Old Testament Introduction
The Bible’s Buried Secrets
Chapter 13, Philological Dating

<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/ancient/bibles-buried-secrets.html>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qalTJzk4kO0>

***About the Video***

What is for the most part an exact copy of the video script follows. There are a few places where individual speakers could neither be heard nor understood: for this we apologize. Every effort was made to be precise: there were just spots that defeated us. Since this is a quote in its entirety it seemed unnecessary to mark it with quotation marks. The notation for each speaker is tedious enough: Narrator, Reader, etc. If you discover bothersome errors, please reply to this website and point them out. You may verify the script more easily by starting to replay it where the “time” stamps indicate discussion begins. The second of the above links is free from advertising and thus easier to use.

***Overview***

We firmly believe that dating differences between oral tradition and written record cannot be established on the basis of grammar, spelling, syntax, and word nuances. Especially, with oral tradition, we have no way of knowing what such grammar, spelling, syntax, or word nuances might have been. For those who make such claims, we wish to see one specific example, with supporting evidence that reveals an unquestionable dating difference in the sequence necessary. We believe that provenance has the superior claim on reality. We close the paragraph with a quote from Emanuel Tov. Tov does not say that Torah reflects four interwoven and overlapping patterns.

“Each Scripture book reflects a different textual pattern.”[[1]](#endnote-1)

***Philology***

Philology (φιλολογία) in its classical sense is the compound word formed by φίλος + λόγος (philos + logos), as anyone can see. Philos is one of four Greek words for love (ἀγάπη, agάpē; ἔρως, eros, φίλος, philos, and στοργή, storgē´). We want and strive to classify these words along moral lines in English; yet, that is not the way Greeks thought. Storgē´ describes familial relationships, and is not necessarily a word for love: the idea of familial relationships may be much broader than a description of affections. Agape, eros, and philos can all run the gamut from the most sensual to the most sublime; each of them can discuss all the nitty-gritty of concrete sexuality, or be so lost in the abstract world of imagination as to be nearly unrecognizable. We cannot say that eros is about passion, when both agape, and philos may be equally sensual and passionate. Nor can we bend these Greek words into a modern discussion of genetic categories. The essential difference between agape, eros, and philos is that agape always has an other-centered emphasis or focus, even in expressing the most intimate sexuality; eros always has a self-centered emphasis or focus; while philos always has a mutuality, a reciprocity, a relationality, a fugal sense, an orchestral quality. Someone will be tempted to bend this idea of philos into quid pro quo (You scratch my back, I’ll scratch yours); yet, quid pro quo is not philos, it is invariably a dual exercise of twin eros, each seeking their own benefit. Philos is something quite different, so that the nature of the mutuality occurs at a much deeper level than the mere physical: which may be why friendship so readily captures the English-thinking mind. However, philos is not mere friendship either. Thinking like a Greek is hard work.

Logos answers to another trilogy: ethos, logos, and pathos. Ethos is the kinds of things we absorb from our parents, family, and culture; logos is what we learn from argument, books, classrooms, and education; pathos is the “school of hard knocks”. There is a world of difference between reading about a bus accident, and being actually thrown under a bus. So, we might try to invent Greek words for philos of ethos, or philos of pathos, in addition to our word of study, philology.

In a nutshell, classically speaking, philology is the love of all kinds of learning in which a mutually beneficial synergy develops between the thing learned and the learner: learning advances the learner; while the learner advances the learning with ever new creativity. As with all synergistic effort, growth is possible, so that the sum is greater than its parts: philology describes a growing productive relationship between learner and learning.

Modern philology has greatly distorted this classical picture: it has become the technical study of language and literature. We have every due respect and love for the legitimate and proper practices of philology, either historic or modern: for philology is a very old discipline.

However, none of these can possibly detect the chronological differences between the poetic Exodus 15:1-21, and the more prosaic circumstances described in Exodus 14, which provide the historic setting for “the Song of the Sea”; or the following circumstances so graphically and prosaically pictured in Exodus 15:22 and following. Indeed, the counterpoint between Israel’s praise and Israel’s griping makes no sense at all if the matrix of evidence is ripped to shreds to satisfy some scholarly whim. Granted, there may be minute, minor variations in grammar, spelling, syntax, and subtleties of meaning; yet, none of these can pinpoint a difference in dates.

