> Should God create another Eve, and I
> Another rib afford, yet loss of thee
> Would never from my heart. No, no! I feel
> The link of nature draw me: flesh of flesh,
> Bone of my bone thou art; and from thy state
> Mine never shall be parted, bliss or woe."[1]

Adam is never so near to our hearts, never so human and lovable, as in this outburst. We are tempted to exclaim with Eve—

> "O glorious trial of exceeding love,
> . . . declaring thee resolved
> (Rather than death, or aught than death more dread
> Shall separate us, linked in love so dear)
> To undergo with me one guilt, one crime!"

Nay, we are reminded—though at a distance—of the words of one greater than Adam, words of which Lord Bacon writes—

"If a man . . . have St. Paul's perfection, that he would wish to be an anathema from Christ for the salvation of his brethren, it shows much of a divine nature, and a kind of conformity with Christ Himself."[2]

But Milton has nothing but condemnation for a chivalry which he understands but does not share, and characteristically makes Adam's devotion to a woman an aggravation of his offence. Can we wonder that no natural goodness in Satan can serve even to palliate in the faintest degree the heinousness of his crime?

Yet it is Milton himself who is responsible for our pity. He might have given us a Mephistopheles, or Dante's "Worm of Sin," and so precluded our sympathy; but the poet in him has proved stronger than the theologian, and, fascinated by his own conception of the slow ruin of a soul, he has invested his creation with a passion and a pathos which are only enhanced by his words of condemnation. He may express what abhorrence he will, but his Satan lives in our memories, not as the guileful serpent, but as the exiled chief, splendid in ruin, from whom the tears that his own fate could not provoke, burst forth irresistibly as he looks upon the partners of his crime—

> "Millions of spirits for his fault amerced
> Of Heaven, and from eternal splendours flung
> For his revolt; yet faithful how they stood,
> Their glory withered."[3]

The exile may be cunning and cruel, but both cunning and cruelty are rooted in despair; and it is the despair, painted as only Milton can paint it, that impresses us most. Let him take his leave of us in words—more pathetic perhaps than any that have been quoted—from *Paradise Regained*—

> "All hope is lost
> Of my reception into grace: what worse?
> For where no hope is left is left no fear.
> If there be worse, the expectation more
> Of worse torments me than the feeling can.
> *I would be at the worst; worst is my port,*
> *My harbour, and my ultimate repose.*"[4]

[1] *P.L.* ix. 908-916.

[2] Bacon's *Essays:* "On Goodness, or Goodness of Nature."

[3] *P.L.* i. 609-612.

[4] *P.R.* iii. 204-210.

Some Elements in the Babylonian Religion and their Comparative Relationship to Judaism.

By W. St. Chad Boscawen, F.R.H.S.

Jewish history is inseparably bound up with the Jewish religion; the gradual development of the one synchronises with the other. The history of the Hebrew people no longer stands alone, but has become absorbed into the broad arena of Oriental history, and its veracity is now attested by numerous confirmations from the histories of Egypt, Assyria, and Chaldea. Recent research has removed the Hebrew race from that abnormal position into which the irrefragable association between their history and religion had forced them. A people with a mission, the people of a promise, they had come to be regarded by many as fenced about with a divine favour which removed them from the ordinary field of history, and forbade the study of their national life being conducted by the ordinary field of historical development. This fence is now removed, and the people—with the Hebrew historical literature—become a part, a most important part, of the great mass of material out of which we reconstruct the early chapters of the world's history. The removal of this motto of

