

# THE URUK LIST OF KINGS AND SAGES AND LATE MESOPOTAMIAN SCHOLARSHIP<sup>1</sup>

ALAN LENZI  
University of the Pacific

## *Abstract*

The Uruk List of Kings and Sages is best known for its genealogy connecting human scholars to antediluvian sages. Since its publication in 1962, however, questions pertaining to the text's specific purpose within the context of Hellenistic Uruk have been neglected. This study seeks to understand two such questions: why is the most explicit scholarly genealogy written in the Hellenistic period?; and who is the last named person in the text? Seeking answers to these questions sheds new light on the text's purpose: it is an attempt by scholars to gain support for themselves and their novel cultic agenda.

Keywords: Hellenistic Uruk, Mesopotamian scholars, Nicharkos, Antiquarianism, Anu cult

## *Abstract*

La réputation de la liste des Uruk de les rois et les sages est due à sa généalogie, qui crée un lien entre les savants humains et les sages antédiluviens. Par contre, depuis sa publication en 1962 on a négligé les questions qui ont affaire au but spécifique du texte dans le contexte de l'Uruk hellénistique. Cette étude cherche à comprendre deux questions dans ce domaine: pourquoi la généalogie la plus explicitement savante est-elle écrite pendant l'époque hellénistique?; et qui est la dernière personne nommée dans le texte? Chercher des réponses à ces questions illumine d'une nouvelle façon le but du texte; c'est une tentative par des savants de gagner du soutien pour leur programme original de culte ainsi que pour eux-mêmes.

Keywords: Uruk hellénistique, sages mésopotamiens, Nicharkos, Goût des antiquités, culte d'Ane

---

<sup>1</sup> I first presented this study at a conference entitled "Babylonia's Imprint on the Hellenistic World" convened at University of California–Berkeley (October 5-6, 2007). I am grateful to the many participants and attendees for their useful feedback and conversation. I also thank my colleague at University of the Pacific, Martha Bowsky, for her very helpful criticism on an earlier draft of this paper and the reviewers for *JANER* for their suggestions. Remaining mistakes, infelicities, oversights, and ill-formed ideas are my own doing.

The “Uruk List of Kings and Sages” (ULKS) was discovered in Anu’s Bīt Rēš temple by German archaeologists during the 1959/60 season and published in 1962 by van Dijk.<sup>2</sup> Since then Assyriologists have cited this Seleucid-era text as the clearest cuneiform evidence that Mesopotamian scholars (*ummânū*) traced their professional ancestry explicitly back to the mythological sages (*apkallū*) of antediluvian fame and thereby implicitly to a relationship with the god Ea. Setting this evidence alongside earlier historical data, it becomes clear that this scholarly genealogy was already functioning in the Neo-Assyrian period but probably even earlier in the late second millennium.<sup>3</sup> Despite its historical importance, this genealogical aspect of our text has over-shadowed other basic questions about the Seleucid historical context in which it arose. Two such questions provide the impetus for this study:

---

<sup>2</sup> The tablet bears the excavation number W.20030, 7. A copy of the tablet may be found in Jan van Dijk and Werner R. Mayer, *Texte aus dem Rēš-Heiligtum in Uruk-Warka*, Bagdader Mitteilungen Beiheft 2 (Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 1980), text no. 89 (= BaMB 2 89). For an edition of the text, see J. van Dijk, “Die Inschriftenfunde,” *Vorläufiger Bericht über die . . . Ausgrabungen in Uruk-Warka* 18 (1962), 44-52 and plate 27. I wish to extend my heartfelt gratitude to the Orient-Abteilung des Deutschen Archäologischen Institutes for making several high quality digital images available to me, against which I was able to collate the tablet. The obverse is encrusted and therefore did not always permit a clear image. The reverse is much cleaner and clearer.

It is significant that our tablet was found among other tablets preserving various rituals known from François Thureau-Dangin’s *Rituels Accadiens* (Osnabrück: Otto Zeller Verlag, 1975 [originally, 1921]). More precisely, van Dijk indicates the tablet “wurde mit den Nummern W 20030, 1-8 zusammen gefunden” (“Die Inschriftenfunde,” 44). These tablets were among the few tablets actually found *in situ*, undisturbed by looters who had littered the area with other tablets and fragments (as noted by Mayer, BaMB 2, p. 13). W.20030, 1 (= BaMB 2 6) and W.20030, 4 (=BaMB 2 5) are *lilissu*-drum ritual texts; W.20030, 2 (=BaMB 2 10) and W.20030, 6 (=BaMB 2 12) are building ritual texts; and W.20030, 3 (=BaMB 2 1) and W.20030, 5 (=BaMB 2 2) are *mās pī* ritual texts. I cannot specify W.20030, 8. Leaving aside the last, these texts fall within the professional sphere of the *ummânū*. Thus, the archaeological context of our tablet already places it within the scholarly sphere of interest. The tablet’s colophon indicates the text was copied in 147 SE/165 BCE. Its approximate date of original composition is a matter this paper will attempt to elucidate.

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., Helge S. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*, Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 61 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988), 202; Claus Wilcke, “Göttliche und menschliche Weisheit im Alten Orient: Magie und Wissenschaft, Mythos und Geschichte,” in *Weisheit: Archäologie der literarischen Kommunikation III*, ed. A. Assmann (München: W. Fink Verlag, 1991), 259-70; Simo Parpola, *Letters from Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars*, State Archives of Assyria 10 (Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1993), XVIII; Francesca Rochberg, *The Heavenly Writing: Divination, Horoscopy, and Astronomy in Mesopotamian Culture* (Cambridge:

1. Despite the well-known importance of scholars in the earlier Neo-Assyrian period and the abundance of materials relating to their activities, why does one find the most explicit and systematic connection between the *ummânû* and *apkallû* in the Seleucid period?<sup>4</sup>
2. How does the last named and oft-overlooked individual fit into this text's plan and into the social context of Hellenistic Uruk?<sup>5</sup>

In order to formulate a plausible answer to these questions I raise three issues very briefly that provide context. First, I review some of the earlier first millennium evidence for the genealogical connection between the *ummânû* and *apkallû*; second, I survey the Seleucid dynasty's relationship to indigenous institutions in Mesopotamia, especially with regard to temples; and finally, I consider aspects of the archaizing theological tendencies of Urukean scribes in the late Persian and Hellenistic periods. In light of this contextualization, I interpret the ULKS as a tendentious document written by scholars who needed to reassert their importance to the community leadership in order to advance their cultic-political agenda. Unfortunately, due to the circumstantial and at times

---

Cambridge University Press, 2004), 183-84; and most recently my own work, *Secrecy and the Gods: Secret Knowledge in Ancient Mesopotamia and Biblical Israel*, State Archives of Assyria Studies 19 (Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2008). Prior to the discovery of the ULKS, Berossus was the best witness to anything like the connection the ULKS demonstrates (see Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic*, 193 for a comparative chart of the sages and kings). Whatever its original date of composition, the simple fact that the tablet is a copy and not the original suggests the text continued to have ideological value that surpassed the particular time and concerns of its origin. Exploiting the text for what it can tell us about scholarly genealogical ideology is therefore legitimate; but, this need not rule out other questions that one might bring to the text.

<sup>4</sup> The position of the scholars in the Neo-Assyrian court, including their appeal to antediluvian *apkallû* as their ancestors, has been recognized by many other scholars. Besides the works cited in the previous note, see the very helpful discussion in Beate Pongratz-Leisten, *Herrschaftswissen in Mesopotamien: Formen der Kommunikation zwischen Gott und König im 2. und 1. Jahrtausend v.Chr.*, State Archives of Assyria Studies 10 (Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 1999), especially 286-320. My focus here is understanding why the *clearest* expression of the genealogical relationship is attested so late in Mesopotamian history.

<sup>5</sup> Van Dijk recognized right away that this last person is of utmost significance for the interpretation of the text and offered tentative ideas about his identity and purpose (see "Die Inschriftenfunde," 45-46, 50, 52). I know of no other explicit treatment of this particular issue since van Dijk's. This study attempts to build on his suggestions.

fragmentary evidence, this interpretation can only be offered as a plausible reading and must therefore remain tentative.

The text of the ULKS is as follows:

1. [*ina ta*]r-[*š*]<sup>i</sup><sup>26</sup> <sup>1</sup>*a-a-lu* LUGAL <sup>1</sup>*u<sub>4</sub>-d<sup>+</sup>60* NUN.ME
  2. [*ina ta*]r-[*š*]<sup>i</sup> <sup>1</sup>*a-lá-al-gar* LUGAL <sup>1</sup>*u<sub>4</sub>-d<sup>+</sup>60-du<sub>10</sub>-ga* NUN.ME
  3. [*ina tar-š*]<sup>i</sup> <sup>1</sup>*am-me-lu-an-na* LUGAL <sup>1</sup>*en-me-du<sub>10</sub>-ga* NUN.ME
  4. [*ina tar-š*]<sup>i</sup> <sup>1</sup>*am-me-gal-an-na* LUGAL <sup>1</sup>*en-me-galam-ma* NUN.ME
  5. [*ina tar-š*]<sup>i</sup> <sup>1</sup>*e[n-m]e-ušumgal-an-na* LUGAL <sup>1</sup>*en-me-bùlug-gá* NUN.ME
  6. [*ina tar-š*]<sup>i</sup> <sup>1d</sup>*dumu-zi* SIPA LUGAL <sup>1d+</sup>*60-en-líl-da* NUN.ME
  7. [*ina tar-š*]<sup>i</sup> <sup>1</sup>*en-me-dur-an-ki* LUGAL <sup>1</sup>*ù-tu-abzu* NUN.ME
- 
8. [EGIR MAR.URU<sub>5</sub><sup>?</sup> *ina*] BALA-*e* <sup>1</sup>*en-me-kár* LUGAL <sup>1</sup>*nun-gal-pìrig-gal* NUN.ME
  9. [*šá* <sup>d</sup>*ištar iš-t*]u AN-*e ana é-an-na ú-še-ri-du* BALAG ZABAR
  10. [*šá* x x ] x x.MEŠ-šú <sup>na4</sup>ZA.GÌN.NA *ina š*-*pir* <sup>d</sup>*nin-á-gal*
  11. [*i-pu-uš i-n*]<sup>a</sup> ME<sup>?</sup> KÙ KI<sup>?</sup> *š*-*bat* [DINGIR LU.U<sub>18</sub>]<sup>8</sup> BALAG *ina maḥ-ri* <sup>d+</sup>60 *ú-kin-nu*

<sup>6</sup> All restorations follow van Dijk's edition unless otherwise stated.

<sup>7</sup> Van Dijk reads the first three preserved signs as x-*kú*<sup>ki</sup> (actually transliterating KUG as *kú* ["Die Inschriftenfunde," 44], but treating it correctly as *kù* in his commentary [49]). He suggests this may have been a geographical name (49), but cannot offer a persuasive candidate. I think a geographical name is likely here but cannot remedy our ignorance. Alternatively, one might consider reading the first sign of the three as ME, suggesting ME(*parši*) *elli*, "pure rite," for the first two signs. The KI might then be explained as KI(*itti*), or simply a defective spelling of *kí*. Following this line of thought, the phrase might be translated as follows: "The lyre was established before Anu by means of a pure rite as a dwelling. . . ." But the text remains unclear.

<sup>8</sup> Van Dijk gives the reading dingir-lu-ulù here without brackets but notes that it is epigraphically uncertain ("Die Inschriftenfunde," 49). I was unable to see any of the signs on the photo of the tablet because the area is too damaged; thus the brackets. Van Dijk mentions that the last sign of the trio, GÌSGAL, might also be read LUḪ since the two are difficult to distinguish in this period. (LUḪ can be read SUKKAL, of course, which is tantalizing in light of Beaulieu's ideas of anti-quarianism presented below, but I see no contextual sense in this reading.) But van Dijk seems to favor another possibility, namely, that the second sign, LU, was a mistake for LÚ (although one might better call it a phonetic writing), citing the same mistake in line 18 (but see note 15 below). Thus read, he translates the phrase as "god (and) man" (i.e., humanity). But this is problematic since one would expect DINGIR (*u*) (NAM).LÚ.U<sub>18</sub> if this meaning were intended. Assuming DINGIR LU.U<sub>18</sub> is the correct reading, I tentatively suggest we render it "the god of a man" (that is, his personal god). Given the possibility mentioned here, in the previous note, and in note 15 below, one might translate the entire line as follows: "He established the lyre or the lyre was established before Anu by means of a pure rite as the dwelling/seat of (his) personal god."

