Uses and Misuses of Ancient Mediterranean Sources

Edited by
Chiara Meccariello and
Jennifer Singletary

Studies in Education and Religion in Ancient and Pre-Modern History in the Mediterranean and Its Environs

Mohr Siebeck

SERAPHIM
Studies in Education and Religion
in Ancient and Pre-Modern History
in the Mediterranean and Its Environs

Editors

Peter Gemeinhardt · Sebastian Günther
Ilinca Tanaseanu-Döbler · Florian Wilk

Editorial Board

Wolfram Drews · Alfons Fürst · Therese Fuhrer
Susanne Gödde · Marietta Horster · Angelika Neuwirth
Karl Pinggéra · Claudia Rapp · Günter Stemberger
George Van Kooten · Markus Witte

12

Uses and Misuses of Ancient Mediterranean Sources

Erudition, Authority, Manipulation

Edited by

Chiara Meccariello and Jennifer Singletary

Mohr Siebeck

ISBN 978-3-16-159943-9 / eISBN 978-3-16-160012-8
DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-160012-8

ISSN 2568–9584 / eISSN 2568–9606 (SERAPHIM)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available at *http://dnb.dnb.de*.

© 2022 Mohr Siebeck Tübingen, Germany. www.mohrsiebeck.com

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was typeset by epline in Böblingen using Minion typeface, printed on non-aging paper and bound by Hubert und Co. in Göttingen.

Cover image: Gypsum wall panel relief, Neo-Assyrian (640BC–620BC), Nineveh, South West Palace, © The Trustees of the British Museum. All rights reserved.

Printed in Germany.

Table of Contents

Chiara Meccariello and Jennifer Singletary
Introduction 1

Section A. Preserving, Archiving, and Detecting Sources

Marie Young and Tonio Mitto
In Search of Former Kings: Copying Sîn-kāšid's and Sîn-iddinam's Inscriptions in the Neo- and Late Babylonian Periods 15

Laura Carlson Hasler
Citation, Collection, and the Protection of Memory in 2 Maccabees 41

Georgios Vassiliades
Livy and the Legends of Rome's Foundation: A "Double Standard" Approach 55

Nereida Villagra
Source Citations in the Scholia to the *Odyssey*: References, Subscriptions, and the Mythographus Homericus 79

So Miyagawa and Heike Behlmer
Quotative Index Phrases in Shenoute's *Canon* 6: A Case Study of Quotations from the Psalms 101

Section B. Authority, Divinity, and Power

Carlos Gracia Zamacona
Divine Words in the Ancient Egyptian Coffin Texts (c. 2000–1500 BCE) 119

Gina Konstantopoulos
"These Are of the Mouth of Ea": The Divine Origin of Incantations and the Legitimation of the Exorcist's Craft 141

Szilvia Sövegjártó
Source Texts as Authority Constructions:
A Conceptual Approach to the Old Babylonian Literary Discourse 163

Ilaria Andolfi
A Writing Hard to Wash Out:
A Reassessment of the Story about Acusilaus and his Bronze Tablets..... 181

Francesca Boldrer
Sacra ... canam: Propertius's Aetiological-Religious Poetry
and His Use of Sources..... 195

Section C. Manipulating and Adapting Sources:
Ancient to Modern

Michael Chen
Adapting Ancient Egyptian Healing Spells onto Late Period Statuary 215

David P. Wright
The Covenant Code Narrative: Neo-Assyrian Influences and Context 225

Mathias Winkler
The Book of Proverbs: Sources Become Invisible 245

Przemysław Piwowarczyk
Using the Scriptures in Documentary Letters from Western Thebes 265

Silvia Gabrieli
Enuma Elish: A Glorious Past and a Curious Present 285

Dustin Nash
Assyriology and the Allosaurus: Sources, Symbols, and Memory
at the Creation Museum and Ark Encounter 303

Biographical notes..... 329

Introduction

Chiara Meccariello and Jennifer Singletary

The use of material from sources is a key feature of both texts and artifacts throughout the ancient Mediterranean world. Strategies such as quotation, citation, and reference to sources; the combination, incorporation, redaction, translation, and copying of source material; or the attribution of information or inspiration to historical or fictional sources are detectable in a variety of ancient texts and artistic productions. Especially in texts pertaining to religion and myth, citing sources, whether historical or supernatural, is a common strategy to imbue texts with authority, antiquity, or sacredness. The use of source material also highlights writers' access to knowledge and tradition and emphasizes their scholarly or literary acumen, while simultaneously legitimating, contesting, or manipulating the knowledge that is disseminated through its reuse. In addition, ancient sources have also been employed in later times for an equally wide variety of purposes, from liturgical to popular, from historical reconstruction to forgery, from scholarly analysis to creative reinterpretation.

The basic premise of this volume is that the use of ancient Mediterranean sources, both in antiquity and in modern times, is a fruitful area for examination by both Classicists and scholars of the ancient Near East and Hebrew Bible, and that attention to the way sources are used in different contexts improves our understanding of the myriad of ways in which this phenomenon plays out. Interdisciplinary dialogue between these fields already informed the development of a scientific approach to sources in the late eighteenth century, when the work of Johann Gottfried Eichhorn in the field of source criticism of the Hebrew Bible served as a model for Friedrich August Wolf's deconstructivist approach to the Homeric text, which, in turn, laid the foundation for the fundamental if now largely outdated practice of *Quellenforschung* among Classical philologists of the nineteenth century.[1] The contents of this volume are a step towards an increasingly interdisciplinary approach to this topic, by encouraging cross-cultural comparison through the juxtaposition of essays that examine the use of sources in a wide range of cultural and historical contexts.

[1] Grafton/Most/Zetzel 1985: 18–26; Most 2016: 935.

This introduction, co-authored by a Classicist and a scholar of the Hebrew Bible and ancient Near East, briefly showcases some of the possibilities for such comparative work. The subsequent sixteen essays examine the use of sources in and from ancient Egypt, Mesopotamia, Israel, Greece, and Rome in different historical contexts that span more than four millennia. Aside from the obvious and long-recognized benefits of an attention to unique cultural contexts, examining a phenomenon that occurs across cultures in individual historical periods is an essential first step to facilitate effective comparison.[2] Phenomena that occur cross-culturally exhibit characteristics that are both similar to other exemplars and unique to their individual textual and social-historical contexts. Cross-cultural comparison is thus worthwhile for a variety of reasons: it can usefully serve to highlight similarities and differences, spur new questions, and enable the formation and refinement of explanatory theories in scholarship.[3] We hope that the essays in this volume will form fodder for additional comparative work on this topic in the future; the remainder of this introduction is one such effort in this direction.

The complex nature of the use of ancient Mediterranean sources in both antique and modern times is encapsulated by the history of the Greek thinker Euhemerus. Euhemerus himself is a somewhat paradoxical figure. His name made it into modern dictionaries, as the eponymous representative of what was later perceived as a philosophical theory, Euhemerism, or, according to the *Oxford English Dictionary* definition, "The method of mythological interpretation which regards myths as traditional accounts of real incidents in human history". But Euhemerus's work, and even his historical identity, are largely mysterious to us. As is the case with several ancient Greek authors, we only have fragmentary remains of his writing, and not one single word-for-word quotation.

The way in which one of our major witnesses to his work introduces him is a good illustration of the complexities of source use in antiquity:

> The ancient author Euhemeros, who came from the city of Messene, gathered together the deeds of Jupiter and of others thought to be gods and wove together a historical narrative from commemorative tablets and sacred inscriptions that were kept in the oldest temples and especially in the temple of Jupiter Triphylios. The commemorative tablet there

[2] As Smith 2000: 239 suggests, the "requirement that we locate a given example within the rich texture of its social, historical, and cultural environments that invest it with its local significance" must be the first step in the four "moments in the comparative enterprise".

[3] Bodel and Olyan summarize such benefits of comparative work in the introduction to their edited volume: "Comparison has the potential to generate new questions and novel insights; it can lead us to a more nuanced understanding of the category of religious behavior that interests us by revealing points of similarity as well as difference; and it can enable us to distinguish that which is common to a larger Mediterranean and West Asian cultural sphere from that which is particular to one or another cultural setting" (Bodel/Olyan 2008: 3–4). See also the similar benefits of comparison across the ancient Near East, as well as pitfalls to be avoided, outlined by Stökl 2012: 5–7 and Nissinen 2017: 43–50.

claimed that a gold column had been set in place by Jupiter himself, on which column he recorded his deeds so that it would be a memorial of his deeds for posterity. Ennius translated and followed this historical account. These are his (Ennius's) words: "There Jupiter gives rule of the sea to Neptune, so that he would rule over all islands and over all places bordering the sea".[4]

Here Lactantius, a Christian writing in Latin in the early fourth century CE, uses a second-century BCE translation by the Latin poet Ennius of the work of Euhemerus, which in turn is a Greek fourth/third-century BCE narrative account allegedly interwoven out of epigraphic records, including one put up by the god Jupiter – that is, Zeus himself – as a perennial monument to his own deeds.