We are deeply indebted to philology for the organization of grammar books, which explain the terrifying details of numerous word endings, which can count in the hundreds for a single word idea, identifying parts of speech and more. We are equally indebted for the analysis of syntax, the study of how words fit together in a sentence, or what emphasis is added by punctuation, and format. What would we do if spelling was never standardized? How would we cope without dictionaries and lexicons? What would be our grasp of knowledge or topics without concordances? In short, how would we ever reach across the boundaries of translation from one language to another, or even plumb the depths of our own native language without philology?

Yes, it is true that there are obvious differences between Chaucerian English (1400), Elizabethan English (1600) Shakespearian English (1600), King James English (1611), Victorian English (1900), and modern English. There are now even striking differences between American English, Australian English, British English, and Canadian English, which are rapidly becoming separate languages: all due to differences in grammar, spelling, syntax, and meanings. By getting us to agree to that which is obvious, we are sold the idea that we should agree about something that is not so obvious. We are not being asked to detect the chronological differences in language across centuries of change. We are not even being asked to find the chronological differences in language between Elizabeth, Shakespeare, and James. We are being asked to delve into the mind of Shakespeare himself, and draw the conclusion that while his tragedies do belong to 1600, his comedies are from a different century (say 1400, because everyone knows that comedy is older than tragedy… NOT), so that Shakespeare did not write his comedies at all.

Moreover, we are being invited to draw such absurd conclusions on the basis of the printed text in our hands: it cannot and must not be done. Even if we owned a Hebrew manuscript, hand lettered in block Aramaic, we would still be linguistic miles removed from cursively and sloppily rendered paleo-Hebrew; let alone Akkadian Cuneiform, which is an entirely different language; or whatever language Moses may have employed. Without that first Akkadian Cuneiform artifact in our possession, it is absurd to think that we can even begin such a Quixotic quest as philological dating.

Structuralism, more accurately higher criticism, that branch of philology which first suggested such dating was both possible and necessary, has now come up with the idea that the differences between “Romeo and Juliet” and “West Side Story” or even the inverse construct cannot be detected because (Boy + Girl) and (Boy’s Family – Girl’s Family) are the same in the first two cases; while (B – G) and (BF + GF) doesn’t change the picture.[[2]](#endnote-2) We are poking fun at the internal self-contradictions within philology. But, if philology cannot even detect the differences between “Romeo and Juliet” and “West Side Story”, how on earth are philologists to detect the differences between a prosaic and a poetic Moses, when both bear the identical provenance.

Nevertheless, we do appreciate the efforts of higher criticism in attempting to discover background context material. We do not appreciate the efforts of higher criticism in attempting to fabricate such background context material by rewriting the record.

Similarly, we appreciate the struggles involved in clarifying the structure of scripture from a wide variety of variant manuscripts. We do not appreciate the willful ignorance that refuses to see that Greek scholars have been engaged in this struggle for centuries, so that what we have has been handed onto us. Yet, we persist in trying to proceed with new structures as though we invented the struggle.[[3]](#endnote-3)

***Script***

Philological Dating (time 19:20)

Quote:

McCarter: The Hebrew Bible is a collection of literature written over about a thousand years.[[4]](#endnote-4) And as with any other language, Hebrew naturally changed quite a bit over those thousand years. The same would be true from English; I’m speaking English of the twenty-first century; and if I were living in Elizabethan times, the words I chose, the syntax I used would be quite different.[[5]](#endnote-5)

N: Scholars examine the Bible in its original Hebrew, in search of the most archaic language, and therefore the oldest passages. They find it in Exodus, the second book of the Bible.

R: “Pharaoh’s chariots and his army, He cast into the sea. His picked officers are drowned in the Red Sea.” — Exodus 15:4

N: This passage, known as the Song of the Sea,[[6]](#endnote-6) is the climactic scene of Exodus, the story of the Israelites in slavery in Egypt, and how Moses leads them to freedom. In all of the Bible, no single event is mentioned more times than the Exodus. With the development of ancient Hebrew script[[7]](#endnote-7) the Song of the Sea could have been written by 1000 BC, the time of Tappy’s alphabet. But, it was probably recited as a poem, long before the beginning of Hebrew writing.

Lawrence E. Stager:[[8]](#endnote-8) It is very likely that it was the kind of story told in poetic form that you might tell around the campfire, just as our songs are easier to remember generally than prose accounts; so we generally think that the poetry is orally passed on from one to another long before they commit things to writing.[[9]](#endnote-9)

Unquote.