12. [ <sup>Id</sup>*bilga-m*]ēš LUGAL<sup>29</sup> <sup>Id</sup>3O-TI-ÉR <sup>lu</sup>*um-man-nu*
13. [*ina tar-ši* <sup>1</sup>*i-b*]i<sup>d</sup>3O LUGAL <sup>1</sup>IDIM-*il-dšú* <sup>lu</sup>*um-man-nu*
14. [*ina tar-ši* <sup>1</sup>*iš-bi*]-<sup>d</sup>ēr-ra LUGAL <sup>1</sup>si-dù *ša-niš* <sup>Id+</sup>EN.LÍL-DÙ *um-man-nu*
15. [*ina tar-ši* <sup>1</sup>*a-bi*]-<sup>e</sup>šú-*uḫ* LUGAL <sup>1</sup>šú-<sup>d</sup>ME.ME *u* <sup>1</sup>ta-qiš-<sup>d</sup>ME.ME *um-man-nu*<sup>mes</sup>
16. [*ina tar-ši* <sup>1</sup>X X]-X LUGAL <sup>1</sup>é-sag-gil-ki-i-ni-IBILA  
*um-man-nu*
- rev.
17. [*ina tar-ši*] <sup>Id</sup>IM-IBILA-SUM LUGAL <sup>1</sup>é-sag-gil-ki-i-ni-ub-ba *um-man-nu*
18. [*ina tar-ši*] <sup>Id+</sup>AG-NÍG.DU-ÛRU LUGAL <sup>1</sup>é-sag-gil-ki-i-ni-ub-ba <sup>lu</sup>*um-man-nu*<sup>10</sup>
19. [*ina tar-ši*] <sup>1</sup>AN.ŠÁR-*aḫ*-MU LUGAL <sup>1</sup>a-ba-<sup>d</sup>NINNU-*da-ri* *um-man-nu*
20. [*šá* <sup>lu</sup>]*aḫ-la-m(i)*<sup>11</sup>-*mu-ú* *i-qab-bu-ú* <sup>1</sup>a-*ḫu*-<sup>2</sup>*u-qa-a-ri*
21. [X -i]š<sup>2</sup><sup>12</sup> <sup>1</sup>ni-*q(a)-qu-ru-su*{text: *šu*}-ú
- 
22. [IM <sup>1</sup>]d+6O-EN-šú-nu A *šá* <sup>1</sup>NÍG.SUM.MU-<sup>d+</sup>6O A<sup>1</sup>{text: MIN} <sup>Id</sup>3O-TI-ÉR
23. [<sup>lu</sup>GAL]A <sup>d+</sup>6O *u an-tum* UNUG<sup>ki</sup>-ú *qāt* NÍ-šú
24. [UNUG]<sup>ki</sup> <sup>iu</sup>GU<sub>4</sub> U<sub>4</sub>-IO-KAM MU-147-KAM <sup>1</sup>an-ti-<sup>2</sup>*i-i-ku-su*
25. *pa-liḫ* <sup>d+</sup>6O NU TÙM-šú LUGAL

<sup>9</sup> Van Dijk thinks this may be an erasure (“Die Inschriftenfunde,” 50).

<sup>10</sup> We expect LÚ, the professional determinative, in front of *ummānu* here (as in lines 12 and 13). LU is probably an aural mistake or substitute for LÚ. Mentioning and rejecting both of these options, Beaulieu has argued that the sign is best taken as part of the previous name: either as IB<sup>1</sup>, in order to “give a more convincing spelling of the name Esagil-kīna-ubbib”; or as LU, in which case he thinks “the scribe might be playfully proposing to equate the two figures [*scil.* Esagil-kīna-apli with Saggil-kīna-ubbib] by making the last part of the name *ubbalu* sound like IBILA, the logogram for *aplu*” (see Paul-Alain Beaulieu, “The Social and Intellectual Setting of Babylonian Wisdom Literature,” in *Wisdom Literature in Mesopotamia and Israel*, ed. Richard J. Clifford; Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 36 [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007], 3-19, here 14, n.32). With regard to the second option, if the motivation Beaulieu suggests is correct, one would not expect the writing of the name he supposes to appear in line 18 but in line 17. Although I would not exclude Beaulieu’s first option mentioned above, the use of the professional determinative in lines 12 and 13 as well as the otherwise identical writings of the names in lines 17 and 18 tip the scale in favor of taking LU with the following word.

<sup>11</sup> The notation *m(i)* indicates the i-vowel may not have been pronounced; see likewise *q(a)* in the following line.

<sup>12</sup> Despite many attempts, I cannot offer a satisfactory restoration of this unfortunate break. One might suggest restoring the beginning of the line with [*e-di-i*]š and translate the line “(but) Nikarchos is alone.” I am reticent about accepting this restoration, however, because it proceeds directly from my interpretation of the text. Although conjectural restorations are often somewhat circular, this one seems entirely so.

During the reign of<sup>13</sup> Ayalu, the king, Adapa was sage.  
 During the reign of Alalgar, the king, Uanduga was sage.  
 During the reign of Ameluana, the king, Enmeduga was sage.  
 During the reign of Amegalana, the king, Enmegalama was sage.  
 During the reign of Enmešungalana, the king, Enmebuluga was sage.  
 During the reign of Dumuzi, the shepherd, the king, Anenlida was sage.  
 During the reign of Enmeduranki, the king, Utuabzu was sage.

After the flood,<sup>2</sup> during the reign of Enmerkar, the king, Nungalpirigal was sage, whom Ištar brought down from heaven to Eana. He made the bronze lyre, whose . . . (were) lapis lazuli, according to the technique of Ninagal.<sup>14</sup> The lyre was placed<sup>15</sup> before Anu . . . , the dwelling of (his) personal god.<sup>16</sup>

During the reign of Gilgamesh, the king,<sup>2</sup> Sin-leqi-unnini was scholar.  
 During the reign of Ibbi-Sin, the king, Kabti-ili-Marduk was scholar.  
 During the reign of Išbi-Erra, the king, Sidu, a.k.a. Enlil-ibni, was scholar.

During the reign of Abi-ešuh, the king, Gimil-Gula<sup>17</sup> and Taqiš-Gula were the scholars.

During the reign of . . . , the king, Esagil-kin-apli was scholar.  
 During the reign of Adad-apla-iddina, the king, Esagil-kin-ubba<sup>18</sup> was scholar.

<sup>13</sup> Literally *ina tarṣi* in its temporal sense means “in the time of” (see CAD T, 242).

<sup>14</sup> Ninagal is Ea’s smith.

<sup>15</sup> The subject of *ukkinū* is taken as an indefinite “they” and thus translated as a passive voice in English. I leave open the possibility, however, that the break at the beginning of line 11 hides a relative particle *ša*. In this case, *ukinnu* would be a subordinate, third person singular form of the verb and Nungalpirigal its subject. “Lyre” later in the line would then be the redundant antecedent of the relative particle (“which he placed [i.e., the lyre] before Anu”).

<sup>16</sup> See note 8 above for this tentative translation.

<sup>17</sup> Van Dijk reads this name as Šū-Gula (“Die Inschriftenfunde,” 51), though it is better interpreted as Gimil-Gula (see W. G. Lambert, “A Catalogue of Texts and Authors,” *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 16 [1962], 66. Correct Lenzi, *Secrecy and the Gods*, 108 accordingly and add Gimil-Gula to the others on p. 119).

<sup>18</sup> This name here and in the following line, despite chronological problems, is probably to be identified with Saggil-kina-ubbib, the author of *The Babylonian Theodicy* (see van Dijk, “Die Inschriftenfunde,” 51). For other ideas about the relationship of Esagil-kina-apla, Saggil-kina-ubbib, and Esagil-kin-ubba, see Beaulieu, “Setting of Babylonian Wisdom Literature,” 14, whose ideas are mentioned briefly in note 10 above.

During the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, the king, Esagil-kin-ubba was scholar.

During the reign of Esarhaddon, the king, Aba-Enlil-dari was scholar, whom the Arameans call Ahiqar.

. . . Nikarchos.<sup>19</sup>

Tablet of Anu-belšunu, son of Nidintu-Anu, descendant of Sin-leqi-unnini, the lamentation-priest of Anu and Antu. An Urukian. (Copied) by his own hand. Uruk, 10 Ayyar, 147th year of Antiochus, the king.

The one who reveres Anu will not carry it off.

### *The Earlier Evidence of a Genealogical Connection*<sup>20</sup>

Gaining a historical perspective on the scholarly genealogical tradition attested in the text of ULKS is the first element of contextualizing our text. Clearly, the ULKS is unique. It lists seven well-known antediluvian kings, each paired with his corresponding *apkallu*-sage, then a single post-diluvian king-*apkallu* pair, followed by eight post-diluvian kings, each with his corresponding *ummânû*-scholar (in one case, two scholars).<sup>21</sup> The list is arranged from start to finish in what one must recognize as an attempt at chronological order.<sup>22</sup> Focusing on the *ummânû*, the implication of the text is rather clear: the human, post-diluvian scholars are the direct professional descendants of the earlier semi-divine *apkallû*. In a previous study I called this traditional genealogical relationship the “mythology of scribal succession.”<sup>23</sup>

There are of course quite early precedents for king lists, antediluvian or otherwise; there are also several earlier examples of kings being listed with their chief scholarly advisor.<sup>24</sup> But there is nothing that traces the royal scholars back through antediluvian times to the *apkallû* as clearly as does the ULKS. We need not

<sup>19</sup> See below for the justification of this identification.

<sup>20</sup> The following section is based on Lenzi, *Secrecy and the Gods*, 106-25.

<sup>21</sup> The three sections are separated on the tablet itself by rule lines.

<sup>22</sup> This remains true despite the fact that there are chronological mistakes. Note that Adad-apla-iddina is placed before Nebuchadnezzar in lines 17 and 18.

<sup>23</sup> Lenzi, *Secrecy and the Gods*, 107.

<sup>24</sup> See the overview in A. Kirk Grayson, “Königslisten und Chroniken,” *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 6 (1980), 86-135. Note especially lists 11, 12, 14, 15, and 17.

require the evidence for the earlier viability of this tradition, however, to conform to this *explicit* and *systematic* presentation of the “mythology of scribal succession.” Our list’s *formulation* of the genealogical tradition should not be made the measure of its earlier *existence*. As others have done, we shall use one of the most basic features of the ULKS as our guide into earlier material: the close association between mythical *apkallū* and their human counterparts. Finding this concept as well as hints of succession between the two groups in earlier cuneiform material gives us good reason to believe the “mythology of scribal succession” existed at an earlier time.<sup>25</sup>

The list of *apkallū* in an incantation belonging to the apotropaic series *Bīt mēseri* is sometimes cited as evidence for the connection between sages and scholars before the Seleucid era.<sup>26</sup> This text names the same seven *apkallū* as the ULKS, but here they are given an ichthyological description.<sup>27</sup> Tablet III 10-13 reads:<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> Others have surveyed this material before. See notes 3 and 4 above for references. The novel contribution here is to highlight two new evidential ideas, in *Bīt mēseri* and in “Advice to a Prince,” and to respond to an important objection raised by Seth Sanders, “Writing, Ritual, and Apocalypse: Studies in the Theme of Ascent to Heaven in Ancient Mesopotamia and Second Temple Judaism” (Ph.D. Dissertation, The Johns Hopkins University, 1999), 125, 144-45.

Many scholars treating the subject of scholarly genealogy often appeal to the Enmeduranki text (e.g., Beaulieu, “The Social and Intellectual Setting of Babylonian Wisdom Literature,” 15 and Rochberg, *Heavenly Writing*, 183-184; see W. G. Lambert, “The Qualifications of Babylonian Diviners,” in *Festschrift für Rykle Borger zu seinem 65. Geburtstag am 24. Mai 1994: Tikip santakki mala bašmu . . .*, ed. Stefan M. Maul; Cuneiform Monographs 10 [Groningen: Styx, 1998], 141-58 for an edition of this text). Although that tradition is clearly related to the issue of antediluvian knowledge and its transmission to scholars, its formulation is a minority view that places an antediluvian *king* at the center of mediation to scholars rather than the antediluvian *apkallū* (see my *Secrecy and the Gods*, 122-127, which also shows the relevance of *LKA* 147 and its unique formulation of the issue). This tradition will not factor into the discussion below.

