incorporated into the Hebrew language.

This last mentioned case is applicable particularly to nouns and proper nouns, and as it is the easiest, we will give an illustration of this first. We know, that the Semetic Babylonians received the theology of their religion from a system combining the religious conception of the former inhabitants (the Sumerians) with that of the Semites, resulting in allotting to each city-state in the country a particular deity. Thus the center of the worship of Ea, the god of the waters, was at Eridu; that of Sin, the moon-god, at Ur; that of Shamash, the sun-god, at Larsa; that of the goddess Ishtar at Uruk; that of Enlil or Bel, the god of the terrestrial world, at Nippur; that of Nergal, the lord of the world of the dead, at Kutha, that of Marduk, the lord of the world, at Babylon; that of Nabu, the god of "enlightening," at Borsippa, and so forth.*) With this religious fusion and theological development, which took place in Babylonia, Palestine was in no direct touch. However, we find that in Palestine many places are named after the Babylonian deities, which must have been caused by an influence of the Babylonian-Sumerian cult. Thus, the mount Nebo bears the name after the god Nabu, "the enlightener". The mount Sinai with the desert north of it, Sin, are named after the moon-god Sin. Beth-Shemesh and En-Shemesh, cities in Palestine, are named after the sun-god Shamash. In Astharoth we recognize the name of the goddess

*) "The Dawn of Civilization", by G. Maspero. Ancient Chaldea. Chapter VIII. Temples and Gods. "Babylonians and Assyrians, Life and Customs," By A.H. Sayce. Art. Religion.

Ishtar, and in En-Rimmon that of the Babylonian air and weather god Ramman. These names, and many others of the same character, must undoubtedly be considered as Babylonian elements adopted into the Hebrew vocabulary*).

In regard to the incorporation of common words into the Hebrew language, it is also proper to give some illustration. We know, that the Semitic Babylonians, after their arrival into the country, maintained their language, but applied to it the cunei-form characters invented by the Sumerians for their own language, the appropriation of which characters has made the writing so considerably complicated. The Sumerian language ceased after a while as a common colloquial means, but continued long to be used in the services at the temples and as a language of "the learned", like our Latin. Many Sumerians words were adopted into the Semitic language, but it was often necessary to define or explain such words. Thus, a word shabattu is defined as "ûmu nuh libbi", i.e. "a day of ceasing(=rest) of the heart". This word is found in the Hebrew language as sabbath =rest - it has also been adopted in our English language - and of Sumerian origin, as it is, must be a Babylonian element. Mu was a Sumerian word meaning "name." It was also used in giving date of year. Dissimilar to our method of indicating years by numbers, they gave a certain mu or name to each year. The Semitic Babylonians adopted this word, but in order to denote, that they meant a name of a person, they prefixed it with the personal pronoun shu, as a determinative, thus making it shu-mu(=he, the name) which became in Semitic equivalent to shumu, the word for "name". This word is also found in Hebrew as shem (=name) and must be an adopted word, as it has no root in the language. In Hebrew it had the additional meaning of "fame, renown", in which, perhaps, a Babylonian influence is recognizable, for no one became more widely known, than he whose name was a mu of a year. We have seen, that the original home of the migrating Semites was the tent. When

*)"Babylonian and Assyrian Life and Customs". by A.H.Sayce. Art.Religion.

they came to Babylonia and became acquainted with the palaces of the Sumerians, they had no word in their language for such buildings, but had to borrow the non-Semitic term é-gal or "great house", which they formed into their own language as ikallu. This word is also found in Hebrew as hēkhâl, meaning "any great and splendid building, as a temple or palace", and is one among the linguistic elements that have been received from Babylonia*).

The Babylonians formed names of places by prefixing to the name of a deity, or to that of any object they held in reverence, according to the Sumerian belief that every object had its zi or spirit, the word bitu, meaning "house" or "place". Thus, we find names like Bit-Shamash;**Bit-Adin, Bit-Uri, Bit-Anunit and others. In Hebrew we find names formed in a similar way, as Beth-Anath (house of echo), Beth-Araba (house of the desert), Beth-Arbel (house of god's court), Beth-Dagon (house of the god Dagon), Beth Leba'oth (place of the lionesses), and Beth-el (=Assyrian Bit-ilu, house of God), in the formation of which names, judging from the analogy, we feel ourselves inclined to assume a Babylonian influence. The name Bethlehem has, most probably, its derivation from the name of the Babylonian god Lakmu, thus meaning "house of the god Lakmu", although by a confounding of the Hebraized Lachem with the word lēchēm, "bread", its meaning has been given as "house of provision". From analogy we deem the former alternative more probable. Even the name Jerusalem, seems to have been formed under Babylonian influence. It reads in Assyrian Ur-salīmmu, and as it appears from one of the Tel el-Amarna letters, that there was a deity adored, Salim, "the god of peace", it is most natural to assume, that the naming of the city was after this god. But Ur = "city" is a Sumerian word. It seems, therefore, that the formation of the name Jerusalem (the city of Salim) is a work under Babylonian influence, analogous to that of the name Ur-Kasdim, (the city of Kesed = god of vic-

*) *Ibid.* and "Dictionary of the Bible", by J. Hastings.

***) In "construct state" the case-termination being lost, bitu becomes bit, as also in Hebrew bāyith becomes beth.

tory) in Babylonia.*)

The temples in Babylonia were also oracles, which were consulted for important undertakings. Something similar did also exist among the Hebrews in regard to their sanctuary. The word for asking is in Babylonian sa'âlu, and as animism seems to have been practised by the Hebrews, it is very probable, that the Hebrew word she'ôl (= Hades, the unknown, "that ~~is~~ to be asked") has its origin from this verb. Nabu was the Babylonian god of literature and science, and thus, the "enlightener", whose function was that of an "interpreter" of the will of the gods. From analogy we can draw the conclusion, that the word nabhi (prophet) in Hebrew has its derivation from that name. An other word, which seems to have come into use among the Hebrews by Babylonian influence, is qorban, (a gift offering to God †)

When so much of Babylonian elements is discernible in the Hebrew language, as shown by these illustrations of a few cases, when the steps of development can be traced, it is evident, that also in other parts of the language, where the development can not, as yet, be delineated, many Babylonian elements have been adopted. Future recoveries of literature in Babylonia and Assyria, as also possibly in Palestine, might bring many more of these elements to light, and thereby make clear much of what now must only conjecturally be accepted.

In the art of writing, the Babylonians and the Hebrews differed. The Babylonians and the Assyrians held unalterably to their old usage of phonograms and ideograms, while the Hebrews made use of letters. And while the cunei-form texts are read from the left to the right, that of the Hebrew language runs in the opposite direction. It might be, that the forefathers of the Hebrews also used originally the cunei-form characters, but from the time we know them as a nation we always detect an alphabet in use in their writings. The opinions differ in regard to, whether the alphabet was received by the Hebrews and the Phoenicians from Egypt, where a sort of alphabet was used in connection with the hieroglyphic

*) "Dictionary of the Bible", by J. Hastings. "Rec. of the Past". A.H. Sayce (new ser.)
*) "Bab. and Assyrian Life and Customs", by A.H. Sayce.

symbols (Vicomte E. de Rouge), or ~~it was~~ introduced into Palestine by the Philistines from Crete (Dr. A.J. Evans, "Scripta Minoa", 1909).*) It was an improvement in the art of writing, but as in the case of the Hebrew language, letters were assigned only for the consonants, it was a defective improvement. For our reading of the Hebrew at present, we must depend in main upon the vocalization of the Masorettes, which is a work of a considerably late age, (400-600 A.D.) The Babylonian characters, then, give the reading more perfectly; and it is questionable, whether the knowledge of the Babylonian-Assyrian language could have been recovered as fully, as it is, if not the complicacy in the system of writing that language had served to give indications of variations and idioms, which otherwise would never have been noticed and learned.

II. Babylonian and Assyrian Elements in the Customs and Laws of the Hebrew Nation.

It being shown, that great many Babylonian elements have been incorporated into the Hebrew language, it is most natural to assume, that also in other respects, much of Babylonian origin has entered into the culture of the Hebrew nation. The language is the expression of a people's thoughts, and when this possesses a great portion of a certain coloring, a reflection of it must also be thrown upon other parts of that people's civilization. For the development of the Hebrew language in a line similar to that of the Assyrian, there was from the very beginning an aptitude on account of a close ethnological relationship, and when, in the progress of the development, the influence lay in the same direction, it was easy to appropriate elements from a sister language. But for the Hebrews to adopt Babylonian elements in their customs and laws, it was not so much the conditions from the beginning that were the active agent, as the more continuous influence exercised politically and socially for a greater length of time. It is therefore necessary to see, if there were also such conditions,

*) "Encyclopedia Britannica", 11th Ed. Art. Alphabet.

that an influence of that character could be exercised. If that was the case, the customs and laws among the Hebrews bearing resemblance to those of the Babylonians and the Assyrians, can be considered as elements adopted by the Hebrews from these peoples.

That such conditions in reality existed, that influence to the effect mentioned must be in force, is apparent from the relation, in which the Semitic Babylonians and the peoples in Palestine stood to each other for a considerable length of time. We know, that the Semites who settled in Babylonia, having become possessors not only of the civilization and material improvements of their predecessors, but also of the political power in the country, very early began to extend their dominion far outside the Babylonian territory. Thus, Lugal-zaggisi, a king of Erech and Ur in Babylonia, about 3000 B.C., tells in an inscription engraved on one hundred vases dedicated to the temple of Enlil at Nippur, how his god (Enlil) "had granted him success before the world, when he placed the lands under his power and subdued them from the rising of the sun to the setting of the sun", and that "at that time he straightened his path from the Lower Sea across the Tigris and Euphrates to the Upper Sea"*]. It is evident from this, that Lugal-zaggisi held a domain from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean Sea, which he denotes as the "Lower and Upper seas".

But even before his time, Babylonian kings seem to have held some sway over the countries near the Mediterranean, as king Ur-Nina of Lagash, about 3200 B.C. relates, that he "imported all sorts of wood for his temple of Nin-Girsu and palace from Magan, the mountain", which place, according to the view of most of the Assyriologists, was the Sinaitic Peninsula. Some read Ma'al instead of Magan, in which case the place would be either Mount Lebanon or Mount Amanus**.)

Whether the immediate successors of Lugal-zaggisi continued to hold the same extensive rule, as he had held, or not, we do not know, as we have no records

*) "The Early History of Syria and Palestine", by Lewis B. Paton.

