PREDICTING THE PAST
IN THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST

Number 354
PREDICTING THE PAST IN THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST

Mantic Historiography in Ancient Mesopotamia,
Judah, and the Mediterranean World

by
Matthew Neujahr

PREDICTING THE PAST
IN THE
ANCIENT NEAR EAST

MANTIC HISTORIOGRAPHY IN ANCIENT MESOPOTAMIA, JUDAH, AND THE MEDITERRANEAN WORLD

Matthew Neujahr

Contents

Acknowledgments

The present work is a slightly revised version of my doctoral dissertation, written under the direction of John Collins at Yale University; it has been a long time in coming to completion. I wish to extend my thanks to the *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* and the University of Chicago press for permission to re-use material from my previously published article, "When Darius Defeated Alexander," in the discussion of the Dynastic Prophecy in Chapter 2. It is with great pleasure that I recognize and offer my thanks to the many individuals who aided me along the way.

First and foremost, I would like to thank my parents. My mother and father instilled in me a love of learning and a respect for education without which I never would have pursued the studies I did. Even when they learned that I sought something as profoundly obscure and nancially unpromising as a doctorate in Hebrew Bible, they met my decision with love and encouragement. My parents were my rst teachers, and they taught me well: they taught me that learning, heaven help us, never, ever ends.

I owe a profound debt to all my teachers. A number of individuals deserve special thanks. At Brown University, Stanley K. Stowers and Saul Olyan rst introduced me to the study of ancient texts; Wendell Dietrich, perhaps more than any other teacher, encouraged me, quite simply, to *think better*; and Susan Ashbrook Harvey and Sumner Twiss likewise gave generously of their time, knowledge, and support. Saul Olyan deserves double thanks, not just for introducing me to the eld I have made my life's work, but for encouraging me to submit my manuscript for publication in the BJS series, and subsequently serving as editor of the work.

During my time at Harvard, JoAnn Hackett, Paul Hanson, and Daniel Harrington, S.J., proved particularly gifted teachers, advocates, and sources of support; I wish to offer each my profound gratitude.

At Yale, Benjamin Foster, William Hallo, W. Randall Garr, David Marcus, and Kevin Van Bladel instructed me not only in the rudiments of various ancient Near Eastern languages but also taught me a great deal on how to read ancient texts. Steven Fraade proved an understanding, patient, and immensely learned teacher in matters of early rabbinic literature. Dale Martin has given generously of his time and advice. Eckart Frahm, upon joining the NELC faculty at Yale, kindly took on a mentoring role and has been unstinting in his help in all matters Assyriological; his

invaluable feedback has saved me from numerous errors (though doubt-less many remain, for which I alone am responsible). Robert Wilson has ever shared generously of his encyclopedic knowledge and keen insight. Finally, John J. Collins has been a wonderful mentor, a gifted teacher, and a zealous respondent to my written work.

I similarly owe a profound debt to my many friends during my time in graduate school; they have served as my most engaged interlocutors and unsparing critics. Emmanuelle Salgues has been my partner in Assyr-iological crime; her good humor and keen intellect made the most try-ing times of studying Akkadian in nitely more bearable. With Matthew Goff, Joshua Burns, Samuel Adams, Yonder Gillihan, and Mladen Popovic I spent many an evening discussing matters of Second Temple Judaism and Dead Sea Scrolls, much to my enjoyment and intellectual betterment. Brent Nongbri, Jeremy Hultin, Kevin Wilkinson, and Dylan Burns have always been happy and passionate conversation partners, offering direc-tion and answers to my questions about the New Testament, Ancient Christianity, Roman history, and sundry aspects of late antiquity; all four of them provided feedback on the early portions of Chapter 6, for which I am particularly grateful. Tracy Lemos has been not only a dear friend but a wonderful sounding board for many years, all the more cherished for her refusal to brook any arguments or ideas she feels are wanting. Chaya Halberstam has been a particularly helpful conversation partner relating to discussions of genre. Brian Vivier, Camilo Gomez Rivas, and Haydon Cherry shared with me their perspectives as historians working in quite different elds; each has helped shape my thought on historiographical matters. A special word of thanks is due Brian Vivier and Lisa Stout, who sustained my work not only through their cherished friendship and stim-ulating conversation but suffered me to live on their futon in what I like to think of as my "hobo-scholar period."

My most profound gratitude is owed to my wife, Lisa, from whom I learn daily. Without her this work might never have reached completion.

Nietzsche writes in *Ecce Homo*: "One repays a teacher poorly if one remains always but a pupil." It is my wish that the present work be accept-able as a meager deposit on a happy debt I could never hope to repay in full.

Abbreviations

AB	Anchor Bible
ABC	A. K. Grayson, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* (Locust Valley, NY: J. J. Augustin, 1975)
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
AfO	*Archiv für Orientforschung*
AfOB	Archiv für Orientforschung Beihefte
A.J.	Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* (*Antiquitates Judaicae*)
AJSL	*American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*
"Akkadian Prophecies"	
	A. K. Grayson and W. G. Lambert, "Akkadian Prophecies," *JCS* 43 (1965): 7–30
ANET	James B. Pritchard, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, 3rd edition with supplement (Princeton: Princeton University Press 1969)
ANRW	*Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972–1998)
AO	Analecta Orientalia
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
AOS	American Oriental Series
ARM	Archives Royales de Mari
AS	Assyriological Studies
BA	*Biblical Archaeologist*
BASOR	*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
BHLT	A. K. Grayson, *Babylonian Historical-Literary Texts* (Toronto Semitic Texts and Studies; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975)
B.J.	Josephus, *Jewish War* (*Bellum Judaicum*)
BJSUCSD	Biblical and Judaic Studies from the University of California, San Diego
BM	tablet in the collections of the British Museum
BO	*Bibliotheca Orientalis*
BOR	*The Babylonian and Oriental Record*
BRS	Biblical Resource Series
BSOAS	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*

CAD	*The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (21 vols. in 26 parts; Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1962–2010)
CANE	Jack Sasson, ed., *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East* (4 vols.; New York: Scribners, 1995)
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CEJL	Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature
CM	Cuneiform Monographs
CNI	Carsten Niebuhr Institute of Near Eastern Studies Publications
COS	W. W. Hallo and K. L. Younger, eds., *The Context of Scripture* (3 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1997–2003)
CP	*Classical Philology*
CQS	Companion to the Qumran Scrolls
CRAIBL	*Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions & Belles-lettres*
CRINT	Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
CT	*Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets, &c., in the British Museum* (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1896–)
CTN	Cuneiform Texts from Nimrud
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
DSD	*Dead Sea Discoveries*
EsBib	*Estudios bíblicos*
ETL	*Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*
ETSMS	Evangelical Theological Society Monograph Series
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IEJ	*Israel Exploration Journal*
IOS	*Israel Oriental Studies*
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JCS	*Journal of Cuneiform Studies*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
JQR	*Jewish Quarterly Review*
JRAS	*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Periods*
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JSP	*Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha*
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series

JSSEA	*Journal of the Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
K	Kuyunjik (tablet in the collections of the British Museum)
KAR	Erich Ebeling, *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur religiösen Inhalts* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1919)
KAT	Kommentar zum Alten Testament
LAPO	Littératures anciennes du Proche-Orient
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LXX	Septuagint
MAOG	*Mitteilungen der altorientalischen Gesellschaft*
MARI	*MARI: Annales de recherches interdisciplinaires*
MC	Mesopotamian Civilizations
MT	Masoretic Text of the Hebrew Bible, according to *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*
Muses	Benjamin R. Foster, *Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature* (3d ed.; Bethesda, MD: CDL, 2005)
NS	New Series
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
OIP	Oriental Institute Publications
OG	Old Greek translation of Hebrew Scriptures
OLA	Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta
OTP	James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983–1985)
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTS	Oudtestamentische Studiën
PEQ	*Palestine Exploration Quarterly*
PFES	Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society
PTSDSSP	Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project = James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Text with English Translations* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995–)
RAI	Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale
RB	*Revue Biblique*
RevQ	*Revue de Qumrân*
RHPR	*Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses*
RLA	Erich Ebeling, et al., eds., *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1928–)
RT	*Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à la archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes*
RTP	*Revue de théologie et philosophie*
SAA	State Archives of Assyria
SAAS	State Archives of Assyria Studies
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series

SBLSS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
SVTP	Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha
TAPS	*Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*
TCS	Texts from Cuneiform Sources
TUAT	O. Kaiser, ed., *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1982–)
VAT	Vorderasiatische Abteilung. Tontafeln (tablet in the collections of the Vorderasiatisches Museum, Berlin)
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WAW	Writings from the Ancient World
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WO	*Die Welt des Orients*
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
YNER	Yale Near Eastern Researches
YOS	Yale Oriental Series
ZA	*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZPE	*Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*

Sigla and Conventions for Transcriptions
of Hebrew and Aramaic Manuscripts

א̇	certain reading of a damaged letter
א̊	uncertain reading of a damaged letter
°	illegible character
א	supralinear addition
ו̓ , י̓	a *waw* that could be read as *yod*, a *yod* that could be read as *waw*
[ ]	lacuna; transcriptions of Dead Sea fragments in this volume attempt to indicate the relative size of the lacuna
vacat	a blank space in a manuscript intentionally left by the scribe

The citation convention for fragmentary texts among the Dead Sea Scrolls is as follows:

4Q552 1 ii 1–8 = (document) 4Q552; (fragment) 1; (column) ii; (lines) 1–8.

Major texts represented by a principal manuscript are cited in the manner of biblical chapter and verse; thus 1QS 4:2 = column 4, line 2 of the Community Rule.

Sigla and Conventions for Akkadian Documents

ku	syllabic readings of Akkadian signs are in italics
KUR	Sumerian logograms in Akkadian texts are transcribed in capitals
[*k*]*u*	Partially preserved cuneiform sign; brackets roughly corresponding to the missing portion of the sign
ú°	Partially preserved cuneiform sign whose transliteration is a single letter
x	Indicates the presence of a cuneiform sign that is damaged beyond legibility
he will go	Translations in italics indicate an uncertain rendering in English, even where the reading of the cuneiform signs seems certain
[…]	lacuna
…	An ellipsis (not bracketed) in the translation of a text indicates text that is unreadable or otherwise obscure (and therefore untranslatable) on the tablet
1′	Line numbering beginning after an indeterminate number of missing lines

1

Introduction

In many ways, the present investigation may be viewed as a history of the use of *vaticinium ex eventu* as a literary technique in the mantic writings of the ancient Near East, from our earliest evidence in Mesopotamian literature of the late second millennium through the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple in 70 c.e. Unlike other studies focused on a literary device, the present work consciously blends literary with historical concerns. This is due to the fact that *vaticinium ex eventu* of the type investigated in the pages to follow involves "predicting" identi able historical phenomena one after another in a literary work that presents itself as communicating mantic knowledge to the audience. As such, the works exhibit a keen interplay between historical consciousness, religious ideology (since the gods are the source of mantic knowledge), and literary traditions that encapsulate or record mantic practices. This combination of historical recitation within a divinatory literary context is perhaps most familiar from the biblical book of Daniel.

Over the past century there has been increasing attention paid to a small corpus of Akkadian compositions that seem to present this historiographic/mantic interplay, containing *vaticinia ex eventu* strongly reminiscent of those found in Daniel. Comments such as the following, made by some of the foremost Assyriologists of the second half of the twentieth century, have served as a strong trigger to the pursuit of the present investigation:

> [T]he origin of apocalyptic literature has been much debated. With the two aforementioned Babylonian prophecies [i.e., the Uruk and Dynastic Prophecies], we have the earliest examples of this type of literature.[1]

> Thus, even if biblical apocalyptic goes no further back than ca. 165 b.c.e. (and this is debatable), there is now no chronological reason to exclude

---

1. A. K. Grayson, "The Babylonian Origin of Apocalyptic Literarture," *Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti* 148 (1989–1990): 203–18; here 203–4.

the possibility of seeing in the Akkadian genre its immediate inspiration. . . .[2]

In such a syncretistic age as the Hellenistic it is certainly possible, perhaps even probable, that the author of Daniel adapted the style of a traditional Babylonian genre for his own purpose.[3]

It is clear that for A. K. Grayson, William Hallo, and W. G. Lambert—the respective authors of the above quotations—the reading of these cuneiform documents has been heavily influenced by their understandings of Daniel and early Judean apocalyptic literature; and, in turn, reading these texts against Daniel leads them to surmise some level of generic, and, indeed, genetic affinity and historical connection among the Mesopotamian and Judean texts. As with so many instances wherein a biblical passage or literary type seems to be paralleled in a cuneiform source, the suggestion that the (later) biblical material is somehow dependent on the (earlier) Mesopotamian material presents itself. This study therefore seeks to lay bare the relationships perceived between these Mesopotamian compositions and Judean works that exhibit comparable use of *ex eventu* historical reviews.

Of Prophecies and Prophets, Predictions and Texts

One of the unavoidable misfortunes of any scholarly pursuit is the necessity of technical jargon. The desire to categorize and analyze inevitably requires the coinage of labels in a seemingly geometric progression. Further, those labels that are sufficiently useful to gain widespread usage almost inevitably begin to adhere to phenomena to which they had not originally had any attachment; and the wider the circulation of a term, often, the less useful it becomes to describe something with any level of specificity or clarity. Such is clearly the case with terms such as "prophet," "prophecy," "oracle," "apocalypse," and any number of terms in the semantic orbit of prediction and divine–human communication.

It is partially in response to this that native, ancient designations have increasingly been retained in scholarly literature. Over the past decades, it has become apparent through numerous studies of the social phenomenon of prophetism that the role of a prophet in ancient Israel did not

---

2. William Hallo, "The Expansion of Cuneiform Literature," in *Jubilee Volume of the American Academy for Jewish Research* (Proceedings 46–47; Jerusalem: American Academy of Jewish Research, 1979–1980), 307–22; here 315.

3. W. G. Lambert, The *Background of Jewish Apocalyptic* (London: Athlone, 1978), 16.

center solely on the prediction of future events.[4] In fact, what it is that a "prophet" did in Israel and Judah is far less clear than we would often like to think. After all, on reading the pertinent texts one will learn that a *nābî*, "prophet," is characterized fundamentally by the behavior designated by the verb *hinnābē* / *hitnabbôt*, "to act in the manner of a *nābî*."[5] The ambiguous role of the prophetic office has thus at times led modern scholars to distinguish between the *nābî* and other figures often lumped together under the rubric "prophet"—most notably the seer (*ḥōzeh*) and visionary (*rō'eh*). In addition, the term "prophecy" has been expanded into a general category encompassing various other figures and phenomena, notably from Old Babylonian Mari and first-millennium Assur, as well as Syria, Transjordan, and Egypt.[6] This is to say nothing of the application of the term "prophet" to figures throughout the world from antiquity to the present. The current scholarly discussion of prophets, prophecies, and the art of prediction in the ancient Near East is a far-flung net, yielding a remarkably heterogeneous haul.[7]

Among the more important recent trends in the study of ancient prophecy is the recognition that the social phenomenon of prophetism must be understood as something quite distinct from the literary remains from which we cull our data concerning prophetic activities. Or, to state the problem in its most basic terms: texts are not prophets. To study a text is a literary endeavor and is not the equivalent of anthropological fieldwork in which the human subject can be observed first hand. Furthermore, it seems highly likely that texts which contain references to the activities of prophetic figures were not themselves written by the prophets whose words they purport to contain. Therefore, in treating texts that purport to relate instances of prophetic activity, or mantic practices more broadly, it is imperative to keep

---

4. See, generally, the now classic treatment of Robert R. Wilson, *Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel* (Fortress: Philadelphia, 1980).

5. There has been an effort to connect Hebrew *nābî* with the Akkadian verb *nabû*, "to call, to name," presumably then meaning "called one," or, less likely, "one who calls on god(s)." See, e.g., Daniel Fleming, "Prophets and Temple Personnel in the Mari Archives," in *The Priests in the Prophets: The Portrayal of Priests, Prophets and Other Religious Specialists in the Latter Prophets* (ed. Lester L. Grabbe and Alice Ogden Bellis; JSOTSup 408; London: T&T Clarke, 2004), 45–64; see especially the addendum, 61–64. The etymology must remain somewhat speculative, as *nb'* is not a productive verbal root in classical Hebrew, the N-stem and Ct-stem attestations being derivative of the nominal form *nābî*.

6. See, e.g., Martti Nissinen, *Prophets and Prophecy in the Ancient Near East* (WAW 12; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003).

7. I should emphasize, however, that this is not necessarily a bad thing. Indeed, in many ways it serves as a corrective to claims of Israel's distinctiveness (read: superiority) vis-à-vis all other ancient Near Eastern cultures. Particularly refreshing is the treatment of Israelite prophecy under the general heading of "mantic" practices in the methodologically magisterial treatment of Israelite religion by Ziony Zevit (*The Religions of Ancient Israel: A Synthesis of Parallactic Approaches* [New York: Continuum, 2001]).

at least one eye on the processes by which mantic activity was recorded in literary form, as well as the motivations for doing so. That is to say, the processes of *scribalization* must be considered when studying such texts.[8] Prophetic oracles may have been composed and delivered by prophetic ﬁgures, but prophetic *texts* are the work of scribes.[9]

Complicating matters has been the resurgence in the last half-century of interest in apocalyptic literature. This has led, perhaps inevitably, to numerous studies searching for the "origin" of apocalypses and apocalyptic thought. Most scholars involved in this project contend that there is some sort of evolutionary relationship between biblical prophetic texts and post-biblical apocalypses. Texts such as Isaiah 24–27, proto- and deutero-Zechariah, and Joel are often invoked as examples of the transition from prophecy to apocalypticism.[10] However, it is also clear that a neat model of evolutionary progression that ignores the imposition and evolution of new cultural elements during the tumultuous periods of Babylonian forced migration, Achaemenid imperial dominion, Hellenistic cultural hegemony, and Roman conquest is unacceptable. At no time had Israel existed culturally isolated from its surroundings, and certainly not in the period leading up to and including the production of apocalyptic literature. The genetic relationship of apocalyptic literature to native prophetic literary templates is a certainty, but it is similarly unassailable that the assimilation of non-Israelite (or better, non-Judean) elements played *some* role in the development of Judean apocalyptic thought and literature.

Enter into this the ﬁve fascinating Akkadian texts, mentioned above, that have come to light over roughly the last ninety years: *Ex Eventu* (Prophecy) Text A, the Marduk Prophetic Speech, the Shulgi Prophetic Speech, the Uruk Prophecy, and the Dynastic Prophecy.[11] These texts have exacted no small amount of excitement among not only scholars inter-

---

8. The past decade has seen an explosion in scholarly interest in the processes of scribalization in the ancient world, particularly among biblicists. See, inter alia, David M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), especially 17–173; William Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book: The Textualization of Ancient Israel* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), especially 1–63; and Karel van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007).

9. This point is made most forcefully and convincingly by van der Toorn; see *Scribal Culture*, 182–88.

10. One thinks immediately of the work of Paul D. Hanson, particularly *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1975); see also Robert Wilson, "The Biblical Roots of Apocalyptic," in Abbas Amanat and Magnus Bernhardsson, eds., *Imagining the End: Visions of Apocalypse from the Ancient Middle East to Modern America* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2002), 56–66; Otto Plöger, *Theocracy and Eschatology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1968); and Stephen Cook, *Prophecy and Apocalypticism: the Postexilic Setting* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995).

11. Texts closely related to these, and sometimes included in the category (notably Grayson and Lambert's "Text B"), will be discussed in Chapter 3.

ested in the history of prophecy but more especially those interested in apocalyptic literature. The feature that unites these texts is the presence of a historical review in the guise of a prediction of the future—that is to say, the literary technique known as *vaticinium ex eventu*, or prediction after the fact. This feature has occasioned many comparisons to the biblical book of Daniel and scholarly claims concerning the history of apocalyptic thought; indeed, various of the Akkadian texts at hand have been called into evidence by scholars in the hope of illuminating Judean material.[12] However, the fact remains that the Akkadian texts themselves are far more poorly understood than the biblical and post-biblical texts to which they are frequently compared. While it is the contention of the present study that the texts do indeed shed light on our understanding of the origin and evolution of a certain cross-section of apocalyptic thought and texts, the issue ought equally to be ipped on its head. That is, comparison with the more familiar biblical and post-biblical apocalypses will do as much or more to clarify our understanding of the Akkadian texts. It is the intent of this study, then, to bring greater understanding to both corpora, mutually cast in starker relief by the light of the other.

The Akkadian *Ex Eventu* Texts: Their Recovery and the History of Scholarship

The rst of the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts to come to light was published in hand copy by Erich Ebeling under the heading "Prophezeiungen" in 1920.[13] The text contains, as Ebeling's label indicates, a series of predictions. Speci cally, the text is concerned with the rise of future "princes" (Akkadian *rubû*) and contains references to the deeds of or circumstances surrounding each.[14] The predictions are widely recognized as instances of *vaticinium ex eventu*. An article containing a transcription, English translation, and collation of the tablet was published in 1964 by A. K. Grayson and W. G. Lambert.[15]

---

12. From the biblical side, see, e.g., Robert Wilson, *Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 119–23.

13. Erich Ebeling, *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur religiösen Inhalts* (Leipzig : J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1920), text 421.

14. It has been claimed further that there is frequently a judgment of a given reign as good or bad in Text A and other of the *ex eventu* texts; see A. K. Grayson, *Babylonian Historical-Literary Texts* (Toronto Semitic Texts and Studies 3; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975). Against this, see the argument of Robert D. Biggs, "Babylonian Prophecies, Astrology, and a New Source for 'Prophecy Text B,'" in *Language, Literature, and History: Philological and Historical Studies Presented to Erica Reiner* (ed. F. Rochberg-Halton; AOS 67; New Haven, CT: American Oriental Society, 1987), 1–14; especially 2, 3.

15. A. K. Grayson and W. G. Lambert, "Akkadian Prophecies," *JCS* 18 (1964): 7–30.

It was this publication that opened the door to the modern study of the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts.[16] The text previously published by Ebeling was assigned the siglum (Text) A; it was published along with three similar texts labeled B–D. Of these, texts C and D (from Neo-Assyrian archives) were later determined to belong to the Shulgi Prophecy and the Marduk Prophecy, respectively.[17] At the time of Grayson and Lambert's article, Text A was the most complete—or, at least, contained the most running text—of the works identi ed as belonging to the group. Unfortunately, Text A nonetheless comes to us in a relatively poor state of preservation; neither the beginning nor the end of the text has been preserved, and there is little hard evidence pointing to exactly how much text is missing. What remains consists for the most part of a series of predictions of "future" reigns of kings, introduced with a standardized formula: "a prince will arise and exercise kingship for *N* years." Then follow varying amounts of detail about the events of the reign just introduced. As will be seen in Chapter 2 of this study, although there is disagreement as to the precise referents of the various reigns, there is general agreement that the text is employing *vaticinium ex eventu*, and that the composition is speaking in veiled terms of past events identi able to its intended audience.

As with Text A, the Shulgi and Marduk texts consist of historical reviews and include "predictions" of future reigns. Thanks to the brilliant reconstruction efforts of Rykle Borger, we now have both the beginning and the end of the Marduk Prophecy, as well as the catch-line of the Shulgi Prophecy.[18] Borger was able to demonstrate that these two texts had been copied one after another in the scribal schools of ancient Mesopotamia as part of a series. This is the only evidence within this small corpus that any of these texts were considered by ancient Mesopotamian scribes to be of a kind; no other such indication of emic genre grouping among these texts exists. It should be noted that the Marduk prophecy, in particular, is distinct from Text A in two major ways: (1) the bulk of the historical review is cached in the past, not future, tense; (2) the events described in the Marduk prophecy have been identi ed with a very high degree of probability.

In the years following Grayson and Lambert's article, it came to be recognized that, while related to the others, Text B did not belong in the group; rather, it is more closely a liated with astrological omen literature—it seems to be, at least in part, a collection of celestial omens.[19] The

---

16. There had been a handful of earlier studies on the text published by Ebeling; see the review of scholarship in Grayson and Lambert, "Akkadian Prophecies," 7–8.

17. Rykle Borger, "Gott Marduk und Gott-König Šulgi als Propheten: Zwei prophe-tische Texte," *BO* 28 (1971): 3–24. Further, Borger demonstrated that these two texts were copied together as part of a series.

18. Borger, "Gott Marduk."

19. This argument has also been made concerning Text A. See Robert D. Biggs, "The

result was to reduce the number of texts in the group by one. However, a fourth text was added to the corpus when Stephen Kaufman and Hermann Hunger published an article concerning a text unearthed by the German excavations at Uruk.[20] This hitherto-unknown composition, called by its editors the Uruk Prophecy, is extant in the sole copy published by Kaufman and Hunger, a single tablet most likely to be dated to the late Achaemenid period. Again, the salient feature of the text is the record of past events formed as predictions about the future. The text is notable for its paradisiacal ending, which is best regarded as an authentic attempt at prediction.

Finally, the fth text of the group, the Dynastic Prophecy, was identied by Grayson while working with fragments in the British Museum.[21] The text is clearly of Babylonian provenance, dating to the early Hellenistic period. Not only is this text interested in "predicting" the rise and fall of Mesopotamian kings after the fact, but it is speci cally concerned (as the name given by Grayson indicates) with the rise and fall of successive dynasties. Only two of the text's columns are well preserved, and the total length of the original composition is debated. What remains of the rst column would seem to deal with Assyria, the next column with Babylonia and its fall to Cyrus, and the penultimate column with Achaemenid rulers and the Macedonian conquest of Asia. The text's nal column is unfortunately quite fragmentary but seems to deal with the early successors of Alexander in the East.

The problem lies in determining just what these texts are, to what purposes they were composed, and what particularly about them has led scholars to group them together. Lambert and Grayson both made appeal to biblical literature in their designation of these works as "prophecies," but within a few years Hallo used the same comparative materials to argue for designating these texts "apocalypses."[22] It very soon became clear that the designation "prophecy" must be quali ed, in order to avoid confusion with the corpora of prophetic oracles from, primarily, the Old Babylonian and Neo-Assyrian periods. It has been noted that while those tablets record oral utterances, proclamations regarding speci c contemporary events and individuals by prophetic gures, our "Akkadian prophe-

---

Babylonian Prophecies and the Astrological Traditions of Mesopotamia," *JCS* 37 (1985): 86–90. On the relation of Text B to the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts, see Chapter 3.

20. Hermann Hunger, *Spätbabylonische Texte aus Uruk, Teil I* (Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft in Uruk-Warka 9; Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1976), 21–23; see Hermann Hunger and Stephen A. Kaufman, "A New Akkadian Prophecy Text," *JAOS* 95 (1975): 371–75; also Stephen A. Kaufman "Prediction, Prophecy, and Apocalypse in the Light of New Akkadian Texts," in *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1974), 1:221–28.

21. Grayson, *BHLT*.

22. W. H. Hallo, "Akkadian Apocalypses," *IEJ* 16 (1966): 231–42.

cies" are literary texts consisting in the main part of the recitation of past events, at least in part as *ex eventu* predictions; there is no evidence in the texts themselves of originating as orally delivered proclamations by a prophetic gure such as a *muḫḫûm*. Maria de Jong Ellis has since advocated calling these works "literary predictive texts" to avoid the inaccuracies of the designations "prophecy" and "apocalypse," and has been followed by a number of scholars.[23] For reasons that will become clear in Chapter 3, I nd this designation unsatisfactory for reasons of its own. Therefore, I employ the designation "Akkadian *ex eventu* texts," "Akkadian *ex eventu* compositions," etc., for the ve Akkadian works at the center of the present investigation, as it is primarily the appearance of the literary trope *vaticinium ex eventu* that serves to connect them.[24]

Chapter 2 of this study begins by offering a thoroughgoing assessment of these ve Akkadian works. I offer transliterations based on the published editions of the texts side by side with fresh translations of each work. The discussion offered on each of the compositions is not intended to be exhaustive commentary; rather, it is intended to highlight and explore the elements of these works that have triggered comparison to Judean apocalyptic texts—and, in a handful of cases, even led scholars to proclaim these works the immediate genetic forerunners of Jewish and Christian apocalypses.

The Akkadian *Ex Eventu* Texts within Mesopotamian Literature

Given that the *ex eventu* texts employ the language of prediction, it is reasonable to situate these works within the larger category of Mesopotamian mantic literature. It was early on recognized that some of the texts bear resemblance to omen collections (particularly astrological omina), at least insofar as elements such as vocabulary, phraseology, and orthography are concerned. The association of ominous signs with future events constitutes by far our largest source of information on Mesopotamian mantic practices, and the recording of these signs in compendia represents one of the chief labors of the ancient scribe. It should, of course, be cautioned that this might be somewhat misleading with regard to mantic techniques in use on the ground in ancient Babylon and Assyria; it is probable that certain methods of divination were more likely to be represented

---

23. Maria de Jong Ellis, "Observations on Mesopotamian Oracles and Prophetic Texts: Literary and Historiographic Considerations," *JCS* 41 (1989): 127–86.

24. The questions of textual liation, literary setting, genre, and label will be pursued at length in Chapter 3.

in written records than others. Chapter 3 of the present work tackles the intertwined questions of category and label, and proceeds by situating the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts within Akkadian literature more broadly. Special attention is paid to the relationship between these texts and more traditional Mesopotamian divinatory compositions while also addressing the literary interplay between mantic and historiographic traditions in ancient Mesopotamia.

Ex Eventu Predictions in Late Second Temple Literature

As will become apparent as this study unfolds, the basis for considering the Akkadian *ex eventu* works alongside Judean apocalyptic texts of the late Second Temple period boils down to very little other than their shared use of *vaticinium ex eventu* as a literary device. Therefore, any claims of cross in uence between Judean texts and these works must closely assess the use of *ex eventu* prediction within Hellenistic- and early-Roman-era Judean compositions. The latter part of this study investigates the development of the *ex eventu* trope through its earliest uses in the Judean tradition: in the books of Daniel and *1 Enoch* (Chapter 4); in several works from among the Dead Sea Scrolls, most particularly the pseudo-Daniel and pseudo-Jeremiah corpora (Chapter 5); and nally in the early strands of the Judean sibylline tradition found in the rst four books of the *Sibylline Oracles* (Chapter 6). If one may seriously entertain the notion of in uence of the Akkadian works on Judean ones, then careful consideration of the ways in which *vaticinium ex eventu* actually appears and functions in various late Second Temple works must necessarily form one side of the comparative enterprise; careful consideration of the Akkadian works alone cannot be su cient to support any such claims.

Method

The methodology pursued in this study is unapologetically comparative. In this vein much ink has already been spilled concerning the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts, but to date no broadly accepted classi cation of these texts has been presented. What is lacking is a "natural history" of the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts, to borrow a phrase from J. Z. Smith.[25] The process of classi cation is both the most fundamental step toward understanding a text (aside from basic command of language) and the most nec-

---

25. Jonathan Z. Smith, *Map Is Not Territory* (Leiden: Brill, 1978), ix.

essarily comparative aspect of the enterprise. From a history-of-religions perspective, this may be viewed as an issue of simple *taxonomy*;[26] from a literary point of view, it may be described as a question of *genre*. There is tremendous overlap between the two, and the efforts to establish a text's religio-historical taxon or literary genre will result in the elucidation of a great deal of the same evidence. However, the two need to be understood as separate—though often complementary—aims, a distinction that all too often is not made clear in studies of ancient (in particular, religious) texts. Genre may be regarded either as temporally and spatially delimited, or as an essentially atemporal mode of categorization; the historian per force works diachronically. The historian of religion, however, cannot stop at assigning a text to a certain category. In Smith's words, "it is not suﬃcient to merely name a text; rather, it is necessary both to locate a text within a history of tradition and to provide some sort of explanation for the processes of continuity and change."[27] This, then, constitutes the goal of the present work for both the Mesopotamian and Judean texts considered.

I contend that the use in various texts of *vaticinium ex eventu* is indicative of more than a simple parallel literary phenomenon—say, a common poetic word pair in Ugaritic and Hebrew verse. Rather, it is indicative of a complex of religio-political ideas employed by authors seeking a common functionality, whose works emerge from a cluster of key socio-historical realia that happen to be analogous cross-culturally and cross-temporally (which by no means is meant to suggest universality). Given the vast distances in culture, language, space, and time that separate the texts under consideration, I beg the reader's patience; this study proceeds with the conviction that such syntheses are to be built slowly, brick by brick, as the foundation of evidence must be adduced with care.

A Note on Texts and Terminology

Except where otherwise speciﬁed in the notes, the following sources for ancient texts are used throughout. Citations of the Hebrew text of the Bible are according to *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Citations of the New Testament are according to the twenty-seventh edition of the Greek text of Nestle-Aland. The Septuagint is cited according to the text of the Göttingen edition. The texts of Greek and Latin works are taken from their respective volumes of the Loeb Classical Library, where available. Sources for all other ancient texts are cited as they appear. Translations are my

---

26. For example, Smith identiﬁes as religio-historical taxa "Hellenistic Judaism," "Apocalypticism," etc. That is, taxa are complexes of socio-cultural realia of a certain temporal and spatial locus.

27. Smith, *Map Is Not Territory*, xi.

own except when otherwise indicated. As a general rule, I have quoted original texts far more extensively for those ancient documents whose editions are less accessible to non-specialists (such as cuneiform documents, Dead Sea Scrolls, etc.) in hope of aiding the reader.

Finally, a brief note should be made concerning terminology. Against the majority stream of contemporary scholarship, I have throughout avoided terms such as "Jewish" and "Judaism" with rare exception. I have become convinced that the use of these English terms as descriptors of phenomena predating the destruction of the Jerusalem temple and the rise of Rabbinic authority alongside institutions such as the synagogue and the *bet midrash* is not simply anachronistic but has the potential to mislead.[28] In keeping with the (opaque) terminology used by the ancient texts themselves, the term "Judean" (intended as a word that does not distinguish between what is "of/related to the place Judea" and what might properly be called "Jewish") is used where other scholars have tended to use "Jewish," even if the Judeans in question are living far outside Judea proper. If the present text is somewhat clumsier for this, I beg the reader's pardon. I nonetheless feel the debt of euphony is repaid in delity.

---

28. See Steve Mason, "Jews, Judeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History," *JSJ* 38 (2007): 457–512. While I do not agree with Mason's arguments on all points, he raises many of the issues that give me pause were one not to distinguish between what modern readers would recognize as "religious" elements of Judean culture prior to the cessation of the Jerusalem temple cult and many of the innovative cultural elements that became codi ed and normative in the evolution of Rabbinic Judaism in the centuries following. This is by no means meant to imply any sort of wholesale break in continuity before and after 70 ce.

2

The Akkadian *Ex Eventu* Compositions: Texts, Notes, and Discussion

In order to lay an adequate foundation for study, the present chapter contains a fresh translation of each Akkadian *ex eventu* composition alongside a transliteration of the Akkadian text, coupled with textual notes and discussion. As stated in the introduction, the discussion presented here is not intended as a comprehensive commentary; rather, it focuses on those elements most pertinent to unpacking the use of *vaticinia ex eventu* in each text. Full transliterations and translations have been included in this study for two reasons: (1) while English translations of all the texts can be found in T. Longman's *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography*,[1] none of the standard and widely available collections of Near Eastern Texts (e.g., *ANET*, *COS*, *TUAT*, *Before the Muses*) contains a translation of each of them; (2) to date there is no single publication in which transcriptions or transliterations of the cuneiform text for all ve works have appeared. Given the number of different publications (and the relative inaccessability of some) to which one would need to turn if inclined to check the translation against the Akkadian, it seemed advisable to transliterate the cuneiform on the basis of published copies and collations and include those transliterations here.[2] This is all the more important given the often obscure and cryptic nature of the texts, both in terms of sense and orthography.

The transliterations and translations that follow owe a great debt to previous scholars' work; I have endeavored to acknowledge fully the work on which I have drawn. Additionally, a brief bibliography (with shortened citations) for each of the texts has been included in the hope of facilitating future research; for full citations, see the Bibliography at the end of this work. Finally, in the discussion following each text only minimal attention is paid to the various literary relationships each text

---

1. Tremper Longman III, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1991).

2. I must stress at the outset that I have not personally collated the tablets in question; thus, the present chapter must not be regarded as a re-edition of any of the texts. A new edition seems unwarranted at this time, thanks to the good fortune that each of these texts has been given an excellent edition by some of the foremost scholars of cuneiform literature.

may exhibit to other ancient Near Eastern compositions; these issues will be pursued in depth in the discussion of genre that serves as the topic of Chapter 3.

Ex Eventu (Prophecy) Text A

Introduction

The text that has come to be known as Prophecy Text A (following the designation of Grayson and Lambert, "Akkadian Prophecies") received substantial attention following its 1919 publication by Erich Ebeling in *KAR*. Several studies soon appeared, notably translations of the text by Ebeling (*AOAT*, 2d ed., 1929) and Robert H. Pfeiffer (*ANET*, 2d ed., 1955) in major compilations intended for non-specialists whose primary interest lay in Old Testament study. The text survives in a single Neo-Assyrian copy from Assur. Because of the amount of missing text, it is not possible to determine de nitively which side of the tablet is the obverse and which the reverse. There are, however, certain features of the composition that recommend treating what Grayson and Lambert's edition labels "First Side" as the obverse of the tablet and their "Second Side" as the reverse. The column enumeration of Grayson and Lambert has been retained (for ease of reference); but, working with the hypothesis that the First Side really is the obverse, the order of the columns on the "Second Side" has been reversed, proceeding from right to left as is the convention for the reverse of a cuneiform tablet.

A word of gratitude is owed to Professor Eckart Frahm, who kindly provided me with a high resolution digital photograph of the tablet in question.

Bibliography

Tablet museum number: VAT 10179
Cuneiform text: Ebeling, *KAR* 421
Edition: Grayson and Lambert, "Akkadian Prophecies" (transcription and collation)
Translation: Robert Biggs, *ANET* 606–7; Grayson and Lambert, "Akkadian Prophecies"; Longman, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography*; Pfeiffer, *ANET* 451–452; Philippe Talon, "Les textes prophétiques"
Studies: Grayson and Lambert, "Akkadian Prophecies"; Hallo, "Akkadian Apocalypses"; Longman, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography*; Ernst F. Weidner, "Texte-Wörter-Sachen" (collation of the tablet)

Transliteration and Translation

<table>
<tr><td>

First Side
Column I

Lacuna

1. [… …] x x [x]
2. [… …] UŠ ḪUR IR GIŠ(?)
3. [… …] $^{d}iš_{8}$–*tár* ^{d}A-*nu-um*
4. [… …] *x* DU-*zu-nim-ma*
5. [… …] *x là ṣa-la-lu*
6. [… …] *ḫi-ṭu*
7. […] ⌈ŠEŠ⌉ AD-*ka*
8. […]-*din-nu*
9. [*illâ rubûm-ma N* MU.MEŠ LU]GAL-
    tú DÙ-*uš*
10. […] ŠA KUR
11. […] NU NA AK
12. […] TUŠ-*ab*
13. […] MEŠ
14. [*illâ rubûm-ma N* MU.MEŠ *šarrutu*
    DÙ-*u*]*š* (*ippuš*)
15. […] x
16. […] x

Lacuna

Column II

Lacuna

1. […] DA^{meš} x x x […]
2. [*illâ rubûm*]-*ma* 18 MU.MEŠ LUGAL-
    [*tú ippuš*]
3. KUR *a-*⌈*bur*⌉-*riš* TUŠ-*ab* ŠÀ KUR
    DÙG-*ab* UN^{meš} ḪÉ.[NUN *immarā*]

4. DINGIR^{meš} EŠ.BAR KUR *ana* SIG$_{5}$–*ti*
    TAR^{meš} IM^{meš} DÙG.G[A^{meš}]

5. GIŠ.ŠÁ.BAR GUN-*sà* AB.SÍN GUN-
    sà ut-[*tar*]
6. ^{d}GÍR *u* ^{d}ŠE.SÌ.IR *ina* KUR *ì*-DÙ-x

</td><td>

First Side
Column I

Lacuna

1. […] …
2. […] …
3. […] Ishtar, Anu
4. […] … *they stood* (?)
5. […] … *not sleeping* (?)
6. […] crime
7. […] *your father's brother* (?)
8. […] *the gave*
9. [A prince will arise and for N years]
    he will exercise [ki]ngship
10. […] … *land* (?)
11. […] …
12. […] will sit
13. […] …
14. [A prince will arise and will exer]
    cise [kingship for N years]
15. […] …
16. […] …

Lacuna

Column II

Lacuna

1. […] *sides* (?) …
2. [A prince will arise] and [will exer-
    cise] king[ship] for 18 years.
3. The land will dwell securely; the
    midst of the land will be well;
    the people [*will experience*]
    prosper[ity.]
4. The gods will issue good decisions
    for the land; the winds will be
    favorable.
5. The yield of the … and the yield of
    the furrow will be abundant.
6. Shakkan and Nisaba will … in the
    land.

</td></tr>
</table>

7. ŠÈG^{meš} *u* A.KAL^{meš} GÁL^{meš} UN
   (! copy: DAN)^{meš} KUR *ni-gu-tú*
   IGI-*mar*

7. There will be rains and oods; the *people* of the land will have a joy-ful celebration.

8. NUN BI *ina* ḪI.GAR *ina* ^{giš}TUKUL
   GAZ-*ak*

8. That prince will be killed by the sword in a revolt.

9. E$_{11}$–*a* NUN-*ma* 13 MU.MEŠ LUGAL-
   tú DÙ-*uš*

9. A prince will arise and he will exer-cise kingship for 13 years.

10. ZI-*ut* ELAM.MA^{ki} *a-na* ^{kur}URI^{ki}
    GÁL-*ma*

10. There will be an Elamite attack against Akkad and

11. NAM.RI ^{kur}URI^{ki} *iš-šal-lal*

11. the booty of Akkad will be carried off.

12. *eš-rit* DINGIR^{meš} GAL^{meš} *ú-saḫ-ḫa*
    IGI.SÁ(! copy: IGI.IGI) ^{kur}URI^{ki}
    TAR-*as*

12. The shrines of the great gods will be destroyed. The offerings of Akkad will be cut off

13. *e-šá-a-tu dal-ḫa-a-tu u là* DÙG.GA^{meš}
    ina KUR GÁL-*ma*

13. There will be confusion, trouble, and hostility in the land.

14. GAL-*tu* TUR-*ma* MAN-*ma šá*
    šùm-šú là MU E$_{11}$–*ma*

14. Greatness will become small. Another man who is unknown (literally: whose name is not spo-ken) will arise and

15. GIN$_7$ LUGAL AŠ.TE DAB-*bat-ma*
    IDIM^{meš}-*šú ina* ^{giš}TUKUL TIL-*mar*

15. he will seize the throne like a king; he will nish off his nobles with the sword.

16. BAR ERIN$_2$–*ni* ^{kur}URI^{ki} DUGUD-*tú*
    ina ḫar-ri šá Ṭup-li-ia-áš

16. With half of the massive army of Akkad he will ll the canals of Ṭupliash,

17. EDIN *u ba-ma-a-ti* SA$_5$–*ma*

17. the plains and the hills.

18. [U]N^{meš} *sú-un-qa dan-na* IGI^{meš}

18. The [pe]ople will experience a ter-rible famine.

19. ⌈E$_{11}$⌉-*a* NUN-*ma* U$_4$^{meš}-*šú*
    GUD$_8$.DA^{meš} *lá* EN KUR

19. A prince will arise but his days will be short; he will not be master of the land.

20. [*illâ*] NUN-*ma* 3 MU.MEŠ LUGAL-
    ta DÙ-*uš*

20. A prince will arise and he will exercise kingship for three years.

21. […] x ÍD^{meš} *sa-ki-ka* SA$_5$^{meš}

21. […] the canals will be full of mud.

22. […] KÚ MEŠ

22. […] …

23. […] ⌈SA$_5$⌉

23. […] …

Lacuna

Lacuna

Column III

Column III

Lacuna

Lacuna

1. AN (?) […]

1. … […]

2. LUGAL BI *kib-ra-a-t*[*i ibêl* …]

2. That king [will rule] the (four) quarters […]

3. UN$^{\text{meš}}$-*šú* ḪÉ.NUN *i*-x […]

4. *sat-tuk* $^{\text{d}}$Í-*gì-gì šá* TAR-*su* DU-*an* AN […]

5. IM$^{\text{meš}}$ DÙG.GA$^{\text{meš}}$ DU$^{\text{meš}}$ ḪÉ.NUN ŠÀ x […]

6. GU$_4$$^{\text{meš}}$ *ina* EDIN *a-bur-riš* [*irabbiṣū*]

7. *di-iš* EN.TE.NA *ana* BURU$_{14}$ *di-iš* BUR[U$_{14}$ *ana kuṣṣi uštabarra*]

8. *i-lit-ti bu-ul* $^{\text{d}}$GÌR […]

9. E$_{11}$–*a* NUN-*ma* 8 MU.MEŠ LUGAL [-*tú ippuš*]

10. PA x […]

11. AN […]

Lacuna

Second Side
Column II

Lacuna

1. […] E UD x […]

2. E$_{11}$–*a* NUN-*ma* 3 MU.M[EŠ *šarrūtu ippuš*]

3. ÍB.TAG$_4$-*at* UN$^{\text{meš}}$ *ana* […]

4. URU$^{\text{meš}}$ ŠUB$^{\text{meš}}$ TUŠ$^{\text{meš}}$ […]

5. *saḫ$_4$–ma-šá-a-tu* GÁL-*ši-ma* x […]

6. *a-na* $^{\text{kur}}$URI$^{\text{ki}}$ *nu-kúr-tú* […]

7. GARZA É-*kur u* EN.LÍL$^{\text{ki}}$ *ana* x […]

8. A A EŠ RI x x NA EN.LÍL$^{\text{ki}}$ […]

9. NUN BI $^{\text{kur}}$MAR.TU$^{\text{ki}}$ *ina* $^{\text{giš}}$TUKUL […]

10. E$_{11}$–*a* NUN-*ma* 8 MU.MEŠ LUGAL[-*ta ippuš*]

11. *eš-ret* DINGIR$^{\text{meš}}$ *ina iš*-x […]

12. GARZA DINGIR$^{\text{meš}}$ GAL$^{\text{meš}}$ *ana* KI-*šu-n*[*u*…]

13. ŠÉG$^{\text{meš}}$ *u* ILLU […]

14. UN$^{\text{meš}}$ NÍG.ḪUL IGI-*mar*

15. NÍG.TUKU$^{\text{meš}}$ ⌈LÁL⌉.DU$^{\text{meš}}$ UKU$_2$$^{\text{meš}}$ NÍG.TUKU$^{\text{meš}}$ […]

---

3. His people [*will experience*] prosperity […]

4. He will restore the regular offerings for the Igigi-gods that were cut off … […]

5. Favorable winds will blow, abundance … […]

6. Cattle [*will lie down*] in green pastures.

7. The grass of winter [will last] to summer; the grass of summ[er will last to winter.]

8. The offspring of beasts […]

9. A prince will arise and [he will exercise] king[ship] for eight years.

10. … […]

11. … […]

Lacuna

Second Side
Column II

Lacuna

1. […] … […]

2. A prince will arise and for three year[s he will exercise kingship.]

3. The remainder of the people […]

4. They will dwell in abandoned cities […]

5. There will be rebellions and […]

6. Hostility against Akkad […]

7. The rights of Ekur and Nippur […]

8. … Nippur […]

9. The land of Amurru [will put] that prince to the sword […].

10. A prince will arise and [he will exercise] king[ship] for eight years.

11. The shrines of the gods […]

12. [*He will not restore*] the rites of the great gods to thei[r] place.