noli me tangere, which had long stood over the storehouse of Hebrew literature and the free submission to critical examination, has not produced those results which many foretold—the destruction of the authenticity of Scripture history. Face to face with the contemporary records of the great empires of the East, with histories in cuneiform and hieroglyphics, the roll of Israel's story sinks into no dark shadow of falsehood, but shines bright with the light of historic truth. If fear was expressed as to the result of the critical study of Hebrew history, with how much more opposition did the student, who proposed to study her religion in the light of the comparative religion. This age has well been called the age of the comparative sciences. Comparative philology was followed by comparative mythology, and this in turn by the broader study of comparative religion. The intimate association between religion and national life could not be broken, and when once the study of the latter commenced, the examination of the former must follow. The admission of the Hebrew people into the band of nations of the East who made the early chapters of the world's story, the recognition of her ethnic and linguistic affinity with the great civilisations of the Tigro-Euphrates valley, at once subjected her religion, as it had her history, to comparison with the creeds of Assyria and Babylonia. The discovery that the sages of Chaldea had legends of the creation and the Deluge which resembled, not only in general outline, but in the minutest detail those recorded in the Hebrew writings, demanded this comparison. Still more important was the discovery of the close affinity between the languages of the Semites of Mesopotamia and the Hebrew people. Here was a vast religious literature of psalms, hymns, and prayers, written in a tongue the sister, if not the parent, of the Hebrew. Minute comparison now became indeed a real possibility—not a comparison of poetic similarities or correspondence of pious thoughts, but a real critical analysis by which we could compare the innermost thoughts of the singers of Israel and the bards of primitive Chaldea. An affinity of races, of language, of religious life, made this study one which could be conducted on true scientific grounds, and therefore the more productive of true results. It was a study even more likely to be productive of valuable results than the comparison of the sacred literatures of the Aryans and the Iranians, which had been the foundation of the science of comparative mythology. It was a comparison which went to the birth-springs of three creeds, Judaism, Christianity, Islam, and its results were of vital importance to each. It must be moreover remembered that Babylonia was the scene of the two most important events in the national and religious life of the Hebrew people. It was from Ur of the Chaldees, from amid the Semites of Babylonia, that Abram had gone forth rich in promise to the land which Yaveh had given him. It was the cradle of the Hebrew nation. Sixteen centuries after, it became the dwelling-place of the flower of the race. It was by the waters of Babylon that Israel learned that bitter lesson which produced her purification, and sent her forth a new people, "purified in heart, and zealous for the Lord." It was the fiery trial of the Captivity that produced the true Hebrew nationalism—an immortal nationalism. The comparisons which I propose to make in this paper may be divided into two classes, those which relate to the dawn of Judaism, the time when Abram was among his own people in Ur of the Chaldees, and those which produced the Hebrew *renaissance*.

The cradle land of the Semite, whether in Central Arabia or on the lower waters of the Euphrates, as some think, was a land of pasturage, and of flocks and herds. At an early period he had entered the land of Chaldea. To the wandering herdsman coming with weary steps from the sun-parched plains of the high lands of Arabia, the fertile fields and rich gardens of Chaldea—the strange walled cities and armed men—must have seemed like another world, and little wonder that they called Chaldea the "garden of God," and placed beside its life-giving streams "the earthly paradise." How early this infiltration of the Semites into Chaldea began we cannot tell, but it must have been in very remote ages, long before the fourth millennium. The inscriptions of Sargon of Agade, and his son, Naram-Sin, date back to B.C. 3800, but they indicate a long association prior to this with the older Akkadian population. The Semites had borrowed the cuneiform writing, and adapted its syllabary to their tongue; already they had established a dynasty on the throne, and the armies of Sargon and Naram-Sin had spread their raids as far as the peninsula of Sinai in the south, and the land of the Amurri or Amorite in the north. But even the contact with the high culture of the Akkadians had not obliterated the old love

of desert life, and the religious literature of this age still sings of the tent and the sheepfold. Ur of the Chaldees was the birthplace of Abram, and, situated on the west bank of the Euphrates, it formed the outpost to the desert, and was in all probability one of the first settlements of the Semites. The Suti or Bedouin of those days, like their modern representatives, had settled under its walls, and when not strong enough to rob, had soon drifted into trade, and the earliest documents of these people were the memoranda of the market. Any religious document therefore from this site is of particular value, and such we fortunately possess. It is a hymn to the moon-god Sin, the local god of Ur, and who was especially the god of the early Semitic Babylonians. The following extract will show its remarkable character :—

