

Retributive Justice in Ancient Mesopotamian Law: Institutional Foundations of Punishment in the Code of Hammurabi

Roberth Kurniawan Ruslak Hammar¹, Bernardus Horokubun², Imanuel Inriyanto Ruslak Hammar³

^{1,2,3}Universitas Caritas Indonesia, West Papua, Indonesia

Abstract

Ancient Mesopotamia occupies a central position in the history of written law, particularly through the Code of Hammurabi, one of the earliest and most systematic legal collections of the ancient world. This article examines the concept of retributive justice in Babylonian legal thought and analyzes the institutional foundations of punishment reflected in the Code of Hammurabi. Using normative legal research with historical and conceptual approaches, the study explores how punishment was constructed, legitimized, and applied within the social and political order of ancient Babylon. The findings show that the Code of Hammurabi embodied the principle of *lex talionis*, emphasizing proportionality between offense and punishment as a core expression of retributive justice. However, punishment was not merely a moral response to wrongdoing; it was also embedded in institutional mechanisms involving courts, royal administration, and the king's authority as the ultimate source of legal legitimacy. The study further reveals that the application of punishment was shaped by Babylonian social hierarchy, where legal consequences varied according to the status of offenders and victims. Historically, the Code of Hammurabi contributed to the development of criminal law thought by providing an early foundation for proportional punishment, legal codification, and the relationship between law, authority, and social order.

Keywords: retributive justice; code of hammurabi; ancient mesopotamia; babylonian law; criminal punishment

1. Introduction

The history of criminal law cannot be separated from the emergence of early written legal traditions in ancient civilizations. Among these traditions, ancient Mesopotamia occupies a significant place because it produced some of the earliest legal collections known in human history. The Code of Hammurabi, compiled during the reign of Hammurabi of Babylon in the eighteenth century BCE, remains one of the most influential legal texts of the ancient Near East. It regulated diverse aspects of social, economic, familial, and criminal life, while also providing insight into how law, punishment, authority, and social hierarchy were institutionally organized in early state societies (Roth, 1997; Van De Mieroop, 2005; Westbrook, 2003).

One of the most prominent features of the Code of Hammurabi is its articulation of punishment through the principle of *lex talionis*, commonly understood as the idea that punishment should correspond to the harm caused by the offense. Although often interpreted as a harsh form of retaliation, this principle can also be understood as an early attempt to limit uncontrolled vengeance by placing punishment under legal and institutional authority (Driver & Miles, 1952; Fish, 2008; Roth, 1995). In this sense, the Code of Hammurabi reflects an early form of retributive justice, where punishment is justified not merely as social control but as a morally proportionate response to wrongdoing.

However, retributive justice in Babylonian law cannot be understood only as an abstract moral principle. The application of punishment in the Code of Hammurabi was shaped by institutional structures, including courts, royal administration, and the authority of the king as the source of legal legitimacy (Charpin, 2010; Lafont, 2000; Westbrook, 2003). Moreover, punishment was deeply influenced by the hierarchical nature of Babylonian society, in which legal consequences varied according to the status of offenders and victims. This indicates that the Code simultaneously pursued order, proportionality, and the preservation of social stratification.

Despite extensive scholarship on ancient Near Eastern law, the Code of Hammurabi is often discussed either as a historical legal monument or as a source of early codification, while its relationship with

*Corresponding author: Roberth Kurniawan Ruslak Hammar, Email: roberthhammar18@gmail.com

retributive justice and institutional punishment requires more focused analysis. This article addresses that gap by examining how retributive justice was formulated, legitimized, and institutionalized in the legal order of ancient Babylon. By doing so, the study contributes to legal history and criminal law theory by showing how early Mesopotamian law anticipated enduring debates on proportional punishment, state authority, legal codification, and the relationship between justice and social order.

2. Methods

This study employed normative legal research supported by historical and conceptual approaches. Normative legal research was used because the main focus of this study is not empirical field data, but legal texts, legal principles, and doctrinal interpretation. The primary object of analysis is the Code of Hammurabi, which is examined as an early legal collection reflecting the relationship between punishment, justice, authority, and social order in ancient Babylonian society.