<sup>26</sup> See, e.g., Parpola, *Letters from Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars*, XVIII.

<sup>27</sup> This recalls Berossus’ description of the sages.

<sup>28</sup> I am citing the text according to the edition in Egbert von Weiher, *Spätbabylonische Texte aus Uruk*, Teil 2, Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft in Uruk-Warka 10 (Berlin: Mann, 1983), text no. 8 (= *SpBTU* II 8) for convenience. An up-to-date critical edition of the series is still lacking. *SpBTU* II 8 is a late text from Uruk, but Borger provides a list of other attested exemplars, most of which come from libraries of the early first millennium (see Rykle Borger, “Die Beschwörungsserie *Bīt mēseri* und die Himmelfahrt Henochs,” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 33 [1974], 183-96; he translates our lines on 192-93). For recent observations on the *Bīt mēseri* series generally, including many citations of secondary literature and the role of apotropaic figurines in it, see Frans Wiggermann, *Mesopotamian Protective Spirits: The Ritual Texts*, Cuneiform Monographs 1 (Groningen: Styx and PP Publications, 1992), 105-13.

They are the seven brilliant *purādu*-fish, *purādu*-fish from the sea,  
the seven sages, who were created in the river,  
who ensure the correct execution of the plans of heaven and earth.<sup>29</sup>

The text continues with a list of four human *apkallū*, Nungalpirigal, Pirigalnungal, Pirigalabzu,<sup>30</sup> and Lu-Nana, who are then described in lines 28-29 of the same tablet as:

Four sages of human descent, whom Ea,  
the lord, perfected with wide understanding.<sup>31</sup>

The presence of these four humans in this text, even though called *apkallū*, suggests several points of similarity with the ULKS that advance our understanding of the *apkallū*–*ummânū* association. In the present context, however, I will limit my comments to a textual feature that others have noted but not utilized as evidence for understanding the *apkallū*–*ummânū* tradition; namely, unlike the seven non-human sages, the four human sages in *Bīt mēseri* have no place in the ritual instructions associated with this incantation.<sup>32</sup> Sanders suggests this discrepancy indicates the four human *apkallū* are “extraneous” while Wiggerman gives it a source critical interpretation, suggesting “the list of *apkallū* does not originate from *bīt mēseri* but from another text—a chronicle?—, from where it was adapted by *bīt mēseri*.”<sup>33</sup> Building on these interpretations, I suggest that the absence of the four human *apkallū* from the ritual instructions is a textual clue that they are in fact a later addition to the incantation. According to this interpretation, the text provides evidence

<sup>29</sup> 10. suḫur<sup>ku6</sup>.zalág.ga suḫur<sup>ku6</sup>.a.ab.ba imin.na.ne.ne

11. pu-ra-du nam-ru-tu pu-ra-du tam-tim se-bet-ti šú-nu

12. imin abgal id.da mú.mú.dè giš.ḫur an.ki.a si.sá.e.ne

13. se-bet ap-kal-lum šá ina id(nāri) ib-ba-nu-ú muš-te-šer ú-šu-rat AN-e ù KI-tim

<sup>30</sup> The artificiality of the first three names in this list has been noted repeatedly in the literature; the *pirig-* element is probably related to the *u<sub>4</sub>*- element in some of the antediluvian sages’ names. On these names, see, e.g., W. W. Hallo, “On the Antiquity of Sumerian Literature,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 83 (1963), 167-76, here 175; Sanders, “Writing, Ritual, and Apocalypse,” 117; and Wiggermann, *Mesopotamian Protective Spirits*, 74 (each citing nearly the same earlier secondary literature).

<sup>31</sup> 28. 4 abgal ù.tu.ud.da nam.lú.u<sub>10</sub>.lu <sup>d</sup>en.ki en geštú dagal.la šu.du<sub>7</sub>.e.ne

29. er-bet NUN.ME i-lit-tu LÚ-ut-tú ša <sup>d</sup>BE(Ea) EN uz-nu ra-pa-aš-tú u-šak-lil-šu-nu-tú

<sup>32</sup> See *SpBTU* II 8 i 30-31.

<sup>33</sup> Sanders, “Writing, Ritual, and Apocalypse,” 117; Wiggermann, *Mesopotamian Protective Spirits*, 108. They do appear extraneous in the incantation when viewed from the perspective of the ritual instructions, and the four human *apkallū* almost certainly were taken from some other traditional context, though we have not yet identified it.

that someone deliberately associated the two groups of *apkallū*, human and mythic, sometime in the early first millennium. That is to say, the disconnect between ritual and incantation provides a hint at alteration or innovation—i.e., an active interest—in the *apkallū* tradition attested here.<sup>34</sup>

We must recognize, however, the fact that the tradition exemplified in *Bīt mēseri* differs in a significant way from the ULKS: in *Bīt mēseri* the tradition occurs in a ritual.<sup>35</sup> If this were the only instance of *apkallū* in a ritual context, this difference in genre would be of little consequence. But, in fact, it is not. The seven *apkallū* are mentioned, for example, in anti-witchcraft incantations in *Maqlū* II 124,<sup>36</sup> V 110,<sup>37</sup> VII 49,<sup>38</sup> VIII 38 (though without names).<sup>39</sup> They also occur in a medical incantation in *LKA* 146 that gives a mythological

<sup>34</sup> For a much more detailed example of finding literary and socio-religious data in the discrepancies between an incantation and its associated ritual, see Tzvi Abusch, “Ritual and Incantation: Interpretation and Textual History of *Maqlū* VII:58-105 and IX:52-59,” in “*Sha’arei Talmon*,” *Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon*, ed. Michael Fishbane and Emanuel Tov with the assistance of Weston W. Fields (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 367-80; reprinted in Tzvi Abusch, *Mesopotamian Witchcraft: Toward a History and Understanding of Babylonian Witchcraft Beliefs and Literature*, *Ancient Magic and Divination* 5 (Leiden: Brill / Styx, 2002).

<sup>35</sup> Besides the generic difference the text also has a difference with regard to the included content: kings are only mentioned with two of the human *apkallū* and none is mentioned with the mythic *apkallū*. Since *Bīt mēseri* is a ritual, we would not expect the sage-king association to appear. Due to their association with Ea, the *apkallū* were “natural” candidates for invocation in apotropaic/exorcistic contexts (see, e.g., Benjamin Foster, “Wisdom and the Gods in Ancient Mesopotamia,” *Orientalia* 43 [1974], 344-54, here 349 and other examples below). But kings are not figures typically invoked in incantations. Thus, it is not really surprising that we do not see the connection made systematically in such a context. However, when a sage-king connection is mentioned, it is interesting to see signs of continuity with the later ULKS. For example, Nungalpirigal is associated with Enmerkar in both *Bīt mēseri* and the ULKS.

<sup>36</sup> 7 *apkallē šūt Eridu likpidūšunūti ana lemuttim*: “May the seven sages of Eridu plan evil for them.” This counters the assertion that the sorcerers have planned evil for the patient in II 117. See Gerhard Meier, *Die assyrische Beschwörungssammlung Maqlū*, *Archiv für Orientforschung Beiheft* 2 (Berlin, 1937), 17 for text and translation.

<sup>37</sup> 7 *apkallē šūt Eridu* [. . .]; see Gerhard Meier, “Studien zur Beschwörungssammlung Maqlū,” *Archiv für Orientforschung* 21 (1966), 77 for the text. Meier’s earlier edition contains nothing except the number 7 from the line (*Maqlū*, 38).

<sup>38</sup> 7 *apkallē šūt Eridu lipāššihū zumuršu*, “May the seven sages of Eridu give his body relief” (Meier, *Maqlū*, 48).

<sup>39</sup> Broken context: [. . .] *šī-ma apkallē ša Apsī* (Meier, *Maqlū*, 54). Note the next line, also broken, has *nēmeqi nikilti Ea iqbū*, “the wisdom, the ingenuity of Ea they spoke.”

account of Ea communicating poultices to humans.<sup>40</sup> From such evidence Sanders has argued that the seven *apkallū* are restricted to myths<sup>41</sup> and rituals during the Neo-Assyrian period (and earlier), and this fact, in his opinion, speaks against their use in a scholarly genealogy before the Seleucid era.<sup>42</sup> Sanders' objection reminds us of the need for sensitivity to genre in adducing evidence, something few others have taken seriously when discussing the issue of scholarly genealogy. There is, however, other non-ritual evidence that both alleviates the problem he raises and provides more support for the earlier *apkallū*–*ummânū* association suggested by the *Bīt mēseri* material.

A textual variant between the only two manuscripts of the Akkadian literary composition “Advice to a Prince,” which is clearly a non-ritual text, supports the close association of the *apkallū* and *ummânū* in the early first millennium. A comparison of the two tablets at lines 4 and 5 reveals our variant of interest.<sup>43</sup>

DT 1:4-5 (the Ninevite version)

a-na NUN.ME-ŠÚ(*apkallīšu*) la i-qūl UD.MEŠ-ŠÚ(*ūmīšu*) LÚGUD.DA.MEŠ(*ikarrū*)  
a-na UM.ME.A(*ummāni*) la i-qūl KUR-su(*māssu*) BAL-su(*ibbalakkissu*)

<sup>40</sup> W. G. Lambert, “The Twenty-one ‘Poultices,’” *Anatolian Studies* 30 (1980), 77-83. See also, e.g., *Bīt rimki* (Rykle Borger, “Das Dritte ‘Haus’ der Serie Bīt Rimki [VR 50-51, Schollmeyer HGŠ Nr.1],” *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 21 [1967], 11:25 + a); the rituals treated by Wiggermann, *Mesopotamian Protective Spirits*; and the (overlapping) attestations noted by J. J. A. van Dijk, *La Sagesse Sumero-Accadienne*, *Commentationes Orientales* 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1953), 20, n.56.

<sup>41</sup> They are found in *Erra* I 162 and *Gilgamesh* I 21 and XI 326 (called *muntalkū*).

<sup>42</sup> He writes, “[t]he human sages, *ummānu*, appear for the first time in Neo-Assyrian king lists, and in the *bīt mēseri* fragments of the Neo-Assyrian period the superhuman *apkallū* are for the first time listed by name and correlated with legendary and historical kings. While Mesopotamian kings remain on the throne, the *apkallū* remain confined to myth and ritual. In the Seleucid period, after the loss of native kingship, the *apkallū* enter history. . . . Evidence of a historically developing identification between the Mesopotamian ritual practitioner and the *apkallū* in general and Adapa in particular finally emerges in Seleucid Uruk” (Sanders, “Writing, Ritual, and Apocalypse,” 144-45).

<sup>43</sup> In the standard edition of the text, Lambert expresses the opinion that the text is from Babylon and should be dated to roughly 1000 to 700 BCE. He also notes, “(t)he text is written on a tablet from the libraries of Aššurbanipal [i.e., DT 1], and no duplicate has yet been found” (W. G. Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960; reprinted, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1996], 110, 111). Steven Cole has recently published a duplicate to DT 1 (*Nippur IV. The Early Neo-Babylonian Governor’s Archive from Nippur*, Oriental Institute Publications 114 [Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1996], no. 128 [= OIP 114 128]); the tablet was found among a cache from Nippur.

(If) he does not listen to his sage, his days will be short.

(If) he does not listen to (his) scholar, his land will rebel against him.

In the standard edition based on DT 1 (the Ninevite version), Lambert took the ME in NUN.ME-šú as a plural marker and read the word as *rubû*, “princes, nobles.”<sup>44</sup> This is understandable in light of line 10 which sets NUN.ME alongside DI.KUD.ME (*dayyānū*, “judges”). In the orthography of the latter term ME *must* indicate plurality. But Reiner has noted that DT 1 typically uses MEŠ to express the plural (line 10’s DI.KUD.ME being the one indisputable exception); thus, it seemed likely to her that NUN.ME in both lines 4 and 10 should be read *apkallu* (singular).<sup>45</sup>

Considering only the evidence of DT 1, I think there is internal evidence in line 26 for the proper reading of NUN.ME in both lines 4 and 10. In line 26 Marduk is called the NUN.ME DINGIR.MEŠ (*apkal itī*, “sage of the gods”) and the NUN (*rubû*, “prince”). These epithets are even adjacent to one another in the line. It is clear therefore that the text knew the distinction and the potential ambiguity between the words *apkallu* and *rubû*. Moreover, lines 4 and 10 could have made the reading *rubû*—if that is what was intended—unambiguous if it had wanted to. But it did not. Therefore, I think, NUN.ME should be read as *apkallu* in DT 1. On this reading, there is a clear parallel established between an *apkallu* and *ummānu* in the Ninevite Version of the text.