"Lord, the ordainer of the laws of heaven and earth, whose command changes not,
Thou holdest the lightning and rains—protector of all living things; there is no god that hath fathomed thy fulness.
In heaven who is supreme? Thou alone art supreme.
On earth who is supreme? Thou alone art supreme.
As for thee, thy word is made known in heaven, and the angels bow their faces.
As for thee, thy word is made known on earth, and the spirits of earth kiss the ground.
As for thee, thy word is spread on high like the wind, and pasturage and watering place are refreshed.
As for thee, thy word is established on earth, and the herb grows green.
As for thee, thy word is seen in the lair and the shepherd's hut, and all living things it increases.
As for thee, thy word hath created law and justice, whereby mankind has established law.
As for thee, thy word is as the far-off heaven and the hidden parts of the earth, which no man knoweth.
As for thee, who can learn thy law, who can explain it?"

Here we have indeed a remarkable fragment, coming as it does from the dawn of Semitic religion. Here we have a god whose theophany is "the lightning and the rain," the god of the storm. It is the theophany of the Yaveh of Sinai. To this we may compare the words of the "Song of Deborah," an undoubted old fragment—

"O Yaveh, when Thou wentest out of Seir,
When Thou marchedst out of the field of Edom,
The earth trembled, and the heavens dropped,
The clouds also dropped water;
That Sinai . . . at the sight of Yaveh,
At the sight of Yaveh, the god of Israel."

In another fragment the "Blessing of Moses" (Deut. xxxiii. 2), there is a similar association. "From the south side the fire shines." So also in Ps. lxviii. 8: "The earth shook, the heavens also dropped at the presence of God." Here we have exactly the same theophany attributed to the god of Sinai as that which is attributed to the moon-god of Ur. This association becomes all the more remarkable when the name of "Sin," the moon-god of the Semites of Babylonia and of the pre-Islamic Arabs of Hymar, becomes clearly an element in the name of Sinai, the word evidently being a locative derivative from this root "Sin," the "Bright." But Sinai was the mountain of the law, the Torah. Was the sanctity of Sinai due to the giving of the law? The answer, I think, is negative. The manifestation of the Divinity in the burning bush takes place upon already holy ground, that which was tabooed, and therefore the command, "Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground." It is most manifest from the statements in the Pentateuch and other portions of the Old Testament that the holiness of Sinai is due not to the giving of the law, but that the law is associated with Sinai on account of its prior sanctity. Sinai is the sacred mount of the old Semitic moon-god, and this sanctity remained until quite late, as evinced by the inscriptions of Christians, Jews, and Pagans, and it was in this district that Nilus found the Saracens, whose customs are most illustrative of the pre-Semitic life. Their worship seems also to have had a strong tendency to moon-worship, for Nilus's own son, Theodulus, when a captive in the hands of these barbarians, only escaped sacrifice by accident; that on the appointed morning his captors did not awake until after sunrise, and so the lawful hour was past. Still more startling, however, is the direct association of the old Semitic god with the giving of laws. "The ordainer of the laws (*tereti*) of heaven and earth," "thy word (*amat*) hath created law and justice," "who can learn thy law, who can explain it?" These are phrases which admit of no other explanation than the association of this Sinaitic god with the law. Now this word *tertu*, from *aru*, "to order," is the exact equivalent of the Hebrew *torah*, thus directly completing the correspondence. The value of this remarkable passage may be supplemented by some historical facts. Both Sargon of Agade or Akkad, and

Naram-Sin, his son, both old royal heroes of the Semites of Babylonia, pride themselves on their conquest of Sinai. It is evidently regarded as a sacred duty, a holy war. To the Egyptians, Sinai was the holy land of Athor; and there is plainly a clear indication of its being a holy centre—a holy mountain—to the tribes of Arabia and Chaldea, as it became afterwards to the Hebrews.