13. [*There will be no*] rains and oods.

14. The people will experience misfortune.

15. The rich will become poor, the poor will become rich […].

16. x x x *a-na* DUMU UKU₂ ŠU-*su*
    TAR-*aṣ* […]

16. *The rich man* will extend his hand
    to the poor man (i.e., he will beg)
    […].

17. […] x AMA KI DUMU.MUNUS-*šá*
    kit-tú i-ta-mi […]

17. […] … mother will speak *truthfully*
    to her daughter […]

18. […] TUŠᵐᵉˢ GALGA KUR GALGA
    x […]

18. will sit, and the counsel of the land
    and the counsel [*of the people*…]

19. x NA KUR KÚ LUGAL UGU
    KUR-*šu* KALA.GA […]

19. … will consume the land, and the
    king [*will bring*] *hardship* against
    his land […].

20. […] x x x […]

20. […] … […]

Lacuna

Lacuna

<center>Column I</center>

<center>Column I</center>

1. […] x BAD
2. […] KUR
3. [*illâ rubûm-ma N* MU.MEŠ LU]GAL-*ta* DÙ-*uš*
4. […] TUŠ-*ab*
5. […] GURᵐᵉˢ
6. […] KI
7. […] x-*ru-ú* TUŠ-*ab*
8. […] DÙ-*uš*
9. [… *ana* K]I-*šu-nu* GURᵐᵉˢ

10. […] x x x x
11. [… *k*]*it-tú i-ta-mu*
12. […] x x
13. […] x

Lacuna

1. […] …
2. […] …
3. [A prince will arise and] he will
   exercies [ki]ngship [for N years]
4. […] will sit
5. […] *will return*
6. […] …
7. […] … will dwell
8. […] will do
9. […] *they will return (them) to their [*
   pla]*ce*

10. […] …
11. […*tr*]*uth they will speak*
12. […] …
13. […] …

Lacuna

Textual Notes

First Side
Column I
11   The second sign should probably be read NA; compare   rst side,
      II 18; second side I 6. It is possible the word here is [*iš*]-*nu-na-ak*, a
      rare spelling for Eshnunna.
Column II
2   According to Lambert's collation ("Akkadian Prophecies," 29),
      the numeral is 18, not 17.

3   The reading ⌜*bur*⌝ follows Lambert's collation ("Akkadian Proph-
     ecies," 29); note the parallels adduced for the restoration of the
     line ("Akkadian Prophecies," 15).

5   The reading AB follows Lambert's collation ("Akkadian Prophe-
     cies," 29); Ebeling's copy reads AD.

6   Shakkan is the god of beasts; Nisaba is the deity of grain. The
     names of the two gods can simply stand for animal life and grain,
     respectively; cf. First Side, III 8.

7   The sign DAN makes little sense here; following Grayson and
     Lambert ("Akkadian Prophecies," 15), I take the sign as an error
     for UN (*nišu*); this reading is re ected in the translation above.

12   For *ú-saḫ-ḫa*, I read a defective spelling of a Dt-stem; cf. Text B
     (in Grayson and Lambert, "Akkadian Prophecies") line 18, which
     contains the same statement but has the spelling *us-saḫ-ḫa-a*. For
     IGI.IGI, I follow the suggestion of Eckart Frahm (oral communica-
     tion) and read a scribal error for IGI.SÁ = *igisû*.

15   This line serves as a good example of the orthographic di   culties
     (and scribal playfulness?) of the text. The scribe here employs the
     same sign to represent two different logograms, IDIM and TIL (as
     well as the similar looking AŠ.TE), in the space of a single line.

16   There are several options for the reading of DUGUD PI; see
     "Akkadian Prophecies," 15. Here, what Grayson and Lambert
     read as the PI sign I have read instead as the signs UD (read *tú*)
     followed by AŠ (*ina*). The sense of the line is not affected either
     way. Tupliash is a district of southern Mesopotamia that includes
     the city Eshnunna.

Column III

4   The reading ᵈÍ-*gì-gì* follows that of Grayson and Lambert; ᵈÍ is the
     only reading that makes sense for the signs following *sut-tuk*.

6–7 For the rationale behind the restorations at the end of these two
     lines, see "Akkadian Prophecies," 15.

Second Side
Column II

6   For the last three signs on this line, see the collation by Lambert
     ("Akkadian Prophecies," 29).

9   Note that in Ebeling's hand copy, line 9 is mislabeled as line 10;
     the numbering that follows in Ebeling's edition is thus off by one
     from this point on.

12   According to Ebeling's copy, the AN sign appears only once, and
     the line begins with the signs PA AN MEŠ. Consultation of a pho-
     tograph of the tablet indicates that a second AN sign is actually
     present, thus yielding: PA.AN (=GARZA) AN (=DINGIR).MEŠ.

Column I

1   Ebeling's copy indicates that the sign UDU is legible; this is uncertain, according to Lambert's collation ("Akkadian Prophecies," 29).

2–3   Grayson and Lambert suggest that there ought to be a dividing line between these two lines of text: "Examination of the original shows that a horizontal line may possibly have been drawn between these lines but it is not visible on the fragment. The context demands such a line" ("Akkadian Prophecies," 15–16).

Discussion

State of the Text

Unfortunately, Prophecy Text A has come to us in a rather sorry state of preservation. VAT 10179, a tablet from Assur likely dating to the seventh century, is the only known exemplar of the text. Neither the beginning nor the end of the text has been preserved; in addition to the obvious interpretive problems that arise from this, it also means that we do not know the name by which the text was known in Mesopotamian scribal circles. Thus it would not be possible to identify this work in the catalogues of literary texts that have been recovered. The abundant use of Sumerian logograms—and often with values atypical for literary texts—along with other stylistic and orthographic features has occasioned comparison to omen literature, particularly astronomical omina; on the possible connection to Mesopotamian omen literature, see Chapter 3.

It cannot be determined with absolute certainty which of the text's two sides comes rst in the composition. As stated above, I tentatively regard the side labeled by Grayson and Lambert "Side One" to be the obverse of the text. The evidentiary basis for this is slight, though suggestive. The rst piece of evidence is based on attempts to identify the reigns of text A with the reigns of kings known to us from the historiographical record. As will be seen in the section immediately following, the most likely reconstruction of the historical references in the text presumes the ordering of columns that results from taking Side One as the obverse (and thus reversing the order of columns on the second side of the tablet to correspond to scribal conventions for writing on a tablet's reverse).

A further bit of suggestive evidence comes in line 4 of Side One column I, which ends with the signs *-zu-nim-ma*. The most natural way to understand these signs is as the ventive ending of a verb, which typically indicates direction toward a rst-person speaker.[3] While this cannot be

---

3. See, e.g., *CAD,* vol. U/W, s.v *uzuzzu* 5c, where one nds the form *iz-zi-zu-ni-ma*, "they

regarded as certain evidence that Text A began with a narrative in the ﬁrst person, it seems plausible that there was some ﬁrst-person text. The most natural place for ﬁrst-person discourse to occur would be at the beginning of the work. This recalls the Marduk Prophecy, which is cast in its entirety as a ﬁrst-person address by the god Marduk. Additionally, the presence of divine names prior to line 4 might suggest the invocation of gods at the beginning of the work, again paralleling what we ﬁnd in the Marduk Prophecy; however, as the text stands, if there was indeed ﬁrst-person discourse at the beginning of this work, it could not have extended past line 8. Even if one grants that these eight lines were in fact cached in the ﬁrst person, such a brief section of text cannot be said to mirror the extensive (~eighty lines) ﬁrst-person narrations of the Marduk and Shulgi prophetic speeches (see below). Most probably, if the signs at the end of line 4 are correctly interpreted as preserving reference to a ﬁrst-person speaker, the text opened with a brief invocation of deities (cf. Marduk Prophecy col. I 1–5); it need not necessarily constitute narrative related to the substance of the rest of the composition.

The tablet originally contained some six columns. Numbered consecutively in their probable order, with reference to their designation in the editions of *KAR* and Grayson and Lambert, they would be: (side one) 1, 2, 3; (side two) 4 (completely missing), 5 (= side two col. II), 6 (= side two col. I). Whether there were additional tablets that belonged to this composition is impossible to determine, but this seems unlikely.

Historical References

It could fairly be said that Prophecy Text A contains not a single reference to a historical person or event that has met with general agreement in the scholarly community. Indeed, the question may rightly be asked: on what grounds ought one to *look* for actual events behind the cryptic words of this text? While this has in fact been the subject of some debate, the degree to which this is considered a settled issue is quite remarkable.

In their edition of the text, Grayson and Lambert note that in the description of each reign events occur that are stereotpyically good or bad. For example:

---

came up to me" (p. 379). Note, however, that although the most plausible reading is a verb with the ventive ending, the ventive does not *always* connote relationship to a ﬁrst or second person, but *may* even be used when the only relationship of the verb is to a third party. This was already recognized by Benno Landsberger in his seminal study on the ventive, "Der 'Ventiv' des Akkadischen," *ZA* 35 (1924): 113–23; especially 114–15. See further N. J. C. Kouwenberg, "Ventive, Dative, and Allative in Old Babylonian," *ZA* 92 (2009): 200–240; especially 232 on "problematic" ventives in OB, where the context is clearly third person despite the presence of the ventive ending.

Good	*Bad*
[A prince will arise] and [will exercise] king[ship] for 17 years. The land will dwell securely; the midst of the land will be well; the people [*will experience*] prosperity. The gods will issue good decisions for the land; the winds will be favorable. The yield of the [?] and the yield of the furrow will be abundant. (First Side, II 2–5)	A prince will arise and he will exercise kingship for 13 years. There will be an Elamite attack against Akkad and *the booty* of Akkad will be carried off. The shrines of the great gods will be destroyed. Akkad *will su er* a defeat. There will be confusion, trouble, and hostility in the land. Greatness will become small. (First Side, II 9–14)

There is no explicit judgment as to the relative worth of the reigns listed, but there is an implicit one: Grayson and Lambert point out that for no reign recorded in the text do both favorable and unfavorable events occur.[4] Furthermore, there seems to be no regular pattern for the alternation of "good" and "bad" reigns. This by itself has been taken as evidence that the text is not a hypothetical, ideological composition about kings, arguing instead that the author has drawn on historiographic records.[5] In a seminal article on the *ex eventu* texts generally and Text A in particular, William Hallo comments regarding our text: "The allusions are just vague enough to suggest the style of predictions, but at the same time they are not nearly vague enough to escape the suspicion that they were inspired by actual historical events that had already transpired in the remote or not-so-remote past."[6]

This immediately raises the following question: if events of the past are the subject of our text, then why does it not relate them in the past tense? Why use the present-future to describe the events that befell the land during reigns of long-dead kings? The answer immediately seized on by nearly all commentators is that Text A is composed of a series of after-the-fact predictions; that is to say, it employs a series of *vaticinia ex eventu*. While I must agree with Hallo that the text itself leaves one with the "impression" that speci c events of the past lay behind the allusions in the text, other connections have led scholars to the belief that Text A employs *ex eventu* prediction. Most notable are similarites with the book of

---

4. "Akkadian Prophecies," 10.

5. Thus Helmer Ringgren, "Akkadian Apocalypses," in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean Wold and the Near East* (ed. David Hellholm; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1983), 379–86: "As far as we can tell, there is no regular alternation of good and bad rulers. This seems to indicate that the author is not following an arti cal pattern, but is in some way or other dependent on an existing historical tradition, even if we are not able to identify the events alluded to" (380).

6. Hallo, "Akkadian Apocalypses," 235.

Daniel, which, as all critical scholars acknowledge, is structured around *ex eventu* prediction, particularly in chapters 8–12. To cite the most obvious connection, the book of Daniel uses very similar terminology to "predict" the rise of unnamed kings:

<div dir="rtl">

ועמד מלך גבור ומשל ממשל רב ועשה כרצונו

</div>

(Then) a mighty king will arise. He will rule a great kingdom and do as he pleases (Dan 11:3)

E_{11}–*a* (*illâ*) NUN (*rubûm*)-*ma* 13.MU.MEŠ (*šanāti*) LUGAL-*tú* (*šarrutu*) DÙ-*uš* (*ippuš*)
A prince will arise and exercise kingship for thirteen years (Text A, First Side, II 9)

The similarity to the book of Daniel has been an important factor in leading the majority of scholars commenting on the text to surmise that the work encodes allusions to specific historical events. As we will see later in this chapter, this is reinforced by similarities to other Akkadian works, especially the Uruk and Dynastic Prophecies.

The key to identifying the events behind Text A's allusions is, as Hallo acutely observed, the lengths of reigns listed in the text. Just as there seems to be no patterning for "good" and "bad" reigns in the text, so do the lengths of reigns recorded in Text A suggest no artifical schema. Therefore, if the lengths of consecutive reigns in Text A can be brought into line with the lengths of consecutive reigns as found in the large number of cuneiform chronographic texs that have survived (in particular, king lists), historical allusions may emerge from the murky depths of Text A's intentionally opaque formulations.

According to Hallo, only twice "do we find a sequence of an 18–year rule followed, within the same dynasty, by a 13–year rule as it is in Text A."[7] The first instance, which Hallo dismisses, is that of Kadashman-Turgu and Shagarakti-Shuriash, kings of the Kassite period. Instead, Hallo prefers the sixth and seventh kings of the Second Isin Dynasty, Marduk-nadin-aḫḫe and Marduk-shapik-zeri.[8] Either identification of the kings in question would place the events in the late second millennium. Among the points in favor of Hallo's identification is that Text A indicates the thirteen-year reign will end when "another man who is unknown (literally: whose name is not called) will arise and he will seize the throne like

---

7. Hallo, "Akkadian Apocalypses," 235.

8. Hallo bases his reconstruction on what he calls the "New Chronicle," published by A. Poebel, *The Second Dynasty of Isin according to a New King-List Tablet* (Assyriological Studies 15; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955). This text was re-edited by Grayson and appears under the heading "An Eclectic Chronicle," Chronicle 24 in *ABC*.

a king" (First Side, I 14–15). In Hallo's view, this accords well with what is known of Marduk-shapik-zeri's successor, Adad-apla-iddina. However, the chronicle text to which Hallo refers is open to interpretation; it does indeed state that "the Arameans and a usurper rebelled against" the king, but, *contra* Hallo, it seems likely that the king against whom the usurper rebelled was Adad-apla-iddina himself.[9] A more significant problem for Hallo's thesis is the lack of unfavorable events in the records of Marduk-shapik-zeri's reign. The thirteen-year reign in Text A is indisputably negative in characterization. Furthermore, J. A. Brinkman has noted that the focus on Elam as an enemy makes little sense; one would expect instead the Arameans and Sutians to be listed as enemies if the references in our text were taken from records of twelfth-century Babylonian kings.[10] In this respect, the use of Elam cannot even be regarded as a cipher, as it would represent enemies from the east, not the west whence came both the Arameans and Sutians.

Hallo was not the first to attempt to identify the unnamed monarchs of Text A with kings known from historiographic records. More than a quarter of a century earlier, E. Weidner proposed an identification of the kings beginning with the thirteen-year reign as Melishipak, Marduk-apla-iddina I, Zababa-shuma-iddina, and Enlil-nadin-aḫe.[11] The advantage of such a reconstruction is that the regnal lengths of the last three kings (thirteen years, one year, three years) correspond to the three consecutive reigns beginning in II 9 of the First Side. The problem is that the length of Melishipak's reign given in Babylonian King List A is fteen years, not the eighteen of Prophecy Text A.[12] This should not be regarded as a decisive blow against the argument, as the lengths of reigns listed in our various chronographic sources on occasion will differ from text to text. Lambert has since come out in support of Weidner's proposal over and against Hal-

---

9. See the convenient translation of Jean-Jacques Glassner, *Mesopotamian Chronicles* (ed. B. Foster; WAW 19; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004), 285. The portion quoted above is Glassner's translation.

10. John A. Brinkman, *A History of Post-Kassite Babylonia* (AO 43; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1968), 129 n. 762. In all, Brinkman lists six arguments, of various weight, against Hallo's identification: (1) neither the Arameans nor Sutians are mentioned in the text; (2) no documents pertaining to the reign of Marduk-shapik-zeri mention either the Elamites or a devastation of the land; (3) the Luristan daggers inscribed with the names of twelfth-century Babylonian kings cannot be used as evidence, as Hallo uses them, to prove Elamite ability to invade Babylon; (4) the Erra epic, which relates to this period, makes no mention of Elamite attacks on Babylonia; (5) no tradition has survived of Marduk-nadin-aḫḫe dying in a revolt; (6) there is no evidence that the tenth king of the Isin II Dynasty ruled for three years.

11. Ernst F. Weidner, "Text-Wörter-Sachen," *AfO* 13 (1939–1940): 230–37; here 236.

12. For an English translation of King List A, see *ANET*, 272. A handcopy of the text can be found in *CT* 36, plates 24–25.

lo's.[13] Like Hallo's thesis, this proposal places the reigns of Text A during the last centuries of the second millennium. In defense of identifying these Kassite kings as the referents in Text A Lambert comments, "it is only our almost total ignorance about the events of their reigns that prevents us from being sure that they are the ones meant."[14] While Lambert may very well be correct, the reverse could equally well be argued: it is our lack of knowledge concerning the events of the late Kassite and immediate post-Kassite period that makes such an identi cation of the rulers in Text A possible.[15] On balance, however, it must be said that Weidner's position seems the more probable of the two alternatives.

Some have questioned whether the references in the text ought to be regarded as *vaticinia ex eventu* at all. In particular, Robert Biggs has noted the great similarity between passages in Text A and astronomical omens. Already in 1968 Biggs had voiced doubts on the prospect of Text A having "any relevance for historical purposes."[16] In discussing a Seleucid era fragment (LBAT 1543) that, in a fashion similar to Text A, gives the lengths of reigns of anonymous kings, he remarks: "The historicity of these gures [i.e., regnal lengths] may well be doubted. In my opinion, too much reliance has been placed on these numbers. They can hardly be considered separately from other gures which are given in omen texts, particularly in astrology."[17] In two subsequent publications, Biggs has argued forcefully for consideration of Text A within the larger framework of omens, especially astrological omens.[18] While Biggs's arguments deserve a close hearing, the question of genre—and therefore, the a nity or lack of a n-ity of Text A to astrological omina—is the subject of the next chapter. However, it is important to note his objection to the assumption that historical information may be gleaned from Text A any more so than from a given collection of omens.

---

13. W. G. Lambert, *The Background of Jewish Apocalyptic* (London: Athlone, 1978), 10. Likewise, see Ernest C. Lucas, "Akkadian Prophecies, Omens and Myths as Background for Daniel 7–12" (Ph.D. diss., Liverpool University, 1989). The dissertation was written under the direction of Lambert.

14. Lambert, *Background*, 10.

15. Lucas, accepting the proposition of Weidner and Lambert, has attempted to identify further reigns in the text ("Akkadian Prophecies, Omens and Myth," 27–29). Lucas himself admits the results are uncertain. The fact that we do not know how much text is missing would seem su cient warning against proceeding further in any attempt to identify other reigns in the text with much con dence.

16. Robert D. Biggs, "More Babylonian 'Prophecies,'" *Iraq* 29 (1967): 117–32; here 128.

17. Biggs, "More Babylonian 'Prophecies,'" 128.

18. Biggs, "The Babylonian Prophecies and the Astrological Traditions of Babylonia," *JCS* 37 (1985): 86–90; idem, "Babylonian Prophecies, Astrology, and a New Source for 'Prophecy Text B,'" 1–14.

Circumstances of Composition

As the text currently stands, there is no indication of authorship. Like the vast majority of ancient Near Eastern literary texts, even if we possessed a complete, undamaged copy of the work, its author would likely remain anonymous. It is similarly difficult to detect when the text was composed. The tablet itself dates to the period from the end of the eighth century b.c.e. to the late seventh century.[19] How much earlier the text may have been composed is a matter of speculation. While there can be no certainty in the attribution of references in the text to kings of the late Kassite or early post-Kassite period, the notion is certainly plausible; Weidner's reconstruction, in particular, is near to convincing. Weight may be added to the argument that the references are to this period by the fact that the Marduk Prophecy clearly refers to events of the twelfth century b.c.e., and the Shulgi Prophecy similarly seems to refer to events of the second half of the second millennium. Both these texts likewise come to us from Neo-Assyrian copies. What is more, there is excellent reason to suspect that the Marduk text was composed shortly after the last events mentioned. This may be taken to indicate the possibility that Text A likewise was composed in this period.

Against this, one should consider the possibility that the time of composition falls far closer to the date of our copy. In particular, Martti Nissinen has suggested that, while most date Text A to the late second millennium, it is "equally comprehensible against the background of Neo-Assyrian concerns."[20] One is then left to surmise either one of two positions: (1) that the reigns mentioned in the work are to be aligned with reigns of Neo-Assyrian monarchs (a task that is hampered by the lack of correlation between the regnal lengths in Text A and our chronographic records of Neo-Assyrian kings); or (2) that the explicit reference is to monarchs of the late second millennium (following, e.g., Weidner), but that the author of the text intended for these rulers and events to serve as ciphers for contemporary Neo-Assyrian politics. The latter position is certainly plausible. That some scribe identified the events of Text A with contemporary events, or simply saw a connection, seems a possible if not likely explanation for the copying of the text in the eighth or seventh century. However, this would not necessarily point to composition in this period, but could rather suggest renewed scribal interest in a centuries-old document.

It is worth noting that Text A includes no references to an intermediary by which the contents of the tablet were transmitted. That is to say, unlike the Neo-Assyrian compendia of prophetic oracles, there is no men-

---

19. Lambert, *Background*, 10.

20. Martti Nissinen, "Neither Prophecies nor Apocalypses: The Akkadian Literary Predictive Texts," in *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and Their Relationship* (ed. L. L. Grabbe and R. D. Haak; London: T&T Clark, 2003), 135–48; here 135.

tion of a prophetic gure by whom the message was delivered prior to being committed to writing.[21] This fact holds for all ve texts studied in the present chapter.

Audience and Function

Of the ve Akkadian *ex eventu* texts considered in this study, the least can be said about Text A in regard to the intended audience and function of the text. We have no idea how the text began or ended; we cannot even de nitively identify any of the monarchs alluded to, if the allusions are to historical gures at all. If the text had been intended to function as political propaganda—that is to say, the scribe(s) responsible intended for the text to convince the audience to support the reigning monarch in a condition that might otherwise lead to a waning or defection of support—the propagandistic motive has been lost to us. Given the similarities of form, content, and language between Text A and the other four texts, it may be stated with a fair degree of con dence that the work was indeed composed as a series of after-the-fact predictions. It stands to reason then that some propagandistic function lay behind its authorship, whatever that may have been. Only the discovery of additional portions of the text will yield certain answers.

The Marduk Prophecy

Introduction

The history of the publication of the Marduk Prophecy is by far the most complicated of any of the texts treated in this chapter. The reader is referred to the edition of Rykle Borger, "Gott Marduk," on which the following transliteration is based. The Marduk Prophecy has survived in three partially complete copies; the most complete are the many joined fragments from Nineveh and the fragment from Assur (13348).

Bibliography

Tablet museum numbers: K 13678 + K 3353 + K 8708 + K 7065 + 89–4–26,62 + BM 99210 + K 12697 + K2158 + Rm 297 + K 13434; Sm 1388; Assur 13348
Cuneiform Text: Borger, "Gott Marduk" = all fragments except Assur 13348 Grayson and Lambert, Akkadian Prophecies" (Text D) = Assur 13348 only
Edition: Borger, "Gott Marduk"

---

21. These compendia have been collected and published by Simo Parpola in SAA 9, and will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter.

Translation: Block, *Gods of the Nations* (rst edition only); Borger, "Gott Marduk"; Foster, *Muses*, 388–91; Grayson and Lambert, "Akkadian Prophecies" (Assur 13348 only); Hecker, *TUAT*, 2.65–68; Longman, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography*; Strawn, text 88 in Chavalas, *Ancient Near East: Historical Sources*; Talon, "Les textes prophétiques"

Studies: Borger, "Gott Marduk"; Güterbock, "Die historische Tradition"; Longman, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography*

Transliteration and Translation

Column I	Column I
1. ᵈḪa-ḫar-nim [ᵈ]Ḫa-a-a-šum	1. O Ḫaḫarnum, Ḫayašum,
2. ᵈA-nu-um ᵈEn-líl	2. Anu, Enlil,
3. ᵈNu-dím-[mud] ᵈÉ-a	3. Nudim[ud], Ea,
4. dˤMuatiˈ(?) ᵈNÁ-um	4. Muati, Nabu!
5. DINGIRᵐᵉˢ GALᵐᵉˢ ZUᵐᵉˢ ḪALᵐᵉˢ-ia₅	5. May the great gods *learn* my secrets!
6. KI (ki ?) K[EŠ]DA-su MÚR.MU MU.MU MU	6. When I have girded my loins, I will tell you my name:*
7. a-na-ku ᵈAMAR.UTU EN GAL-ú	7. I am Marduk, the great lord,
8. LALᵐᵉˢ ḫa-a-ṭu DUᵐᵉˢ KURᵐᵉˢ-ni	8. the *inspector* who goes (upon) the mountains,
9. LAL ḫa-i-ṭu MU.DU.IS KUR.KURᵐᵉˢ	9. he who inspects, the one traversing the lands,
10. ša KUR.KURᵐᵉˢ DÙ.A.BI-ši₄-na	10. who, over all the lands
11. TA È ᵈUTU-ši EN KU₄ ᵈUTU-ši	11. from sunrise to sunset,
12. DUᵐᵉˢ-ku a-na-ku-ma	12. constantly goes back and forth: it is I!
13. DUG₄.GA a-na KUR Ḫat-ti DU-ik	13. I decreed that I should go to the land of Hatti.
14. Ḫat-ti-i áš-al	14. I called Hatti to account.
15. ᵍⁱˢGU.ZA ᵈA-nu-ti-ia₅	15. The throne of my supreme divinity
16. i-na lìb-bi-šá ad-di	16. I set up in its midst;
17. 24 MU.AN.NA.MEŠ i-na lìb-bi-šá TUŠ-ma	17. for twenty-four years I dwelt in its midst.
18. [K]ASKALᵐᵉˢ DUMUᵐᵉˢ KÁ.DINGIR.RAᵏⁱ	18. The (commercial) caravans of the Babylonians
19. i-na lìb-bi-šá GIN-in	19. I established in its midst.
20. [x].MEŠ-šá NÍG.GÁLᵐᵉˢ-šá ù NÍG. GAᵐᵉˢ-šá	20. Its […], its goods and property
21. [ana ?] [ᵘʳᵘ]UD.ₗKIBₗ.NUNᵏⁱ ᵘʳᵘEN. LÍLᵏⁱ	21. *to* Sippar, Nippur

    * Arguing that the introductory passage in this text conforms to formulaic presentations of secrecy induction in Akkadian works, Alan Lenzi suggests an alternate translation of this line: "As soon as I get ready, I will speak my words" (Secrecy and the Gods: Secret Knowledge in Ancient Mesopotamia and Biblical Israel [SAAS 19; Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2008], 54).

22. [*u* ? ^{uru}KÁ.DINGIR.R]A^{ki}
     LAL^{meš}-*ṭa*

23. [*šar Bābili* ?] ⌊E₁₁⌋ -*ma*
24. […] DAB-*ma*
25. […] x A x [… ^{uru}K]Á.DINGIR.RA^{ki}
26. *ša* SUR.MEŠ […] MEŠ SAL (*šal* ?)-*ma*
27. SIL.DAGAL^{gal ur}[^u *Bābili* ?]^{ki} DÙG-*ma*
28. MU AGA [^d*A-nu-t*]*i-ia₅*

29. *ù* ALAM DÙ-*t*[*i* (?) …] x
30. A.MEŠ IM^{meš} […]
31. 3 *u₄-mi* […]
32. AGA ^d*A-nu-ti-ia₅* […]

33. *ù* ALAM ⌊DÙ⌋ […]
34. *ana* SU-*ia₅* UM […]
35. *aḫ-ḫi-s*[*a ana* ^{uru}KÁ.DINGIR.RA^{ki} MU-*ma*]
36. ÍLA[^{meš} GUN.ḪI.A^{meš}-*ki-na*]
37. ⌊KUR⌋-[KUR^{meš} *ana* ^{uru}KÁ.DINGIR.RA^{ki}-*ma*]

Lacuna

1′. […] x x […]
2′. […] x […]
3′. [… *šar*(?)] *Bal-ti-il₅* DÙG […]

4′. […] *É-kur Bal-ti-il₅* […]
5′. [É.KUR^{me}]^š-*šú* GIM NA₄.ZALAG₂ Z[ALAG₂-*ir -ma*]
6′. […] MEŠ *ṭa-aḫ-da* NÍG.BA [*su-ma* ?]
7′. […] DÙG NE AḪ U[R ? …]
8′. [ITU U₄ M]U.DIŠ.KAM A.AN […]
9′. […] ERIM^{meš} ^d*En-líl* KI-*šú ki* KEŠDA-*s*[*u*]
10′. […] x GIM MUŠEN^{meš} PA^{meš} GAR-*un* [-*šu* ?]
11′. [KUR.KUR^{me}]^š DÚ.A.BI-*ši₄-na* SA₅-*l*[*i*]
12′. […] SA₅-*ma* KUR *Aš-šur* ŠÙD-*ub*

13′. [… *ṭuppi*] NAM^{meš} NÍG.BA-*su*
14′. […] ŠE (?) BA *an-na* GI.NA SUM-*šu*

22. [*and* Babyl]on *they marketed*.

23. [A king *of Babylon*] arose, and
24. […] *led*
25. […] … […to B]abylon
26. …

27. The processional (way) of [*Babylon*] was fair.
28. …the crown of my supreme [divin]ity

29. and the image of… […]
30. water and winds […]
31. for three days […]
32. The crown of my supreme divinity […]

33. and the image of… […]
34. to my *body* … […]
35. I return[ed. To Babylon I said:]

36. "Bring[your tribute,]
37. O land[s, to Babylon]

Lacuna

1′. […] … […]
2′. […] … […]
3′. [… *the king*] of Baltil *was pleasing* [*to me*]
4′. […] the temple of Baltil […]
5′. its [temple]s sh[one] like gems

6′. […] and luxury *I gave* [*him*]
7′. […] … […]
8′. [month, day, and y]ear …[…]
9′. […] When I drew up with him the troops of Enlil,
10′. I bestowed [*upon him*] wings like a bird;
11′. He lled all of the [land]s.

12′. […] he lled, and I blessed the land of Assur.
13′. I gave him [*the tablet*] of destinies.
14′. […] … I gave him a rm "Yes."

15′. [aḫ-ḫi-s]a ana ᵘʳᵘKÁ.DINGIR.RAᵏⁱ MU-*ma*

15′. [I retur]ned, and for Babylon I said:

16′. Í[L]Aᵐᵉˢ GUN.ḪI.Aᵐᵉˢ-*ki-na* KUR.KURᵐᵉˢ

16′. Br[in]g your tribute, O lands,

17′. *ana* ᵘʳᵘKÁ.DINGIR.RAᵏⁱ-*ma* DU UN DÍM MA DIŠ KI

17′. to Babylon …

18′. *ana-ku* ᵈAMAR.UTU EN GAL-*ú*

18′. I am Marduk, the great lord;

19′. EN NAMᵐᵉˢ *u* E[Š.B]AR *a-na-ku-ma*

19′. lord of destinies and de[cis]ions am I!

20′. *man-nu* DAB KASKAL *a*[*n*]-*ni-ta*

20′. Who (but I) has made this journey?

21′. KI DU-*ku aḫ-ḫi-sa* [*a-na*]-*ku* DU₁₁.GA

21′. I have returned from the place to which I went; I myself decreed it.

22′. *a-na* KUR ELAM.MAᵏⁱ DU-*ma*

22′. I went to the land of Elam,

23′. DUᵐᵉˢ DINGIRᵐᵉˢ DÙ.A.BI *a-na-ku-ma* DU₁₁.GA

23′. I myself ordered (so) that all the gods went.

24′. ŠUK.ᵈINANNAᵐᵉˢ É.ḪI.Aᵐᵉˢ *a-na-ku-ma* TAR-*as*

24′. I myself cut off the offerings of the temples;

25′. ᵈGÍR *u* ᵈŠE.SÌ.IR *ana* A[N]-*e* E₁₁-*li*

25′. I brought the gods of cattle and grain up to heaven.

Column II

Column II

1. ᵈŠEM ŠÀ KUR GIG-*iṣ*

1. Siris (the goddess of fermentation) made the land sick,

2. AD₆ᵐᵉˢ UN.ḪI.A KÁᵐᵉˢ BEᵐᵉˢ-*a*

2. the people's corpses blocked the gates.

3. ŠEŠ ŠEŠ-*šú* KÚ

3. Brother consumed brother,

4. *ru-u₈-a ru-u₈-a-šú ina* ᵍⁱˢTUKUL *i-ra-si-ib*

4. friend slew his friend with a weapon.

5. DUMUᵐᵉˢ DÚᵐᵉˢ *a-na* DUMUᵐᵉˢ MAŠ.KA₁₅ᵐᵉˢ

5. Free citizens toward the poor

6. ŠU.MIN-*su-nu i-ma-ak-ka-ku*

6. streched out their hands (to beg);

7. ᵍⁱˢGIDRI LUGUD₂.[D]A GIB KUR GIB-*ik*

7. authority diminished (literally: the scepter grew short); injustice lay across the land;

8. LUGALᵐᵉˢ I[M.G]I KUR TURᵐᵉˢ

8. […] *rebel* kings diminished the land;

9. UR.Aᵐᵉˢ *a-lak-tam* TARᵐᵉˢ

9. lions cut off travel;

10. UR.GI₇ᵐᵉˢ [*išeggû* (?)]-*ma* UN.ḪI.A *ú-na-šá-ku*

10. dogs [*went mad*] and bit people—

11. ⌊*ma*⌋-[*l*]*a ú-n*[*a-š*]*á-ku úl* TIᵐᵉˢ ÚŠᵐᵉˢ

11. as many as they bit did not live, but died.

12. U₄ᵐᵉˢ-*ia₅* SA₅-[*m*]*a* MU.DIŠ.KAMᵐᵉˢ-*ia₅* SA₅-*ma*

12. I fulﬁlled my days, I fulﬁlled my years.

13. *a-na* URU-*ia₅* KÁ.DINGIR.RAᵏⁱ

13. To my city Babylon

14. *ú* É-*kur Sag-íla* ŠÀ TÙM x

14. and to Ekursagila I returned.

15. *a-na-ku* ÈŠ *da-ra-a-ti* DÙ.A.BI MU-[*ma*]

15. I … I decreed,

16. *a-na-ku* DU₁₁.GA ÍLA^meš GUN^meš-*ki-*[*na*]

16. I myself commanded, "Bring your tribute,

17. KUR.KUR^meš *ana* ^uruKÁ.DINGIR.RA^ki-*m*[*a*]

17. O lands, to Babylon!"

18. DU UN DÍM MA DIŠ [KI]

18. … […]

19. LUGAL KÁ.DINGIR.RA^ki E₁₁ [-*a / ma* ?]

19. A king of Babylon will arise;

20. É TAB.RI^meš

20. the wonderous temple,

21. *É-kur Sag-gil* GIBIL-[*ma*]

21. Ekursagila, he will renew.

22. GIŠ.ḪUR^meš AN-₍*e*₎ *ù* KI-[*tim*]

22. The plans of heaven and earth

23. *i-na É-kur Sag-gil* GIŠ.ḪUR [-*ma / ir* ?]

23. he will draw in Ekursagila;

24. SUKUD^meš-*šú ú-šá-na* LUḪ-[*ta* ?]

24. he will *double* its height. (Tax) exemptions

25. *a-na* URU-*ia*₅ KÁ.DINGIR.RA^ki GAR-[*an* ?]

25. he will establish for my city Babylon.

26. ŠU DAB-*ma ana* URU-*ia*₅ KÁ.DINGIR.RA[^ki]

26. He will lead me to my city Babylon

27. ₍*ú É*₎-*kur Sag-íla šá da-ra-ti* KU₄-[*an-ni* ?]

27. and he will return [*me*] to eternal Ekursagila.

28. [^gišMá]-*tuš-a* GIBIL-[*ma*]

28. He will restore my processional boat

29. [^gišsik]-*kan-na-ti-šá ṣa-ri-ra*ₓ(! copy: KUR) SA₅-[*la* ?]

29. and he will overlay its [ru]dder with precious metal,

30. [*ki-šad*]-*i-šá pa-šal-la* (?) *ú*-[…]

30. its neck with gold [he will cover.]

31. ⌈LÚ⌉.MÁ.LAḪ₄ *mut-tab-bi-li*-[*šá* ?]

31. The boatmen who serve [*it*]

32. [*a-n*]*a lìb-bi-šá* E[₁₁-*la* ?]

32. he will brin[g] aboard it;

33. ZA[G] *u* GÙB GIB^meš […]

33. they will be divided to the right and to the left […].

34. [LUGA]L *šá* KI *ka-kab* (?) *É-kur Sag-*[*íla / gil*]

34. [The ki]ng … Ekursag[ila]

35. […] KI LA (?) […]

35. […] … […]

Lacuna

Lacuna

1′. […] x x x […]

1′. […] … […]

2′. ⌈*šá*⌉ *da-ra-a*-[*ti* …]

2′. for eve[r …]

3′. ^gišMá-*daḫ-ḫe*-[*du* …]

3′. Madaḫḫe[du]

4′. ^gišsik-*kan-na*-[*ti-šá* …]

4′. [its] rudder […]

5′. [*k*]*i-šad-i*-[*šá* …]

5′. [its n]eck […]

6′. LÚ.MÁ.LAḪ₄ […]

6′. The boatmen […]

7′. *a-na lìb-bi*-[*šá* …]

7′. aboard it […]

8′. ^dNÀ DUMU […]

8′. Nabu […]

9′. DU.MEŠ *šá* DIŠ […]

9′. … […]

10′. *ù É-kur* […]

10′. and Ekur […]

11′. *šá da-ra-a*°-[*ti* …]

11′. for eve[r …]

12.′ NUN BI DINGIR […]

12′. That prince… […]

13′. *É-kur* É x […]   13'. Ekur… […]
14′. ÍD DINGIR […]   14'. river… […]
15′. A^meš KÙ^meš […]   15'. pure water […]
16′. *É-kur* É x […]   16'. Ekur… […]
17′. ⌐ŠU⌐ ^d*Nin*-x […]   17'. The hand of … […]

<div align="center">

Tablet Assur 13348
Column III

</div>

<div align="center">

Tablet Assur 13348
Column III

</div>

Lacuna   Lacuna

1′. [*šá da*]-[*ra*⌐*a-ti*⌐⌐KU₄] [-*šu*]   1'. [for ev]er he will [bri]ng [him]
2′. […] GIŠ (?) ME (?) ŠA₆ x […]   2'. […] …
3′. […] x x Ú x x   3'. […] …
4′. [… š]*á* x x ⌐GIN⌐-*an*   4'. […] … he will establish.
5′. [É⌐*kur*⌐ É x x DUB IGI   5'. [E]kur …
6′. […] MEŠ-*šá* NÍG.BA-*si*   6'. […] …he will give it
7′. [… DING]IR SIG₅ IGI   7'. […] he will see the goodness of the
                                               god.
8′. [… BAL]A (?).MEŠ-*šú* GÍD.DA^me[š]   8'. […] his [*rei*]gn will be long.
9′. [*É-kur*] *É-giš-nu₁₁-ga*[*l*]   9'. Ekur Egishnugal
10′. [GIM NA₄.Z]ALAG₂ ZALAG₂-*ár-*   10'. he will make shine [like a g]em.
     m[*a*]
11′. [*bit* ?] ^d*Nin-g*[*al*]   11'. [*The sanctuary*] of Ning[al],
12′. °É (?) ^dEN.ZU   12'. *The sanctuary* of Sin,
13′. [E]N KÙ.BABBAR-*šá* NÍG.   13'. [tog]ether with their silver, [their]
     GÁL(?).⌐MEŠ⌐-[*šá* ?]   *possessions*,
14′. NÍG.GA^meš *šá* x […]   14'. and their properties … […]
15′. *ina* KÁ (*bāb*) DINGIR x […]   15'. In the gate of (divine) … […]
16′. […] DINGIR x […]   16'. […] … […]

<div align="center">

Assur 13348
Column IV

</div>

<div align="center">

Assur 13348
Column IV

</div>

1. KI ^dEN.Z[U …]   1. with Si[n …]
2. *šá É-giš-nu-g*[*al* …]   2. of Egishnug[al …]
3. KUR UR.BI […]   3. the land together […]
4. NUN BI KALAG-*ma* GAB[A.RI …]   4. That prince will be strong and an
                                               opponent [*he will not have.*]
5. URU *i-šar* BIR^meš UKKIN^me[š]   5. He will direct himself toward the
                                               city and gather the scattered.
6. *É-kur É-gal-maḫ ù* É.KUR^m[eš]   6. Ekur-Egalmaḫ and the (other)
                                               temples
7. GIM [N]A₄.ZALAG₂ ZALAG₂-[*ár*]-   7. he will make shine like a precious
     [*m*]*a* ^d*Nin-ga*[*l*]   stone. Ninga[l],
8. ^d*Gu-la* ^d*Kur-nu-ni* (?)-*t*[*um*]   8. Gula, Kurnunit[u],
9. [^u]^ru (?) *Ḫa-rid-di ši-na-t*[*i*]   9. (?) *the city Ḫariddi*, these

10. É.É *maš-tak la-le-ši-n*[*a*]

10. (to their) houses, the abodes of their delight,

11. *uš-te-pé-el-ši-na-ti-m*[*a*]

11. he will return them.

12. NUN BI *šu-maḫ* Úᵐᵉˢ-*šú* KUR G[U₇]

12. That prince will make the land feed on the splendor of his grass(lands).

13. U₄ᵐᵉˢ-*šú* GÍD.DAᵐᵉ[ˢ]

13. His days will be long

14. […] x x NI TI BE MEŠ

14. […] …

15. […] x MEŠ KU x […]

15. […] …

16. […] SAG RU TI […]

16. […] …

17. x x URUᵐᵉˢ-*ni* x

17. … cities …

18. É.KURᵐᵉˢ GIM NA₄.ZALAG₂ ZALAG₂-[*á*]*r-m*[*a*]

18. He will cause the temples to shine like gems.

19. DINGIRᵐᵉˢ DÙ.A.BIᵐᵉˢ-*šú-nu*

19. All of the gods

20. *uš-pe-e*[*l*]

20. he will bring bac[k].

21. KUR BIR UKKINᵐᵉˢ-*m*[*a*]

21. He will gather in the scattered land an[d]

22. SUḪUŠᵐᵉˢ-*šá* GIN-*an*

22. make ̣rm its foundations.

23. KÁ.GAL AN-*e*

23. The gate of heaven

24. [G]I.NA B[A].BAD

24. *will be o*[*p*]*en* [co]nstantly

25. […] x […] x […]

25. […] … […] … […]

Lacuna

Lacuna

Assur 13348
Column V

Assur 13348
Column V

1. [*mus-s*]*a i-pal-làḫ*

1. she will revere he[r husband]

2. [ARḪUŠᵐᵉˢ *ana* UN].ḪI.Aᵐᵉˢ GIN-*an*

2. He will be [compassionate to the pe]ople

3. [GURUŠ GU]N-*su*

3. [The young man, his bur]den

4. [… GI]N-*an*

4. […*he will be*]*ar*.

5. [NUN BI KUR.KURᵐᵉˢ DÙ.A. B]I-*ši₄-na*

5. [That prince, the lands—al]l of them—

6. [*i-be*]-*el*

6. [he will ru]le.

7. [*ù a-na-ku-ma* DINGIRᵐᵉˢ D]Ù.A.BI

7. [and I and a]ll [the gods]

8. [KI-*šu sá-al-ma*]-*ku*

8. [having befriended him]

9. [ELAM.MAᵏⁱ] GAZ

9. will destroy [Elam].

10. [URU.ḪI.Aᵐᵉˢ-*šá* G]AZ

10. [He will de]story [its cities.]

11. [URU *be-ra-* t]*i-šá*

11. […] its [fortres]ses

12. [*ú-sa-ma-a*]*k*

12. [he will cover ov]er.

13. [LUGAL GAL *šá* ᵘʳᵘ*De-e*]*r*

13. [The great king of De]r

14. […] x

14. […] …

Lacuna

Lacuna

Column III   Column III

Lacuna   Lacuna

1′. […] x x […]   1′. […] … […]
2′. […] UŠ T[I (?) ...]   2′. […] … […]
3′. […] x x A TUK-*ši*   3′. […] … will acquire
4′. [… *n*]*i-tum* GI.NA GIN-*an*   4′. […] … he will establish perma-
                                                 nently.

