

THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

No. 2—April, 1903.

I.

THE ALLEGED LEGALISM IN PAUL'S DOC- TRINE OF JUSTIFICATION.

COMPARISONS between the teaching of Paul and the teaching of Jesus are the fashion of the day. A purely historical and a practical motive combine to lend interest to these comparisons. Prompted by whichever motive, the problem sought to be solved by them is the continuity or non-continuity of the religious impulse which shaped the origin of Christianity. The historian asks: Were two distinct forces introduced, the one by Jesus, the other by Paul? Or must we say that, on the whole, Paul's work lay in the line of the further carrying out of the principle introduced by Christ? If the former, can we determine the exact relation of difference or perhaps even heterogeneity in which the two stood to each other? Can we trace the interaction between them in their subsequent development, the degree in which each contributed toward the final result, and the mission which in virtue of this final result Christianity has since then accomplished in the world? If the latter, can we point out the unity of fundamental principle in the variety of doctrinal formulation? Can we draw the lines which run from the centre posited by Jesus to the several points of the wide circumference along which we observe the versatile and comprehensive religious genius of Paul moving? To the practical mind, on the other hand, this same problem of continuity, or lack of continuity, appears of decisive importance for the attitude to be assumed toward the modern attempt to supplant the theology of the Reformation, so largely based on Paul, by a less elaborate, less speculative, more congenial, be-

BABYLON AND ISRAEL: A COMPARISON OF
THEIR LEADING IDEAS BASED UPON
THEIR VOCABULARIES.*

ON the 26th of January of this year, Prof. Friedrich Delitzsch, of Berlin University, delivered an address in the Sing-Akademie of Berlin on "Babylon and the Bible," on behalf of the German Society for the Exploration of Babylonian Antiquities. At the request of the Emperor the address was delivered again in the palace of Potsdam.

It is not too much to say that it has caused a sensation in Germany. The twelfth thousand has now been published, and the number of replies and the importance of the opponents have scarcely ever been surpassed.

Before I was aware of Prof. Delitzsch's address, it had been my intention to make my opening discourse upon the light thrown upon the Old Testament by the Babylonian monuments, as a kind of review of the new edition of Schrader's *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament*. This intention has been changed slightly by the reading of Prof. Delitzsch's dissertation and of the replies to it by Profs. Barth, Strack, König and Oettli-Greifswald; and I have determined to enlarge the scope of preparation by making a complete comparison of the vocabularies of the Hebrew and Babylonian and by comparing them in all important particulars with the vocabularies of the Syriac and Arabic languages. The results of this investigation I shall present to you under four heads: (1) Man and His Natural Surroundings; (2) Laws and Institutions; (3) Literature and Traditions; (4) Religious Ideas.

Before entering upon the statement of results, let me premise that there are four great groups of Semitic languages, which may be classified according to the time of their literary development; Babylonian, Hebrew, Aramaic and Arabic. Words which are of the same radicals, or of radicals which have

* This article was delivered as an address at the opening of the ninety-first session of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary at Princeton, September 18, 1902.

changed according to certain fixed rules (corresponding to Grimm's laws in Indo-European), and which in addition have the same, or a derived, or similar meaning, may be taken as having belonged to the primitive Semitic language; unless it can be shown historically or linguistically that one has taken over the root or the meaning of another. The language which varies most from the agreement found in the other three will have wandered farthest from the primitive Semitic, or will have severed connection first from the primitive family. The two languages which agree most closely will have continued the longest in the closest relations. Now, some philologists have taught that among these four groups, Babylonian and Hebrew are most closely allied in vocabulary, and some have insinuated that this close alliance implies the derivation of Hebrew ideas and vocabulary from the Babylonian.

In looking at the list of vocables used to express the same ideas in the different Semitic dialects, I was surprised to find that the current views of the relations of the different groups did not correspond with the facts. You will yourselves notice, when I come to make more detailed statements, that the Hebrew and Aramaic are much more similar in root and meaning than either is like the Babylonian, and although I have not finished my comparison with the Arabic along all the lines, it is my present conviction that the same will be found true of it—*i.e.*, that it is more closely connected with the Hebrew and Aramaic than with the Babylonian. I did not depend for this assertion on special lists of vocables. I have gone to the trouble of counting all the roots and vocables beginning with the letter *r* (one of the letters which change most infrequently in the Semitic dialects) which occur in Hebrew, Aramaic and Babylonian, up to the word רָבָּב, with the result that I find the agreements between the Hebrew and Aramaic to be fifty-six per cent., against twenty-nine per cent. between Hebrew and Babylonian.

My second premise is that the nations or races which predominate over the thought and persons of others, influence the ideas and language of the subject peoples in such a marked way as to leave no doubt of this influence in the mind of the student of language. If Babylonian influenced the Hebrew in the degree which some claim, we should expect to find that the specific Babylonian ideas, and these ideas as embodied in recognizable forms of words, have been adopted by the Hebrews. Let me illustrate and enforce this point.