***) "Records of the Past". New Series. Edited by A.H. Sayce.

of it. But when, after the lapse of a century, the power in Babylonia was shifted from Lagash to Accad, two of the kings of that city Sargon and his son Naram-Sin, about 2900-2850 B.C., tell of conquests made of many countries, even as far as to "the sea of the setting sun", and mention among them "the land of Martu". Sargon even claims to have "crossed the sea of the setting sun" (the Mediterranean)* and recently discovered monumental evidences show, that this was no mere boast*†). Now, Martu seems to mean the land far west, and to be identical with what in later texts is called (matu) Amurru, "the land of the Amorites". It was evidently the land of Palestine. Or, if Martu denoted the whole southern region at the eastern end of the Mediterranean, Palestine was included in that territory†).

The succeeding rulers of the dynasty of Accad probably for a time held sway over the distant countries. But it is possible, that when the dynasty began to fall into decay, and other centers of power arose in Babylonia, the conquered peoples made attempts at regaining their independence. However, there seems to have been some governing authority, that kept up unbroken the connection between the east and the west of the empire. For Gudea, patesi of Lagash, about 2600 B.C. tells in a inscription on a statue found at Telloh and now in the Louvre, how "Ningirsu, his beloved god, opened his way from the Upper Sea to the Lower Sea", how "in Amanum the mountain of cedars", he procured cedars of great length, "at Ursu, in the mountains of Ibla (south of Amanum), he cut down zabanu - and skaku - and tulubu-trees", how "from Shamanu, the mountain of the land of Minu (still further south), from Subsalla (Mount Lebanon), the mountain of Martu, he brought great blocks of stone, from Tidanum (the Ante-Lebanon), the mountain of Martu, he brought shirgal-ghabbia (alabaster?) stone,----- how in Kagal-ad-da-ki, the mountain Ki-mash (Hermon or Mash =Arabia Petraea) he dug copper, and from the land of Melukhka (near the Sinaitic Peninsula) he brought ushu wood, etc.", all for his temple of Nigirsu*†). We must assume, that all these materials used for the building

*"Records of the Past". New series. Edited by A.H.Sayce.

*†"The Early History of Palestine and Syria", by Lewis B. Paton.

*†"The Dawn of Civilization", by G. Maspero. †) "Records of the Past". A.H.Sayce.

of the temple were acquired by peaceful traffic, if otherwise, Gudea would have made mention of some warfare and conquest. But strong hands must, however, have held the reins of government over the distant territories. For only then could it be possible to bring costly materials safely from places so far distant. Gudea gives himself the humble title of patesi. Who his overlord in Babylonia was at the time, we do not know, but he must have held an unimpaired sway over the western countries.

When, after a century, the center of power was moved to the city of Ur in the southern part of Babylonia, a king of that city, Dungi (2459-2401 B.C.)*) is said, in an inscription on a tablet skilfully reconstructed by Thureau-Daugin from several fragments of duplicates (in *Orientalistische Litteratur Zeit*, 1898), to have made victorious expeditions against several countries, and among them of Simuru, which is undoubtedly Simyra, the modern Sumra on the Mediterranean, Karkhar (east of the Ante-Lebanon), Kharshi, probably identical with Kir-Heresh, a chief stronghold of Moab, Khumurti (Gomorra), and Kimash, which here probably is the mountain region of Hermon. It seems, that, although the relations throughout the extensive domain were usually peaceful, it was necessary at times, on account of a revolt or some disorder, to make a reconquest of some districts. But it all shows, that the Babylonians were still lords of the whole territory out to the Mediterranean and along its eastern coast, and thus also of Palestine.

The immediate successors of Dungi, Bur-Sin I (2401-2392 B.C.), Gimil-Sin (2392-2383 B.C.) and Ibi-Sin (2383 - 2358 B.C.) seem to have maintained the rule unabated over the same domain**. Of Gimil-Sin it is recorded, that he reconquered among others, Simanu, or Shamanu on the Mediterranean shore, and Zabsali, which apparently is the same as Subsalla (the mountain country of Lebanon). A date formula for the fourth year of the reign of this king commemorates also

*) "A History of Babylonia and Assyria", by R.W. Rogers (1915)

**) "A History of Babylonia and Assyria", by R.W. Rogers.

his building of the "Wall (or fortification) of Martu called Muriq-Tidnim**). Tidnu seems to have been a mountain district in the land of the "Amurru" (the Amorites), probably in the northeastern part of Palestine. Of Ibi-Sin we possess only one record of conquest, and that is that of Simuru. Whether this was the city on the Mediterranean, or some other place of the same name, we are at present at a loss to know.

In Babylonia a period of confusion seems to have followed the glorious reign of this dynasty of Ur. Elam, the country east of Babylonia, which time after another had been subdued by the Babylonians, and for a longer or shorter period held under their rule, had now, wholly Semitized and inhabited by a new race stronger than the old one, grown potent enough, not only to secure independence, but also to make profitable conquests into the land of its former superiors. It was in consequence of an invasion from that country, that the dynasty of Ur was brought to an end, its last king, Ibi-Sin, being carried away captive to Anshan, about 2358 B.C. However, the Elamites were not yet powerful enough to establish rule in Babylonia. The power there was seized by two rival dynasties, the one of Nisin, and the other of Larsa**). But after some lapse of time the Elamites succeeded in making themselves lords of Babylonia. Their king Kudur-nankhunda made a victorious inroad into the country, devastating and pillaging its cities and carrying off from them their treasures and even statues of gods. The date of this raid is given, in an inscription †), by the Assyrian king Ashur-bani-pal as being 1635 years before his time, that is 2285 B.C. We find how soon after this, Elamite princes supplant the natives as kings in several of the city-states in Babylonia.

It would be natural to suppose, that during such contentions and change of hands of the political power in Babylonia, its whole empire would fall to pieces, the different subjugated peoples availing themselves of the opportunity

*) "The Early History of Syria and Palestine", by Paton.

**)" History of Babylonia and Assyria", by Rogers. †) "Records of the Past", Birch

to regain their independence. But these seem to have become so greatly accustomed to the supremacy exercised from Babylonia, that it was considered as a thing of due order, that he who held the sceptre over Babylonia should also have dominion over all parts of its subjected domain. Thus, we find, how Kudur-Mabug, one of the Elamite kings and a successor of Kudur-nankhunda, styles himself, among other titles, as adda-Martu, king of "Martu" (i.e. Westerland, Syria and Palestine.) It is, however, possible, that he had to make some re-conquests. We have in the 14th chapter of Genesis a piece of history, which seems to be applicable to the conditions of this period. Even if it must be admitted, that it is connected with some difficulty to determine the exact place of this story among the leading events and to identify the persons mentioned in it, yet, as it displays a remarkable exactness in the descriptions of the conditions both politically and ethically at the time, the fact cannot be denied, that it is, at least as descriptive, a page of authentic Babylonian and Palestinian history. It tells, how "it came to pass in the days of Amraphel king of Shinar (Babylonia), Arioch king of Ellasar (Larsa,) Chedorlaomer king of Elam and Tidal king of Goiim, that they made war with Bera king of Sodom and with Birsha king of Gomorrah, Shinab king of Admah, and Shemebar king of Zeboim, and the king of Bela Twelve years they served Chedorlaomer, and in the thirteenth year they rebelled. And in the fourteenth year came Chedorlaomer, and the kings that were with him." It is evident that in this military expedition the king of Elam was the overlord, and that the other kings with him were his vassals called upon to assist him. It can also be inferred from the story that it was considered to be his legitimate right to have the submission of the inhabitants of these cities and likewise of the peoples that surrounded them. For it is said that they

conquered not only the five kings, but also "smote the Rephaims in Ash-teroth Karnaim, and the Zuzims in Ham, and the Emins in Shaveh Kiriathaim, the Horites in their mount Seir, and all the country of the Amalekites, and also the Amorites that dwelt in Hazazon-tamar"(places that surrounded the five cities in nearly all directions.) All these peoples might also have revolted in combination with the cities in the Siddim-valley. If Chedor-laomer had come into possession of these peoples by conquest, he must have made an expedition to these regions once before. But this is hardly probable. It is more natural, then, to assume that he in receiving, most probably by inheritance, his dominion with the over-lordship over Babylonia, also received, as appurtenant thereto, the dominion of all the subject countries. These peoples mentioned in the story had for twelve years been faithful to him, but in his fourteenth year he had to reconquer them. Attempts have been made to identify the kings, who are mentioned as partaking in this expedition. Amraphel has generally been considered to be the Babylonian king Hammurabi, and Arioch has been identified with Rim-sin, king of Larsa, whose name is also written in Sumerian Eri-Aku. The name of Chedorlaomer, or as it would be in the Elamite language Kudur-Lagamar, has not yet been discovered on any monument. But the existence of such a name, at that time, is very likely. Lagamar is the name of a well-known Elamite deity, and Kudur-Lagamar would signify "the servant of the good Lagamar." (31)

When, shortly after this, the Elamite supremacy had come to an end, Hammurabi, the sixth king of the dynasty of Babylon, having defeated them, and made his own city the centre of power, about 2100 B.C., the dominion of the whole extensive empire came into his hands. Thus, a true Babylonian domination over the many peoples of far east and far west had again been

31) "Dawn of civiliz." Maspero.

established. Hammurabi was undoubtedly the most illustrious among the ancient Babylonian kings. He is described as a great conqueror, a wise organizer and a benefactor to all his subjects. He endeavored to establish such a system of order in all parts of his domain, that peace and safety should be assured to all from east of Babylonia to the shore of Mediterranean. 32)

One of the most important of his works was the compilation of a code of laws. A copy of this was found at Susa by J. de Morgan (in 1902) and is now in the Louvre and is known as the Code of Hammurabi. A masterpiece in itself from so remote an age, it has certainly had influence upon and perhaps served as a model for laws of other peoples and most probably those of the Hebrews.

In a catalogue or gazetter, which he drew up as a prologue to his code, Hammurabi classified the peoples in his empire respectively around the centres of their worship. He was wise to understand, that the strongest tie, that held a people together, was that of religion, and that by combining into a regular political system the different centres of worship, he had bound all his subjects together with the strongest ties. 32) There lay in this idea a deeper tendency, an endeavor by the searching human intellect to find the One God, of whom all the different cults could be considered as so many manifold manifestations.