5′. ᵈ*Nin-g*[*ír-s*]*u i-šal-laṭ-ma*   5′. Ning[irs]u will prevail.
6′. ÍD^{meš} [K]U₆^{meš} BAL^{meš}-*ma*   6′. The rivers will bring [ ]sh;
7′. A.ŠÀ A.GÀ[R] GUN SA₅   7′. Field (and) mead[ow] will be full
                                                 of yield;
8′. Ú.BAR [S]ID *a-na* BURU₁₄   8′. the grass of [wi]nter (will last) to
                                                 summer,
9′. Ú.BAR BURU₁₄ *a-na* SID BAR^{meš}-*ra*   9′. the grass of summer will last to
                                                 winter.
10′. BURU₁₄ KUR SI.S[Á] KI.LAM SIG₅   10′. The harvest of the land will pros-
                                                 per; the market will be favorable.
11′. ḪUL^{meš}-*tu uš-te-eš-še-ra*   11′. Evil will be set right;
12′. LÙ^{meš} LUḪ^{meš} ḪUL^{meš} ZALAG₂^{meš}   12′. disturbances will be cleared up,
                                                 evil will be brought to light.
13′. DUNGU^{meš} BAR^{meš}-*a*   13′. Clouds will always be visible.
14′. ŠEŠ ŠEŠ-*šú* ARḪUŠ^m[^{eš}]   14′. Brother will love brother,
15′. DUMU AD-*šú* GIM ⌊DINGIR⌋   15′. A son will rever[e] his father like
     i-pal-là[*ḫ*]   a god.
16′. AMA DUMU.MUNUS *a*-[…]   16′. Mother will […] daughter,
17′. ^{mí}É.GI₄.A *uk-tal-*[*lal mus-sa i*]-⌈*pal*⌉-   17′. the bride will be we[d] (and)
     ⌊*laḫ*⌋   revere [her husband.]
18′. ARḪUŠ^{meš} *a-na* UN.[ḪI.A^{meš} GIN-   18′. Compassion will be established
     an]   among the people.
19′. GURUŠ GUN-*su* [… GIN-*an*]   19′. The young man [*will bear*] his
                                                 burden.
20′. NUN BI KUR.KUR^{meš} [DÙ.A.BI-   20′. That prince [will ru]le [all the
     ši₄-na i-be]-⌈*el*⌉   lands.]
21′. *ù a-na-ku-m*[*a*] ⌈DINGIR⌉^{meš}   21′. I an[d] all the gods,
     DÙ.A.BI
22′. KI-*šu sá-al-ma-ku* ELAM.MA^{ki}   22′. having befriended him, will
     GAZ   destroy Elam.
23′. URU.ḪI.A^{meš}-*šá* GAZ^{meš}   23′. He will smash its cities;
24′. URU *be-ra-ti-šá ú-sa-ma-ak*   24′. he will cover over its fortresses.
25′. LUGAL GAL-*a šá* ^{uru}*De-er*   25′. As for the great king of Der,
26′. *i-na* NU TUŠ-*šu* ZI-*šu-ma*   26′. he will lift him from his unsuitable
                                                 position (literally: his no-seat) and
27′. *ša-aḫ-ra-ár-ta-šú* KÚR-*ár*   27′. he will change its devestation.
28′. ḪUL-*šu* x-*šu-ma* ŠU-*su* DAB-*ma*   28′. His evil plight […], take him by
                                                 the hand and

29′. *a-na* ᵘʳᵘ*De-e*[*r*] *ù É-kur* UD-*gal-kalam-ma*

30′. *šá da*-[*ra*]-°*a-ti* KU₄-*šu*

Column IV

Lacuna

1′. x […]
2′. *ša* DING[IR …]
3′. 4 BÁN […]
4′. 4 BÁN […]
5′. 1 BÁN ZÌ.DA […]
6′. 1 SILA₃ […]
7′. 1 SILA₃ LÀL 1 SILA₃ Ì.⌈NUN⌉.⌈NA⌉
8′. 1 SILA₃ GIŠ.PEŠ.x […]1 SILA₃ ᵍⁱˢGEŠTIN.ḪÁD.A
9′. 1 SILA₃ [? *šaman*] NA₄BUR
10′. 1 SILA₃ x DÙG.GA NU ŠE SUM IR
11′. 1 U[D]U.NITA₂ GI.NA
12′. *b*[*u*]*r* GU₄ *š*[*á*] [*u*]*š-tam-ru-ú*
13′. *ana za-qí-qí an-n*[*i* ?]-°*i uq-tam-ma*
14′. ITU U₄ *ù* MU.DIŠ.KAM ⌈A⌉.[A]N ŠÙD-*šu*
15′. ᵈ*Ḫa-ḫar-num* ᵈ*Ḫa-a-a-šum* AL.TIL

16′. *a-na-ku* ᵈ*Šul-gi*

Colophon:

17′. *ki-i* KA ᵍⁱˢLE.U₅.UM GABA.RI KÁ.DINGIR.RAᵏⁱ SAR-*ma* IGI.KÁR

Stamp:

18′. KUR ᴵAN.ŠÁR-DÙ-A
19′. *šar₄* ŠÚ *šar₄* KUR AN.ŠÁRᵏⁱ

29′. to Der and the Ekurdimgalka-lamma

30′. return him forever.

Column IV

Lacuna

1′. … […]
2′. … […]
3′. 40 quarts of […]
4′. 40 quarts of […]
5′. 10 quarts of   our […]
6′. 1 quart of […]
7′. 1 quart of honey, 1 quart of ghee
8′. 1 quart of …, 1 quart of raisons
9′. 1 quart of [*oil*] from a bowl
10′. 1 quart of good …
11′. 1 *regular* sheep
12′. a fattened calf
13′. will be burned for this spirit.
14′. Month, day, and year I will bless him.
15′. "O Ḫaḫarnum, Ḫayašum" complete.
16′. "I am (divine) Shulgi"

Colophon:

17′. According to the writing board, copy of Babylon, written and checked.

Stamp:

18′. Palace of Assurbanipal,
19′. king of the world, king of the land of Assur.

Textual Notes

Column I

1   Ḫaḫarnum and Ḫayašum are obscure Mesopotamian deities, lacking any signi cant role within the pantheon or cult.

8,9   I am unsure how to translate the LAL sign at the beginning of each of these lines. One would expect this sign to represent a form of the verb ḫiāṭum; however, a form of ḫiāṭum is spelled out syllabically following the LAL sign in both lines. I tentatively regard the syllabic spellings as glosses by a scribe trying to clarify the readings of the two LAL signs.

22   The reading *iḫt ṭa* for LAL^mes-*ṭa* follows the suggestion of Hecker, *TUAT*, 2.66.

27   Following the suggestion of Borger that the rst three signs of this line could be read SIL.DAGAL^gal = *rib t* ("Gott Marduk," 6).

3′   Baltil is an alternate term for Assur.

Column II

28   ^giš*Má-tuš-a* is the proper name of Marduk's processional boat. A boat for carrying a god—that is, the cult statue of that god—was a typical feature of Mesopotamian temple cults.

29   The KUR sign must either be given a reading ra_x (following Borger), or simply be regarded as a scribal error.

3′   Madaḫḫedu is the proper name of another processional boat.

Assur 13348

The column enumeration of this tablet follows Borger's edition. In the initial publication of the text by Grayson and Lambert, "Akkadian Prophecies," the columns are enumerated as follows:

Borger	Grayson and Lambert
III	ii, obverse
IV	i, reverse
V	ii, reverse

Assur 13348, column III

While column II of the Assur tablet preserves no verbs, and therefore no indication of tense, the text of column III begins in the present/future tense, following the shift that occurred in II19.

Assur 13348, column V

This column proves the overlap and position of the Assur copy within the running text from the Kuyunjik tablet. These lines are parallel to column III 18′-25′ of the main text, and are restored on the basis of those lines.

Column III

8, 9   I follow Borger's suggestion that Ú.BAR be understood as a logogram for *d šu*. One would normally expect Ú.BAR$_8$.

Column IV

1'-12'   The text concludes with a list of offerings.

15'   The signs AL.TIL serve as a scribal notation indicating the completion of the text.

16'   This line serves as a notation indicating which text is supposed to be copied following this one. As elsewhere in antiquity, ancient Mesopotamian texts were typically known by their opening lines. Thus, the text that is to be copied as part of a series following the Marduk Prophecy begins *anāku* ^{d}*Šulgi*, "I am (divine) Shulgi," that is to say, the Shulgi Prophecy.

Discussion

State of the Text

    As stated above, the history of the reconstruction of the Marduk Prophecy is extremely complicated. The publication of the fragments spanned more than seven decades before Borger's reconstruction of the text was published. For a full account of this publication history, see Borger, "Gott Marduk," 3–4. For convenience, a list of the publication of fragments prior to Borger's edition is listed below:

K 13678 = *CT* 25, plate 46
K 8708 = *CT* 13, plate 45
K 3353 = F. Martin, "Mélanges assyriologiques"[22]
K 3353 + K 8708 + K 13678 join = H.-G. Güterbock, "Die historische Tradition"[23]
K 7065 = K. D. MacMillan, "Some Cuneiform Tablets"[24]
K 2158 = C. Virolleaud, "Nouveaux fragments"[25]
BM 99210 = Grayson and Lambert, "Akkadian Prophecies"
Assur 13348 = Grayson and Lambert, "Akkadian Prophecies"

---

    22. Francois Martin, "Mélanges Assyriologiques," *RT* 24 (1902): 96–108.

    23. Hans-Gustav Güterbock, "Die historische Tradition und ihre literarische Gestaltung bei Babyloniern und Hethitern bis 1200," *ZA* 42 (1934): 1–91. The photograph of the joined fragments is presented in Tafel III, pp. 80–81.

    24. Kerr D. MacMillan, "Some Cuneiform Tablets Bearing on the Religion of Babylonia and Assyria," *Beiträge zur Assyriologie* 5 (1906): 531–712; the handcopy in question appears as text number XXXV, p. 683.

    25. Charles Virolleaud, "Nouveaux fragments inédits du Musée Britannique," *Babyloniaca* 1 (1906): 183–210. K 2158 is copied on pp. 198–99.

Aside from the joins made by Güterbock, all other joins were made by Borger. We are extremely fortunate to have both the beginning and the ending of the text preserved. The Marduk Prophecy is in fact the best preserved of the ve Akkadian compositions under consideration in the present chapter and the only composition represented by as many as three manuscripts. It should also be noted that, while our surviving copies are all from Assyria, the colophon clearly indicates that the text was copied from a tablet in Babylon.

Historical References

Whereas we are almost entirely in the dark when trying to iden-tify historical allusions in Prophecy Text A, the allusions of the Marduk Prophecy are, by comparison, relatively easily identi ed. We are not lim-ited to trying to peg regnal years to the chronographic record, coupled with vague references to weal or woe. In part this is due to the fact that the Marduk Prophecy, alone among the texts investigated in this chapter, is not composed in the main of *ex eventu* predictions. Instead, we nd past tense narrative with references to three episodes of major international power plays. The rst, found in I 13–22, is the conquest of Babylon by the Hittite king Mursilis I in ca. 1595; the second is the conquest of Babylon by Tukulti-Ninurta I of Assyria in ca. 1225;[26] the third, found in I 22′-II 12, is the conquest of Babylon by Kudur-Naḫḫunte of Elam (1155–1150).[27] In all three cases, the conquest of Babylon is portrayed as Marduk, high god of Babylon, deciding of his own free will to depart to a foreign land. The image is a literary-theological re ection of the removal of Marduk's cult statue as part of the victor's spoils.[28] There is no concern with historical events in the intervening years between the removal and repatriation in each instance. What is most telling is that the bulk of the text—everything from II 19 on, nearly four full columns of text—is focused on the king responsible for returning the cult statue of Marduk from Elam to Babylon. Historically we know that this feat was accomplished by Nebuchadnezzar I during the reign of the Elamite king Ḫutelutush-Inshushinak (ca. 1120–1110). However, it is in II 19, with the rise of the king who brings Marduk back from Elam, that the text switches from past-tense narration of histori-cal events to a "prediction" of the future. While the defeat of Elam in the text can be con dently connected with the actions of Nebuchadnezzar I, it

---

26. The account of the Assyrian conquest is lost; it must have been recorded in the miss-ing text between lines 37 and 3′ of col. I. Beginning where the text resumes in 3′, Marduk is already in Assur (here called Baltil).

27. See Borger, "Gott Marduk," 21.

28. The image is of course familiar to students of the Hebrew Bible; Yahweh's decision to abandon his abode in Jerusalem is vividly depicted in, e.g., Ezekiel 10–11. See Daniel I. Block, *The Gods of the Nations* (ETSMS 2; Jackson, MS: Evangelical Theological Society, 1988) 125–61 (especially 149–59).

hardly needs to be said that the idyllic description of life in Babylon asso-
ciated in the text with Marduk's return from Elam must not be regarded
as a reference to actual historical occurences; rather, these descriptions are
merely stereotypical tropes and phrases employed to indicate a period of
general prosperity.

Circumstances of Composition

There are two issues to be addressed: (1) the implied authorship
of the text; (2) the actual circumstances of scribal composition. The text
itself is pseudonymous, as it is presented in its entirety as a   rst-person
direct address by the god Marduk; the conceit is only broken with the
scribal notations at the close of the composition. This feature is somewhat
unusual for an Akkadian composition and has occasioned comparisons
to Judean apocalyptic literature, in which pseudonymous authorship is
the norm. Beyond this, one can locate the implied time of authorship in
the third quarter of the twelfth century b.c.e. The text presents itself as a
speech delivered after Marduk's departure to Elam around the middle of
the century, but before Nebuchadnezzar I had risen to the throne in 1126.
The period of actual authorship is certainly later, most likely late in the
reign of Nebuchadnezzar I, as will be argued below.

Audience and Function

While perhaps not much can be said about the intended audience of
the composition, much can be said on its likely intended function. As has
been noted above, the text is extremely uneven in its attention to histori-
cal events: the description of the coming king beginning in II 19 occupies
nearly twice as much space as the other references to Marduk's travels to
and returns from foreign lands. The author of the text is clearly using the
episodes of Marduk's departure   rst to Ḫatti and then to Assur as mere
background for his main purpose. We therefore must answer the question
as to whether the text was composed before Nebuchadnezzar I succeded
in his conquest of Elam and repatriated Marduk's cult statue, or after the
fact.

It must be regarded as a possibility that the text was composed during
Nebuchadnezzar I's reign, but prior to his conquest of Elam. It is known
that he made several campaigns against Elam prior to successfully taking
the capital, Susa, and recapturing the stolen cult statue of Marduk. There-
fore, the text may have been composed as a propaganda piece; it would
have been intended to drum up support for Nebuchadnezzar's continued
campaigns against Babylon's oppressors to the east. The text would func-
tion as divine sanction for the ongoing military efforts of the Babylonian
king, as well as guarantee of their eventual success.

It is more probable, however, that the prediction of Nebuchadnezzar
I's success against Elam is *ex eventu*; furthermore, it was most likely com-

posed while Nebuchadnezzar was still king.[29] This position ts well with what we know of literary production during Nebuchadnezzar I's reign. It is now widely held by scholars that the composition known as *Enuma Elish* was in fact composed under Nebuchadnezzar I.[30] That text is far less a document about creation—as it is most often characterized—than it is a religio-political screed detailing Marduk's ascendency in the Mesopotamian pantheon and his legitimation as king. The ascendancy of Marduk in Babylonian religion can now be located temporally with a great deal of con dence during the reign of Nebuchadnezzar I. It is most likely that the Marduk Prophecy is a document primarily concerned with religious and political ideology following on the heels of Nebuchadnezzar's military success. Whereas *Enuma Elish* primarily celebrates Marduk as king over the divine realm, the Marduk Prophecy celebrates Nebuchadnezzar I as king over the earthly realm. The effectiveness of Nebuchadnezzar I's propaganda machine can be seen in the survival of documents composed during his reign in multiple copies made centuries later.

An alternative to a late second millennium date would be to locate the authorship in the rst half of the rst millennium. Accordingly, the prediction contained in II 9 and following is still to be understood as *ex eventu*, but it need not have been composed during Nebuchadnezzar I's reign. As discussed above in relation to Text A, the Marduk Prophecy could be viewed as composed during the Neo-Assyrian period, equally as a propaganda piece, using events of the late second millennium as ciphers for political activities of the rst millennium. While this cannot be disproved de nitively without the discovery of a copy of the text centuries older than our current copies, it seems the less likely of the two options. Given the vast amount of space dedicated to the Elamite invasion, that it follows two other well-known second millennium defeats of Babylon, the abundant literary remains focused on Nebuchadnezzar I and his defeat of Elam, and the manner in which *ex eventu* prediction is used in other texts (particularly the Dynastic Prophecy and the Judean texts discussed in Chapters 4–6), it seems, on balance, more likely that the text was indeed composed shortly after the events described. The author of the Marduk Prophecy sought to glorify Nebuchadnezzar I both in his lifetime and in

---

29. This agrees with the opinions of, among others, Borger, "Gott Marduk," 21–23; Ringgren, "Akkadian Apocalypses," 382; Grayson, *BHLT*, 16; Longman, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography*, 138.

30. The proposal is that of W. G. Lambert, "The Reign of Nebuchadnezzar I: A Turning Point in the History of Mesopotamian Religion," in *The Seed of Wisdom* (ed. W. S. McCullough; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964), 3–13. See also J. J. M. Roberts, "Nebuchadnezzar I's Elamite Crisis in Theological Perspective," in *Essays on the Ancient Near East* (ed. Maria de Jong Ellis; Hamden, CT: Archon, 1977), 183–87. While the position has won a great deal of support among scholars, it has not gone without opposition; see, e.g., Thorkild Jacobsen, "The Battle between Marduk and Tiamat," *JAOS* 88 (1968): 104–8.

the memory of generations to come, a function that appears to have succeeded brilliantly.

A final note should be made of the fact that this text alone among the group of Akkadian *ex eventu* texts contains a list of offerings prior to the colophon. This could potentially indicate use of this text in a cultic setting. Other texts containing "biographical" information about legendary (in our case, divine) kings of old similarly conclude with a list of gifts; one thinks immediately of the famous Cruciform Monument of Manishtushu. As Longman notes, scholars are in broad agreement that this text is a fictional royal inscription, composed long after the reign it supposedly commemorates.[31] However, the nature of the donations at the end of this text and the Marduk Prophetic Speech are quite different. In our text, food items are donated, presumably for use by temple personnel as well as for offerings to the god. In the case of the Manishtushu text, however, the list of donations comprises the bulk of the text. The king is said to have raised the daily provisions of all sorts of food stuffs for the temple of Shamash, in addition to donating well over 100 minas of gold ornaments, more than 2 talents of silver, and garments for dressing the divine statutes. The text is clearly concerned first and foremost with glorifying Manishtushu as an outstanding patron of the temple. The list of donations preserved at the end of the Marduk Prophecy does not seem to serve any such purpose. Indeed, it is unfortunate that we do not possess the textual transition from the composition proper to the list of donations with which the tablet ends.

The Shulgi Prophecy

Introduction

Like the Marduk Prophecy, the Shulgi Prophecy is preserved in multiple copies, one from Nineveh and a second from Assur. Following Borger's edition, the transcription and translation below are based on the fragments of the tablet from Ashurbanipal's library. The other extant copy, from Assur, was originally published by E. F. Weidner[32] and later collated by Lambert.[33] For a list of variants between the two versions, I refer the reader to Borger, "Gott Marduk," 15; and Grayson and Lambert, "Akkadian Prophecies," 19–20.

---

31. Longman, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography*, 81, and the literature cited there.
32. Weidner, "Texte-Wörter-Sachen."
33. Lambert, "Akkadian Prophecies," 30.

Bibliography

Tablet museum numbers: K 4445 + K 4495 + K 4541 + K 15508 + 79–7–8,98 (+)
     K 5346 + K 10020; VAT 14404
Cuneiform Text:
     K 4445 = Winckler, *Sammlung von Keilschrifttexten II*, text 13
     K 4445 col. 2 & 3 = Strong, "Three Cuneiform Texts"
     K 4541 col. 2 = Strong, "Three Cuneiform Texts"
     K 4541 = *CT* 13, plate 49
     K 4495 = Grayson and Lambert, "Akkadian Prophecies," Text C
     K 15508 = Grayson and Lambert, "Akkadian Prophecies," Text C
     K 5346 = Borger, "Gott Marduk"
     K 10020 = Borger, "Gott Marduk"
     79–7–8,98 = Borger, "Gott Marduk"
     VAT 14404 = Weidner, "Texte-Wörter-Sachen"
Edition: Borger, "Gott Marduk"
Translation: Borger, "Gott Marduk"; Foster, *Muses*, 357–59; Longman, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography*; Talon, "Les textes prophétiques"
Studies: Borger, "Gott Marduk"; Longman, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography*; Grayson and Lambert, "Akkadian Prophecies"

Transcription and Translation

Column I	Column 1

1. *a-na-ku* ^{d}[*Š*]*ul-g*[*i*]   1. I am (divine) Shulgi
2. *na-ram* ^{d}*En-líl ù* ^{d}*Nin-l*[*ìl*]   2. beloved of Enlil and Ninl[il].
2. *e-tel-lum* ^{d}UTU *iz-zak-ra-a*[*n-ni*]   3. The lord, Shamash, told [me];
4. ^{d}15 *be-el-ti ú-šab-ra-*[*an-ni*]   4. Ishtar, the lady, revealed (it) [to me].
5. AD-*ma u$_{4}$-ma-am ù* DINGIR x […]   5. Father and *mother*(?), god […]
6. *mi-im-ma$_{10}$ ša i-ni pi-i* DINGIR^{meš} 6. whatever from the mouths of the
    [? *rabûti*]   [great] gods
7. *iš-mu-ú* ⌈AD⌉*-ú-a* ED[IN ? …]   7. my fathers heard […]
8. ÚRI^{ki} *li-iz-z*[*a-am-mur* ?]   8. May Ur *constantly* s[*ing*]
9. UD.UNUG^{ki} *l*[*i* …]   9. May Larsa […]
10. *i-na ú-ri-šu ur-d*[*u*]-[…]   10. From his roof he descended […]
11. *i-na ú-ri* KÁ.GAL […]   11. From the roof of his gate […]
12. *ri-mu ù sír-re-mu* x […]   12. a wild bull and wild donkey […]
13. [*š*]*a* URU E[N.LÍL^{ki}…]   13. of (my) city N(ippur)
14. x RA MA DA A […]   14. … […]
15. x KI 6-*šu l*[*i* …]   15. … six-fold […]
16. […] *l*[*i* …]   16. […] … […]
17. […] x […]   17. […] … […]
Lacuna   Lacuna

1′. [… ME]Š   Lines 1′-13′ too broken for translation
2′. [… K]I (?)
3′. [… T]I (?)
4′. [… *a*]*m-mur*
5′. […] KI
6′. […] NA KI
7′. [… Z]A (?)
8′. [… MA]Š (?) GAG
9′. [… L]Ú (?) MEŠ
10′. [… *p*]*ar* (?)-*ri-ik*
11′. [… M]AŠ (?) NA
12′. [… A]Š (?) DA
13′. [… G]AR (?) KI
14′. […] x DU$_{10}$.GAR^{ki} 14′. […] (the land of) Damru
15′. [… A]Š (?) KI   Lines 15′-18′ too broken for translation
16′. […]-*ma*
17′. […]-*e* (?)
18′. […]-*e* (?)

Lacuna (approximately 13 lines)   Lacuna (approximately 13 lines)

<div align="center">Column II   Column II</div>

Lacuna (approximately 13 lines)   Lacuna (approximately 13 lines)

1′. […]   1′. […]
2′. *e-bé-el* UB.DA.LIMMU$_2$.BA   2′. I ruled the four quarters (of the
3′. *iš-tu* ^{d}UTU.È   world)
4′. *a-di* ^{d}UTU.ŠÚ.A   3′. from the rising of the sun
5′. *ú-šar-ši-id* EN.LÍL^{ki} *Dur-an-ki*   4′. to the setting of the sun.
                                                  5′. I founded Nippur Bond-of-
6′. *e-pu-uš pi-ia* DINGIR^{meš} *še-mu-*   Heaven-and-Earth.
     nin-ni   6′. I opened my mouth and the gods
                                                       listened to me.
7′. *i-na zu-un-ni ra-ma-ni-ia*   7′. From my own resources
8′. BÀD *ša-a-šu lu-ú e-pu-uš*   8′. I built that wall
9′. *lu-ú ú-ki-in*   9′. and made (it) rm.
10′. *iq-ba-am* ^{d}*En-líl e-pu-uš* UD UL   10′. Enlil ordered me: "build…"
     LA (?)
11′. ^{d}*En-líl iq-ba-a-am-ma*   11′. Enlil ordered me, and
12′. *Bal-da-ḫa-a lu-ú uš-ḫar-miṭ*   12′. I destroyed Baldaḫa.
13'. *iq-ba-a-am* ^{d}*En-líl*   13'. Enlil ordered me:
14′. *e-pu-uš qab-lam*   14'. "Wage war!"
15′. ^{d}*En-líl iq-ba-a-am*   15'. Enlil ordered me,
16′. *Bal-da-ḫa-a lu-ú uš-ḫar-miṭ*   16'. I destroyed Baldaḫa
17′. *i-na ki-im-ti* (?)-*šu*   17'. from his family.
18′. *e-li kib-ra-a-ti lu-ú uš-te-eš*-BU 18'. Over the (four) quarters (of the
                                                       world) I …

19'. *iq-ba-a-am* ᵈ*Nin-líl*

19'. Ninlil ordered me:

20'. ᵈ*Ḫu-um-ba si-dir*

20'. "Put Ḫumba in order!"

21'. *ša* LUGAL EREN

21'. Of the King of *Susa*

22'. x x x 15 x […]

22'. … 15 … […]

23'. […] x BAL x […]

23'. […] … […]

Lacuna (approximately 10 lines)

Lacuna (approximately 10 lines)

Column III

Column III

Lacuna (a few lines)

Lacuna (a few lines)

1'. […] x

1'. […] …

2'. […] ŠIR

2'. […] …

3'. [… KÁ].DINGIR.RAᵏⁱ

3'. [… Ba]bylon

4'. […] ⌈DUMUᵐᵉˢ⌉ EN.LÍLᵏⁱ

4'. […] the citizens of Nippur

5'. [*ù* (?)] KÁ.DINGIR.RAᵏⁱ

5'. [*and*] Babylon

6'. […] x *ša-a-šu la iz-za-az*

6'. […] … will not stand

7'. [*…la* (?) *id*]-*di-na-aš-šu*

7'. [… will/did *not* g]ive him

8'. […] BALA-*am*

8'. […] (*nor*) reign

9'. [… *la* (?) *i-d*]*i-na-aš-šum-ma*

9'. [… he did *not* (?) gi]ve to him.

10'. [… *šar*] x *kib-ra-a-ti*

10'. [… *a king of*] the (four) quarters of (the world);

11'. [… D]UMUᵐᵉˢ EN.LÍLᵏⁱ

11'. [… the ci]tizens of Nippur

12'. [*ù* (?) KÁ.DINGIR.RA]ᵏⁱ *i-te-gu-ú*

12'. [*and Babylon*] he has neglected.

13'. [*d*]*i* (?)⌐*in*⌐ (?) [*m*]*i-šá-ri*

13'. [C]orrect [jud]gment

14'. *la id-di-n*[*u-šu* (?) *muš-ke* (?)]-*nu-ti*

14'. he has not give[n *for the impover*]*ished*.

15'. NUN *šu-ú i-na* ⌐*u₈*⌐-*i a-a-i*

15'. That prince with "woe!" and "alas!"

16'. *it-ta-na-al-lak*

16'. will roam about.

17'. *a-na* LUGAL KÁ.DINGIR.RAᵏⁱ

17'. To the king of Babylon

18'. *ù* EN.LÍLᵏⁱ

18'. and Nippur

19'. *iš-te-niš na-ad-na* KUR.KUR

19'. all the lands are given as one.

20'. *a-a-ú* LUGAL *šá* EGIR-*ia*

20'. Whichever king after me

21'. *il-la-a e-li Bal-d*[*a-ḫa-a* (?)]

21'. will arise, on account of *Bald*[*aḫa*]

22'. KUR ELAM.MAᵏⁱ *a-na* ᵈUTU.UD.[DU]

22'. (and) the land of Elam to the east

23'. *iš-te-niš i*[*n*]-[*neš-ši* (?)]

23'. together *wi*[*ll be confused…*]

24'. Ḫa-at-tu-ú x […]

24'. Ḫatti […]

25'. KÁ.DINGIR.RAᵏⁱ […]

25'. [*will defeat*] Babylon.

26'. *a-ḫu-ú*° […]

26'. Brother […]

27'. *i-n*[*a* …]

27'. … […]

28'. KI[Š …]

28'. … […]

29'. x […]

29'. … […]

Lacuna (approximately 17 lines)

Lacuna (approximately 17 lines)

Column IV

Lacuna (approximately 17 lines)

1'. [… *i*]*n-né-e*[*p-pu-uš* (?)]
2'. *i-na* ⌈*ka*⌊⌉*mat*⌉ KÁ.DINGIR.R[A^{ki}]
3'. *e-piš* É.GAL *šá-a-ši i-nam*-⌈*ziq*⌉

4'. NUN *šu-ú ma-ru-uš-ta im-mar*
5'. *ul i-ṭa-ab* ŠÀ-*šu*
6'. *a-di šar-ru-ti-šu*
7'. MÈ *u qab-lum*
8'. *ul ip-pár-ra-su*
9'. *i-na* BALA *šu-a-tu* ŠEŠ ŠEŠ-*šú* GU₇

10'. UN^{meš} DUMU^{meš}-*ši-na*
11'. *a-na* KÙ.BABBAR BÚR^{meš}
12'. KUR^{meš} *iš-te-niš* ⌊*in*⌋⌈*neš*⌉*ša-a*

13'. GURUŠ KI.SIKI[L] [*iz-z*]*i-ib*

14'. *ù* KI.SIKIL *iz-zi-ib* GURUŠ

15'. AMA UGU DUMU.MUNUS
     KÁ-*šá id-dil*
16'. [N]ÍG.GA KÁ.DINGIR.RA^{ki}
17'. °*a-na qé-reb* SU.BIR₄^{ki}
18'. *ù* KUR *Aš-šur*^{ki} *ir-ru-ub*
19'. LUGAL KÁ.DINGIR.RA^{ki}
20'. *a-na* NUN *Aš-šur*^{ki} NÍG.ŠU
     É.GAL-*šu*
21'. [N]ÍG.GA-*šu a-na qé-reb* [*Aš-šur*] ⌊^{ki}⌋
22'. *uš-te-eṣ-*[*i* …]
23'. *a-di* [*u*]*l*-[*la-a*]
24'. *da-a*[*r-im*] [^{uru}*Bal-til*]

Lacuna (a few lines)

Column V

1. […] x ⌈DIŠ⌉ *i-ri-i*[*ḫ* …]
2. […] *u* (?) *šip* (?)-*ṭa-a-tum*
3. [nothing preserved]
4. [*iš*]-*šak-ka-na-ma*
5. [*ib-r*]*u ib-ra-šu ina* ^{giš}TUKUL *ú-šam-qat*
6. [*ru-u*₈]-*a ru-u*₈-*a-šú ina* ^{giš}TUKUL *ú-ḫal-laq*

Column IV

Lacuna (approximately 17 lines)

1'. [… *will be*] bui[*lt*]
2'. In the area of Babylo[n],
3'. the builder of that palace will be vex[ed].

4'. That prince will experience misery
5'. and his heart will not be pleased.
6'. As long as he is king,
7'. ghting and war
8'. will not stop.
9'. In that reign brother will devour his brother;
10'-11'. people will sell their children for money.
12'. The lands all together will be confused.
13'. The man [will ab]andon (his) young woman,
14'. and the young woman will abandon (her) man;
15'. mother will bar the door against daughter.
16'-18'. The [p]ossessions of Babylon will go to the midst of Subartu and the land of Assur.
19'-22'. The king of Babylon will send the property of his palace to the prince of Assur, his [p]roperty to the midst of [Assur]

23'-24'. For [al]wa[ys; Baltil]

Lacuna (a few lines)

Column V

1. […] …
2. […] …
3.
4. [he w]ill set (it) and
5. [frie]nd will slay his friend with a sword;
6. companion will kill his companion with a sword.

7. [KUR (?)me]š UR.BI (*ištēniš*) ZÁḪmeš-*m*[*a*]

8. [UN (?)]meš TURme[š]

9. [EN].LÍLki *in-na-ad-d*[*i*]

10. [NU]N *šu-ú re-šá-a-šú il-la-*[*a*]

11. [UR]U *šá ina* GÚ ÍD IDI[GNA]

12. °*ù* ÍD BURANUNki *ša*[*k-nu* …]

13. °*i-na qí-bit* dE[*n-líl*]

14. [B]ALA LUGAL KÁ.DINGIR.[RAki]

15. *i-qá-at-ti* […]

16. *a-a-um-ma i-⌐na⌐* x […]

17. *i-⌐te⌐* (?)-[*ebbe* (?) ...]

18. KUR x […]

19. *e-⌐la⌐⌐a⌐⌐ti⌐* [*Bád-Tibira*k]i

20. *a-na áš-ri-šú* °*ú-tar*

21. [G]ÍR.SUki LAGASki

22. °*ù-ta-ad-da-áš*

23. [*eš*]-⌐*ret*⌐ DINGIR.DINGIR *i-né-ep-pu-uš*

24. [ŠUK.dINANNAmeš DINGIRmeš GA]Lmeš *ú-ka-an*

25. […] ⌐*u*⌐ BARAmeš

26. [*ana ašr*]-*šú-nu ú-tar*

27. [… *eš-re*]*t* EN.LÍLki

28. […] *Ì-si-in*ki

29. […] *in-né-ep-pu-uš*

30. […] x *in-na-ad-di*

31. [… *i*]*b-bi-šú*

32. [… *l*]*a* (?)-*a*

33. […K]I

Lacuna (approximately 13 lines)

Column VI

Lacuna (approximately 17 lines)

1′. […] AN

2′. [*a-na-ku* dŠ*ul-gi* AL.T]IL

Rest of text broken

---

7. [*The land*]s will be totally destroyed.

8. [*The people*] will diminish;

9. [Nip]pur will be thrown down.

10. That [*prin*]*ce*'s head will be raised

11. (*because of*) the city which beside the Tigris

12. and the Euphrates is s[et …]

13. By the order of E[nlil]

14. the [r]eign of the king of Babyl[on]

15. will come to an end […]

16. a certain one …

17. will a[*rise*…]

18. … […]

19. *above* [... Bad-Tibira]

20. he will restore (literally: return to its place).

21. Girsu and Lagash

22. he will renew.

23. The [san]ctuary of the gods will be (re)built.

24. He will (re-)establish [the offerings of the gre]at [gods.]

25. […] and shrines

26. [to] their [places] he will restore.

27. [… the sanctu]ary of Nippur

28. […] Isin

29. […] will be (re)built.

30. […] will be thrown down.

31. […] …

32. […] …

33. […] …

Lacuna (approximately 13 lines)

Column VI

Lacuna (approximately 17 lines)

1. […] …

2. ["I am (divine) Shulgi," com]pleted.

Rest of text broken

Textual Notes

Column I

5   The use of the sign u_4 almost requires understanding the second word as "day" (*ūmu*), not "mother" (*ummu*); however, this makes little sense following AD = *abu*, "father". This line is problematic and de es easy interpretation.

Column II

12'   Following Foster's translation (*Muses*, 357), I take the signs as a proper name, Baldaḫa.

22'   For Susa one would expect MÚŠ.EREN, not simply EREN.

Columns IV-VI

      Note that the column numbering in Grayson and Lambert's earlier edition proceeds in the reverse of Borger's (used here):

Borger	Grayson and Lambert
IV	iii
V	ii
VI	i

Column IV

23'-24' Restored on the basis of VAT 14404.

Column V

24   Restored on the basis of VAT 14404

Discussion

State of the Text

    Unfortunately, the Shulgi Prophecy is poorly preserved. Approximately the last 30 lines preceding the colophon are missing. We are fortunate, however, to have two exemplars.[34] There are minor variations

---

34. Three small, quite broken fragments published in D. J. Wiseman and J. A. Black, *Literary Texts from the Temple of Nabû* (CTN 4; London: British School of Archaeology in Iraq, 1996; fragments 64, 65, and 69), seem to contain literary accounts of the reign of Shulgi. Biggs has suggested that they may be part of the Shulgi Prophecy ("Šulgi in Simurrum," in G. D. Young, M. W. Chavalas, and R. E. Averbeck, eds., *Crossing Boundaries and Linking Horizons: Studies in Honor of Michael C. Astour on His 80th Birthday* [Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 1997], 169–78). Suggestive as Biggs's proposal is, the fragments, small and without context as they are, are of little help in reconstructing the Shulgi Prophecy.

between the two, primarily involving alternate spellings. It is also worth noting that the tablet from Nineveh (on which the above transcription is based) contains no dividing lines to distinguish sections of text. The Assur tablet (VAT 14404) does include some dividing lines. This could imply that dividing lines may not have been included in the original composition, but were only added by later copyists. Alternatively, it could also suggest that (for some copyists) dividing lines were not always considered an integral part of a composition to be reproduced as faithfully as the cuneiform text itself.

Historical References

Like the Marduk Prophecy, the Shulgi Prophecy begins with a lengthy narrative of the past, cast in the rst person. In fact, as Borger argues, the form of this initial part of the text is that of a royal inscription.[35] This makes perfect sense, as Shulgi was an actual king, the second ruler of the Third Dynasty of Ur. If the contents of II 1–9 are meant to imply that Shulgi founded Nippur, the text is plainly wrong. It may however only intend to convey that Shulgi initiated many building and/or restoration projects, such as work on the city wall.

Unlike the Marduk Prophecy but like Prophecy Text A, the Shulgi Prophecy then goes on to include predictions about the reigns of a series of kings. However, much as is the case with Text A, the allusions are frustratingly vague. IV 16'-19' makes reference to goods being taken from Babylon to Assyria. This has been plausibly identi ed as a reference to Tukulti-Ninurta's defeat of Babylon, ca. 1225 (see the discussion of the Marduk Prophecy I 37 ff, above).[36] Treating this identi cation as secure, Borger has suggested that the reference to Ḫatti in column III refers to the sack of Babylon by Mursilis I (cf. Marduk Prophecy I 13–22). However, the identi cation even of Tukulti-ninurta's sack of Babylon, while quite likely, must be regarded as tentative.

Circumstances of Composition

As stated above, Shulgi was the second king of the Ur III dynasty, a Neo-Sumerian dynasty of the late third millennium.[37] A surprisingly large number of literary texts associated with Shulgi have survived, in

---

35. Borger, "Gott Marduk," 22.

36. Borger, "Gott Marduk," 23; Longman, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography*, 145.

37. An overview of Shulgi's reign can be found in Jacob Klein, "Shulgi of Ur: King of a Neo-Sumerian Empire," *CANE* 2.843–57. For a recent summary of the history of the Ur III period in general, see Marc van de Mieroop, *A History of the Ancient Near East* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004), 69–79. For a more technical study, see Piotr Steinkeller, "The Administrative and Economic Organization of the Ur III State: The Core and the Periphery," in *The Organization of Power: Aspects of Bureaucracy in the Ancient Near East* (ed. R. D. Biggs and M. Gibson; Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1987), 19–41.

particular the so-called Shulgi hymns.[38] Shulgi is perhaps most notable for introducing divine kingship into southern Mesopotamia, incorporating the cult of the king into pre-existing cults.[39]

Obviously, Shulgi himself did not compose our text; rather, it simply seeks to leverage the prestigious legacy that Shulgi had worked hard to build. That there seem to be references to military actions of the mid-second millennium could be taken as evidence that the composition of this work, like the Marduk Prophecy, ought to be located somewhere in the last several centuries of that millennium. One runs a risk, as already seen in the discussion of Text A, in assigning a text with poorly understood historical allusions to a period whose history is itself poorly understood. One could, as in the case of the Marduk Prophecy, argue for a date of composition in the Neo-Assyrian period. Such a date is certainly possible. However, given the lack of clear references to events of the rst millennium, coupled with the fact that this text was copied as part of a series with the Marduk Prophecy, which most likely derives from the twelfth century, I tentatively favor a date in the late second millennium.

Audience and Function

It is clear from documents composed during Shulgi's reign that he was obsessed with manufacturing a very exalted royal ideology. In addition to claiming divine status for himself, he claimed descent from the divinized kings of the First Dynasty of Uruk, who themselves became the subject of numerous legendary narratives. In fact, the bulk of Sumerian literature that survives consists of documents from the time of Shulgi, preserved in Old Babylonian copies. Given the legacy of King Shulgi, it seems very likely that the Shulgi Prophecy was intended to serve as royalist propaganda in much the same manner as the Marduk Prophecy.

It seems likely that the reign announced in V 16–17 is the last of the text. The description of this reign, entirely positive, continues until the text breaks; there are roughly thirty lines missing before the end of the text proper. Given the attention lavished on the nal king of the Marduk Prophecy, it is reasonable to surmise that the Shulgi Prophecy continued with a description of this same reign for the remainder of the text. If that is the case, then the Shulgi prophecy likely functioned to legitimate a reigning monarch. The major difference is that the Shulgi Prophecy presents what appears to be a single reign, portrayed elaborately and entirely negatively leading up to the focus of the text, whereas the Marduk Prophecy is happy to couch the lead-in as past tense narrative and "predict" only the reign of the protagonist. Either way, the effect is the same: the last mon-

---

38. Klein, "Shulgi of Ur," 846–47 and 848–55; see also idem, *Three Šulgi Hymns: Sumerian Royal Hymns Glorifying King Šulgi of Ur* (Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University, 1981).

39. Klein, "Shulgi of Ur," 846.

arch is guaranteed by the gods success, peace, and a glorious reign. Like the Marduk Prophecy and, as we shall see, the Uruk Prophecy, political stability and the well-being of the land are guaranteed by proper attention to and restoration of the cults of the gods (V 20–29). The interconnection between proper cultic function and the establishment of an ideal polity is a feature of the ideology of these texts that will appear again in several of the Judean works investigated in Chapters 4–6 of this study.

The Uruk Prophecy

Introduction

Like Prophecy Text A, the Uruk Prophecy has survived in a single exemplar only. It was uncovered during the 1969 German excavations at Warka; it is unique among the ve texts surveyed in this chapter in that it was found during a scienti c archeological dig (the rest found their way into European museums during the late nineteenth century). We again encounter the familiar refrain, "a prince/king will arise," to introduce a series of ostensibly anonymous kings; and, as is the case with the Marduk Prophecy, we are fortunate enough to have the end of the text preserved.

Bibliography

Tablet museum number(s): Warka 22307/7
Cuneiform Text: Hunger, *Spätbabylonische Texte aus Uruk* I.3
Edition: Hunger, *Spätbabylonische Texte aus Uruk* I.3
Translation: Beaulieu, "The Historical Background of the Uruk Prophecy";
        Hecker, *TUAT* 2.69–70; Hunger, *Spätbabylonische Texte aus Uruk*
        I.3; Hunger and Kaufman, "A New Akkadian Prophecy Text";
        Talon, "Les textes prophétiques"
Studies: Beaulieu, "The Historical Background of the Uruk Proph-
        ecy"; Goldstein, "The Historical Setting of the Uruk Prophecy";
        Höffken, "Heilszeitherrschererwartung im babylonische Raum";
        Hunger and Kaufman, "A New Akkadian Prophecy Text";
        Kaufman, "Prediction, Prophecy, and Apocalypse in the Light of
        a New Akkadian Text"; Scurlock, "Whose Truth and Whose Jus-
        tice"; Scurlock "Prophecy as a Form of Divination; Divination as
        a Form of Prophecy"

Transliteration and Translation

<div>

Obverse

1. […] IZKIM^{meš}-*ú-a*
2. […] *ú*
3. […] x *mu*
4. […] *in-né-ép-pu-šù*
5. […] x *mu it-tén-pu-uš*
6. […] x *[l]i-mu*
7. [… *i*]-*ti-iq*
8. […] x *an-na-a šá-ṭar-šú*
9. […] *dan-na-tú ina* KUR GÁL-*ši*

10. […] x MU-*šu*
11. […] x *iz-zi-zu*
12. […AŠ].TE AD-*šú là* DAB-*bat*

13. […] x TIR.AN.NA.KI ^{giš}GU.ZA DAB-*bat*
14. […] MEŠ *a-na* KI-*ši-na* GUR-*ár*

15. […] *šal-pú-ut-tim* GAR-*an*

16. […] GAR-*an*
17. [… BÀ]D.AN.KI *id-di*
18. […] x *ú-ta-as-sa-ar*
19. [… *ina* BÀ]D.AN.KI *uš-šab*
20. [… *ana* BÀ]D.AN.KI *il-lak*
21. […] *ra-šá-tu-nu*
22. [… IZK]IM -*šú kaš-ši-da-at*
23. […] LUGAL *ina* É.GAL-*šú a-na* ŠID.MEŠ ITU
24. *ú-tas-sar*

</div>

<div>

Obverse

1. […] my signs
2. […] …
3. […] …
4. […] they will be made
5. […] … it was made
6. […] …
7. [… it] crossed over
8. […] … this is its writing
9. […] there will be hardship in the land.

10. […] … his name
11. […] … they stood
12. […] the king's son will not seize his father's [thr]one.
13. […] … (of) Uruk will seize the throne.
14. […] … he will restore to their place.
15. […] he will set (something of ?) ruination.
16. […] he will set
17. […] he laid [*in*] Der
18. […] … he will be con ned
19. […] he will dwell in Der
20. […] he will go to Der
21. […] you (pl.) having been acquired
22. […] its/his [om]en is *certain*
23. […] The king in his palace for several months
24. will be con ned.

</div>

<div>

Reverse

1. […] ZI-*am-ma sap-ḫa-a-ta* KUR *i-bé-e*[*l*]
2. [… LUG]AL *šá iš-tu qé-reb mat tam-tì šá ina qé-reb* ŠU.AN.NA.KI DÙ-*šú be-lu-ú-tu*
3. [*arki*]-*šú* LUGAL E₁₁–*ma di-i-ni* KUR *ul i-da-a-nu* EŠ.BAR KUR *ul* TAR-*as*

</div>

<div>

Reverse

1. […] will arise and rul[e] the scattered (people) of the land
2. [… ki]ng who is from the Sea Land, who had ruled in Babylon.

3. [After] him a king will arise, but he will not perform justice for the land; he will not make the (right) decisions for the land.

</div>

4. [ᵈ]LAMA UNUGᵏⁱ *da-ri-tu₄ iš-tu qé-reb* TIR.AN.NA.KI *ib-bak-ma ina qé-reb* ŠU.AN.NA.KI *ú-še-eš-šib*

4. He will remove the ancient protective goddess of Uruk and make her dwell in the midst of Babylon.

5. [*l*]*a* ᵈLAMA UNUGᵏⁱ *ina* BARÁ *šú ú-še-eš-šib la* UNᵐᵉˢ-*šú ana* NÍG.BA *i-qa-ás-su*

5. One who is not the protective goddess of Uruk he will cause to dwell in her sanctuary; he will give to her for a gift those who are not her people.

6. UNᵐᵉˢ *šá* UNUGᵏⁱ *bil-ti ka-bit-ti im-mid* UNUGᵏⁱ *ú-ḫar-rab* ÍD.MEŠ *sa-ki-ki ú-mál-lu*

6. He will impose a heavy tax on the people of Uruk. He will lay Uruk waste; he will ll the canals with mud,

7. GARINᵐᵉˢ ŠUB-*di* EGIR-*šú* LUGAL E₁₁–*ma di-i-ni* KUR *ul i-da-a-nu* EŠ.BAR KUR *ul* TAR-*as*

7. and neglect the cultivated meadows. After him a king will arise, but he will not perform justice for the land; he will not make the (right) decisions for the land.