There are several degrees of separation between the reader of this passage and the ultimate alleged original source, Zeus, and potential for distortion lurks at every step. Going through the various layers of this stratification of sources, we encounter several intriguing issues.

First, Lactantius's report of Ennius's words. These were only available to him in a prose version, probably not coinciding with Ennius's original translation, which might well have been in verse; at any rate, scholars have shown that several fragments quoted by Lactantius cannot possibly be literal quotations of Ennius's work.[5] Lactantius's own religious agenda is also, potentially, grounds for suspicion: Euhemerus features in a book entitled *De falsa religione*, which sets out to demonstrate that pagan religion is false, and leverages Euhemerus's work precisely to this purpose.

Second, Ennius's translation. This was a rendering in another language and context, and perhaps medium (verse vs. prose), presumably with some kind of artistic intent and/or ideological engagement; and we know enough of Latin translations of Greek originals in this and later periods to expect a far greater amount of freedom than in what we consider translation today.

Third, Euhemerus himself. He claims to be drawing on inscriptional records of historical deeds: but did he really find such a glaring proof of the real origins of the gods, one that had been standing in place for a long time, though remaining unnoticed and unable to dismantle the whole of Greek religion? Is this a fictional claim of Euhemerus, a rhetorical construct, or even a forgery?

And finally, at the bottom of our pile of layers, we find none other than Zeus, in Euhemerus's view a human being deified after death, who is supposed to have recorded his own *res gestae* as a monument for future readers – if such an individual existed, can we trust his account of his own exploits?

When confronted with this intricate web of sources, the modern reader is likely to be easily led to incredulity by different factors. One factor would certainly be our presumable reluctance to believe in a historical Zeus whose deeds

[4] Lactant. *Div. inst.* 1.11.33–34 = Euhemerus, test. 3a + fr. 19 *BNJ* (all translations of Euhemerus's fragments and testimonia are by Christensen 2014, at times slightly adapted).

[5] See especially Laughton 1951.

became the stuff of Greek mythology, which of course might go hand in hand with our reluctance to acknowledge Zeus's existence *tout court*; but other factors also come into play. For example, the numerous (alleged) stages of transmission, and the fact that of this long and complex process we only see the tip of the iceberg, while all the named sources are lost: we have no Ennius, no Euhemerus, and of course no inscribed column put up by Zeus. Another factor may be our disenchanted take on human ability and willingness to report sources faithfully, not only when their use is part of a specific agenda, as in the case of Euhemerus's revolutionary assertions and of Lactantius's Christian exploitation of them, but also when sources are simply translated, summarized, or even cited. Last but not least is our awareness of the existence of fictional and quasi-fictional literature, with its array of rhetorical devices, and its inherent keenness to invention and distortion – indeed, despite the title *Sacred Register* (*hiera anagraphe*), many scholars now see in Euhemerus's work a philosophical-religious treatise in the format of a utopian novel, a fictional first-person account of the author's journey to the places where he uncovered the gods' true nature.[6]

This may all seem clear to the modern scholar. But what about the ancient reader? Believing in Euhemerus's account seems to us an act of faith comparable to believing in Zeus, and admittedly Euhemerism was not so widespread in antiquity as to encourage one to deem his sacred history a masterpiece of persuasion or an ideological success. But an epitome of Lactantius's work, prepared by the author himself, introduces a summary treatment of the same Euhemerus story that we have seen in the full version by naming two linchpins of its credibility, namely *rerum fides*, "the trustworthiness of facts", and *temporum vetustas*, "antiquity".[7] Obviously this well serves Lactantius's religious agenda, to which Euhemerus's alleged proof of the non-divinity of pagan gods is a precious ally; but *fides rerum* and *vetustas* are key concepts here, and they are used precisely because they are known to be effective. In particular, resorting to an epigraphic source is an attested *topos* in demonstrations of reliability, and it is easy to see why: an inscription is a tangible object, often associated with templar contexts; it is an original potentially available for the public to see, against which anyone could theoretically check an author's claims. As to antiquity, the older the source, the closer it is, at least chronologically, to the event itself, and the more likely it is to be or to directly derive from an autoptic account; and even if an old written record may undergo material decay, and a report of a very old account may be affected by the familiar telephone game effect, antiquity of the ultimate source is widely and persuasively used to boost an argument. These elements certainly helped to characterize Euhemerus's sources as good ones and to create an impression of diligent research or, to put it in Augustine's words, "*historica diligentia*".[8]

[6] On the scholarly debate on the genre of this work see Winiarczyk 2002: 19–27.

[7] Lactant., *Epit.* 1.11.33–34 = Euhemerus T 3b.

[8] August., *De civ. D.* 6.7 = Euhemerus T 4g.

Ultimately, we may find that our response to a passage like Lactantius's is largely different from the expected response of his contemporary readers. Among them, the density of named sources in Lactantius's passage may have inspired, rather than a sense of remoteness from the original account, one of admiration for Lactantius's knowledge, erudition, and familiarity with textual resources; and this could have proven key to persuasion. As for Euhemerus himself, it is significant that Lactantius's and other Christian authors' keenness to trust and exploit his work is in striking contrast with the less flattering portrayal of this author in non-Christian Greek literature. Plutarch, for example, refers to his account as "quackeries" (φενακισμοί), and accuses him of "having himself constructed copies of an unbelievable and non-existent mythology", thereby "sowing atheism over the whole of the inhabited earth".[9] Plutarch's motive is as religious as Lactantius's, but the different religious view leads to a different approach to Euhemerus's alleged use of inscriptional records: for Plutarch, the fact that no other has ever seen these records is suspicious, and he concludes his brief treatment of Euhemerus by denying – pretty much like modern scholars – the very existence of the places where Euhemerus purports to have found them.

The example of Euhemerus showcases some of the crucial aspects of the use of ancient sources tackled in the three sections of this volume, from the discovery and preservation of past knowledge to the complex intertwining of source use and authorization strategies, to the adaptation of old sources to new contexts. References to a written copy of the Torah in two texts from the Hebrew Bible as well as two later parabiblical texts highlight similar issues.[10]

Though a number of scholars have suggested that one of the key hallmarks of Judaism, as distinct from earlier Israelite or Judean religions, is the central role given to the written Torah,[11] the literary and rhetorical strategies used by biblical and parabiblical writers to construct and disseminate the Torah as the authoritative text *par excellence* are just beginning to be explored.[12] The oldest text that seems to reference the written Torah as a single, unified entity is the narrative of its discovery by the high priest Hilkiah, and subsequent delivery to King Josiah, in 2 Kings 22–23. In this biblical text, the protagonists call for radical religious innovations that claim to be based on this supposedly newly recovered copy of the Torah, which they cast as reforms or restorations of older Israelite and Yahwistic practices. This tale imbues the Torah with both a special antiquity and authority, bolstered by the support of the religious establishment (represented by the high priest), confirmed through divination by the prophetess Huldah, accredited by the educated elite (the scribe Shaphan), and decreed as authoritative

[9] Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 23.360A = Euhemerus T 4e.

[10] Jennifer Singletary thanks Prof. Reinhard Kratz for many productive discussions about these texts during her time at the Collaborative Research Centre 1136.

[11] Collins 2017, Lee 2011, Satlow 2006.

[12] Otto 2017.

by the royal house. Yet, the specific contents of this supremely authoritative work are not recorded here, either through direct quotation or even paraphrase. What exactly Shaphan read to Josiah, and Josiah read to the populace, is a mystery.

The report of the reintroduction of the laws of the Torah by Ezra in Ezra 7–10 and Nehemiah 8 also includes the instigation of radical religious innovations that claim to be based on antique prescriptions and practices from a written copy of the Torah. But though the reading of its contents in public is described in these texts as well, the exact contents remain unknown. In 1 and 2 Maccabees, again the foundation of a major religious reform (cast this time as a polemic against Greek religion, Hellenism, and Hellenized Jews) is presented as a reinstatement of older, more original practices, and a written Torah is cited, but not directly quoted or paraphrased, to prove this assertion. Compare this text to the Letter of Aristeas, which takes a different stance regarding Hellenization: this pseudepigraphic work seeks to legitimate the Greek translation of the Torah by relating a legendary tale of its miraculous completion by 72 unanimous priests. Both these parabiblical stories continue to use the rhetorical technique of attributing unique antiquity and authority to their sources to justify what are actually sharp departures from previous practice, without revealing many key details about the source itself.