The answer to the contextual and practical problems presented by the resulting parallelism in lines 4 and 5 comes from the duplicate published by Cole.<sup>46</sup>

<sup>44</sup> *Babylonian Wisdom Literature*, 112-13.

<sup>45</sup> See Erica Reiner, “The Etiological Myth of the ‘Seven Sages,’” *Orientalia* 30 (1961), 9 and n.1.

<sup>46</sup> Cole, *Nippur IV*, 268-74 (OIP 114 128). Hurowitz, through whom I became acquainted with this issue, points out the contextual difficulties with this reading nicely. Although he recognizes that “*apkallu* is an excellent parallel for *ummānu*” since “(b)oth refer to sages and masters of the basic fields of wisdom,” he goes on to say the following: “[w]hile the later [*sic.*, latter; the *ummānū*] could be courtiers who could proffer advice at court and be heeded by the king, the former [the *apkallū*] can impart their wisdom only in an indirect manner [i.e., because they were mythological sages], and the king could not be expected to really heed them. The reading *apkallu* would therefore be problematic on practical grounds if the text is not to be considered as speaking metaphorically” (Victor Hurowitz, “Advice to a Prince: A Message from Ea,” *State Archives of Assyria Bulletin* 12 [1998], 49, n.23). I would add to this that *apkallu* does not seem an appropriate parallel term to *dayyānū* in line 10.

OIP 114 128 (the Nippur version)

a-na NUN.MEŠ-šú(*rubîšu*) NU(*lā*) ME(*iqūl*) UD.MEŠ-šú LÚGUD.DA.MEŠ

a-na um-ma-a-nu NU ME KUR-su BAL-su

(If) he does not listen to his princes, his days will be short.

(If) he does not listen to (his) scholar, his land will rebel against him.

Lines 4 and 11 (= DT's line 10) in the Nippur version of the text have the unambiguous reading NUN.MEŠ-šú, i.e., *rubîšu*, "his nobles." This is probably the better reading of the two versions since it fits the social situation envisioned by the text much better than the mythological sage-figures of the Ninevite version. Moreover, *rubîšu* provides a suitable parallel for the terms in both lines 5 (*ummānu*) and 10 (*dayyānū*).

So why was *apkallu* employed in parallel to *ummānu* in line 4 of the Nineveh version? It seems the composition did not always do so. The reading in the Nineveh version is either a graphic corruption of the original reading (it left out three *Winkelhaken* in the MEŠ sign twice, in lines 4 and 10, thereby forming ME) or, more likely, there was a deliberate, if small, alteration to the text that was ideologically motivated.<sup>47</sup> If Hurowitz is correct in seeing a relationship between the "Advice to a Prince" and Ea,<sup>48</sup> then this text would be a significant and appropriate textual location to assert a connection between the *apkallū* and their descendants, the *ummānū*. Bringing them together may have seemed an almost "natural" thing to do in this text in light of the "mythology."<sup>49</sup> Significantly, the "Advice to a Prince" explicitly sets the identification of the *apkallū* and *ummānū* within the context of royal advising. In this regard, our text shows another conceptual continuity with the ULKS and suggests that the *apkallū* are not found exclusively in ritual contexts during the early first millennium.

As is well-known, antediluvian knowledge had special significance in Mesopotamia.<sup>50</sup> The most important example of this fact for the

<sup>47</sup> Cole, *Nippur IV*, 274 mentions the possibility, based on a mistake in the text, that the Nippur tablet was a practice tablet written from dictation. If that is so, then it is unlikely that the confusion between *apkallu* and *rubū* could be attributed to a simple graphic error.

<sup>48</sup> Hurowitz, "Advice to a Prince."

<sup>49</sup> It is possible, therefore, that the production of this variant was not wholly conscious.

<sup>50</sup> For other examples of antediluvian knowledge (though sometimes in a broken context), see the examples gathered by Lambert, "Catalogue of Texts and Authors," 72 at the note on VI 15.

purposes of this study comes from an oft cited colophon of a medical tablet from Ashurbanipal's library, *AMT* 105,1 (K.4023), lines 21-25. This colophon shows not only the association of antediluvian sages and a human sage but also the "mythology of scribal succession" in action.<sup>51</sup>

Salves (and) bandages: tested (and) checked, which are ready at hand, composed by the ancient sages from before the flood, which<sup>52</sup> in Šuruppak in the second year of Enlil-bani, king of Isin, Enlil-muballit, sage of Nippur, bequeathed.<sup>53</sup>

Although the number of *apkallū* is unspecified in this text, the indication of plurality of sages and the antediluvian time frame strongly suggest an association with the seven sages known from traditions such as *Bīt mēseri* and the ULKS. The fact that the tablet claims the *apkallū* composed<sup>54</sup> these recipes bolsters the authority (by invoking these beings associated with Ea) and legitimacy (by asserting antiquity) of the recipes contained in the text. But I do not think that is its primary purpose. The claim is not made in the context of a ritual; so it does not primarily function to create *ritual* power. Rather, the claim occurs in a colophon, a label that communicates something about the tablet for other would-be readers/users of it. The invocation of the *apkallū* and a claim to antediluvian knowledge in a colophon intends therefore to affect the *social* situation in which the tablet is used. In this case the colophon credentials a human being as the possessor of antediluvian knowledge (i.e., medical recipes). Revealed by primeval *apkallū*, mediated to the human sage Enlil-muballit, and transmitted, presumably, by means of various

<sup>51</sup> For the original copy of the tablet, see R. Campbell Thompson, *Assyrian Medical Texts* (London: H. Milford / New York: Oxford University Press, 1923; reprinted, Osnabrück: Otto Zeller Verlag, 1983), 105,1 (=K.4023, col. iv, and thus probably from Nineveh). I have cited the text according to Hermann Hunger, *Babylonische und assyrische Kolophone*, *Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 2 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag / Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon and Bercker, 1968), no. 533, with corrections from Yaakov Elman, "Authoritative Oral Tradition in Neo-Assyrian Scribal Circles," *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society* 7 (1975), 19-32, here 31.

<sup>52</sup> This refers back to salves and bandages.

<sup>53</sup> 21. [na]p-ša-la-tú tak-ši-ra-nu lat-ku-tu<sub>4</sub> ba-ru-ti šá ana [š]U šu-sú-ú

22. šá KA NUN.ME.MEŠ-e la-bi-ru-ti šá la-am A.MÁ.URU<sub>5</sub>(abūbi)

23. šá ina LAMXKUR<sup>ki</sup>(šuruppak) MU.2.KÁM <sup>1d</sup>EN.LÍL-ba-ni LUGAL <sup>umu</sup>Í.SI.IN<sup>ki</sup>

24. <sup>1d</sup>EN.LÍL-mu-bal-liš NUN.ME NIBRU<sup>ki</sup> [e]z]-bu

<sup>54</sup> Note that as with Ea in the "Catalog of Texts and Authors" (see note 50 and just below), the Akkadian reads *ša pī*.

copyists to the present possessor, *AMT* 105,1 implies the same notion of succession as the ULKS.

A similar idea is probably attested in *KAR* 177, obv. iv 25-32, a text containing hemerologies, which reads:<sup>55</sup>

Favorable days. According to the seven s[ages(?)].

Duplicate of a tablet from Sippar, Nippur, Babylon, Larsa, Ur, Uruk, and Eridu.

The scholars excerpted, selected, and gave it to Nazimuruttash, king of the world.<sup>56</sup>

It seemed highly unlikely to the editor (Lambert) that the seven cities named in the text represented the seven exemplars from which the scribe worked. In other words, it seems unlikely that the scribe was looking at seven different copies while writing his own tablet. Instead, Lambert proposed that the seven cities represent a succession of exemplars. Each of the exemplars was written by one of the seven sages one after another thereby creating a line of succession for the present tablet that extends back into earliest times. The claim of this colophon, therefore, is that the tablet of hemerologies over which the *ummânû* labored goes back to the *apkallû* and ultimately originated in Eridu, the home city of Ea. This again demonstrates an example of the "mythology of scribal succession" and an implicit assertion of antediluvian knowledge.

Finally, although not giving specific proof of a genealogical relationship, the content of the well-known "Catalog of Texts and Authors" edited by Lambert attests once again the close connection between Ea, the mythological *apkallû*, and the *ummânû* as in the "mythology of scribal succession."<sup>57</sup> In this text Ea is credited

<sup>55</sup> The tablet is from Aššur and presumably the NA period. The text and restorations follow W. G. Lambert, "Ancestors, Authors, and Canonicity," *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 11 (1957), 1-14, here 8. Lambert also gives the remainder of the colophon, rev. iv 1-3 (8), which is of no interest in this context, and sets out von Soden's readings in a follow-up note ("Ancestors, Authors, and Canonicity [JCS XI, 1-14]: Additions and Corrections," *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 11 [1957], 112).

<sup>56</sup> 25. UD.MEŠ(*umû*) DÙG.GA.MEŠ(*tābūtu*) KA 7 a[*p<sup>2</sup>-ka<sup>2</sup>-l<sup>2</sup>*]

26. *gab-ri* ZIMBIR<sup>ki</sup>(*Sippar*) NIBRU<sup>ki</sup>

27. KÁ.DINGIR.RA<sup>ki</sup> UD.UNUG<sup>ki</sup>(*Larsa*)

28. ÚRI<sup>ki</sup> UNUG<sup>ki</sup>(*Uruk*) *eri<sub>4</sub>-du<sub>10</sub>*<sup>ki</sup>

29. *un-ma-a-ni ú-na-as-si-ḥu-ma*

30. *ú-na-as-si-qu-ma*

31. *a-na<sup>1</sup> na-zi-múru-u[t-ta]š*

32. *šâr šú(kiššati)* SUM-nu(*iddinû*)

<sup>57</sup> See the edition in Lambert, "Catalogue of Texts and Authors," 59-77.

with the authorship of several large and important works (see I 1-4). Following his works, the catalog lists Oannes-Adapa, the first mythological *apkallū* in the common list of sages of the Uruk list, *Bīt mēseri*, and Berossus, and credits him with the authorship of the astronomical series *Enūma Anu Enlil* (5-6). It also lists him as the author of another work later in the catalog (VI 15-16). Although the title of this other work is only partially preserved, it is notable that the preserved portion reads *ša lām abūbi*, “from before the flood.” Following these first two authors (Ea and Oannes-Adapa), the catalog enumerates many other works and their putative authors.<sup>58</sup> Two of these are known to be *apkallu*: one, named Enmeduga (IV 11), does not have a preserved title, but is known as the third antediluvian sage in the common list of sages; another is called a sage but his name is not preserved (III 7). The majority of the remaining authors are *ummânū*, usually *āšipū* or *kalū* but also including a *bārū*. Several among those listed in the catalog are also listed in the ULKS: Sin-leqi-unnini (VI 10), Kabti-ili-Marduk (II 2), Sidu (VI 13), Gimil-Gula (VI 8), Taqiša-Gula (IV 9), and Saggil-kina-ubbib (= Esagil-kin-ubba in the ULKS) (V 2). The last human *apkallu* in *Bīt mēseri*, Lu-Nana (VI 11), is also attested. To find mentioned by name scholars who would be remembered hundreds of years later in the tradition (in the ULKS) is somewhat remarkable. But it is even more remarkable that these scholars, along with a couple of mythological sages and the god Ea, are placed alongside other, presumably less celebrated scholars, many of whom we know absolutely nothing beyond what this text preserves. This suggests the genealogical relationship to antediluvian sages extended to all scholars as a class.

Taken as a whole, a general picture emerges that sustains the idea that the “mythology of scribal succession,” though never presented as clearly as in the ULKS, was quite alive early in the first millennium. The *ummânū* fashioned themselves—consciously or perhaps unconsciously<sup>59</sup>—into the scribal heirs of the antediluvian sages,

<sup>58</sup> Lambert believes the list has no apparent order (“Catalogue of Texts and Authors,” 76) while Karel van der Toorn has suggested the “classification of the literature is by presumed antiquity” (“Why Wisdom Became a Secret: On Wisdom as a Written Genre,” in *Wisdom Literature in Mesopotamia and Israel*, ed. Richard J. Clifford; Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 36 [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007], 21-29, here 21). Van der Toorn’s view has merit, but a decision in this matter is not important for the present purpose.