If we open the Syriac chronicle of Joshua the Stylite at any part, we shall find that the vocabulary is marked by foreign words, mostly proper and official names and names of things.

These words determine for us the age of the chronicle, and also the breadth and depth and direction of the influence which was exerted upon the Edessene Syrians from without. In this book most of the proper names are Greek, Latin and Persian, as are also most of the names of government and military officials. The ecclesiastical officers have almost altogether Greek names: Greek also are the words *hostage*, *statue of the emperor*, *the military turtle*, *ark*, *granary*, *aqueduct*, *air*, *litre*, *corner*, *treasurer*, *price*, *public bath*, *basilica*, *xenodochium*, *park*, *eparchy*, *province*, *hamlet*, *paper*, *porch*, *public walk*, *lights*, *tapers*, *censers*, *candles*, *theatres*, *dancers*, *fools*, *lewd behavior*, *drinking cup*, *fight with wild beasts*, *clergy*, *stole*, *cabbage*, *mallows*, *dog's grass*, and others. Latin are *modius*, *nummus*, *dux*, *bucellatum*, *castrum*, *comes*, *legiones*, *ossa*, *pretorium* and *palatium*. Hebrew are *Hosanna*, *tebel*, *kabh*. The names of the months and perhaps some other words are Babylonian.

What is true of the chronicle of Joshua is true, also, of the Syriac Dictionary in general. Every word on page 18 of Brockelmann's *Syrian Dictionary* is Greek or Persian, and there is not a page of the whole dictionary which does not contain a foreign word. These words are mostly Greek and Persian, with a slight admixture of Latin, Arabic and even Sanscrit. When you look at MacLean's *Dictionary of Modern Syriac*, you will find that the character of the vocabulary has changed; the words are no longer predominantly Greek and Latin, but Turkish, Arabic and Kurdish. The Greek and Latin words have been largely driven out of popular usage. The whole history of the Syriac language for 1500 years thus illustrates the changes due to the dominance of foreign government and ideas.

What is true of Syriac in so great measure is true of other languages in greater or less degree. According to the late Dr. Samuel Kellogg, nine-tenths of the vocabulary of modern Persian are words of Arabic origin. Engelmann has a glossary of Spanish and Portuguese derived from the Arabic. Sanders has a German *Fremdwörterbuch* in two large volumes. The English language, while predominantly Anglo-Saxon, Latin and French, has traces of Celtic, Arabic, Spanish, Dutch, Greek, German, Hebrew and American-Indian; and, in short, of almost every language of the earth with whose people the English have been brought into contact.

Now the Hebrew, no less than other languages, was subject to this influx of new vocables under the influence of new ideas. It cannot be denied that some Hebrew words have been derived from the Egyptian. For example, כִּי, "kind," of the first

chapter of Genesis, seems to be certainly of Egyptian origin. There is no Semitic root that will account for it, and the Coptic word *μνε* has "genus," "species," as its ordinary meaning.

Again, we can scarcely believe that it is chance merely which caused the word **הֵיכָל**, "great house, palace or temple," to be used neither in the Pentateuch, Joshua, nor Judges. We can account best for its appearance in 1 Samuel, to denote the great house at Shiloh, through the influence of the great king, Tiglath Pileser I, who lived about 1100 B.C., and pushed his conquests and his influence as far as the Mediterranean. The same may be said of the word **פָּחָה**, "governor," which first occurs in 1 Kings x. 15; and of the word **סִנָּן**, "vice-priest" or "vice-governor," which was introduced into Biblical Aramaic and later Hebrew and corresponds to the Babylonian *shaknu*, "one who takes the place of another."

After these premises, we advance to the body of our discourse, and shall proceed, in the first place, to examine the vocabulary of the four great languages, as it affects man and his surroundings. The word for body, **פֶּגֶר**, occurs in all but Arabic; **נֶפֶשׁ** occurs in all; **נִשְׁמָה** in all but Babylonian; **רוּחַ**, in the good sense of *spirit*, in Hebrew, Arabic and Syriac; in the sense of *spook* in Babylonian. The following are the same in all: head, hair, beard, eye, flesh, nose, ear, heart, rib, tooth, tongue, hollow of the hand, lip. Hand, foot, leg and finger are the same in Hebrew, Arabic and Syriac, but differ in Babylonian. The word for skin is the same in Babylonian, Aramaic and Arabic, but differs in Hebrew. The word for thumb, or big toe, is the same in Hebrew, Arabic and Babylonian. The word for skull is the same in Hebrew and Babylonian.

The general word for clothing oneself, **לָבַשׁ**, is the same in all four languages, and each has derivatives from this root to denote articles of clothing. But this is the only verb common to the four: the Hebrew poetical word **עָטָה** being found, besides, in Syriac only.