These four texts share a number of common features: they all present innovations in religious practice as restorations of older, more original practices based on a particular antique text; they all describe the public reading of the written Torah's contents to an audience who are portrayed as previously unaware of its contents. Yet each of these texts was composed in a different context, and each also purports to depict different historical settings. Each text thus reveals the features of the Torah the different writers found most significant and thus chose to highlight for their audiences, providing a lens into a variety of strategies for legitimating and authorizing the text, as well as the development of these strategies over time. Much about who composed these texts and why, however, remains unclear, as do the contents and form of the Torah(s) they reference. What documents made up the Torah(s) described in these four texts? Is the Torah referenced in 2 Kings 22 co-extensive with some version of Deuteronomy, or is it referring to a version of the larger Pentateuch? What was most likely included in Ezra's Torah? In Judas Maccabeus's? To which version of the Septuagint does Aristeas refer, and what did its Hebrew *Vorlage* look like? We can only speculate, yet how, why, and in what forms the written Torah became authoritative for different communities is crucial to our understanding of how Judaism eventually became known as a "religion of the book".

These examples from ancient Greece, the Hebrew Bible, and parabiblical texts have several enticing commonalities: for example, a narrative of discovery, which is so construed as to imbue the recovered source with antiquity and authority; the rooting of religious innovation or contestation in an antique text;

and different reactions of different writers to the same source, either in selecting and highlighting what is most relevant or in the overall assessment of the source. These, of course, only represent a fraction of the many aspects and facets of the use of ancient Mediterranean sources that beg examination. The remainder of this volume discusses many more. The essays that follow are based on papers delivered at the international conference "'As It Is Written'? Uses of Sources in Ancient Mediterranean Texts", held in Göttingen in October 2018 as part of the activities of the DFG-funded Collaborative Research Centre 1136, Bildung und Religion in Kulturen des Mittelmeerraums und seiner Umwelt von der Antike bis zum Mittelalter und zum Klassischen Islam. The volume also includes contributions based on papers delivered at the workshop "(Mis)use of Sources: Ancient and Modern", organized by Jennifer Singletary at the 64th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale (Innsbruck, July 2018), as well as two additional contributions solicited by the editors to ensure balanced representation of the various fields.

Building on these two events, the overall purpose of this book is to explore uses and misuses[13] of ancient Mediterranean sources in a variety of periods, places, and contexts, focusing on strategies of incorporation of derivative materials as a key to understanding the dissemination of religious and mythological knowledge.[14] Of course we make no claim to comprehensiveness, either in the geographical and chronological coverage or as regards genres and topics. What this volume offers is rather a series of case studies displaying multiple approaches to and perspectives on the ways in which various writers dealt with ancient Mediterranean sources.

Section A, "Preserving, Archiving, and Detecting Sources", includes essays that focus on the use of sources in historical periods ranging from the Neo-Babylonian period in Mesopotamia, to Imperial Rome, to Early Christian Egypt, and explore issues such as the preservation and archiving of earlier works or traditions in ancient texts as well as modern scholarly techniques to detect textual quotations. Marie Young and Tonio Mitto ("In Search of Former Kings: Copying Sîn-kāšid's and Sîn-iddinam's Inscriptions in the Neo- and Late Babylonian Periods") contribute new editions of three school copies of royal inscriptions from the Neo-Babylonian and Late Babylonian periods, analyzing what they reveal concerning which aspects of the originals the apprentice scribes copying them studied most intensively. Laura Carlson Hasler ("Citation, Collection, and the Protection of Memory in 2 Maccabees") analyzes citation practices in 2 Mac-

[13] By "misuse" of a source – an umbrella term with no pretense of reflecting the views of ancient writers or readers – we mean any intentional or unintentional departure from the source that entails a significant change in the source's message.

[14] The inclusion of Greek mythological texts alongside more undisputedly religious texts is based on their role in preserving and disseminating knowledge on deities, heroes and heroines, and their interrelations. See e. g. the definition of myth in Louden 2006: 9.

cabees, arguing that these help to form a culturally vital archive in the wake of destruction. Georgios Vassiliades ("Livy and the Legends of Rome's Foundation: A 'Double Standard' Approach") investigates the inclusion of legendary materials in Livy's account of the early history of Rome, showing that the historian, while programmatically avoiding confirming or refuting the validity of myths, exploited the mythical tradition so as to endow his narrative of Rome's foundation and early expansion with religious authority. Nereida Villagra ("Source Citations in the Scholia to the *Odyssey*: References, Subscriptions, and the Mythographus Homericus") explores a tantalizing collection of Greek mythological narratives related to specific lines of the Homeric poems. By investigating the regular mention of authorities in the subscription of each narrative, Villagra highlights the combination of different sources into self-standing narratives as a typical feature of Imperial mythography. So Miyagawa and Heike Behlmer ("Quotative Index Phrases in Shenoute's *Canon* 6: A Case Study of Quotations from the Psalms") illustrate the use of a quantitative method of corpus and computational linguistics – the historical text reuse detection program TRACER, developed by the Göttingen Centre for Digital Humanities – for the investigation of biblical text reuse in the works of the Egyptian Christian abbot Shenoute and his successor Besa.

In Section B, "Authority, Divinity, and Power", five scholars explore Egyptian, Mesopotamian, and Graeco-Roman texts with a view to elucidating both the use of divine words and strategies of authorization based on the employment of sacred, secret, or other sources construed as authoritative. Carlos Gracia Zamacona ("Divine Words in the Ancient Egyptian Coffin Texts [c. 2000–1500 BCE]") proposes a classification of the interactions between gods and the deceased in a corpus of ancient Egyptian mortuary texts of a mostly dialogical nature, the so-called Coffin Texts, demonstrating that divine words are especially used to endorse the deceased in transitional or difficult moments or to equate them with the gods, thereby equipping them with a "powerful tool for legitimation". Gina Konstantopoulos ("'These Are of the Mouth of Ea': The Divine Origin of Incantations and the Legitimation of the Exorcist's Craft") examines the ways in which *āšipūtu*, or the craft of the exorcist, is legitimated through association with Ea and Adapa in ancient Mesopotamia. Szilvia Sövegjártó ("Source Texts as Authority Constructions: A Conceptual Approach to the Old Babylonian Literary Discourse") analyzes intertextual relations between the bilingual manuscript CBS 11341, Sing a Song for Šulgi, and the Šulgi hymns known as "fictional autobiographies". Ilaria Andolfi ("A Writing Hard to Wash Out: A Reassessment of the Story about Acusilaus and his Bronze Tablets") explores, through the case of the Greek mythographer Acusilaus, the *topos* of attributing the mythological, genealogical or historical content of one's own writing to a material source, such as bronze tablets, as a way to demonstrate access to secret and authoritative knowledge. Finally, Francesca Boldrer ("*Sacra … canam*: Propertius's Aetiolog-

ical-Religious Poetry and His Use of Sources") investigates Popertius's "Roman elegies" with a view to bringing to light the poet's antiquarian and comparative research and at the same time to unveiling the strategies he used to underscore his own divine inspiration.

Section C, "Manipulating and Adapting Sources: Ancient to Modern", explores free reuses of sources and adaptation of sources to new contexts and media, both in antiquity and in modern times. Michael Chen ("Adapting Ancient Egyptian Healing Spells onto Late Period Statuary") examines the complexities of the adaptation of texts onto religious objects in the case of Egyptian healing statues of the Late period (c. 664–332 BCE). Inscribed with magical texts drawn from a known corpus, these statues reveal visual strategies for the adaptation or manipulation of the healing spell texts so as to enhance their efficacy as healing objects. David P. Wright ("The Covenant Code Narrative: Neo-Assyrian Influences and Context") identifies texts within the Pentateuch that belong to a narrative associated with the law collection found in Exodus 20:23–23:19 (the Covenant Code), building on his thesis that this collection was created using the Laws of Hammurabi as a primary source, and arguing that the Covenant Code was contextualized through its placement within a larger narrative. Mathias Winkler ("The Book of Proverbs: Sources Become Invisible") discusses the selection, manipulation, and concealment of Egyptian materials and source attribution in different versions of the book of Proverbs. Przemysław Piwowarczyk ("Using the Scriptures in Documentary Letters from Western Thebes") analyzes scriptural quotations in Coptic monastic letters from Western Thebes in Egypt (sixth to eighth century CE), focusing on manipulative strategies such as decontextualization, conflation, and free creation of scriptural passages. Silvia Gabrieli ("Enuma Elish: A Glorious Past and a Curious Present") highlights different transmission strategies used in both ancient and modern times for the Babylonian Epic of Creation, particularly in contemporary media. In the last essay in this section, Dustin Nash ("Assyriology and the Allosaurus: Sources, Symbols, and Memory at the Creation Museum and Ark Encounter") also discusses contemporary uses of ancient Mesopotamian sources, focusing on the use, or perhaps more accurately misuse, of Assyriological material at the Creation Museum in Kentucky.