<sup>59</sup> Mythmaking need not always be conscious nor considered duplicitous or

themselves closely allied with Ea, the patron deity of the *ummânû*. This relationship of scholarly succession gave mythological support for the roles of the *ummânû* at court and in society as ritual experts, counselors to the king, and authors of important cuneiform works.<sup>60</sup> As this mythology of succession was accepted and reified—that is, after it was accepted as a fact of the ordered cosmos—it would have galvanized the importance of the scholarly texts for the scholars and for the king they served. Given the precarious professional existence of the scholar (see “The Forlorn Scholar”)<sup>61</sup> and their institutional dependency for scholarly support, this development was a major contribution to their social security.

### *Seleucid Treatment of Indigenous Mesopotamian Institutions*

The Seleucid attention to indigenous traditions as well as their support of Mesopotamian temples—whether directly or indirectly—is the second element in understanding the Hellenistic context from which our text arose. Historians of Hellenistic Mesopotamia in recent decades have successfully countered earlier, largely Hellenocentric scholarly opinions about Seleucid neglect or disinterest in and thus demise of traditional Babylonian settlements and institutions.<sup>62</sup> The alleged neglect, in fact, originates with modern historians

---

manipulative. As Russell McCutcheon notes, “[a] thoroughly social theory of religion posits individual actors’ intentions, plans, and organizations not as causes of, but as artifacts that result from social formation, as the evidence of pre-existent, communally shared intellectual and material conditions beyond the scope or control of the individual. . . . Social formations are therefore complex, interactive, partially intentional yet completely blind processes” (see *Critics Not Caretakers: Redescribing the Public Study of Religion*, Issues in the Study of Religion Series [Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001], 27-28).

<sup>60</sup> The scholars may also have inscribed their relationship to the *apkallû* in the palace reliefs as argued by Mehmet-Ali Ataç, “Scribal-Sacerdotal Agency in the Production of the Neo-Assyrian Palace Reliefs: Toward a Hermeneutics of Iconography” (Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 2003). I have only been able to read the abstract as the dissertation itself was unavailable to me for consultation. Ataç only briefly mentions this idea in his “Visual Form and Meaning in Neo-Assyrian Relief Sculpture,” *The Art Bulletin* 88.1 (2006), 69-101, here 87, 88-89.

<sup>61</sup> See Simo Parpola, “The Forlorn Scholar,” in *Language, Literature, and History: Philological and Historical Studies Presented to Erica Reiner*, ed. F. Rochberg-Halton; American Oriental Series 67 (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1987), 257-78.

<sup>62</sup> See especially Susan Sherwin-White, “Seleucid Babylonia: A Case-Study for the Installation and Development of Greek Rule,” in *Hellenism in the East: The*

who had not adequately factored the cuneiform evidence into their accounts and rather too eagerly believed the tendentious reports concerning Babylon given by such classical authors as Strabo (*Geography* 16.1.5), Pausanias (*Description of Greece* 1.16.3), and Pliny (*Natural History* 6.26.122).<sup>63</sup>

Based on a growing body of cuneiform and archaeological evidence, recent scholars have suggested that the Seleucids actually made significant investments in traditional Mesopotamia. Chronicles, astronomical diaries, and administrative documents attest to the fact that Seleucid rulers took part, at least at times, in various traditional temple rituals and supported the temples through various projects of renovation or repair, especially in Babylon.<sup>64</sup> Archaeology

---

*Interaction of Greek and Non-Greek Civilizations from Syria to Central Asia after Alexander*, ed. Amélie Kuhrt and Susan Sherwin-White; *Hellenistic Culture and Society* 2 (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987), 1-31; Amélie Kuhrt and Susan Sherwin-White, *From Samarkhand to Sardis: A New Approach to the Seleucid Empire*, *Hellenistic Culture and Society* 13 (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993); and Amélie Kuhrt, "The Seleucid Kings and Babylonia: New Perspectives on the Seleucid Realm in the East," in *Aspects of Hellenistic Kingship*, ed. Per Bilde *et al.*; *Studies in Hellenistic Civilization* 7 (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1996), 41-54. See also Pierre Briant, "The Seleucid Kingdom, the Achaemenid Empire and the History of the Near East in the First Millennium (sic) BC," in *Religion and Religious Practice in the Seleucid Kingdom*, ed. Per Bilde *et al.*; *Studies in Hellenistic Civilization* 1 (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1990), 40-65. Briant notes that recent investigators have abandoned Droysen's idea of the Hellenization of the Near East and have turned their attention to understanding the continuation of local institutions and cultural patterns. However, "this essential and fruitful attempt at reinterpretation remains more often than not unfinished and incomplete" due to academic specialization.

<sup>63</sup> See D. T. Potts, *Mesopotamian Civilization: The Material Foundations* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997), 280, 284-85 and especially T. Boiy, *Late Achaemenid and Hellenistic Babylon*, *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 136 (Leuven: Peeters, 2004), 77-78, 135-36. For a convenient translation of Strabo's comments, see M. M. Austin, *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest: A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), no. 188.

<sup>64</sup> See, e.g., A. Kirk Grayson, *Babylonian Historical-Literary Texts*, *Toronto Semitic Texts and Studies* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975), 19-20, n.29, where he entertains the idea that the Dynastic Prophecy may have had an anti-hellenistic element in it but opposes S. K. Eddy's idea of widespread anti-Hellenistic sentiment in Seleucid Mesopotamia (in his *The King is Dead: Studies in the Near Eastern Resistance to Hellenism 334-31 B.C.* [Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961]) by listing the cuneiform evidence that records Seleucid patronage of traditional Babylonian cultic institutions. See further Grayson's *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* (Locust Valley, NY: J. J. Augustin, 1975; reprinted, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2000), 278, n.2, where he lists various kinds of evidence of Seleucid temple restorations, among other things. (Grayson notes here renovations during the reign of Antiochus IV Epiphanes [175-164 BCE], citing M. Rostovtzeff, "Seleucid Babylonia: Bullae and Seals of Clay with Greek Inscriptions," *Yale Classical Studies* 3 [1932],

often confirms reports of temple renovation and perhaps equally significantly has yet to provide evidence for the Hellenization of temple architecture. In fact, quite the opposite case holds true: Seleucid rulers seem to have encouraged the continued use of traditional temple styles when renovation projects were undertaken.<sup>65</sup>

There is also some evidence that the Seleucids, at least at times, accommodated themselves to Mesopotamian traditions. Perhaps the most famous example of this is Antiochus I's royal inscription of 268 BCE. In this archaizing inscription Antiochus I appropriated the traditional language of kingship, utilized throughout earlier Mesopotamian royal inscriptions, in order to present his own rule in the linguistic garb of an indigenous king. The opening lines read: "I am Antiochus, great king, strong king, king of the inhabited world, king of Babylon, king of the lands, the provider of Esagil

---

3-113, here 6-7, as evidence; but upon closer inspection of Rostovtzeff one will see that he has in fact dated the Kephalaion inscription [now known to be from 201 BCE] to the reign of Antiochus IV. Adam Falkenstein indicates that the proper reading for the date was established only some time after its initial publication [*Topographie von Uruk: I. Teil Uruk zur Seleukidenzeit* (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1941), 7, n.3]. There is, therefore, currently no evidence to the best of my knowledge for renovation of Mesopotamian temples under Antiochus IV.) Note also S. M. Sherwin-White, "Babylonian Chronicle Fragments as a Source for Seleucid History," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 42 (1983), 265-70 and her analysis in "Ritual for a Seleucid King at Babylon?" *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 103 (1983), 156-59, citing Grayson's earlier work (159, nn.40-41). Amélie Kuhrt and Susan Sherwin-White, "Aspects of Seleucid Royal Ideology: The Cylinder of Antiochus I from Borsippa," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 111 (1991), 81-2 survey the data (chronicles and diaries) for Seleucid work on Marduk's temple in Babylon, dating between 322/1 to 224/3 and Kuhrt, "The Seleucid Kings and Babylonia," 48 cites an astrological diary that proves Antiochus III engaged in cultic rites as late as 187 BCE. For the diaries specifically, see, e.g., R. J. van der Spek, "The Astronomical Diaries as a Source for Achaemenid and Seleucid History," *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 50 (1993), 91-101 and Wayne Horowitz, "Antiochus I, Esagil, and a Celebration of the Ritual for Renovation of Temples," *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 85 (1991), 75-77.

<sup>65</sup> See Lise Hannestad and Daniel Potts, "Temple Architecture in the Seleucid Kingdom," in *Religion and Religious Practice in the Seleucid Kingdom*, ed. Per Bilde et al.; *Studies in Hellenistic Civilization* 1 (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1990), 107, who cite the Bit Rēš temple's traditional design as evidence (a temple refurbished at least a couple of times during the Seleucid period). They conclude with the following: "we can hardly escape the conclusion that there was no official programme of Hellenization of the religious sphere during Seleucid rule. The evidence from Babylon points rather to the contrary, that the Seleucid kings, like many later colonizers, encouraged traditionalism in the religious sphere" (123). See also Susan B. Downey, *Mesopotamian Religious Architecture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), 7-50, especially 11, 14, 16, and 38 (all concerning temples in either Babylon or Uruk).

and Ezida, foremost son of Seleucus, the king, the Macedonian, king of Babylon.”<sup>66</sup>

Even if we were to interpret all of these Seleucid activities as exploiting indigenous traditions to further their own rule, we should probably only conclude from this that the Seleucids were doing what a long line of earlier Mesopotamian rulers—indigenous or otherwise—had done.<sup>67</sup> But, we need not imagine the Seleucid appropriation or support of Mesopotamian institutions as a simple one-way, top-down mechanism of exploitation.<sup>68</sup> There may be indications that some of the local elites encouraged the rulers to adopt Mesopotamian ways, either explicitly or implicitly. For example, several historians have suggested that Berossus’ *Babyloniaca* was explicitly written to encourage the foreign Seleucids, especially Antiochus I, to sympathize with and support Mesopotamian traditions.<sup>69</sup> And

---

<sup>66</sup> The Akkadian text of 5R, no. 66 reads: 1.<sup>1</sup>an-ti-<sup>2</sup>u-ku-us LUGAL GAL 2. LUGAL dan-nu LUGAL ŠÁR LUGAL E<sup>ki</sup> LUGAL KUR.KUR 3. za-ni-in é-sag-il ù é-zi-da 4. IBILA SAG ša <sup>1</sup>si-lu-uk-ku LUGAL 5. <sup>1a</sup>ma-ak-ka-du-na-a LUGAL E<sup>ki</sup> 6. a-na-ku (see Kuhrt and Sherwin-White, “Aspects of Seleucid Royal Ideology,” 75-76 for a transliteration and translation, with previous literature cited on p. 73, n.13; see also Austin, *The Hellenistic World*, no. 189, for an accessible translation). The analysis of Kuhrt and Sherwin-White demonstrates the inscription’s mostly traditional Babylonian royal rhetoric and points out its few non-Babylonian features (“Aspects of Seleucid Royal Ideology,” 78-86). Boiy has noted that the cuneiform script used in this inscription is archaizing (i.e., making an attempt to look older than it is), and thus he suspects the royal titles, which are traditional but not always found in more contemporary royal inscriptions, are also archaizing (see T. Boiy, “Royal Titulature in Hellenistic Babylonia,” *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie* 92 [2002], 241-57, here 248). This is significant in light of section three below.

<sup>67</sup> For a recent attempt to formulate the Seleucid imperial policy toward Mesopotamia as one of indirect rule that supported and utilized (i.e., exploited) indigenous institutions rather than imposing specifically Hellenistic ones, see Michael Sommer, “Babylonien im Seleukenreich: Indirekte Herrschaft und indigene Bevölkerung,” *Klio* 82 (2000), 73-90. After a brief look at Hellenistic Palestine (i.e., the events leading up to the Maccabean revolt), Sommer examines Mesopotamia under the Seleucids and sets this alongside a discussion of British indirect rule in India. The latter becomes an ideal type to test the notion of indirect rule in the ancient Hellenistic Mesopotamian context.

<sup>68</sup> See Sherwin-White, “Seleucid Babylonia: A Case Study,” 9.

