

Now it also seems that by the time of Nebuchadnezzar, it had displaced Babylonian in Babylon, and we have texts, we have legal texts in Babylon, a great many of them in which they are all written in the Babylonian but there will be a clay envelope on which there will be marked in Aramaic a summary of what's in the text. So that there is good reason to think that Nebuchadnezzar and his family spoke Aramaic. In the book of Daniel the first two chapters and three and a half verses == the first chapter and three and a half verses of the second are in Hebrew. Then it says that the people came before Nebuchadnezzar and they said in Aramaic (the KJV translates it in Syriac when it is really Aramaic -- Syriac is a late dialect of Aramaic, this was Aramaic) and then it says what they said in Aramaic and from there on it's all Aramaic to the end of ch. 7. Then it reverts to Hebrew. But it would seem that Babylonian was then like Latin was in the Middle Ages, the official language for records and that sort of thing but that the people actually talked Aramaic.

Babylonian in some ways is closer to Hebrew than Aramaic is, in other ~~xxx~~ words it is more difficult. Any other question?

(Student: You just touched on Egyptian,,, not directly in cuneiform, but the fact that Egyptian has no vowels, does that . . .

MacRae: No, the fact that the writing has no vowels. -

(Student: That's what I mean. The hieroglyphics has no vowels; does that explain the fact that you'll see two Egyptian names spelled differently in different books like Akinot and Igknagton? Could you explain that?

Yes, well one thing we have to remember is that pronunciation changes constantly. You take little children, and you will find that their talk is a little different from their parents. It's always