Our contributors focus primarily on texts that are related to the realm of religion. In the context of our work at the Collaborative Research Centre 1136, we worked to initiate a collective reflection on how textual products that presuppose and disseminate knowledge about religious and mythological contents reuse and repurpose existing knowledge, thereby functioning as links in more or less long and variously configured transmission chains. These transfers of knowledge, which could take place in different contexts (for example within families, religious institutions, political centers, or educational institutions), belong to the realm of education as conceptualized by the Collaborative Research Centre 1136,

which encompasses formal education, processes of socialization, as well as "the development of reflection on God, the world, and the self (according to the German concept of '*Bildung*')".[15]

Three main aspects have emerged from our contributors' work that are worth special mention here as particularly interesting areas for future comparative research. First, a recurring tension between tradition and innovation appears to underlie the use and manipulation of sources that inform the transfer and dissemination of religious knowledge. On the one hand, citing sources helped ancient writers to connect to the past and anchor their work in accepted traditions. The use of sources is, in this sense, a form of authorization, and underlines a writer's competence and cultural capital. At the same time, source manipulation, adaptation of sources to new contexts, and deconstruction and reconstruction of source materials were often tools for innovation, as authors tried to legitimize or even mask departures from tradition by referencing the same authoritative, traditional sources they sought to go beyond.

Second, as several of the essays in this volume show, many of the processes of knowledge transfer encoded in written texts were reserved for elite recipients, an even more restricted group than the already restricted number of literates. In some cases, a small elite was the only actual addressee of a given text (Chen), or highly educated recipients were the only ones who could understand the subtlety of the use of sources (Winkler) or unmask deliberate manipulation or free use of sources. This raises many important questions about how the use of sources worked with respect to different audiences, intended or actual.

Third, a number of essays highlight the importance of materiality in a physical or metaphorical sense. For example, the insertion of long quotations in a narrative may function as a virtual surrogate for physical archive spaces (Carlson Hasler); while the attribution of the content of one's own writing to a material source such as a bronze tablet may be used to demonstrate access to secret, ancient, or elitist knowledge (Andolfi); and the written word may be adapted to the materiality of iconographical media so as to achieve new effects (Chen). The interplay of text and material culture is another important avenue for future research on the use of sources.

Through these and other insights, we hope the following contributions will show that what is a somewhat unsettling and humbling truth – that in the study of antiquity we are often bound to refraction and mediatedness with regard to our sources – can turn into a challenging and exciting research tool, which ultimately allows us to glimpse the mentality surrounding several links in the transmission chain.

For the food for thought and new research directions that these essays have offered to us, we would like to thank the DFG-funded Collaborative Research

[15] Gemeinhardt 2017: 327.

Index of Ancient Authors, Texts and Written Artifacts

Acts of Thecla 273
Acusilaus of Argos
– *Genealogies* 82–84, 181–192
Aeschylus
– *Prometheus Bound* 789 188
– *Suppliants* 944–949 188
Andron 83
Antoninus Liberalis 91
Apollodorus
– *Library* 83–91
Apollonius Rhodius 87, 90
Aristotle 198
Asclepiades of Tragilus 82, 87, 95
Asinius Pollio 55
Augustus
– *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* *189*, 196, 208

Ben Sira
– *Sirach* 45:24 *275*
Berossus
– *Babyloniaca* *147*, 285, 290–291
Besa 8, 102, 105–107, 110
– MONB.BA 105
– MONB.BB 105
Bible
Hebrew Bible
– Deuteronomy 241–242
– Esther 51–52
– Exodus
1:22–2:10 241
20 235
20:2 236
20:23–23:19 9, 225, 230
20:23–21:1 229
21:2, 2–11 229, 232, 233–234
21:12–17 228
21:18–32 226
21:22–27 226–227
21:26–27 229
21:31 *227*
21:35–22:3 229
22:4 229
22:6–8 229
22:9–12 229
22:13–14 229
22:20–30 230
22:20–26 232
22:20–22 233–234, 236
23:7–8, 9 233–234
23:9–19 230, 235
23:20–33 231
23:22–24 231
23:25 231
24 232, 238, 240
24:3–8 + 116β 225, 236
– Ezekiel
11:5 112
– Ezra 42–44, *49*, 51
1–6 *44*
2 *43*
3 *44*
6:6–12 47
7–10 6
– Genesis 274
1–8 313
15 232–240
15:7 236
15:13–14 233–5
– Jeremiah
17:10 111

34
34:18
34:20
41
– Job
19:13–14
29:23
40:15–24
– Jonah
2:3
– 1 Kings
3:12
5:9–14
5:9
5:10
– 2 Kings
22–23
22
– 1 Maccabees
– 2 Maccabees
1
1–2
1:1–2:31
1:10–2:18
1:27
2
2:13–15
2:29
4:12
9
9–10
11
11:13
11:15
11:16–38
11:22–38
11:24
15:35
15:36
15:39
– 3 Maccabees
– Nehemiah
8
– Proverbs
1–29
1–9
1:1–24:22
1:1
237–238
237
237
237
268
273
322
271
253
259
253
259
5
6
6, 48
6–7, 41–52
50
48–50
43
43
50
43, 50
42
50
44
43
47
45–46, 49–50
47
47
47
47
48
51
52
52
44
42–51
6
245–261
249
247, 251
249–250
246, 248–249
10–24:22
10:1a
22:17–24:22
22:17–23:11
22:17–18
22:17
22:20
22:21–22
23:11
23:12–24:22
24:22
24:23–24:34
24:23a
25–29
25:1–31:10
25:1–2
25:1
25:2–8
29
29:27
30
30:1–14
30:1
30:3
30:15–33
31
31:1–9
31:1–2
31:1
31:3, 5
31:4
31:10–31
31:10–12
– Psalms
1
6
7
7:10 (9)
32 (33):15
37:12
62
62:2
75:3
75:4
117:5
248, 251
246, 249, 259
245–246, 256–259
255–258
258
249, 259
256–260
258
257
257–258
257
249, 251, 253
246–252
248–249, 251, 255
252
252, 255
246–249, 252
252
252
252
249, 251
251
246, 250–253
252–253
251–252
249, 251
251–252
252
246, 250–253
253
253
251
252
101–113, 250, 254, 265, 271
112
106
111
111
110, 112
268
273
273
275
275
271

– 1 Samuel 112
16:7 110–111
New Testament
– 1 Corinthians
13:4 271
– John
8:32b 276
8:44 277
– 1 John
2:4 277
5:17 276
– 2 John
8 270
– Luke
16:13 272, *274*
16:18 272
– Mark
10:11–12 272
– Matthew
5:32 272
6:24 272, *274*
7:2 271
25:40 274
28:18 *270*
– Pauline Epistles 108, 113, 265, 276
– 1 Thessalonians
5:14 271
New Testament Apocrypha
– 1 Clement 273
Septuagint 6, *110*, 112, 237, 245, 248–256, 259–260, 268, *269*, 273, 275
Callimachus 199, 206–209
– *Aetia* 208, *see also* Callimachean *Diegeseis*
Callimachean *Diegeseis* *85*
Calpurnius Piso 63–64
Cassius Hemina 63
Cato
– *Origins* 63, *68–69*
Cicero 64, 74
– *On Duties*
3.10.41 *72*
– *On the Laws*
1.5 57–58
– *On the Republic*
2.1.3 61
2.2.4 62
Cincius Alimentus 63, *206*
Claudius Quadrigarius 59
Coffin Texts
– B2Bo 121, 128
– B6C 128
– CT I
31d–32a 125
49b–c 128
81j–k 128
118a *131*
137d *131*
149b *131*
174 j–n 124
176j 126
189c 127
298f–299c 132
302e–f 133
312a 125
324a–325a 127, 129
326b–327b 129
– CT II
23d–24e 133
43b 130
46a 121
53h *130*
57b-c *131*
86e–87c *131*
162bc 133
175e *126*
176k-p 125
208c–209a 132
316a–317b 129
318 d–321 b 130
– CT III
56a–57h 130
179d *132*
214a–215a 125
299a–f 133
321e *131*
– CT IV
58a *131*
72h–73e 128