<sup>69</sup> See Stanley Mayer Burstein, *The Babyloniaca of Berossus* (Sources from the Ancient Near East I/5; Malibu: Undena Publications, 1978), 5-6, who believes Berossus’ departure for Cos late in his life may indicate Berossus’ disappointment with the Seleucid policies toward Babylon. See also Paul-Alain Beaulieu, “The Historical Background of the Uruk Policy,” in *The Tablet and the Scroll: Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William W. Hallo*, ed. M. Cohen, D. Snell and D. Weisberg (Bethesda: CDL Press, 1993), 49. But see Amélie Kuhrt, “Berossus’ *Babyloniaca* and Seleucid Rule in Babylonia,” in *Hellenism in the East*, 32-56, who contends Berossus may have written in order to provide the Seleucids with local ideological

recently Paul-Alain Beaulieu has set the Uruk Prophecy within a larger religious agenda and interpreted the enigmatic text as an implicit attempt to persuade Antiochus I to support the Uruk temple, thereby furthering the newly revived cult of Anu and Antu.<sup>70</sup>

While properly recognizing Seleucid adoption or support of Babylonian traditions and institutions, we should not allow the pendulum to swing too far toward a thorough-going pro-Babylonian policy. As noted by Sherwin-White, “there is . . . a tendency in writing on the Seleucids, and on the hellenistic world in general, to concertina three whole centuries of history and assume . . . that what is characteristic of one century, or of part of it, is equally true of the whole.”<sup>71</sup> Thus, we should not assume that temple renovations started under Alexander or a ruler fashioning himself according to the pattern of a good Mesopotamian king in the mid-third century was *the* Seleucid policy, that it *always* characterized the Seleucid policy for the duration of the empire in *every* location under their governance.

Two well-known dedicatory inscriptions from the second half of the third century (i.e., 244 BCE, during the reign of Seleucus II, and 201 BCE, during the reign of Antiochus III) that describe temple renovations on Uruk’s Bīt Rēš temple might in fact hint at a cooling of Seleucid interests in Mesopotamia, at least outside the city of Babylon.<sup>72</sup> Although both inscriptions describe the temple renovation as having been undertaken “for the life of the king” (*ana bulṭa ša RN*) and probably therefore suggest the indirect involvement of the Seleucid rulers, the actual administrators of the work

---

support for their regime, especially in order for them to rebut claims made by Ptolemaic authors such as Manetho and Hecataeus (55-56).

<sup>70</sup> He writes, “The Uruk Prophecy is therefore a rewriting of historical material with the purpose of vindicating the establishment (presented as the reestablishment) of a new cult (*i.e.* the cult of Anu as reorganized in the third century by the priesthood of the Bīt Rēš), to present the ruler who will foster this cultic revival (*i.e.* one of the contemporary Seleucid rulers [which Beaulieu later identifies as Antiochus I]) as a new Nebuchadnezzar, to obliquely suggest that his father was a neglectful, and therefore malevolent, ruler (as Nabopolassar had been), and to predict an everlasting rule for his dynasty, even a rule of divine character” (Beaulieu, “Uruk Prophecy,” 49).

<sup>71</sup> Sherwin-White, “Seleucid Babylonia: A Case Study,” 3.

<sup>72</sup> Editions of the two texts may be found in Falkenstein, *Topographie von Uruk*, 4-7. For the Kephalon inscription, see the improved readings offered by van Dijk, “Die Inschriftenfunde,” 47 (though he accidentally attributes the inscription to Nikarchos instead of Kephalon). For Seleucid interaction with Mesopotamian cults, see note 64.

according to these texts were city/temple officials, the famous Anu-uballit–Nikarchos and Anu-uballit–Kephalon.<sup>73</sup> Even if these inscriptions point to indirect Seleucid involvement or support,<sup>74</sup> they also suggest that the kind of personal interest in Mesopotamian temple construction apparently exhibited by Antiochus I had waned somewhat among his successors, an opinion affirmed by Beaulieu in his interpretation of the Uruk Prophecy and its historical context.<sup>75</sup>

### *Antiquarianism*

This brings us to the last element of historical context: antiquarianism at Uruk. Certainly others have noticed the conspicuous rise of the Anu and Antu cult in Hellenistic Uruk in both the archaeological evidence of the massive Bīt Rēš temple dedicated to Anu and Hellenistic cuneiform texts.<sup>76</sup> But Beaulieu has offered a compelling explanation of this cultic development along with its attendant

---

<sup>73</sup> For these two men, their titles (*šaknu* and *rab ša rēš āli ša Uruk*), hierarchical relationship, families, and attestation elsewhere in Seleucid cuneiform documents, see L. Timothy Doty, “Nikarchos and Kephalon,” in *A Scientific Humanist: Studies in Memory of Abraham Sachs*, ed. Erle Leichty *et al.*; Occasional Publications of the Samuel Noah Kramer Fund 9 (Philadelphia: University Museum, 1988), 95–118. Kephalon’s title has since been connected to temple rather than civic duties (see T. Boiy, “Akkadian-Greek Double Names in Hellenistic Babylonia,” in *Ethnicity in Ancient Mesopotamia: Papers Read at the 48th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale Leiden, 1–4 July 2002*, ed. W. H. van Soldt [Leiden: Nederlands Instituut Voor Het Nabije Oosten, 2005], 57 n. 47, citing studies by van der Spek and Joannès). Anu-uballit–Kephalon is also known from an Aramaic inscription found on 15 bricks in the Irigal temple in Seleucid Uruk (see R. A. Bowman, “Anu-uballit–Kefalon,” *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 56.3 [1939], 231–43 and Falkenstein, *Topographie von Uruk*, 31); he was apparently responsible for some restoration work in that building, too. It is significant to note that Anu-uballit–Nikarchos received his name, according to the inscription, directly from the Seleucid king (*šá 'an-ti-<sup>2</sup>-i-ku-su LUGAL KUR.KUR.MEŠ 'ni-qi-qa-ar-qu-su MU-šú šá-nu-ú iš-kun-nu*, “whom Antiochus, the king of the lands, named Nikarchos as his other name”). Also, one should at least consider the possibility of a relationship between the meanings of the men’s Greek names (Νίκαρχος and Κέφαλον) and the positions of authority these inscriptions give to the men.

<sup>74</sup> Such is a reasonable assumption, I think, in light of the magnitude and therefore expense of the project. See, likewise, L. T. Doty, “Cuneiform Archives from Hellenistic Uruk” (Ph.D. Dissertation, Yale University, 1977), 30 and Downey, *Mesopotamian Religious Architecture*, 45.

<sup>75</sup> See Beaulieu, “Uruk Prophecy,” 50 for this opinion.

<sup>76</sup> For the former, see, for example, Downey, *Mesopotamian Religious Architecture*, 17–32, who identifies the Bīt Rēš as “the most important religious structure in Uruk during the Seleucid period” (17), and for the latter, see Amélie Kuhrt, “Survey of Written Sources Available for the History of Babylonia under the Later

theological distinctives. He argues that it is a deliberate, archaizing theological program under the direction of temple functionaries, probably beginning in the late Persian period and culminating in Hellenistic times.<sup>77</sup> A key element in this program was the fashioning of the Urukean pantheon after the canonical god list An = Anum, thereby exalting Anu and Antu, ancient patron gods of Uruk, to its head while demoting other high-ranking deities like Marduk, the old imperial capital's head deity, and Ishtar, a goddess prominent at Uruk in earlier periods, to a lower level in the pantheon.<sup>78</sup> Beaulieu describes the reasons for this theological move as follows:

By putting Anu back in the foreground the religious establishment of Uruk achieved a double purpose. They created a theological system which could challenge the dominant Marduk-Nabû theology of Babylon, and they promoted an Urukaean deity to the head of their new version of the national pantheon, thus enhancing local pride.<sup>79</sup>

In other words, with the disintegration of indigenous imperial structures under foreign regimes with little interest in arcane Mesopotamian theological matters, local cults were able to reassert their own distinctive interests. The local temple elites in Uruk did this by utilizing

---

Achaemenids," in *Achaemenid History I: Sources, Structures and Synthesis*, ed. Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg (Leiden: Brill, 1987), 147-57, here 151.

<sup>77</sup> See Paul-Alain Beaulieu, "Antiquarian Theology in Seleucid Uruk," *Acta Sumerologica* 14 (1992), 47-75. (Beaulieu also focuses on antiquarianism in his "Antiquarianism and the Concern for the Past in the Neo-Babylonian Period," *Bulletin of the Canadian Society for Mesopotamian Studies* 28 [1994], 37-42). Beaulieu dates the rise of the prominence of Anu and Antu by the appearance of these deities in personal names. Summarizing his findings, he writes: "the crucial phase of the process had probably already taken place by the end of the fifth century" ("Antiquarian Theology," 55).

<sup>78</sup> Beaulieu cites *SpBTU* I 126 as evidence that the old god-list was known in Seleucid Uruk ("Antiquarian Theology," 73, n.40). He discusses other related archaizing items, too, such as bringing an obscure goddess like Amasagnudi, consort of Papsukkal/Ninšubur, the vizier of Anu, to cultic prominence.

<sup>79</sup> "Antiquarian Theology," 68. Since greater antiquity was perceived as conferring greater authority in Mesopotamia, one might add that Uruk had a distinct advantage in reasserting the claims of the Anu cult against the claims of the Babylonian Marduk cult: Anu was considered older than him even by such traditions as the *Enūma Eliš*. However, even if one wishes to see the exaltation of Anu in terms of re-asserting the authority and position of a local deity within the pantheon, this does not exclude the possibility that other concerns contributed to the decision to do so. The decision to exalt Anu, e.g., may also have been influenced by the increasing importance of astrology among scholars, who at this later period of Mesopotamian history were now primarily associated with temples.

ancient (conceived as such by mid-first millennium times) god-list traditions to exalt Anu to the head of the pantheon.

Beaulieu believes this development also provides an explanation for the great number of scholarly texts that have turned up in Seleucid-level excavations at Uruk, both traditional kinds known from elsewhere as well as those with an explicitly Urukean bias.<sup>80</sup> In fact, as Beaulieu explains, one colophon, attached to TCL 6 38, seems to offer justification for the new rituals of the Anu cult via the familiar “pious fraud” trick: Kidin-Anu “found” some ritual tablets in Elam, where the sinister Nabopolassar had taken them much earlier. He copied them there in order to return to Uruk and properly restore the Anu cult.<sup>81</sup>

The archaizing tendency was also deployed in Kephalon’s temple dedicatory inscription from 201 BCE mentioned above.<sup>82</sup> Although not so much as hinted at in the earlier Nikarchos inscription of 244 BCE, the later inscription names Adapa himself, the first of the antediluvian *apkallū*, as the founder of the Bīt Rēš temple.<sup>83</sup>

With this and the other two contextual points in mind, we may now attempt to answer the questions I posed at the beginning of this study.

### *The Uruk List of Kings and Sages as a Hellenistic Document*

The ULKS clearly draws upon earlier ideas to formulate its list. What I have emphasized in the foregoing is that its formulation of the list, although unique, is better viewed not as a new invention from old material, but as a very systematic and explicit formulation of an old association, one that is evidenced already in early first millennium materials. Given the deliberate and learned antiquarian interests identified in texts by Beaulieu, it seems quite reasonable

---

<sup>80</sup> See François Thureau-Dangin, *Tablettes d’Uruk à l’usage des Prêtres du Temple d’Anu au Temps des Séleucides*, Textes Cunéiformes du Louvre 6 (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1922) (= TCL 6); *SpBTU* 1-5, *BaMB* 2, etc. The Uruk Prophecy is an example of a distinctively Urukean text.

<sup>81</sup> See Beaulieu, “Uruk Prophecy,” 47 for the analysis. The text may be found in Thureau-Dangin, *Rituels Accadiens*, 79-80, 85-86 and Hunger, *Babylonische und assyrische Kolophone*, #107.

<sup>82</sup> Also mentioned by Beaulieu in connection with antiquarianism (see “Antiquarian Theology,” 68).

<sup>83</sup> See Falkenstein, *Topographie*, 6 and van Dijk, “Die Inschriftenfunde,” 47 (improving Falkenstein) for the text.

to include the ULKS in that intellectual current, too. Thus, just as the scholars responsible for moving Anu to the head of the pantheon utilized the Kassite period An = Anum god-list for that purpose, so too they used earlier traditions about *apkallū-ummânū* relations to further their religious authority and other aspects of their agenda, especially their standing vis-à-vis political leadership.