The word for shoe and the verb for putting on shoes are the same in all but Arabic.

There is no common word for cap, or hat, trousers, stockings or coat. The nearest to a common word is **כְּרִי**, "shirt," though the kind of garment meant in Babylonian is doubtful, and in Arabic it means "veil."

The word **בַּיִת** for house is found in all four; and with a slight variation of meaning, **מִשְׁכָּן**, "tabernacle." Every house had

an opening, פֶּתַח, with the same name in all four; but Hebrew and Babylonian alone close it with a דֶּלֶת, and *l b* is found in Babylonian and Arabic alone, and is probably of non-Semitic origin. There is no common word for window or carpet.

The occupations of the men were farming and herding, the names for seed and feed being the same in all four languages. The word for garden is the same in all. The river that waters the garden is the same in all but Syriac, where the word occurs but with a different meaning. Tree is the same in all but Arabic, where the corresponding word means "stick." Vegetables, or greens, are the same in all except that the Arabic refers rather to grass for beasts. There is no common word for flower. The words for wheat and onion are the same in Hebrew, Arabic and Syriac; and they have a common word for barley in Hebrew and Syriac. A common word does not occur for smith. There is a word common to the Hebrew, Babylonian and Syriac which is used for smelting gold, silver and copper, and perhaps iron; and in Arabic a derivative of the same root means pure silver, copper or lead. The words for silver and lead (or tin) are common to all; iron to all but Arabic; gold varies. All the words for baking and cooking vary, the Babylonian having the same as the Hebrew and Syriac for "bake" or "cook," in general. They all used the same word for riding upon animals; and the word for chariot is the same in Hebrew, Syriac and Arabic. In Babylonian, it is formed from the same root, but with a different preformative. There is no common word for plough or plough-share.

The domestic animals owned by the primitive Semites were cattle, for which we have the common generic word בָּקָר and also common words for ox, steer, young cow and calf. Common to all, also, are the words for mule, ass, horse, sheep, ram, goat and dog. They all knew the gazelle, hare, wolf, bear, eagle or vulture, raven and fly; but not the fox and lion by the same name, though they all had names for both. The Hebrew and Babylonian had the same word for turtle-dove and the same word for one kind of owl; the Hebrew, Babylonian and Arabic denoted two different kinds of moth by the same words.*

Looking at the actions of man, we find that they had common words for lying down and for sleeping. The word for rising is the same in Hebrew, Arabic and Syriac; the words for standing and washing are the same in Hebrew, Arabic and Babylonian; and the word for sitting is the same in Hebrew, Syriac and Babylonian.

* See further in Delitzsch, *Assyrische Thiernamen*.

In regard to the senses, we find that "to smell" is the same in Hebrew, Arabic and Syriac; "to smell bad" is the same in Hebrew and Babylonian, and with the added sense of "evil, unfortunate," is the same in all four languages. טוב "to smell good" and "be good," is found in all four; as is also בְּשֵׂם, "to smell good, be pleasing, smile."

There is no common word for touch or taste.

They all have the same word, שָׁמַע, "to hear."

In regard to seeing, there is the greatest possible variety. The Hebrew רָאָה is the common word in Arabic also. The Hebrew poetical word חָזָה is the ordinary word in Syriac. Neither is found in Babylonian, but in their place we have *amāru*, which in the others means "to say" or "command," and *baru*, which in Hebrew and Syriac means "create."

"To eat" is the same in all, and שָׁקָה, "to drink," while שָׁתָה is found in all but Arabic. The words for water and the word שָׁכַר, "wine" (or an equivalent from the same root), are found in all. There is no common word for saying, speaking, reading, etc. The Hebrew אָמַר, "to say," is the same in Syriac, but in Arabic means "to command," and in Babylonian, "to see." דִּבֶּר, "to speak," is in this sense peculiar to the Hebrew; in Babylonian the ordinary words are *dabābu* and *zakāru*; in Arabic, كَلَّمَ and كَلَّمَ.

The word "to call" or "to read" is the same in Hebrew, Arabic and Syriac, but does not occur in Babylonian, where we have *nabu* instead. "To know" is the same in Hebrew, Syriac, Ethiopia and Babylonian, but Arabic has a different word. "To be wise" is the same in Hebrew, Arabic and Syriac; in Babylonian the word occurs but seldom, and means "to understand." "To remember" is the same in Hebrew, Arabic and Syriac, but differs in Babylonian.

Passing on from man in his physical make-up and surroundings, let us glance at the laws of the Babylonians and Hebrews, especially as they are illustrated by language. Here let me premise that many laws are the same substantially in all society, being necessary to the very constitution and existence of the same. Spencer has brought this out very clearly in his *Data of Ethics*, and the Apostle Paul endorses it in his doctrine of the law of God written in the heart.