The immediate successors of Hammurabi, Samsu-iluna his son (2080--2043 B.C.) and Abi-eshu his grandson (2043-2015) held undoubtedly the same extensive sway, although no records tell of it directly. But it must be assumed that all had continued in its proper order from the fact that Abi-eshu's son Ammi-ditana (2015-1978) styles himself "king of the vast land of Martu." No rebellion or disorder seems to have occurred, and no reconquest

32) "Hist. of Babylon" L.W.King

being necessary, the monuments are silent. It is also probable that the two last kings of the dynasty Ammi-zaduga (1978-1957) and Samsu-ditana (1957-1926), maintained the traditional limits of the empire, as nothing to the contrary is recorded. ³³⁾ But it may be highly doubted, whether the next dynasty, that of Uru-asagga (the Sea-country,) which was partly contemporary with the first, held any dominion over the west, for political contentions and attacks from eastern tribes seem to be weakening Babylonia at the time, and after this the rise of new kingdoms, as Assyria and Mitanni, severed the connection with the western countries. ³⁴⁾

But we have seen from the cited testimonies of the monuments that Babylonia for over one thousand years, with perhaps some interruption at the beginning, held sway over all the countries of the west and among them over Palestine. A rule, so lengthy in duration, must necessarily have exercised a most profound influence upon the peoples of that dominated area, an influence, the effects of which must also, not in the smallest measure, have survived with the Hebrews. It is true, the Hebrews did not as yet exist as a distinct nation, but most of the peoples dwelling in Palestine or arriving there during this period, became later the constituents of that nation. Although it took some considerable length of time before this coalition into a nation was accomplished, and the peoples in the meanwhile became subjected to other influences, yet, the impressions from the Babylonian influence were so deeply imprinted upon their social life, that they could not be blotted out, but survived with the Hebrews in a great many parts of their civilization.

A factor that greatly aided in cementing together the east and the west of the empire during the Babylonian rule, was the occurrence, during that period, of the second great Semitic migration, known as the Canaanitic.

³⁵⁾ ~~It~~ seems to have begun about 2600 B.C. and continued for centuries. We

³³⁾ "Hist. of Babylon" by L.W. King ³⁴⁾ "Hist. of Babyloni and Assyria" - R.W. Rogers

have seen, that it principally was a westward move of the peoples and that most probably in this migration the real ancestors of the Hebrew nation came to Palestine, after perhaps some sojourning in the western part of Babylonia. Under the protective rule of the Babylonians, this migration could take place safely and peacefully. Favoring circumstances, found in many of the new countries, invited the roaming nomads into a settled life, and even if they for a while held to their pastoral occupation, they also soon began to devote themselves to fruit- and agri-culture. Industrial activity was given a push and trade flourished. New cities were built. One of these was Harran in Mesopotamia on the eastern side of Euphrates, which city during this period became one of the most important centres for the trade-routes from east and west and north and south. We notice in the Hebrew records, how the ancestors of the Hebrews are represented as being in a close relation to that city. Rebeka, the wife of Isaac, came from there; Jacob lived there for many years and received from there his two wives, and at Harran several of his sons, the fathers of the Israelitic tribes, are said to have been born (Gen. c.24,28,29,30), which all must designate that they counted an origin from, or at least a close relationship to, that place.

After the cessation of the Babylonian rule in the west, the peoples of Palestine and Syria seem to have come more in contact with Egypt. The Egyptian monuments of the Twelfth Dynasty (2000-1786 BC) tell of mutual visits of Egyptian nobles among Palestinian tribes and of Asiatics in Egypt. Thus, we have in the reign of Usertesen I (1980-1935) the "Tale of Sinuhet," an Egyptian noble, who on account of some political plot fled from Egypt to Palestine, and well received by the tribes there, dwelled for many years among them, till he in his old age returned to Egypt.³⁶⁾ And in the reign of Usertesen II (1906-1887) we

³⁶⁾ "Ancient Records of Egypt, etc." col. ed. by James H. Breasted

³⁵⁾ "The History of Babylonia and Assyria" "A History of Egypt" W.M. Flinders Petrie by H. Winckler (1907)

have in the tomb of Khnum-hotep a record by the royal scribe Nefer-hotep, in the sixth year of the king, telling of the arrival of 37 Aamu (Asiatics) with their chief heg setu Absha (Prince of the Hills Abishua), bringing present; and they were hospitably, nay, even royally received, the picture showing them in nothing inferior to the Egyptians, either in civilization or in external elegance. This bears resemblance to the story of Abraham's visit in Egypt (Gen. 12: 10-12.) Although the relations in general seem to have been friendly, yet we read on the stela of the commandant Sebek-khu of a military expedition undertaken by Usertesen III (1887-1849) against a region called Sekmem (Shechem?) in Rutenu (Syria or Palestine.) How much this involved, or if it was the only campaign into Asia undertaken by this dynasty, we are unable to say. The Egyptians had interests through their mines in the Sinaitic Peninsula, and some complications might have provoked an attack upon some of the tribes in the adjacent country. But the Egyptians do not seem to have held subject, during this period, any part of Syria or Palestine.

From the Babylonians the western peoples had learned to form themselves into leagues or alliances, both for defence and for acquirement of common advantages. Traces of the existence of such alliances are found both in the Hebrew records in our Bible and in the monumental records of the Babylonian and Assyrian kings. Thus, we read in Gen. 15:18-21, that when the promise was given to Abraham of the country, the land should be given "unto his seed from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates: the Kenites, and the Kenizzites, and the Kadmonites, and the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Rephaims, and the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Girgashites, and the Jebusites." The mentioning of these peoples, who did not alone inhabit the promised territory, and some of whom were even outside of it, can intelligibly be understood only by the supposition that they constituted a league and as such were regarded as the strongest power in the country. We have seen, how,

at the expedition of Chedorlaomer and the Babylonian kings into Palestine, the five cities of the Siddim-valley, with several of the surrounding peoples, had allied themselves and jointly rebelled, and were now jointly subdued. It is questionable whether the Babylonians in the short time in which this campaign seems to have been accomplished, were able to bring warfare against each of the peoples separately, or, if they did not rather, in conquering the allied army, consider them all as conquered. In the records of the military expeditions of the Babylonian and Assyrian kings there are often given long lists of conquered peoples and cities, which it is impossible to assume to have been subdued separately in the time assigned to many of the expeditions. More satisfactory is, then, the assumption that these peoples and cities constituted leagues, and that fighting conjointly and their allied army being defeated, they were all in one stroke brought into submission.

It is most probably that it was by means of such national compact of the peoples in Syria, Palestine and the districts south of Palestine, strengthened by an influx of other peoples from the north, who also pressed all the former peoples southwards, that the Semitic population in this part of Asia became powerful enough to penetrate even into the northern part of Egypt and after a while to seize the political power there, establishing what is known as the Hycsos-rule in Egypt. This seems to have happened about 1680 BC. Very little is known of these Hycsos rulers. The account given of them by the Egyptian historian Manetho³⁷⁾ (about 260 B.C.) rests mostly upon later tradition. The contemporary monuments give us scarcely more information than the names of a few of them.³⁸⁾ There seems to have been two, or perhaps three, of these rulers with the name Apepa. One of them, Ra-aa-user Apepa, has left a mathematical papyrus, written in his 33rd year, and of another Ra-aa-genen Apepa there is a fine altar of black granite dedicated to Set of Avaris. A king Set-aa-pehti Nubti-set is mentioned in an inscription of

37) Josephus contra Apion I. 38) "A Hist. of Egypt," Flinders Petrie.
"Ancient Records of Egypt" Breasted.

Ramesses II (1298-1231) as having reigned at Tanis 400 years previously, and after whom some ~~certain~~ era had been continued (perhaps from the establishment of the Hycsos rule?) Another of these rulers was Se-user-en-ra Khyan, who must have held a very extensive sway, as monuments of him are found, not only at Gebelen in Southern Egypt, as they are found in the northern Delta, but also at Knossos in Crete and at Bagdad. And indeed, the fact that these rulers made Avaris (or Tanis) in the extreme eastern part of Delta, their capital, indicates that they ruled not only Egypt but also countries in Asia. One of the royal titles of Khyan was ang adebu, "encompasser of the lands," and the constant titles upon his scarabs and cylinders is Hig Setu, "prince (or ruler) of the hills (i.e. countries)"- from which title most probably the name Hycsos is derived. The Hycsos rule was, thus, a rise of an empire in the western part of Asia, with Egypt as its centre of power. And from their monuments it is shown that these rulers were in no small degree in possession of a civilization and had in a short time become Egyptianized.

Avaris, their capital, lay probably on the same site as what was later called Tanis, which in Hebrew has been transliterated into Zoan. An unique statement in Num. 13:22, that "Hebron (in Palestine) was built seven years before Zoan in Egypt," seems to link these two cities in some respect together. The name Hebron means "confederation," and it is possible that the allied peoples for some short time made this city their centre, before setting up their capital in Egypt. At least, from subsequent events we can judge that Palestine must have been a place of scene of some of the acts played in this movement. How great part, if any, the Hebrew tribes took in it, we are unable to say. There are scarabs of a ruler, evidently belonging to this period, who gives his name as Jacob-her or Jacob-el, which is a pure Hebrew name. It is possible that some chief of the Jacob-tribe of Israel had for a time gained the leadership in this

obscure age.³⁹⁾ But the assumption of the Jewish historian Josephus (contra Apion I) that the forefathers of the Hebrews were these Hycsos, is undoubtedly an exaggeration, although it might contain a kernel of truth in so far as also the Hebrew ancestors must have been among the peoples who at that time were dominating.

After a rule of about a hundred years the Hycsos dominion came to an end. The native dynasties in Egypt, of whom there seem to have been during this period several contemporaries, held as tributaries under the Hycsos, had now begun to regain strength. In particular, the Se-genen-ras of the seventeenth dynasty of Thebes felt strong enough to begin a fight for independence. But it was Aahmes I (1587-1562), the founder of the eighteenth dynasty, who, after four years of war with the foreigners, as recorded by his captain-general of marines Aahmes on the walls of his tomb at El-kab, succeeded in driving the Hycsos out of Egypt, seizing and destroying their great stronghold at Avaris. They then retreated to Palestine. But even there he attacked them at a place Sharuhen in the southern part of the country, whence he dislodged them after a siege of six years and pursued them further northwards. If he then made some part of the country tributary it is not expressly stated. However, a record from the reign of his grandson Thotmes I (1541-1516), telling of a military expedition into Rutenu (Palestine) "for the purpose," as it is said, "of taking satisfaction upon the countries," because "that enemy had plotted conspiracy" (i.e. had rebelled), seems to imply that the peoples there had had some allegiance which they attempted to throw off. It is stated of this king that he subdued a considerable part of the country. But it was his son Thotmes III (1501-1447,) the "Alexander the Great of the Egyptians," who completed the conquest of Palestine, Syria and Naharina (the country north of Syria) in his fourteen military expeditions, which he undertook from his 23rd to his 42nd years of reign and recorded in his "Annals" upon the walls of the temple of Amen at Karnak.⁴¹⁾ He met and defeated on his sixth expedition at

39) ----- 40) 41) -----
"A History of Egypt" by James H. Breasted. IBid. "A Hist. of Egypt" by Flinders Petrie.