8. KIMIN KIMIN KIMIN KIMIN KIMIN *bu-še-e* KUR URÍ.KI *a-na* KUR SU.BIR₄.KI TI-*qé*

8. Ditto ditto ditto ditto ditto. He will take the property of Akkad to Subartu.

9. EGIR-*šú* LUGAL E₁₁–*ma di-i-ni* KUR *ul i-da-a-nu* EŠ.BAR KUR *ul* TAR-*as*

9. After him a king will arise, but he will not perform justice for the land; he will not make the (right) decisions for the land.

10. *kib-ra-a-ti er-bet-ti i-bé-el a-na šu-mi-šú kib-rat i-nu-uš-šú*

10. He will rule the four quarters (of the world), and the (four) quarters (of the world) will quake at his name.

11. EGIR-*šú* LUGAL *ina qé-reb* TIR. AN.NA.KI E₁₁–*ma di-i-ni* KUR *i-da-a-nu* EŠ.BAR KUR TAR-*as*

11. After him a king will arise in the midst of Uruk and he will perform justice for the land; he will make the (right) decisions for the land.

12. GARZA ᵈ*A-nu-ú-tu ina qé-reb* TIR. AN.NA.KI *ú-ka-a-nu*

12. He will establish the rites of the Anu cult in Uruk.

13. ᵈLAMA UNUGᵏⁱ *da-ri-ti iš-tu qé-reb* ŠU.AN.NA.KI *ib-ba-kam-ma ina qé-reb* TIR.AN.NA.KI *ina* BARÁ-*šú*

13. He will bring the ancient protective goddess of Uruk from the midst of Babylon; in the midst of Uruk, in her sanctuary

14. *ú-še-eš-šib* UNᵐᵉˢ-*šú a-na* NÍG.BA *i-qa-ás-su* E.KURᵐᵉˢ *šá* UNUGᵏⁱ DÙ-*uš* Éᵐᵉˢ DINGIRᵐᵉˢ *ana* KI-*ši-na* GUR-*ár*

14. he will let her dwell. He will give her her own people as a gift. He will rebuild the temples of Uruk, he will restore the sanctuaries of the gods.

15. UNUGᵏⁱ *ud-da-áš* KÁ.GALᵐᵉˢ UNUGᵏⁱ *šá* NA₄.ZA.GÍN DÙ-*uš*

15. He will renew Uruk. He will build the gates of Uruk out of lapis

ÍD^{meš} GARIN^{meš} *ṭuḫ-du u* HÉ.GÁL
ú-mál-li

lazuli. He will ll the rivers (and) cultivated meadows with abundance and plenty.

16. [EG]IR-*šú* LUGAL DUMU-*šú ina qé-reb* TIR.AN.NA.KI E₁₁–*ma kib-rat er-bet-ti i-bé-el*

16. After him a king, his son, will arise in the midst of Uruk, and he will rule the four quarters (of the world).

17. [*be-lu*]-*ú-tu ù* LUGAL-*ú-tu ina qé-reb* TIR.AN.NA.KI DÙ-*uš a-di ul-la* BALA-*šú i-ka-a-nu*

17. He will exercise [ruler]ship and kingship in the midst of Uruk; his dynasty will be established forever.

18. [LUGAL]^{meš} *ša* UNUG^{ki} *ki-ma* DINGIR^{meš} *ip-pu-šú be-lu-ú-tu*

18. [The king]s of Uruk will exercise rulership like the gods.

Textual Notes

Obverse

5, 7   The pronoun "it" is used in translation in the absence of any context that might hint as to the gender or nature of the missing subject.

8   The signs could be divided either of two ways: *an-na-a šá-ṭar-šú*, yielding "this is its writing;" or *an-na a-šá-ṭar-šú*, yielding "I write it." Note that following this line, the rest of the composition is cast in the present-future tense.

14   The phrase "to their place" likely has cultic implications; see Reverse 14. The feminine "their" likely re ects goddesses or temples.

22   The term *kaššidu* is rare; Hunger and Kaufman note the occurrence of this term in a diviner's manual, where it seems to mean something like "indecisive" or "unavoidable."

Reverse

8   The notation KI.MIN literally means "ditto." Obviously, this line constitutes a major crux in the interpretation of the text and will be addressed below in the discussion. The removal of property "from Akkad to Subartu" in this line is to be understood as "from Babylon to Assur."

11   The spelling *i-da-a-nu* must be taken as a singular verb form; the spelling with nal vowel is not wholly unusual in late texts.

17   I have translated BALA/*palû* elsewhere in these texts as "reign"; its semantic range stretches from the sense of "dynasty" to

"reign" to, at times, indicating speci cally the year a particular king ascended the throne, or any regnal year.[40]

Discussion

State of the Text

As can be seen in the transcription above, approximately half the text survives in a fairly good state of preservation. The obverse of the text is extremely fragmentary, but the text that survives does lend some clues as to its possible contents. The date of the tablet is di cult to ascertain. H. Hunger and S. Kaufman have suggested a date in the late Achaemenid period.[41] However, the tablet was found in a trench that contained some tablets dated to the Seleucid period;[42] Lambert suggests that the tablet dates to this time.[43] Complicating matters, the nd spot contained two libraries; the lot number to which this tablet was assigned suggests linking it to the earlier of the two libraries, indicating a late Achaemenid dating is somewhat more likely.

Historical References

Almost nothing can be gathered about the speci c contents of the obverse. However, the text of the reverse is clearly most interested in the fate of the protective goddess, or *lamassu*, of Uruk. We discover in line 4 of the reverse that a king who does not provide justice for the land will remove the *lamassu* of Uruk and take her to Babylon. In line 11 we are introduced to a new king, who will perform justice for the land, and, moreover, return the *lamassu* from Babylon to Uruk (line 13). Much as in the Marduk Prophecy, the historical event in which the Uruk Prophecy is interested is the removal and repatriation of a cult statue.

Given the speci city of the action alluded to—the removal of a cult statue from Uruk to Babylon and back again—the prospects for identifying the major actors in our text are quite good. H. Hunger and S. Kaufman have argued that the *lamassu* in question be identi ed as the cult statue

---

40. On the origin of this term, its varied uses, and similarity to Hebrew semantic constructions, see Peter Machinist, "The Transfer of Kingship: A Divine Turning," in Astrid Beck et al., eds., *Fortunate the Eyes That See: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Seventieth Birthday* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995), 105–20.

41. Hermann Hunger and Steven A. Kaufman, "A New Akkadian Prophecy Text," *JAOS* 95 (1975): 371–75.

42. Jürgen Schmidt, *26 und 27. vorläu ger Bericht über die von dem Deutschen Archäologischen Institut und der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft aus Mitteln der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft unternommen Ausgrabungen in Uruk-Warka 1968 und 1969* (Abhandlungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 16; Berlin: Mann, 1972), 56.

43. Lambert, *Background*, 10.

of Ishtar from the Eanna temple in Uruk; further, they note that only one
king claims to have returned the *lamassu* of Uruk: Nebuchadnezzar II, the
Neo-Babylonian king of the late seventh and early sixth century b.c.e.[44] In
addition to Nebuchadnezzar's own claims, however, we have an inscrip-
tion of Nabonidus in which that king not only reports the return of the
statue by a king of Babylon (the name is broken), but states that the statue
of Ishtar had been removed from the Eanna temple some 200 years earlier
during the reign of the Babylonian king Eriba-Marduk.[45]

   With these two kings identified, the text becomes relatively clear.
The rulers mentioned in the broken lines at the end of the obverse would
be Marduk-balassu-iqbi and Baba-aḫa-iddina, who are known to have
fought against the Assyrians in the region of Der.[46] The first two lines
of the reverse would refer to the brief chaotic period prior to the rise of
Eriba-Marduk. The major crux of the text follows the description of the
oppressive reign attributed to Eriba-Marduk: in line 8 we find the nota-
tion KI.MIN, meaning "ditto," written five times. Hunger and Kaufman
offer two suggestions, noting that neither is wholly satisfactory: (1) the
five KI.MIN signs indicate the five Babylonian kings with brief reigns who
continually struggled against Tiglath-Pileser III of Assyria until his con-
quest of Babylon; the problem here is that the text would then jump from
Tiglath-Pileser III to Nebuchadnezzar with no mention of the Neo-Babylo-
nian kings who preceded him. (2) The signs are intended to indicate a long
period of Assyrian dominance until the rise of Nabopolassar, founder of
the Neo-Babylonian empire, who would be the king mentioned in line 9.
The last king mentioned in the text would therefore be Amel-Marduk, son
of Nebuchadnezzar. Of these two options, the second is preferred here.

   Lambert has questioned this identification of the historical allusions
on the grounds that it does not account for all the kings alluded to in
the text; he also seems deeply bothered by the fact that this interpretation
would have the text declare that Amel-Marduk would rule "like a god,"
whereas in reality he had a brief two-year stay on the throne. Instead of
focusing on the *lamassu*, Lambert is interested in accounting for all the
kings by aligning the text with chronographic records of first-millennium
Babylonian kings. He therefore identifies the king mentioned in line 2 of
the reverse as Marduk-apla-iddina II (biblical Merodach-baladan). The
next four kings in the text would be the Assyrian kings Sargon II, Sennach-

---

44. Hunger and Kaufman, "A New Akkadian Prophecy Text," 373–74; Kaufman, "Pre-
diction, Prophecy, and Apocalypse in the Light of New Akkadian Texts," in *Proceedings of
the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1974),
1.221–28; see especially 226–27.

45. Hunger and Kaufman, "A New Akkadian Prophecy Text," 374; see Brinkman, *A
Political History of Post-Kassite Babylonia*, 221-22

46. Hunger and Kaufman, "A New Akkadian Prophecy Text," 374.

erib, Esarhaddon, and Ashurbanipal. The last two kings are then Nabopo-
lassar and Nebuchadnezzar.[47] He explains the   ve occurences of KIMIN
in line 8 (which for him come in the middle of Esarhaddon's reign) as
referring to   ve actions described in preceding lines.[48] While there can be
no certainty on the matter, this interpretation seems less likely than those
proposed by Hunger and Kaufman. Furthermore, Lambert's interpreta-
tion discounts (1) the fact that Nebuchadnezzar II claims in an inscription
to restore a goddess's cult statue to Uruk, whereas we have no evidence
for such an act by Nabopolassar; and (2) the fact that Nabonidus ascribes
the removal of a cult statue to Eriba-Marduk

A slightly different identi cation of the kings found in this text has
been proposed by Jonathan Goldstein, who agrees with Hunger and
Kaufman that the place to begin is with the identi cation of Eriba-Marduk
as the king who removes the *lamassu* of Uruk. The last king of reverse, line
8, he identi es as Tiglath-Pileser III; the next king is then Shalmaneser V,
and the good king of lines 11–15 would be Marduk-apla-iddina.[49]

Finally, JoAnn Scurlock has offered an interpretation of this text
whereby the anonymous kings are intended to stand not for Neo-Babylo-
nian monarchs but for Neo-Assyrian ones.[50] While Scurlock's suggestion
is interesting, I   nd her argument that Assyrian monarchs have not been
considered for the references of this text as the result of a pro-Babylonian
ideological bias among Assyriologists to be utterly unconvincing. In the
end, the Babylonian monarchs proposed by Hunger, Kaufman, and others
are a better   t given the textual evidence that survives. An additional
problem in Scurlock's study is her somewhat uncritical assertions that the
last-mentioned king is a "messiah," and that there is a coherent "genre" to
which this text belongs, assertions that she proposes to support her iden-
ti cation of Neo-Assyrian monarchs.

Of the reconstructions proposed, I   nd that of Hunger and Kaufman
most persuasive; the protective deity in question must be identi ed with
the Ishtar statue of Uruk, the king who returned it should be identi ed as
Nebuchadnezzar II, and the   nal king of the prophecy should be identi-
  ed as Amel-Marduk. These identi cations of the individuals and events
in the text have since been supported by Paul-Alain Beaulieu, who differs,
however, on the date of composition.[51]

---

47. Lambert, *Background*, 11.

48. Lambert, *Background*, 18–19 n. 16.

49. Jonathan Goldstein, "The Historical Setting of the Uruk Prophecy," *JNES* 47 (1988): 43– 46.

50. JoAnn Scurlock, "Whose Truth and Whose Justice? The Uruk and Other Later Akkadian Prophecies re-Revisited," in *Orientalism, Assyriology and the Bible* (ed. Steven W. Holloway; She   eld: Phoenix Press, 2006), 449–67.

51. Paul-Alain Beaulieu, "The Historical Background of the Uruk Prophecy" in *The Tab-*

Circumstances of Composition

As in the case of Text A, little can be said about the authorship. The presence of the first-person common singular possessive suffix in line 1 of the obverse may indicate that the broken text originally contained a first-person narrative introduction; Longman has therefore argued that this text, like the Marduk and Shulgi prophecies, was originally pseudepigraphic and autobiographical.[52] This is certainly possible, but cannot be proved. The date of composition is the subject of some debate. For reasons that will become clear in the following section, I would place the composition of the Uruk prophecy late in the reign of Nebuchadnezzar II.

Audience and Function

The intended audience of the Uruk Prophecy should be clear: it is the people, more specifically the elites, of Uruk. It takes a peculiar view of Mesopotamian history of the first millennium; the see-saw of power between Babylon and Assur are seen through the eyes of Uruk in the far south. Those kings are bad who do not have the best interests of Uruk, in particular, Uruk's cult, at heart; those kings are good who do right by Uruk and its cults.

The function of the text is quite clearly propagandistic. It claims that the son of the ruler who restored the *lamassu* to Uruk will exercise kingship like the gods; his dynasty will be eternal. According to the reading of Hunger and Kaufman, as well as that of Beaulieu, this king is to be identified with Nebuchadnezzar II's son, Amel-Marduk. His reign may be described as anything but god-like; after two years the throne was usurped and his "eternal" dynasty came to an end. As noted above, this incongruity was one of the factors that led to Lambert's differing interpretation. However, the identity of Amel-Marduk makes perfect sense if we regard the text as switching to a legitimate attempt to predict the future at precisely this point. As will be seen in Chapters 4–6 of this study, this is indeed a very common element in Judean texts that employ *ex eventu* prediction. The mere fact that Amel-Marduk lasted only two years as king informs us that he was an incredibly weak king; forces opposed to him must have arisen near the very beginning of his reign, if indeed not sooner. The Uruk Prophecy was therefore likely composed by supporters of Nebuchadnezzar II in Uruk, particularly those in cultic circles. The most probable intent of the text was to drum up support for Nebuchadnezzar II's chosen heir.

Scurlock has recently argued that the purpose of this text, along

---

52. Longman, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography*, 147. See Chapter 3 below for detailed consideration of Longman's claims for the autobiographical nature of the texts considered in this chapter.

with the other *ex eventu* compositions, ought not be termed propagandistic since they continued to be copied.[53] Scurlock does indeed raise an interesting point: why would a text that seems most likely to have been authored in the Neo-Babylonian period continue to be copied in the very late Persian or early Hellenistic period? While no one could hope to answer this question with any certainty, Scurlock is indeed correct that this text, like the others surveyed in this chapter, lends itself admirably to re-use and re-interpretation in a variety of historical contexts (see my comments above on the Neo-Assyrian copies of the Marduk Prophecy).[54] Given the refusal of these texts actually to employ the names of individuals, preferring instead generic ciphers, it is easy to see how such works could potentially be revived and reapplied to a variety of socio-historical circumstances.

The Dynastic Prophecy

Introduction

The Dynastic Prophecy survives in a single copy, identi ed by Grayson while working with fragments in the British Museum. Portions of four columns have been preserved, labeled by Grayson i–iv. The tablet is of such slight curvature that Grayson was unable to determine how much might be lost, but supposed that the composition originally consisted of only four columns. Lambert has since argued that the text likely originally consisted of some six columns, based on the contents of the preserved text. This theory will be addressed in the discussion below; for the sake of clarity, Grayson's enumeration has been retained.

Bibliography

Tablet museum number(s): BM 40623; BM 34903?[55]
Cuneiform text: Grayson, *BHLT*
Edition: Grayson, *BHLT*
Translation: Grayson, *BHLT*; Longman, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography*;
    Foster, *Muses*; Talon, "Les textes prophétiques"

---

53. Scurlock, "Prophecy as a Form of Divination; Divination as a Form of Prophecy," in *Divination and Interpretation of Signs in the Ancient World* (ed. Amar Annus; Oriental Institute Seminars 6; Chicago: Oriental Institute, 2010), 277–316; here 278.

54. Ibid., 278–79.

55. Grayson (*BHLT*, 22) suggests that this fragment, previously published in handcopy as *CT* 51, no. 122, is conceivably from the same tablet as BM 40623.

Studies: Geller, "Babylonian Astronomical Diaries and Corrections of Diodorus"; Grayson, *BHLT*; Lambert, "Background of Jewish Apocalyptic"; Longman, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography*; Marasco, "La 'Profezia Dinastica'"; Neujahr, "When Darius Defeated Alexander"; Scurlock "Prophecy as a Form of Divination; Divination as a Form of Prophecy"; van der Speck, "Darius III, Alexander the Great and Babylonian Scholarship"

Transliteration and Translation

Column I	Column I
Lacuna	Lacuna
1. […]-*in-n*[*i*]	1. […] *to me*
2. […]-*ni-in-ni*	2. […] *to me*
3. […] MU *e-zib*	3. […] I/he departed
4. […] x GAL^meš	4. […] … great
5. […] NUMUN-*ma*	5. […] *seed* and
6. […] x *i-mur*	6. […] … he saw
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---	--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
7. […] *ár-kát u₄-mu*	7. […] later day
8. […] *is-sa-kip*	8. […] will be overthrown
9. […*i*]*g-gam-mar*	9. […] will be annihilated
10. […*e-mu*(?)]-*qu* ^kur*Aš-šur*^ki	10. […] [*arm*]*y* of Assyria
11. […] ŠEŠ(?) KÙ GA *ú*	11. […] … and
12. […] x ZI-*am-ma*	12. […] will rise up and
13. […] TIN.TIR^ki ZI -*am-ma*	13. […] Babylon, will rise up and
14. […] *is-sa-ak-ki-pi*	14. […] will be overthrown
15. […]-*nu-tu* ÍL-*ma*	15. […] … he will bear
16. […] x GIN-*ma*	16. […] … *he will go* and
17. […] *i-ṣab-bat*	17. […] he will seize
18. […] *i-naq-qar*	18. […] he will demolish
19. […] *i-sa-am-ma-ak*	19. […] he will cover
20. […*šillatum*(?) *ka-bit*(?)]-*tum* TIN.TIR^ki *ú-še-reb*	20. [… extens]ive [*booty*] he will bring to Babylon.
21. […*Esagil*(?)] *ù é-zi-da*	21. […*Esagil*] and Ezida
22. […] *ú-za-a-an*	22. […] he will adorn
23. […] É.GAL E^ki DÙ-*uš*	23. […] he will build the palace of Babylon
24. […] x EN.LÍL^ki *a-na* E^ki	24. […] … Nippur to Babylon
25. [*N* MU.A]N.NA^meš LUGAL-*ú-tu* DÙ-*uš*	25. [… for N yea]rs he will exercise kingship

Column II	Column II
Lacuna	Lacuna

1. x […]	1. … […]
2. *a-a*-[…]	2. … […]
3. TA x […]	3. … […]
4. *i-te-lu* x […]	4. will go up … […]
5. *i-sa-ak-kip* x […]	5. will overthrow … […]
6. 3ᵗᵃ MU.AN.NAᵐᵉˢ [*šarrūtu ippuš*]	6. For three years [he will exercise kingship]
7. *pal-lu-uk-ku ù-k*[*a-an* …]	7. Borders *he will f*[*ix*…]
8. *a-na* UNᵐᵉˢ-*šú ú-k*[*a*(?)-…]	8. For his people he will […]
9. EGIR-*šu* DUMU-*šu* {*ina*} AŠ.TE *u*[*š-ša-ab*(?) (…)]	9. After him, his son will *s*[*it*] on the throne […]
10. *ul i*-(erasure) [*bêl*(?) *māta*(?)]	10. He will not [*be master of the land*]
11. E₁₁-*a* ˡᵘNUN *ḫa-a*[*m-ma-'u* (…)]	11. A re[bel] prince will arise […]
12. BAL-*e ḫar-ra-an*ᵏ[ⁱ …]	12. The dynasty of Harran [*he will establish*]
13. 17ᵗᵃ MU.[A]N.NAᵐᵉ[ˢ *šarrūtu ippuš*]	13. [He will exercise kingship] for 17 year[s].
14. UGU KUR *i-dan-nin-ma* EZEN *é*(?)-*sa*[*g*(?)-*íl*(?) …]	14. He will oppress the land and the *festival* of *Esa*[*gil he will cancel*]
15. BÀD ina Eᵏⁱ (erasure) x […]	15. A fortress in Babylon … […]
16. ḪUL-*tì a-na* ᵏᵘʳURIᵏⁱ *ú-ṣa-am-m*[*ar*]	16. He will plot evil against Akkad
17. LUGAL ᵏᵘʳELAM.MAᵏⁱ *i-te-eb* ᵍⁱˢGIDRI x x […]	17. A King of Elam will arise; the scep-ter … […]
18. *ina* AŠ.TE-*šu i-de-ek-ke-šu-ma* ([…])	18. He will remove him from his throne and ([…])
19. AŠ.TE DAB *u* LUGAL *šá* {*ina*} AŠ.TE ZI-⌜*ú*⌝	19. He will seize the throne and the king whom he raised from the throne
20. LUGAL ᵏᵘʳELAM.MAᵏⁱ *a-šar-šú ú-nak-k*[*a-ar* (…)]	20. the king of Elam will chan[ge] his place ([…]).
21. *ina* KUR *šá-nam-ma ú-še-šeb-šú* ([…])	21 He will settle him in another land ([…])
22. LUGAL *šu-ú* UGU KUR *i-dan-nin-m*[*a* (…)]	22. That king will overpower the land an[d …]
23. KUR.KURᵐᵉˢ *ka-la-ši-na bil-tum* x […]	23. All of the lands [*will bring*] tribute …
24. *i-na* BAL-*e-šu* ᵏᵘʳURIᵏⁱ *šub-tum ni-i*[*ḫ-tum la*(?) *uššab*]	24. During his reign, Akkad will [*not* dwell] peaceably.

Column III

1. […] x x […]
2. x-[b]a/[m]a-tum LUGAL^meš x […]
3. šá a-bi-šú az(?)-[…]
4. ⌈2⌉^ta MU.AN.NA^meš [šarrūtu ippuš]

5. LUGAL šá-a-šú ^lúša-re-š[i …]
6. ⌈a⌉-a-um-ma ^lúNUN-⌈ú⌉ […]
7. ⌈ZI⌉-am-ma A[Š.TE iṣṣabat]
8. 5 MU.AN.NA^meš LUGAL-[ú-tu ippuš]
9. ^lúERIM^meš ^kurḫa-ni-i x […]
10. ZI^meš x x x x x […]
11. ⌈^lúERIM^meš⌉-šú […]
12. [ḫ]u-bu-ut-su i-ḫab-ba-t[ú šillatsu]

13. i-šal-la-lu ár-ka-nu ^lúER[IM^meš-šú]

14. ú-kaṣ-ṣar-ma ^gišTUKUL^meš-šú Í[L]

15. ^den-lil ^dUTU u ^d[Marduk(?)]
16. DA ^lúERIM^meš-šú GIN[^meš-ma]
17. su-kup-tu ^lúERIM^meš ḫa-ni-i ⌈i⌉-[šak-ka-an]
18. šil-lat-su ka-bit-tum i-šal-l[a-al-ma]

19. a-na E.GA-šú ú-[še-reb(?)]
20. ^lúUN^meš šá lum-nu i-[mu-ru(?)]

21. dum-qa [immarū(?)]
22. lìb-bi KUR [iṭâb(?)]
23. za-ku-tú […]
Lacuna

Column III

1. […] … […]
2. … kings … […]
3. which his father … […]
4. [He will exercise kingship] for two years.
5. A eunu[ch *will kill*] that king
6. Any prince [*will arise*]
7. Will arise and [seize the] th[rone]
8. [He will exercise] king[ship] for ve years.
9. The army of the Hanaean […]
10. will attack … […]
11. his army […]
12. [Th]ey will plunder his [p]roperty, [his booty]
13. they will carry off. Afterwards, [his] arm[y]
14. he will array; [he will ra]ise his weapons.
15. Enlil, Šamaš, and [*Marduk*]
16. will walk beside his army.
17. He [*will e ect*] the defeat of the Hanaean's army.
18. He will car[ry] away his extensive booty [and]
19. he [will bring] it to his palace.
20. The people who [*had experienced*] misfortune
21. [*will experience*] well-being.
22. The mood of the land [*will be good.*]
23. Tax exemption […]
Lacuna

Column IV

Lacuna
1. […] x x
2. [x^ta MU.AN.NA^meš šarrūtu (?)] DÙ-uš

3. […] ú-dal-la-lu₄
4. […]-am-ma KUR DAB-bat
5. […]
6. […] i-bé-el-lu
7. […] DINGIR^meš GAL^meš

Column IV

Lacuna
1. […] …
2. [*For N years*] he will exercise [*king-ship*]

3. […] *he will oppress*
4. […] … and he will seize the land
5. […]
6. […] *they will rule*
7. [… *secret*] of the great gods

8. [… *la mu-du*]-*ú la tu-kal-lam*

8. [*you may show it to the initiated, but to the uninitiat*]*ed* you may not show (it).

9. [… E]N KUR.KUR

9. [*It is a secret of Marduk,* lo]rd of the lands.

---

10. […] x 1-*en ṭup-pi*
11. […] *mun-nab-tum*
12. […] *šá-ṭir* IGI.TAB
13. […] x GAR-an
14. […] x
Lacuna

10. […]   rst, tablet
11. […] Munnabtum
12. […] written, collated
13. […] …
14. […] …
Lacuna

Textual Notes

Column I

8–9   It is possible that there is a dividing line between these two lines of text.

21   Ezida is the name of the temple of Nabu in Borsippa.

Column II

There is apparently a haplography in this line; the sign AŠ must be reckoned twice, once as *ina*, once for AŠ.TE.

Column IV

The line numbering in the text above follows that of Grayson, *BHLT*. Note, however, that van der Speck numbers the lines of this column differently, assuming six missing lines. Thus my line 1 is van der Speck's line 7.[56]

6   The rendering "they will rule" seems most plausible; while suggestive, it is, frustratingly, in an entirely broken context. The word could also be taken as "it will be extinguished," from the verb *belû*. Finally, although less likely, there is the possibility that a singular verb is here written with   nal vowel (compare Uruk Prophecy r. 11, where context demands a verb with   nal –u be taken as singular).

7–9   The reconstruction follows that of Grayson, *BHLT*.[57]

11   Munnabtum is a personal name; it may be the name of the copyist, the copyist's patronymic, the owner of the tablet, etc. As van

56. R. J. van der Speck, "Darius III, Alexander the Great and Babylonian Scholarship," in *A Persian Perspective: Essays in Memory of Heleen Sancisi-Weerenburg* (ed. Wouter Kenkelman and Amélie Kuhrt; Achaemenid History 13; Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2003), 289–346; here 314–15.

57. On the secrecy colophon, see R. Borger, "Geheimwissen," *RLA* 3.188–91. On secrecy in Akkadian literature generally, see Lenzi, *Secrecy and the Gods*.

der Speck notes, however, it is also the name of an astrologer of the Neo-Assyrian period; the use of the name here may amount to a pseudepigraphical attribution to a known scholarly gure writing prior to the fall of the Neo-Assyrian empire.[58]

Discussion

State of the Text

What survives of the Dynastic Prophecy is two relatively well-preserved columns, and two quite poorly preserved columns. In his edition of the text, Grayson stated his belief that the entirety of the original composition was most likely only four columns.[59] Lambert has subsequently challenged this on grounds of content, arguing for a six-column manuscript of which hypothetical columns *3 and *4 are missing, leaving columns *1 and *2, *5 and *6, which Grayson numbers I–IV.[60] Whether there was once an account of the Achaemenid kings from Darius I to Artaxerxes III in Lambert's putative columns *3 and *4 is hard to determine, although it certainly seems plausible; the position has been endorsed, perhaps most notably, by van der Speck.[61] The truth of the matter is that if two additional columns in the middle of the text did exist at one time, it is entirely possible, perhaps even likely, that they would not greatly in uence our interpretation of the text's function and purpose.

Historical References

There is wide agreement on the identity of many of the historical allusions in the Dynastic Prophecy: the reigns of Neo-Assyrian kings (column I, almost entirely reconstructed based on the content of the subsequent columns); the reigns of Neo-Babylonian kings (II 1–10); the empire's downfall under the reign of Nabonidus (II 11–16); the institution of Achaemenid rule under Cyrus (II 17–25); Achaemenid succession intrigues (III 1–8); the invasion of Alexander the Great (III 9–23); and nally what would appear to be predictions concerning the reigns of Alexander's successors

58. R. J. van der Speck, "Darius III, Alexander the Great and Babylonian Scholarship," 318.

59. According to Grayson (*BHLT*, 27), the curvature of the tablet is such that it is impossible to determine just how much may have broken off, but he supposes it likely that the entire text originally consisted of four columns, each of which is preserved in part.

60. W. G. Lambert, *Background*, 13; see also Susan Sherwin-White, "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. A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin-White; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), 1–31; here 11.

61. R. J. van der Speck, "Darius III, Alexander the Great and Babylonian Scholarship," 311–12.

in IV 1–6, although the column is fragmentary in the extreme. By far the easiest allusion to identify comes in II 11–16, where the king is quite obviously Nabonidus. He can be so identified because: (1) he is called a rebel, in accordance with the hostile attitude toward him shown by the clergy of Babylon; (2) he ruled for seventeen years; (3) Nabonidus was known for his patronage of the the cult of Sin in Ḥarran, mentioned here; (4) he is portrayed as hostile to his own land. This comports perfectly with both the historical reports and hostile texts directed toward Nabonidus that have survived.[62] The reign following is therefore that of Cyrus the Great.

Difficulty and scholarly disagreement begin to arise in column III. Grayson has convincingly interpreted the opening eight lines of column III as referring to the assassination of the Persian king Arses by the eunuch general Bagoas, who then placed Darius III on the throne in 336 b.c.e. This leads to the appearance in line 9 of Alexander's forces, called here the "army of the Hanaeans" ($^{lú}ummāni^{meš\ kur}ha$-ni-i).[63] Alexander the Great is called "King of the Haneans" in an astronomical text dated to 329 b.c.e., making fairly certain his identification with the Hanaean here.[64] In the present text, then, the Hanaean Alexander proceeds to defeat Darius III in lines 11–13 of column III.

It seems clear that III 11–13 refer to a victory of Alexander over the Persians; the most famous candidates for this allusion are the battles at the Granicus (334 b.c.e.), Issus (333), and of course Gaugamela (331). The most remarkable element of the passage follows: according to lines 13–17, the defeated Persian king arrays his army and then defeats the Macedonians. The bald inaccuracy of this account is all the more striking in the face of the historically accurate, and occasionally quite specific, accounts contained earlier, most notably the detailed references to the reign of Nabonidus. The text is further complicated by the fact that, following this account, the first six preserved lines of the final, fourth column—after which the composition proper ends—are divided into three sections by two horizontal lines drawn across the column width. Judging by the use of such dividing lines in this and the other exemplars of Akkadian *ex eventu* texts, this would seem to indicate three more significant reigns. Caution should, however, be urged in the interpretation of these six lines, as only fifteen cuneiform

62. On the reign of Nabonidus, see P.-A. Beaulieu, *The Reign of Nabonidus, King of Babylon, 556–539 B.C.* (YNER 10; New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989).

63. The term is a deliberate archaism, paralleling reference to the Persians by the term "Elamite." In the second millennium, the term *ḫanû* connoted a class of soldier, e.g., at Mari (*CAD* Ḫ, *ḫanû*, 82). In the Hellenistic period, there is an apparent identification of the land of the Ḫanû with Thrace (Grayson, *ABC*, 256).

64. The left edge of the tablet in question gives the following date: MU.8.KAM ^{I}*A-le[k-sa-a]n-dar-ri-is* LUGAL *šá* TA *mat Ḫa-ni-i* (ed. A. J. Sachs and H. Hunger; *Astronomical Diaries and Related Texts from Babylonia*, vol. 1 [Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1988], text 328).

signs are at all legible. Further, as we have seen, the use of dividing lines to separate reigns is consistent neither in this text nor in the other texts surveyed above. Nonetheless, Grayson speculates that the three sections in column IV 1–6 refer to the reigns of Philip Arrhidaeus, Alexander IV, and Seleucus I, respectively.[65] Sherwin-White prefers to see in the   rst section the reign of Darius III (IV 1–2), followed by Philip Arrhidaeus and Alexander IV in the second section (IV 3), and   nally Antigonus.[66]

An altogether different interpretation of the text has been offered by R. J. van der Speck, who in fact offers two possible interpretations without choosing de nitively between them. The   rst interpretation involves denying that the text contains a reference to the defeat of Alexander's troops at all, and in fact celebrates the victory of Alexander over Darius III. Van der Speck offers   ve reasons for reading the text this way: (1) historically, a defeat of Alexander simply did not happen; (2) the text states that Darius's reign ends after   ve years; (3) the possessive pronoun of the phrase "his extensive booty" (III 18) most likely refers to the last named king, that is, Darius; (4) the phrase "to his palace" in III 19 suggests Alexander, since the palace treasury of Darius III would be at Susa, not in Babylon; and (5) the "worldview of the author" viewed Darius III negatively.[67] All these objections, however, can be easily countered.

Taking van der Speck's points in reverse order, there is no   rm ground on which to decide what the worldview of the author of the Dynastic Prophecy might be, save what the Dynastic Prophecy says. It is certainly correct, as van der Speck argues, that we possess texts that portended disaster for Darius III; that does not mean that all scholars and scribes during his reign awaited the coming of Macedonian armies with open arms. The claim that the reference to taking booty to a palace   ts Alexander better than Darius is subjective; the text certainly does not state *where* the palace in question is. Rather, the removal of booty to the king's palace should be viewed simply as a stereotypical action of a conquering king. Van der Speck's third claim, that "his booty" should be seen as the booty removed from Darius III as the last-mentioned king is, at best, suggestive and not conclusive. Complicating matters is the fact that signi cant portions of the text in III 9–11 are broken or otherwise illegible, and Darius therefore is not necessarily the protagonist most recently mentioned by the text. Van der Speck's second point is potentially the strongest; however, it is not decisive, and while the text explicitly states, upon Darius III's accession, that he will reign for   ve years, it does not, *pace* van der Speck, state explicitly that his rule will end once and for all after   ve years. Finally, the

---

65. Grayson, *BHLT*, 27; Sherwin-White, "Seleucid Babylonia," 14.

66. Sherwin-White, "Seleucid Babylonia," 14. On the rule of Antigonus in native Babylonian perspective, see the so-called *Chronicle of the Diadochi* in Grayson, *ABC*, text 10.

67. Van der Speck, "Darius III, Alexander the Great and Babylonian Scholarship," 327.

fact that a historical review cast as a prediction might contain references to events that never transpired is no surprise at all.

More problematic for this interpretation is that van der Speck has no convincing way to explain away the clear reference to the overthrow of the Hanaean army, and simply suggests a scribal error.[68] However, van der Speck's second interpretation falls very nearly in line with the interpretation offered here: namely, that it is at this point in the *ex eventu* prediction that the text transitions from recitation of past events to an actual attempt to predict the future.[69]

Any understanding of the text that posits the inclusion of reigns by Alexander's successors serves to further problematize the reference to Alexander's defeat. As Grayson states, "It is extremely unlikely that the 'prophet' would deliberately falsify the outcome and aftermath of such a famous and well-known battle" as Gaugamela.[70] However, he proffers no explanation as to why the text does indeed contain such a reference. The lack of an explanation has in part occasioned a vastly different interpretation of the text by Mark Geller.[71] Geller maintains that the lines in question deal not with Darius and Alexander but rather with the war between Antigonus and Seleucus circa 310–307. There are two main objections to this reading, for which Geller proposes not wholly satisfying answers. First, if Geller is right, then the text would proceed from a description of Darius III directly to the wars of the Diadochoi. The implementation of Greek rule under Alexander would receive no mention whatsoever. Despite Geller's protestations to the contrary, this would be quite strange. Second, again countering Geller's protestations, the reference to Antigonus's army as the army of the Hanaean makes little sense. True, it is perfectly reasonable that a late-fourth- or early-third-century Babylonian text would refer to Alexander's successors, including Antigonus, as *Ḫanû*. However, the designation is employed in the context of the Dynastic Prophecy as a term of distinction, by which a new character is introduced. Seleucus would be no less *Ḫanû* than Antigonus—and the use of this epithet only makes sense if the other protagonist cannot be identi ed as *Ḫanû*. This leads us back to Darius III. Finally, it must be noted that the main reason for positing the exclusion of Alexander from this text is that, as Geller quite rightly notes, no one has offered an adequate explanation of how or why this text would relate the defeat of Alexander at the hands of Darius.

The obvious solution is that the author of the Dynastic Prophecy

68. Van der Speck, "Darius III," 329–30.
69. Van der Speck, "Darius III," 332–35.
70. Grayson, *BHLT*, 26.
71. Geller, "Astronomical Diaries," 5–7. Geller's view has been subsequently endorsed by Matthew Stolper, "Mesopotamia, 482–330 B.C.," in *Cambridge Ancient History* (2d ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 4.234–60; see especially 4.241 n. 24.

is here making an attempt at an authentic prediction—one that did not come true.[72] This possibility has in fact been considered and summarily dismissed by several commentators based on their various theories of the text's purpose;[73] only van der Speck seems to consider this a plausible solution. Grayson, for one, believes it is possible to detect a good-bad-good-bad pattern for the founder of each dynasty.[74] From this he extrapolates that the last reign of column IV, which he identi es as that of Seleucus I, is categorized as bad. Therefore, he posits, the text functions as anti-Seleucid propaganda; the problematic account of Darius's victory over Alexander is bizarre but inconsequential for the purpose toward which the Dynastic Prophecy was composed. Helmer Ringgren has offered a very similar conclusion, suggesting that the text was composed as a critique of the Seleucids.[75] A slightly different conclusion is reached by Sherwin-White, who seems to think that the text culminates with a negative assessment of the "reign" of Antigonus, and in fact amounts to pro-Seleucus I propaganda.[76] She further claims that the inclusion of historical inaccuracies should not occasion much surprise, and invokes a passage from 2 Maccabees, treating the Dynastic Prophecy as if it were simply a chronographic text, and not framed as a mantic work.[77]

---

72. Thus Lambert: "If the text ended at that point one would say that it was composed after Alexander's rst defeat of the Persians at Granicus to encourage the Babylonians to help Darius against the invader. However, the text continues with more reigns, though too broken to specify" (*Background*, 13).

73. E.g., Lambert, *Background*, 13; Sherwin-White, "Seleucid Babylonia," 11.

74. Grayson, *BHLT*, 17. This idea is highly speculative (as Grayson himself admits), and highly problematic. For one thing, the scribal use of dividing lines suggests against dividing the "dynasties" in accordance with modern historiographic convention. Most notable is the fact that the reign of Nabonidus (II 11–16) is isolated from what precedes and follows by dividing lines, and is identi ed as an independent dynasty, "the dynasty of Harran" (*palê ḫarran*[ki], line 12). Additionally, if the text was originally six columns in length, it would further upset Grayson's dynasty-per-column scheme. For a general critique of the categorization of reigns as good and bad in the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts, see Biggs, "Babylonian Prophecies," 2–3.

75. Ringgren, "Akkadian Apocalypses," 383.

76. Sherwin-White, "Seleucid Babylonia," 11, 14. Cf. Pierre Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire* (trans. Peter T. Daniels; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2002), 864.

77. An entirely unconvincing appeal is made to 2 Macc 13:9–24 as evidence of "the transformation of defeats into victories"; and generally, she claims that "the function of texts such as these is not 'objective' history" (Sherwin-White, "Seleucid Babylonia," 11). The same objection appears almost verbatim, here with a reference to 2 Macc 11:1–15, in Susan Sherwin-White and Amélie Kuhrt, *From Samarkhand to Sardis: A New Approach to the Seleucid Empire* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 8–9. However, it must be stressed that in no way could one ever suggest that 2 Maccabees is a "text such as" the Akkadian *vaticinium ex eventu* texts. No, the Dynastic Prophecy is not written according to contemporary historiographic standards; however, it does function as a piece of political propaganda in the form of a mantic text, one in which events of the past are recited. If the audience cannot iden-

In the case of our present problem, two texts which consist of *vaticinia ex eventu* and which contain historically inaccurate predictions may profitably be brought to bear on the problem of Darius's victory. These are Daniel 10–12 and *Sibylline Oracles* 4:40–192. While these will be treated in detail in Chapters 4 and 6, respectively, a brief overview of the Danielic and sibylline passages is appropriate here for elucidating the use of *vaticinium ex eventu* in the present context.

The book of Daniel has, of course, been widely cited by those writing on the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts, invoked as a parallel case of *vaticinium ex eventu*.[78] To my knowledge, however, none has cited the nal prediction of Dan 12:1–12 (especially vv. 11 and 12) in regard to the Dynastic Prophecy III 13–23. Chapters 10–12 of Daniel constitute a lengthy nal apocalyptic vision, with an extended historical review (in the guise of prediction) covering the reigns of kings from the Persian era through the career of Antiochus IV Epiphanes in 11:2b–12:4. Antiochus IV is, of course, the wicked foreign king *par excellence* in much Judean literature of the Hellenistic era. Daniel 11:30–35 refers to his oppression of Judea, in particular his interruption of the cult (v. 31). The same offense of Antiochus IV is likewise recorded as a prediction in the vision of Dan 8:9–11. In both cases, the apocalyptist is concerned with predicting—legitimately—the downfall of the foreign oppressor.[79] The apocalyptist who authored Dan 12:11 is concerned speci -

tify as accurate the *ex eventu* predictions made, the text fails in its function as propaganda. Sherwin-White has failed to shed any light on the issue of why the Dynastic Prophecy might report something that would certainly be identi ed by the audience as inaccurate—thus undermining the text's political propagandistic function.

78. E.g., Grayson, *BHLT*, 20–21; Lambert, *Background*, 13–17; J.-G. Heintz, "Note sur les origines de l'apocalyptique judaïque, à la lumière des 'Prophéties akkadiennes,'" in *L'Apocalyptique* (ed. M. Philonenko and M. Simon; Paris: Librarie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1977), 83; Longman, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography*, 188–89; Helge Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man* (WMANT 61; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988), 472–74, 488–90; G. F. Hasel, "The Four World Empires of Daniel 2 against Its Near Eastern Environment," *JSOT* 12 (1979): 17–30; and E. C. Lucas, "Daniel: Resolving the Enigma," *VT* 50 (2000): 66–80. Note also the comparison to a passage from *Sibylline Oracles* 3 in Grayson, *BHLT*, 17–19.

79. In Dan 8:14 an angelic intermediary is overheard proclaiming that the disruption of the cult will last "for two thousand three hundred evenings and mornings." The reference is actually to the number of *tamîd* offerings (twice daily) that will be missed. This yields a prediction that the cult will be restored after 1,150 days. See John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 336. Given that this differs from the length of time before the restoration of the cult reported in 1 Macc 4:52–54, it is quite likely that this constitutes a legitimate attempt at predicting restoration at the end of a series of *ex eventu* predictions. In contrast to the predictions in Daniel 12, the prediction here seems to involve the amount of time that will elapse before the proper functioning of the cult resumes, not to the period of the end time and the resurrection of the righteous. All of these likely are interpretations of the "three and a half years" of Dan 7:25 (repeated in 12:7, and in 9:27 as a "half week" of years).

cally with offering the date of the onset of the eschaton and resurrection of the righteous dead—that is, the end of days (קץ ימים)—which will once and for all end foreign domination. Verse 11 tells the reader in no uncertain terms how long it will be until this happens: "From the time when the continual offering is taken away and the desolating abomination is set up is one thousand two hundred and ninety days." The failure of this prediction was certainly not lost on the tradents responsible for the book of Daniel. Hence we read in 12:12, "Blessed is the one who waits and attains to the thousand three hundred and thirty- ve days." Clearly what we have here is a real prediction of 1290, days which, upon its failure, was emended by adding 45 days, yielding a prediction of 1335, days.[80] The original attempt at prediction has been left in the text, despite not coming to fruition; a further prediction has been tacked on as a corrective.

This phenomenon appears again in Book 4 of the *Sibylline Oracles*.[81] It is widely recognized that lines 49–101 of this work constitute an older anti-Macedonian oracle, not necessarily Judean in origin. It was subsequently reworked by a Judean redactor of the late rst century c.e., who has transformed the work into an eschatological judgment against Rome.[82] The author of the anti-Macedonian passage has employed two distinct frameworks for ordering this *ex eventu* prediction of history. On the one hand, the text schematizes history according to four world-dominating kingdoms;[83] on the other hand, this has been wedded to a schema of ten generations of world history.[84] According to this text, world history culminates in the fourth kingdom, which arises in the tenth generation, after which the eschaton ensues (4:171–92). Our passage identi es the Persians as reigning in the ninth (penultimate) generation.[85] This leads the reader to conclude that the fourth kingdom, Macedonia, must be that of the tenth generation. However, to a rst-century Judean living after the

---

80. This was already recognized by Hermann Gunkel in the nineteenth century (*Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit: Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen 1 und Ap Joh 12* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1895], 269). Cf. James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (ICC; Edinburgh: Clark, 1927), 477; Collins, *Daniel*, 400–401.

81. See Chapter 6 for a fuller discussion of *Sibylline Oracles* 4.

82. See David Flusser, "The Four Empires in the Fourth Sibyl and in the Book of Daniel," *IOS* 2 (1972): 148–75. Cf. John J. Collins, "The Sibylline Oracles" *OTP* 1.381.

83. Cf. Daniel 2, 7; the Qumran text 4QFour Kingdoms (4Q547); and the rst chapter of the Zoroastrian composition *Zand- Vohuman Yasn*.

84. Cf. the Apocalypse of Weeks in 1 Enoch; 11QMelchizedek; and *Sibylline Oracles* 1, discussed below in Chapters 4, 5, and 6, respectively. See Flusser, "Four Empires," on both these schematizations of history.

85. The Persians rule for one generation (line 66). Before them, the Assyrians rule for six generations (line 50), then the Medes for two generations (line 55). This tallies to nine generations. Line 47 speci es that the end-time occurs during the tenth and nal generation. See Chapter 6.