The fact, therefore, that the Babylonians had the sixth, seventh and eighth commandments in much the same form as the Hebrews does not prove that the one nation derived these laws from the

other. Besides, the characteristic laws of the Ten Commandments are the first four and not the last six. Looking, then, at the last six commandments of the Decalogue philologically, what reason is there for supposing that the Hebrews derived these commandments from the Babylonians? None whatever, as the following facts will prove.

The nearest to a common word for "kill" in the Semitic languages is קָטַל. It occurs in all except the Babylonian. The only word from a root "to kill," which is the same in Babylonian and Hebrew, is *zibu*, i. e., זָבַח "sacrifice."* The nearest to a general word for stealing is גָּנַב, which occurs in all but Babylonian.† The Babylonian does not possess the Hebrew words for fornication and adultery. נָאֵף and זֹנֶה do not occur at all; and זָנָה has in Babylonian the meaning "to be angry." The Babylonian does not possess the characteristic word of the tenth commandment חָמַד, "to covet."

In a country where children were sold, or released from filial duties in accordance with the laws of adoption, we would not expect to find, nor do we find, the fifth commandment in its Old Testament sanctity.

As to the fourth commandment, the word *sabattu* certainly occurs in a calendar; but in this calendar not only the seventh, fourteenth, twenty-first and twenty-eighth days of the month are called *sabattu*, but also the nineteenth. Prof. Barth claims that it is doubtful whether this calendar of Sabbaths affects all the months of the years, or merely the intercalary months.‡

It is not stated in the calendar that any but the king and the physician were to keep these Sabbaths. The old opinion that this day is called in the Babylonian "a day of rest for the heart" is now generally given up; and the phrase *nûh libbi* is taken to mean "placating the heart of God." However, notice that this word occurs in Syriac and Arabic, as well as in Hebrew and Babylonian. It was, therefore, probably a primitive Semitic

* The verb from which this is derived had not been found, when Delitzsch published his Dictionary. Two examples have since come to light. They are both found in the Assurnasirpal inscription of I Raw. iii. 85 and 89. These are both doubtful examples, however, since it is necessary to give to the last sign the unusual reading *bi*, or *be*, instead of the usual reading *bat*, in order to read *azbe*, instead of *asbat*, as was formerly universally done.

† May not the primary meaning of this root be "to remove," "to lead at the side?" See Lane's Arabic Dictionary, *in loco*, and compare the Hebrew of Job xxi. 18, xxvii. 20.

‡ My colleague, Prof. Davis, informs me, however, that he has himself examined the original of this calendar, and that there is no doubt whatever that the Sabbath days are to be found in all the months of the year. My own reading of the published documents leads me to the same conclusion.

word. Notice, further, that both the verb שָׁבַת and the noun שַׁבָּת are of frequent occurrence in Hebrew; while only two places can be cited by Delitzsch in his dictionary in which the verb occurs, and both of these in syllabaries. In one of these places it is said to be the synonym of *gamáru*, "to complete, or destroy," and it is on this single word that he bases his opinion that *shabátu* means "feiern," "to keep a festival." Now, according to Delitzsch and Meissner, *gamáru* means "vollkommen machen," "fertig sein" (*i. e.*, to make perfect, be ready); and neither in their dictionaries gives it the meaning of "feiern." In his comment on the second syllabary Delitzsch does not even suggest a meaning for the verb.*

The noun is found in the calendar above mentioned. Delitzsch says truly that here the days are characterized as those on which no work could be done: "the king shall not change his coat, nor ascend his chariot, nor sacrifice, nor speak judgment, nor eat roast or boiled meat. Moreover, the physician should not lay his hand on the sick." Notice, none but the king and physician are here specifically mentioned as bound to observe this day. Notice, secondly, that not every seventh day, but the seventh, fourteenth, nineteenth, twenty-first and twenty-eighth days of the month are to be observed. Finally, applying the test of history to this law, we find that as a matter of fact the seventh, fourteenth, twenty-first and twenty-eighth days were not observed by Babylonians as days of cessation from labor.

Prof. Lotz examined over five hundred tablets, and came to this conclusion. I have extended this line of investigation so as to cover 2554 Babylonian contract tablets, with the following results: Of all the days in the month, the twenty-first enjoys the distinction of having had the most contracts written upon it, to wit, 180, or more than seven per cent.; the fourteenth also is above the average, having eighty-eight, where the average is eighty-five. The seventh and twenty-eighth have five-eighths and six-eighths of the average due to them, one having fifty-four and the other sixty-seven. The nineteenth alone shows up as a true day of rest. Only eight out of 2554 tablets are dated the nineteenth of the month, less than one-tenth per cent. of the average. This nineteenth was a fast rather than a feast day. Although a Sabbath, it was not a day of joy like the Hebrew Sabbath, but more like the day of atonement. In conclusion, we may sum up by saying