Kadesh on the Orontes perhaps the last nucleus of the Once Hycsos power. But he pushed his victorious campaign as far as to Carchemish on the Euphrates, which city he took, and penetrated also into the land of Mitanni on the eastern side of the river. He visited with warfare almost every place in Palestine, Syria and Naharina, subjecting all the cities and exacting from them a heavy tribute. On one of the pylons of the temple at Karnak he gives a list of 119 city-states subdued by him in Palestine, and on the walls of the same temple a list of 350 towns captured in Northern Syria and Naharina.⁴²⁾

Palestine was thus, with the adjacent countries, laid under Egyptian dominion. This meant to the unfortunate population there a state of oppression, nay, even of servitude. For besides the great spoils that were looted from the conquered cities at their submission, and the loss of many of their inhabitants, who were taken as prisoners to Egypt and held there as slaves, a heavy annual tribute was imposed upon them, the failure or delay in paying of which was interpreted as an act of rebellion evoking a new subduing with subsequent punishment. No excuses were accepted for delay in fulfilling this duty, not even war, famine or pestilence. And the best from the country had to be given.⁴³⁾ Oftentimes the Egyptian officials, who collected the tribute, were dishonest and did not properly send it to the king. The subjected peoples were then blamed as the ones who had not paid and had innocently to suffer for it. The story of the servitude of the children of Israel in Egypt, as depicted in the two first chapters of the book of Exodus, is undoubtedly a true picture of the conditions of subjected peoples at this time. There were evidently Semitic tribes, who remained in Egypt or at its frontiers, when the main and stronger body of the Hycsos people were expelled. These tribes were now held in bondage. But the oppression did not occur solely in Egypt; it extended also into Palestine and other countries.

⁴²⁾Ibid.

⁴³⁾"Early Hist. of Syria and Palestine"- L.B.Paton.

Held under such an oppression, it is not surprising to find the liberty loving Semitic peoples in Palestine and Syria attempting, at every possible opportunity, when there was the smallest hope of success, to throw off this heavy oppressive yoke. The Pharaohs had therefore to undertake repeated expeditions into the Asiatic territory to reconquer either one or another of cities that had rebelled. Such expeditions were made by the immediate successors of Thotmes III. Egyptian garrisons were also posted at important places in the conquered countries. But there seems to have been after a time a relax of the Egyptian supremacy. We have concerning the conditions of Syria and Palestine during this period very interesting sources of information in what is known as the Tel-el-Amarna letters, which, to a number of several hundred, were discovered in 1887 in Egypt at a place bearing the name given to these letters, and where one of the Egyptian kings had begun the erection of a new capital. They consist of clay tablets inscribed with Babylonian cunei-form characters and in the Babylonian language, and are reports from the vassal kings or governors in Palestine, Syria and Naharina, as also letters from kings of Babylonia, Assyria, Mitanni and other countries, sent to the Egyptian Pharaohs Amenophis III (1414-1378) and Amenophis IV. Akh-en-Aten (1378-1360.)⁴⁴⁾ From these letters we learn that the vassal princes in Palestine and Syria were in general faithful, at least as they declare themselves, to their Egyptian lord, but that there was very much struggling between themselves, also that they were alarmed by the advance of the Hittites, who pressed forward from the north and already occupied some regions, and by the appearance upon the scene of action of a people or power, which they designate by the name Kha-bi-ri. It has been supposed that these Kha-bi-ri were the Hebrews, who now began their conquest of the country. But neither the character and direction of the movement of the Khabiri, nor the derivation of the name seem to support this supposition. The Khabiri movement began in the

44) "Records of the Past" Edit. by A.H. Sayce. Tel-el-Amarna correspondence.

northern regions and extended southwards, while the Hebrews must have made their entrance from the south or the east. And the name Khabiri, as it is written in the Tel el-Amarna letters, must come from the stem חבר, the Hebrew ḥabher and the Assyrian ibru, meaning "friend," or "companion," and thus mean "allies," while the name Hebrew has its derivation from the stem עבר, the Hebrew 'ābhar and the Assyrian ibiru, "to cross" or "pass over." However, some Assyriologists hold that in the Amarna letters the Hebrew י (ayin=') is represented by the Babylonian kh, and that Khabiri, therefore, is 'Abiri, which can be syncopated into 'Ibri.

45) But it is more probable that the Khabiri either were new Aramaic tribes penetrating into the countries, or signified a renewal of the Semitic peoples of forming themselves into a league in order to be enabled to regain their independence from Egypt. It is possible, in the latter case, that some of the Hebrew tribes partook in the movement.

It is remarkable to see in this Tel el-Amarna correspondence the great effect of the Babylonian influence upon the peoples in Palestine, Syria and other countries of the west, that although these peoples were now under the Egyptian rule, yet the Babylonian language was used as the means of communication even in the official reports that were sent to the kings in Egypt. In spite of the domination by Egypt, and the influence exercised from that country, yet, Babylonian literature, art and concepts seem to have held their own among the peoples who once were connected with Babylonia. It was as an international means of communication between the different nations that the Babylonian language was used. For besides this, each country seems to have had its own language. In Palestine we find from glosses in the letters that the language used there was Hebrew in almost the same form, as we find it in a later time.

In the letters from the vassal princes there are constant appeals to Pharaoh for help, that he may send troops for checking the advance of the Hittites and stopping the movements of the Khabiri. But these appeals seem to have been

45) "The early Hist. of Syria and Palestine" - Lewis B. Paton.

to no avail. The Pharaoh Amenophis IV Akhenaten was too much interested in his new religion and new capital at Amarna to pay any attention to affairs outside Egypt. One city after the other was lost in Asia, either by being taken by the Hittites or by siding with the Khabiri and making itself independent. 46) No more military expeditions were made into Asia during the continuation of the eighteenth dynasty. But with the beginning of the nineteenth dynasty, its first king, Ramesses I (1320-1318) made preparations for one, which his son Setee I. (1318-1298) carried into execution. He succeeded in re-establishing in part the Egyptian rule in Palestine. His son Ramesses II. Miamun (1298-1231) invaded Palestine in his second and fourth years. Besides he made great expeditions into Palestine, Syria and Naharina, as he has recorded, in his fifth and eight years. But he found that in order to win anything, he had to fight against the combined forces of the Hittites and all the northern and western peoples who were allied with them. It was a great and stubborn war, in which only little could be won as a lasting result. At last in the 21st year of the reign of Ramesses an "Offensive and Defensive Treaty" was agreed to "between Ramesses,^{I,I} Miamun, the great king of Egypt, and Khetasar, the great king of Kheta" (the Hittites), written on a silver tablet. Besides stipulations ensuring the integrity of the rights of each of the nations of undisturbed jurisdiction over their respective subjects, the boundary line was fixed by this treaty, so that Syria and all the territory in the north should belong to the Hittites and Palestine to Egypt.⁴⁷⁾ However, this state of affairs did not last very long. The Hittite empire was soon broken up into a number of small states, and in Egypt inner political contentions so weakened its power that all dominion over any part of Asia was forever lost. Ramesses III (1202-1170) of the twentieth dynasty made an inroad into Palestine, but his operations there seem to have been more nominal than actual. 48) Released from the

46) "Records of the Past" - Edit. by A.H. Sayce. Tel el-Amar. Corr.

47) "Hist. of Egypt" - by Flinders Petrie; "Hist. of Egypt" - by J. Breasted.

48) "Records of the Past" - by A.H. Sayce.

oppressive Egyptian rule, the Semitic tribes could now settle by themselves their political affairs, and it was now that the Hebrew tribes united into a nation and acquired the possession of Palestine as their country.

When the Hebrews thus emerged from the mass of peoples in Western Asia as a distinct nation about 1200 B.C., their fathers having, as we have seen, been subjected to the influences of two principal powers, the Babylonian and the Egyptian, besides others with whom they had come into contact, their civilization was naturally the resulting product of all these influences. This is in agreement with the course of development in the world, that a new nation inherits from the nations before it what they have acquired of civilization and improvements in by-gone time. But among the elements which thus constituted the Hebrew civilization, the marks of the early Babylonian influence were deepest imprinted upon their social life. This was, as we have shown in our preceding historical outline, due to the two causes: that the Babylonian influence was the first and had the character of being fostering and educating, and that the Hebrews were ethnologically related to the Babylonians and therefore had a natural disposition towards receiving impressions from them more readily than from any other people, especially from anyone outside their stem. We find, therefore, from the very beginning many Babylonian elements in the civilization of the Hebrews, not only in regard to their language, which we have already shown, but also in their customs and laws.

A Babylonian influence is traceable, in the first place, in the calendar used by the Hebrews. Although they had lately been under the Egyptian rule, they did not accept the Egyptian year for reckoning time. This year consisted of 365 days divided into 12 months of 30 days each and 5 additional days (the epagomenae), and as the excess-hours of the year were neglected, it was a vague year, the beginning of which fell in the length of time on every day of the tropical year. ⁴⁹⁾ They accepted a year more similar to that used by the Babylonians.

⁴⁹⁾ "Ancient Records of Egypt" - James H. Breasted. Chronology (after Meyer).

The Babylonian year consisted of 360 days and had 12 months of 30 days each, and as it fell short of the tropical year, an extra month was intercalated every sixth year.⁵⁰⁾ Besides, another correction was made after the lapse of 120 years by intercalating a second extra month. ⁵¹⁾ The Hebrew year was a lunar year of 354 days with correction every second or third year, so as to bring it into coincidence with the tropical year. It consisted ordinarily of 12 synodical months, but the year of correction was given 13 months and thus made an embolismic year of 384 days. The month began at new moon and continued until next new moon, the months thus having a length of alternately 29 and 30 days.⁵²⁾ As the Babylonians, in early times, had two kinds of year, the one the economic year, which began in the autumn, and the other the solar year beginning in the spring, so we find the Hebrews using two kinds of years. Their civil year began with the month of Tishri at about the autumnal equinox, and their sacred year with the month of Nisan at about the vernal equinox. The Babylonians named their new-year's festival in the autumn in the Sumerian language Zag-mu (in the Assyrian Ris-sattu) meaning "the head of the year," which corresponds to the Hebrew name of the same festival on the first of Tishri (Rosh Hashanah) which also means "the head of the year." The names of the months were about the same among the Hebrews as among the Babylonians, as can be seen from this comparative table: (See next page)

50) "The Dawn of Civilization" by G. Maspero. Chaldaea.