***Philological Dating***

We got a hint from the closing statement of the previous chapter on the Tel Zayit Stone that a discussion of philological dating was headed our way. “To discover the most ancient text in the Bible, scholars examine the Hebrew spelling, grammar, and vocabulary.”

We discussed this topic in our previously published, Chapter 2, Dating. Select the button at:

https://www.swrktec.org/old-testament-introduction

Here are a few, more comprehensive, approaches:

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dating_methodologies_in_archaeology>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philology>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Structuralism#In_linguistics>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Structuralism#In_literary_theory_and_criticism>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Noam_Chomsky#Linguistic_theory>

Of the four methods, which we discussed (provenance, 14C, pottery, and philology), we insisted that philology, employed outside of the boundaries of its capability, is always the least accurate of dating methods.

***Provenance***

Provenance is the historical record of the object from A to Z. It is the chain of custody that preserves crime scenes. It is exactly as good or as bad as the character of the person or persons who maintained it, and the care with which they preserved it. The provenance of a liar is of little or no merit at all. The provenance of a careless person is worth even less. The provenance of an honest, careful observer may provide dates that are good within a year, a month, a day, an hour, a minute, a split second. Careful observers will apply all the care that is necessary for expressing the significant figures for the topic at hand. This is how we know the exact day of birth for some important ancient persons, while others are lost and must be given date estimates from surrounding circumstances. If the date is not explicitly stated in the provenance, then it is necessarily an estimate. The accuracy of that estimate is no better than the technology upon which it is based.

***Skills***

Philological dating, as we use the term here, involves far more than mere word analysis.[[10]](#endnote-10) Otherwise, anybody could grasp after philological solutions based on standardized and uniform printed texts. In this case anybody could be a philologist and we wouldn’t need experts. A philologist does not base the work on printed texts, for the most part. A philologist works from original artifacts, manuscripts, and monuments. Any caveman can discern the difference in printed editions between Judges, Joel, and Jonah.

Not everybody can look at two ancient manuscript copies of the same document and determine that one is older than the other: based on minor variations in grammar, spelling, and syntax; or based on which words are arcane or not.

***Arcane and Dead Language***

First of all, for the most part, decisions, about which grammars, spellings, syntaxes, and words are arcane, are very subjective when evaluating languages that are no longer in use.

We would find it impossible to date a modern prayer or song, poem or even some prose as arcane simply because it contained known arcane words: such as thy, thee, ye, thou, and the like. There is no rule that prohibits the use of such words. Similarly, there is no rule which prohibits a modern writer from using a Spenserian style of penmanship. Indeed, this is how calligraphers make their livelihood. If we cannot expect to distinguish two modern documents by such methods, where we know what arcane and Spenserian mean; how can we expect to apply them in a field where we must discover the rules as we go along.

You know that, thee and thou, are arcane words because you handle the English language every day of your life. The expression, “Nobody says that anymore,” is no mystery to you: you recognize the arcane automatically and immediately. You do not handle block Aramaic, paleo-Hebrew, and Akkadian Cuneiform every day, and neither does anybody else: the recognition of arcane grammar, spelling, syntax, and words in such languages is magnitudes more difficult than in one’s native language where base line understanding is always current. In documents that do not exist, such as the Akkadian Cuneiform text of Exodus, or some supposed oral tradition it is impossible to detect arcane use.

***Evidence***

In ancient documents, we must find enough uses of a thing to determine its grammar, spelling, syntax, and word meanings from use.[[11]](#endnote-11) We are unlikely to be lucky enough to stumble upon ancient grammars segregated by decades, centuries, or millennia. No ancient word lists or spellers are likely to come our way; no discussions of syntax, no lexicons either. Lexicons and grammars are relatively modern inventions and ancient ones are a rare archaeological find. In our case we thought ourselves extremely lucky to find a schoolboy’s alphabet slate from 1000, the Tel Zayit stone. We were not lucky enough to find his spelling book, or his first reader. When one comes across a word, or grammatical structure, or word sequence, such as S-V-O, subject-verb-object, that occurs hundreds or thousands of times, anybody can eventually figure out what it means: so definitions, rules of grammar, and common syntax can be formed. But when one comes across a word that is used once or twice, or a strange syntax[[12]](#endnote-12), or a totally foreign grammatical structure: for example, a third person, past tense, passive voice, imperative mood, verb; then the task becomes considerably more daunting.[[13]](#endnote-13)