Roman destruction of Jerusalem in 70 c.e., the Macedonians could hardly be considered the last oppressors prior to Jerusalem's glorious restoration. Therefore, the redactor clumsily ignores the ten-generation scheme of the original oracle and simply appends a lengthy section on Rome, a fth kingdom.[86] According to the book as we have it, the Macedonians herald the onset of the eschaton, and yet, paradoxically, it is not until after the Roman destruction of Jerusalem that the end-time comes. The situation is precisely analogous to what we have seen in the Dynastic Prophecy: an oracle of liberation from foreign oppression has been incorporated into a nal work that knows that the predicted liberation never took place. Hence, in *Sibylline Oracles* 4, just as in the Dynastic Prophecy, a series of *vaticinia ex eventu* culminating in an actual but failed prediction has been later expanded so that the text now names successive foreign adversaries.

Circumstances of Composition

There is no indication that the text once contained an extensive rst-person narrative framework analogous to what one nds in the Marduk and Shulgi prophecies. Therefore, little can be said about the implied authorship. For the date of composition and the temporal/social location of the text's actual authorship, see below.

Audience and Function

If the above interpretation is correct, then we are once again dealing with a piece of political propaganda; by casting the propaganda as a prediction of the future, the propagandist seals his position with the approval of the gods, those who control the fate of humankind. If the audience believes that the text is authentically old, then they are led to conclude that the "history" in the text was legitimately predicted, assuring them of the reliability of all the predictions in the text. Now, this is not to say that the content of the *ex eventu* predictions is necessarily "historically reliable" by modern criteria; that is by no means to be assumed. However, what must be assumed is that the author of such a propagandistic work included events that—whether they happened or not—are recognizable and pre-sumed veri ed by the intended audience of the text. Is it reasonable to suppose that any Mesopotamian audience after 330 could recognize as accurate the claim that the Persian Great King had successfully repulsed the Macedonian onslaught?

The main objection against viewing Darius's victory over Alexander as a legitimate attempt at prediction has been the fact that the composition continues beyond this point, and seems to narrate later reigns. However,

---

86. Flusser ("Four Empires," 157–59) makes the interesting observation that even in later Judean texts that employ a historical scheme with Rome as the last oppressive kingdom prior to Jerusalem's restoration, the scheme is always one of four kingdoms, not ve.

as we have seen, both Daniel 12 and *Sibylline Oracles* 4 contain a legiti-mate prediction that failed but which nonetheless was preserved. The tra-dents of the original oracles simply revised their predictions, adding to the text rather than rewriting it. The entire purpose of employing *vaticinia ex eventu* is that the technique instills confidence in the predictive powers of a given text. The only reasonable explanation for the inclusion of the account of Alexander's defeat is that it was the original conclusion to a text that sought to gain support for Darius—likely composed on the heels of Alexander's victories at the Granicus or Issus.[87] With the surrender of Babylon by the satrap Mazaios and the death of Darius in 330 the original prediction had obviously failed. Some Babylonian scribe or school, instead of disregarding the Dynastic Prophecy, obviously felt the text important enough to preserve—and what is more, to update. This in turn explains the illogical (probable) appearance of the Diadochoi (col. IV) in a text cel-ebrating the defeat of Macedon.

Notes on the Ideology of the Akkadian *Ex Eventu* Texts

Considerations of form and genre will be undertaken in greater detail in the next chapter; however, at this point it is useful to reflect, provision-ally, on certain aspects of the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts, particularly the notions of history, kingship, and divination that lie in the background of these compositions.

Time

While it was possible to speak in earlier generations of people in the ancient world possessing a cyclical notion of time,[88] to distinguish them from the linear and teleological understanding of time evinced in the

---

87. See Amélie Kuhrt, "Survey of Written Sources Available for the History of Baby-lonia under the Later Achaemenids," in *Achaemenid History I: Sources, Structures and Synthe-ses* (ed. Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg; Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 1987), 147–57. Refraining from suggesting a date for the text, Kuhrt nonetheless wonders, "Could the text have been composed before Gaugamela in order to rally Babylonian sup-port for the Achaemenids and thus be shifting into the realm of genuine prophecy at this point?" (155). A case for a post-Gaugamela date of the text is argued in Gabriele Marasco, "La 'Profezia Dinastica,'" *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 15, no. 2 (1985): 529–37; see especially 533.

88. As championed, e.g., by Hallo, "Akkadian Apocalypses," and, much more recently, by Brent Strawn in the introduction to his translation of the Marduk Prophecy in Mark Cha-valas, ed., *The Ancient Near East: Historical Sources in Translation* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006), 169.

Judeo-Christian tradition, such chauvinistic generalities now carry little weight. There is nothing in the ve Akkadian texts surveyed in this chapter that would imply anything other than a linear understanding of time and history. What is more, the very nature of *ex eventu* prediction of the type found in these works presupposes a highly deterministic or fatalistic notion of historical events. The logic that pins such historical reviews together is that the events of the past happened in an unalterable sequence; casting them as predictions per force implies that this sequence is determined before the events themselves happen. How deeply the scribes responsible for these texts ruminated on this implication is impossible to say. However, as these texts have it, the progression of time is neither cyclic nor schematic in any obvious ways. A king may be good or bad, disasters may happen or the land may be at peace; but these do not occur in any xed pattern. The closest one comes to a schematic presentation of the past is in the Dynastic Prophecy; however, even there it seems that the circumstances and even number of dynasties are arbitrary and re ect the chronographic traditions available to the scribe.

Furthermore, these texts, while heavily steeped in native mantic traditions, particularly the style and language of omen compendia, exhibit a distinct form of divination. The texts lack the conditionality of the omen form; the predictive propositions of these texts are presented as immutably certain, not in anyway contingent (e.g., on the observation of the appropriate sign). Since the events predicted are immutable, so too then do the texts differ from omens in that an omen portending ill could be averted by certain ritual acts. The relationship between the *ex eventu* texts and Mesopotamian omina, among other literary forms, is pursued in greater detail in the next chapter. However, this formal distinction points to a fundamental difference in the ways that the two types of texts conceive of the progression of human events: for the *ex eventu* texts, wherein each prediction is contingent on the actualization of the previous one, history marches forward on a divinely ordained and presumably immutable path.

Kingship

In the presentation of the o ce of kingship, all ve texts seem to be consistently conservative; that is, they appear to re ect traditional and conservative Mesopotamian notions of kingship.[89] In an earlier period, the document known as the Sumerian King List exerted a powerful in u-

_____

89. This is not by any means to suggest that notions of kingship did not display variation and undergo change throughout Mesopotamian history; however, certain elements tended to be conserved through the centuries. See J. N. Postgate, *Early Mesopotamia: Society*

ence on normative notions of rule in Mesopotamia.[90] In that text, kingship exists as a boon given to humankind by the gods. Furthermore, kingship is unique: it resides with one and only one king at a time. The Mesopotamian chronographic tradition recognizes as the seat of kingship only whatever city or state seems to have held hegemonic supremacy in a given period. If a king fails and his city is destroyed, kingship removes itself to another location. Again, this idea seems particularly consonant with the portrayal of royal power in the Dynastic Prophecy; there is no competition, no split- ting of hegemony. One dynasty arises and assumes the position of the dynasty previous to it; power cannot be shared. While less obvious in the other *ex eventu* compositions, this notion likely lies behind the presenta- tion in these texts of king ruling after king in an unbroken string, always one succeeding another, never coeval.

Scribal Discourses Combined

Finally, one should take note of the manner in which these texts bring together types of discourse that are normally kept separate in ancient Mesopotamian compositions: historiography and mantic practice are inti- mately intertwined in these texts, in a manner not seen in other works. While it is true that there are a small number of Mesopotamian omens that seem to make reference to events of the past (so-called historical omens), the situation in the *ex eventu* texts is fundamentally different. Here we are confronted not with a simple historical note of interest, but with a con- scious recitation of a progression of past events. These works are, in short, expressive of a type of historiography. What marks these texts as unique and distinct from other texts of the chronographic tradition in Akkadian and Sumerian is that they are simultaneously, and unambiguously, man- tic texts. They *predict*. To anticipate later portions of this study, it is in this creation of a new discourse partaking of both historiographic and mantic traditions that the Akkadian works are most like the Judean compositions to which they have often been compared.

---

and Economy at the Dawn of History (London: Routledge, 1992), 22–50; and idem, "Royal Ideol- ogy and State Administration in Sumer and Akkad," *CANE* 1.395–411.

90. On the ideology of the Sumerian King List, see especially Piotr Michalowski, "His- tory as Charter: Some Observations on the Sumerian King List," *JAOS* 103 (1983): 237–48;

3

The Genre Problem: Ancient Contexts and Modern Categories

A very large portion of the scholarly energies expended on the analysis of the texts discussed in Chapter 2 has been devoted to determining precisely how best to categorize them. The present chapter evaluates various proposals on how to categorize the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts within the spectrum of ancient Mesopotamian literature. Since several prominent scholars have proposed different literary genres as appropriate ways of situating the texts to aid scholarly analyses, this chapter seeks first, to discuss briefly the problem of what precisely we mean when we speak about genre; second, to survey those forms of Akkadian literature to which the *ex eventu* texts bear significant literary similarity; and third, to assess to what, if any, literary genre(s) it might be useful to understand these works as belonging.

Genre and the Categorization of Texts

As the historian of religion Jonathan Z. Smith has emphasized in his work, in many ways the most fundamental activity of scholarship is categorization.[1] Data is accumulated, sifted, and organized; the very act of organization is not only the result of a scholar's conclusions regarding a datum but to a very large degree the expression of those conclusions as well. This is true not only of texts and material artifacts but of historical phenomena as well. For example, Smith identifies as religio-historical taxa "Hellenistic Judaism," "apocalypticism," etc.[2] That is, complexes of socio-cultural realia of a certain temporal and spatial locus are identified and labeled for the purpose of analysis, and thus taxa are created. Taxa

---

1. See, e.g., Smith's retrospective essay "When the Chips Are Down," in *Relating Religion: Essays in the Study of Religion* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 1–60, especially 19–25.

2. J. Z. Smith, *Map Is Not Territory*, viii-x.

are always both suprataxa and subtaxa; that is, they are both members of larger constructs and inclusive of smaller ones. Thus, "Hellenistic Judaism" may be subsumed under "Judaism," as "apocalypticism" may (in dealing with a specific incarnation) be subsumed under "Hellenistic Judaism." However, this "two-dimensional" representation of relationships must be recognized for what it is: a convenience of presentation.

In the case of the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts, the intimately related problems of category and label have proved particularly vexing. For four decades now, scholars have engaged the question of which of these texts belong grouped together and what that group should be called.[3] In arguing for one or another designation, scholars such as Grayson, Lambert, Hallo, Biggs, Ellis, Longman, and Nissinen have appealed to other works of literature. On the basis of similarities and dissimilarities, cases for one or another designation for this "type of literature" have been argued. In other words, a great deal of the scholarly effort expended on the study of the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts has focused on the question of literary kind, that is, *genre*. The idea is simple: if we can identify the genre to which these texts belong, we can better understand the individual texts. In the words of Thomas Pavel, "Genre helps us figure out the nature of a literary work because the person who wrote it and the culture for which that person labored used genre as a guideline for literary creation."[4]

Genre and the Study of Ancient Near Eastern Texts

The way in which genre traditionally has been addressed in the study of ancient Near Eastern literature has been quite uneven, and often largely uninformed by the study of genre as undertaken by literary critics and theorists; this obtains in the study of the *ex eventu* texts no less than other types of literature.[5] Without question, the greatest amount of work done on genre in ancient Near Eastern literature comes out of the study of the

---

3. In reality, this process has been going on far longer; as a convenience, I take the critique of the category "prophecy" (proposed in 1964 by Grayson and Lambert) by Hallo ("Akkadian Apocalypses," published in 1966) as the starting point of the modern debate over genre.

4. Thomas Pavel, "Literary Genres as Norms and Good Habits," *New Literary History* 34 (2003): 201–10; here 202.

5. The notable exception to this is Longman's study, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography*. See also the opening chapter on genre by Kenton Sparks, *Ancient Texts for the Study of the Hebrew Bible: A Guide to the Background Literature* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2005), 1–24. Additionally, much nuanced work on genre has been done on specific forms of biblical verse; see, e.g., F. W. Dobbs-Allsopp, *Weep, O Daughter of Zion: A Study of the City-Lament Genre in the Hebrew Bible* (BO 44; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1993); idem., "Darwinism, Genre Theory, and City Laments," *JAOS* 120 (2000): 625–30.

Hebrew Bible. Yet by no means is this to suggest that questions of genre are engaged in a methodologically consistent manner by biblicists. A survey of the secondary literature in this eld demonstrates that the term "genre" is used in a variety of ways; usually it is used to categorize texts based on a combination of characteristics of form and content. What might seem an exception to this is the methodology known in biblical studies as "form criticism." Form criticism was pioneered by the late-nineteenth-/early-twentieth-century scholar Hermann Gunkel. In particular, Gunkel concerned himself with determining the genre (*Gattung*) of text units from, primarily, two corpora. On the one hand, he applied some of the insights generated by the Grimm brothers' study of folklore to the patriarchal narratives in Genesis.[6] On the other hand, Gunkel also brought his form-critical focus to bear on the book of Psalms. It is especially in the study of Psalms that literary-critical biblical research would continue to re ect Gunkel's form-critical in uence throughout the twentieth century, thanks in no small part to the later work of Sigmund Mowinckel in the 1920s and 1930s.[7]

Two important aspects of biblical form criticism should be noted. First, form criticism deals almost uniformly in small units, and—with the exception of individual psalms—generally does not deal with literary works in their entirety. Form critics tend to deal with individual components of a biblical book as independent compositions, and seldom make genre claims based on the received form of a book as a whole. Second, biblical form criticism has never been entirely literary—by which I mean aesthetic—in its practice. It has been a tenet of form criticism since the work of Gunkel that each and every literary type corresponds to one particular socio-historical setting (a text's S*i   im Leben*).[8] Therefore, the form

---

6. See the introduction to his commentary on Genesis; it has been published as an individual volume in English translation as *The Stories of Genesis* (trans. John J. Scullion; Vallejo, CA: BIBAL, 1994). It is largely because of Gunkel's serious application of folklore theory to Genesis that the work of the Russian folklorist Vladimir Propp would later exert not insubstantial in uence on the study of biblical narrative, in particular after the appearance of the English translation of his *Morphology of the Folktale* (trans. Laurence Scott; Bloomington, IN: Research Center, Indiana University, 1958 [original Russian publication, 1928]).

7. Mowinckel's work was originally published in six volumes: *Psalmenstudien* (6 vols.; Kristiana: Jacob Dybwad, 1921–1924). It should be noted that Mowinckel did not agree entirely with the approach of Gunkel, and his work exhibits his own particular take on the form-critical enterprise. See also Albert-Louis Descamps, "Les genres littéraires du Psautier. Un état de la question," in *Le Psautier: Ses origines, ses problèmes littéraires, son in uence* (ed. Robert de Langhe; Orientalia et Biblica Lovaniensia 4; Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1962), 73–88; Pius Drijvers, *The Psalms: Their Structure and Meaning* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1965); Claus Westermann, *The Psalms: Structure, Content and Message* (trans. R. H. Gehrke; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1981).

8. See Erhard Blum, "*Formgeschichte*—A Misleading Category? Some Critical Remarks," in *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century* (ed. Marvin A.

critic's purpose in identifying a text's form is that the proper identity of form will yield historical data regarding the ancient production and/or use of the text.

The past several decades have seen an increasing awareness on the part of scholars of ancient Near Eastern literatures of developments within literary-critical circles regarding genre. The reader-response movement, indebted largely to the work of Stanley Fish, has made signi cant inroads. The work of Fish has been instrumental in forcing scholars—even those who do not subscribe to his reader-response or interpretive-community models—to realize that the generation of meaning for a text is always, at least in part, performed by a text's audience. As a corollary, it follows that membership in a literary genre is more a product of how and by whom a text is read than it is a feature of the text itself. More recently, the work of in uential Russian literary theorist Mikhail Bakhtin has been employed by numerous scholars.[9] Carol Newsom's work has proved particularly in uential in popularizing his work among biblical scholars.[10] Bakhtin stresses that while genres are ever changing, they are nonetheless simultaneously conservative; in his words, "Genre is a representative of creative memory in the process of literary development."[11] Newsom applies this insight to the study of apocalypses, suggesting that it may pro tably be used to help explain the similarity of works (e.g., mystical, gnostic, etc.) that, while

Sweeney and Ehud Ben Zvi; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003), 32–45. Blum recognizes a difference between "form" and "genre" as the latter is typically used in biblical studies; he asserts that, since the proper task of a biblical scholar is exegesis of the text, study of form by itself without consideration of genre—particularly in the historical emergence and evolution of genres—ought to be abandoned (45). For some overviews of biblical form criticism, see Gene M. Tucker, *Form Criticism of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971); Martin J. Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism in Its Context* (JSOTSup 274; She eld: She eld Academic Press, 1999); Klaus Koch, *Was ist Formgeschichte? Methoden der Bibelexegese. Mit einem Nachwort, Linguistik und Formgeschichte*. (3d ed.; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1974); Rolf Knierim, "Criticism of Literary Features, Form, Tradition and Redaction," in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Modern Interpreters* (ed. Douglas Knight and Gene M. Tucker; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985) 123–65.

9. See especially Stanley Fish, *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980); Mikhail Bakhtin, "Discourse in the Novel," in idem, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin* (trans. Michael Holquist and Caryl Emerson; Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981); idem, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (ed. and trans. Caryl Emerson; Theory and History of Literature 8; Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984).

10. See Newsom, *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 3–31; eadem, "Spying Out the Land: A Report from Genology," in *Seeking Out the Wisdom of the Ancients: Essays O ered to Honor Michael V. Fox on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. R. L. Troxel, K. G. Friebel, and D. R. Magary; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 437–50. The latter was reprinted in Roland Boer, ed., *Bakhtin and Genre Theory in Biblical Studies* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007).

11. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 106.

chronologically and culturally removed from early Judean apocalypses, nonetheless are strongly reminiscent of them.[12]

Similarly, prototype theory has recently made inroads among scholars of ancient Near Eastern literatures. In many respects, prototype theory is similar to older "family-resemblance" models of genre;[13] however, born out of research in the field of cognitive science, it offers a more structured model of comparison that recognizes the differing weights that readers assign to different features of a text.[14] This approach proceeds by identifying certain texts as prototypical of a kind of literature, and then identifying the privileged features of the prototype(s) that lead us to group them. One of the advantages of such an approach to genre is that it provides for a significant latitude for variation within a literary type. However, like models that posit "theoretical genres" (such as the epos-prose-drama-lyric of Northrop Frye),[15] prototype theory is in essence ahistorical in its application, and thereby limited in regard to certain types of textual investigation.

Against this, however, the work of the conservative opponents of post-war New Critic formalism has continued to be used by scholars of the ancient Near East. In particular, the works of René Wellek and E. D. Hirsch have continued to find a space in the conversation.[16] Hirsch is in many ways a logical choice for biblicists to draw on. According to Hirsch, (1) identifying the author and authorial intent is a necessary component of interpretation;[17] (2) the meaning of a text is independent of the cultural context of the reader;[18] (3) "the goal of interpretation as a discipline is constantly to increase the probability that [our interpretive guesses] are

---

12. Newsom, "Spying Out the Land," 448.

13. See, e.g., Alistair Fowler, *Kinds of Literature* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982).

14. On prototype theory, see Michael Sinding, "After Definitions: Genre, Categories, and Cognitive Science," *Genre* 35 (2002): 181–220.

15. Northrop Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957), see especially 243–340. However, Frye actually implicitly proposes other types of genres and means for distinguishing them; see the critique of Frye by Tzvetan Todorov, *The Fantastic: A Structural Approach to a Literary Genre* (trans. Richard Howard; Cleveland: Case Western Reserve University Press, 1973), 3–19; see also Gérard Genette, *The Architext: An Introduction* (trans. Jane E. Lewin; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992; originally published as *Introduction à l'architexte* [Paris: Seuil, 1979]). Genette denies both the validity of this view of genre as well as the frequently voiced claim that it originates with Aristotle.

16. E. D. Hirsch, Jr., *Validity in Interpretation* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1967); René Wellek and Austen Warren, *Theory of Literature* (3d ed.; New York: Harcourt Brace Javonovitch, 1977). The third edition appeared in 1962; the original edition was published in 1942. For the continued use of such scholars, see Kenton Sparks, *Ancient Texts for the Study of the Hebrew Bible: A Guide to the Background Literature* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2005), 1–24; and Longman, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography*.

17. See Hirsch, *Validity in Interpretation*, 1–23.

18. Hirsch, *Validity in Interpretation*, 44–51.

correct";[19] (4) identi cation of genre is a necessary precondition to a valid interpretation of a text. Why should such a view of the interpretive enterprise be so appealing to biblicists? For two reasons. First, most biblicists are trained in, and primarily concerned with, ancient history. Their primary piece of historical data is a single anthology of literature that has been continually read and re-interpreted for nearly twenty centuries. A theory of literature that encourages certainty in pronouncing some interpretations valid and others invalid furthers the modernist historian's enterprise of producing an *accurate* picture of the past. Second, many biblical scholars come to the eld with a religious commitment to their primary object of study; "correct" interpretation for some such individuals may be as much a soteriological as it is a literary endeavor. This renders Hirsch's belief that reading is a matter of getting it right or getting it wrong extremely appealing.

Among genre theorists I have found particularly useful the structuralist approaches of Tzvetan Todorov and Gérard Genette in formulating my own views of genre for approaching ancient texts.[20] Todorov denies the claims of some, such as Maurice Blanchot, that genre ought to be ignored; the contention that every work of literature somehow transgresses the generic rules to which it should adhere is no indication that genres really don't exist. In fact, Todorov claims, the very opposite is implied: "Not only because, in order to be an exception, the work necessarily presupposes a rule; but also because no sooner is it recognized in its exceptional status than the work becomes a rule in turn."[21] Furthermore, genres necessarily serve a double function: they serve authors as "models of writing" no less than they serve readers as "horizons of expectation."[22] This is a point also stressed by the American structuralist Jonathan Culler.[23] In Culler's words, genre "serves as norm or expectation to guide the reader in his encounter with the text."[24]

However, the question of what genre actually does for the critic remains open. There are literary theorists who speak dismissively of genre as merely taxonomic, or speak dismissively of those who create merely taxonomic generic systems. That is, some critics object that genre must relate to the fundamental structure of literature—or, even more broadly, culture in general—and not merely pigeonhole individual works. In the words of Alastair Fowler, "Genres are often said to provide a means of

---

19. Hirsch, *Validity in Interpretation*, 207.

20. See especially Tzvetan Todorov, *Genres in Discourse* (trans. Catherine Porter; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990); idem, *The Fantastic*; Genette, *The Architext*.

21. Todorov, *Genres in Discourse*, 15.

22. Todorov, *Genres in Discourse*, 18.

23. Jonathan Culler, *Structuralist Poetics* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1975), especially 135–39.

24. Culler, *Structuralist Poetics*, 136.

classi cation. This is a venerable error."[25] While the point is understood—genre certainly performs functions beyond the labeling of texts—this nonetheless greatly underestimates the power of "merely" taxonomic systems, both for shaping culture and for revealing a culture's shape. Determining a native, ancient generic classi cation for each of our texts—that is, how an ancient Mesopotamian scribe would catalog each *ex eventu* text within the widest gamut of written documents—would yield invaluable information for the historian.[26] Thus, when Fowler states that the "taxonomic application" of genre is "unexpectedly limited," and further that "[t]he main value of genres is not classi catory," we must ask a very simple question: value *for whom*? Fowler envisions a situation in which all necessary cultural knowledge is already possessed by the reader. We readers of ancient texts—in particular, of ancient Mesopotamian texts—are forced to construct our knowledge of the culture on the basis of somewhat randomly (and, most often, poorly) preserved literary remains. Generating categories, the very act of producing, changing and re ning taxonomies, is part and parcel of then allowing genre to perform its various roles in the communication between the ancient scribe and a modern audience that the scribe could never have imagined.

More recently, the increasing in uence of New Historicism in literary-critical circles has resulted in a pronounced turn toward critical-theory and cultural-studies modes of approaching genre. Such approaches look beyond more formal aspects of texts and seek to interpret and group books, lms, websites, etc., as artifacts of culture, resulting in a sort of Geertzian "thick description" of genre. That is, for such critics genre has become basically a taxon of culture. In discussing the genre of a book, for example, one needs to consider more than simply the text: the front matter, back matter, cover art, blurbs, marketing, placement in stores, Internet presence, who reads it, what talk shows discuss it, what media reviews it—every interaction of an individual with the book-as-cultural-object is a communicative act that generates meaning, shaping its place within culture—that is, locating it within a genre. [27] More overtly than classical literary approaches, such an approach depends deeply on the fact that the critic discussing genre is simultaneously a cultural actor taking part in an emic process of naming and categorizing.

---

25. Alastair Fowler, *Kinds of Literature* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982), 37.

26. I should stress that by no means do I assume that an emic category is in some way more "correct" than a modern, etic category. Rather, I merely wish to point out that an ancient, emic categorization of texts would provide data for the historian.

27. See, e.g., the discussion of genre and its usefulness by Barry Langford, *Film Genre: Hollywood and Beyond* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005), especially 1–54.

Approaching Genre in the Study
of the Akkadian **Ex Eventu** *Texts*

If we grant Todorov and other structuralists the notion that questions of genre are questions in the domain of poetics—that is, a study of the structure of literature, independent of the *interpretation* of that literature—then it is no surprise that the New Critics and structuralists are far more interested in genre, and take it far more seriously, than do scholars adopting various post-modernist positions. However, while there is much of value to be taken from the more traditional literary modes of engaging genre discussed above, their methodological constructs are not wholly adequate for the task at hand. This stems in large part from the fact that literary theorists are almost entirely interested in the literature of modernity, with regular forays into the literatures of medieval Europe as well as Greek and Latin classics that are viewed as the forebears of modern (Western) literature. Poorly preserved texts in partially understood, extinct languages, copied in a three-dimensional written medium are not standard grist for the genre-theory mill.

This problem is even more pronounced in the more recent approaches to genre re ecting deep in uence from New Historicism that seek to bring an enormous swath of cultural information to bear on the categorization of texts, focusing on issues such as function and authority. The fact that such an approach depends deeply on an emic knowledge of the culture in which a text (or lm, or advertisement, etc.) stands may be viewed as a sharp contrast to the way we scholars of ancient texts must necessarily interact with our chosen data. We are not emic actors taking part in an ever-evolving discourse; fundamentally, we wield genre as an etic tool of analysis. It is certainly true that there are occasional emic markers of textual grouping; although these must be seriously considered by the modern critic of ancient texts, one cannot for a moment pretend that the critic possesses the sort of insider knowledge that is required for something like genre analysis of contemporary lm.

Given our liminal position as cultural outsiders, the most broadly applicable tools for genre analysis are those suggested by the more traditional literary approaches to genre. Therefore, in the discussion to follow, I will focus primarily on elements of form and structure: Is the text poetry or prose (or, where on a spectrum of low to elevated language does it fall)? Is the text narrative? A monologue? Dialogue? First or third person? Does it address the reader directly? Is it a reminiscence about the past? Does it contain commands directed at the audience? Is authorship explicitly indicated? What about the actual media on which the text is recorded—does the tablet contain information beyond the composition scratched onto it? Are there stylistic markers, such as a list format or truncated line length? Does the orthography indicate something about author and audience?

This is, of course, not the only way to approach genre in the case of the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts. However, questions such as those listed above represent criteria somewhat removed from the more involved and admittedly more speculative processes of reconstructing the historical roles and functions of our texts. The hope, therefore, is that it avoids at least a certain amount of circularity in unpacking questions of literary a   nity and historical use. What is more, insofar as earlier scholars of these texts are explicit about their discussions of literary genre or type, they seem to have in mind such formal, structural, and thematic criteria—rendering them necessary criteria to consider when assessing their generic claims. I, of course, make no claim that such an approach to genre is "best" or even necessary; genre may be approached by a great number of different perspectives relying on different analytical criteria. Quite simply, consideration of such criteria seems appropriate to the task at hand.

The Akkadian *Ex Eventu* Texts in the Context of Mesopotamian Literature

Determining genre is fundamentally a task of literary comparison. For an audience engaging a contemporary text of a familiar type, this activity may be entirely subconscious. However, for the scholar approaching novel texts composed in languages that are no longer spoken, thousands of years before his own time, and which suffer from various states of poor preservation, the question of textual   liation must be actively engaged. The most prudent means of determining an appropriate genre grouping for the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts is to begin by situating them within their native Akkadian literary milieu. The pages to follow consider the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts in relation to those types of cuneiform literature that have been invoked in the search for literary parallels, relatives, and forebears.

1. Mesopotamian Omen Literature

Any discussion of divinatory texts (even texts that only pose as predictions) from Mesopotamia must deal, if only brie   y, with the enormous corpus of omens preserved in cuneiform.[28] The observation of ominous

---

28. There are several excellent, current overviews of Mesopotamian omina. See especially Stefan Maul, "Omina und Orakel. A. Mesopotamien," *RLA* 10.45–88, with bibliography current through 2002. See also Frederick H. Cryer, *Divination in Ancient Israel and Its Near Eastern Environment* (JSOTSup 142; She   eld: JSOT, 1994), 124–80; Francesca Rochberg,

events correlated with predictions of the future served as the privileged method of divination throughout Mesopotamian history. Omens take the following form: "if x then y." A typical liver omen reads: "If the top of the wind pipe of the liver [of a sheep] opposite the left plain of the Finger is atrophied downward: You will seize the enemy forti ed city."[29] As Ulla Koch-Westenholz puts it, the practice of interpreting ominous signs came near to an exercise in arithmetic:

> A simple rule that is common to all kinds of Babylonian divination is of almost mathematical rigour: within the same omen, a good sign combined with a good sign has a good prediction; good combined with bad means bad; bad combined with bad means good. Expressed algebraically, the rule is also familiar to us: + + = +; + - = -; - - = +. An often quoted example of this rule is found in the astrological texts: if a well-portending planet is bright: favourable (+ + = +); if it is faint, unfavourable (+ - = -); if an ill-portending planet is bright, unfavourable (- + = -); if it is faint, favourable (- - = +).[30]

What is more, omen literature is by far the single largest genre of literary (that is to say, non-administrative, non-epistolary, etc.) texts to have survived. Omens were collected and systematized with tremendous zeal by ancient scribes, so that by the time of the great royal libraries of the Neo-Assyrian period, an immense body of material had been organized into "canonical" series. These series are almost surely the result of pulling together earlier, thematically arranged omen collections. Although certainty is not possible, it is widely thought that this process crystallized sometime in the late second millennium b.c.e.[31] Among the more important omen compendia of which we have knowledge are the following:[32]

- *Enūma Anu Enlil*, a compendium of celestial/astrological omens, 70 tablets.[33]

- *Iqqur Ipuš*, perhaps best categorized as a menology, this series contains both terrestrial and celestial omens correlated to speci c months.[34]
- *Šumma Ālu*, the opening omen of which begins, "if a city is set on a hill," a series of omens covering a very wide variety of everyday observations, comprising some 120 tablets.[35]
- *Šumma Izbu*, a compendium of teratological omens enumerating various "monstrous" births and their ominous signi cance, totaling 24 tablets.[36]
- *Sakkikû*, a "diagnostic and prognostic handbook," some 40 tablets long.[37]
- *Alamdimmû*, a compendium of physiognomic omens, comprising some 23+ tablets.[38]

Virolleaud, *L'Astrologie Chaldéen: Le Livre intitulé "enuma (Anu) ᵢˡBel"* (Paris: Librairie P. Geuthner, 1908–1912). New editions of parts of the series have appeared since the 1970s: Erica Reiner and David Pingree, *Babylonian Planetary Omens. Part One: The Venus Tablets of Ammi aduqa, Enūma Anu Enlil Tablet 63* (Bibliotheca Mesopotamica 2,1; Malibu, CA: Undena, 1975); Reiner and Pingree, *Babylonian Planetary Omens. Part Two: Enūma Anu Enlil, Tablets 50–51* (Bibliotheca Mesopotamica 2,2; Malibu, CA: Undena, 1981); Reiner and Pingree, *Babylonian Planetary Omens. Part Three* (CM 11; Groningen: Styx, 1998); Reiner and Pingree, *Babylonian Planetary Omens. Part Four* (CM 30; Leiden: Brill, 2005); Francesca Rochberg, *Aspects of Babylonian Celestial Divination: The Lunar Eclipse Tablets of* En ma Anu Enlil (AfOB 22; Horn: Berger & Söhne, 1988); Wilfred H. van Soldt, *Solar Omens of Enūma Anu Enlil: Tablets 23 (24)-29 (30)* (Uitgaven van het Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul 73; Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul, 1995). For an excellent overview of Mesopotamian astrology, see Koch-Westenholz, *Mesopotamian Astrology*. See also Francesca Rochberg, *Heavenly Writing*; and Erica Reiner, *Astral Magic in Babylonia* (TAPS NS 85.4; Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1995). Mention must also be made of the important astronomical handbook *MUL.APIN*, which ends with a collection of astronomical omens; see the critical edition by Hermann Hunger and David Pingree, *MUL. APIN: An Astronomical Compendium in Cuneiform* (Horn: Berger & Söhne, 1989).

34. See the edition of René Labat, *Un calendrier Babylonien des travaux des signes et des mois (série iqqur puš)* (Paris: Champion, 1965).

35. See the edition of Friedrich Nötscher, *Die Omen-Serie* šumma lu ina mêlê šakin *(CT 38–40)* (Rome: Ponti cal Biblical Institute, 1930). A new edition of the rst twenty-one tablets of the series has been published by Sally Freedman, *If a City Is Set on a Height: The Akkadian Omen Series* Šumma lu ina mêlê šakin (vol. 1; Occasional Publications of the Samuel Noah Kramer Fund 17; Philadelphia: Samuel Noah Kramer Fund, 1998).

36. See the edition by Erle Leichty, *The Omen Series* Šumma Izbu (TCS 4; Locust Valley, NY: Augustin, 1970).

37. See the treatment of diagnostic omina by Nils Heeßel, *Babylonish-assyrische Diagnostik* (AOAT 43; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2000).

38. *Alamdimmû* is technically the title of the rst section (twelve tablets) of the series, which is comprised of ve different subseries. For a treatment of Mesopotamian physiognomic omens, see Barbara Böck, *Die Babylonisch-assyrische Morphoskopie* (AfOB 27; Vienna: Institut für Orientalistik der Universität Wien, 2000). For physiognomic omina in early Judaism, see Mladen Popovic, *Reading the Human Body: Physiognomics and Astrology in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Hellenistic-Early Roman Period Judaism* (STDJ 67; Leiden: Brill, 2007).

- *dZaq qu*, a compendium of dream omina, 11 tablets in length.[39]
- *Bārûtu*, the canonical compendium of liver omens, likely consisting of approximately 100 tablets in its Neo-Assyrian form.[40]

This brief list should give some sense of the enormity of the omen corpus and the immense amount of scholarly energy devoted to omens by the scribes of ancient Mesopotamia. It should be borne in mind, however, that the omens thus collected were not the only accepted means of divination. There is evidence that various other forms of divination were practiced, including lecanomancy, libanomancy, aleuromancy, necromancy, and bird augury.[41] Many omens, particularly liver and celestial omens, are recorded outside the "canonical" series in letters, reports, and other documents. In the case of liver omens, some of these have survived inscribed on pieces of clay shaped like a sheep's liver with attention drawn to a speci c ominous formation. Additionally, it is well known that prophecy of a type similar to that in ancient Israel was practiced in different areas of Mesopotamia in different periods, with varying degrees of o cial (royal) legitimation; the issue of prophecy will be treated later in the present chapter. Despite the variety of forms of divination, it can be said with con dence that, at least from the Old Babylonian period onward, extispicy held a privileged place in Mesopotamian divinatory practice, with astrology gaining in importance in the rst millennium b.c.e.

Given the immense resources poured into the careful collection of vast numbers of omens, it is little surprise that the learned scribes of Mesopotamia should have drawn on this deep stock of mantic tradition when composing other texts that purport to relate future events. Several commentators have noted the similarity of phrasing, orthography, and general style

---

39. See A. Leo Oppenheim, *The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East. With a Translation of an Assyrian Dream-Book* (TAPS 46.3; Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1956). The interpretation of dream omens should be distinguished from the interpretation of symbolic dream elements such as one nds in Daniel 7. In *dZaq qu*, elements of the dream do not symbolically represent real world persons or events; rather, they are prosaic objects or actions linked rather arbitrarily to predictions. Thus, by way of example, we nd the following predictions in Tablet C, reverse, column II: "(43) If he sinks into a river and comes up: he will w[orry]. (44) If he crosses a river: he will experience confusion. (45) If he goes down into a river and comes up: he will stand up (in court) against his adversary. (46) If he comes up from the river: good news" (translation follows Oppenheim, 287).

40. There is no modern edition of all the extant portions of the series; however, see Ulla Koch-Westenholz, *Babylonian Liver Omens: The Chapters* Manz zu, Pad nu, *and* P n t kalti *of the Babylonian Extispicy Series Mainly from Aššurbanipal's Library* (CNI 25; Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum, 2000); eadem (as Ulla Susanne Koch), *Secrets of Extispicy: The Chapter* Mult biltu *of the Babylonian Extispicy Series*. On the development of the series in the Old Babylonian period, see Ulla Jeyes, *Old Babylonian Extispicy: Omen Texts in the British Museum* (Uitgaven van het Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul 64; Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul, 1989), especially 7–14.

41. See Maul, "Omina und Orakel," 83–88.

of the   ve *ex eventu* compositions studied in Chapter 2 with Akkadian omen texts.[42] Robert Biggs has identi   ed phrases in Text A that otherwise appear only in astrological omina.[43] Notwithstanding the very real nature of these stylistic similarities, the *ex eventu* texts cannot be regarded as simply a subset of the omen genre. There are four main reasons for sharply distinguishing between omens, on the one hand, and the *ex eventu* texts, on the other.

First, and perhaps of greatest importance, the predictions of the *ex eventu* texts lack conditionality. The very possibility that the ominous sign might not occur—and therefore, the prediction of the omen apodosis not occur—distinguishes omens from *vaticinia ex eventu*. After-the-fact predictions are employed precisely because the audience can recognize that the events contained therein have already occurred. The authority of the prediction must therefore be presented and understood as absolute and unconditional. In this respect the predictions of the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts are much more like what one   nds among the prophetic books of the Hebrew Bible than like the various omen types common to Mesopotamian divination. So while the predictions of, for example, Text A strongly echo omen apodoses, the composition lacks omen protases because the audience must understand that non-ful   llment is an impossibility.

Second, while the "predictions" of the *ex eventu* texts must be understood literally, this is not so for Mesopotamian omens. In practice, omens were recognized as either portending good or bad; the speci   cs of the apodosis could be ignored and the general tenor applied to the immediate situation or royal query.[44] The only thing that matters within such a context is whether the query that provoked the diviner to look at the signs, be it the heavens, oil on water, a sheep's exta, etc., receives a positive or negative reply. Again, this is wholly incompatible with the purpose and structure of the *ex eventu* texts. Not only must the predictions be understood as absolutely authoritative in that they will occur, but the texts only function if the reader recognizes that the speci   c events "predicted" actually matter and can be identi   ed with historical events known to the audience.

42. E.g., Grayson and Lambert, "Akkadian Prophecies," 7; Hallo, "Akkadian Apocalypses," 235; Lambert, "History and the Gods: A Review Article," *Orientalia* NS 39 (1970): 176; Grayson, *BHLT*, 15; Kaufman, "Prediction, Prophecy, and Apocalypse," 222; Beaulieu, "Historical Background," 42 and n. 7; Philippe Talon,"Les textes prophétiques du premier millénaire en Mésopotamie," in *Prophéties et oracles* (ed. Jésus Asurmendi, et al.; Supplément au Cahier Evangile 88; Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1994), 97–125.

43. Robert D. Biggs, "Babylonian Prophecies and the Astrological Traditions of Mesopotamia," *JCS* 37 (1985): 86–90; see also Biggs, "Babylonian Prophecies, Astrology, and a New Source for 'Prophecy Text B,'" 1–14, especially 3–4.

44. See, e.g., Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia*, 214–15. Regarding Neo-Assyrian royal queries of haruspices, Oppenheim notes that the "predictions are considered to be of interest only insofar as they are favorable or unfavorable; the speci   c events predicted are disregarded. In short, the predictions are reduced to yes-or-no answers" (215).

Third, the predictions of omens are never absolute; they can be averted by means of an apotropaic ritual. Chief among these are the rituals designated by the term *namburbi*, designed to appease the gods and avert doom portended by an ominous sign.[45] Sometimes, *namburbi* rituals are even included within omen compendia themselves, notably in *Šumma Ālu*.[46] In the words of Niek Veldhuis, "Omina present themselves as propositions about the future on the basis of observation (either provoked or non-provoked). Namburbis present themselves as rituals to forestall evil predicted by a bad omen."[47] Therefore, not only is the fulfillment of a prediction based first on whether or not a specific sign is observed, but if the sign portends ill then the entire prediction may be nullified by the execution of the appropriate ritual act. This is clearly unacceptable for an *ex eventu* passage containing a legitimate attempt at prediction.

Fourth and finally, none of the omen compendia refers so clearly to historical events in a chronological progression as do the *ex eventu* texts. It is true that some omens contain references to specific cities or foreign enemies (particularly the astrological omens of *Enūma Anu Enlil*). However, the very nature of omens—that a prediction depends first on the observation of the appropriate sign—rules out the possibility that predictions be arranged in the chronological order in which they are to come to fruition. Therefore there is no necessary dependence of one omen on the accuracy of any other omen in a compendium. Each coupling of portent and prediction is independent of every other. Again, this is entirely at odds with the construction of an *ex eventu* historical review; each prediction's actualization is a precondition of the following prediction's accuracy. That each prediction has come true and led to the next prediction in the sequence coming true is the logic that underpins the entire trope of extended *vaticinium ex eventu*.

As this brief overview should make abundantly clear, there is no firm ground for considering the *ex eventu* texts to be of the same literary genre as omens, or some sub-genre thereof. Though the similarities in form and phraseology are without doubt real, they do not constitute generic identity for either the modern or the ancient reader. One must agree at least in essence with the statement of A. K. Grayson that "[t]he authors of Babylonian 'prophecies' [i.e., the *ex eventu* texts] were, like all Babylonian scholars, as conversant with divinatory texts as eighteenth century Euro-

---

45. *Namburbi* rituals have been the subject of an intensive study by Stefan Maul: *Zukunftsbewältigung: Eine Untersuchung altorientalischen Denkens anhand der babylonisch-assyrischen Löserituale (Namburbi)* (Baghdader Forschungen 18; Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, 1994).

46. See Richard Caplice, *The Akkadian Namburbi Texts: An Introduction* (Sources and Monographs, Sources from the Ancient Near East vol. 1, fasc. 1; Malibu, CA: Undena, 1974), 8.

47. Niek Veldhuis, "On Interpreting Mesopotamian Namburbi Rituals," *AfO* 42/43 (1996): 145–54; here, 152.

pean intellectuals were with the Bible and classics. The Babylonian scribes thought in patterns conditioned by long familiarity with prognostication and wrote in clichés subconsciously borrowed from that literature."[48] As will be seen below, the in uence of omen literature in matters of style was not limited to the *ex eventu* texts.

2. So-Called Historical Omens

One small group[49] of omens deserves to be singled out for special comment before moving on from the question of the relationship between the *ex eventu* texts and omen literature: the historical omens.[50] With the exception of some very late collections, they do not appear together in a single major compendium but are found in a variety of sources, especially in liver omens. They are known from rst-millennium sources such as the series *Bārûtu* as well as second-millennium sources, notably a group of liver models from Old Babylonian Mari. These omens are of particular interest for the study of the *ex eventu* texts in that they likewise attest to a scribal tradition that wedded pieces of Mesopotamian historiographic traditions with mantic traditions. The following liver omen is typical of the "historical" type: "If the 'palace gate'[51] is covered with tissue, it is an omen of Shulgi (*a-mu-ut ᵈŠul-gi*) who captured Tappa-Daraḫ."[52] Indeed, Albrecht Goetze lists three variants of this single liver omen, each linking an observed feature to the capture of Tappa-Daraḫ. Other omens of this type are similar; an omen protasis containing an observation is linked

48. A. K. Grayson, "The Babylonian Origin of Apocalyptic Literature," 204.

49. Ulla Koch-Westenholz has estimated that one in two thousand omens contains a historical apodosis (*Mesopotamian Astrology*, 15).

50. Historical omens were rst collected by Ernst F. Weidner, "Historisches Material in der babylonischen Omina-Literatur," *MAOG* 4 (1928–1929): 226–240; among the early studies of this material, see especially A. Leo Oppenheim, "Zur keilschriftlichen Omenliteratur," *Orientalia* NS 5 (1936): 199–228; J. Nougayrol, "Note sur la place des 'presages historiques' dans l'extispicine babylonienne," *École Pratique des Hautes Études, Section des Sciences Religieuses, Annuaire* (1944–1945): 5–41; Albrecht Goetze, "Historical Allusions in Old Babylonian Omen Texts," *JCS* 1 (1947): 253–66. For more recent additions to the group of historical omens, see, inter alia, Erica Reiner, "New Light on Some Historical Omens," *Anatolian Studies Presented to Hans Gustav Güterbock on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (ed. K. Bittel, P. H. J. Houwink Ten Cate, and E. Reiner; Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut in het Nabije Oosteen, 1974), 257–61; Ivan Starr, "Notes on Some Published and Unpublished Historical Omens," *JCS* 29 (1977): 157–66; ibid., "Historical Omens concerning Ashurbanipal's War against Elam," *AfO* 32 (1985): 60–67.

51. This term refers to a speci c formation of the sheep's liver.

52. See Goetze, "Historical Allusions," 260. This and the other omens treated in the article were published by Goetze in *Old Babylonian Omen Texts* (YOS 10; New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1947).

to an apodosis that, instead of a general remark of weal or woe, offers a small fact about a past king. Thus one also ᴪnds an Old Babylonian liver omen with the apodosis, "it is an omen of Sargon (*a-mu-ut Šar-ru-ki-in*) who had no equal." Goetze notes the similarity of this omen to a passage in the Chronicle of Sargon that reads, "Sargon, king of Akkad, (ascended to the throne) in the *palû* of Ishtar, and had no peer or equal."[53] Presumably the diviner in practicing his trade would treat what we term "historical omens" just as he would the "normal" omens.[54] That is, the omen of Shulgi mentioned above would be regarded as an ominous sign linked to a positive outcome, essentially meaning "the king will take his enemy prisoner."