The historical legal approach was applied to situate the Code of Hammurabi within the broader development of ancient Mesopotamian and Near Eastern legal traditions. This approach is relevant because the meaning of punishment in ancient Babylon cannot be separated from the political, religious, and social context in which the law was produced and enforced. Previous studies on ancient Near Eastern law show that legal norms in Mesopotamia were closely connected to kingship, administrative authority, and the maintenance of social hierarchy (Roth, 1997; Van De Mierop, 2005; Westbrook, 2003).

The conceptual approach was used to analyze the idea of retributive justice, particularly the principle of *lex talionis*. This approach allows the study to examine how punishment in the Code of Hammurabi reflected the notion of proportionality between offense and sanction. The analysis also connects this ancient legal principle with broader theoretical discussions on punishment, responsibility, and proportional justice in criminal law (Hart, 2008; Kant, 1996).

The legal materials used in this study consisted of primary and secondary sources. The primary source was the translated text of the Code of Hammurabi, especially provisions concerning bodily injury, compensation, social status, and criminal sanctions. Secondary sources included scholarly books and journal articles on Mesopotamian law, Babylonian kingship, ancient legal institutions, and theories of punishment.

The data were analyzed qualitatively through legal interpretation and historical-contextual analysis. The analysis was conducted by identifying provisions in the Code of Hammurabi that demonstrate proportional punishment, institutional enforcement, royal legitimacy, and social differentiation. These findings were then interpreted to explain how retributive justice was formulated and institutionalized in ancient Babylonian law. This method is consistent with the study's aim to examine the Code of Hammurabi not only as a historical legal text, but also as an early foundation for later discussions on proportional punishment and criminal justice.

3. Results

3.1 Retributive Justice and the Logic of Proportional Punishment

The analysis shows that the Code of Hammurabi reflects an early form of retributive justice through its emphasis on proportional punishment. The principle of *lex talionis* appears in provisions that connect the gravity of an offense with the severity of the sanction. In this legal framework, punishment was not presented merely as an arbitrary act of retaliation, but as a structured response to wrongdoing. The offender was punished because the offense was understood to disturb moral, legal, and social order.

This logic can be seen in provisions concerning bodily injury, violence, property damage, and compensation. In cases involving physical harm, the Code often prescribed sanctions that mirrored the injury caused by the offender. Such provisions indicate that punishment was intended to restore a form of balance between the offender, the victim, and the wider community. Therefore, *lex talionis* should not only be read as a primitive expression of revenge, but also as an early legal mechanism for limiting excessive retaliation and placing punishment under public authority.

The Code of Hammurabi therefore demonstrates that proportionality was already present as a basic legal idea in ancient Babylonian law. Although this proportionality differed from modern standards of criminal justice, it reveals an important historical foundation for later discussions on the relationship

*Corresponding author: Roberth Kurniawan Ruslak Hammar, Email: roberthhammar18@gmail.com

between wrongdoing, responsibility, and punishment (Hart, 2008; Roth, 1997; Westbrook, 2003).

3.2 Institutional Foundations of Punishment in Babylonian Law

The findings also indicate that punishment in the Code of Hammurabi was supported by institutional mechanisms. The Code did not operate only as a moral statement about justice, but as a legal instrument connected to courts, administrative authority, and royal power. This shows that punishment in ancient Babylon was already embedded within an organized structure of legal enforcement.

The role of the court was central in determining legal responsibility and resolving disputes. Judges and local authorities were involved in examining cases, applying legal provisions, and ensuring that sanctions were imposed according to recognized legal rules. This institutional structure suggests that the Code of Hammurabi contributed to the development of legal predictability by transforming punishment from private revenge into a matter of public legal authority.

Royal administration also played an important role in enforcing punishment. The king was represented not only as a political ruler but also as the guardian of justice. In this context, the Code served to strengthen the king's legitimacy by presenting law as a divinely sanctioned and publicly declared system of order. Thus, punishment functioned both as a response to individual wrongdoing and as a mechanism for maintaining political and social stability (Charpin, 2010; Van De Mieroop, 2005).