The facts of the matter are that we are not deluged with tons of Noahic, Japhetic, Hamitic, Semitic post Flood literature: we have none biblical of which we are aware.[[14]](#endnote-14) We do not really know what happened at Babel; we know what it says biblically, but in terms of real experience we have nothing. We have highly developed Mesopotamian cuneiform, and Egyptian hieroglyphics, with the emergence of alphabetic writing. For Canaanite, Phoenician, and paleo-Hebrew we have a few modern grammars and lexicons written by truly prodigious people. To assert that we know enough about any of these to discern their dating based on observable arcane expression alone is a fool’s errand. In several cases, we don’t have enough material to establish basic meaning and grammar. If meaning has to be determined from cognate languages, then where is the sensitivity to nuance, which determines age? If a first translation can only be made after finding a parallel language monument, then where is the detail that can fix a date?

We are not being asked to believe that Judges, Joel, and Jonah are sourced from different dates based on internal markers and topical subject matter. We are being asked to believe that two chapters from the same document and the same scroll, with the same subject matter, are in fact time different; in spite of the fact that their provenance claims them to be time identical. Moreover, we are being asked to believe such a thing without tangible proof, with a paucity of supporting evidence from the period.

***Oral Tradition***

Now, if the claim were being made that the whole book of Genesis was based on oral tradition, we would still be skeptical about that view. While there is no surviving evidence, of which we are aware, that Moses received all or part of Genesis in written form; it stretches the boundaries of human credulity that such great empires could administer their taxes and vital statistics based on memory: if that were the case, then why did they write covenants.[[15]](#endnote-15) Genesis appears to be information that Moses is the first to ever record: but these documents we have just cited support the view that this cannot possibly be the case.

That being said, the claim that the Song of the Sea is an ancient oral tradition, predating Moses by thousands, hundreds, or even only decades of years is ludicrous. The Song of the Sea is not found in Genesis, where we might tolerate some oral tradition; it is found at Exodus 15, surrounded by a detailed provenance for its existence. To support such a claim, we must begin by assuming that the existing provenance is fabricated; then we must be willing to slash the existing evidence to threads, thus destroying it; finally, we must reconstruct both evidence and provenance to support a story of modern human make. But, who will be the authority that dictates such a reconstruction: what gives that “expert” the right to do so?

The point being made by *The Bible’s Buried Secrets* is that Moses, according to them, did not write Torah. They are building a foundation so that they can claim that a few Canaanites, not even many, left Egypt, perhaps as early as 1406 BC, stumbled on the name JHVH, wrote a song about it, the Song of the Sea, made the Canaanite Hit-Parade as early as 1200 BC, and some scribe(s) concocted a whole legendary false-history around the song, in order to explain it, in 950 BC, with later editions in 850, 600, and 500 BC. On top of that we are able to figure all of this out on the basis of grammar, spelling, syntax, and word nuances, which differ between the oral tradition and the written script; neither of which had ever been in writing before.[[16]](#endnote-16) Fantastic! Unbelievable! Inconceivable!

***Conclusion***

We firmly believe that dating differences between oral tradition and written record cannot be established on the basis of grammar, spelling, syntax, and word nuances. Especially, with oral tradition, we have no way of knowing what such grammar, spelling, syntax, or word nuances might have been. For those who make such claims, we wish to see one specific example, with supporting evidence that reveals an unquestionable dating difference in the sequence necessary. We believe that provenance has the superior claim on reality. We close with a quote from Emanuel Tov. Tov does not say that Torah reflects four interwoven and overlapping patterns.

“Each Scripture book reflects a different textual pattern.”[[17]](#endnote-17)

If Moses in fact wrote in Akkadian Cuneiform, how would philology ever make the transition across the translation boundary into paleo-Hebrew?

[[18]](#endnote-18)

1. <http://www.emanueltov.info/docs/papers/10.bibletexts.2008.pdf>, page 26 [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
2. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Structuralism>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Historical_criticism>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Semiotic_literary_criticism>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Noam_Chomsky> [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
3. As in dad to son, “Son, let’s have a serious talk about the facts of life.” “Sure, Dad, what did you want to know?” Each new generation wants to proceed in oblivion to whatever has gone before as thought the entire universe was their creation. [↑](#endnote-ref-3)
4. This would be true with a 1406-1366 BC writing for Torah, but it cannot be made true with a 950, 850, 600, and 500 BC dates for J, E, D, and P respectively. This would place the completion of the entire Old Testament at 50 AD; yet the Dead Sea Scroll evidence and the Septuagint both point to a 200 BC completion date. So either McCarter has made a tremendous error in judgment, or his belief in an early date for Torah is being twisted to support a theory in which he really does not believe. To support *The Bible’s Buried Secrets*, McCarter should have used a figure between 450 and 750 years. [↑](#endnote-ref-4)
5. McCarter’s statement is linguistically true as stated. Languages do obviously change with time. In the case of the “Song of the Sea” this fact is simply irrelevant and inapplicable. It cannot be made useful for comparing two documents written at the same time.