* He states simply that there is found "ein verbum *shabátu* in mannigfacher Anwendung auch K. 4359, Obv. 20-23." According to Meissner's Supplement, we should also compare ZA. 4274 and 829-18, 4159, Col. I, 24, where "Ud mit der Aussprache u = sha-bat-tum g^e-setzt wird."

worthy that neither **רָאָה נְבִיא** nor **חֹזֶה** occurs in Babylonian, although the root of the first named is found in common use. On the other hand, the Babylonian words for seer—*baru*, *sha'ilu*, *âshipu*, *âsû*, *mashmashu*, *mushshakku*, *shabru*, and *mûdê terte*—are not found in Hebrew. Beside this evidence from the language, we may place that from the historical documents recorded on the monuments. These show that the seers of Babylon neither claimed the high prerogatives nor executed the lofty functions of the mighty Hebrew prophets. The records of Babylon and Assyria fail to show a single writer, a single speaker, a single preacher of righteousness and holiness, let alone any one who can compare with an Elijah, an Amos, or an Isaiah.

But coming still more closely to the centre of the Hebrew religion, let us look at their words for priest and worship. The Hebrew knows but one word for priest, **כֹּהֵן**, and but one for a false priest, **קִטְר**—according to Baudissin, a word manifestly derived from the Aramaic.

The Arabic and the Aramaic agree with the Hebrew in the use of **כֹּהֵן**, though the two former may both have derived it from the last named. But the Babylonian employs neither of these words, though it has an almost unlimited variety of hitherto unclassified terms for different kinds of priests, such as *kalu*, *shangu*, *shalu*, *pashishu*, *shaknu*, *ramku*, *shangamachchu*, *lagaru*, *nisakku*, *shukkallu*, *machchu*, *surmachchu*, *surru*, and *musharbidu*. Not one of these names is ever found, in the sense of priest at least, in Hebrew, Aramaic or Arabic.

Nor is much more evidence of connection between the religious systems of the two peoples to be derived from their names for the offerings. Prof. Jastrow, in his most interesting and learned work on the religions of Babylonia and Assyria, gives the impression that here at least the Hebrews were largely influenced by the Babylonians.* But the fact that the same things are found in two religious systems is no proof that one system has derived this particular thing from the other. For notice, first, that wherever you have sacrifice you will almost certainly have distinctions between clean and unclean animals—that is, between those which are proper for sacrifice and those which are not proper. Secondly, you will almost always find some offerings daily or continuous, and others occasional or festal. And thirdly, these sacrifices will

* The people, he says, had but little share in sacrifices, and “in this respect the cult of the Hebrews, which has so many points in common with the Babylonian ritual as to justify the hypothesis that the details of sacrificial regulations in the priestly code are largely derived from the practice in Babylonian temples, was more democratic” (see *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 668).

be made to placate the gods for forgiveness of sins, or for confer-
ence of favor. Now, these and all other general characteristics
of sacrifice, which are found alike in the Hebrew and Babylonian
systems, will not prove that one of those systems derived from the
other. If the distinctions, names, seasons and purposes of the
sacrifices were the same, the argument would be strong and con-
vincing that one had either derived from the other, or that they had
sprung from a common source. Let us consider here the evidence
of the language. זבח, the word for something slaughtered, occurs
in Babylonian, though the verb has not yet been certainly found.
Both noun and verb are common in Hebrew, Arabic and Ara-
maic. קרב, the generic word for offering in Hebrew, Arabic and
Aramaic, and its derivative, קרבן, are found but seldom in
Babylonian.* The Babylonians recognized apparently a free-will
offering,† but they have no חטאת, or sin offering; no אשם, or
trespass offering; no נדר, or vow offering; no תודה, or thank
offering; no תרומה or תנופה, heave or wave offering; no מנחה,
or meal offering. Most of their sacrifices consist of libations of
oil, or water, or wine. The names of the sacrifices whose roots
are found in some form in both Hebrew and Babylonian are
עלה and נרבה, זבח, נסך. The names of the sacrifices in Hebrew
which are not found in Babylonian are נדר, אשם, חטאת, שלם,
תמיד and מנחה, תנופה, תרומה, תודה. The names of sacrifices
found in Babylonian and not in Hebrew are pirkêti, kutrinnu,
ginû, niķu, sarķu, mashshakku, sattukku and taklimu.