A scrutiny of the precise manner in which the scribes behind the ULKS formulated their genealogy reveals the cultic and especially political aspects of their aspirations. As for the cultic aspect of the agenda, it is surely significant that Nungalpirigal, the first postdiluvian *apkallu*, makes a bronze lyre that finds its final resting place in front of Anu. This creates a connection between our text and the renewal of the cult of Anu as discussed by Beaulieu. But there is more to matters than this simple fact. By placing this cultic act of devotion first in the list, right after the flood, the ULKS intends to give the Anu cult prominence; the *first* human sage was a devotee of Anu. Moreover, the list probably supplies an etiology for the relationship between Nungalpirigal, the Eana temple, and Anu, thus answering any would be critics of the novel idea that Anu's house could displace Eana.

As for the political aspect of the agenda, there are at least three points that require attention. First, we know that the locus of scholarship had shifted from court to temple,<sup>84</sup> thereby removing (as far as we can tell) scholars from regular influence within the centers of political power. Invoking the association of scholarship with memorable kings and their mythical sages or famous human scholars in the ULKS attributes to the Seleucid-era scholarly professions a venerable history, which in turn implies the scholars deserved a higher level of political influence or support than in fact they were enjoying at the time (see also the discussion of line 21 below). Second, by emphasizing their historical connection to the antediluvian sages—the agents of Ea—the scholars were granting themselves authority rooted in divinity, a particularly difficult kind of authority to dispute. Less systematic formulations of this genealogical idea in earlier materials provide us with the evidence to see that these Seleucid-era scribes were not inventing something new. Rather,

---

<sup>84</sup> See, e.g., Francesca Rochberg, "The Cultural Locus of Astronomy in Late Babylonia," in *Die Rolle der Astronomie in den Kulturen Mesopotamiens: Beiträge zum 3. Grazer Morgenländischen Symposium (23-27 September 1991)*, ed. Hannes D. Galter, *Grazer Morgenländische Studien* 3 (Graz: Graz, 1993), 31-45, here 44.

their systematic and explicit formulation demonstrates their concern to make their position well-understood. No longer wandering the halls of the palace at a time when scholarship's importance went without saying, these men could assume nothing was self-evident. The fact that Berossus includes something of the same idea in his work, which was probably written during the reign of Antiochus I, points to this conclusion as well. The scholars, it seems, were deploying a mythmaking strategy to elevate their position and importance in society, even if achieving imperial-level influence was not their ultimate goal. Third and finally, the genealogy suggests a position of both antiquity and prominence and thus implicitly authority to Sin-leqi-unnini, the first human *ummânu* in the list and ancestor of the scribe who copied the present tablet. I doubt that it is a coincidence that this same figure is the eponymous ancestor of the scribe writing the tablet.<sup>85</sup> In its present form, therefore, alongside the more general points of exalting the cult of Anu and attributing importance to scholars, we note for the sake of completeness that this list is clearly biased toward the Sin-leqi-unnini scribal clan.<sup>86</sup>

But are the scholars who created and copied this list really trying to manipulate the Seleucid court? Are they trying to insinuate that the traditional association of kings and scholars should continue under a non-native king? Although this is possible, it is difficult to imagine how the scribes would ever have acquired an audience for their ideas. Moreover, the identification of the person in the last line of the text before the colophon indicates a negative answer to these questions and suggests a more subtle tactic from the scholars.

As is often the case, the culmination of an Akkadian list occurs in its final line where matters are summarized or its *telos* obtained. Thus, as van Dijk already recognized,<sup>87</sup> the contemporary purpose

---

<sup>85</sup> For a discussion of scribal ancestors and their four clans in Uruk, see Lambert, "Ancestors, Authors, and Canonicity" and "Ancestors, Authors, and Canonicity (JCS XI, 1-14): Additions and Corrections."

<sup>86</sup> See likewise van Dijk, "Inschriftenfunde," 50. It would not be surprising to someday find a list contemporary with the ULKS that places a rival ancestor/clan, Ekur-zakir, for example, in a similarly prominent position. It is interesting that a number of members of the Ekur-zakir clan actually owned *apkallu*-seals. So it is clear that the *apkallu* tradition was utilized by other scribal clans. See Ronald Wallenfels, "Apkallu-Sealings from Hellenistic Uruk," *Baghdader Mitteilungen* 24 (1993), 309-24 and Tafeln 120-23.

<sup>87</sup> "Inschriftenfunde," 45-46, 52. Concerning the reading of the last line, see also van Dijk's later comments in his brief note "Die Tontafelfunde der Kampagne 1959/60," *Archiv für Orientforschung* 20 (1963), 217.

of the ULKS probably rests precisely here. Unfortunately, the last line of our text is extremely frustrating. Unlike previous lines naming kings and scholars, all we have in this line is a break hiding one or two signs, a broken IŠ sign, and a name. No one has yet been able to provide an acceptable restoration for the beginning of the line.<sup>88</sup> The following interpretation, therefore, must remain tentative.

Whatever the first word may be, I think van Dijk was correct to suggest that the name of the final person in the list, a certain *1ni-qa-qu-ru-su'-ú*, is none other than the Nikarchos (Νίκαρχος) known from the dedicatory inscription found in the Bīt Rēš temple dating back to 244 BCE. Although some have questioned this proposed identification due to the orthography of the name on the tablet,<sup>89</sup> variations in Greek names are rather common.<sup>90</sup> Indeed, a list of orthographic variations attested for Nikarchos in archival texts, provided to me by L. T. Doty,<sup>91</sup> suggests his name was something of a moving target for the scribes. Thus, the identification seems quite plausible. This in turn opens line 21 to an interesting line of interpretation.

I suggest that Nikarchos, the *šaknu* of Uruk in the mid-3rd Century, occupies in line 21 the position of the tenth and final “king” of

<sup>88</sup> See note 12 above for a suggestion.

<sup>89</sup> See van Dijk, “Inschriftenfunde,” 52.

<sup>90</sup> A perusal of the various transcriptions of Greek names in Akkadian documents demonstrates, in my opinion, the general problem Greek phonology posed for the Semitic scribal ear. See W. Röllig, “Griechische Eigennamen in Texten der babylonischen Spätzeit,” *Orientalia* 29 (1960), 376-91, who attempts to make some phonetic generalizations. Despite correlations, there are many exceptions to his rules, some of which involve metathesis of consonants and the insertion of a vowel in the cuneiform script between what are contiguous consonants in the Greek. For example, Δημήτριος is written *De-e-mi-ti-ri-su* and *De-e-mi-ri-su* while Δημήτρια is written *Di-i-me-ri-ti-ya* (384, though the latter may be a scribal error). For the related issue of Mesopotamian scribal representations of Akkadian and Sumerian phonology in Greek letters (i.e., the Graeco-Babyloniaica texts), see Marckham Geller, “The Last Wedge,” *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie* 86 (1997), 43-95 and the recent critique by Aage Westenholz, “The Graeco-Babyloniaica Once Again,” *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie* 97 (2007), 262-313.

<sup>91</sup> He provides the following variants of the name as found in Seleucid archival texts: *ni-iq-ar-ku-su*, *ni-iq-ar-qu-ra*, *ni-iq-ar-qu-su*, *ni-iq-ar-qu-ú-su*, *ni-iq-ar-ra-su*, *ni-iq-ár-ra-su*, *ni-i-qi-ar-qu-su*, *ni-iq-qar-su*, *ni-qi-ar-qu-su* (personal communication; cited with permission). Van Dijk reads the name in ULKS as follows: *ni-q(a)-qu-ru-su'*(text: *šú-u*). As stated in note 11 above, the notation *q(a)* indicates the a-vowel may not have been pronounced.

the ULKS.<sup>92</sup> Associating him with ancient kings of renown and doing so by listing him in the tenth (a number of completion) and final (a place of prominence) position in the list exalts him well-beyond what one would expect from his actual civic title. As is well-known, temple building was a royal prerogative in ancient Mesopotamia and Nikarchos had shown leadership in the re-building of the Anu temple as indicated in the dedicatory inscription of 244 BCE. The presentation here therefore is probably intended to praise and flatter Nikarchos in light of his king-like actions.<sup>93</sup>

Yet there is something amiss in our line; it is uneven and unprecedented. For unlike the kings listed in the lines before Nikarchos, no scholar's name follows his on the tablet. There is no successor to the famed Aḫiqar.<sup>94</sup> Instead, there is a gap on the tablet to the end of the line. Conspicuous in its contrast to the repetitive lines that precede, the text infers with this absence that the office of scholar was unoccupied during Nikarchos' time.<sup>95</sup> Given the norm established by the previous lines in the text, this should be viewed as an unacceptable situation for the scholars in Uruk. Contemporary

---

<sup>92</sup> Nikarchos is clearly not listed as a king; notice the absence of LUGAL after his name. My interpretation suggests the placement in the text was a symbolic gesture. Although Nikarchos was a member of the Aḫu'tu clan, his work on the temple would have benefited all of the scribal clans. It is therefore not surprising to see a text with a Sin-leqi-unnini bias honor him as the ULKS does. Van Dijk accepted the identification of the name with Nikarchos tentatively; but, having confused Nikarchos for Kephalon in the dedicatory inscription of 201 BCE mentioned above, he wanted to make Nikarchos the last of a long line of sage/scholars that stretched back to Adapa. Apart from the confusion, I do not think the list supports this idea.

<sup>93</sup> Moreover, the fact that the list only includes indigenous Mesopotamian kings prior to Nikarchos may even say something about the hopes for or the idealized status of renewed indigenous rule during Nikarchos' leadership. The scholar who originally composed the ULKS could have continued his list with kings from Persian and Seleucid times if he had wanted to. King lists containing Persian and Seleucid royal names have been discovered at Uruk. See van Dijk, "Inchriftenfunde," 53-60 and Grayson, "Königslisten und Chroniken," 97-98, his King List 5.

<sup>94</sup> For a convenient survey of the person known as Aḫiqar in various ancient texts, see James C. Vanderkam, "Ahikar/Aḫiqar" in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, edited by David Noel Freedman (6 Vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1992), 1.113-15; and for the literary work associated with his name, see Vanderkam's article, "Aḫiqar, Book of," in the same work (1.119-20).

<sup>95</sup> If there had been a scholar named with Nikarchos, he would have been the eleventh post-diluvian scholar on the list since there are two scholars, Gimil-Gula and Taqīš-Gula, mentioned with king Abi-ešuh in line 15. But as there are only nine post-diluvian kings in the list, Nikarchos's scholar would be the scholar for the tenth reign. Excluding the invocation attached to the end of the tablet (line 25), the gap at the end of line 21 is the only one on the entire tablet.

scholars, the list implies, were not being properly recognized; they were not receiving their ancient due.

How could scholars respond to this situation? They did what they knew to do: they wrote a text—our text—to assert emphatically their ancient role as inheritors and perpetuators of antediluvian knowledge, to lay claim unmistakably to divine authorization of their status, and to reiterate in strong terms the importance and supremacy of their cult. Ending as it does with Nikarchos, the text flatters the man to which they could appeal while also reminding him of the current deficiency. The scholars knew that Nikarchos was not really a king. Further, they of all people would be aware of the fact that they were not going to be imperial advisors like their predecessors to him or to the non-indigenous Seleucid kings. But the text's ending praises their patron for his past activity in order to induce him to take up their cause and give them the attention their ancient pedigree deserved. If imperial interests in Uruk were on the wane, Nikarchos may have been their only and best hope to further their interests.

The ULKS presents a new formulation of an old scribal genealogical idea, composed under foreign rule that showed uneven interest in things Mesopotamian, during a scribal renaissance in Uruk of archaic indigenous lore. From these historical contextual clues it is reasonable and plausible to suggest that the Uruk List of Kings and Sages is a tendentious document written by scholars who felt the need to reassert their importance to the community leadership in order to advance their cause, the renewal of the Anu cult. Recognizing the tentativeness of the evidence, this interpretation remains only a possibility for the time being.

### *Bibliography*

BaMB 2 = van Dijk and Mayer, 1980

CAD = *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary*

*SpBTU* II = von Weiher, 1983

TCL 6 = Thureau-Dangin, 1922

Abusch, Tzvi. "Ritual and Incantation: Interpretation and Textual History of *Maqlû* VII:58-105 and IX:52-59." In "*Sha'arei Talmon*:" *Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon*, ed. Michael Fishbane and Emanuel Tov with the assistance of Weston W. Fields, 367-80. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992.

———. *Mesopotamian Witchcraft: Toward a History and Understanding of Babylonian Witchcraft Beliefs and Literature*. Ancient Magic and Divination 5. Leiden: Brill / Styx, 2002.