51) "The Beginnings of History" by François Lenormant.

52) "A Handbook to the Bible" by F.R. and C.R. Conder.

53) "Handbook to Bible," by Conder. "Dict. of the Bible" by Hastings.

| <u>Hebrew names of the months</u> | <u>Babylonian names of months</u> | <u>Corresponding to</u> |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Nîsân (or Abîb) | Nîsanu | March - April |
| Îyyâr (or Ziv) | Âru | April - May |
| Sivân | Simânu | May - June |
| Tammûs | Du'ûzu | June - July |
| Âb | Âbu | July - August |
| Elûl | Ulûlu | August - Sept. |
| Tishrî (or Ethanim) | Tashritu | Sept. - October |
| Marcheshvân (or Bul) | Arach-shamnu | Oct. - Nov. |
| Kislêv | Kislîmmu | Nov. - Dec. |
| Tebêth | Tebêtu | Dec. - Jan. |
| Shebâth | Shabatu | Jan. - Feb. |
| Adâr | Addâru | Feb. - March |
| Ve-Adâr | Magru ša Addâri | Intercalary month |

It was particularly the moon that governed the Hebrew year. From the motion of the satellite the beginning of the year and of the months was determined and the time set for the festivals that were to be celebrated. ⁵³⁾ It is remarkable to notice that the ordinance concerning this, that appertained to the calendar and to the celebration of the festivals, is represented as having been given to the Hebrews at Sinai, the mountain of the Babylonian Moon-god Sin.

Even in the observance of the Sabbath by the Hebrews we detect a Babylonian influence. There are in the Babylonian calendars explicit directions for the observance of certain days, on which no secular work was permitted. These days are in one instance given as the 7th, 14th, 21st, and the 28th day of the month. Thus, every seventh day had to be kept as a day of rest, as was the case with the Hebrews. But it is a question, yet unanswered, whether with the Babylonians the same dates were to be observed in every month. In the Hebrew writings

⁵³⁾"Handbook to Bible"- Conder. "Dict. of the Bible"- Hastings.

⁵⁴⁾"Dict. of the Bible"- Hastings. "Encyc. Brit."

there are allusions to a connection between "the sabbaths and the new moons" (2 Kings 4:23. 1 Chr. 23:31. Isa. 1:13. Eze. 45:17 et al.), and it is probable that originally with the Hebrews the celebration of the Sabbath was in connection with the changes of the faces of the moon. The same might have been the case in Babylonia. Then, the day of rest must fall on different dates in different months. We have a statement of a Sabbattu falling in an intercalary month (Uûlu) on the 19th day. And also, as it is probable that the terms nubattu, meaning "rest, pause," and sabbattu are from the same root and denote the same thing, and as we have statements of nubattim celebrated on the 3rd and the 16th day of a month and the 4th day of another month (Âru), it seems very likely that the day of rest could fall on any date of the month.⁵⁴⁾ In later times we know that the Hebrews held with unalterable strictness to the order of the seventh day for their sabbath.

From the Babylonians the Hebrews also, most probably, adopted the custom of dividing the day and night into twenty-four equal parts or hours. Originally the Hebrews seem to have held to a division of the day into morning, noonday and evening, but later we find traces of the use of hours. It is stated of one of the Hebrew kings - Ahaz (734-720 BC) - that he introduced from Assyria to Jerusalem a device for measuring the time (2 Kings 20:11), undoubtedly a sun-dial or gnomon, the "polos" which, according to Herodotus (II - 109), was an invention by the Babylonians.

Babylonian elements can be detected in many of the customs of the Hebrews.⁵⁵⁾ But it must be noticed that very much of what was originally Babylonian, became in the course of time considerably modified, so that only slight traces of it remained. The articles of dress used by the Semites in Palestine were, at an early period, of Babylonian fashion, but later other styles from neighboring

55) "Dawn of Civilization"- Maspero. "Babylonians and Assyrians"- Sayce.
"Dict. of Bible"- Hastings. "Hist. of Babylon"- King.

western peoples became prevalent. In some of the outer garments used by the Hebrews the Babylonian pattern is noticeable in pictures on the monuments, which leads to the natural conclusion that in other articles of apparel, also, some of the Babylonian design had been retained. The agricultural implements were about the same in Palestine as in Babylonia, as can be found from monumental pictures and inferences in writings. As in Babylonia an estate was not considered complete without a garden, so it was among the Hebrews that "a well watered garden" (Isa.58: 11. Jer.31:12) was considered an emblem of luxuriant fertility and material prosperity. Because of this fact, all residents, especially in the country districts, had their houses surrounded by gardens. In regard to the arts and crafts, the relations seem to have been the same among the Hebrews as among the Babylonians. The carpenters, the smiths, the bricklayers, the stone-cutters, the potters and the weavers occupied equally among the two peoples honorable positions, and it is most probable that these trades were brought to the Hebrews from Babylonia. Some of the other trades, as those of the dyers, the perfumers and the fullers, were perhaps received from the western peoples. One thing, remarkable of notice, is that as in Babylonia the members of the various trades formed themselves into associations or unions, so also was the case in Palestine. For we find this from such expressions in Hebrew as "bene hecharashim," "bene hazzoredim," "bene happecharim," - i.e., "sons of the carpenters," sons of the smiths," sons of the potters," etc., which expressions denote, not only apprenticeship in the trades, but also membership in the associations of the respective trades (cf. Nehem.3:8. 3:31. Ezer.2:42. 1 Chron.4:21 ff. Also Acts 19:25). Something similar to this is also the expression: "bene nebhi'im," "sons of the prophetes" - i.e. members of the prophetic order.

In the art of building Babylonian influence can also be traced⁵⁶⁾ In

56) Ibid.

reality, the Hebrews never developed any native style of architecture. They followed alien models, in consequence of which we find in use among them Phoenician, Egyptian, Greek and even Roman styles of architecture. But the art of architecture has a history of its own, from which it is not appertaining to our subject to give any statement. However, this we notice. In Babylonia, where the land was low and level, it was necessary in building a temple or a palace first to make an elevated plan, upon which the buildings could be erected. Sometimes a second elevated plan had to be made inside the first one, and even a third inside the second, and so forth, in order to bring the temple to a required height. In Palestine, where nature had placed mountains and high places, it was not necessary to follow this plan of building. However, we find that the temples in Palestine, and particularly that of King Solomon in Jerusalem, were built in that terrace-like form, resembling somewhat the zig-gurat in Babylonia, because of which we also find the temple in the Hebrew scriptures referred to as "the high place." Only a Babylonian influence can account for the use of this form in the building. This is the more evident, as we meet with as many things in a Babylonian temple, which are exactly alike to what we find in the temple of Jerusalem. In the innermost part of a Babylonian temple was the Holy of Holies. In front of it was a golden table, on which the shew-bread was laid. There was also a Barakku or "mercy seat" (in Hebrew Kapporeth), on which Bel, the king of the gods, was believed on certain days to seat himself, while all the gods of heaven and earth stood around him with bowed heads. Here was "the seat of the oracles," where inquiries were made concerning important undertakings and where answers were given from the "tablets of destiny," believed to be born by the god on his breast, the answers being given to the ministering priest, who interpreted them (the "Urim and Thummim" of the Hebrews). In front of the shrine was an altar cased in gold, and

another altar stood in the outer court. Here also was the great basin of bronze for purification purposes (the "sea," yām, of the temple of Solomon.). In a temple, excavated by Mr. H. Rassam, a coffer or ark was found, in which two small slabs of marble were deposited inscribed with a record of the erection and dedication of the sanctuary.⁵⁷⁾ All this, found in Babylonian temples, bears the closest resemblance to what we know was in the temple at Jerusalem, according to the descriptions given of it in 1 Kings, 6 & 7 and 2 Chron. 3 & 4, and places beyond all doubt the Babylonian influence in the erection and the fixtures of the Hebrew temple.

In the laws of the Hebrews there is a great part that bears an unmistakable resemblance to what we find in the Babylonian law.⁵⁸⁾ In the endeavors that were made, particularly by the first dynasty of Babylon, to unify the subjected peoples of the empire with that of the ruling country, the Babylonian law, as enacted by Hammurabi, was certainly not unknown to any people within the governed realm. The Hebrew laws are stated to have been given by Moses, the great organizer and leader of the Hebrew people. Although these laws, in their present form in the Pentateuch, undeniably bear traces of a later development, by reason of which it cannot to a certainty be determined, how great part of them was the legislation of Moses, yet, it must be assumed that their principal structure was his work. For the situation at that period, when the tribes were welded together, was such as to certainly necessitate the establishment of an authority for the administration of justice, which was accessible to all and recognized by all. But this could be done only by placing the legal and judicial system upon the basis of an appeal to an awakened religious conscience. We find, therefore, that in the Hebrew laws appeals are constantly made to the religious obligations, and that at the head of the laws the decalogue is placed, which certainly must be the work of Moses.

57) "Babylonians and Assyrians" - A.H. Sayce. Art. Religion.

58) "The Code of Hammurabi" - Edit. by R.F. Harper (1904).

But irrespective of this ethical character of the Hebrew laws, a Babylonian influence is recognizable in their civil statutes. In the first place, we notice in these statutes the absence of such primitive precepts in the administration of justice, as the application of old inappropriate customs, self-help and blood feud, which generally are predominant in a new undeveloped society. We find, in its stead, strict jurisprudential principles laid down, which certainly could have been done only by following, as a model, some previously existing rule of order. Such a one, most naturally, must have been, as we have seen from the circumstances, the Babylonian law. Next we find that the same principle upon which in general respects the Code of Hammurabi was founded,⁵⁹⁾ also formed the basis of the Hebrew civil law. Although the Code of Hammurabi presented the whole population as divided into three classes, the awilu⁶⁰⁾ or the patricians, the muskinu⁶¹⁾ or the poor, and the ardu⁶²⁾ or the slaves, and set forth respective privileges and duties of each, yet, it made such provisions as to practically place all the inhabitants in a state of political equality. For a muskinu was counted in a lower class only because of his inability to fulfill the high duties of an awilu,⁶³⁾ and an ardu was permitted to acquire his freedom and to be raised to the dignity of an awilu. Equal political rights were in like manner granted by the Hebrew law to all members of that nation. The citizens of the Hebrew community (gāhāl ʿēdhāth Isrāʿēl) were all considered as ezechim, i.e. "natives." But there was also a class named in contradistinction to these gerim, i.e. "strangers," to whom the law, however, grants the same privileges as to the natives. The name muskinu is found in its Hebrew form, as misken meaning "impoverished," but no indication is given of them as a class. In regard to the "ʿebhadhim" or "slaves" the provisions were obviously the same in the Hebrew law as in the Babylonian. A slave was regarded as "his master's money" (Exod. 21:21) and the master could punish him by flogging at will, but not kill him. At the same time, as the

59) "The Code" - Epilogue. 60) §§ 1. ff. 61) §§ 8.15 ff. 62) §§ 15 ff. 63) §§ 140, 216, et al.