There is a classic position in the study of Mesopotamian omens that claims an extremely intimate link between omina and historiography—in particular, chronicles. This position is perhaps best articulated by J. J. Finkelstein, who claims that omens are in fact the generative source behind the Mesopotamian chronicle tradition:

> As the result of the publication in more recent years of omens dating back to the beginning of the second millennium b.c. [such as that quoted above], containing historical allusions known theretofore only from very late versions, the historical veracity of the omens has come to be acknowledged by modern scholarship more readily than in decades past. . . . [T]he omen texts, and the historical information imbedded in them lie at the very root of all Mesopotamian historiography, and . . . as a historical genre they take precedence in both time and reliability over any other genre of Mesopotamian writing that purports to treat of the events of the past.[55]

However, there is little reason to follow Finkelstein in his appraisal of the relationship of omens and chronographic texts in ancient Mesopotamia. While noting Finkelstein is indeed correct that the Chronicle of the Early Kings[56] seems to have drawn on omens mentioning the kings of Akkad, A. K. Grayson nevertheless strenuously disagrees with Finkelstein's position.[57] Rather than viewing omens as the most reliable, most

---

53. Goetze, "Historical Allusions," 255.

54. So John Van Seters, *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1983), 78–79.

55. J. J. Finkelstein, "Mesopotamian Historiography," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 107, no. 6 = *Cuneiform Studies and the History of Civilization* (1963): 461–72; quotation from pp. 462–63.

56. Text no. 20 in Grayson, *ABC*; texts no. 39 and 40 in Jean-Jacques Glassner, *Mesopotamian Chronicles* (Writings from the Ancient World; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004).

57. A. K. Grayson, "Divination and the Babylonian Chronicles: A Study of the Rôle Which Divination Plays in Ancient Mesopotamian Chronography," *La Divination en Méso-*

authentic foundation of historiography in Mesopotamia, Grayson remarks, "it must be emphasized that divination plays no essential rôle in the origin or development of the chronographic literature of Ancient Mesopotamia. In fact it plays no essential rôle in Sumero-Akkadian historiography."[58]

The question of the relationship between Mesopotamian omina and historiography is often taken in the direction of whether omens may generally be regarded as "empirical" and "scientific." While numerous scholarly voices have been heard in favor of the facticity of the historical omens,[59] I remain skeptical as to their historiographic import. As Ulla Koch-Westenholz has observed, one encounters various elements that cast doubt on the "empirical" nature of the historical omens: (1) multiple protases are linked to the same historical event (as seen above in the omen of Shulgi); (2) the "history" of the omens shows remarkable agreement not only with Mesopotamian chronographic texts but with elements of literary texts detailing the legendary events of kings of old (what she terms "Old Babylonian sagas"); (3) some of the historical omens contain physically impossible protases, such as the moon being eclipsed on the twentieth day of a lunar month.[60]

Whether the anecdotal protases of the so-called historical omens are factually accurate, though a question of great interest among some Assyriologists, is not really at issue here. True, there seems to be some interplay between the chronographic tradition and omen texts, just as our *ex eventu* compositions clearly betray knowledge of that tradition. However, the historical omens are still omens in form, and for that reason alone must be regarded as generically distinct from the five Akkadian *ex eventu* texts with which we are dealing. However, the interrelationship of *some* chronographic texts (such as the Chronicle of the Early Kings) with *some* omens highlights the ways in which Babylonian scholars and authors were influenced by the various forms of literature with which they were familiar, and how content cross-pollinated scholarly texts without regard to generic boundaries.

---

potamie Ancienne et dans les Régions Voisines (RAI 14; Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1966), 69–76, especially 71–73 on his general agreement with Finkelstein regarding the Chronicle of Early Kings; see also Grayson, *ABC*, 45–47. Whereas the Chronicle of Early Kings seems to consist, at least in part, of omen apodoses, the Religious Chronicle seems to have drawn on omen protases; see *ABC*, 37, and Grayson "Divination," 74–75.

58. Grayson, "Divination," 76.

59. E.g., Edmond Sollberger, "Sur la chronologie des rois d'Ur et quelques problemes connexes," *AfO* 17 (1954–1956): 10–48; Jean Bottéro, "Symptômes, signes, écritures en Mésopotamie ancienne," *Divination et rationalité* (ed. J. P. Vernant et al.; Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1974), 70–197. For an overview of the positions and a history of the debate, see Daryn Lehoux, "The Historicity Question in Mesopotamian Divination," in *Under One Sky: Astronomy and Mathematics in the Ancient Near East* (ed. John M. Steele and Annette Imhausen; AOAT 297; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2002), 209–22.

60. Koch-Westenholz, *Mesopotamian Astrology*, 15–19.

It should be noted that JoAnn Scurlock has recently referred to the texts of both the Uruk Prophecy and the Dynastic Prophecy as "historical omens."[61] For the reasons outlined above, I find such a descriptor wholly unsatisfying and fundamentally inaccurate. Scurlock's main argument actually has nothing to do with whether or not the *ex eventu* texts ought to be categorized as omens; she notes simply, "all sorts of everyday occurrences had potentially ominous significance, so it is hardly surprising that at some point significant historical events began to acquire predictive value in their own right."[62] This assumes a function—and indeed, an intention—for these texts that, while not impossible, is nowhere clearly indicated. The lack of conditionality in the *ex eventu* texts demonstrates clearly that they are not being used in the same way as omens, not even those conventionally called by scholars historical omens, as discussed above.

3. Prophecy Text B

Among the texts published by Grayson and Lambert under the rubric "Akkadian Prophecies" is a work known from multiple exemplars and given by these authors the siglum "Prophecy Text B." Shortly after Grayson and Lambert's work appeared, Robert Biggs published an additional copy of the text that served both to fill lacunae and to give a greater appreciation for the extent of the work.[63] The similarities between this text and the others published by Grayson and Lambert (Text A and portions of both the Shulgi and Marduk speeches) are obvious: they consist in part of vague predictions with repeated references to the rise of kings. A brief excerpt will serve to demonstrate the similarity with the *ex eventu* compositions discussed in detail in Chapter 2:[64]

---

61. Scurlock, "Prophecy as a Form of Divination; Divination as a Form of Prophecy."

62. Scurlock, "Prophecy as a Form of Divination; Divination as a Form of Prophecy," 278.

63. Robert D. Biggs, "More Babylonian 'Prophecies,'" *Iraq* 29 (1967): 117–32.

64. The main exemplar of this work was published in *CT* 13, plate 50. To this Grayson and Lambert added several parallel texts ("Akkadian Prophecies," 12, with handcopies provided on pp. 24–25). Biggs has published additional tablets containing portions of this work in two articles: "More Babylonian Prophecies" and "Babylonian Prophecies, Astrology, and a New Source for 'Prophecy Text B.'" The text survives in no fewer than nine fragmentary manuscripts from Nineveh and Nippur; one manuscript is likely from a Babylonian site, perhaps Babylon itself (see Biggs, "New Source," 6). The transcription and translation following is based on the edition in Biggs, "More Babylonian Prophecies."

18. *eš-rit* DINGIR^meš GAL^meš *us-saḫ* -*ḫa-a* RI.RI.GA^meš EN.LÍL^ki *ina* ^giš TUKUL GÁL

18. The shrine of the great gods will be destroyed; the inhabitants of Nippur will be reduced by the sword.

19. DINGIR^meš GAL^meš UR.BI GALGA^meš-*ma ur-tú ana a-ḫa-meš* SUM-*nu-ma*

19. The great gods will consult one another, they will send word to one another, and

20. BAL LUGAL *ana* KI-*šu* GUR^meš *šal-lat ia-mu-ut-ba-li iš-šal-lal*

20. they will restore the rule of the king to its place. The spoils of Yamutbal will be carried off.

21. DUMU LUGAL *šá ina* KA UN^meš MU-*šú la na-bu-ú* E₁₁–*ma* AŠ.TE DAB

21. A son of the king whose name the people do not mention (i.e., is unknown) will arise and seize the throne.

The excerpted passage displays an obvious a nity to the *ex eventu* texts in both vocabulary and content. For example, the use of the logogram E₁₁, Akkadian *elû*, to indicate ascendancy to the throne is common to all ve texts considered in Chapter 2 as well as Text B. Similarly, the phrase AŠ.TE DAB in line 21, rendered *kussâ iṣabbat*, "he will seize the throne," occurs both verbatim and with minor variations in the *ex eventu* texts: AŠ.TE DAB in Dynastic Prophecy II 19; AŠ.TE (*kussâ*) DAB-*bat* (*iṣabbat*) in Text A II 15; [AŠ].TE (*kussî*) AD (*abi*)-*šú là* DAB-*bat* (*iṣabbat*) ("he will not seize his father's throne") in the Uruk Prophecy, obv. line 12. Additionally, the main witness to the composition begins with what has been termed a "mythological introduction" narrated in the past tense. This recalls the Marduk Speech and the Shulgi Speech. However, certain formal elements sharply delineate between the ve *ex eventu* texts, on the one hand, and Prophecy Text B, on the other. Speci cally, in addition to a general similarity to the phraseology of omen apodoses found in Text B, it has been noted that there are in fact verbatim parallels with astrological omens.[65] Further, while there are stylistic contacts between omen apo-

---

65. See Beate Pongratz-Leisten, *Herrschaftswissen in Mesopotamien: Formen der Kommunikation zwischen Gott und König im 2. und 1. Jahrtausend v.Chr.* (SAAS 10; Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 1999), 53. Pongratz-Leisten notes that SAA 8 459 at two points shares astrological omen apodoses with Text B. The rst is Text B line 16 which is paralleled by SAA 8 459 r. 5–6:

Text B: ŠEŠ ŠEŠ-*šú ru-ʾú-ú-a ru-ʾú-a-šú ina* ^giš TUKUL *i-ra-sip*…
SAA 8 459: … ŠEŠ ŠEŠ-*šú ru-*[*ʾu-ú*] [*r*]*u-ʾà-a-šú ina* ^giš TUKUL *i-ra-sip* …

The second instance comes in Text B line 29, which parallels SAA 8 459 r. 14–15:

Text B: *Èš-nun-na*^ki KU-*ab* x [x x x] ŠÀ KUR DÙG-*ab* ZÁḪ NIM.MA^ki *ú* UN-*šu*
SAA 8 459: ÈŠ.NUN.NA.KI ⌈SUM-*in*⌉ [x x x x] ⌈x⌉ *ab* ŠÀ KUR DÙG-*ab* ZÁḪ NIM.MA^ki *ú* UN.MEŠ-*šu*

doses and the *ex eventu* compositions, Text B contains astrological omen protases as well. For example:

32. DIŠ IZI.GAR TA AN.PA *a-na* AN.ÚR *iṣ–ru-u*[*r . . . m*]*a-gal* ZALAG₂–*ir*	32. If a meteor (literally: torch) ashed from the zenith of the sky to the horizo[n, . . .] shone brightly,
33. *ina* ŠÀ-*šú* ᵈIM KA-*si ka-l*[*a ūmi* . . .]	33. at the same time Adad thundered, al[l day . . .]
34. NU *in-na-ṭa-lu* IM DAL.[BA. NA . . .]	34. cannot be seen, a *wind* (?) bet[ween . . .]
35. *a-na* ᵈ*En-líl* EŠ.BAR BI *ana* KUR NIM.MAᵏⁱ [*nadin*]	35. to Enlil, its omen[66] [concerns] Elam.

The above passage is not merely *similar* to astrological omens in language and content; it *is* an astrological omen.[67] The most recently published copy of the work PBS 13 84[68] contains a signi cant amount of heretofore unavailable text, much of which serves to reinforce the particularly strong relationship between Text B and astrological omen compendia. The reverse of the tablet contains no fewer than six omens beginning with astrological protases:

Line 2: if a star ashed all day . . .
Line 3: if a big star which is like a torch . . .
Line 10: if the Fish has a conjunction with Jupiter . . .
Line 11: if Venus entered the moon . . .
Line 18: if the Fish . . .
Line 25: [if] Venus . . .[69]

The text is separated into sections by the use of dividing lines, much as we have seen used in the *ex eventu* texts. However, whereas in the *ex eventu* texts they serve to separate reigns of kings (but never in an entirely consistent fashion), in this copy of Text B a line comes between the end of one omen apodosis and the protasis of the next. Hence, a division appears

---

Transcriptions of SAA 8 459 are given according to the edition of H. Hunger, *Astrological Reports to Assyrian Kings* (SAA 8; Helsinki: Helsinki University, 1992).

66. Biggs notes that the noun *purussû* ("decision"), especially in conjunction with the verb nad nu, seems to have the technical meaning of "astrological omen" ("More Babylonian Prophecies," 127); see also Rochberg, *Heavenly Writing,* 266–67,

67. Albeit one with an unusually long protasis. Biggs notes as one of the formal differences between Text B and astrological omen compendia the fact that Text B contains predictions of considerably greater length than one normally nds in omen texts ("New Source," 6).

68. It is this tablet that is published by Biggs in "New Source."

69. See Biggs, "New Source," 10–13.

between lines 1 and 2, 2 and 3, 9 and 10, 10 and 11, 17 and 18, and 24 and 25 of the reverse of PBS 13 84. Dividing lines employed in this manner are also regularly encountered in omen compendia.

Even in the earlier section of Text B (lines 1–31),[70] although we do not find omen protases, there is peculiar phrasing not found in the *ex eventu* texts. Thus we find in lines 26–27 an either/or statement: "either (*šumma*) the great gods will consult one another . . . or (*šumma*) there will be an Amorite attack."[71] The very next line offers a variant prediction, as one might expect to find in an omen collection: "destruction of the king; variant (KIMIN): destruction of the land and [its] people." Such phrasing makes sense in the case of an omen text but not in an *ex eventu* text that seeks to lay out a sequence of identifiable historical events.

Given that so much of Prophecy Text B now known to us is structured in the form of astrological omens, serious questions need to be asked concerning the section of the composition that in some ways very closely resembles the material found in the *ex eventu* texts. Biggs had early on suggested that the material at the beginning of Text B ought to be regarded as a peculiarly lengthy omen apodosis,[72] but subsequently retracted this interpretation.[73] The early portions of this text continue to defy easy interpretation.

The very conditionality of the omen form indicates that something very different is going on in Text B from what we find in the *ex eventu* works. The efficacy of a historical review cast as a prediction lies in the definitive nature of the "predicted" historical event: there can be no room for the possibility that the necessary sign might not appear or that the portended event be avoided by means of a *namburbi* ritual. The fatalistic view of political history in the *ex eventu* texts is at odds with the mechanistic fatalism of the omen literature, to which Text B seems particularly beholden. This is not to say that Text B is a typical omen text; it certainly is not. However, the facts (1) that it includes astrological observations as protases of conditionals and (2) that given observations may lead to one or another result together indicate that Text B is not only more similar to omens in form but is functioning in a way much less in line with the *ex eventu* texts than with more traditional Mesopotamian omen literature.

---

70. Following Biggs ("More Babylonian Prophecies") and Grayson and Lambert ("Akkadian Prophecies"), line numbers refer to the copy of the text published as *CT* 13 50 for the portions of the text preserved therein.

71. This is how Biggs translates the passage; another way to interpret these two lines is to read *šumma* in each case as introducing the protasis of a conditional (the apodosis of which is lost, as the ends of the lines are broken). Neither construction is to be found in the five *ex eventu* texts treated in Chapter 2.

72. Biggs, "More Babylonian 'Prophecies,'" 118.

73. Biggs, "New Source," 7.

4. The Fürstenspiegel

Among the numerous Mesopotamian texts generally grouped together under the rubric "wisdom" is a poem commonly known as the Babylonian *Fürstenspiegel*.[74] An edition with English translation of the work has been published by W. G. Lambert under the title *Advice to a Prince*.[75] The text is understood by scholars as a *speculum regis*, a critique of bad kingship and advice on how to rule.[76] While the text is universally recognized to be a piece of wisdom literature and while it lacks any of the mantic aspects of the *ex eventu* texts, it nonetheless is one of the literary works in Akkadian that, in certain ways, corresponds most closely in literary form to our ve *ex eventu* texts. Like these, the *Fürstenspiegel* employs both the form and general vocabulary of omen apodoses; in the place of omen protases are statements of royal action in the preterite tense, absent the conditional *šumma*. For example:

[1] A king did not heed justice; his people will be thrown into chaos, his land will be devastated.

[2] He did not heed the justice of his land; Ea, King of Destinies, [3] will change his destiny, he will continually pursue him in hostility.

[4] He did not heed his nobles; his days will be cut off.

[5] He did not heed his advisors; his land will rebel against him

It seems that the reader of the text was meant to supply the conditional; the very similarity to the omen form would in fact almost certainly bring the conditionality of the lines to mind.[77] Hence, rendering the text

---

74. This designation for the text seems to have originated with Benno Landsberger, "Studien zu den Urkunden aus der Zeit des Ninurta-tukul-Aššur," *AfO* 10 (1935–1936): 140–59. The text had been published in copy form more than thirty years earlier by T. Pinches, *JRAS* (1904), 415.

75. See W. G. Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960; reprint: Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1996), 110–15. Lambert provides a transcription and translation on these pages; a handcopy of the tablet (DT 1) can be found in the same volume, plates 31–32.

76. The term *speculum regis* or *speculum regum* came to be used to designate a type of literature in medieval Europe; note, e.g., the works of Godfrey of Viterbo (*Speculum regum*, c. 1180), Simon Islip (*Speculum regis*, c. 1344), and Alvarus Pelagius (*Speculum regum*, c. 1341). For the pre-history of this literary type in Greco-Roman antiquity, see J. Manuel Schulte, *Speculum Regis: Studien zur Fürstenspiegel-Literatur in der greichisch-römischen Antike* (Antike Kultur und Geschichte 3; Münster: Lit, 2001), esp. 11–16 on the mature, medieval literature. See also M. Roberts, "Fürstenspiegel," *Der Neue Pauly*, vol. 4, cols. 693–95.

77. Especially since the "conditional" aspect of an omen was often represented by the sign DIŠ (= Akkadian *šumma*, "if"), a single vertical stroke at the start of each omen.

as does Lambert, "*If* a king does not heed justice . . . , " makes much more sense. Additionally, the *Fürstenspiegel* shares with the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts the mimicry not only of omen vocabulary and partial form but of typical omen orthography. As Lambert observes, "Paleographically too this text is related to omens in its frequent use of ideograms where other types of texts would write out the words syllabically."[78] Oppenheim, in fact, refers to this text simply as an "omen collection."[79]

Since it seems clear that the predictive aspect of the *ex eventu* texts is lacking in the *Fürstenspiegel*, we are dealing with a signi cantly different literary phenomenon. However, beyond the similarities in orthography, vocabulary, and phrasing, one ought to bear in mind that there are additional points of contact. Foremost, both the *Fürstenspiegel* and the *ex eventu* texts are primarily concerned with kings and kingship. The text speaks so strongly as a didactic voice to a king, with strong suggestions of a Neo-Assyrian milieu, that I. M. Diakonoff has argued that the *Fürstenspiegel* was composed as a warning to the Neo-Assyrian king Sennacherib.[80] While we now know the text to have been composed earlier than this, we nonetheless also possess a letter addressed to Sennacherib's successor, Esarhaddon, in which the composition is quoted as a warning.[81] One must not minimize the difference that the *ex eventu* compositions present themselves as mantic texts, that is, works mediating divine knowledge ostensibly about the future, while the *Fürstenspiegel*—despite being copied at times as part of the omen series *Šumma ālu*—lacks any mantic elements save stylistic in uence from omen literature; nonetheless, the texts do share something in terms of functionality. The *ex eventu* texts, like all texts that purport to provide knowledge about the future, are intended to have consequences in the present; predictions of future weal and woe are intended to encourage or admonish certain behaviors in the audience of the mantic specialist/author. The speci c concerns, however, are not identical. While the *ex eventu* texts seek to generate support for native claimants to the throne over non-native/illegitimate rulers, the *Fürstenspiegel* is intended to warn a native Mesopotamian king (and, quite likely, a speci c

---

78. Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom*, 110.

79. Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia*, 224.

80. I. M. Diakonoff, "A Political Pamphlet from about 700 B.C.," in *Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger on His Seventy-Fifth Birthday* (ed. H. G. Güterbock and T. Jacobsen; AS 16; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), 343–49. Diakonoff's suggestion, however, must ultimately be abandoned: a recently published copy of the text pre-dates Sennacherib. See Steven W. Cole, *Nippur IV: The Early Neo-Babylonian Governor's Archive from Nippur* (OIP 114. Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1996), introduction and text number 128.

81. The text was published as *CT* 54 212. See Erica Reiner, "The Babylonian Fürstenspiegel in Practice," in *Societies and Languages of the Ancient Near East: Studies in Honour of I. M. Diakono* (ed. M. A. Dandamayev; Warminster, UK: Aris & Phillips, 1982), 321–26.

reigning Neo-Assyrian monarch) about the dire consequences of abusing the power he already possesses. The *Fürstenspiegel* is clearly directed to a monarch whereas the intended audiences of the *ex eventu* texts, as argued in Chapter 2, are segments of society that are unsure whether to lend their social and political clout to the claim of a specic royal gure, particularly in the face of foreign domination.

In short, there is little reason to consider the *Fürstenspiegel* and the *ex eventu* texts to be of a single literary type. The similarities of the texts are detailed here primarily to highlight how Mesopotamian omen literature exerted a powerful stylistic in uence on scribes who, trained in the copying of such standardized works as the canonical omen compendia, composed texts that mimicked the style, vocabulary, and orthography of omens.

5. The Historiographic Tradition: Chronicles, King Lists, etc.

As has been repeatedly stressed already, there most clearly is some connection between the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts and Mesopotamian chronographic traditions. If we are to maintain that the *ex eventu* texts do indeed refer to kings in historical succession, refer to events in the reigns of those kings known from chronographic texts, and at times even include the number of years of a king's rule, then we must admit that the scribes who authored these works must have had recourse to chronographic works, or at least shared sources in common with them. In fact, several modern authors writing specically on the topic of historiographic texts have felt it necessary to address the relationship of the *ex eventu* works to texts such as chronicles. Thus, John Van Seters devotes a section to the *ex eventu* texts in a chapter entitled "Mesopotamian Historiography."[82] Van Seters, citing Hallo, suggests that Text A relied in part on the text known as the Eclectic Chronicle, as well as on a document that listed the regnal lengths of successive kings of the period.[83]

Jean-Jacques Glassner has likewise addressed the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts under the rubric "historiographic literature" in his edition of Meso-

---

82. Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 96–99.

83. Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 98. Hallo, however, seems to imply that the author of Text A was writing independently of any reference to this or another chronicle: "In any case, we thus see that the most explicit of the so-called prophecies gives every indication of recording, in its peculiar style, events of a past suciently recent or well-established in memory to accord with the more prosaic accounts of the same period as transmitted in the chronographic literature" (Hallo, "Akkadian Apocalypses," 239). It seems more plausible that the authors of Text A and other *ex eventu* texts simply had access to written chronicles and borrowed liberally, and loosely, from them. The Eclectic Chronicle appears as Chronicle 24 in *ABC*, and as Chronicle 47 in Glassner, *Mesopotamian Chronicles*.

potamian chronicles.[84] However, like Van Seters, Glassner has little to say other than that the *ex eventu* texts clearly betray knowledge of Mesopotamian historiographic traditions, such as the chronicles. There is nothing in the literary structure, style, or orthographic presentation that would lead one to identify the *ex eventu* compositions as being of a single literary type with the chronicles. Most glaring, of course, is the use of the present-future tense in the *ex eventu* texts, against the use of past-tense narrative and date formulae in the chronicles, clearly indicating past time. The chronicles and the *ex eventu* texts are no more identical in genre than are the biblical books of Ezra-Nehemiah and Haggai. It should therefore come as no surprise that Grayson, writing after he had worked on the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts with Lambert, would author an article titled "Divination and the Babylonian Chronicles" that makes no mention of the *ex eventu* texts.[85]

6. Prophecies

Of greater interest are the Mesopotamian texts, primarily from Old Babylonian Mari and seventh-century Assyria, that are now most commonly known as prophecies.[86] This material has spawned a tremendous amount of secondary literature, primarily among those who seek to relate it to prophetic activity in ancient Israel and Judah. The Mesopotamian texts are united in that they purport to record the words of a god or goddess via an intermediary, variously called *āpilum/āpiltum* (literally, "answerer"), *muḫḫûm/muḫḫūtum* ("ecstatic"), or *assinnum* ("cult singer"), along with one or two other infrequent designations in the Mari texts; and

84. Glassner, *Mesopotamian Chronicles*, 20–21.

85. Grayson's essay "Divination and the Babylonian Chronicles" was presented at the fourteenth Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale in 1965, a year after "Akkadian Prophecies" appeared in print.

86. Happily these works appear in thorough, modern editions. For the Mari texts, see Jean-Marie Durand, *Archives Épistolaires de Mari I/1* (ARM 26; Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilizations, 1988); see also idem, *Les documents épistolaires du palais de Mari* (3 vols.; Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1997–2000). Much of the prophetic corpus from Mari has also been translated into English by Wolfgang Heimpel, *Letters to the King of Mari: A New Translation with Historical Introduction, Notes, and Commentary* (MC; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003). Two Old Babylonian prophecies from Eshnunna have been published by Maria de Jong Ellis, "The Goddess Kititum Speaks to King Ibalpiel: Oracle Texts from Ishchali," *MARI* 5 (1986) 235–66. For the Neo-Assyrian texts, see Simo Parpola, *Assyrian Prophecies* (SAA 9; Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1997). Note also the collection of references to prophetic activity in the Neo-Assyrian corpus by Martti Nissinen, *References to Prophecy in Neo-Assyrian Sources* (SAAS 7; Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 1998). Transliterations and English translations of the prophecy texts have been provided together in a most convenient volume by Martti Nissinen, *Prophets and Prophecy in the Ancient Near East* (WAW 12; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003).

primarily *raggimu/raggintu* ("speaker, proclaimer") and *maḫḫû* (an Assyrian dialect variant of Babylonian *muḫḫûm*) in the Neo-Assyrian materials.[87] It is worthwhile at this point simply to emphasize what we mean by "prophecy": namely, a *type* of divination, wherein an individual, male or female, issues oral declarations as if spoken directly by a god to a third party.[88] One must put away the long Western tradition that views divination and prophecy as somehow opposed; divination is a category of social performance of which prophecy is but one type.[89]

The literature on Mesopotamian prophecy and its relationship to Israelite and Judean prophecy is immense and could not possibly be recounted here. Suffice it to say that there is broad agreement that the sociological phenomenon underlying and leading to the written record of both Mesopotamian and biblical prophetic oracles is roughly analogous. The literary forms, however, are quite different. Even among the Mesopotamian materials there is a distinction of literary genre. As a rule, the Old Babylonian prophecies are recorded in letters; however, much of the Neo-Assyrian material is preserved in oracle compendia.[90] Therefore, the question is not strictly whether the *ex eventu* texts are of the same genre as Mesopotamian prophecies (themselves preserved in multiple genres), but instead whether the institution of prophecy has somehow influenced the production of the *ex eventu* texts.

---

87. For an overview of the terms for and function of the various prophetic figures in these corpora, see Herbert B. Huffmon, "A Company of Prophets: Mari, Assyria, Israel," *Prophecy in Its Ancient Near Eastern Context: Mesopotamian, Biblical, and Arabian Perspectives* (ed. M. Nissinen; SBLSS 13; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000), 47–70; on the Mari material, see the excellent introduction by J.-M. Durand, "Les 'déclarations prophétiques' dans les lettres de Mari," *Prophétie et oracles*, 8–74; Durand includes a roster of the named individuals called variously *muḫḫûm*, *āpilum*, and *assinnum* in the Mari texts, 25–27. See also the overview by Eckart Frahm, "Prophetie," *RLA* 11.7–11.

88. This extremely brief, short-hand definition draws on several well-established and largely complementary definitions of prophecy. See, inter alia, Manfred Weippert, "Aspekte israelitischer Prophetie im Lichte verwandter Erscheinungen des Alten Orients," in *Ad bene et deliter seminandum: Festgabe für Karlheinz Deller zum 21. Februar 1987* (ed. G. Mauer and U. Magen; AOAT 220; Kevelaer/ Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988), 287–319 (here 289–90); Abraham Malamat, "A Forerunner of Biblical Prophecy: The Mari Documents," in *Ancient Israelite Religion: Esssays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross* (ed. P. D. Miller, P. D. Hanson, and S. D. McBride; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 33–52 (especially 34–35); and Nissinen, "What Is Prophecy? An Ancient Near Eastern Perspective" in *Inspired Speech: Prophecy in the Ancient Near East* (ed. John Kaltner and Louis Stulman; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 17–37.

89. This point has been made repeatedly in the scholarly literature on prophecy in the Near East. See, e.g., Nissinen, SAAS 7.4–9, 164–69; similarly, with an emphasis on the usefulness of distinguishing types of divination, see idem, "Prophecy and Omen Divination: Two Sides of the Same Coin," *Divination and Interpretation of Signs in the Ancient World* (ed. Amar Annus; Oriental Institute Seminars 6; Chicago: Oriental Institute, 2010), 341–47.

90. On the processes of textualization especially in regard to the Neo-Assyrian material, see Beate Pongratz-Leisten, "'The Writing of the God' and the Textualization of Neo-Assyrian Prophecy," forthcoming in A. Lange, ed., *I Am No Prophet* (Leiden: Brill).

This is a question that is nearly impossible to answer with certainty. On the one hand, there does not seem to have been the same sort of literary influence exerted on the *ex eventu* texts by written Mesopotamian prophetic oracles as was exerted by omen literature or even chronicles: the phrasing and orthographic peculiarities of the *ex eventu* compositions are far more similar to what one finds in omen compendia than in the prophetic compendia. On the other hand, the mode of communicating information about the future is quite similar: predictions of prophetic figures are simple, declarative statements, not contingent on the observation of any ominous sign and apparently cannot be negated by a specified apotropaic ritual. In a manner similar to the Shulgi and Marduk texts, in prophetic oracles the god or goddess typically speaks in the first person. Thus we find, for example, in the Neo-Assyrian oracle compilation K 4310 individual oracles beginning with statements such as *a-na-ku* ᵈ15 *ša* ᵘʳᵘ*arba-ìl*, "I am Ishtar of Arbela" (SAA 9 1.1:18′), and *a-na-ku* ᵈEN *is-si-ka*, "I am Bel; I speak to you" (SAA 9 1.4:17). K2401 contains oracles of salvation, again spoken in the voice of the deity, recounting past acts of the god on behalf of the king (SAA 9 text 3, especially sections 3.2 and 3.3). Among Mesopotamian mantic texts, this comes perhaps closest to what we find in the Marduk and Shulgi speeches, with their lengthy first-person narrations of past actions by the divine/divinized speaker in question within an overall mantic context. However, I must agree with the assessment of Simo Parpola regarding these sections:

> The individual promises are on the whole very generally formulated (safety, protection, defeat of unspecified enemies, stability of throne); even when names are mentioned (2.4, 3.2, 3.5, 7, 8), one looks in vain for accurate and concrete "predictions." This indicates that the course of history as such was of little or no interest to the prophets. What mattered was whether or not the God was with the king. . . .[91]

This constitutes a major point of distinction with the concern of the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts, whose functions seem dependent on presenting the audience with identifiable events of the past.

Despite certain similarities, the objection offered at the outset still stands: given that there is no reason to suspect that the *ex eventu* texts were the product of a prophet, that is, someone who would have borne the native designation *āpilu*, *muḫḫû*, *raggimu*, etc., it makes little sense to continue to refer to the texts simply as "Akkadian prophecies." Indeed, none of the Akkadiean *ex eventu* texts even mentions prophetic figures, nor do they suggest the transmission of a divine message to a third party via an intermediary. Thus my preferred designation, "*ex eventu* text," avoids

---

91. Parpola, *Assyrian Prophecies*, lxvi.

the confusion generated by the term "prophecy"; it speci cally refers to a literary phenomenon that bears no necessary relation to the sociological role performed by a prophet. To retain the designation "prophecy" is not merely innacurate as a descriptor of literary form (for "prophecy" is not a genre of literature, but a sociological phenomenon that may be represented in written records in a wide variety of literary forms[92]), but it actively misrepresents what we are able to reconstruct about the production of the *ex eventu* texts.

While it is clear that we cannot make any   rm claims about the direct relevance of the written forms of prophecy in Mesopotamia to the scribal production of *ex eventu* compositions, Scurlock has recently argued that these texts are directly related to aspects of "biblical prophecy." In particular, she compares the Uruk and Dynastic prophecies to sections of Nahum and Isaiah. She seeks to place these two Akkadian works on the same footing as the biblical texts by the following logic: (1) she assumes that the Akkadian texts, which she otherwise calls "historical omens," are nonetheless "prophecies"; (2) they speak about past events; (3) speaking about past events is therefore part of Mesopotamian divinatory texts; (4) some passages in prophetic books talk about past events; ergo (5) "biblical prophecy", like the "prophecies" of the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts, can be subsumed under the heading "divination," and speci cally the category "historical omens."[93]

As regards Scurlock's argument, as should be clear, I think it is patently obvious from a historical and sociological perspective that the actions of prophets in ancient Israel and Judah ought to be categorized as a type of divination. I deny that the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts can in any way be accurately described as a form of Mesopotamian omen literature. There is certainly no warrant for calling the prophetic books of the Bible omen literature. Further problematizing Scurlock's work is that she focuses in particular on Isaiah 36–37, the famous historical narrative that occurs both here and in 2 Kgs 18:13–19:37 in nearly identical form.[94] This text is not prophetic, oracular, or otherwise mantic in any conceivable way; the only perspective from which one could align these chapters with predictive practice is a very particular canonical-confessional one. Su   ce it to say that Scurlock's argument for categorizing such passages in the Hebrew Bible as being of one type with the Akkadian *ex eventu* works fails to convince on several fronts.

---

92. To underscore this point, see the texts collected by Nissinen in SAAS 7.
93. Scurlock, "Prophecy as a Form of Divination," 283.
94. Scurlock, "Prophecy as a Form of Divination," especially 287–91.

7. First-Person Narrative Compositions

The claim that the most important literary genre for understanding the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts is a group of (fictional) first-person narratives, specifically in the names of legendary kings, has been pursued most vigorously by Tremper Longman III.[95] The idea does not originate with Longman, but had its first notable champion in Güterbock.[96] Güterbock noted the very great similarity between the fragments of the Marduk Prophecy then known to him and what he termed *narû*-literature—so called because of the fiction that the compositions were copied onto tablets from original inscribed royal monuments, steles known in Akkadian as *narûs*. Longman's contention will be pursued in detail below; for now it must suffice to note that only two of the five *ex eventu* texts are definitively in the first person, as has been discussed in Chapter 2. If one is looking for generic influence or identity, the endeavor should logically be limited only to the Marduk and Shulgi texts. The extant portions of the other three texts in our small corpus would seem to share little with these first-person fictional royal narratives.

The Genre(s) of the Akkadian *Ex Eventu* Texts

Whenever an ancient text is found and published for the first time, the question of that text's genre is actively engaged. In truth, any time any text is read by any reader, questions of genre are wrestled with and, at least provisionally, decided upon. With the publication of the very first exemplar of our group of Akkadian *ex eventu* texts—Text A—the question of genre was addressed. Although, due to the format of the publication, Ebeling initially published neither discussion nor translation of Text A, the hand-drawn copy of VAT 10179 published as text 421 in *KAR* was placed beneath a one-word heading: *Prophezeiungen*. While the choice of this heading is ambiguous—it is probably best understood in English in a neutral sense simply as "predictions"—it nonetheless calls to mind "prophecy" and the prophetic books of the Hebrew Bible.[97] The link to

---

95. See Longman, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography*.

96. Güterbock, "Die historische Tradition."

97. Hence Manfred Weippert, in dealing with the Neo-Assyrian prophetic oracles, suggests retaining the German designation "Prophezeiung" for the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts, and distinguishing it from the Mari and Neo-Assyrian prophetic oracles which he proposes calling "Prophetie." See Weippert, "Assyrische Prophetien der Zeit Asarhaddons und Assurbanipals," in *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: New Horizons in Literary, Ideological and Historical Analysis* (ed. F. M. Fales; Rome: Istituto per l'Oriente, 1981). English unfortunately lacks quite correlative terms; calling the *ex eventu* texts "predictions" simply lacks enough specificity to be an analytically useful taxon.

biblical prophecy was reinforced in the translations and scholarly discussions to follow,   nally cemented when a translation and discussion of the text was published alongside three others by Grayson and Lambert under the title "Akkadian Prophecies," a designation that soon unleashed a torrent of debate. Although in theory the debate is over literary taxonomy—that is to say, genre—it will become clear in the review of the various positions below that the purposes and suppositions of scholars weighing in on the debate have rarely been purely literary.

Suggested Genres

1. Prophecy

Though probably introduced by Ebeling's copy of the text in *KAR*, the designation of the   ve *ex eventu* texts as "prophecy" was cemented with Grayson and Lambert's publication "Akkadian Prophecies." Grayson has even issued a defense of the term, arguing that "prophecy" be retained for the *ex eventu* texts, while "oracles" be used to categorize those texts that record the words of a prophetic   gure.[98] "Akkadian prophecies" has been the most common way to refer to the texts of our corpus in scholarly literature.

However, as noted already, the designation "prophecy" is fundamentally unsatisfying, if not out and out inappropriate. One problem is that the term is not a generic designation; there is no single genre "prophecy" upon whose literary features scholars agree. This is made most clear by the fact that the texts that Assyriologists agree are the products of prophetic speech are themselves heterogeneous in form. A second problem with the designation "prophecy" is a correlate of the   rst: prophecy points not to a literary form but to an underlying social phenomenon. As stated above, there is no reason to suppose that our   ve *ex eventu* texts originated as the speech acts of a *muḫḫû, raggimu*, etc.

Grayson has introduced a wrinkle to his continued use of the designation "prophecy." Since his publication of the Dynastic Prophecy, Grayson has argued that the "Akkadian prophecies" are a sub-grouping of the larger genre "historical-literary text."[99] Thus, in his article "Assyria and Babylonia" in the series of pieces on "Histories and Historians of the Ancient Near East,"[100] Grayson includes a section on the Akkadian

---

98. See, Grayson, *BHLT*, 13–14. Philippe Talon has endorsed this nomenclature, distinguishing between "textes prophétiques" and "textes oraculaires." See Talon, "Les textes prophétiques."

99. See Grayson, *BHLT*; idem, "Assyria and Babylonia," *Orientalia* NS 49 (1980): 140–94, especially 182–83.

100. See the "Preface" by John Wevers, *Orientalia* 49 (1980): 137–39.

ex eventu texts, under the heading "Historical-Literary Texts," sub-heading "Prophecies." The term "historical-literary text" functions as a macro-genre in Grayson's usage, on a taxonomic level analogous to royal inscriptions and chronographic texts. These two, along with historical-literary texts, form the three major literary taxa to which Grayson assigns all texts that are in some way "historical." Each of the three groups is subdivided many times. The historical-literary texts are divided into (1) prophecies, (2) historical epics (itself subdivided into three types); and (3) pseudo-autobiographies.[101] There is nothing inherently problematic in such a classi catory system; it seems certain that the *ex eventu* texts do indeed contain identi able historical data, and thus considering them broadly among ancient Mesopotamian historical sources is not inappropriate. Nor, however, is it necessary (nor does Grayson claim it to be so); one could maintain Grayson's designation of our texts as "prophecies" but instead situate them within a taxonomical hierarchy with "mantic texts" at the most abstract level.

2. Apocalypse

The staunchest proponent of the designation "apocalypse" is William H. Hallo.[102] His proposal is based on the fact that the use of *vaticinium ex eventu* in our texts is most closely paralleled by Judean works such as Daniel 9 and 10–12. In constructing his argument in favor of the designation "apocalypse," Hallo drew on the work of the venerable scholar of Jewish and Christian apocalyptic texts R. H. Charles. In particular, Hallo sought to demonstrate that Text A was on a par with the book of Daniel in terms of "its treatment of unful lled prophecy, in its temporal and spatial scope, in its anonymity or pseudonymity, and in its deterministic view of world history."[103] It was only with regard to a fth point that Hallo found Text A lacking: eschatology. But, he speculates, "Although our text does not preserve any 'Messianic' portions, it espouses a cyclical view of history which may very well have culminated in a nal, catastrophic time of troubles leading into a nal and permanent *Heilszeit* under the aegis of a savior-king."[104]

Hallo is certainly correct in that it is far more interesting, and seemingly more fruitful, to compare the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts to early Judean apocalypses rather than to the books of the biblical prophets. However, his work is in some ways the victim of its historical circumstance. Hallo wrote

---

101. Grayson, "Assyria and Babylonia," 182–88.

102. He rst proposed this terminological change in his article "Akkadian Apocalypses." Hallo has reasserted his position, with additional textual support and re nement, in "The Expansion of Cuneiform Literature."

103. Hallo, "Akkadian Apocalypses," 241.

104. Hallo, "Akkadian Apocalypses," 241.

on Text A at the dawn of a new era in the study of apocalyptic literature; the years immediately following were to substantially rede ne the study of apocalypses and apocalypticism.[105] This was to take two main forms: discussion of apocalypticism as a sociological phenomenon with apocalyptic texts as its artifacts,[106] and discussion of the literary form and structure of the texts that are generally regarded to be apocalypses.[107] A second problem is Hallo's contention that ancient Mesopotamians had a "cyclical" view of history; although once a common claim in the literature, and one with a pedigree extending back far earlier than Hallo's work, there is little if any evidence to support the notion. In all likelihood this idea originated as a chauvinistic distinction between biblical historical thought, conceived of as linear and therefore like our own, over and against "pagan" thought, benighted by polytheism and nature worship, unable to conceive of time beyond the seasonal cycle. Although Hallo's designation "apocalypse" for these texts has found some support,[108] particularly among Assyriologists, his claim that the *ex eventu* texts are properly termed "apocalypses" has been widely rejected.[109]

Obviously a large portion of the problem depends on one's de nition of "apocalypse." There are several factors contributing to confusion when dealing with the study of apocalypses that do not hold, for example, in the study of Israelite and Mesopotamian prophecy. Prophecy, for all the slipperiness surrounding the term, is in some ways a known quantity. Prophecy is a divinatory technique. Like observing oil on water, consulting liver omens, or operating a Ouija board, prophecy is a means of obtaining information about the present or future from an unseen, non-earthly source. Prophecy is a social phenomenon: the prophet, like the Tarot reader, performs a social role. Whether or not a prophet's activi-

---

105. This "new era" of apocalyptic studies is often regarded as beginning in force with the publication of Klaus Koch's *Ratlos vor der Apokalyptik* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1970).

106. See especially the in uential work of Otto Plöger, *Theokratie und Eschatologie* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1959), issued in a second edition that was then translated into English as *Theocracy and Eschatology* (trans. S. Rudman; Oxford: Blackwell, 1968); and that of Paul D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*. For a convenient summary of Plöger, Hanson, as well as earlier twentieth-century scholarship, see J. Douglas Thomas, "Jewish Apocalyptic and the Comparative Method," *Scripture in Context: Essays in the Comparative Method* (ed. Carl D. Evans, William H. Hallo, and John B. White; Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series 34; Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1980), 245–62.

107. See especially the volume edited by John J. Collins, *Apocalypse: Morphology of a Genre*. *Semeia* 14 (1979).

108. E.g., Longman, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography*, 167–78.

109. See, e.g., Borger, "Gott Marduk," 24; John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (2d ed.; BRS; Grand Rapids, MI; Eerdmans, 1998), 27; Kaufman, "Prediction, Prophecy, and Apocalypse"; Helmer Ringgren, "Akkadian Apocalypses"; Wilson, *Prophecy and Society*, 119–23.

ties are somehow recorded has no bearing on whether prophecy actually occurs within a society as a phenomenon. One can debate what should or should not be termed a "prophetic text"; that is a literary question, speci - cally a question of genre. The question of prophetic activity is a sociological and—for students of ancient cultures—a historical question.

The apocalypse question is of a different order. There is no social phenomenon "apocalypsing" quite analogous to "prophesying." The study of apocalypticism begins with locating literary a   nity to a known quantity, a text that is an "apocalypse." Unsurprisingly, historically this has begun with *the* Apocalypse, the Revelation of John preserved in the New Testament.[110] By scholarly consensus, the literary category "apocalypse" also includes a select group of pre-Christian Judean texts, most notably the last six chapters of the book of Daniel. The issue is complicated when one seeks to   nd the origins of this literary genre. Thus, while not terming the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts "apocalypses," both Grayson and Lambert have sought to locate the origins of Judean apocalypses in these very texts.[111] The hunt for precursors is precarious because, logically, a text that is a precursor to a genre cannot be a member of that genre. Therefore, the scholar in search of precursors to apocalypses must turn to texts that, while not apocalypses, are in some meaningful way "apocalyptic." One thinks immediately of the many studies seeking to locate the origins of the genre apocalypse in prophetic texts such as Zechariah or Isaiah 24–27.[112] Almost universally, however, these searches for origins are not concerned with literary a   nity alone but with the social contexts in which apocalypses and apocalypse-like texts are produced.

This has led to the production of often confused and confusing terminology. An apocalypse, properly understood, is a text that belongs to the literary genre "apocalypse." The adjective "apocalyptic" can be—and has been—used to refer to anything that resembles some aspect of an apocalypse. Carol Newsom has written quite frankly on the trouble with the term "apocalyptic":

> To be honest, I have some reservations about the usefulness of the adjective "apocalyptic." There are serious questions whether it refers to a perspective with enough speci city to be useful in identifying the common element in a very diverse body of texts. Still, it remains unavoidable, even

---

110. This, of course, is the simple historical reality, invoked to help explain the state of confusion that still obtains in the study of apocalypses. I do not intend to suggest that any modern theoretical construct of the genre "apocalypse" or the sociological taxon "apocalypticisim" need start by construing Revelation as normative and paradigmatic for the construct.

111. A. K. Grayson, "The Babylonian Origin of Apocalyptic Literature," 203–18; Lambert, *Background of Jewish Apocalyptic*.