The argument could be made that the whole approach of *The Bible’s Buried Secrets* is the excessive application of Structuralism. *The Bible’s Buried Secrets* begins with a preconceived structure in which:

 a. Only archaeology expresses real history.

 b. The date of authorship cannot precede extant artifacts by more than a few years.

 c. The motivations for writing must consist of hidden agendas: thus the words have no real meaning, their only meaning is in present time.

 d. The form of books can be determined from careful analysis of key words or concepts: in this case J, E, D, and P.

 e. The origin of the books involved is not found in their chronology or their provenance, but in their key-word structure.

 f. The form is so important that the books must be rearranged to satisfy the form.

While other fields have abandoned Structuralism because of its many flaws; higher-critics in general, and *The Bible’s Buried Secrets* in particular cling to it.

As a scientific method Structuralism is untenable: it is simply wrong from a number of angles. We must be careful here to distinguish textual criticism, which is a partially legitimate attempt to analyze extant manuscripts to determine the original words used, its real historical form; rather than the illegitimate attempt to find its hidden form, which is the goal of higher criticism.

“When text has a significant political or religious influence (such as the reconstruction of Biblical texts), scholars have difficulty reaching objective conclusions.”

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philology#Textual>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Textual_criticism>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philology>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Synchrony_and_diachrony>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Structuralism>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Noam_Chomsky>

Structuralism is the very thing that is being lampooned in *Dead Poets Society*.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dead_Poets_Society> [↑](#endnote-ref-5)
6. The “Song of the Sea” is the, “claimed-to-be oldest literary text”, according to spelling, grammar, vocabulary, syntax, and the like. How do we analyze an orally transmitted poem, which no longer exists as an orally transmitted poem, for spelling, grammar, vocabulary, syntax, and the like? Where do we find the parallel orally transmitted examples that are necessary to discover word meanings, grammatical structure, and the like? Having found such a body of oral “literature” how do we go about discovering which words and structures are arcane and which are not arcane? We know how to do this with written documents from different eras. How do we do this with oral memories from the same era? This is what is impossible to accomplish. Specifically, which words have changed in time, and how? Which spellings? Which grammar? Which vocabulary? Which syntax? [↑](#endnote-ref-6)
7. Accurately speaking, this is paleo-Hebrew, not “ancient Hebrew script”. [↑](#endnote-ref-7)
8. Lawrence E. Stager (1943 …), professor of archaeology at Harvard: Works: Gezer, Tell el-Hesi, Ashkelon.

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lawrence_Stager> [↑](#endnote-ref-8)
9. Stager’s theorem is difficult to apply to any literary concept of Psalms. We would have to imagine troubadours sitting around the campfire for decades, while David or other hymnodists only recorded them later. This is especially difficult to apply with the genre called Todah. Todah are specifically written prayers, recording and giving thanks for an historic blessing from Yahweh, and officially laid up in the most holy place as part, the most important part, of a thank offering. The entire book of Jonah is a Todah: are we to imagine that it never really happened, simply because it is strange?

This is supposedly a separate poem preserved by oral tradition. Why would we not draw the same conclusion about Genesis 1, or any other number of poetic verses of Scripture? As a matter of fact, poetry as a class, tends to preserve matters of grammar and syntax far beyond their common use. People still use iambic pentameter in poetry and music. How can we avoid the possibility that the poetic form is ancient, while its content may very well be contemporary to the surrounding text? This is a nonsense conclusion. Poetry and hymnody cannot be dated by their peculiarities of grammar and syntax, especially when the pertinent documents are no longer or never were extant for scrutiny.