- Ataç, Mehmet-Ali. "Scribal-Sacerdotal Agency in the Production of the Neo-Assyrian Palace Reliefs: Toward a Hermeneutics of Iconography." Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 2003.
- . "Visual Form and Meaning in Neo-Assyrian Relief Sculpture." *The Art Bulletin* 88.1 (2006): 69-101.
- Austin, M. M. *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest: A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Beaulieu, Paul-Alain. "Antiquarian Theology in Seleucid Uruk." *Acta Sumerologica* 14 (1992): 47-75.
- . "The Historical Background of the Uruk Policy." In *The Tablet and the Scroll: Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William W. Hallo*, ed. M. Cohen, D. Snell and D. Weisberg, 41-52. Bethesda: CDL Press, 1993.
- . "Antiquarianism and the Concern for the Past in the Neo-Babylonian Period." *Bulletin of the Canadian Society for Mesopotamian Studies* 28 (1994): 37-42.
- . "The Social and Intellectual Setting of Babylonian Wisdom Literature." In *Wisdom Literature in Mesopotamia and Israel*, ed. Richard J. Clifford, 3-19. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 36. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007.
- Boiy, T. "Royal Titulature in Hellenistic Babylonia." *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie* 92 (2002): 241-57.
- . *Late Achaemenid and Hellenistic Babylon*. Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 136. Leuven: Peeters, 2004.
- . "Akkadian-Greek Double Names in Hellenistic Babylonia." In *Ethnicity in Ancient Mesopotamia: Papers Read at the 48th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale Leiden, 1-4 July 2002*, ed. W. H. van Soldt, 220-25. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut Voor Het Nabije Oosten, 2005.
- Borger, Rykle. "Das Dritte 'Haus' der Serie Bit Rimki (VR 50-51, Schollmeyer HGŠ Nr.1)." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 21 (1967): 1-17.
- . "Die Beschwörungsserie *Bit mēseri* und die Himmelfahrt Henochs." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 33 (1974): 183-96.
- Bowman, R. A. "Anu-uballit-Kefalon." *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 56.3 (1939): 231-43.
- Briant, Pierre. "The Seleucid Kingdom, the Achaemenid Empire and the History of the Near East in the First Millennium (sic) BC." In *Religion and Religious Practice in the Seleucid Kingdom*, ed. Per Bilde et al., 40-65. Studies in Hellenistic Civilization 1. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1990.
- Burstein, Stanley Mayer. *The Babyloniaca of Berossus*. Sources from the Ancient Near East I/5. Malibu: Undena Publications, 1978.
- Cole, Steven. *Nippur IV. The Early Neo-Babylonian Governor's Archive from Nippur*. Oriental Institute Publications 114. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1996.
- Dijk, J. van. *La Sagesse Sumero-Accadienne*. Commentationes Orientales 1. Leiden: Brill, 1953.
- . "Die Inschriftenfunde." *Vorläufiger Bericht über die . . . Ausgrabungen in Uruk-Warka* 18 (1962): 44-52 and plate 27.
- . "Die Tontafelfunde der Kampagne 1959/60." *Archiv für Orientforschung* 20 (1963): 217.
- Dijk, Jan van and Werner R. Mayer. *Texte aus dem Rēš-Heiligtum in Uruk-Warka*. Bagdader Mitteilungen Beiheft 2. Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 1980.
- Doty, L. Timothy. "Cuneiform Archives from Hellenistic Uruk." Ph.D. Dissertation. Yale University, 1977.

- . “Nikarchos and Kephalon.” In *A Scientific Humanist: Studies in Memory of Abraham Sachs*, ed. Erle Leichty *et al.*, 95-118. Occasional Publications of the Samuel Noah Kramer Fund 9. Philadelphia: University Museum, 1988.
- Downey, Susan B. *Mesopotamian Religious Architecture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988.
- Eddy, S. K. *The King is Dead: Studies in the Near Eastern Resistance to Hellenism 334-31 B.C.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.
- Elman, Yaakov. “Authoritative Oral Tradition in Neo-Assyrian Scribal Circles.” *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society* 7 (1975): 19-32.
- Falkenstein, Adam. *Topographie von Uruk: I. Teil Uruk zur Seleukidenzeit*. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1941.
- Foster, Benjamin. “Wisdom and the Gods in Ancient Mesopotamia.” *Orientalia* 43 (1974): 344-54.
- Geller, Marckham. “The Last Wedge.” *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie* 86 (1997): 43-95.
- Grayson, A. Kirk. *Babylonian Historical-Literary Texts*. Toronto Semitic Texts and Studies. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975.
- . *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles*. Locust Valley, NY: J. J. Augustin, 1975; reprinted, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2000.
- . “Königslisten und Chroniken.” *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 6 (1980): 86-135.
- Hallo, W. W. “On the Antiquity of Sumerian Literature.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 83 (1963): 167-76.
- Hannestad, Lise and Daniel Potts. “Temple Architecture in the Seleucid Kingdom.” In *Religion and Religious Practice in the Seleucid Kingdom*, ed. Per Bilde *et al.*, 91-124. Studies in Hellenistic Civilization 1. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1990.
- Horowitz, Wayne. “Antiochus I, Esagil, and a Celebration of the Ritual for Renovation of Temples.” *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 85 (1991): 75-77.
- Hunger, Hermann. *Babylonische und assyrische Kolophone*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 2. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag / Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon and Bercker, 1968.
- Hurowitz, Victor. “Advice to a Prince: A Message from Ea.” *State Archives of Assyria Bulletin* 12 (1998): 39-53.
- Kuhrt, Amélie. “Berossus’ *Babyloniaka* and Seleucid Rule in Babylonia.” In *Hellenism in the East: The Interaction of Greek and Non-Greek Civilizations from Syria to Central Asia after Alexander*, ed. Amélie Kuhrt and Susan Sherwin-White, 32-56. Hellenistic Culture and Society 2. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987.
- . “Survey of Written Sources Available for the History of Babylonia under the Later Achaemenids.” In *Achaemenid History I: Sources, Structures and Synthesis*, ed. Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg, 147-57. Leiden: Brill, 1987.
- . “The Seleucid Kings and Babylonia: New Perspectives on the Seleucid Realm in the East.” In *Aspects of Hellenistic Kingship*, ed. Per Bilde *et al.*, 41-54. Studies in Hellenistic Civilization 7. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1996.
- Kuhrt, Amélie and Susan Sherwin-White. “Aspects of Seleucid Royal Ideology: The Cylinder of Antiochus I from Borsippa.” *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 111 (1991): 71-86.
- . *From Samarkhand to Sardis: A New Approach to the Seleucid Empire*. Hellenistic Culture and Society 13. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993.

- Kvanvig, Helge S. *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 61. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988.
- Lambert, W. G. "Ancestors, Authors, and Canonicity." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 11 (1957): 1-14.
- . "Ancestors, Authors, and Canonicity (JCS XI, 1-14): Additions and Corrections." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 11 (1957): 112.
- . *Babylonian Wisdom Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960; reprinted, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1996.
- . "A Catalogue of Texts and Authors." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 16 (1962): 59-77.
- . "The Twenty-one 'Poultices.'" *Anatolian Studies* 30 (1980): 77-83.
- . "The Qualifications of Babylonian Diviners." In *Festschrift für Rykle Borger zu seinem 65. Geburtstag am 24. Mai 1994: Tikip santakki mala bašmu . . .*, ed. Stefan M. Maul, 141-58. Cuneiform Monographs 10. Groningen: Styx, 1998.
- Lenzi, Alan. *Secrecy and the Gods: Secret Knowledge in Ancient Mesopotamia and Biblical Israel*. State Archives of Assyria Studies 19. Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2008.
- McCutcheon, Russell. *Critics Not Caretakers: Redescribing the Public Study of Religion*. Issues in the Study of Religion Series. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001.
- Meier, Gerhard. *Die assyrische Beschwörungssammlung Maqlû*. Archiv für Orientforschung Beiheft 2. Berlin, No Publisher, 1937.
- . "Studien zur Beschwörungssammlung Maqlu." *Archiv für Orientforschung* 21 (1966): 70-81.
- Parpola, Simo. "The Forlorn Scholar." In *Language, Literature, and History: Philological and Historical Studies Presented to Erica Reiner*, ed. F. Rochberg-Halton, 257-78. American Oriental Series 67. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1987.
- . *Letters from Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars*. State Archives of Assyria 10. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1993.
- Pongratz-Leisten, Beate. *Herrschaftswissen in Mesopotamien: Formen der Kommunikation zwischen Gott und König im 2. und 1. Jahrtausend v.Chr.* State Archives of Assyria Studies 10. Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 1999.
- Potts, D. T. *Mesopotamian Civilization: The Material Foundations*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997.
- Reiner, Erica. "The Etiological Myth of the 'Seven Sages.'" *Orientalia* 30 (1961): 1-11.
- Rochberg, Francesca. "The Cultural Locus of Astronomy in Late Babylonia." In *Die Rolle der Astronomie in den Kulturen Mesopotamiens: Beiträge zum 3. Grazer Morgenländischen Symposium (23-27 September 1991)*, ed. Hannes D. Galter, 31-45. Grazer Morgenländische Studien 3. Graz: Graz, 1993.
- . *The Heavenly Writing: Divination, Horoscopy, and Astronomy in Mesopotamian Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Röllig, W. "Griechische Eigennamen in Texten der babylonischen Spätzeit." *Orientalia* 29 (1960): 376-91.
- Rostovtzeff, M. "Seleucid Babylonia: Bullae and Seals of Clay with Greek Inscriptions." *Yale Classical Studies* 3 (1932): 3-113.
- Sanders, Seth. "Writing, Ritual, and Apocalypse: Studies in the Theme of Ascent to Heaven in Ancient Mesopotamia and Second Temple Judaism." Ph.D. Dissertation. The Johns Hopkins University, 1999.

- Sherwin-White, S. M. "Babylonian Chronicle Fragments as a Source for Seleucid History." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 42 (1983): 265-70.
- . "Ritual for a Seleucid King at Babylon?" *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 103 (1983): 156-59.
- . "Seleucid Babylonia: A Case-Study for the Installation and Development of Greek Rule." In *Hellenism in the East: The Interaction of Greek and Non-Greek Civilizations from Syria to Central Asia after Alexander*, ed. Amélie Kuhrt and Susan Sherwin-White, 1-31. Hellenistic Culture and Society 2. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987.
- Sommer, Michael. "Babylonien im Seleukenreich: Indirekte Herrschaft und indigene Bevölkerung." *Klio* 82 (2000): 73-90.
- Spek, R. J. van der. "The Astronomical Diaries as a Source for Achaemenid and Seleucid History." *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 50 (1993): 91-101.
- Thompson, R. Campbell. *Assyrian Medical Texts*. London: H. Milford / New York: Oxford University Press, 1923; reprinted, Osnabrück: Otto Zeller Verlag, 1983.
- Thureau-Dangin, François. *Tablettes d'Uruk à l'usage des Prêtres du Temple d'Anu au Temps des Séleucides*. Textes Cunéiformes du Louvre 6. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1922.
- . *Rituels Accadiens*. Osnabrück: Otto Zeller Verlag, 1975 (1921).
- Toorn, Karel van der. "Why Wisdom Became a Secret: On Wisdom as a Written Genre." In *Wisdom Literature in Mesopotamia and Israel*, ed. Richard J. Clifford, 21-29. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 36. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007.
- Vanderkam, James C. "Ahikar/Ahiqar." In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, edited by David Noel Freedman, 1.113-15. 6 Volumes. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- . "Ahiqar, Book of." In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, edited by David Noel Freedman, 1.119-20. 6 Volumes. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Weiher, Egbert von. *Spätbabylonische Texte aus Uruk*, Teil 2. Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft in Uruk-Warka 10. Berlin: Mann, 1983.
- Wallenfels, Ronald. "Apkallu-Sealings from Hellenistic Uruk." *Baghdader Mitteilungen* 24 (1993): 309-24 and Tafeln 120-23.
- Westenholz, Aage. "The Graeco-Babyloniaca Once Again." *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie* 97 (2007): 262-313.
- Wiggermann, Frans. *Mesopotamian Protective Spirits: The Ritual Texts*. Cuneiform Monographs 1. Groningen: Styx and PP Publications, 1992.
- Wilcke, Claus. "Göttliche und menschliche Weisheit im Alten Orient: Magie und Wissenschaft, Mythos und Geschichte." In *Weisheit: Archäologie der literarischen Kommunikation III*, ed. A. Assmann, 259-70. München: W. Fink Verlag, 1991.