Their religious festivals, also, differed in name and, so far as
we know, in design. There is no חג, or pilgrim festival, among
the Babylonians, a word and a thing so familiar to the Hebrews
and the Arabs. There is no evidence of a feast of tabernacles,
nor of a day of atonement. It has lately been asserted, it is true,
that the word *pashâchu*, corresponding to the Hebrew פסח, has
been found in Babylonian as the name of a feast. To this I would
answer, (1) that the meaning of *pashâhu* does not suit any of the
meanings commonly attributed in the dictionaries and versions to
the Hebrew root פסח; (2) the transliteration of the Samekh in
Syriac and Arabic by Tsodhe would lead us to expect a similar letter

* Kurbannu, from כרב, "to be gracious," is met with in a sacrificial sense. Delitzsch in his dictionary gives no example of the religious usage of קרב; but Meissner in his "Supplement" gives two examples. One is from K. 168, Rs. 16, and reads *ina pân parakki ginû lukarrib*, "let him bring the offering before the adytum." The other is from Craig's *Religious Texts* and is used in connection with *zibi*, "sacrifices."

† They called this offering *nidbu*, or *nindabu*. It will be noted that both of these forms differ from the Hebrew, though the root is the same.

in Babylonian, unless, as is possible, both the Syriac and Arabic words are derived directly by borrowing from either the Hebrew or Greek.* Thirdly, even granting that *pashachu* is the name of a feast and that the פֶּשַׁח was originally the same, what does it prove? Simply that a feast, so called, was in existence before the Hebrews went out from Ur of the Chaldees. Or, perhaps, that the feast, the אֶרֶב, which they asked permission of Pharaoh to celebrate in the wilderness to Jehovah was a פֶּשַׁח. But it does not disprove that the festival of the Passover, as it was instituted by Moses and celebrated in later times, was in view of and in commemoration of the passing over of the angel of death and the salvation of the Israelites in Egypt. The *Pascha* of the Syrians and of the Arab Christians is in memory of the death of Jesus, not of the delivery of the Jews from Egypt. Its purpose is different. Its observances are different. And there is no more reason why Moses should not have changed the observance and purpose of an old festival of the primitive Semites while keeping the name, than there is for the Lord's not having changed the name of the Jewish Passover while changing its purpose and observance.

But I must pass on from the festivals, from the laws and institutions, and omitting the discussion of the literature and traditions of the Hebrews, we come next to the religious ideas *par excellence*.†

* You could scarcely find a more difficult root for which to determine the comparative Semitic equivalent than the Babylonian *pashâchu*. For Babylonian *sh* may correspond to Hebrew Samekh, Sin or Shin. The Hebrew Samekh may correspond to Arabic Sin, Shin or Sad; Hebrew Sin, to Arabic Sin or Shin; and Hebrew Shin, to Arabic Sin, Shin or Tha. Further, the Babylonian rough breathing represents four signs in Arabic; so that there might be sixteen different roots in Arabic, any one of which might correspond to the Babylonian *pashâchu*. As a matter of fact, ten roots are found in Arabic, any one of which might correspond to the Babylonian, but no one of which has a proper meaning. In like manner the Hebrew has four roots, aside from homonyms; but no one of these has a meaning equivalent to that of the verb *pashachu*, "to recuperate, or heal." Neither of the three Syriac roots which would phonetically correspond to the Babylonian *pashachu* has a corresponding meaning. The Syriac פֶּשַׁח "to be glad" cannot be phonetically connected with it, and besides the meaning is not the same. As far as I can make out, after examining all the words in the dictionaries the Syriac Tsodhe nowhere else represents a Babylonian *sh*. It is true that in this particular case, the Syriac Todhe stands for a Hebrew Samekh. Only once elsewhere does this occur, to wit, in the Hebrew פֶּשַׁח, "divination." Here, it is probable that one of the two languages took over the word from the other, since it is not found in either Babylonian or Arabic. As for פֶּשַׁח in Syriac, the same may have been the case; or, more probably, the Syrians have derived the word from the Greek πᾶσχα. There are four other words in Brockelmann's Syriac Dictionary derived from the Greek in which Sigma is transliterated by Tsodhe.

† Let me merely remark in passing, that Prof. Delitzsch's remarks on *Tiamat* do not commend themselves as philologically just. The root which will best account

On the doctrines of God, sin, grace, pardon, salvation, faith, the Messiah, the kingdom, what evidence is there that the Babylonians influenced the Hebrews? What does philology teach us? Of the Hebrew words for sin, none but the word חטא is found in Babylonian; and this is a primitive Semitic root. All the other Hebrew words for sin are absent from the Babylonian.* And on the other hand, all the other Babylonian words are absent from the Hebrew.† Of the words for grace, חַנּוּן and חַמּוּם are found in all four languages, but neither חֶסֶד nor רְצוֹן occurs even in root in Babylonian.‡

Of the words for pardon, only one occurs in a moral sense in Babylonian.§

for יהוים is found in Hebrew only. The verb יהוים can scarcely be a denominative verb, for that would most probably have the form יהוים. Besides, the form יהוים would be the ordinary Semitic form *taf'âl* or *tif'âl*.

* That is, עוֹן, רָשַׁע, פָּשַׁע, זָכָה, תְּהַלֵּה, זָכָה, נְלוּזָה.