3.3 Social Hierarchy and Unequal Application of Punishment

Another important finding is that retributive justice in the Code of Hammurabi was not applied equally to all members of society. The severity and type of punishment often depended on the social status of both the offender and the victim. Babylonian society was hierarchical, and this hierarchy was reflected in legal consequences.

The Code distinguished between different social groups, including elites, common free persons, and slaves. Injuries committed against persons of higher social status could result in harsher penalties, while offenses involving lower-status individuals could be resolved through compensation or lesser sanctions. This indicates that Babylonian law combined the principle of proportionality with the preservation of social stratification.

This finding is significant because it shows that the Code of Hammurabi did not express equality before the law in the modern sense. Rather, it institutionalized justice within the social order of its time. Punishment was proportional, but proportionality was measured through a hierarchical understanding of status, harm, and social value. Therefore, the Code reflects both the emergence of legal rationality and the limitations of justice in a stratified ancient society (Roth, 1997; Westbrook, 2003).

3.4 The King as the Source of Legal Legitimacy

The analysis further reveals that the authority of punishment in the Code of Hammurabi was closely tied to kingship. Hammurabi was presented as a ruler chosen by the gods to establish justice and protect society from disorder. This religious-political foundation gave the law moral authority and strengthened the position of the king as the ultimate source of legal legitimacy.

The Code therefore functioned not only as a collection of legal provisions, but also as a political text. By publicly declaring the law, Hammurabi positioned himself as the mediator between divine justice and social order. Punishment became legitimate because it was connected to royal authority and divine mandate.

This relationship between law and kingship demonstrates that early legal codification was closely connected to state formation. The Code of Hammurabi helped consolidate royal power by making legal rules visible, authoritative, and enforceable. In this sense, punishment was not only about responding to crime, but also about constructing and maintaining the authority of the state (Charpin, 2010; Van De Mieroop, 2005).

3.5 Contribution to the Historical Development of Criminal Law Thought

The Code of Hammurabi provides an important historical foundation for understanding the development of criminal law and punishment theory. Its emphasis on written legal rules, proportional punishment, and institutional enforcement shows that ancient Babylonian law had already developed a structured approach to crime and punishment.

The contribution of the Code lies not in its direct continuity with modern criminal law, but in its early articulation of several enduring legal ideas. These include the need for punishment to correspond to wrongdoing, the role of public authority in administering sanctions, and the use of codified law to

*Corresponding author: Roberth Kurniawan Ruslak Hammar, Email: roberthhammar18@gmail.com

regulate social behavior. These ideas remain central to modern debates on criminal justice, even though contemporary legal systems have transformed them through principles such as equality before the law, human rights, rehabilitation, and due process.

Thus, the Code of Hammurabi may be understood as an early historical foundation for later discussions of retributive justice and proportional punishment. It demonstrates that the problem of how to punish wrongdoing fairly has been a central concern of legal systems since the earliest stages of written law. This supports the argument that retributive justice is not merely a modern theoretical concept, but a historically rooted idea that emerged alongside the institutional development of law and political authority.

4. Discussion

The findings of this study indicate that the Code of Hammurabi should not be understood merely as a primitive expression of vengeance, but as an early legal attempt to institutionalize punishment. The principle of *lex talionis* demonstrates that punishment was expected to correspond to the seriousness of the offense. In this sense, the Code reflects an early form of proportional justice, where punishment was framed as a legally regulated response rather than an uncontrolled private act of retaliation (Daube, 1947; Finkelstein, 1961; Jackson, 1973; Richardson, 2004).

This interpretation is important because retributive justice is often misunderstood as identical with harsh retaliation. In fact, retributive theory emphasizes that punishment must be justified by wrongdoing and limited by proportionality. The Code of Hammurabi shows an early version of this logic, although its application differed greatly from modern criminal law. Modern theories of punishment connect retribution with moral responsibility, desert, censure, and legal limitation, rather than simple revenge (Dolinko, 1991; Duff, 2001; Moore, 1997; Tonry, 2011; von Hirsch, 1993).