Babylonian law granted to an "ardu" the privilege of buying himself free,⁶⁴⁾ so the Hebrew law provided that an "Ebhedh" should be given his freedom, if he so desired, on the seventh or Sabbatical year. Considering how little attention was paid at that age to the rights and freedom of individuals, the Hebrew law exhibits a marvellous liberality, and, as no other law was then existing, that presented a similar compliance to the requirements of all the classes of the people, than the Babylonian law, this one must evidently have been its model.

That the civil law of the Hebrews in a great many respects was modelled after the Babylonian law, becomes the more evident when we notice the fact that many of the statutes that set forth the privileges and the responsibilities of the citizens in their diverse estates of life and occupations, are in both laws almost alike in form. This relates particularly to ordinances regarding the duties and rights of parents and children, of husband and wife, of master and slave, and regarding marriage, special rights of women and right of inheritance. Both laws impose for violation of the same very nearly the same degree of penalty, and provide most strictly for fair trials in the infliction of punishments. Suspicion should not be considered a sufficient cause for bringing a man to trial. A criminal had to be taken in the act, and nobody could be convicted upon mere circumstantial evidences.⁶⁵⁾

But not only in the great strictness in the administration of justice do the Babylonian and the Hebrew laws bear resemblance to each other, but also in that they both, nearly to the same extent, retained some primitive features of judicial procedure, such as district and family responsibility,⁶⁶⁾ ordeal and the lex talionis. There are instances, although very few, when in Babylonia cities and families have been held responsible for violations committed by individuals. And in like manner it was among the Hebrews. Although the Hebrew law strongly restricted the extension of retaliating beyond the immediate offender in cases of

64)"Baby. and Assyr." - Sayce. Slavery & free. 65) The Code §§ 1:3.4. 66) § 23.

crimes committed against individuals (Deut.24:16.), yet, we find that in case of religious apostacy, it was enacted that not only the actual transgressors, but also the whole district, where they had their domicile, should be held responsible and be punished (Deut.13:12-16.). And we have also in a case of disobedience of a divine command, which was counted as an act of treason, an instance when not only the transgressor, but also his whole family were put to death (Josh. 7:18-25.). As to the Ordeal, we find in the Hebrew law a prescript for the use of a "water of bitterness," mē hāmmārim, with a solemn ceremony, in the case of an accused woman, thereby to detect her innocence or guilt (Num.5:11-31.). Something similar we find in use in Babylonia in causing an accused person to leap into the sacred river, where, if he was innocent, he swam, but if not, he drowned with his guilt.⁶⁷⁾ This practice was a procedure rather permitted than ordered by the two laws, partly to comply with the deeply rooted magical ideas of the time. The lex talionis was in the criminal precepts of the two laws the ruling principle.⁶⁸⁾ "Eye for eye, tooth for tooth, limb for limb," was the penalty for assault (Exod.21:24), and in case of a willful murder, life was to be given for life. The prescripts for the application of this principle are remarkably the same in the Babylonian and the Hebrew laws. The two laws also agree in extending the "talio" to a sort of symbolic retaliation in decreeing in certain cases as punishment the cutting off of a hand or a limb that was considered instrumental in committing a crime or an immoral act. In Babylonia, the hand that struck a father or stole a trust should be cut off, the tongue that denied father or mother should be cut out, and the eye that pried into forbidden secrets should be blinded.⁶⁹⁾ Something similar we also find decreed in the Hebrew law in Deut.25:11. It is very probable that the lex talionis originally was applied strictly in its literal sense, but later we find that, both in Babylonia and among the Hebrews, the enforcement of the retaliation in most cases of personal injury was modified into imposing a corresponding recompense.

67) §§ 2.132

68) §§ 196 ff.

69) §§ 192-195, et al.

That the Babylonian and the Hebrew laws also in many points differed from each other, must be considered as a matter of course, as the political situations, experiences and localities of the two nations were not the same. But that, in spite of the prevailing differences in the conditions, so much is found common in the laws of the two peoples, as has been partly shown, certainly leads to the conclusion that the greater part of the civil law of the Hebrews was formed after the concepts of justice that had been presented in the Babylonian law.

- - - - -

III. BABYLONIAN AND ASSYRIAN ELEMENTS IN THE RELIGION OF THE HEBREW NATION

At the first aspect, it seems, as though there could not have been any connection between the Babylonian-Assyrian and the Hebrew religions, the two being in their respective character so widely different from each other. The Babylonian religion was an amalgamation of two different elements: the one the religious conception of the Sumerians, a pantheistic spiritism, according to which every object, either concrete or abstract, was accompanied and governed by its zi or spirit, which, however, could also act independently of the object, and the other the Semitic view, a much higher conception, a realistic deism, according to which a god is a real person, free and independent to act according to his own free will, possessing, however, human attributes, but in a more perfect degree.⁷⁰⁾ It was out of these two different conceptions that the Babylonian religion was formed and developed, in its first stage, into an incoherent polytheism. Later on brought into a more perfect and harmonious system, yet it never rose above the level of polytheism. - The religion of the Hebrews, on the other hand, even if it, at its beginning, contained some polytheistic elements, yet in its principle was a strict monotheism, in which the more exalted Semitic conception had been maintained, and, this applied to only one, he was regarded as possessing all forms, attributes and functions of the godhead.

In spite of this essential difference, there are points of contact between the two religions. There was among the Babylonians a development of their religion tending to unite into a harmonious system the different cults of their many deities. So far progressive does this tendency seem to have been, as not only to make the Babylonian theology systematically consistent, but also to be an endeavor to resolve the manifold deities into forms or manifestations of one god. We have seen how the Babylonian king Hammurabi aimed at the realization of something consistent with this idea, when he undertook to consociate the different cults within his empire, and made Marduk the principal among the gods, even if he did this from political motives, knowing that a union of the different religious cults should strengthen the union, in which his subjects were politically held together under his rule. If it was by an impulse created by Babylonian influence in this respect, that the Hebrew religion, as we know it, came into existence, we are unable to judge, but similar conditions seem to have prevailed, and the Hebrews might have learned from the Babylonians. At all events, it was the great work of the most intelligent Hebrew organizer and lawgiver, Moses, to unite by the strong tie of a common religious cult the tribes, which he had undertaken to create into a nation. It was a time of an important occurrence. A new nation was to be born, whose place in history should be of no small import in the development of the world-culture. And as history shows, at very important epochs, great heroes and geniuses have been given to humanity with such extra qualifications, as to make them capable of achieving the great tasks that at such times have been of vital importance, so it was here. Moses seems to have been a man of extraordinary ability, and as he also, which is shown not only from the Hebrew records, but also can be proven from other historical sources and from the circumstances, had had the opportunity of receiving the highest education of the time, he was fully qualified for the great work, which was destined to become his.

Egypt had at this period, on account of inner political contention and disorder, come into a state of decline, and had lost the supremacy over the countries in Asia.⁷¹⁾ In Palestine intruding new peoples from north had pressed many of the tribes settled there southwards and even out of the country. There were now Semitic tribes in the northeastern part of Egypt, in the Sinaitic peninsula, in the wilderness north of it and in districts in Palestine, who knew that they were closely related. Dispersed, as they were, they needed a leader. And the leader came. He had begun his work in uniting some of the tribes in the northeastern part of Egypt and was bringing them in contact with their brethren at Sinai. Now was the opportunity for these dispersed and suppressed tribes to make efforts to come into possession of what they considered to be rightfully theirs: a country, and their independence. The country, which they considered to be theirs, was Palestine. There their fathers had arrived and habitated in peace under the protective rule of the Babylonians, until other peoples intruded and the Egyptians made inroads into the country laying it under subjection. Now, as the Egyptian supremacy was broken, it was needed quite little of agitation to arouse in these Semitic tribes the strongest enthusiasm for the cause of establishing themselves in the land of their fathers. The exodus of the Israelites from Egypt is, therefore, to be considered as a great political movement, and their wandering in the wilderness as the period of fighting out inevitable conflicts and of establishing the social foundation, upon which they became united and prepared for their place in the history as a nation.

But in a time of tribulation and difficulties, when there is a longing for better conditions, but uncertainty prevails of their acquisition, the need is felt of assistance from a being more potent than man's own power. But, who was the god of these "children of Israel," as these tribes denominated themselves? They could not cling to any of the gods of Egypt, for these would naturally

71) For this period: Tel el-Amarna letters, trans. in the "Records of the Past," ed. by A.H. Sayce. "Det Israelitiska folkets Uppkomst" by J. Waller (Uppsala).

stand by the Egyptians and subvert any plan for emancipation from that country. The gods of Babylonia were too far off and could not render them assistance, separated as they now were from them by other powers with other interests cutting them off. And they could not accept any of the gods of Palestine, for these were worshiped by peoples inimical to the Israelites, and they would not promote any endeavor to deprive their worshipers of the possession of the country. There was, therefore, no god suitable to the conditions of the Israelites. But then, in the wilderness, at Sin's mountain, when no other hope was to be found, Moses found the God of Israel. He had no name. He is represented only as the one who is "a being" (Exod.3:14.). Jahweh which is the 3rd person masculine singular imperfect of Qāl of the verb hâyâh "to be," thus meaning "he is",⁷²⁾ is in reality no name but a descriptive attribute. Nothing more suitable could have been selected for the occasion than this appellation of the deity. For the worship of a God, who is described with no particular attribute, except this one as being "existing," could be accepted by all as compliable with the religious demand, whatsoever the preference of cult. It is, however, improbable that this form of religious worship was invented then. It seems to have existed long before, particularly among the Kenites, a tribe of the Midianites, who occupied the district around and north of Sinai.⁷³⁾ These nomadic "children of the desert," with their simple manners of living and straightforward piety, found satisfactory for their religious demands a plain cult without systematic details, a worship of a God of whom they simply knew that he existed and was with them as their supporter and protector. That this simple Jahweh cult had been in use also among the other nomadic tribes, is indicated by the occurrence of proper names compounded with the name of that deity, as we find in e.g. "Jochebed," the mother of

72) The Hebrew tenses not indicating any definite relation of time, this form can equally be translated "he was," "he is," or "he shall be." From this ambiguity of meaning most probably the expression is: "He who was, who is and who shall come." (Rev. 1: 8.).