112. See, e.g., Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*; Cook, *Prophecy and Apocalypticism*.

if it sometimes seems to be little more than a scholarly grunt and gesture toward something that we recognize but cannot quite articulate.[113]

Newsom's reference to a "perspective" is important. Very often it is supposed that there is a mode of thought, different from "normal" thought, marked by apocalyptic tendencies. This mode of thought may or may not be accompanied by a variety of specific actions. This constitutes a social phenomenon called "apocalypticism." Somewhat perversely, apocalypticism as a mode of understanding one's circumstances need not lead to the production of an apocalypse—and I think I can safely surmise it most often has not. The situation is only confused further when modern scholars insist on using the adjective "apocalyptic" as a noun signifying a category of texts that may or may not be apocalypses in literary form.[114]

However, there do exist widely accepted definitions of the genre apocalypse among scholars of Second Temple Judaism and early Christianity. Probably the most influential attempt to outline the constituent elements of the genre apocalypse has been *Semeia* 14, edited by John Collins. The contributors to the volume produced charts in which they mark the presence or absence in various texts of more than twenty-five elements of form and content. From this they distilled an essential definition of the genre:

> "Apocalypse" is a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world.[115]

The Akkadian *ex eventu* works fall short of this definition on several counts: three of the texts lack a narrative framework, although it is pos-

---

113. Carol Newsom, "Apocalyptic and the Discourse of the Qumran Community," *JNES* 49 (1990): 135–44; here 135 n. 1.

114. As is championed by, e.g., Lester Grabbe, "Introduction and Overview," in *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic, and Their Relationships* (ed. L. L. Grabbe and R. D. Haak; JSPSup 46; London: T&T Clark, 2003), 2–43; and idem, "Prophetic and Apocalyptic: Time for New Definitions—And New Thinking," *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic, and Their Relationships* (ed. L. L. Grabbe and R. D. Haak; JSPSup 46; London: T&T Clark, 2003), 108–33. It seems as if Grabbe's position is triggered in part by a frustration with the narrow confines of using "apocalypse" only to refer to a text of a specific literary genre, which by most accounts would exclude something like Isaiah 24–27, which, while widely regarded as having apocalyptic features, is not an apocalypse in form. "Apocalyptic" then serves as a catch-all category for texts that exhibit some influence from the social phenomenon of apocalypticism. However, the use of the word "apocalyptic" as a category of texts serves only to muddle further an already muddy picture. See the response to Grabbe by John J. Collins, "Prophecy, Apocalypse and Eschatology: Reflections on the Proposals of Lester Grabbe," in *Knowing the End* (ed. Grabbe and Haak), 44–53.

115. John J. Collins, "Introduction," in *Apocalypse: Morphology of a Genre. Semeia* 14, 9.

sible some sort of framework existed in the now missing sections of those works; none of them involves a supernatural intermediary between the god and the human recipient; none of them speci es a human seer as recipient of the revelation; there is no indication of a transcendent temporal reality in any of them (i.e., the texts lack apocalyptic eschatology).[116]

The de nition offered in *Semeia* 14 is of course not the only possible approach to the question What is an apocalypse? Another well-regarded approach to apocalyptic texts has been offered by Christopher Rowland. Rowland focuses primarily on the aspect of revealed mysteries as the heart of what he terms "apocalyptic": "The use of the word apocalyptic to describe the literature of Judaism and Christianity should, therefore, be con ned to those works which purport to offer disclosures of the heavenly mysteries, whether as the result of vision, heavenly ascent or verbal revelations."[117] In this regard, Michael Stone has similarly highlighted the importance of revelation of divine secrets as an integral part of apocalyptic discourse in early Judaism.[118] According to Rowland, however, eschatology ought *not* be used as a hallmark of apocalyptic; this is because, in his view, the eschatology found in "apocalyptic" is not substantially different from eschatological notions that one encounters in non-apocalyptic, contemporary Judean and Christian compositions. This objection, obviously, is little help to us in comparing the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts to early Judean apocalypses, as the former lack anything that might properly be called eschatology. Furthermore, I am simply not convinced by Rowland's objections that apocalypses lack a distinct and distinguishable eschatological outlook compared to other Judean works. Even more problematic for adopting Rowland's approach is that he shuns the idea that discussions of "apocalyptic" be especially concerned with questions of either literary form or content.[119] Rather, for Rowland, the *sine qua non* of "apocalyptic" is revelation by means of audition, vision, or dream.

Separating the adjective "apocalyptic" from the noun "apocalypse" and then substantivizing it as something that is not coterminous with "apocalypse" is somewhat confusing. With the lack of a noun to modify (e.g., apocalyptic outlook, apocalyptic discourse, etc.) the term is hopelessly vague. It seems to be something of a theological category for Rowland, divorced from those things (i.e., texts) that might belong to it, yet

---

116. See John J. Collins, "Apocalyptic Eschatology as the Transcendence of Death," *CBQ* 36 (1974): 21–43.

117. Christopher Rowland, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 71.

118. Michael Stone, "Lists of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature," *Magnalia Dei, the Mighty Acts of God: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright* (ed. F. M. Cross, W. E. Lemke, and P. D. Miller; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976), 414–54.

119. In his words, "[C]ontent and form should not in the rst instance be the bases for a de nition of apocalyptic" (*Open Heaven*, 71).

simultaneously de ned by them. Such an approach to apocalypses is too open ended and non-speci c to be useful as an analytical category in the present investigation. It is, however, worth noting that the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts fail to pass the apocalypse test on Rowland's criteria as well. There is no interest in the revelation of heavenly mysteries outside the events of human history; and even here, it is questionable whether one can or should apply the term "heavenly mystery" to the unfolding of political events as contained in these texts. There is certainly no indication that the contents of the texts originated in a vision, audition, or dream.

3. Literary Predictive Text

The term "literary predictive text" was coined by Maria de Jong Ellis as a genre designation for the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts.[120] Her reasons for seeking a new, neutral term for these texts are largely in line with the objections voiced above concerning the designations "prophecy" and "apocalypse." Noting that both these terms are problematic, other scholars have also begun to use Ellis's terminology.[121] Martti Nissinen has further expanded on Ellis's position, arguing for her designation while highlighting the numerous problems with the designations "prophecy" and "apocalypse."[122] While I fully agree with Ellis that the previous terminology must be avoided, the term "literary predictive text" is wanting for reasons of its own. Besides being somewhat unwieldy, it speci es almost nothing about the grouping of texts that it is intended to denote. Nearly any mantic text could accurately be described as both literary and predictive, be it one of the Akkadian *ex eventu* works, Prophecy Text B, one of the Qumran pesharim, or the contents of a fortune cookie. The proposed name is simply too non-speci c to serve as a truly useful designation, be the texts grouped by literary or some other criteria. An appropriate label need not only be broad enough to describe all texts intended, but at the same time be narrow enough to exclude those texts which that label is *not* intended to designate.

4. Fictional Akkadian Autobiography with a Prophetic Ending

By far the most extensive and serious attempt to deal with the genre of the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts in purely literary terms has been that of Tremper Longman III in his book *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography*. Not surprisingly, he identi es the genre of these texts as " ctional Akkadian autobiography with a prophetic ending," the last phrase serving to dis-

---

120. Ellis, "Observations on Mesopotamian Oracles."

121. E.g., Pongratz-Leisten, *Herrschaftswissen in Mesopotamien*.

122. Nissinen, "Neither Prophecies nor Apocalypses."

tinguish it from the other types of ctional Akkadian autobiography he identi es.[123]

Longman begins by explicitly engaging literary-critical works on the issue of genre. His understanding of genre is most strongly indebted to the work of E. D. Hirsch,[124] although it exhibits a number of in uences. On the one hand, Longman recognizes that genre is a negotiated communication between author and audience; the reader's ability to understand a text is contingent on the reader identifying elements of genre.[125] On the other hand, Longman seems to deny that the generation of meaning in a text is contingent on this interplay between author and audience; rather, for him there is one meaning of a text, and one single genre to which a text appropriately may be assigned:

> The importance of identifying the genre of a text extends beyond that of classi cation. As Hirsch persuasively argues, the meaning of a text is genre-bound. In other words, the reader can arrive at a correct understanding of a text only through a correct genre analysis. Thus, in interpreting a text, the reader/critic must take steps toward determining its proper genre.[126]

Longman proceeds with the assumption that meaning is absolute, not negotiated; each text has one and only one "*proper* genre"—what E. D. Hirsch terms "intrinsic genre"—which is the key to recovering *the* meaning of a given text. Despite comments such as his recognition of genre as a product of dialogue between author and audience, Longman tends toward a rei cation of genre: genres are things that exist in substance *out there*; it is our job as critics to pluck the correct genre from the aether, t the appropriate texts into it, and esh out the text on the basis of what we assume the necessary components of this independently existing genre must be. His results when this method is applied to the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts are quite awed. The rst hints of this are presented in his very rst chapter:

> If, for instance, there is evidence of a rst-person historical prologue preceding a prophecy section of the most complete Mesopotamian prophecy texts (Marduk and Šulgi) and hints of such a rst-person form in the fragmentary introductions of others (Uruk Prophecy and Dynastic Proph-

---

123. These include rst person narrative texts such as the Sargon Birth Legend and the Cuthaean Legend of Naram-Sin.

124. See Hirsch, *Validity in Interpretation*, especially chapter 3. For a powerful critique of Hirsch (among others), see Stanley Fish, *Is There a Text in This Class?*, especially chapter 15, "What Makes an Interpretation Acceptable?"

125. Longman, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography*, 7.

126. Longman, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography*, 15.

ecy), then it is highly probable, though not certain, that in the remaining prophecy text (Text A) there is a similar rst-person introduction even though it is not extant. Since all these texts cohere into a de nable subgenre (= intrinsic genre) of a larger genre of ctional autobiography (= broad genre), this hypothesis may be correct from analogy alone.[127]

As this claim is made in the introduction, Longman has put the cart before the horse; Longman has not yet had a chance to demonstrate either (1) that the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts do indeed cohere into a single intrinsic genre, or (2) that they are all members of the broad genre " ctional Akkadian autobiography." However, note that even at this stage the reasoning is proceeding in the reverse order of that in which it is presented: the feature whose presence Longman is attempting to deduce (rst-person narrated autobiography) is a necessary component of the "broad genre" and not a distinguishing characteristic of the "intrinsic" genre. Membership in a single sub-genre is assumed to require membership of all texts in the same macro-genre. The model assumed here follows closely on traditional biological taxonomy: *Alligator mississippiensis* and *Melanosuchus niger* both belong to the family Alligatoridae; therefore, they must belong to the same higher order taxa, Order Crocodylia, Class Reptilia, etc.

Longman's assertion is awed on at least two levels. On one level, I reject the underlying assumption that there is a single necessary genre to which a given text must belong. Genre is best understood primarily as a heuristic tool mediated by relationships. The construction of genres is wholly dependent on the presence of an audience interacting with a text; therefore genre identi cation can never be absolute.

The second aw comes in the identi cation of all the *ex eventu* texts as members of a single "intrinsic genre." Longman nowhere makes an argument for this. He is far more concerned with arguing that each text belongs to the macro-genre of " ctional autobiography." For Longman, rst-person narration of the past represents the *sine qua non* for his genre. Thus we nd the following statements:

- Regarding the Uruk Prophecy: "Nevertheless, the evidence of rst person narration in these prophecies and the concept of generic probability … provide su cient evidence to make one reasonably certain that the Uruk Prophecy … is an autobiographical text."[128]

---

127. Longman, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography*, 16.

128. Longman, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography*, 147. The evidence to which he here refers consists of the ends of three lines from the extremely fragmentary obverse of the text. As was argued in the previous chapter, only the reading IZKIM^meš-*ú-a* as "my signs" in line 1 of the obverse is at all suggestive. While I certainly grant that this is most plausibly understood as indicating some lost rst person discourse in this line of text, I remain skeptical that this is su cient evidence by which to declare the entire work a rst person composition; it

- Regarding the Dynastic Prophecy: "In conclusion, generic probability and explicit, though broken, rst-person references indicate that the Dynastic Prophecy is an autobiographical text similar to the Marduk, Šulgi, and Uruk prophecies."[129]
- Regarding Text A: "[I]ncreasing generic similarity (i.e., the narrower the class) enhances the certainty of a judgment based on probability. Thus, Text A's generic similarity to the Marduk, Šulgi, Uruk, and Dynastic prophecies (particularly the rst two) points to the probability (not certainty) of Text A's autobiographical character."[130]

After his survey of each text, Longman then summarizes the characteristics of this genre. Three of his characteristics, however, depend on his argument of "generic probability," namely, (1) each text is presented as the speech of a "royal/divine gure"; (2) each text is an "autobiography"; (3) each text shares the common structure of a rst-person introduction, followed by a rst-person narrative history, and nally a prediction section.[131] In reality, these traits appear only in two of the ve texts. The weakness of Longman's generic assessment should now be clear: in his eagerness to prove that each of these texts belongs to the macro-genre " ctional autobiography" he has failed to demonstrate that the ve *ex eventu* texts themselves constitute a coherent sub-genre. This point is merely assumed as fact—as it has been by most scholars working on these texts—and never explicitly engaged.

While it is not impossible that future nds will reveal that there is signi cant rst-person narration in each of the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts, the evidence for such a claim at present rests on inference drawn from a handful of suggestive cuneiform signs in wholly broken context—where evidence exists at all (see Chapter 2). Longman does indeed deserve credit for drawing attention to these scant clues, but his conclusion that all the texts likely contained both a rst-person introduction and a narrative history seems unwarranted. How much weaker a foundation, then, is

---

certainly does not indicate that the text is cast as a remembrance of the past. See the discussion of the Uruk Prophecy in Chapter 2.

129. Longman, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography*, 152. The rst person references here are even less convincing than Longman's evidence for the Uruk Prophecy: "The rst two lines [of column 1] provide a hint, in that the few signs at the end of these lines appear to be rst-person references (-*ninni*). Speci cally, they are subjunctive of the ventive, which often designates motion toward a rst person speaker" (151). While I agree that these signs are suggestive of a rst person point of view, to call these "explicit" indications of rst person narration throughout the entire document is an overstatement; these few cuneiform signs, absent context, provide little if any justi cation for supposing an autobiographical narrative of past events in column 1 of the Dynastic Prophecy.

130. Longman, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography*, 162.

131. Longman, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography*, 164.

there for labeling Text A, the Uruk Prophecy, and the Dynastic Prophecy "autobiographies" in any meaningful way, which is to say nothing of the argument that they are framed as royal/divine utterances. Even if each of the ve *ex eventu* texts does begin with some rst-person prose—for which, again, there is indeed some cause to speculate—there is no reason to suppose that Text A, the Uruk Prophecy, and the Dynastic Prophecy are autobiographical. In point of fact, given trace remains and consideration of available space on the tablets of Text A, the Uruk Prophecy, and the Dynastic Prophecy, there is some reason to speculate against the idea that any rst-person introduction would have contained an autobiographical narrative of any substance.

Assessment

As the above review should indicate, those designations for the ve Akkadian *ex eventu* texts now currently in use by scholars are inadequate. Of those surveyed, "prophecy" and "apocalypse" are misleading, and " ctional autobiography" is simply unsupported by three of the texts thus designated. Only Ellis's suggestion of terming these works "literary predictive texts" is satisfying on the level of accuracy. However, the term is unsatisfactory in that, although accurate, the term is not precise; as a quali er, it fails to distinguish those works that it names from numerous other works that are intended to be excluded by the term. Therefore, I return to where the introduction of this study began, de ning our corpus by the one literary feature that scholars agree is present in each work: these are Akkadian *ex eventu* texts.

This is not to say that the presence of *vaticinium ex eventu* by itself is enough to properly delineate a literary genre. It is not; this is all the more true given that this device takes quite a different form in the Marduk Prophecy (and, to a lesser extant, in the Shulgi Prophecy) than in the others. *Vaticinium ex eventu* of the type we nd in the Akkadian works under consideration is a single literary trope that our texts happen to share. However, it is a rare enough feature of Akkadian literature that it serves as a useful criterion by which to delimit a group of texts, be they identical in terms of genre or not. Furthermore, it should be noted, it is the very presence of *ex eventu* prediction that has generated almost the entirety of the scholarly literature that discusses these texts. In some way, academics have already decided that it is this feature, so familiar to scholars of the ancient Near East from its presence in certain Judean apocalypses, that has rendered these texts "important" for modern study.

Given our present state of knowledge, it seems inadvisable to view these texts as joint members of any single literary genre judging by formal criteria. At the very least, the Marduk and Shulgi texts ought to be dis-

tinguished from the other three compositions. It hardly seems accidental that, of our ve texts, we nd these two—and only these two—generically linked by ancient scribes. It is also telling that these two royal/divine speeches are the only texts in our group that survive in more than a single exemplar. Güterbock's and Longman's association of these texts with rst-person compositions such as the Sargon Birth Legend makes quite a bit of sense. It is highly plausible that such ctional "royal inscriptions" written from the point of view of a legendary king of early Mesopotamia in uenced the composition of the Marduk and Shulgi texts, and, reciprocally, that scribes would have recognized these two works as belonging to this larger tradition of rst-person narrative concerning the exploits of long-ago rulers. However, even between these two texts there exist signi cant differences; most notably, the Marduk Prophecy only "predicts" the rise of one future monarch, in contradistinction to the four other texts. Additionally, the presence of a list of offerings in this text alone raises questions about the possibility of a distinct audience and function, at least by the time of our Neo-Assyrian copies.

It is questionable how closely related the structures of the various *ex eventu* compositions are beyond the distinguishing feature of rst- versus third-person point of view. We know that minimally roughly the rst eighty lines of both the Marduk and Shulgi compositions take the form of past narration; essentially the entirety of the extant portions of the other three texts has been composed in the present-future tense. Text A bears closer resemblance to Mesopotamian celestial omina than do the other texts; the Dynastic Prophecy is alone both in containing a secrecy colophon and showing signs of secondary expansion; the Uruk Prophecy is alone in focusing on the affairs of an individual city and its cult—a city that is not the seat of kingship, no less. In short, there is reason enough to argue that the variation among the extant portions of these texts is such that classifying them as works partaking of a single literary form, particularly given our present state of knowledge, is unwarranted if not simply misguided.

The Akkadian *Ex Eventu* Texts
in Their Greater Near Eastern Context

This chapter began with an assertion, familiar especially from the work of J. Z. Smith, that a scholar's rst task—especially a scholar who concerns himself primarily with comparison—is that of taxonomy. This is equally true for students of literature and for students of the history of religion. The recognition and creation of genres are always at least in part an exercise in taxonomy. As was discussed at the outset of this chapter,

some theorists of genre are interested in the historical development and differentiation of genres, while others view genre identi cation as fundamentally an act of synchronous comparison. Some of the efforts to identify a genre for the *ex eventu* texts have largely fallen into this latter type: given the lack of native Mesopotamian genre designations, scholars have treated all of Akkadian literature—and, even more broadly, all Near Eastern literature—as the palette from which similar compositions may be selected. To borrow once again from Smith, this is fundamentally analogous to traditional Linnaean taxonomy, the familiar hierarchical system in which an organism is assigned to a kingdom, phylum, class, order, family, genus, species, and numerous intervening taxa (e.g., subphylum, etc.).[132]

However, as has already been seen, a great number of studies in the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts (e.g., those of Grayson, Hallo, Lambert, et al.) are primarily interested in the relationship of these works to later Judean apocalypses. The interest here is not one of synchronous classi cation but rather of diachronic development.[133] That is, the classi catory interest in the *ex eventu* texts may be seen as analogous to the changes and challenges that have beset Linnaeus's biological classi catory system in the twentieth and twenty- rst centuries: despite the terms with which these scholars discuss the genre of the *ex eventu* texts, they are not interested in a synchronous taxonomy, such as the taxonomic system of Linnaeus, but rather in phylogeny or cladistics. That is, Grayson, Hallo, Lambert, and others are interested in the possibility of genetic liation between the Akkadian and Judean texts diachronically, speci cally whether the latter are genetic descendants of the former. The goal is not to locate a text within a set of ever smaller boxes, like Russian nesting dolls, but rather to place it on an evolutionary tree in the manner of a cladogram or genealogical chart. Each node signi es a text, a direct genetic descendant of the text(-type) at the next node up the tree. The disadvantage of organizing texts (as opposed to organisms) on such an evolutionary-genealogical chart is that, when modeling the evolutionary relationships of organisms, once a species branches off on a cladogram that branch can never rejoin existing branches. In the case of texts, species can interbreed, and branches of the "family tree" need not end in nodes; they may rejoin other branches time and again, only once more to diverge and produce new literary types or encode unique religio-historical phenomena.

A problem is posed by the fact that many scholars, such as Grayson,

---

132. For Smith on the analogical use of biological and, speci cally, Linnaean taxonomy, see especially "Fences and Neighbors," *Imagining Religion: From Babylon to Jonestown* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 1–18.

133. Cf. D. J. Wiseman, *Nebuchadrezzar and Babylon* (Schweich Lectures; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 93–98. While Wiseman does not argue explicitly for a designation for the Akkadian texts, he overtly states that they are of the same "genre" as Daniel (97).

Hallo, and Lambert, are interested primarily in the religio-historical study of the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts, yet have undertaken such study cached largely in literary (generic) terminology. Though the phrasing has varied, the persistent question has been: "Are the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts really (proto-)apocalypses?" It is worthwhile to return to our discussion of the genre apocalypse begun above, and in particular to the definition of the genre offered in *Semeia* 14. The contributors to *Semeia* 14 began with an assertion: there are some texts that bear such strong literary similarity that there is great merit in grouping them under the generic rubric "apocalypse." Further, the hallmark examples of this group—for example, Daniel, *4 Ezra*, *2 Baruch*, *1 Enoch*—are widely agreed upon. The process of listing a genre's constituent features proceeds first from a sense that certain texts belong together, then to describing why.

In short, the scholars responsible for *Semeia* 14 are themselves first readers; the definition of the genre that is offered is largely unencumbered by diachronic speculation and theories of the rise of this type of literature. That is, *Semeia* 14 takes as its object of study the literature, not the individuals who produced it. This is a distinction that has proved remarkably difficult to make among scholars of ancient Near Eastern texts; the difficulty undoubtedly has been caused to a greater or lesser degree by the fact that ancient Near Eastern studies has been dominated by historical critics. By focusing on genre, a literary-critical concern, many such scholars have been led (unconsciously?) to draw conclusions of literary dependence (or non-dependence). The question of dependence is a fundamentally historical concern, focused on the contact and communication of cultures and the transmission of religious phenomena and ideas.

By identifying an earlier Near Eastern text as generically identical to a later Judean one, a scholar can make a much stronger case for the origins of a type of Judean writing in a culturally foreign setting. For example, Lambert suggests that the author of Daniel likely knew of the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts, or texts of the same literary genre (assuming they in fact constitute a distinct genre). For him, our text of Daniel looks the way it does because ancient Judean authors cribbed the literary form from Mesopotamian literary prototypes. Such a conclusion is unwarranted. As will be argued in detail in the next chapter, the evidence for direct literary dependence of Daniel on Babylonian prototypes is minimal and, where it exists, circumstantial. The connection is made even more tenuous when one considers that elements held to be crucial to the genre apocalypse by scholars of apocalypses—for example, a narrative framework, angelic mediation of revealed knowledge, post-mortem reward and punishment—are lacking in the Akkadian texts. Therefore, the question that lies before us is not primarily "Are Judean apocalypses of the same genre as the Akkadian texts?" Rather, it is the nature and function of the trope of *vaticinium ex eventu* with which we must concern ourselves.

The fact of the matter is that the use of *vaticinium ex eventu* in the Akkadian texts and certain early Judean apocalypses is strikingly similar. The discussion above combined with the investigation of Judean works in the next three chapters should make it clear that the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts are not directly relevant to the investigation of the *literary form* of Judean apocalypses. However, given the content of these "predictions," the similarity of the texts does raise fascinating questions about the cultural and political realia surrounding their composition. The light that each corpus may shed on the other, therefore, shines not on overall literary structure but rather on social function and the modes and methods available to ancient scribes for expression. To anticipate our conclusions: the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts share with one another and the Judean texts to be investigated a developing discourse of "mantic historiography."

Chapter 2 argued for a specific historical location of each of the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts, and within that locus a particular function. Herein lies the comparative value of these texts. Therefore, the following section of our investigation will consider in turn the unique historical circumstances that gave rise to the various Judean works composed prior to the Roman destruction of Jerusalem in 70 c.e. that contain similar *ex eventu* historical reviews. The elucidation of this material serves a threefold purpose: (1) on the simplest level, to demonstrate the tenuous connection between Judean apocalypses and the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts on questions of formal dependence; (2) to clarify the use of *ex eventu* prediction in texts produced by late Second Temple Judean scribes; and (3) to fully situate the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts within their greater Near Eastern milieu as part of a literary phenomenon wedding mantic and historiographic practice that emerged multiple times in differing cultural contexts.

Daniel and *1 Enoch*: *Ex Eventu* Prediction in the Early Historical Apocalypses

[T]he origin of apocalyptic literature has been much debated. With the two aforementioned Babylonian prophecies [i.e., the Uruk and Dynastic Prophecies], we have the earliest examples of this type of literature.

<div align="right">A. K. Grayson[1]</div>

Thus, even if biblical apocalyptic goes no further back than ca. 165 b.c.e. (and this is debatable), there is now no chronological reason to exclude the possibility of seeing in the Akkadian genre its immediate inspiration.

<div align="right">W. W. Hallo[2]</div>

In such a syncretistic age as the Hellenistic it is certainly possible, perhaps even probable, that the author of Daniel adapted the style of a traditional Babylonian genre for his own purpose.

<div align="right">W. G. Lambert[3]</div>

Each of the above quotations (familiar already from the introduction) bears witness to a school of thought, prominent primarily among Assyriologists, that the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts directly in uenced the writing of apocalypses by Judeans of the Hellenistic and early Roman periods. Of the three authors quoted, Grayson is in some regards the most circumspect. While he asserts that the Uruk and Dynastic prophecies are full-blown examples of "apocalyptic literature" (how this may differ from an "apocalypse" for Grayson remains unstated), he never directly asserts that the author of some Judean apocalypses actually read these works. He does, however, speak plainly of "origins," leaving little doubt that some genetic relationship is precisely what Grayson has in mind. He nishes his

---

1. Grayson, "Babylonian Origin," 203–4.
2. Hallo, "Expansion of Cuneiform Literature," 315.
3. Lambert, *Background*, 16.

essay with the following claim: "From this source [i.e., Akkadian *ex eventu* texts] the idea spread to civilizations near, Persian and Hebrew, and far, Greece and Europe."[4] The mechanism of this spread, however, remains unstated; further, it is unclear if "the idea" refers to the technique of *vaticinium ex eventu* specifically, eschatological thought generally, the literary form apocalypse, or some other entity.

Hallo is much more straightforward. He sees the chronological gap between the Babylonian and Judean authors as the only significant argument against the reliance of Second Temple Judean apocalyptists on the model of the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts. However, the discovery of the Dynastic Prophecy, dating after the time of Alexander, solves that problem for him.

Lambert is by far the most assertive of the three. He points simply to the ecumenical nature of the Hellenistic age, the vast movements of peoples and armies, the spread of languages and exchange of ideas. The similarity of the Judean and Babylonian works is, for him, sufficient to rule out the possibility that they arose each independent of the other. The Hellenistic age provides the context in which the Judean authors of Palestine and Babylon would have encountered, read, and absorbed the (proto)-apocalyptic Babylonian works. Lambert draws on the fact that Babylonian lore was transmitted in Greek and Aramaic to suggest that Akkadian *ex eventu* texts may have been translated into more accessible languages.[5]

Lambert's position has been taken up and somewhat modified by Ernest Lucas. Lucas agrees with Lambert that Daniel is directly dependent on one or more of the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts, but goes about tackling the problem of transmission differently. Instead of supposing that some or all of the Akkadian texts may have been translated and circulated in Aramaic or Greek, Lucas proposes simply that the author of Daniel (specifically, Daniel 11) lived in Babylonia.[6] This suggestion, as well as other general proposals that sections of Daniel betray familiarity with Babylonian texts and traditions, will be pursued at the end of this chapter.

For Hallo, Grayson, and Lambert, "apocalypse" means, primarily if not exclusively, the book of Daniel. The reliance of these and other authors on appeals to literary genre has been discussed in Chapter 3. To recapitulate my conclusions, it seems ill advised to assign all five of the Akkadian *ex eventu* works to a single literary type; it is solely the use of *vaticinium ex eventu* that allows the reader to connect them both to one another and to Daniel. If these texts had a direct influence on the book of Daniel, it is in Daniel's use of *ex eventu* prediction that such influence ought to be sought.

---

4. Grayson, "Babylonian Origin," 211.

5. Lambert, *Background*, 15.

6. Ernest Lucas, *Daniel* (Apollos Old Testament Commentary 20; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2002), 272.

The present chapter therefore seeks to elucidate the *ex eventu* passages in Daniel, one of the earliest Judean apocalypses and the only one admitted to the Jewish (and, subsequently, Christian) canon.[7] In addition to Daniel, the *ex eventu* passages in the apocalypse known as *1 Enoch* will be investigated; not only do these sections of *1 Enoch* stem from the same time and socio-political circumstance as Daniel, but there has long been excellent reason to see in various parts of *1 Enoch* evidence of Babylonian influence.

The Book of Daniel

Background and Structure

The first striking element that any reader of Daniel will notice is that it is a literary work composed in two different languages. Chapter 1 of Daniel is composed in Hebrew; at 2:4b the work transitions to Aramaic, which is the language of the book through chapter 7; chapters 8–12 are again in Hebrew. This fact alone has occasioned numerous theories concerning the composition of the work. Some commentators have supposed that the entire work was originally in Hebrew, which was then (partially) translated into Aramaic;[8] others have proposed precisely the reverse.[9] Our earliest manuscript evidence comes from Qumran scrolls that, insofar as they are preserved, attest to the same language division familiar from the Masoretic textual tradition.[10]

Perhaps more puzzling is that the book contains two distinct types of material that do not quite correspond to the language division of the book: chapters 1–6 contain prose tales about Daniel the wise man in the

---

7. Admittedly, a strong case may be made for Revelation being, in essence, a second "Judean apocalypse" in the Christian canon. However, Revelation lacks any *ex eventu* historical review of the type found in, e.g., Daniel and *1 Enoch*.

8. See, e.g., Johan Lust, "Daniel 7,13 and the Septuagint," *ETL* 54 (1978): 62–69.

9. See, e.g., R. H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1932) xxxvii–l; H. L. Ginsberg, *Studies in Daniel* (Texts and Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America 14; New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1948), Chapter 5.

10. The Hebrew to Aramaic transition at 2:4b is preserved in 1QDanᵃ, published by Dominique Barthélemy in Barthelémy and J. T. Milik, *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD 1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955). The transition from the Aramaic of chapter 7 to the Hebrew of chapter 8 is preserved in 4QDanᵃ and 4QDanᵇ. Preliminary editions of these two were published by Eugene Ulrich, "Daniel Manuscripts from Qumran: Part 1: A Preliminary Edition of 4QDanᵃ," *BASOR* 268 (1987): 17–37; and idem, "Daniel Manuscripts from Qumran: Part 2: Preliminary Editions of 4QDanᵇ and 4QDanᶜ," *BASOR* 274 (1989): 3–26. These manuscripts have since been fully published by Ulrich in Ulrich et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms to Chronicles* (DJD 16; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000).

court of the Babylonian and Persian kings; chapters 7–12 contain apocalyptic visions. Further complicating matters is the fact that the OG of Daniel contains substantially different versions of chapters 4–6, and all Greek versions contain the Prayer of Azariah, the Song of the Three Young Men (both inserted after 3:23), and the stories of Susanna and of Bel and the Dragon (both following chapter 12), all of which are lacking in the MT. These facts, coupled with the evidence of the Qumran Pseudo-Daniel texts and 4QPrayer of Nabonidus, which is clearly related to Daniel 4,[11] strongly support the position that the prose tales of Daniel, and quite likely the separate visions of the latter portion of the book, were independent compositions in origin that were subsequently collected.[12] In all likelihood, the older Aramaic tales were incorporated into a later Hebrew framework.[13]

The Hebrew framework consists of the opening chapter, which introduces the reader to the characters and setting of the court tales, and chapters 8–12, consisting of three apocalyptic oracles. Each of these oracles contains a historical review in the form of an *ex eventu* prediction; it is specifically these sections of Daniel that Grayson, Hallo, Lambert, and others see as influenced by the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts.

Daniel 8: Symbolic Vision, Angelic Interpretation

Daniel 8 marks the book's return to Hebrew following six chapters of Aramaic and contains the second of the four apocalyptic visions of the book; it is the first chapter to offer a full-blown *ex eventu* prediction of the type we have seen in the Akkadian texts. The chapter begins by dating Daniel's vision to the third year of the reign of Belshazzar; the author of Daniel 8 (just as we find in Daniel 5 and 7) apparently believes Belshazzar to have been successor to Nebuchadnezzar, not co-regent (to Nabonidus)

---

11. It had long been recognized that the royal figure of Daniel 4, although there called Nebuchadnezzar, bears strong resemblance to the depiction in cuneiform texts of the later Babylonian king Nabonidus; see, e.g., Wolfram von Soden, "Eine babylonische Volksüberlieferung von Nabonid in den Danielerzählungen," *ZAW* 53 (1935): 81–89. On this literary motif in general and the relation of 4QPrayer of Nabonidus to Daniel 4, see Matthias Henze, *The Madness of King Nebuchadnezzar: The Ancient Near Eastern Origins and Early History of Interpretation of Daniel 4* (JSJSup 61; Leiden: Brill, 1999).

12. See Lawrence Wills, *The Jew in the Court of the Foreign King: Ancient Jewish Court Legends* (Harvard Dissertations in Religion 26; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), especially Chapter 3.

13. I essentially follow the position of John J. Collins on the development of the book of Daniel as a whole; see Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), 29–38. Famously, Baruch Spinoza already posited multiple authors for the book of Daniel in his *Tractatus theologico-politicus* in 1674. For a defense of the unity of Danielic authorship, see H. H. Rowley, "The Unity of the Book of Daniel," *HUCA* 23 (1950–51): 233–73.

as found in cuneiform sources.[14] The introduction is followed in vv. 3–14 by the vision proper, introduced by the formula "I lifted my eyes and saw—and there!—" (ואשא עיני ואראה והנה).

The vision that follows employs animal symbols: rst, a ram with two horns dominates all around it (3–4); next, a he-goat with a notable horn between its eyes comes and destroys the ram and its power (5–7); the goat's notable horn breaks and is replaced by four horns (8); then another horn grows from one of the four, becomes great, and throws down the host of heaven (9–11); the daily offering of the Jerusalem temple is taken away and a host given over to the goat (11–12); and nally an angel calls to another asking how long this will last, with the response "2,300 evenings and mornings" (13–14). While the symbolism is transparent enough, the author of Daniel 8 has generously furnished an interpretation of the vision immediately following in vv. 15–26. The narrative incorporates the interpretation by portraying Daniel, heretofore presented in the book as the wisest sage and seer of all the land, as dumbfounded by the vision. Fortunately an angel ("one whose appearance is like a man," כמראה גבר, v. 15) is at hand. Verse 16 identi es the individual as Gabriel, who is told to interpret the vision for Daniel. He gives the interpretation as follows:

- The ram with two horns represents the kings of Media and Persia (v. 20).
- The he-goat is the king of Greece, and the horn between its eyes is the rst king, that is, Alexander the Great (v. 21).
- The four horns that follow represent the four kingdoms that result after Alexander's death and the partition of his empire (v. 22).
- The last horn mentioned is a bold-faced king who plots against the holy ones and oppresses the prince of princes; it is he who will remove the *tamîd* offering from the temple, and he will be defeated, but not by human agency (vv. 23–26).

The only Greek king who is accused in ancient sources of interrupting the Jerusalem cult is Antiochus IV Epiphanes, the obvious unnamed referent behind the last horn of the vision.

The actions of Antiochus IV and the Maccabean uprising that followed are all too familiar, notably from the accounts of 1 and 2 Maccabees and Josephus, though scholars differ on matters of detail and relative

---

14. Belshazzar was apparently in charge of affairs in Babylon during Nabonidus's sojourn in Teima. That he was not king is made abundantly clear in the cuneiform sources. For example, the so-called Nabonidus Chronicle (text no. 7 in Grayson, *ABC*; text no. 26 in Glassner, *Mesopotamian Chronicles*) makes clear that, though Belshazzar ("the prince" in the text) was present in Babylon, Nabonidus's absence prevented the Akitu festival from taking place (see ii 5–6, 10–11). The Akitu festival required the presence of the king in Babylon.

dates. A prolonged excursus into the motivations of the Seleucid king and the Judean political struggles leading up to the suspension of normal cult function in 168 b.c.e. lies outside the purview proper of the current investigation.[15] It must suffice to say that the author of Daniel 8 mentions no problems of governance or cult save the interruption of the daily offering under the rule of Antiochus.

What chapter 8 shares with the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts is readily apparent. The text contains the "prediction" of future unnamed monarchs, a period of hardship is announced (in this case, the disruption of the Jerusalem temple cult); and a prediction that the period of tribulation will end relatively soon. The interest in succeeding dynasties— first the coming of the Medes/Persians, then the Greeks, then the splintering of Alexander's kingdom by his successors—resonates with the Dynastic Prophecy. The mention of 2,300 evenings and mornings refers to the twice-daily *tamîd* offerings, yielding a total of 1,150 days.[16] This is slightly less than three-and-a-half years, the predicted length of tribulation found earlier in the book (e.g., at 7:25); it is likely intended as a corrective to that earlier prediction.[17] According to 1 Macc 4:52–54, however, the desecration of the temple lasts exactly three years. Collins takes this as evidence that the prediction with which the vision closes cannot be *ex eventu*, as the rest of the vision is.[18] If this is correct, then Daniel 8 shares with the Uruk and Dynastic Prophecies the feature of a concluding legitimate attempt at prediction. Finally, Dan 8:26, with the angel's orders that Daniel keep what he has seen a secret, may call to mind the secrecy colophon with which the Dynastic Prophecy ends.

The differences between Daniel 8 and the Akkadian *ex eventu* compositions are, however, even more noticeable than the similarities. The Akkadian *ex eventu* texts (possibly with the exception of the Marduk Prophecy) enumerate the rise of successive anonymous monarchs; this is not the case in Daniel 8, where only Alexander and Antiochus IV are singled out in the vision. Then there is the matter of the animal symbolism: cryptic though

15. For the history of Judea in this period, the reader is referred to the following works: Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (rev. ed.; 3 vols. in 4 parts; ed. G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Goodman; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1973–1987), vol. 1; Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Hellenistic Period* (2 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974); Victor Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999 [rept. of the 1959 ed.]); and, most recently, Anathea Portier-Young, *Apocalypse against Empire: Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011), 49–215.

16. Against the ancient tradition (as attested in some of the versions) that understands the passage to mean 2,300 days, see James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1927), 342–43.

17. So Collins, *Daniel*, 336;

18. Collins, *Daniel*, 336.

the Akkadian texts may be, there is no attempt to further veil the messages of those texts through symbolic representation. One also must take into account the mode of revelation: Daniel, a seer, introduces himself in the rst person. This may be argued to echo the Shulgi and Marduk texts; however, Daniel is a human visionary who must have his vision explained to him by a divine intermediary. The two Akkadian texts that are clearly in the rst person have divine (or divinized) narrators; these texts are records of straightforward divine utterances, not narratives of divine knowledge mediated to a human adept. None of the Akkadian works portrays a speci c individual to whom the divine secrets are mediated; it is merely the cuneiform tablet on which the text is recorded that serves as link between prediction and audience. This in fact constitutes one of the main structural differences between the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts and all the Judean works that we will survey. None of the Akkadian texts takes the form of a narrative in which a human diviner receives a revelation and then reports or records it.

In short, there is little reason to suspect that Daniel 8 is actually modeled on the form of one of our Akkadian *ex eventu* texts. The works certainly share a deterministic view of history, insofar as they all partake in the conceit that the rise and fall of kings has been ordained well in advance. Further, they share a reluctance to name the gures about whom they speak. However, there is nothing in the actual literary form of Daniel 8 that is closely analogous to any or all of the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts. Most important, even the structure of the *ex eventu* prediction itself in Daniel 8 looks little like the continuous string of kings one nds in most of the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts.

Daniel 9: The Explicit Re-use of Native Mantic Texts

Unlike chapter 8, Daniel 9 seems to be of a composite nature. The chapter begins with Daniel speaking in the rst person and offers a date formula, this time dating the events to the rst year of Darius "of the stock of Media" (מזרע מדי, v. 1). Verse 2 then announces the circumstance that triggers the *ex eventu* prediction of the chapter: "I Daniel perceived in the books the number of years that, according to the word of Yahweh which came to the prophet Jeremiah, were to ful ll the destruction of Jerusalem: 70 years."[19] Chronologically this is somewhat perplexing, if not downright

---

19. The reference is to Jer 25:11, 12 and 29:10. 2 Chronicles 36:20–22 understands the prophecy to have been ful lled during the reign of Cyrus; Zech 1:12 understands the seventy years as not yet expired in the second year of Darius I's reign. Clearly the author of Daniel 9 rejects the notion that Jeremiah's prophecy was ful lled by either the return of the Judean exiles or the completion of the Second Temple.

amusing. There was no King Darius son of Ahasuerus (Xerxes in the Old Greek); Collins argues that the king is purely ctional, and therefore the temporal location of this chapter is indeterminate, but "before the advent of Cyrus."[20] Whatever the solution to this muddled chronological setting may be, as the chapter has it, Daniel immediately embarks on a lengthy prayer that takes up the bulk of the chapter in vv. 4–19, proclaiming the sins of his people and petitioning for Yahweh's mercy. It is only in v. 21 that Gabriel—as Daniel is still nishing his prayer— ies in (literally) for the purpose of imparting divine knowledge (v. 22).

Gabriel interprets the seventy years to mean seventy "weeks of years," that is, 490 years or ten jubilee cycles.[21] This time period has been appointed for the purpose of the purgation of sin from the Judean people, "to nish transgression, to bring sins to completion, and to atone for iniquity, to bring in eternal righteousness and to seal a vision and a prophet, and to anoint a holy of holies" (v. 24). Daniel is further told that it will be "seven weeks," i.e., forty-nine years, from the time he started his prayer until there is an anointed ruler (משיח נגיד), which is to say, a high priest overseeing the Jerusalem temple (v. 25). For Daniel, however, this is clearly no cause for celebration, as the seventy weeks of expiation are still only in their infancy. Jerusalem will be built again, and will remain so for sixty-two weeks, albeit in distressful times (v. 25). At the end of these sixty-two weeks, the anointed one—that is, the high priest—will be cut off (v. 26).[22] This is almost certainly a reference to Onias III, murdered in roughly 171 b.c.e.[23] Following this, the army of a coming ruler (עם נגיד הבא) will destroy Jerusalem and its temple (v. 26). The last verse of the chapter states that this ruler will ally himself with "the multitude" (הרבים) for one week, and for half a week he will suppress offerings, putting in their place the "desolating abomination" (שקוצים משמם); after that, the desolator will be destroyed (v. 27).[24] Note that here "half a week" corresponds to three-

---

20. Collins, *Daniel*, 349.

21. Periodization of history into seventy weeks of years, ten jubilees (i.e., ten groups of seven sevens), etc., recurs time and again in Judean eschatological works. We shall encounter it in variant forms in the Apocalypse of Weeks of *1 Enoch*, discussed in the second part of this chapter, as well as in certain Dead Sea Scrolls documents discussed in Chapter 5. It has even been suggested, albeit not entirely convincingly, that a sabbatical/jubilee-based chronology underlies biblical historiography in general; see Klaus Koch, "Die mysteriösen Zahlen der judäischen Könige und die apokalyptischen Jahrwochen," *VT* 28 (1978): 433–41.

22. Because of the use of the term "anointed" (משיח), traditional Christian interpreters—as well as modern conservative Christians—tend to understand the passage in terms of messianic expectation (and therefore as a reference to Jesus) rather than as referring to the Jerusalem high priesthood.

23. See Collins, *Daniel*, 356; Montgomery, *Daniel*, 381; Louis F. Hartman and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel* (AB 23; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1978), 252. Onias's death at the hands of Menelaus is recorded in 2 Macc 4:23–28. Cf. Dan 11:22.

24. On the replacement of the *tamîd* offering with the "abomination of desolation," see

and-a-half years, the period that must pass before the restoration of the cult as predicted by Dan 7:25. Again, the nal reference is obviously to the interruption of the Jerusalem cult by Antiochus IV.

We are again faced with an *ex eventu* historical review, this time in a highly schematized form. There is neither reference to the rise and fall of successive monarchs nor to dynasties or kingdoms. Rather, history from the supposed period of Daniel until the end of the Antiochene persecution is laid out as ten periods of seven weeks of years, or ten units of seven sevens, and is concerned solely with the proper function and legitimacy of the Jerusalem temple cult. The arti ciality of the schema is obvious.[25]

It is crucial to note that Daniel is here explicitly reworking an older mantic text: the book of Jeremiah. There is no doubt that in Jeremiah the original prediction of seventy years represents an arbitrary, albeit highly auspicious, gure.[26] Quite famously, the gure of seventy years as a period of devastation prior to restoration occurs in an inscription of the Neo-Assyrian king Esarhaddon.[27] In the so-called Black Stone Inscription, Marduk decrees that Babylon shall lay desolate for, apparently, eleven years; the text praises Marduk for "reversing" something. What has been reversed are the cuneiform wedges used to write the number "70," which is attested on a duplicate text as the original prediction; the result of reversing the strokes for writing 70 is a revised number of eleven years. Unsurprisingly, it was eleven years after being desolated by Sennacherib that Esarhaddon began to restore Babylon. The changing of the gure is strikingly similar to what we see in Daniel, where successive authors have offered adjustments to the "three-and-a-half years" mentioned in Daniel 7.

In addition to the explicit re-use of an Israelite/Judean mantic text, Daniel 9 exhibits numerous points of contact with other prophetic works. The long prayer in the middle of the chapter is especially rich in allusions to other biblical texts.[28] As Michael Fishbane points out, Daniel 9 closes with another biblical citation: Dan 9:26–27 cites Isa 10:22–23, or possibly

---

Johan Lust, "Cult and Sacri ce in Daniel: The Tamid and the Abomination of Desolation," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (ed. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 2.671–88.

25. On this and similar chronographic schemes in eschatological literature, see the chapter "Apocalyptic Historiography," in Michael Stone, *Ancient Judaism: New Visions and Views* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011), 59–89.

26. In the words of Jack Lundbom: "The number 70 is stereotyped, and thus no more than an approximation. If it corresponds to anything, it is the conventional description of a full life-span (Ps 90:10)" (*Jeremiah 21–36* [AB 21B; New York: Doubleday, 2004], 249).

27. See Daniel D. Luckenbill, "The Black Stone of Esarhaddon," *AJSL* 41 (1924–1925): 165–73.

28. See Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985), 487–88.

the similar passage in Isa 28:15, 17–18.[29] The language of these Isaianic passages appears not only here, but thoroughly permeates Daniel 11 as well. It is safe to say that, while there is little indication of direct literary in uence by the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts upon Daniel 9, the chapter aunts its author's deep interest in and re-use of other predictive texts from his own, Judean tradition.

Daniel 2 and 7: **Ex Eventu** *Prediction in Schematic Form*

The presentation of history in Daniel 9 is both brief and highly schematic. While the arti cial 490–year schema does not appear earlier in the book, a different schematization of history does appear in the story of the statue in chapter 2 as well as the vision of the four beasts in chapter 7. Both these chapters differ from the apocalyptic visions of chapters 8 through 12 in that there is little concern for any individual king; rather, they both employ a highly arti cial schema of the succession of great powers in the Near East.