† To wit, annu, arnu, egu, shertu.

‡ The latter is found with slight variations of form and meaning in both Syriac and Arabic. The former root means "to envy" in Arabic, and "to revile" in Syriac. According to Brockelmann, the uoun חֶסְדָּא in Syriac means not merely "ignominia," but "clementia."

§ These words are רָפָא, קָבַךְ, קָלַח, נָשָׂא, קָבַר, בָּטָה. All of these, except the last, occur in Babylonian, but not in a moral sense except קָבַר. The examples given in Zimmern's *Beitraege zur Kenntnis der Babylonischen Religion*, page 92, leave no room for doubt that this last verb is found in the Babylonian in the sense of atone. On account of the importance of this question, I shall translate a part of his evidence. "*Kuppuru* shows itself in all the places in which it occurs as a technical expression for specific action, which the *asipu* (i.e., the inchanter, or priest) performs on persons, as, for example, on the king and on the sick, and on lifeless objects, such as a house. The original meaning of *kapûru* seems to be 'to wash away,' which lies, also, at the basis of the Syriac קָבַר. Compare the legend of Eroskigal, line 82, Rev. 20: *dimtasa ikappar*, 'he wipes away their tears.' From this it comes to mean in the Piel, 'to blot out,' and as a special expression of the expiatory ritual, 'to expiate, to atone for' (sühnen). There can be no doubt that this *kuppuru* of the Babylonian expiatory ritual is the same as the קָבַר of the Old Testament, as a technical designation in the language of the priests for 'to atone for.'" The best example of this use that Zimmern gives is to be found in No. 26, col. II, lines 1-3, of his *Beiträge*. Zimmern transliterates as follows: (1) urizu tanakkis-ma sarra tu-kap-par arki-su (2) tak-pi-ra-a-ti eb-bi-e-ti sarra tudap-par (3) kima tak-pi-ra-a-ti tuq-te-it-tu-u ana hâhi tu-se-sa. This means: "A lamb shalt thou slaughter to atone for the king. Then shalt thou atone for the king with pure offerings. When thou hast finished the offerings, bring them out at the door." To these facts Zimmeru adds the following conjectures: "From factual grounds (aus sachlichen Gründen), it is scarcely thinkable that this same technical designation among the Babylonians and Hebrews rests upon an original relationship. Rather are we necessitated to accept here, also, a borrowing of the word on the part of the Hebrews, especially in its specific technical meaning. But such linguistic borrowing points further to a factual influencing." Prof. Zimmern claims further, in a note, that the Syriac derives the use of the word in the sense of atone either from the Hebrew or directly from the Babylonian; and that the Arabic, in

The great word that clears the guilty, צָרַק, is found in Babylonian only in one proper name and once in the Tel-el-Amarua letters.

The verb קָרַשׁ is found in Delitzsch only once, and its meaning is not defined. Two derivatives occur in the sense of *hierodoule*. The adjective *ḵuddushu* is found several times in the sense of *pure*. According to Meissner, the verb occurs once in the sense of purify.*

The word "saviour," so precious to us in its English form of Jesus, never presents itself on the monuments; nor does מִשַׁח, "to anoint," nor its derivative, מִשְׁחָה. Nor does the doctrine of salvation through a redeemer, nor of an anointed servant of God, appear on the tablets of Babylon. Nor is there any such thing as predictive prophecy, as distinguished from fortune-telling or soothsaying, nor a doctrine of the kingdom of God.

Not one of the usual Hebrew words for faith occurs in Babylonian, except חָסָה, "to flee for refuge," once or twice in its literal sense. In Babylonian the common words for "to trust" are *rahāṣu* and *takālu*, the latter occurring frequently in the noun form *tukultu*, "trust, reliance."†

like manner, derives from the Syriac. In another note, he affirms that קָפַר and *kuppuru* may also be formally connected, since in בְּרִית and תְּנִיחָה also the form speaks in favor of borrowing. One might be excused for asking how Dr. Zimmern can prove this latter statement. Are בְּבִית and שְׁבִית also derived from the Babylonian? Is not תְּנִיחָה of the same form as תְּנִיחָה? And is there not a sufficiently large number of nouns with prefixed Tau in Hebrew to justify the supposition, that these may be a residuum from primitive Semitic, without compelling us to the conclusion that they must have been taken over in form or in meaning, or in both, from the Babylonian? Further, the use of the Hebrew קָרַח, "to cut" in connection with בְּרִית, in conjunction with the facts with reference to the blood covenant, as narrated by Dr. Henry Clay Trumbull and Henry M. Stanley, would lead us to believe rather that בְּרִית was derived from, or connected with, קָרַח "to cut" than from *baru* "to see." Again, one would like to know what documentary evidence there is in proof of these various assertions as to derivation in the case of *kapāru*? Why could the need and the fact of atonement not have been a primitive idea among the Semites? It may be remarked, that in all the examples of the use of *kuppuru* given in the *Beiträge*, the verb governs the object, even when a person, in the accusative; whereas in Hebrew, the person for whom the atonement is made is always preceded by a preposition.