78a 129
83g–h 134
114d–g *124*
– CT V
37b–c *124*
44d–e 133
– CT VI
26a–c 131
69a–d 129
222a–e 125
223d–f 126
253i 126
273d–e 130
307r–t *124*
322e *131*
322i *131*
347d 134
– CT VII
20r *132*
37g 122
231o–232b 131
235p–q 132
364b *124*
– D1C 128
– Djehuty, tomb of 122
Coptic Letters
– *BKU* I 92 see *SB Kopt.* II 861
– *BKU* II 290 267
– *BKU* II 318 267, *275*
– *O.Berlin* inv. P 12491 267
– *O.Brit.Mus.Copt.* I 52/1, 59/1, 62/2 267
– *O.Crum* 52 267, *269*
– *O.Crum* 71, 72, 84, 258, 371, 484, 485, ad 1 267
– *O.Crum* 73 267, *269*, 272, 276, 277
– *O.Crum* 74 267, *269*
– *O.CrumVC* 54 267, *269*, *273*
– *O.Frange* 8, 38, 45, 120, 162, 164, 165, 168, 173, 174, 186, 205, 212, 238, 349, 385 + 485, 402, 433, 434, 440, 442, 493, 568, 581, 603, 636, 652, 668, 752, 774 267, 269–270
– *O.Frange* 14 267, *269*
– *O.Frange* 120 267, *270*
– *O.Frange* 168 267, 270–271
– *O.Frange* 238 267, *270*
– *O.GurnaGórecki* 23 *27*
– *O.Mon.Phoib.* 8 267, *269*
– *O.Saint-Marc* 45, 361 267
– *O.Saint-Marc* 206 267, *269*
– *P.Berlin* Inv. 12491 271–272, 274
– *P.Mon.Epiph.* 106, 108, 109, 110, 111, 115, 143, 201, 210A, 307, 459, 267
– *P.Mon.Epiph.* 348 267, 270
– *P.Mon.Epiph.* 434 267, 271
– *P.MoscowCopt.* 80 267
– *SB Kopt.* II 861 267, 268
– *SB Kopt.* II 906 267

Damascius
– *Difficulties and Solution of First Principles* 290–292
322.1–6 *287*
Demetrius of Scepsis *87*
Didache 274
Dionysius (of Samos or Scytobrachion) 83
Dionysius of Halicarnassus 63, 72, 186
– *Roman Antiquities*
1.6 *63*
1.7 *64*
1.8.1 64
1.9–44 64
1.9–90 64
1.57–60 *68*
1.64.5 69
1.64.6 69
1.87.4 72
2.33.2 209
2.38.3 *206*
– *On Thucydides*
5.1 191

Edubba texts 173–177
– Edubba C (The advice of a supervisor to a younger scribe) 176
– Examination of a Scribe (Examenstext A) 175
Elevation of Ishtar *28*
Elius Stilo 208
Ennius 3–4, *200*
Enuma Elish 285–298
I.1–4 293
I.1–7 294–295
I.8–10 294
I.12–14 294
I.2:30–3:57 295
IV.138-V.66 293
VI.123 287
Assyrian Recension 287–290
Epic of Gilgamesh 143, 158, 168, 183, 295–297
Eratosthenes
– *Catasterisms* 89, 91
Erra and Ishum 158, 289–290
Esarhaddon's Succession Treaty 238–242
Eudemus of Rhodes *285*, 290–291
Euhemerus 2–5, 183
Euripides
– *Alcestis* 83–84
Exorcism
– Catalogue of Texts and Authors 142–148, 153
– Exorcist's Manual 142–147

Fabius Pictor 63, *206*
Flavius Josephus
– *Against Apion* *45*, 254

Gellius 64, *202*
Getty Hexameters
– *1A*
col. 1.1 190
Gudea cylinder 167, *178*

Healing statues
– Berlin 7554 222
– Cairo JE 46341 (Djedhor) 216–222
– Copenhagen 974 222
– Leiden F 1950 (Socle Behague) 222
– Louvre E10777 (Tyszkiewicz statue) *217*, 222
– Turin 3030, 3031 222
– Turin suppl. 9 + Florence 8708 (Psammetik-Seneb) 218, *221*
Hecataeus of Miletus 184–185, 191
– Frag. 1 EGM 181
Herodorus 83
Herodotus 184–188
1.5.3 58
2.143.1–4 *187*
2.147.2 *188*
5.49.1 189
7.152.3 58
Hesiod 83, 87, 93, 109, 182, 250
– *Works and Days* 106–201 188
Homer 1, 191, 207, *see also* Homeric *scholia*, Mythographus Homericus
– *Iliad* *103*
– *Odyssey*
11.321 87
11.326 85, *90*
12.69 86
13.96 84
19.518 90
Homeric *scholia*
– *Scholia on Odyssey*
3.4 84
3.91 84
11.326 97
11.321–322 81, 95–96
11.326–327 81
11.519–521 82
11.582 82
12.69–70 82, 93–94
12.85b 82
13.96b 82
13.259a 82
14.327–328 82

Horace *206*, 207

Jason of Cyrene 43, 48
John Cassian
– *Conferences* 10.13 271–273

Lactantius 3–5
– *Divine Institutes*
1.11.33–34 *3–4*, 183
Larsa Cylinder *22*
Laws of Hammurabi 225–242
57–58 229
117 229
122–126 229
148–149 229
154–156 229
192–195 229
196–201 226–228
206–210 226–228
207–208 229
244–249 229
250–252 226
253–266 226
266–267 229
268–271 229
§ 1–13 231
Epilogue 230
Letter of Aristeas 6, 44
Licinius Macer 64, 69
Livy
– *History of Rome* 55–74, *199*, 200, 204, 207, 209
1.1.1–3 66
1.1.4 6
1.1.6–8 68
1.1.9 68
1.1.11 69
1.2.1–5 68
1.2.6 68
1.3.1 69
1.3.2–3 69
1.3.5–11 70
1.4.1–4 70
1.4.6 71
1.4.7 71
1.5.1–1.6.3 72
1.6.3–4 72
1.7.1–2 72
1.7.2–3 72
1.7.3–4 73
1.7.4–15 73
1.7.4 73
1.7.8 73
1.7.10 73
1.10.3–5 209
1.11.5–9 *206*
1.16.4 *65*
6.1.1–3 58
43.13.2 *61*
Lucan
– *Civil War* 102
Lycophron 83

Macrobius *202*
– *Saturnalia*
1.12.22–27 208
Marduk Ordeal Text 289
Mythographus Homericus, *see also* Homeric *scholia* 79–97
– *PSI* 1173 81, 84, 94–97

Neo- and Late Babylonian Inscriptions
– AO 17635 *15*, 17, 23–24, 27–30, 37–38
– BM 33344 *15*, 17–19, 30, 35–36
– BM 91081 *15*, 17–18, *23*, 30, 35–36
Nineveh Planisphere (BM K.8538) 311–312

Ostraca *see* Coptic Letters
Ovid *67*
– *Fasti*
1.481 *67*, *195*
– *Metamorphoses* *195*
8.174–182 *88*
14.623–771 *200*, 210

Panyassis 83
Papyri, *see also* Coptic Letters, Mythographus Homericus
– *Harris Magical Papyrus* 217
– *P.KRU* 106 269
– *P. Lond.*VI 1928 271

Parthenius
– *Sufferings in Love* 91–92
Paul of Tammah
– *On Humility* 10 273–274
Pausanias 182
1.20.3 *88*
2.16.3 190
4.20.4 190
4.26.7–8 190
Peisander 83
Pherecydes of Athens 82–91, 97
Pherecydes of Syrus
– Frag. 2 Schibli 183
Postumius Albinus 59
Philo Byblius
– *FGrHist*
790 F1 183
Philodemus
– *On Piety* 83–84
Plato 82–83
– *Theaetetus*
191b–c 187
– *Timaeus*
23e 183
Plutarch 5
– *Isis and Osiris*
23.306A *5*
– *Life of Marcellus*
6.4 *209*
– *Life of Mark Antony*
66.1–2 *208*
– *Life of Romulus*
16.10 209
17.6 207
– *Life of Theseus* 88–89
Polybius *55*, 59
2.35.6 209
39.1.4 59
Propertius 195–210
2.31 *196*
3.9.1 *205*
4.1.1–2 197
4.1.1 202, 208
4.1.3–4 201
4.1.3 *195*
4.1.18 *195*
4.1.19 *201*
4.1.22 *195*
4.1.26 *195*
4.1.64 200
4.1.67–68 197
4.1.69 *195*
4.1.71 205
4.1.75–76 205
4.1.126 195
4.1.169 195
4.2 195, 197, 204
4.2.1–2 200
4.2.3 201
4.2.4 *204*
4.2.12 *195*
4.2.19 *196*
4.2.51–52 *204*
4.2.57 *205*
4.4 196, 202, 204
4.4.1–2 *198*
4.4.18–19 207
4.4.36 207
4.6 197, 202, 207
4.6.1–4 207
4.6.1 *195*, *198*, 202
4.6.11 207
4.6.25 *207*
4.6.39 207
4.9 196–197, 201, 204
4.9.26 *195*
4.9.33 *195*
4.9.43 *195*
4.10 196–197, 204
4.10.1 200
4.10.2 *198*
4.10.7 *209*
4.10.39 209
Proverb Collection
2.38 175
2.40 175
2.47 176
2.50 175
2.54 176
2.56 176
Proxenus 83
Pseudo-Eratosthenes *85*
(Pseudo-)Euodius of Rome
– *On the Passion and Resurrection* 42 276