The old desert life of the Semites is fully represented in this remarkable fragment. It is the moon-god who by his *word* (*amat*) calls into life the verdure, fills the pasturage and watering-places. By his will the flocks and herds are increased. Here, then, we have the life of the patriarchal age, the life which we see in the times of Jacob and Laban. It is this love of the pastoral nomad life which marks the early books of the Old Testament, and it is doubly important to find it here.

In restoring the life of an ancient people through the medium of their sacred books, nothing is so valuable as the conception they form of the future state, which is usually an idealised form of the earthly life. We get another example of this early pastoral age in hymns. Here a man is sick with fever, and the magical prayer is, "May they give health to the body of the sick man. On the butter which is brought from the pure stall, and the milk which is brought from the pure sheep-cote,—on the pure butter lay a spell. May the man, the son of his god, recover. May the man be bright and pure as the butter; may he be white as this milk." Heaven to these nomads was a land flowing with milk and honey, whence the goddess brings to the sick butter and milk in "a lordly dish." It is this simplicity of life which we find in the older hymns, before Akkadian polytheism had obliterated it, which gives us the groundwork of Semitic culture. Out of this fragment there rises a more important subject. Man is described as "the son of his god." The essential basis of Semitic life was the *clan* or *gens;* the father was the head, and above him was the father of all, *the god*. The tribe were the offspring of the tribal god, and it was to him that they were bound with all the ties of filial attachment. It is the remarkable conception of the "fatherhood of god" which forms one of the most beautiful features of the sacred literature of Babylonia. In no ancient literature, except that of Israel, do we find so high an ethical conception of the relation of man to his god, or the true nature of sin as in this religion of Babylonia. In most religions of the ancient world sin is associated with pain, but to the Babylonian as to the Hebrew psalmist it is a moral alienation from God—in fact, a rupture of the filial relationship.

It is this conception which has produced one of the most interesting portions of the literature, the Penitential Psalms; a series of religious documents which are only to be compared with Hebrew literature. Indeed, this comparison is the more striking when we note the name by which they are called. The series is termed *Sigu*, which is explained as a "cry of lamentation," the exact equivalent of the Hebrew *Shig-ga-ion* or *Shig-io-noth*, titles applied to the curiously penitential literature of the seventh Psalm, and also the third chapter of Habakkuk. In this section of the Babylonian literature, we get the most pure Semitic thought. These psalms have been called "Akkadian Penitential Psalms," but this is an error; the Akkadian version is a translation of the older Semitic, not the original, as shown by the use of Semitic words in the translation where the writer has been unable to hit the sense. Of the high religious tone of those ancient works, there can be no doubt, as shown by the following example:—

> "Mankind is made to wander, there is none that knoweth.
> Mankind, as many as are called by name, what do they know?
> Whether it be good or ill there is none that knoweth.
> O lord! destroy not thy servant.
> When cast into the waters of the abyss take his hand.
> The sins I have sinned turn to a blessing.
> The transgressions I have committed may the wind carry away.
> Strip off my many wickednesses as a garment.
> Oh, my god, seven times seven are my transgressions, forgive my sins.
> May thy heart be appeased as the heart of a mother who has borne children.
> As a mother who has borne children, as a father who has begotten them, may it be appeased."

Or another example, even more striking in its Hebrew character, may be quoted—

> "In lamentation is he seated, in cries of anguish and trouble of heart, in evil weeping, in evil lamentation.
> Like doves does he mourn bitterly night and day;
> To his merciful god like a heifer he roars.

> Painful lamentation does he raise.
> Before his god he bows down his face in prayer.
> He weeps as he draws near; he holds not back."