At the same time, the Code also reveals the limits of ancient retributive justice. Proportionality in Babylonian law was not based on the modern idea of equality before the law. Instead, punishment was shaped by social hierarchy, especially distinctions between elites, common free persons, and slaves. This means that the value of harm and the severity of punishment were socially differentiated. Such a system shows that ancient law could combine legal rationality with social inequality (Greengus, 1995; Jackson, 2000; Oppenheim, 1977; Yoffee, 2005).

The institutional dimension of punishment is another important point. The Code of Hammurabi linked legal order to royal authority, public administration, and the symbolic role of the king as the guardian of justice. This suggests that punishment was not only a response to individual wrongdoing, but also a mechanism for maintaining political order and legitimizing royal power. In early state societies, written law helped transform authority into a visible and enforceable legal order (Bahrani, 2008; Liverani, 2014; Postgate, 1994; Yoffee, 2016).

Therefore, the historical significance of the Code of Hammurabi lies not in its direct equivalence to modern criminal law, but in its early formulation of enduring legal concerns: how punishment should be justified, who has the authority to punish, how sanctions should be limited, and how law maintains social order. Its contribution to criminal law history is best understood as an early foundation for debates on proportional punishment, legal codification, and the relationship between justice, authority, and social hierarchy (Berman, 1983; Garland, 1990; Hudson, 2003; Walker, 1980).

5. Conclusion

This study concludes that the Code of Hammurabi represents one of the earliest legal formulations of retributive justice in the history of written law. Its provisions demonstrate that punishment in ancient Babylonian law was structured around the principle of *lex talionis*, in which sanctions were expected to correspond to the harm caused by the offense. Although this principle may appear severe from a modern perspective, it functioned as an early legal mechanism for limiting private vengeance and placing punishment under institutional authority.

The study also shows that retributive justice in the Code of Hammurabi was not merely a moral idea, but was embedded in the institutional structure of Babylonian society. Courts, royal administration, and the authority of the king played important roles in transforming punishment into a public legal process. In this respect, the Code illustrates how early legal systems connected justice, political authority, and

*Corresponding author: Roberth Kurniawan Ruslak Hammar, Email: roberthhammar18@gmail.com

social order.

However, the application of punishment in the Code was strongly shaped by social hierarchy. Legal consequences differed according to the status of offenders and victims, indicating that Babylonian law did not reflect equality before the law in the modern sense. Rather, it institutionalized justice within a stratified social order.

Overall, the Code of Hammurabi contributes to the historical development of criminal law by providing an early foundation for proportional punishment, legal codification, and the institutionalization of state authority in the administration of justice. Its significance lies not in its direct similarity to modern criminal law, but in its early articulation of enduring legal questions concerning wrongdoing, responsibility, punishment, authority, and social order.