* To wit, in Nab. Bez., Col. I, 32: *tēbibtishu nḵaddishma*, seinen Glanz reinigte ich. It is found also in line 77 of the second *Shurpu* inscription published in Zimmern's *Beiträge*.

† In the four languages, the words for believe and trust may be thus arranged :

Hebrew.....	אָמֵן	[אָמַן, אָמַן]	תְּכַל	תְּכַל
Assyrian.....			רָחַן	תְּכַל
Syriac.....	אָמֵן	[אָמַן, אָמַן]	אָשַׁתַּר	תְּכַל
Biblical Aramaic.....	אָמֵן		רָחַן	
Arabic.....	אָמֵן	[אָמַן, אָמַן]	עָקַד	הַכֵּל

sign of the rough-breathing, and the He by the smooth-breathing sign, which is found here. But notice that whether Prof. Delitzsch or Prof. Barth be correct, it was the Babylonian which derived from the Hebrew and not the Hebrew from the Babylonian. For the Babylonian has neither the verb הָיָה , "to be," nor the verb חָיָה , "to live," nor any derivative of either. Their word "to live" is *balātu*, which we have preserved in our English Bibles in the proper name Merodach-Baladan. Their words for "to be" are *nabû* and *zakâru*, with the noun *shuma*, and *ishû* and *bashû*.^{*} So that if we take Delitzsch's interpretation of the signs as correct, we have the Hebrew name for God, Jehovah, existing in the time of Abraham. This would agree with the history of Abraham as recorded in Genesis, but would overthrow the long-held theory that the name Jehovah was first revealed to Moses at the burning bush. If the common interpretation of Ex. iii. 15, 16, and vi. 3 be given up, what might not happen to the divisive theories of the Pentateuch?

Let me call your attention, before I close, to a very important consideration in estimating the influence of ancient Babylon upon the children of Israel. The fact that the stories of the creation and the flood, the existence of angels and of a Sabbath, the use of sacrifices and of the name Jehovah, are found on the monuments to characterize the age of Abraham, does not invalidate the Scriptures, but rather confirms them. The remarkable thing is that we find so many of the names and institutions of Genesis and so few of Exodus and Leviticus. As you recall the testimony that I have presented to you, could you have possibly expected stronger confirmation of the close pre-Mosaic relations of Babylon and Israel and of the later confirmed and continuous estrangement and hostility between the two?

You will notice, too, that I have not shirked the difficult questions that have been raised concerning the relations existing between the ancient Hebrews and the Babylonians. I have collected a vast mass of further materials along every line of thought and action, which were known to the ancient Hebrews and Babylonians, so far as they have been gathered into their respective dictionaries. These I have in large measure classified, but time would forbid to mention more at this time. Nor do I deem it necessary, for I presume that it would not change your judgment on the merits of the case.

Before closing I cannot refrain from calling the attention of this audience to that long line of opposition between the religions and

^{*}The Arabic and Syriac have the same word as the Hebrew for "to live," and the Syriac, but not the Arabic, for "to be."

the policy of the Hebrews and Babylonians, which extends from the time when Abraham was called out of Ur of the Chaldees, to leave his country and his kindred, until in the Apocalypse and the later Jewish literature Babylon became the height and front of the offending against the kingdom of the God of Israel. All through that extended and extensive literature of the ancient Hebrews, all through those long annals of the Assyrians and Babylonians, wherever the Hebrews and the Assyrio-Babylonians were brought into contact, it was by way of opposition. The only exceptions were in the cases of some weakling, Jehovah-distrusting kings. But with these exceptions, prophets and kings and poets emphasize and reiterate the antagonism, essential and eternal, existing between the worship of Jehovah and the worship of the idols of Babylon. And when the children of Israel had been carried away to the rich plains of Babylon, so beautiful, so vast, was it as a Greek patriot to the Athens of his dreams, or a Scotsman to his "ain countrie?" Not thus. But they wept when "they remembered Zion." "How shall we sing the Lord's songs in a strange land?" Not thus does the Catholic pilgrim sing when he treads the streets of papal Rome and stands in awe beneath the dome of St. Peter's. Not thus does the Arab Hadji pray when he bows within the sacred precincts of the Kaaba. But thus has every Jew throughout the ages, the record of whose thoughts and feelings has been preserved to us; and thus does every child of Abraham, according to the promise, feel—that not to Babylon, the golden city, the mother of science and arts and commerce and of idolatry and harlotries and sorceries, do we look for the springs of our religion and the hope of our salvation, but to Jerusalem, the golden, the city of the great King.

PRINCETON.

ROBERT DICK WILSON.