Here we have a most Hebraic tone of penitential thought, as we may compare Isa. xxxviii. 14, "I did mourn as a dove," also Isa. lix. 11, "I did mourn as a dove; mine eyes fail with looking upward: O Lord, I am oppressed; be Thou my surety." So also, in the most Assyrian of the Hebrew prophets, Nahum, we read: "Her handmaids mourn as with the voice of doves tabering upon their breasts." It is this conception of the severance of the son from the father which so marks all these penitential psalms of Babylonia. Indeed, these ancient documents serve to bring out more clearly the true theory of Semitic perfectionism, a "walking with God." It is this that we find in the life of Enoch who walked with God—an expression which may be illustrated by the Assyrian expression for perfect agreement, "foot and foot," or "step and step." It was this trusting, filial relationship which constituted the perfect life rewarded, not by death, but by "a going to God," as in the case of Enoch or the Chaldean Noah, or the most typical example of the pure Semitic propheticism—Elijah, whose end was an absorption into the immortal. It is this placing of the "god" in *loco parentis* that is one of the most beautiful features of these old documents of the Semites of Babylonia. Let me take another feature of this relationship! When the kings of Babylonia presented a statue to the temple of a god, they always presented a full set of robes with it. Why? When the king went into the temple to pray, he took the robe from his own shoulders and placed it on the statue, taking that of the statue and placing it on his own shoulders. As Nebuchadnezzar says in one of his inscriptions, "When I had clothed myself, then Merodach, my lord, loved me." Here we have an interesting illustration of a custom familiar to us in Hebrew records, but perhaps not as fully recognised as it might be. We have a very early trace of this in Hebrew history, as in the case of David and Jonathan. In 2 Sam. i. 18, we have a record of a covenant of clothes. "Then Jonathan and David made a covenant, because he loved him as his own soul. Then Jonathan stripped himself of the robe that was upon him and gave it to David, and his garments even to his sword, and to his bow and to his girdle." It is the covenant of clothes, whereby the parties became bound to one another, which is the groundwork of many beautiful incidents in Hebrew history. It explains the rending of garments as a sigh of grief; it illustrates, also, the transference of the prophetic mission from Elijah to Elisha by the mantle of the prophet.

It is the intimate relationship—personal, tribal, and latterly national—between the god and his people which is a marked feature of Semitic, Babylonian, and Hebrew thought. But, as I have already said, religious progress symchronises with national progress. Monotheism is either tribal or national. The monotheism of Israel was an evanescent feature until true nationalism arose after the Captivity. A people who were prone at any moment to turn to the worship of Baal and Ashtaroth, who had no religious solidarity, return from the Captivity of not much more than half a century a people united in national aspirations and religious fervour. The *raison d'être* of Judaism had been recognised; the "law of Yaveh," becomes no longer a mere code, it is the "vital element of Judaism"—all in all. It is this common *bund* which centuries of persecution—the "sword penetrating into the very heart"—has been unable to sever. It is this association with the national god through his law which is so important a feature in Judaism, but also in the religion and history of Babylonia. In this dawn of nationalism the comparison with Babylonia is most striking. In the childhood of Israel, David was proclaimed king in Hebron. The Tell el-Amarna tablets prove to us that Hebron was the old civil capital of the tribes of Southern Palestine. Here in the "city of the four," Kirjath-Arba, the old *verbundung* of Southern Palestine tribes had met. But the sacred city was even then Jerusalem. Here the priest kings ruled by the "oracle of the great king"—like Melchizedek, the priest of the Most High. Not hereditary rulers, as Abditaba says in his letters, "Not from my father or my mother am I ruler, but from the oracle of the great king." By the taking of Jerusalem the civil and religious centres were united, and we can well realise the words of the, to my mind, most Davidic of the Psalms, the fifteenth. Here we have an outburst of pious joy as Israel, through David, constitutes itself the *client* of Yaveh: "Lord, who shall sojourn in Thy tent; who shall dwell in Thy holy hill?" It is this establishment of Israel as the *gerim* or

clients of Yaveh upon the hill already sacred as a temple site in Canaanite times that first centralises religious and civil authority in the land. Just as the Arabs to this day style the dweller in Mecca beside the Caaba *jār Allāh* "the client of Allah," so now the new kingdom becomes the *protégé* of Yaveh. So it was in Babylonia in B.C. 2200, the powerful King Khammurabi welded all the old kingdoms of Babylonia into one, and centralised the rule in Babylon. With this centralisation, Merodach, the god of Babylonia, became the national god. Babylon becomes now his city, the Babylonians his chosen people, their wars his wars, and he becomes an acting factor in their life. He now becomes *the* god, *primus inter pares.* This may be illustrated by the hymns of this age—