Pseudo-Shenoute 107

Quintilian
– *The Orator's Education*
10.1.39 61

Rules of Pachomius 107–108

Sabinus 184
Sahidic Psalter 107
Sallust 55
School texts, *see* Edubba texts
Scipio Aemilianus 61–62
Shenoute 269, 273–274
– *Canons* 101–113
– MONB.XF 109
– MONB.YJ 109–111
– *Discourses* 101, *274*
Sempronius Asellio 59
Simylos 207
Solon 183
Sophocles
– *The Women of Trachis*
683 188
Stephen of Thebes
– *Ascetic Discourse* 71 273
Suda
– α942 Adler =
Acusilaus T1 EGM 182
– δ202 Adler 187
– σ11 Adler =
Acusilaus T12 EGM 184
– φ214 Adler = Pherecydes of Syrus
frag. 2 Schibli 183
Suetonius *197*, 203
Šulgi texts 176–177
– Sing A Song for Šulgi
(CBS 11341 [PBS 1/1
No. 11]) 8, 163, 169, 178
iii 41–45 166
iii 54–57 169
iii 62–66 167
iv 46–53 169
iv 73–77 166
iv 78–85 168
iv 86–88 169
iv 93–96 166
– Šulgi Hymns
(Šulgi A–Y) 163, *165*
– Šulgi A
(ETCSL 2.4.2.01) 165
– Šulgi B (ETCSL 2.4.2.02)
lines 311–316 170–171, 175–176
– Šulgi C
(ETCSL 2.4.2.03) *164*
– Šulgi D–E
(ETCSL 2.4.2.04–05) 164–165
– Šulgi E (ETCSL 2.4.2.05)
lines 53–62 169
lines 253–287 169
lines 240–252 169
lines 246–257 167
lines 256–257
lines 308–313 169
– Šulgi F
(ETCSL 2.4.2.06) *164*
– Šulgi G-H
(ETCSL 2.4.2.07–08) *164*
– Šulgi K
(ETCSL 2.4.2.11) *164*
– Šulgi L–M
(ETCSL 2.4.2.12–13) *164*
– Šulgi O–T
(ETCSL 2.4.2.15–20) *164*
– Šulgi X
(ETCSL 2.4.2.24) *164*
– Šulgi Y
(ETCSL 2.4.2.25) *164*
– Šulgi, the Runner
(Šulgi A) 165
Sumerian King List
(ETCSL 2.11.1) 152, 177

Targumim 260
Teaching of Amenemope 245, 255–260
Thucydides
1.21.2 58
1.22.2 *57*

Uruk List of Kings and Sages
146, 151

Valerio-Horatian laws 61–62

Valerius Antias 64
Varro
– *Divine Antiquities* 198–200, 202, *206*, 208
– *On the Latin Language*
5.46 *200*
5.66 *208*
6.52 67
Vergil
– *Aeneid* 67–70, 103, 200–202
1.267–271 *69*
1.286–288 *69*
4.614 *67*
6.760–766 70
6.789–790 *69*
7.148-285 *68*
8 201
8.185–272 208
8.208–209
8.306–313 *201*
8.513 *201*
12.794–795 *69*

Zeno of Citium
SVF 1.301 187

General Index

Adapa 141–143, 147–155, 158
– *see also* Profession, sage
Afterlife 168
– *akh* 125, 29, 132
– Attack in the 120, 134
– *ba* 129, 134
– Duat 129
Anime series 295–296
– *see also* Musical group, Novel
Augustus *60*, 69–70, 189, 196–197, 202–210
Authenticity 45, 48–49, 158, 165, 184–185
– Fabrication 44, 48, 61
Authority
– Divine 71, 73, 112, 128, 142, 146–147, 154, 158, 198, 241
– Kingly 69, 210
– Military 60
– Religious 5, 56, 60–61, 72–74, 217, 269

Bible
– Coptic 101, 105, 107, 267
– Covenant Code 225–242
– New Testament 265, 276
– Pentateuch/Torah 5–6, 9, 48, 108, 225
– Septuagint 6, 110, 237, 245, 250, *252*, 254–255, 260

City
– Alba Longa 69
– Alexandria *46*, 51, 83–84, 91–2, 255
– Amarna 149–151
– Assur *22*, 145–146, 286–289
– Aulis 182
– Babylon 16, 18–21, 141, 146, 171–172, 286–289, 312, 315
– Borsippa 18–19
– Cercas 182
– Dura Europos 286
– Eridu 149, 153, 155
– Jerusalem 42, 45
– Khorsabad 312
– Larsa 22, 30, 173
– Mashkan-Shapir 17, 23–26
– Messene 2, 84, 190
– Nineveh 17, 141, 149, *174*, 287– 288
– Nippur 23, 164–165, 169–177, *298*
– Palmyra 286
– Pylos 84
– Rome
  – Ara Maxima 196–197, 201, 208, 210
  – Area Apollinis *196*, 203, 207
  – Aventine Hill 206, 208
  – Capitoline Hill 196–197, 201, 204, 208, *210*
  – Forum Boarium 196, 208
  – Forum Romanum 197
  – Palatine Hill 72–73, 196–197, 201–203, 207–210
  – Vicus Tuscus 195, 206, *210*
– Sefire 238
– Sippar *18*, 22, 287
– Susa 312
– Tell Haddad 148–149, *151*
– Thebes (Greece) 89–92, 97, 188, 190
– Toimanen 274
– Troy 65–67
– Ur/Urim 17–19, 27, 30, 164–167, 169, 173, 175, 177
– Uruk 17–19, *22*
Creation science 303–325
– Bio-classification system 322
– Deep geological time 322
– Ecological zonation model 320
– Group identity 305–306
– Paraconformities 323
– Polystrate fossils 323
– Scientific affect 323

– Uniformitarianism 323
– Young Earth 303–310, 315, 317, 321, 323–324
Curse *145*, 230–231, 237–239, 241
– Affliction 150, 154–157
– Analogical 238–241

Digital Analysis
– ASCII 105
– Coptic SCRIPTORIUM 105
– CoptOT 105–106, 110
– eTRAP 102–104, 112
– Machine learning 105
– Natural language processing 102
– Optical character recognition (OCR) 105
– OCRopus 105
– Prosobab 18
– ROEDEL 106
– TEI XML 105
– Tesserae 102
– TRACER 8, 102, 106, 110–112
– TRAViz 106
– Unicode 104–105
– Virtual Manuscript Room 105, *109*
– WordNet 104, 106
Digital humanities 102
Dinosaur
– Allosaurus 303, 320–321
– Apatosaurus 322
– Behemoth as 322
– Nonavian 320
– Pachycephalosaur 322
– Sauropod 318, 322
– Spinosaur 322
– Stegosaur 322
– Tyrannosaur 318
– Utahraptor 318–320
Divination 5, 144–145, 150, *188*, 198
– *see also* Prophecy
– Astral 143, 150
– Augury 60, 72, *168*, 197–198,
– Extispicy *144*, 150, 175–176
– Mirror 188–189
Divine intervention 56, 60, 71

Euhemerism 2–4
Esagil-kīn-apli 146, 152; *see also* Profession, sage
Evolution 295, 317–318, 323–324
– *see also* Dinosaur
– extinction 321–322
Exorcism, *see also* Witch
– Demon 135, 143, 145, 150, 153–158
– Exorcist 22–23, 142–158
– Illness 144, 153–156

Genealogy 181–192
– Telescoping 186
God(dess)
Canaanite
– Bel 286, 297; *see also* God, Zeus
Egyptian
– Atum 125, 130, 133, 219, 222
– Geb 122, 125, 127–128, 133
– Hapi 133
– Heliopolitan 217
– Horus 120, 122, 129–134, 205, 216–217, 219–220, 222;
  – ~-child 216
– Isis 127–128, 216
– Khopri 130
– Kronos-Petbe 108
– Nephthys 121
– Ogdoad 217–218
– Osiris 120, 24–129, 132–133
– Ra (Re) 121, 123, 126, 128–129, 133, 219–222,
– Ruty 130
– Shu 129, 133
– Thoth 123, 130, 133, 218
Greek
– Amphitrite, *see* God, Posidonia
– Aphrodite 88–89, 96
– Artemis 88–89, 96–97
– Circe 86
– Dionysus *83*, 88–89, 96
– Hera 86
– Heracles (Hercules) 187–188, 196–201, 208–210
– Poseidon 84, 93–96
– Posidonia 81, 84
– Zeus 3–4, 93, 97, 183, 291; *see also* God, Bel, Jupiter