Such hypothesizers are only blowing smoke and hot air: they haven’t got a clue about the facts of their claims. By multiplying “experts” an idea is peddled or shilled that has no internal cohesiveness or substance, no evidence whatsoever, just the multiplication of opinions: as a consequence, it cannot possibly be true. We’ve been sold a “bill of goods”, worthless Brooklyn Bridge stock. “There is a new sucker born every minute.” — David Hannum, often falsely attributed to P. T. Barnum [↑](#endnote-ref-9)
10. We have used the term, philology, to embrace a whole set of parallel skills. Technically a philologist is a “word lover”, specializing only in words. In the broader sense this field involves a whole army of decipherers, epigraphers, grammarians, historians, lexicographers, linguistics experts (some, highly scientific), literary critics, philologists, phoneticians, experts in the technical analysis of writing media and surfaces, plus a host of others, all focused on the ancient artifacts at hand. Since these skills are often brought together in a single person, we are not surprised to find a number of polymaths working in the field.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philology> [↑](#endnote-ref-10)
11. <http://phoenicia.org/phoeniciandictionary.html>

<http://www.worldcat.org/title/comparative-lexicon-of-ugaritic-and-canaanite/oclc/213891910> [↑](#endnote-ref-11)
12. Syntax is a strange beast. We live in an age where computers demand perfect syntax: because a computer is not smart enough to reason beyond a syntactical error. One misplaced dot in a link sequence like ht[.]tp(s)://www.pdq.xyz turns the whole communication into meaningless gibberish.

In ancient artifacts, we are frequently dealing with objects that have no readily apparent syntax. This should not surprise us. Spoken language is the original, it works without rules for spelling: sounds are the only important thing. Grammar and syntax are expressed by intonation, pause, facial expression, and even body language. In the development of alphabetic writing the discovery and expression of these things was a process, and art. Early alphabets were frequently written without vowels: most likely because the importance of vowels went unrecognized until somebody tried to pronounce a text with only consonants. Artifacts are frequently written in all majuscule letters, with no word separation, no punctuation, and no accentuation. Where is the syntax in that? The expert has to figure it out as he goes along: syntax without syntax. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Behistun_Inscription> [↑](#endnote-ref-12)
13. In the English mindset it is simply impossible to construct an imperative that is not second person, present, indicative. Here are some modern attempts to formulate ancient grammars for Phoenician and Canaanite.

Note that Krahmalkov does not attempt to penetrate the maze (or fog) beyond 1200 BC. Note also that he classifies Phoenician as Punic. Also, we remind our readers that the Amarna letters are written in Akkadian cuneiform, not in Canaanite. We were unable to find a grammar for paleo-Hebrew. How would we construct a grammar of oral tradition, and what would it mean.

<http://www.brill.com/phoenician-punic-grammar>

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1357578?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents> [↑](#endnote-ref-13)
14. Perhaps the term Proto-Indo-European languages would have been more descriptive and more accurate scientifically.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Proto-Indo-European_language> [↑](#endnote-ref-14)
15. The Treaty of Mesilim between Lagash and Umma (2500-2100 BC)

<http://www.duhaime.org/LawMuseum/LawArticle-1313/2550-BC--The-Treaty-of-Mesilim.aspx>

New Sumerian Divorce Document (2100-2001 BC)

<http://jewishchristianlit.com/Topics/Contracts/divorc01.html>

Old Assyrian Divorce Document (????)

<http://jewishchristianlit.com/Topics/Contracts/divorc03.html>

Old Assyrian Marriage Document (1900-1801 BC)

<http://jewishchristianlit.com/Topics/Contracts/marri02.html>

The Code of Hammurabi (1754 BC)

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Code_of_Hammurabi>

<http://www.theology.edu/egypt3.htm>

Mesopotamian Abrogation of Marriage Agreement (1500-1401 BC)

<http://jewishchristianlit.com/Topics/Contracts/marri03.html>

The Treaty of Kadesh (1283-1274 BC)

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Egyptian%E2%80%93Hittite_peace_treaty>

Ugaritic Manumission and Marriage (????)

<http://jewishchristianlit.com/Topics/Contracts/marri04.html> [↑](#endnote-ref-15)
16. Truly, the comic book versions were plagiarized from the movies. This, of course, comes from the fact that it is now popular in the twenty-first century to make movies of comic books that were prevalent from circa 1945, suggesting the joke that the Mosaic prosaic provenance is obviously older than the poetic entertainment version, the Song of the Sea. [↑](#endnote-ref-16)
17. <http://www.emanueltov.info/docs/papers/10.bibletexts.2008.pdf>, page 26 [↑](#endnote-ref-17)
18. If you have been blessed or helped by any of these meditations, please repost, share, or use any of them as you wish. No rights are reserved. They are designed and intended for your free participation. They were freely received, and are freely given. No other permission is required for their use. [↑](#endnote-ref-18)