"Thou art the king of the land, the lord of the world.
Oh, first-born of Ea, omnipotent over all lands.
Oh, mighty lord of mankind, king of the universe,
God of gods.
The merciful one among the gods who raises the dead to life.
Merodach, king of heaven and earth.
King of Babylon and lord of Esagilla.
King of Ezida, lord of the house of life.
Heaven and earth are thine.
The whole circuit of heaven and earth is thine.
The incantation that gives life is thine.
The holy spell that gives life is thine.
Mankind, even the black heads, are thine.
All living souls that are called by name, that exist in the world, are thine."

From this period onward, Merodach occupies exactly the same position in regard to Babylonia that Yaveh does to Israel, in the writings of the prophetic age. Babylonia is "his chosen field," "his land." Babylonia is his chosen city, as Zion is that of Yaveh, and E-Saggil, "the house of the exalted head," his dwelling-place, where he is ever to be consulted.

The enemies of the nation are his enemies. This is notably shown in the case of the overthrow of the Medes. Prior to B.C. 549, the Medes, growing in power, had been a serious danger threatening the empire—as enemies of the empire they were enemies of the national god. It is he who was against them through his chosen instruments—

"Merodach, the great lord, caused Cyrus his little servant to go up against Astyages, the king of the Barbarians; he overthrew him; his city, Ecbatana, he captured, and his spoil he carried away."

Cyrus is spoken of here as "the lesser" servant of the national god, because he is doing his work; Nabonidus himself being the greater servant. Here Cyrus occupies exactly the same position that is assigned to him by Yaveh in the 44th chapter of Isaiah, where he is spoken of as "Cyrus, my shepherd." Kings and princes do his work in destroying these national foes; and he applies to these enemies the same epithets as the Hebrew god, *the unrighteous* (*la magari*) who shall be utterly swept off the face of the earth. He is a jealous god, and as such he brooks no interference with his sovereignty, this is most clearly illustrated in the case of the last of the Babylonian kings, Nabonidus. He was a vacillating ruler, caring rather for pleasure, and especially for antiquarian researches, than for State duties. In the valuable chronicle tablet of this period we read the oft-repeated phrase, "Bel came not forth," denoting that the annual processions of the gods were not celebrated. In addition to this neglect of the worship of the national god, the king attempted a bold reformation towards centralisation of religion, by gathering together in the temple of Merodach the statues of all the local gods. This naturally had a most serious effect on the priest caste. The priests of Bel Merodach were offended, and *ergo*, the god himself, at being associated with these local divinities; and the priests of the various local temples, many of them older than Babylon itself, were naturally incensed against the king, who deprived them of their local *palladia*. The action of the king naturally produced a religious revolution in the land. The king was against the god; he was no longer the *client* of Merodach. The Babylonians, like the Jews, were at this time looking to the same source for deliverance. Cyrus, the Persian, was hailed alike by Jew and Babylonian as the one who would restore religion and bring peace. It must be remembered that at this period, B.C. 538, there was a rich and powerful Jewish element in the population, and it is evident they took the popular side in the crisis. It is not, therefore, to be wondered at, that with these elements in his favour, Cyrus should enter city after city, and lastly, Babylon itself, without fighting. By Babylonian and Jew Cyrus was hailed as a Messiah. He freed the Babylonians from the eccentric rule of an unpopular king, and afforded to the Jews the prospect of deliverance. But he comes as the

servant of the national god. He is doing his work, avenging his honour. Thus he speaks of the conqueror—

"Merodach, the great lord, restorer of his people, beheld with joy the deeds of his vice-regent, who was righteous in hand and heart. To his city of Babylon he summoned him to march; like a friend and a comrade he went by his side; without fighting or battle, he caused him to enter Babylon. The lord god, who in his mercy raises the dead to life, and who benefits all men in trouble and prayer, has in favour drawn near to him and made mighty his name. Merodach, the great lord, freed the heart of his servant, whom the people of Babylon obey."