Israelite
– Yahweh 230, 232–233, 236, 240–242
Italic
– *Bona dea* 208
Mesopotamian
– Anunnaki 25
– Assur 288–289
– Damkina 155
– Ea 141–158, 231, 294
– Geštinanna 168–169
– Ishtar *28*, 231
– Laḫamu 288, 291
– Laḫmu 288, 291
– Lugalbanda 20
– Marduk 19–20, 146, 154–158, 286–294, 296–298
– Nabu 18, 289, 294
– Nanshe 155
– Nergal 25–28, 231
– Nindub 168
– Ningirsu 167
– Ninsun 20
– Nisaba 165–169
– Šamaš 22
– Sin 231, 289
– Tashmetum 289
– Tiamat 291–294
– Zarpanitum 289
Roman
– Apollo Palatinus, *see* temple
– Mars 60–62, 70–71
– Jupiter 2–3, 67–68, 73, 196–204, *208*, *210*; *see also* Zeus
– Pomona 210
– Venus 66–70
– Vesta 199, 210; *see also* Vestal Virgins
Grammatical categories
– Ablative absolute 66–67, 71
– Complementizer 108, 110
– Direct discourse 66
– Entextualization 199, 121
– Evidential 121–122
– Flagging formula 267
– G stem 150
– Indicative 67
– Indirect discourse 66–67
– Infinitive 66
– Injunctive 229
– N-perfect form 150
– Oblique agent 125, 127
– Š-stem 150
– Second tense 128
– Stative 121, 125–126
– Subjunctive 66
– Subordinate clause 66–67

Kaššaptu, *see* Witch
King
– Arthur 296
Etruscan
– Mezentius 68
– Tarquinius Superbus 61
Greek
– Pyrrhus 83
Israelite
– David 42, 50, 246–250, 254, 267, 271
– Solomon 246–255, 259–260
Italic
– Latinus 67–68
Judean
– Hezekiah 246–250, 255
– Josiah 5–6
– Zedekiah 237
Mesopotamian
– Ashurbanipal 15–16, *19*, 141–144, 289
– Assur-nirari V 238–239; *see also* Treaty
– Esarhaddon 16, 141, 144, 152, 174, 238–241, 289
– Gudea 167–168
– Hammurabi/Hammurapi 9, 16, 144, 225–231, 315
– Ishme-Dagan 172
– Nabonidus 22, 27
– Nabopolassar 21
– Nebuchadnezzar *16*, 21–23, 152, 287, 331
– Sargon of Akkad 241
– Sargon II 241, 288, 312
– Sennacherib *141*, *286*, 288
– Sîn-iddinam 6, 15–31
– Sin-kāšid 15–31
– Ur-Namma 172, 315
Persian
– Artaxerxes 23
– Darius I 312

Roman
– Numa 64
Sabine
– Acron 204, 208
Seleucid
– Antiochus I Soter 291
– Antiochus IV Epiphanes 42–43, 46, 48
– Antiochus V Eupator 46–48
– Seleucus I Nicator 291

Language
– Akkadian 15, 19, 141, 148–154, 158, 238, 291, 295
– Ancient Greek 5–8, 51–52, 60, 103, 112, 207, 245–255, 259–60
– Arabic 103
– Aramaic 238, *255*, 291
– Coptic 101–113, 120, 265–278
– Demotic *120*, 122, *265*
– English 103
– German 103
– Hebrew 103, 245–261
– Latin 3, 102–103
– Sumerian 15, 31, 141–142, 148–158, 165, 171–172, 176, 178, 315–316
– Tibetan 103
Law
– Abortion 306
– Animal, pertaining to 229
– Apodictic 229–235
– Assault 226–229
– Capital crime 229
– Casuistic 228–229, 232, 235
– Debt-slavery, *see* Law, slavery
– Divine court 120
– Financial liability 228
– General 228
– Homicide 226–228, 241
– Injury 226–228, 241
– Penalty 228, 237–240
– Slavery 226–229, 232–236
– Talion (dyads) 226–228, 241
– Verdict 120, 128, 131
Library *19*, 41–42, 50–51
– of Alexandria 46, 51, 255
– of Ashurbanipal 141–142, *174*
– of Nehemiah 45–46
– Palatine 203

Magic 16, *124*, 127–131, 143–156, 189–191, 215–223
– Sympathetic 129
Memory 41–52, *124*, 186–188, 210
– Collective 197, 202
– Cultural 303–325
– Local 51
Monasticism
– Abbot 101, 266, 271
– Abraham of Hermonthis 266, 269
– Ammonas 268
– Antony 268
– Apa Isaac 269
– Apa Victor 275
– Besa 102, 105–7, 110
– Bishop 266, 269, 272, 274–275, 277
– Cell 265
– Cenobitic 107
– Desert Fathers and Mothers 107
– Eremitic 107
– Frange *266*, 269, 277
– *Horologia* 107
– Letter 269–277
– Macarius the Great 268
– Monastery 101, 107; White Monastery 101, 105, 107–108
– Monk 101–113, 265–278
– Pheu 269
– Prayer 265, 271
– Rule *109*
– Shenoute 101–113, 269
Museum
– Ark Encounter 303–325
– British Museum 141, *149*, 292, 311
– Creation Museum 303–325; racism 308
– Diorama 313, 315, 318
– Exhibit 306, 308–309, 313–317, 320, 322
– Experience 309
– Hyperreality 323–324
– Interpretation 310, 312, 316–318, 321–325
– Louvre 15, 23, 312
Musical group
– Cesair 294–295

– Deathlehem 293–294
– Dyspanic 295
– Rotting Christ 292–293
– Wave 296; *see also* Anime, Novel

Nehemiah 42–43, 45–46, 50
Novel
– Fate/Strange Fake 292, 296–297; *see also* anime, Musical group

Oral tradition 68, 186–190, 206, 226

Paleontology, *see* dinosaur
Panhellenism 190–191
Poetry 58, 195–210
– Elegiac 195
– Epic 91, 202
– Lyric 91
Profession
– *Āšipu*, *see* Exorcist
– Astrologer 16, *195*, 205
– Craftsman 189, 215, 218
– Exorcist 22–23, 141–158, *see also* Exorcism
– *Mašmaššu* 143, 148
– Musician 166–170, 174–175, 178
– Physician 143–144, 157, 228
– Priest 5, 42, 70, *145*, 155, 176, 183, *185*, *187–188*, 198, 202, 208, 221, 291; lamentation 19, 129, 132, 143
– Ritual practitioner 215
– Sage 141–142, 146–158, 166–167
– Scholar 16–17, *22*, 31, 83–86, 92, 141–142, 146, 148, 152, 174, 177, 205, 249–250, 255, 259–261, 286
– Scribe 5, 18–38, 167–78, 240; ~al apprentice 7, 17–24, 31, 165, *173*, 177–178, *see also* Scholarship
– Singer 166–171
– Ummânu, *see* Profession, scholar
– Wise man, *see* Sage
Propaganda 141, 174, 287, 290
Prophecy 46, 112, 150, *183*, 189, 198, 202–203, 207, 254, 271–272
– Prophet 5, 42, 73, 112, *185*, 203, 253

Region
– Alps 65, 209
– Babylonia 18, 27
– Canaan 226, 231–232, 241
– Colchis 87, 95
– Crete 88–89, 96, 313
– Dia 88, 96
– Egypt 42–43, 101–113, 119–135, 149, 215–223, 232–236, 239, 245, 255–261, 265–278, *291*
– Germany 209
– Greece 181–192, 200
– Israel 112, 225–242, 247, 310
– Latium 66–67, 201, 208
– Macedonia 66
– Mesopotamia 15–31, 141–158, 163–178, 225–226, 241, 287–298, 303–325
– Naxos 84
– Paphlagonia 65
– Patavium 66
– Peloponnese 73
– Sicily 66, 189
– Upper Egypt 101–102, 265
Religion
Christianity
– Coptic 101–113, 265–278
– Fundamentalist 309
Judaism 5–6
– Hellenistic 41
Pagan 3–4, 109, 112, 294
Ritual 19, 50–51, 107, 121, 128, 131–132, 141–158, 163–178, 195–198, 215–223, 232–242, 286, 289
– Akitu festival 286–289
– Animal 232–240
– Apotropaic 143, *153*
– *Bīt Mēseri* 147, 153
– "Effective" speech 150
– Efficiency 215–223
– Libation 128, 131–132, 176
– Purification 128, 240
– Recitation 107, 121, 217, *219*, 268, 286
– Spell 120–135, 145, 215–223

Sanchuniathon 183
Scholarship
– *see also* Profession, scholar
– Curriculum 17, 142–146, 164, 171–178, 290
– Edubba, *see* Scribal school