73) "Origin of Israel" by Walles. "Syria and Palestine" by Paton.

Moses, and "Moriah," a mountain in Palestine. But the majority of the Hebrew tribes had, as it seems, quite early through influence from other peoples exchanged this for some other cult used in the country where they had their habitation. It could, therefore, be said of them, that although Jahweh had originally been their God, he "was not known to their fathers, the patriarchs, by that name, but as El-shadai (God Almighty)" (Exod.6:2,3.).

It was around the altar and erected tabernacle of Jahweh, that Moses succeeded in gathering the Hebrew tribes together as a nation. And as such, he had them to enter into a covenant with their God, promising to obey and serve him faithfully. It was upon an ethical basis, that the religion of the Hebrews was promulgated. Jahweh is represented as having by his own free, moral choice elected them as his people, and they are required to accept him, also by free choice, as their God. In this ethical character of the Hebrew religion the secret of its strength and future unique development lay. When the Hebrew tribes succeeded in winning their freedom and acquiring the land of Palestine, they saw in this the guidance and assistance of Jahweh. Their faith in Him was strengthened and He became with indisputable right the God of their country.

The religion of the Hebrews we know from their writings, which constitutes the Old Testament of our Bible. In these writings the development of the religion has its history given from the point of view of the Prophecy. For it was by this most important religious movement in the Hebrew nation, unique in its character and unparalleled elsewhere in history, that the Hebrew religion received its development as presented in a series of divine revelations, and was framed into its systematic form.⁷⁴⁾ Thus built up under the influence of inspiration the structure was divine, but the materials used human and secular. It is among these materials we detect a great many Babylonian elements. This is the case first in regard to the cosmogony of the Hebrews. Similar to the story of creation, recorded in the first chapter of Genesis, a Babylonian story of

74) "Gamla och Nya Testamentets Religion" (Old and New Testament Religion) - S.A. Fries.

creation has been found, described on cunei-form tablets, of which fragments were recovered in 1874 at Kouyunjik or Nineveh by the noted Assyriologist, Mr. George Smith. These tablets, it is true, were written at a later time, as they were found in the library of Assurbanipal, but they were most probably, like many other epics, copied from older originals. The tablets appear to have been seven in number, each containing one day or period of the work of creation, but, unfortunately, not all of them have been recovered, and of several of those found, ~~not~~ only parts are extant. Yet, what remains of the record, presents a striking similarity to the Biblical account. In both, the history of the creation is divided into successive acts, which follow each other in nearly the same order. In both we have the conception of chaos as a watery abyss, which preceded the present world. The self-same word is used in the two languages of this chaos: tehôm in the Hebrew, and Tiamat in the Assyrian, although in the Assyrian account Ti'amat becomes a mythological monster, which with its brood fights against the creating gods. In this, perhaps, the great contrast was depicted which must be imagined to have existed between chaos and order, darkness and light, inanimateness and life. If there be in the Hebrew story something corresponding to this, it might be implied in the expression: "werúah̄ elohim mērāhēphēth'al-pēnē hāmmāyim," i. e. "and the spirit of Elohim (or an immense (a god's) wind) was hovering over the faces of the waters." The two documents agree in the description of the separation of the waters, of the creation of the light, as a first act, and then of the appointment of the celestial bodies "for signs and for seasons and for days and years," also in giving to the creation of man a special prominence. There are, however, some differences between the two accounts, but in general outline and in the most of the details the two works are similar.⁷⁵⁾

But there is also another set of Babylonian creation tablets, which were discovered at the same time as the former, but of which the colophon informs,

75) "Records of the Past" - edit. by A.H. Sayce, vol. I.

that they had been copied from older documents from the library of Cutha in Babylonia. They are therefore named "The Cuthæan Legend of the Creation." They differ in some respects from the others, especially in not presenting the creation in successive acts, and in letting the chaotic brood of Ti'amat inhabit the already existing earth, till they were destroyed, not by Marduk, as stated in the former tablets, but by Nergal. Besides, there is another tablet named "The Non-Semitic Version of the Creation-Story," which was found by Mr. H. Rassam at Sippara in 1882, and is written in two languages, the Sumerian and Semitic-Babylonian.⁷⁶⁾ It differs somewhat from the former, but mainly in giving the creation story in a concised form. We find, thus, that there were among the Babylonians and Assyrians various accounts of the creation. That the same was also the case among the Hebrews, we can assume from the fact that there are in the book of Genesis two parallel and somewhat diverse accounts of the creation, the one, to which we have already made some references, contained in the first chapter and continued to the 4th verse of the 2nd chapter, and the other, beginning with the 4th verse of the 2nd chapter and continuing to the end of it. In view of the striking similarity between the Babylonian and the Hebrew accounts of the creation, it is clear that the cosmogonies of the two nations are very closely related and that the materials of the Hebrew creation stories, although composed under the influence of the inspired prophecy are of Babylonian origin.

In the story and description of the Garden of Eden, the abode of the first men, the materials are undoubtedly Babylonian. Professor Fr. Delitzsch has suggested that the name Eden might be a Hebraized form of the Babylonian ēdinu meaning "plain" or "field." It was a Sumerian word, which the Semites borrowed at their arrival into the country. Originally it denoted the whole plain of Babylonia, but particularly the name ēdinu seems to have been given to the plain or district around the city of Eridu. This city is termed in the inscriptions

76) Ibid. Vol. VI.

"the good" or "holy" place as being the seat of Ea, one of the principal gods, "and near it," it is said, "was a garden, where grew the holy palm-tree, the tree of life." This "tree of life" seems to have been a very sacred symbol in ancient Babylonia, and we find it often pictured on cylinders and sculptures.⁷⁷⁾ On such a cylinder of very ancient workmanship, now in the British museum, a picture is shown of a tree with a man and a woman by the side of it stretching out their hands for the fruit, and behind the woman a serpent. It has been supposed that this picture would represent what we read about in our Bible: the temptation and fall of our first parents. At any rate, it is most probable that the story of the Garden of Eden and what there happened has been received from Babylonia, all the more, since the garden seems to be located there, the rivers Tigris and Euphrates being mentioned among the rivers watering the garden (Gen.2:10-14.).

Many cunei-form tablets on the mythology of the Babylonians and their knowledge or belief concerning the earliest age might have existed, which, as yet, have not been recovered. Of great and valuable aid a work therefore has been, which has supplied great many parts to the fragmentary knowledge of the Babylonian mythology, which it has been possible to acquire from recovered monuments. This work is a History of Chaldaea, compiled by Berosus, who was a priest of Bel at Babylon in the time of the immediate successors of Alexander the Great. He wrote his work, as it seems, in three books and in the Greek language, translating into that language the ancient annals of his country.⁸⁰⁾ Unfortunately, this historical work is lost, and only fragments of it are extant in quotations made from it by Greek authors and several of the Ecclesiastical Fathers. Despite some possible errors due to mistakes in copying, these fragments must be considered as containing, in main, what was written in the original records, from which the history had been extracted. He tells that from the beginning up to the great deluge, ten kings have governed over Babylonia during a period of 120

77) "Hist. of Babylonia"- Geo. Smith. 80) "The Ante-Nicene Fathers"-Vol. II, pp. 80, 121. Re-edit. by A. H. Sayce (1895). "Chaldea" by Z. A. Regosin.

sars or 432,000 years. The first of these kings was Adôros, who reigned for 10 sars or 36,000 years. The next was Alaparos, who reigned for 3 sars or 10,800 years. The third was Amelon or Amillaros, who reigned for 13 sars or 76,800 years. And the following were Ammenon for 12 sars or 43,200 years, Amegalaros or Megalaros for 18 sars or 64,800 years, Daônos or D-aôs for 10 sars or 36,000 years, Edoranchos or Evedôreschos for 18 sars or 64,800 years, Amemphsinos for 10 sars or 36,000 years, Otiartes or Ardates for 8 sars or 28,800 years, and Xisuthros or Sisithros for 18 sars or 64,800 years. This last one was the hero of the deluge.⁸²⁾ This account of the ten kings seems to correspond with what we read in the 5th chapter of Genesis of the ten antediluvian Patriarchs from Adam to Noah. The numbers of years of the reigns in the Berossian account are fabulous, but the lengths of lifetime given to the fathers in the Hebrew record are no less mythological. It has been thought that the numbers represented astronomical cycles.⁸³⁾ This might be true in the case of the Babylonian account, but in the Hebrew the numerical scheme was most probably reconstructed under the influence of the prophetic inspiration for a dogmatical purpose. At any rate, there is no doubt but that the genealogy is of Babylonian origin.

Of Xisuthros, the tenth of the before-mentioned kings, Berossus tells that he by the orders of Kronas (=Ea) built an ark, in which he saved himself, his family and friends, and pairs of all animals from the destruction of the deluge.⁸⁴⁾ He was thus the Babylonian Noah. But we have also an account of the Deluge in a cunei-form inscription, which was recovered by Mr. George Smith in 1872 at the same site where the Creation Tablets were later found. It is an Epic consisting of twelve parts or tablets, in which the adventures of Gilgamesh, the Babylonian Hercules, are described. The first tablet is lost, as is also a part of the second.

The account of the Deluge is introduced as an episode into the eleventh of these

82) *Chronicorum Eusebii Lib. I. p. 10.* 83) *"Begin. of Hist." - Lenormant.*

84) " " " " - Ed. by A. Schoene - Berlin (1875).

tablets, being represented as told to Gilgamesh by the hero of the great occurrence himself, whose name is given as Khasisadra.⁸⁵⁾ It has been supposed that the protagonist of this epic should be a solar personification, and that the subject-matter of each tablet corresponded with the signification of a sign of the Zodiac. The content of the eleventh tablet should then answer to the eleventh sign, which was the Aquarius. But, regardless of this, the Babylonian account of the Deuluge bears the greatest resemblance to the story we have of it in the Bible, not only in the main presentation, but also in most of the details. Both accounts agree in ascribing the Deluge to the anger of the deity at the wickedness of the world (Gen.6:5-8. Deluge Tablet col.I, lines 33-38.IV.15.). The command given to Khasisadra by the god Ea to build the ship (ilippu) of which we read in the Babylonian account Col. I, lines 21-44, parallels almost verbatim the command given to Noah in Gen.6:14-21. The numbers of measurement being in the Babylonian text mutilated, a comparison of the sizes given in the two accounts of the ark cannot be made. There seems, however, to be a dissimilarity between the accounts in respect to this. In the Babylonian text "600 cubits" has provisionally been supplied for the length of the ship, and "120 cubits" for its height and breadth (I:25,II:3,4.). The Hebrew story gives the size as 300 cubits in length, 50 cubits in breadth and 30 cubits in height (Gen.6:15.). The Babylonian account also describes the ship as provided with six decks and divided into seven stories, each with nine compartments, and that it had a mast (II:3-9), while the Hebrew story describes the ark as being in the form of a "chest" (tebâh) with three stories (Gen.6:16.). But the Babylonian and the Hebrew accounts agree in the statement, that the vessel was smeared with bitumen inside and outside (II:10,11. Gen.6:14.). And the order to take into the ark or ship the whole family, all kinds of animals, and a sufficient supply of food for them all, is equally set forth in the two accounts (I:41-45.Gen.6:18-21.). The utter destruction

85) "The Hist. of Babylonia"- George Smith, Rev. & ed. by A.H.Sayce (1895).

of all living on earth is also told alike in both (II:42 to III:26. Gen.7:17-23).