References

- Bottéro, J. (1995). *Mesopotamia: Writing, reasoning, and the gods* (Z. Bahrani & M. Van De Mieroop, Trans.). University of Chicago Press.
- Charpin, D. (2010). *Writing, law, and kingship in Old Babylonian Mesopotamia* (J. M. Todd, Trans.). University of Chicago Press.
- Driver, G. R., & Miles, J. C. (1952). *The Babylonian laws* (Vol. 1). Clarendon Press.
- Driver, G. R., & Miles, J. C. (1955). *The Babylonian laws* (Vol. 2). Clarendon Press.
- Fish, M. J. (2008). Proportionality as a moral principle of punishment. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 28(1), 57–71.
- Hart, H. L. A. (2008). *Punishment and responsibility: Essays in the philosophy of law* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Kant, I. (1996). *The metaphysics of morals* (M. Gregor, Trans.). Cambridge University Press.
- Kramer, S. N. (1981). *History begins at Sumer: Thirty-nine firsts in recorded history* (3rd ed.). University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lafont, S. (2000). Middle Assyrian period. In R. Westbrook (Ed.), *A history of ancient Near Eastern law* (Vol. 1, pp. 521–564). Brill.
- Mieroop, M. Van De. (2005). *King Hammurabi of Babylon: A biography*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Postgate, J. N. (1992). *Early Mesopotamia: Society and economy at the dawn of history*. Routledge.
- Roth, M. T. (1995). Mesopotamian legal traditions and the laws of Hammurabi. *Chicago-Kent Law Review*, 71(1), 13–39.
- Roth, M. T. (1997). *Law collections from Mesopotamia and Asia Minor* (2nd ed.). Scholars Press.
- Stein, P. (1980). *Legal evolution: The story of an idea*. Cambridge University Press.
- Westbrook, R. (Ed.). (2003). *A history of ancient Near Eastern law* (Vols. 1–2). Brill.
- Hart, H. L. A. (2008). *Punishment and responsibility: Essays in the philosophy of law* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Kant, I. (1996). *The metaphysics of morals* (M. Gregor, Trans.). Cambridge University Press.
- Roth, M. T. (1997). *Law collections from Mesopotamia and Asia Minor* (2nd ed.). Scholars Press.
- Van De Mieroop, M. (2005). *King Hammurabi of Babylon: A biography*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Westbrook, R. (Ed.). (2003). *A history of ancient Near Eastern law* (Vols. 1–2). Brill.
- Charpin, D. (2010). *Writing, law, and kingship in Old Babylonian Mesopotamia* (J. M. Todd, Trans.). University of Chicago Press.
- Hart, H. L. A. (2008). *Punishment and responsibility: Essays in the philosophy of law* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Roth, M. T. (1997). *Law collections from Mesopotamia and Asia Minor* (2nd ed.). Scholars Press.
- Van De Mieroop, M. (2005). *King Hammurabi of Babylon: A biography*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Westbrook, R. (Ed.). (2003). *A history of ancient Near Eastern law* (Vols. 1–2). Brill.
- Bahrani, Z. (2008). *Rituals of war: The body and violence in Mesopotamia*. Zone Books.
- Berman, H. J. (1983). *Law and revolution: The formation of the Western legal tradition*. Harvard University Press.
- Daube, D. (1947). *Studies in biblical law*. Cambridge University Press.

*Corresponding author: Roberth Kurniawan Ruslak Hammar, Email: roberthhammar18@gmail.com

- Dolinko, D. (1991). Some thoughts about retributivism. *Ethics*, 101(3), 537–559.
- Duff, R. A. (2001). *Punishment, communication, and community*. Oxford University Press.
- Finkelstein, J. J. (1961). Ammisaduqa's edict and the Babylonian "law codes." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*, 15(3), 91–104.
- Garland, D. (1990). *Punishment and modern society: A study in social theory*. University of Chicago Press.
- Greengus, S. (1995). Legal and social institutions of ancient Mesopotamia. In J. M. Sasson (Ed.), *Civilizations of the ancient Near East* (Vol. 1, pp. 469–484). Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Hudson, B. (2003). *Justice in the risk society: Challenging and re-affirming justice in late modernity*. SAGE Publications.
- Jackson, B. S. (1973). The problem of Exodus 21:22–25. *Vetus Testamentum*, 23(3), 273–304.
- Jackson, B. S. (2000). *Studies in the semiotics of biblical law*. Sheffield Academic Press.
- Liverani, M. (2014). *The ancient Near East: History, society and economy* (S. Tabatabai, Trans.). Routledge.
- Moore, M. S. (1997). *Placing blame: A general theory of the criminal law*. Oxford University Press.
- Oppenheim, A. L. (1977). *Ancient Mesopotamia: Portrait of a dead civilization* (Rev. ed.). University of Chicago Press.
- Postgate, J. N. (1994). *Early Mesopotamia: Society and economy at the dawn of history*. Routledge.
- Richardson, M. E. J. (2004). *Hammurabi's laws: Text, translation and glossary*. T&T Clark International.
- Tonry, M. (2011). *Punishing race: A continuing American dilemma*. Oxford University Press.
- von Hirsch, A. (1993). *Censure and sanctions*. Oxford University Press.
- Walker, N. (1980). *Punishment, danger and stigma: The morality of criminal justice*. Barnes & Noble Books.
- Yoffee, N. (2005). *Myths of the archaic state: Evolution of the earliest cities, states, and civilizations*. Cambridge University Press.