– *Hypomnemata* 80, 92
– Paleography 17, 27, 31
– Scribe, *see* Profession
– Scribal exercise 17, 23, 107, *265*, 290
– Scribal school 7, 17–18, 23, 164–165, 171–177, 242, 257, 290
Seven sages of Eridu 153
– *see also* Profession, sage
Sîn-lēqi-unnini *19*, 143, 152
– *see also* Profession, sage
Source object
– Brick 16, 19, 31
– Clay barrel 23–24, 28, 38–39
– Cone 18
– Foundation deposit 16, 23, 31, *153*, 168
– Nail 18
– Ostracon *107*, 220, 265–275
– Papyrus 79–97, 107, 122, 124, 130, 182, 188, 217–219, 265–278, 310, 315
– Pottery sherd, *see* Source object, ostracon
– Seal *153*, 313, 315
– Statue 16, 131, 134, 145, *187*, 195, 199–200, 203–206, 210, 230, 286; healing 9, 215–223
– Stela 131, 216–217, 222
– Tablet 2–3, 16–31, 141–177, 181–192, 287–290, 298, 310–315
Source type
– Administrative *18*, 22, 30
– Annal 59, 63–64
– Anonymous 80, *203*, 249–250
– Anthology 246–248, 253
– Appendix 225, 230–236, 241
– Archive 7–10, 16, 23, 42–52, 142, 186–189, 253, 266, 316
– Authentic 45–48, 158, 164–165, 174, 184–185
– Bilingual 8, 19, 27–28, 146, 153, 156–157, 163, 166, 172, 331
– Biography 8, 196, 216; auto~ 125, 163–178
– Book 2, 41–45, *50*, 108–112, 119, 183–4, 191, 203, 267, 295, 322; Sybilline 203, *see also* Codex
– Canonical *42*, 50, 142, 146, *148,* 269, 273–276, 289; non-~ 146
– Catalogue 87, 142–148, 153, *165*, 182, 207
– Circular, *see* Source Type, Correspondence
– Citation 1, 4, 6, 41–52, 79–97, 106, 141–58, 81, 85, 92, 191, 267–276, *285*, 294
– Codex 81
– Collection 8–9, 16, 41–52, 142, *155*, *174*¸ 176, *200*, *203*, 225, 245–251, *257*, 259
– Colophon 18 290
– Commentary 80–86, 91–92, 146, 271, 287–292,
– Compendium 79, 142–145
– Consecration 60, 154
– Contestation 1, 6
– Copied 1, 5–7, 16–31, 81, 145, *185*, 248, 255, 259–260, 277, 311
– Correspondence 6, 16–17, 42–50, 61, 81, 226, 266–277; festal 43
– Countertext 287, 289
– Curse 230–231, 237–241
– Damaged 28, 30, 58, 149, 166
– Decree 44, *52*,
– Derivative 87
– Destruction of ~ 28, 41–43, 190, 203–204
– Dialogic 8, 119–120, 126, 154–156
– Didactic 171, 178
– Epistolary, *see* Correspondence
– Epitome 4, 291
– Exercise, *see* Scholarship
– Exhortation 44, *52*, 110, 229–230
– Exploitation of, *see* Textual reuse
– Extrabiblical 276, 303, 309
– Facsimile 27
– Fictional 3–4; *see also* Source Type, Biography
– Fragmentary 2–3, 15, 18, 23–24, 63–64, 79–90, 143, 149–151, 164, 180–181, 251–252, 285, 287–290, 297
– Genealogy, *see* Genealogy
– Gloss 24, 27–30, *79*, 85, 90
– Healing spell 215–223
– Historiography 43–52, 58–59, 62–64, 74, 181–187, 291
– Homily 276

– Hymn 8, 163–178, 207
– *Hypomnemata*, *see* Scholarship
– Incipit 104, 142–146, 157, 165, 181
– Inscription 2–5, 15–31,141–2, 166–167, 174, 177, 183–192, 218–221, 225, 231, 241
– Integrated 91, 255–259, 287
– Invisible 245–261
– Lectionary 107
– Legitimation of ~, *see* Authority
– Lemmata, *see* Source Type, Citation
– Letter, *see* Source Type, Correspondence
– Lexical list 28, 146, *175–6*,
– Liturgy 108, 164–166, 173, 177, 265–267
– Magical, *see* Magic
– Manipulation of, *see* Textual reuse
– Metatext 144, 246–248
– Monastic, *see* Monasticism
– Monograph 246–253, 261
– Mortuary 8, 119–135
– Multilingual 112
– Mythological *7*, 55, 61, 79, *85*, 109, 148, 158, 215
– Oath 237–240
– Official 44, 269
– Parabiblical 5–6
– Paratextual 120
– Philosophical 4, 61
– Poetical, *see* Poetry
– Price list 17
– Proem 183
– Prophecy, *see* Divination
– Prophylaxis 154
– *Propositio* 202
– Prose 3, 82, 86, 92, 181–184, *187*, 191, 209
– Psalter 106–107 268
– Pseudepigraphic 6
– Pseudoscholarly 308
– Pseudoscripture 275
– Quotation, *see* Textual reuse
– Rabbinic 260
– Reconstructed 1, 10, 187, 204–205, 291, 297–298
– Rhetorical 3
– Rubric 122, *142*, 146, 157, 164, 173
– Scholia, *see* Scholarship
– Sermon 101, 106
– Subscription 8, 79–97, 146
– Superscription 245–260
– Syllabary 15–17, 27
– Undamaged 58
– Verse 3
– Wisdom saying 245–248

Temple 2, 16–19, 29, 31, 42, 48–52, 132, 144, 167–172, 183, 196–210, 215, 230–231, *288*, 291
– Cella *22*, 168
– Column 3–4, 183
– Pedestal *22*, *203*
– Restoration of ~ *22*, 48, 196, 204
Greek
– Argive Heraion 189
Mesopotamian
– Eanna 17–18, *22*
– Ebabbar *22*, 25
– Ekankal 20
– Eninnu 167
– Esagila 30, 230, 290
Roman
– Apollo Palatinus 196, 203
Textual analysis
– Complementarity 220–222
– Digital, *see* Digital analysis
– Intertextuality *148*, 163–166, 170–177, 216, *220*, 223
– Onomasiology 120
– Quotative index 101–113
– Semasiology 120
– Thematic clustering 252
– Thematic structure 229
– Variance 171, 222
– Vocabulary 56–62
Textual reuse
– Abbreviation 30–31, 156–158
– Adaptation 5–10, 89, 92, 110–111, 215–223, 228, 235, 241, 254–256, 268, 273
– Allusion 69, 103–104, 107, *164*, *199*, 207, *240*, 253, 259–260, 269, 288–289
– Analogy *44*, 47, 103–104, 216, 238–241, 277
– Cohyponym 104–106

– Compilation 49, 142–144, 177, 245–247
– Conflation 9, 29, 268, 271–273, 275
– Deletion 104, 111, 250–253, 260
– Distortion 3–4
– Dittography 26
– Edition 103, *245*, 255
– Equivocation 58, *65*, 69–71
– Erasure, *see* Textual reuse, deletion
– Forgery 1, 3, *47*, 49
– Free creation 268, 273–277
– Ghostwriting 103–104
– Idiom 103
– Insertion 10, 28–30, 87, 110, 235, 250
– Invention 4, 72, 173, 198, 208
– Paraphrasing 6, 103–104, 107, 267, 270, 293
– Personal pronouns 104
– Pseudocitation 276
– Pseudodocumentarism 184–186
– Quotation 1–7, 10, 81–87, 90, 101–113, 142, *166*, 182, 202, 206–208, 256–258, 266–277, 291–292; Near-verbatim 103–104; Verbatim 103–104, 110, 112, 202
– Rationalization 64
– Recontextualization 109, 112, 225
– Semantic 103–106, 120, 127
– Summarization 4, 83, 86–87, 92, 103–104, 277
– Synonym 104–106, 288
– Syntactic 103–104, 113
– Translation 2–6, 103–104, 107, 176, 249, 254–257
– Valency pattern 126
– Winged words 103
– Word order 104, 110

Time Period
– Ante-diluvian 142, 146–153
– Post-diluvian *146*, 152, 313
– Jurassic 303, 320, 324

Egypt
– Late Period 9, 215–223
– New Kingdom 131, 217
– Ptolemaic 44–46, *291*

Greece
– Byzantine 79, 182, 266
– Minoan 313

Mesopotamia
– Early Dynastic IIIa 172
– Isin 173
– Larsa 173
– Late Babylonian 7, 15–31
– Late Uruk 313
– Neo-Assyrian 16, 141–158, 225–242, 303, 311–312
– Neo-Babylonian 15–31
– Old Babylonian 23, 30, 142, 148, 154, 163–178, 243

Persia
– Achaemenid 23, 144, 313
– Seleucid 42, 46–48, 152

Rome
– Augustan 70, 196–210
– Imperial 79, 92
– Late Republican 72, 199, 204
– Prehistory 56–66, 70

Treaty 68, 144, *189*, 225, 232–240

Vestal virgin 70–71, 197–199, 202, 206–207, *210*
– Sacred fire 210

Witch
– ~craft 143–145
– *Kaššaptu* 155–157

Writing system
– Archaizing 15–17, 20–23, 30
– Cuneiform 15, 143, 152, 158, *167*, 287–8, *291*, *297*, 310
– Demotic 120
– Ductus 16, 21–22, 28-30
– Hieratic 122–124
– Hieroglyphic 119-124, 219–221
– Hyperarchaic 27