These passages are sufficient to show that Cyrus was welcomed by the Babylonians; and the short time in which he assumed and established here his new empire, proves the willingness of the people to submit to him. The policy of Cyrus, in thus recognising the religion of Babylon, in restoring the Jews, and becoming a prayerful servant of Nebo and Merodach, would seem to contradict the statements of Isa. lv. 1, where he is accredited with the most iconoclastic tenets; but his actions were only in perfect accordance with the subsequent action of Cambyses and Darius in Egypt, where the former conformed to the worship of Neit at Sais, and the latter to the adoration of Ammon, to whom he built a temple in the oasis of El Kargeh.

The great religious movements of this period have an intimate association with Judaism; and to the flower of the race, around whom they were taking place, cannot have been without a lesson. In them we can see some of the forces which produced the marvellous *renaissance* of Judaism. It must be remembered that the Captivity was no epoch of durance vile. It was, moreover, a Captivity tempered by every opportunity of social and religious intercourse, through the medium of a kindred tongue. Here the national temple was the centre of religion, as the second temple became to the Jews. The great temple was fed by the smaller local temples, which in a great measure corresponded to the post-Captivity institution of the synagogue. The great festivals corresponded to the Hebrew festivals almost day for day. In Nisan, the feast of the spring, or opening, varied from the eighth to the fifteenth of the month, according to the period of the equinox. In Tisri, there came the "harvest feast"; while the strange festival of "weeping and darkness," which occurred on the fifteenth Adar, and preceded "the day when the destinies of all men were forecast," bears a strange resemblance to Purim. How thoroughly henotheistic, if not monotheistic, the religion of Babylon was at this time may be seen from the prayer offered in the temple on the opening of the year—

"O Bel, who in his strength has no equal! O Bel, blessed sovereign, lord of the world, bestowing the favour of the great gods! The lord who in his glance has destroyed the strong. Lord of kings, light of mankind, establisher of trust! O Bel, thy sceptre is Babylon, thy crown is Borsippa! O lord of the world, light of the spirits of heaven, utterer of blessings, who is there whose mouth murmurs not of thy righteousness, or speaks not of thy glory, and celebrates not thy dominion? O lord of the world, who dwellest in the temple of light, reject not the hands raised to thee! Be merciful to thy city of Babylon, to E-Sagilla, thy temple, incline thy face, and grant the prayers of thy people the sons of Babylon.

Here is a prayer which at once marks Merodach as *the god* of Babylonia, standing in the same relation to the land and the people, the children of Babylon, that Yaveh did to Israel, or Chemosh to Moab. It is in this perfect organisation, the nationalising of religion, that we find one of the most powerful elements which affected the Hebrew people during their residence in Babylonia.

The Captivity was the true *renaissance* of the Jewish people. Broken into divers factions, with no common bond, no common aim, with a half-developed religion confined almost entirely to the school of the Jerusalem prophets—we find them returning from a short captivity of less than seventy years, a changed, a new people; zealous of the worship of a *national* god, impregnated with a national love and spirit, so deeply ingrained in their nature that the severest persecutions to which any body of people has ever been, and I am sorry to say still is, subjected, has failed to eradicate it from the hearts even of the poorest and weakest. Entering Babylon with an incomplete law, they emerge with a religious and secular code perfect in all its branches. These facts speak for themselves, and show the intimate relationship there is between the religion of Babylonia and Judaism, and how vastly profitable is the comparative study of the two systems.