86) But, then, with respect to the duration of the Deluge, there is a dissimilarity in the two stories. According to the Babylonian account the whole period of the Deluge seems to have been seven weeks or 49 days, (III:19-45), while the Hebrew account, according to one source (the Elohist version) gives the duration of the flood as one lunar year and ten days, or a full solar year of 365 days (Gen.7:11,24; 8:3-5,13,14), and according to another source (the Jehovist version) seems to assign to it a duration of 101 days (Gen.7:12,17; 8:6-12.). But despite this difference, the principle underlying the reckoning of the Epochs of the Deluge might have been the same in both accounts. It seems to have been a septenary system, in the application of which the numbers have been differently combined. 87)

In their concluding parts the two accounts are remarkably similar. The Babylonian account tells that the ship grounded on the mountain of Nizir, and that Khasisadra after waiting for seven days sent forth a dove, which, as it could not find any resting place, returned. He then, seemingly after seven days, sent forth a swallow, which also returned. But when after having sent forth a raven, which did not return, he had become assured that the water had subsided, he opened up his ship and let out all the animals. He then made a sacrifice to the gods (III:32-46.). All this agrees with what we read in the Hebrew account of the ark stopping on the mountains of Ararat and of Noah sending forth a dove three times and, after having ascertained that the earth was dry, of his going out of the ark and offering to God (Gen.8:4-20.). The dissimilarity in the two accounts in regard to the name of the mountain, where the vessel stopped, is perhaps to be ascribed to the vagueness in the use of geographical appellations. "The mountains of Ararat" in the Hebrew account might denote, not only the mountain range now known by that name, but also the mountain chains south of it ex-

86) "The Hist. of Babylonia"- George Smith "The Deluge Account."

87) "The Beginnings of History"- F. Lenormant "The Deluge".

tending down toward the Persian Gulf on the east of the Tigris. And as Nizir was a region in that southern mountain-district, a coincidence in the statements of the two stories is conceivable. Despite some few differences in the details between the two accounts, their similarity is so great, that it admits of no doubt that they have a common origin. And as the Babylonian Deluge story is older - we know of its existence at least 2200 BC - it is evident that the Hebrew account of the Deluge was obtained from Babylonia.

The Babylonian account tells, furthermore, that Khasisadra after the deluge was taken up to the gods and given immortality. (IV:22-30.). A corresponding tale we have in the Hebrew record, although it is stated there that it was Enoch, the great grandfather of Noah, who was translated for his piety (Gen.5:24.). "The whole Chaldean account of the Deluge is worthy of minute comparison with that in the book of Genesis, and will be found interesting, both in the points where it agrees with and those where it differs from the Biblical record."
(George Smith)¹⁾.

The Gilgamesh Legend seems to have something corresponding in the Hebrew record in what is said of Nimrod in Gen.10:8-12, that "he began to be a mighty one in the earth and was a mighty hunter before the Lord²⁾" i.e. "an exceedingly mighty (a god's) hunter," and that the memory of him survived in the saying: "Even as Nimrod the mighty hunter before the Lord."

But not only in the historical and mythological parts do we find Babylonian elements in the religious writings of the Hebrews, but also in the more ethical of them. Tablets have been recovered in Babylonia, containing prayers or hymns, which bear a great resemblance to some of those which we find in our Bible. They express the most sublime and noble thoughts, and are indeed a true communication of the heart of the worshiper with his God. We will here give extracts from a couple of these hymns.

1) "The History of Babylonia" - George Smith.

2) A Hebrew idiom.

Here is a part of a Penitential Psalm:

"The heart of my lord is wrath; may it be appeased!
May the god whom I know not, be appeased!
O lord, my sins are many, my transgressions are great!
The sin that I sinned I knew not,
The transgression I committed I knew not.
The lord in the wrath of his heart has regarded me,
God in the fierceness of his heart has revealed himself to me.
I sought for help, and none took my hand;
I wept, and none stood at my side;
I cried aloud, and there was none that heard me,
I am in trouble and hiding; I dare not look up.
To my god, the merciful one, I turn myself, I utter my prayer;
The feet of my goddess I kiss and water with tears,
The sins I have sinned turn into a blessing;
The transgressions I have committed let the wind carry away!
Strip off my manifold wickednesses as a garment!" 1)

And here is a prayer to Sin, - from Ur, the birthplace of Abraham:

"Father, long-suffering, and full of forgiveness, whose hand upholdeth
the life of all mankind!
First-born, omnipotent, whose heart is immensity, and there is none who
may fathom it!
In heaven who is supreme? Thou alone, thou art supreme!
On earth, who is supreme? Thou alone, thou art supreme!
As for thee, thy will is made known in heaven, and angels bow their faces.
As for thee, thy will is made known upon earth, and the spirits below
kiss the ground." 2)

Thus, we have found, that there are many Babylonian and Assyrian elements in the civilization and cult of the Hebrew nation. In reality, Babylonian, yet we have chosen to designate them also as Assyrian, as the two countries stood in a close relation to each other, and Assyria, appropriating the Babylonian culture, was in some cases instrumental in bringing the influence of it to other nations. The ancient Babylonians were the originators of nearly all branches of the human culture. Even in the sciences and arts, which we now possess, we must regard the Babylonians as the ones who laid down the first rudimentary principles from which these creations of the intellect have developed. The imparting of the Babylonian elements into the civilization and cult of the Hebrews has, therefore, in no small degree, had its effect upon the civilization of the world,

1) "Babylonians and Assyrians"- A.H.Sayce, Ch. XI. p. 260-261.

2) Ibid. p.261.

the Hebrews being an important connecting link between the ancient and the modern world. The Greeks received from the Babylonians a great many elements, which they further developed and gave to the world. But these were in the line of mathematics, astronomy and liberal arts. The Hebrews appropriated other elements and developed them. They were in the line of Ethics. And in this, their work stands unique in the history of mankind. It is a work which has stood, and will stand, as a model and a fundamental basis of all true civilization.

Works used in Composing this Thesis

- Biblia Hebraica, Edit. Aug. Hahn Lipsiae 1886.
Breasted, James H. A History of Egypt. New York 1905 (Chas. Scribner & Sons).
" " " Ancient Records of Egypt: Hist. Documents 4 vols. Chicago 1906
(University of Chicago Press).
Conder, F.R. and C.R. A Handbook to the Bible. London and New York.
Encyclopaedia Britannica. 11th Ed. Cambridge, Engl. 1910-11 Articles: Babylonia
and Assyria, Babylonian Relig. and Laws, Hebrew
langu., liter. and relig., Jews, Semitic Languages, etc.
Eusebii Pamphili Chronicorum Libri Duo. Edidit A. Schoene, 2 vol. Berolini 1875.
Fries, S.A. Gamla och Nya Testamentets Religion (Old and New Testament
Religion). Stockholm 1912.
Gesenius, Wilhelm, Hebraische Grammatik, herausgegeben von E. Rödiger, 19^{te} Aufl.
Leipzig, 1862.
Harper, William R., Elements of Hebrew, Chicago-1886.
Harper, Robert F. Code of Hammurabi, Translit and Translat... 1904.
Hastings, James. Dictionary of the Bible, New York.. 1909.
Hebrew-English Lexicon, based on Leopold's Lex. Manuale, London (Sam. Bagster).
Hilprecht, H.W., Explorations in Bible Lands. Phila. 1903 (Holman).
Jahn, J.,... Biblical Archaeology, Transl. by Thom. C. Upham, New York 1853.
Josephus, Flavius, Antiquities and Wars of the Jews, Transl. by W. Whiston, Phila.
Kent, Charles Foster, The Student's Old Testament, Vol. 1, New York.. 1904.
King, Leonard W. A History of Babylon. London, 1915.
" " " A History of Sumer and Akkad, London, 1910.
Layard, Austen H. Nineveh and Its Remains, London, 1867.
Lenormant, Francois... The Beginnings of History, New York, 1899.
Lyon, D.G... An Assyrian Manual, New York, 1892.
Maspero, G... The Dawn of Civilization, Edit. by A.H. Sayce, 4th Ed. New
York, 1901.
Maspero, G..... The Struggle of the Nations, Edit. by A. H. Sayce, New York,
1897.
Paton, Lewis Bayles, The Early History of Syria and Palestine, New York, 1901.
Petrie, W.M. Flinders, A History of Egypt, 3 Vols., 1, 2, New York, 1899, 3, London,
1905.
Ragozin, Zenaide A.. The Story of Chaldea, London and New York, 1896.
Rogers, Robert William, A History of Babylonia and Assyria, 2 vols. New York
and Cincinnati 1915 (Abingd.
Press).
Rydberg, Viktor.. Jehova- Tjänsten hos Hebreerna (The Jehovah- cult among the
Hebrews). Stockholm 1896.
Sayce, A.H..... Babylonians and Assyrians, Life and Customs, New York 1900.
" " " Records of the Past (New Series) 6 vols. London 1888-1892.
" " " The Races of the Old Testament, Oxford and New York 1891.
Smith, George .. The History of Babylonia, Edit. and Revis. by A.H. Sayce
London 1895.
" " Assyria, Edit. and Revis. by A.H. Sayce, London, 1897.
Smith, Philip .. An Ancient History, 3 vols. London, 1868.
Smith, William.. A Dictionary of the Bible.
Walles, J. Det Iraelitiska Folkets Uppkomst (The Rise of the Nation of
Israel). Uppsala, 1904.
Winckler, Hugo.. The History of Babylonia and Assyria, Transl. by J. A. Craig,
New York, 1907.
Young, Robert... Analytical Concordance to the Bible, New York, 1893.