In Daniel 2, Nebuchadnezzar has a troubling dream; he demands of the various mantic specialists at his court not merely that they interpret the dream, but rst tell him what his dream was, and then unpack the meaning. Of course no one is able to do this—no one, that is, save Daniel. Our hero tells the king what he dreamed, and in 2:31–34 describes the statue: the statue has (1) a head of gold; (2) breast and arms of silver; (3) loins and thighs of bronze; and (4) legs of iron; however, the iron legs terminate in feet that are partly iron and partly clay. Daniel then offers the following interpretation: First, the head of ne gold represents the current king and his kingdom (v. 38); within the parameters of narrative logic, this is a most excellent start given that Daniel and his fellow diviners were under threat of execution. The silver and bronze portions represent "another kingdom, inferior to you; and a third kingdom, one of bronze, that will rule all the earth" (v. 39). Finally the iron represents a fourth kingdom; the mixed clay and iron signify that it will be a "divided kingdom" (v. 41), and furthermore that the divisions of that kingdom will intermarry (v. 43; cf. Dan 11:6, 17). The referents, though three of them are unnamed, are clear: gold = the Babylonian kingdom; silver = Median; bronze = Persian; iron = Greek; mixed clay and iron = the splitting of Alexander's kingdom among the Diadochoi, especially Ptolemaic Egypt and Seleucid Syria. Daniel's explanation ends with a prediction that these kingdoms will be destroyed by a non-human power (vv. 44–45).

Chapter 7 involves a similarly schematic review of Near Eastern his-

---

29. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 490.

tory in the form of a prediction. Here the revelation is given not to the king but to Daniel directly; the chapter presents itself as Daniel's written record of what he saw (7:2; cf. Dan 12:4; Isa 30:8; Rev 1:19). Daniel sees four great beasts from the sea: rst, a lion with the wings of an eagle (v. 4); second, a bear with three ribs in its mouth (v. 5); third, a leopard with four wings (v. 6); and fourth, a beast "different from all the beasts before it," with iron teeth and ten horns (7). Daniel is told by an interpreting divine gure in 7:17 that these beasts are four kings or, more likely, four kingdoms.[30] Again, the kingdoms should be identi ed as (1) Babylonian, (2) Median, (3) Persian, and (4) Greek. The description of the fourth beast, Greece, is especially rich in detail. Typically, the ten horns are identi ed as Greek kings, most likely successive Seleucid monarchs.[31] In Daniel's vision, an eleventh horn springs up, unseating three before it. This horn clearly represents Antiochus IV, who is said to "speak words against the Most High" and who will "change times and law" (v. 25), a clear reference to the Antiochene persecution that disrupted the cultic calendar (1 Macc 1:44–49; 2 Macc 6:2–7). According to the same verse, this disruption of the cult will last for "a time, (two) times, and half a time," that is, three-and-a-half years.

The schematizing of Near Eastern history as a succession of four all-powerful empires was common in the ancient world;[32] this has already been touched on in Chapter 2, in the discussion of the Dynastic Prophecy. The Greco-Latin tradition is full of related sequences: famously, Hesiod speaks of four ages of history, described as gold, silver, bronze, and iron (*Works and Days* 109–75). Both Herodotus and Ctesias attest to the progression Assyria–Media–Persia in Greek historiography; this scheme of imperial succession gets incorporated by later authors who develop a ve-kingdom schema with Rome following Greece.[33] Similarly, a passage in the Zoroastrian *Zand- Vohuman Yasn* (also known as the *Bahman Yasht*) divides history into four periods, likened to metals.[34] Daniel 2 and

---

30. MT reads "kings" (מלכין); however, LXX, the Vulgate, and the Syriac all read "kingdoms." As Collins notes, the difference in the words involves merely the confusion of *yod* and *waw*, which are all but indistinguishable in the orthography of the period; the versions are likely correct in their reading (Collins, *Daniel*, 275, note to v. 49; and 312).

31. Charles, *Daniel*, 179; Montgomery, *Daniel*, 293; Collins, *Daniel*, 320.

32. See especially Joseph Ward Swain, "The Theory of Four Monarchies: Opposition History under the Roman Empire," *CP* 35 (1940): 1–21; David Flusser,"The Four Empires in the Fourth Sibyl and in the Book of Daniel," *IOS* 2 (1972): 148–75.

33. Flusser ("Four Empires," 157–59) cites Claudius Rutilius Namatianus, Aelius Aristides, Tacitus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Appian as authors employing the ve-kingdom schema Assyria-Media-Persia-Greece-Rome.

34. See Anders Hultgård, "Forms and Origins of Iranian Apocalypticism," in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (ed. David Hellholm; Tübingen: Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1983), 387–411. Hultgård argues that some of the apocalyptic content of the medieval Zoroastrian materials originated in Avestan sources. See also Flusser, "Four

7 should doubtless be viewed against this background of a fairly widespread historiographic trope.

The classical historian Arnaldo Momigliano has taken the schematic presentation of history in these two chapters of Daniel as the base for his claim that the author of Daniel must have been familiar with classical Greek historiography, in particular, the *Histories* of Herodotus.[35] This claim has been picked up and greatly expanded in a monograph by Paul Niskanen.[36] Momigliano's point that neither Daniel nor the Dynastic Prophecy—nor any other text employing the notion of successive empires beginning with Assyria/Babylon, Media, Persia—predates Herodotus is certainly true; therefore, his contention that this trope is Hellenic in origin cannot be ruled out. On the other hand, Niskanen's argument that Daniel actually evinces deep intertextual relationships with Herodotus's *Histories* presses the case farther than the evidence allows.[37] While Niskanen's work directs welcome attention toward possible Hellenic in uences on the composition of Near Eastern texts generally and Daniel in particular, it does not follow that Herodotus (or any other Greek author) is *the major* literary in uence on Daniel, as he suggests, nor even that Herodotus is one of several main in uences. The work of both Momigliano and Niskanen on Daniel recalls the work of J. J. Finkelstein and others on the relationship between Mesopotamian oracles and historiographic texts, as discussed in Chapter 3. I am similarly skeptical of historiographic compositions such as Herodotus's *Histories* forming the template on which West Asian *ex eventu* texts were formed. Whatever Daniel's immediate historiographical in uences, it cannot be denied that the work's author(s)/tradents are

Empires," 167; and Samuel K. Eddy, *The King Is Dead: Studies in the Near Eastern Resistance to Hellenism 334–31 B.C.* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961), 16–22. Eddy is certainly overly con dent in his presentation of the *Zand-Vohuman Yasn* as a Hellenistic document; he goes so far as to offer his own version of the text with "material of late origin" excised "in an attempt to approximate the original version" (343). While I tentatively subscribe to the view that the *Zand-Vohuman Yasn* preserves material originating in the Hellenistic period (or earlier), there can be no certainty on the question short of discovering an ancient manuscript of the lost Avestan tract on which the *zand* comments.

35. Arnaldo Momigliano, "Daniel and Greek Theory of Imperial Succession," in idem, *Essays on Ancient and Modern Judaism* [ed. Silvia Berti; trans. Maura Mausella-Gayley; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994], 29–35; see also idem, "Biblical Studies and Classical Studies: Simple Re ections upon the Historical Method," in *Essays*, 3–9.

36. Paul Niskanen, *The Human and the Divine in History: Herodotus and the Book of Daniel* (JSOTSup 396; London: T&T Clark, 2004).

37. Particularly troublesome for Niskanen's work is the lack of attention to the social setting—and, likely, multiple social settings—in which the book of Daniel was composed. Additionally, Niskanen presses the case for Herodotean in uence to the point of exclusion of other in uences on the composition of Daniel. Finally, Niskanen's concern with particular words and phrases that seem to correspond between Daniel and the *Histories* leads him to devote minimal attention to the fact that Daniel and the *Histories* exhibit radically different literary forms, i.e., they are texts of quite different genres.

operating in conversation with the histories (written or otherwise) that they had at their disposal.

What we find in these chapters of Daniel is something far different from what we find in the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts. Only the Dynastic Prophecy exhibits any interest in what might be construed as distinct successive kingdoms; but note that even there the author presents history as a succession of individual monarchs, not at all like what we see in these two chapters of Daniel. Furthermore, the Dynastic Prophecy lacks the universality of Daniel 2 and 7. In the words of Momigliano, "The 'dynastic prophecy' assumes that Babylonia remains, while its conquerors, good or bad, change. The 'dynastic prophecy' does not account for a universal history but for a local one."[38] While Daniel 2 and 7 do present a significant expanse of history as if it were prophecy, the particular form that the *vaticinium ex eventu* takes is quite distinct both from the Akkadian material and from what we encounter in Daniel 10–12.

Daniel 10–12: The Kings of North and South

The longest oracle in the Book of Daniel comes in the closing three chapters. In truth, chapter 10 serves merely to set the scene—again we find a date formula (the third year of Cyrus, v. 1), followed by a first-person introduction to the narrative (v. 2). We find precisely the same introduction to Daniel's vision here in 10:5 ("I lifted my eyes and saw") as we encountered in chapter 8. And once again, Daniel encounters an angelic figure in the form of a man (v. 5) who mediates the divine mystery to Daniel; this figure should most likely be identified as Gabriel.[39] The figure announces his intention to reveal something to Daniel in 10:20; the revelation takes up all of chapter 11, and the figure finally concludes his speech at 12:4. Chapter 11 is by far the most detailed and complex of the several *ex eventu* passages contained in Daniel; and, indeed, it is that section of Daniel in which commentators have found the closest parallel to the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts.[40]

The notice in 11:2 that "Three more kings will arise" is both familiar and puzzling. The rise of one or more anonymous kings is familiar from Dan 8:23 and, of course, serves as the hallmark of the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts. Puzzling is the fact that Daniel 11 envisions only four monarchs in the Achaemenid dynasty. Numerous explanations have been offered, but

---

38. Momigliano, "Daniel and Imperial Succession," 33.

39. The mention of "the first year of Darius" serves to connect this figure with the story in Daniel 9, which features Gabriel as Daniel's angelic informant. See Collins, *Daniel*, 376.

40. See, e.g., Lambert, *Background*, 15.

none is entirely satisfactory;[41] it seems as if the author of the oracle was simply anxious to move on to the Hellenistic period, the real meat of the chapter, and disposes of the Persian Empire in a single verse.

The rise and fall of Alexander the Great are related in 11:3–4. The anonymous king is again introduced with the characteristic phrasing ועמד מלך, "a king will arise" (cf. 11:20, 21). However, the kingdom already slips from his lineage in v. 4, and by v. 5 we encounter the founder of the Ptolemaic kingdom, Ptolemy I Soter, introduced appropriately enough as "the King of the South." Furthermore, we are told one of his princes will be mightier than he; most scholars agree that this is a reference to Seleucus I Nicator, who joined forces with Ptolemy against Antigonus, who had seized control of the satrapy of Babylon. Seleucus, of course, was the founder of the Seleucid Empire, the largest of the daughter kingdoms formed from Alexander's conquests.[42] From this point on, the heirs of Seleucus are referred to by the cipher "King of the North." The epithets for the Seleucid and Ptolemaic kings make perfect sense when one assumes an intended audience located in Judea, sandwiched between Egypt to the south and Syria to the north.

While the author of Daniel 11 is able to move from Cyrus to the establishment of the Seleucid Empire in the span of four verses, Antiochus does not appear on the scene until 11:21, some sixteen verses later. The intervening text consists of specific references to the political machinations within and between the Seleucid and Ptolemaic kingdoms; in particular, v. 10 begins with the accession of Antiochus III in 223 b.c.e.[43] There is no obvious judgment, be it condemnation or endorsement, in Daniel's "prediction" of these events. It seems that the author is merely concerned with giving a report of the events leading to the succession of Antiochus IV to the throne. Indeed, this may be said of the entire narrative up until the desecration of the temple. In the words of Elias Bickerman:

> For Daniel (11:25) this war [i.e., between Antiochus IV and Ptolemy VI] is nothing but a natural and necessary phase (11:25) in the worldly rise

---

41. Montgomery suggests that the reference is to the four Persian monarchs named in the Bible: Cyrus, Xerxes, Artaxerxes, and Darius III Codomannus (*Daniel*, 423). Hartman and Di Lella agree, save the substitution of Darius II for Darius III (*Daniel*, 288). Otto Plöger protests that, for Daniel at least, Xerxes and Darius were "Medes" and therefore not to be included among the four Persian kings; he prefers Artaxerxes I, Darius II Artaxerxes II, and Artaxerxes III (*Das Buch Daniel* [Gütersloh: Mohn, 1965], 158).

42. See, e.g., Montgomery, *Daniel*, 427; Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*, 9–10, 51–53.

43. For the specific events and personages alluded to, see Collins, *Daniel*, 379–82; on the interactions between the Seleucid and Ptolemaic kingdoms from the time of Antiochus III onward, see Dov Gera, *Judaea and Mediterranean Politics 219 to 161 B.C.E.* (Brill's Series in Jewish Studies 8; Leiden: Brill, 1998); on the rise of Antiochus IV, see Otto Mørkholm, *Antiochus IV of Syria* (Copenhagen: Gyldendalske Boghandel, 1966), esp. 11–50.

of the persecutor, which does not require any specific explanation. It receives its meaning from the very fact that it leads one step closer to the culmination of Antiochus' career and thus, of necessity, to his subsequent fall.[44]

The remainder of the chapter, some twenty-four verses, pertains to the actions of a single king: Antiochus IV Epiphanes. As he is introduced, the text makes clear its negative assessment of the king: "Then a despicable man will arise, one to whom the glory of kingship has not been given; he will arrive by means of subterfuge and seize the kingdom through intrigues" (Dan 11:21). The contents of the revelation can be summarized as follows.

- This "despicable" monarch (Antiochus) makes war on the King of the South (Ptolemy VI Philometor; v. 25). This is the first campaign of Antiochus IV against Egypt, in 170 b.c.e.[45]
- Antiochus withdraws from Egypt in v. 28; his heart is "set against the holy covenant" and he acts on this, returning to his own land with "great spoil." This most likely refers to the plundering of the Jerusalem temple mentioned in 1 Macc 1:20–24.[46]
- Verses 29–30 recount (as prediction, of course) Antiochus's second campaign against Egypt, in 168 b.c.e. After being turned back by Roman ships in support of Egypt (the ships of the *kittîm*), he is said to "rage against the holy covenant."
- In v. 31 we are told that the king's forces go to the sanctuary, remove the *tamîd* offering and set up the abomination that makes desolate (cf. 8:11; 9:27). Verses 32–35 speak of the persecution of the Judeans, some of whom are "violators of the covenant" (v. 32), others "the wise," many of whom will die (vv. 33, 35).
- Verses 36–39 form something of an interlude, meditating on the hubris of Antiochus.
- Verse 40 marks the transition from *ex eventu* prediction to a legitimate attempt by the author to predict the future. "At the time of the end," we are told, Antiochus will again go to war with Egypt. This time, however, he will die "between the sea and the glorious holy mountain" (v. 45).

---

44. Elias Bickerman, *The God of the Maccabees: Studies on the Meaning and Origin of the Maccabean Revolt* (trans. H. R. Moehring; Leiden: Brill, 1979), 16.

45. On the invasion of 170, see Mørkholm, *Antiochus IV*, 64–87.

46. See Collins, *Daniel*, 383; Bickerman, *God of the Maccabees*, 11. Polybius notes that after his campaign against Ptolemy VI Philometor, Antiochus had sacked ▨▨ ▨▨▨▨▨▨ ▨▨▨ ▨▨▨▨, "most of the temples" (*Histories* 30.26).

Antiochus, of course, did not die on a third campaign against Egypt.[47]
The   rst four verses of chapter 12 close the angel's speech; he tells Daniel
that at the time his people are delivered there will be a resurrection of
the dead, "some to everlasting life and some to reproach and everlasting
shame" (12:2). With a now familiar trope, Daniel is told to keep the rev-
elation secret in 12:4. The book closes with angelic interlocutors discuss-
ing how long the desolation of the temple will last. An answer of 1,290
days is given in v. 11; this is rather awkwardly emended to 1,335 days
in v. 12. Clearly the author of Dan 12:12 was not happy with the state of
affairs 1,290 days after the desecration, despite the fact that the temple had
already been reconsecrated by Judas Maccabee.

What are we to make of this material in light of the Akkadian texts sur-
veyed in chapter 2? Certainly, the use of the phrase ועמד מלך, "a king will
arise," recalls the *šarru/rubû illâ* of the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts (although
a different verbal root is used). And, more than the other sections of Dan-
iel containing *ex eventu* prediction, the sustained attention to the Seleucid
Empire over the course of several kings may be compared to the inter-
est in successive kings and the fortunes of their reigns as found in the
Akkadian compositions. However, direct parallels are lacking. Aside from
the phrase "a king will arise," there are no direct verbal correspondences
that suggest reliance of Daniel on any of the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts. The
overall structure of Daniel 10–12 also   nds no close parallels with any of
the   ve Akkadian texts.

It is true that the revision of the   nal prophecy at the end of Daniel 12
is similar to the secondary expansion of the Dynastic Prophecy, as argued
in chapter 2. However, this speaks not to some reliance of Daniel on the
Dynastic Prophecy (for, it would imply knowledge of both an unrevised
and revised version), but instead to the general scribal willingness to edit,
rewrite, and expand existing mantic texts—a phenomenon equally appar-
ent in the prophetic books of the Hebrew Bible or Mesopotamian omen
compendia.

Preliminary Conclusions

This survey of *ex eventu* texts in Daniel casts serious doubt on the
position that Daniel is somehow indebted to the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts.
Most notable in terms of narrative structure is the fact that, with the excep-
tion of Daniel 2, all the *ex eventu* passage are   rst-person accounts by a seer
of a divine revelation, contained within a larger third-person narrative
framework; furthermore, that revelation needs to be mediated to the seer

---

47. See Mørkholm, *Antiochus IV,* 70–72.

by a divine intermediary ("angel"). The Akkadian *ex eventu* texts simply are not arranged as third-person narratives with multiple actors: they are more or less records of revelation with no (extant) narrative of how the revelation was mediated. This is true even of the Marduk and Shulgi texts, which at least share with Daniel 7–12 *vaticinia ex eventu* presented via an explicit rst-person point of view. However, these two texts lack the third-person narrative structures of Daniel. In both the Akkadian works, the text announces itself as a speech, and content follows. The speakers themselves are not part of a larger narrative, and there is neither an explicit audience nor an interpretation of the words of the two gures.

The fact that Daniel similarly chooses to present historical events as if they were predicted long ago should not be minimized. However, ought this be taken as su cient evidence to argue dependence on Babylonian prototypes? Presenting past events as predicted long ago is not a terribly complicated literary device; the Deuteronomistic History employs prophecy–ful llment tropes throughout.[48] Further, the keen eye of the modern critical scholar is not needed to spot precisely what the author of Daniel is doing. Already in antiquity, Porphyry demonstrated that Daniel was written following the events of the Antiochene persecution.[49] It is due to Porphyry's insights that the historical interpretation of Daniel got its foothold in the West, via Jerome's attempt to refute Porphyry's claims in his commentary on Daniel. Indeed, Montgomery is moved to claim, "Western scholarship has been delivered from the vagaries of apocalyptic exegesis through the mediation of Jerome."[50]

While direct dependence on Babylonian prototypes is not impossible, it seems improbable that the visions in Daniel are based on the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts known to us. Beyond the fact that there are few formal features in Daniel that precisely parallel passages from the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts, the problem of transmission remains unresolved. While Lambert's suggestion that the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts could have been translated into Aramaic or Greek is not impossible, there is little if any reason to suppose that this actually occurred. While Berossus does indeed transmit elements of Babylonian culture to the Hellenistic world, we lack evidence of Babylonian literary texts actually translated into Greek or

---

48. In the words of Richard Nelson, "DH used three major systems of organization to pull together the complex story of Israel's history in the land: end-of-era re ections, dual overlapping chronologies, and a prophecy–ful llment schema" ("The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History: he Case Is Still Compelling," *JSOT* 29 [2005]: 319–37; here 320). See, e.g., 1 Kgs 13//2 Kgs 23:15–18; 1 Kgs 21:23//2 Kgs 9:30–37.

49. See P. M. Casey, "Porphyry and the Origin of the Book of Daniel," *JTS* NS 27 (1976): 15–33. It should, however, be noted that Porphyry believed all of Daniel to be written *ex eventu*, and attributed the account of Antiochus IV's death in Daniel 11 to an otherwise unattested third campaign against Egypt.

50. Montgomery, *Daniel*, 469.

Aramaic—let alone esoteric texts such as these, found neither in Akkadian catalog texts nor in any sizable number of copies. It likewise seems imprudent to assume that chapter 7–12 of Daniel were composed in Babylonia rather than Palestine solely to satisfy the claim that these chapters reflect knowledge of cuneiform texts.[51] The detailed knowledge of events in Jerusalem and Palestine, combined with the fact that the texts are concerned first and foremost with the desecration of the Jerusalem temple, points to composition in or around Jerusalem.[52] Is it impossible that there is some sort of indirect influence? Could the visions of Daniel draw on earlier (Danielic?) texts that themselves were influenced by, or written in reaction to, our Akkadian *ex eventu* works? Certainly such speculation cannot be disproved. However, the manufacture of hypothetical intermediaries as connectors between texts whose literary similarity is highly limited seems unwarranted. There is precious little to suggest that Text A, the Uruk Prophecy, or the Dynastic Prophecy was known outside very, very limited scribal circles; inventing intermediary forms of transmission is at least as problematic as arguments in favor of direct knowledge that are questionable based on the evidence of literary remains.

Daniel is, however, not the only Judean text employing extended historical reviews in the form of *vaticinia ex eventu*. It is possible that other Judean apocalypses and eschatologically oriented compositions bear the imprint of influence from the Akkadian *ex eventu* compositions. After Daniel, the most likely place to look is in the near contemporary *ex eventu* passages in the work commonly known as *1 Enoch*. This is especially the case given the scholarly consensus that there are numerous Babylonian traditions embedded in the Enochic material.

The Book of *1 Enoch*

There can be little doubt that the most influential Judean apocalypse in antiquity, apart from Daniel, was *1 Enoch*; in addition to the famous citation of *1 Enoch* as scripture in the epistle of Jude 14–15, *1 Enoch* is one of the most widely attested compositions among the Qumran Scrolls.[53] Although

---

51. There have been several claims for Danielic reliance on different Babylonian texts; this will be addressed below.

52. Many scholars identify the authorship of Daniel 7–12 with a group called *ḥasîdîm*, mentioned in 1 Macc 2:42 and 7:13, a party of Judeans involved in the revolt against Antiochus IV. These scholars include, *inter alia*, Montgomery, *Daniel*, 87; Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization*, 196–98; Hartman and Di Lella, *Daniel*, 43; Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1.175–80; John E. Goldingay, *Daniel* (Word Biblical Commentary 30. Dallas: Word Books, 1989), 326. Collins (among others) calls this connection into question, but nonetheless sees the visions of Daniel 7–12 as reflecting the situation in Palestine (*Daniel*, 66–69).

53. Portions of *1 Enoch* are preserved in at least eleven different manuscripts; moreover,

lost to the West for almost two thousand years, the work was translated into Ge'ez and preserved by the Ethiopian Church, and was (re-)introduced to Europe in this form in the eighteenth century, although a certain number of citations in Greek were long known. The fragments of the work in Aramaic from Qumran are the only surviving manuscripts of *1 Enoch* written in what was (most likely) the language of original composition.[54]

The book contains material pertaining to Enoch, the seventh-generation descendant of Adam mentioned in Gen 5:18–24. There we learn that "Enoch walked with God; and he was no more, for God took him" (v. 24). Enoch became a central gure in late Second Temple apocalyptic discourse and later mystical traditions; the book of *1 Enoch* tells of Enoch's otherworldly journeys and the heavenly knowledge revealed to him.

Background and Structure

The composition we call *1 Enoch* is actually a compilation of ve major works: (1) The Book of the Watchers (chapters 1–36); (2) the Parables of Enoch (also known as the Similitudes; chapters 37–71); (3) the Book of the (Heavenly) Luminaries (chapters 72–82); (4) the Dream Visions (chapters 83–90); and (5) the Epistle of Enoch (chapters 91–105). These are followed by two brief appendices dealing with the birth of Noah (106–107) and another book of Enoch (108).[55] Of the ve major sections, the Parables are

the Enochic *Book of Giants* is preserved in an additional nine manuscripts. See George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 1–36; 81–108* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 9–11.

54. The Aramaic fragments of *1 Enoch* were rst collected, studied, and published by J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976). The Greek fragments have been collected in Matthew Black, *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece* (Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graecae 3; Leiden: Brill, 1970). Translations of the text preserved in Greek and Aramaic are my own. My facility with classical Ethiopic (Ge'ez) is, I feel, insu cient to offer my own translations here; therefore, all quotations of the Ethiopic text of *1 Enoch* are taken from George W. E. Nickelsburg and James VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation Based on the Hermeneia Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004), unless otherwise stated. Additional translations consulted include E. Isaac, "1 Enoch," in *OTP*, 1.5–89; R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1893); Matthew Black, *The Book of Enoch or I Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes* (SVTP 7; Leiden: Brill, 1985); Michael A. Knibb, "1 Enoch," in *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (ed. H. F. D. Sparks; Oxford: Clarendon, 1984), 169–319; Siegbert Uhlig, *Das äthiopische Henochbuch* (Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit 5/6; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1984). For the Ethiopic text (with English translation), see Michael A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1978).

55. This follows the presentation of Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 7–8. Cf. John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 43–44; Black, *Book of Enoch*, 12–23; and the introductory material by Isaac, "1 Enoch," *OTP* 1.6–7. The divisions are based on the work of R. H. Charles, who

unattested among the Qumran fragments, whereas the Book of the Luminaries appears in a far more extensive form than the (apparently abbreviated) version known from the Ethiopic manuscript tradition.[56]

The history of composition of *1 Enoch* is an incredibly complex issue, regularly debated in the scholarly literature. The present investigation, however, is interested in a relatively small portion of the text. Within the mass of material preserved in *1 Enoch* are two independent apocalypses that employ *vaticinia ex eventu* similar to those found in Daniel and the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts. The rst is the Animal Apocalypse, preserved in *1 Enoch* 85–90; the second is the Apocalypse of Weeks, disjointedly preserved in *1 Enoch* 93:1–10 and 91:11–17.

The Animal Apocalypse

The Animal Apocalypse is the second vision in the Book of Dream Visions.[57] The visions are presented as a rst-person account by Enoch to his son Methusaleh. The Book of Dream Visions opens, "And now, my son Methuselah, I will show you all the visions that I saw; before you I will recount (them)" (*1 Enoch* 83:1). The Animal Apocalypse takes the form of an extended allegory in which the history of the world from Adam to the eschaton is narrated, substituting various animals for both prominent individuals from the biblical text as well as groups. The technique obviously recalls Daniel 8. In order to demonstrate the allegorical method of the Animal Apocalypse, the following summarizes the vision's telling of the history of the world from Adam to Abraham:[58]

- A white bull and young heifer bear two calves, one black, the other red. The black calf strikes the other. Later, she bears a white bull, followed by many black bulls and cows. All commentators are in agreement that this represents Adam, Eve, and their children (85:3–10).

---

offered only a slightly different division of the material over a century ago; see Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 24–33.

56. See Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 7–8.

57. As with most of *1 Enoch*, the Animal Apocalypse survives in full only in Ethiopic. A tiny portion of text from *1 Enoch* 86 is preserved in 4QEn[f]; 4QEn[d] and 4QEn[e] preserve sections of chapters 88 and 89. Unfortunately, the Qumran manuscripts do not preserve any portion of *1 Enoch* 90, in which the events of the Seleucid period are recounted.

58. For a detailed study of the various elements of the allegory, see especially Patrick A. Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of* 1 Enoch. (Early Judaism and Its Literature 4; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993). On the use of animal imagery throughout this section, see David Bryan, *Cosmos, Chaos and the Kosher Mentality* (JSPSup 12; She eld: She eld Academic Press, 1994), 34–139.

- Stars descend from heaven, take the form of bulls, and mate with the cows; their offspring are elephants, camels, and asses. This clearly represents the story of the fallen Watchers and the giants alluded to in Genesis 6 and expanded on in the Book of the Watchers (86:1–6). The divine judgment and punishment for these actions is related in chapters 87 and 88.
- One of the heavenly beings of chapters 87 and 88 discloses a mystery to a white bull, who thereupon is transformed into a man. He builds a vessel and survives a ood. The referent is obviously Noah. After the   ood, this man disembarks with three bulls, one white, one red, and one black, representing Ham, Japheth, and Shem (89:1–9).
- These three bear all sorts of wild animals, representing the Gentile nations; then a white bull (Abraham) is born (89:10).

The vision then becomes increasingly involved with the details of the biblical text: 89:11–38 summarizes the biblical narrative from Abraham through the exodus from Egypt; vv. 39–40 refer to the events of Joshua and Judges. 89:42–50 narrates the period of Israel's   rst three kings (represented by rams), who protect the   ock of sheep (Israel) from dogs (Philistines), wild boars (Amalekites), and foxes (Ammonites).[59] The third sheep, Solomon, builds a "tower" for the "Lord of the sheep"—that is, the Jerusalem temple (89:50). The history of the divided monarchy and exile is condensed into the next nine verses; we   nd that the sheep abandon the house of the Lord (v. 54), in return for which the Lord of the sheep abandons his house (v. 56) and rejoices in the destruction of the sheep by various wild animals (v. 58).

At this point, the chronology of the narrative becomes somewhat confused. 89:59–64 relates the appointing of seventy angelic shepherds to watch over the   ock of Israel, each in turn for seventy "times." Most commentators agree that each period is equal to seven years, resulting in the same 490–year scheme for the post-exilic history of Israel as we saw in Daniel 9.[60] The text itself is unclear on this point, however. What is also unclear is the precise moment at which the seventy shepherds are given their charge. Since Yahweh has already abandoned his sanctuary, it is likely that the period intended is a very short time prior to Nebuchadnezzar's destruction of Jerusalem in 587 b.c.e.; the destruction of the temple is not mentioned until 89:66. Nickelsburg suggests that the seventy shepherds are appointed during the reign of Manasseh. He bases this conclusion on the assumption of a 490–year period and counts backward from

---

59. On the identi cation of Israel's enemies in these verses, see Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 383.

60. See, e.g., Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 331; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 392;

the period of the Antiochene persecution.[61] Tiller, however, reckons that the period begins after the events of 2 Kgs 24:1, that is, roughly 598 b.c.e.[62] Others would have the institution of the angelic shepherds take place with the Assyrian conquest of the Northern Kingdom of Israel in 722.[63] It is impossible to be certain, given the ambiguity of the passage. It is dubious that the author of the Animal Apocalypse was concerned with a precise counting of years, or even had access to sources with precise chronological information about the period from the end of the Judean monarchy down to the time of Antiochus IV.[64] The use of round figures such as seven, seventy, and ten is typical of the Judean *ex eventu* works; the historical data need only roughly align with the numerical patterns employed.

The rule of the seventy shepherds recalls numerous biblical passages in which human leaders, God, or angels act as shepherds. As Nickelsburg notes, the passage draws especially on the imagery of Ezekiel 34 and Zechariah 11.[65] However, the shepherds are disobedient, and destroy far more of the sheep—that is, Israel—than are put down by God for destruction.[66] The text divides the rule of the shepherds into four periods:

- The first period lasts for twelve angelic shifts (89:65–72a). The shepherds hand too many of the sheep (Israel) over to the wild beasts (foreign nations) for destruction; the temple is destroyed in v. 66.
- The second period begins in 89:72b with the notice that three sheep return and attempt to build "all that had fallen down from that house," including the temple (still called "the tower").[67] The key piece of information comes in v. 73b: "And they began again to place a table before the tower but all the bread on it was polluted and not pure." That is, the functioning of the Jerusalem cultus was compromised and illegitimate.[68] As Nickelsburg notes, this echoes language in Mal 1:7 and 12; similarly, CD considers the Second Temple cultus to be illegitimate (CD 4:17–5:19) and commands its readers not to participate in it while citing Mal 1:10 (CD 6:11–13).

---

61. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 392.

62. Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 330.

63. So Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 254; Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 187.

64. Cf. the chronological confusion in the orders (and even names) of monarchs in Daniel.

65. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 391. Cf. Ps 100:3; Isa 40:11.

66. On shepherds leading Israel astray, see, e.g., Isa 56:11; Jer 23:2; Zech 10:3.

67. All Ethiopic manuscripts have "three," save a single manuscript that originally read "two" but has been corrected to three. Tiller (*Animal Apocalypse*, 338–39), following Dillman, takes "two" as the original reading. These would then represent the Davidic governor Zerubbabel and the high priest Joshua. It is possible that three, however, is the original reading, with Sheshbazzar or Nehemiah intended as the third temple builder.

68. See, e.g., Gabriele Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 82–83;

The section ends in 90:1, where all the Ethiopic manuscripts read, "And I saw until the time when thirty-seven shepherds had been pasturing. . . ." However, given the total of seventy and the numbers forthcoming, this must be emended to thirty-five shepherds.[69]

- The third period is introduced in 90:2, with the arrival of "all the birds of heaven"—the switch from wild beasts to birds of prey indicating the appearance of the Greeks.[70] Noteworthy is the absence of any specific identifiable mention of Alexander. The description of the period ends with v. 5, which makes the numerical correction in 90:1 obviously necessary: "And I saw until the time that twenty-three shepherds had been pasturing, and they completed in their respective times fifty-eight times."

- The fourth and final period during which the angelic shepherds hold sway receives the greatest amount of attention, occupying 90:6–19. This reflects the period of Seleucid domination of Judea.[71]

The vision begins with lambs being born to the blind sheep of Israel (90:6–7). There is a long scholarly tradition of identifying these with a party of ultra-pious Judeans termed the *ḥasîdîm*.[72] The key figure is introduced in 90:9b: "And I saw until a great horn sprouted on one of those sheep." Commentators since Charles are near unanimous in identifying this figure with Judas Maccabee.[73] He fights against the previously mentioned birds, as well as against the shepherds; in response, the angel who was recording the deeds of the shepherds shows the book, with their misdeeds, to God (90:14; 17). God intercedes (vv. 15, 18); and a sword is given to the sheep (v. 19), who are then able to slay all their oppressors. Notable is the failure to mention the specific act of cult desecration by Antiochus IV that served as the focal point of the visions in Daniel.

Questions about the coherence of this final section of the Animal Apocalypse have been raised; in particular, there seems to be a doublet, with material in 6–9a, 11, and 17–19 paralleling the material in 9b, 10, and 12–16.[74] In Nickelsburg's view, this points to a version of the Animal

---

69. See, e.g., Black, *Book of Enoch*, 274. According to Tiller (*Animal Apocalypse*, 345 n. 5), the emendation to 35 was already suggested by Richard Laurence in 1821.

70. For attempts to assign the various species of bird in this passage with various Hellenistic kingdoms, see, e.g., Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 248; Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 345–46.

71. Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 221–22; 249; Black, *Book of Enoch*, 275. See, however, Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 351.

72. See, e.g., Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 249–50. However, see above the section "Preliminary Conclusions" to Daniel.

73. So Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 222; Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 188; Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 43–44; Black, *Book of Enoch*, 276; Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 355; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 400.

74. Jonathan Goldstein suggests this basic division of the material in *1 Maccabees* (AB

Apocalypse composed prior to the Antiochene persecution, which was subsequently updated to include references to Judas Maccabee (the ram with the "great horn").[75] Tiller, however, believes the content referring to Judas is original to the composition.[76] That an apocalyptic vision would be later reworked and expanded to reflect recent events should occasion no surprise. Whatever the specifics of the compositional history of the Animal Apocalypse, it is clear that the version that has come down to us dates from some time following the successes of Judas Maccabee.

The vision, however, does not end there. The passage continues, making clear that the victory of Israel under Judas is not merely a historical event, but it also heralds the onset of the eschaton. In 90:20–27, God appears enthroned in the holy land and pronounces judgment on all the angelic figures, including the seventy shepherds, who sinned. They are cast into a fiery abyss (v. 27). Following this, 90:28–38 relates a new creation. Jerusalem ("the house") is completely rebuilt (vv. 28–29), and all the nations symbolized by animals and birds see the error of their ways, and do obeisance to the flock of Israel (v. 30). Furthermore, all the sheep that had been dispersed—that is, the various Judean diaspora communities—are brought into Jerusalem (v. 33). Finally, v. 37 relates the birth of a white bull with large horns. This figure is almost certainly to be interpreted as a "new Adam," recalling the first white bull in the vision.[77] The chapter closes with Enoch awaking and remembering the vision in 90:39–42.

The similarities to Daniel, particularly chapter 8, are obvious. Not only are animals used symbolically, but the horns are used to represent particularly important individuals in each vision. Similarly, the framing of the Animal Apocalypse and Daniel 8 are similar: both compositions provide third-person narrative frameworks wherein a vision is witnessed by a seer who is guided and aided by angelic intermediaries. And, like Daniel 9, the Animal Apocalypse employs an artificial, schematic chronology of the Second Temple period that takes Jeremiah's prophecy of seventy years as its starting point.

The Animal Apocalypse differs from the visions of Daniel 7–12 in that there is no concern for specific foreign monarchs; the foreign nations that serve as Israel's adversaries are distinguished as different types of animals, but specific leaders are not singled out. Most surprisingly, there is no overt reference to the "abomination of desolation." The Animal Apoca-

---

41; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976), 40–42. The parallels between the two groupings of verses have been expanded upon by Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 396–98. See, however, James C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS 16; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1984), 162–63.

75. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 360–61; 398.

76. Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 350–57; he does, however, acknowledge that 90:13–15 are an interpolation based on a reworking of vv. 16–18 (362).

77. See, e.g., Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 45.

lypse is far more interested in the fact that Israel was "blind" and that the Second Temple cultus was illegitimate; these are the reasons for the woes of the Seleucid period, not the actions of a foreign king. In this regard, the *ex eventu* prediction of the Animal Apocalypse is even farther removed from the ideology of the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts than is the book of Daniel. Cryptic though the Akkadian texts may be, there is nothing in them remotely resembling the symbolic allegory of the Animal Apocalypse.

One could, however, argue that the Animal Apocalypse shares with the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts (or, at the very least, the Marduk Speech and the Uruk Prophecy) a look forward to the idyllic reign of a specied ruler. Charles argues that the white bull of 90:37 is not some Adam *redivivus* gure but rather "the Messiah." He qualies this, however, by noting that the gure has no specic role to perform, which he interprets as meaning that "the Messiah-hope must be regarded as practically dead at this period."[78] If this indeed is the case, then it is unclear what sense it makes to employ the term "messiah" at all. It is true that, since this gure is represented by an animal, a human is most certainly intended, as opposed to a gure such as the One-like-a-Son-of-Man in Daniel 7, who is most convincingly interpreted as angelic.[79] The text, however, does not state explicitly that the white bull will exercise kingship. In any event, there is nothing like the repeated rise of monarchs that one nds in the Akkadian works. Indeed, aside from the symbolic representations of David and Solomon, kingship plays no role in the Animal Apocalypse.

The Apocalypse of Weeks

The second section of *1 Enoch* employing an extended *vaticinium ex eventu* is a much briefer passage, commonly known as the Apocalypse of Weeks, found in the fth major division of *1 Enoch*, the Epistle of Enoch.[80] As the text of *1 Enoch* has come down to us, the latter portion of the passage has been displaced to an earlier point in the text; the proper ordering

---

78. Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 258.

79. See, e.g., J. Coppens, "Le Fils d'Homme daniélique et les relectures de Dan VII, 13 dans les apocryphes et les écrits du Nouveau Testament," *ETL* 37 (1961): 5–51; and especially the work of Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel* (HSM 16; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977), 144–45; idem, "The Son of Man and the Saints of the Most High in the Book of Daniel," *JBL* 93 (1974): 50–66; idem, *Daniel*, 304–10.

80. Many scholars have long considered the Apocalypse of Weeks to be an older piece incorporated into the later epistle; see, e.g., Loren Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91–108* (CEJL; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 49, 60–64. However, some recent scholarship has tended to see it more thoroughly integrated into the epistle; see Michael A. Knibb, "The Apocalypse of Weeks and the Epistle of Enoch," in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (ed. G. Boccaccini; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005), 213–19.

of the text, 93:1–10 followed by 91:11–17, has been long recognized. This reconstruction was proved to be correct upon the discovery of the Aramaic fragments of *1 Enoch* from Qumran. The manuscript 4QEnᵍ fragment 1 column iv preserves substantial portions of *1 Enoch* 93:9–10 + 91:11–17.[81] In this respect we are doubly fortunate, as a much greater proportion of the Apocalypse of Weeks survives in the original Aramaic than is the case for the Animal Apocalypse.

The Apocalypse proper begins in 93:3 with the words, ות[ב] נסב חנוך מתלה אמר, "And Enoch aga[in] took up his discourse [literally: parable] and said. . ." (4QEnᵍ 1 iii 22–23). In the speech that follows, Enoch lays out a schematic presentation of history divided into ten weeks. This, of course, equals ten units of seven, or seventy subdivisions of history; once again, then, we have a Judean *ex eventu* composition re-using the seventy–year prophecy of Jeremiah, adjusting it to form a schematic presentation of history down to the Seleucid period. Each week is described quite briefly, with the description of the majority of the weeks limited to a single verse.

Enoch begins by identifying himself as "the seventh" (referring to the number of generations from Adam) in the first week (93:3). The second week covers the period down to Noah (93:4). In the third week, "a man will be chosen as the plant of righteous judgment"; the referent is clearly Abraham (93:5). The fourth week includes the exodus from Egypt and concludes with the "covenant for all generations" and the construction of the tabernacle (93:6). The author of the Apocalypse of Weeks passes over the conquest, period of Judges, and establishment of the Israelite monarchy under Saul then David without comment; 93:7 limits itself to reporting that the fifth week witnesses the building of the Solomonic Temple. The description of the sixth week differs, in that it is almost entirely negative: "all who live in it will become blind, and the hearts of all will stray from wisdom; and in it a man will ascend.[82] And at its conclusion, the temple of the kingdom will be burned with fire, and in it the whole race of the chosen root will be dispersed." This last point is a transparent reference to the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem and exile (93:8).

With the seventh week the author's particular concerns come to the fore; this week receives the lengthiest description of any in the apocalypse, occupying 93:9–10 and 91:11. The first comment on the seventh week is that a "perverse generation" will arise, and that "all its deeds will be perverse" (93:9). The very next verse goes on to describe the conclusion of the

---

81. Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 265–69, and Plate XXII. All quotations of the Aramaic text of the Apocalypse of Weeks are taken from Milik's edition.

82. The reference is almost surely to the assumption of Elijah, as is the reference in the Animal Apocalypse at 89:52. See, e.g., Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 273; Ferdinand Dexinger, *Henochs Zehnwochenapokalypse und Offene Probleme der Apokalyptikforschung* (Studia Post-Biblica 19; Leiden: Brill, 1971), 131.

week, in which "the chosen will be chosen … to whom will be given sev-enfold wisdom and knowledge" (93:10). This should be construed as a ref-erence to the author's own time.[83] The description of this group, and of the week, is completed in 91:11 where, however, the Ethiopic contains a much more expansive text than the surviving Aramaic fragments allow.[84] The Aramaic reads ולהון עקרין אשי חמסא ועבד שקרא בה , "And they will uproot the foundations of violence and the structure of falsehood in it" (4QEnᵍ 1 iv 11). As Nickelsburg notes, the lack of any reference to the building of the Second Temple is quite unexpected; this is particularly so given the explicit mention already of the construction of both the tabernacle and the Jerusalem temple, and later the destruction of the temple.[85]

Verses 12 and 13 relate the events of the eighth week; for the rst time, the week is designated as a week of "righteousness" (קשוט). A sword will be delivered to the righteous, who will execute judgment on the wick-ed.[86] This recalls the sword given to the sheep in the Animal Apocalypse (90:19).[87] Furthermore, the temple will be rebuilt; 4QEnᵍ 1 iv 18 reads: ויתבנא היכל [מ]ל[כ]ות רבא ברבות זוה, "And the temple of the kingdom of the Great One will be (re)built in the greatness of its glory." With this the text returns to its emphasis on the cultic history of Israel—hearkening also to the position that the Second Temple cult was illegitimate.

The remainder of the Apocalypse of Weeks deals with an ideal future. In the ninth week, righteousness will be revealed to all humanity, and the deeds of wickedness will vanish from the earth (91:14). During the tenth week, in the seventh part of the week, the nal judgment occurs, with spe-ci c mention of the punishment of the Watchers (91:15). At this point, the rst heaven will pass away and be replaced by a new heaven (91:16), after which there will be "many weeks without number forever" during which sin will no longer exist (91:17).

The brevity of the passage accounts, in part, for the small number of identi able historical references in the text. The paucity of such references makes the passage more di cult to date than either (the nal form of) the

---

83. So most commentators, e.g., Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 273; Black, *Book of Enoch*, 291; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 447. Note, however, Dexinger understands this to refer to an ear-lier period, since he holds the apocalypse to have been composed in the Maccabean era (*Zehnwochenapokalypse*, 136–40).

84. The lengthier Ethiopic text ought to be regarded as a secondary expansion, prob-ably introduced to better assimilate the verse to its displaced location in the Ethiopic version. See Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91–108*, 128–31.

85. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 447; see also Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91–108*, 122,

86. Note that the Ethiopic contains a term for "oppressors" instead of "wicked." The sword here, however, is best understood as a metaphor for God's righteous judgment against the wicked, and not as a reference to struggle against foreign oppressors. See VanderKam, *Enoch*, 148–49.

87. As Nickelsburg notes, the "sword of judgment" is a common motif in the prophetic corpus (*1 Enoch 1*, 448); see, e.g., Isa 34:5–6; 66:16; Jer 44:13; 47:6; Ezek 30:24.

Animal Apocalypse or the apocalyptic visions of Daniel. That being said, the text is speci c enough that most scholars suggest dates for the composition of the work that range between shortly before the Antiochene persecution in late 167 to early in the period of Maccabean resistance.[88] Like the Animal Apocalypse, but unlike the visions of Daniel, there is no reference to the desecration of the Jerusalem cult by Antiochus IV. Unlike the Animal Apocalypse, the Apocalypse of Weeks does not seem to mention Judas Maccabee or the revolt against Antiochus. Given this, it seems most probable that the Apocalypse of Weeks was composed sometime in the period of Hellenistic reforms that preceded the revolt.[89] If so, this would make the Apocalypse of Weeks the earliest Judean historical review in the form of a *vaticinium ex eventu*.

Regardless, the formal differences between this composition and the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts are the starkest seen thus far. Like the Animal Apocalypse and Daniel, the narrative framework, mode of revelation, and mediation of otherworldly beings distinguish the Apocalypse of Weeks from the Mesopotamian texts.[90] Furthermore, as with the other Judean works, the functioning of the cult is the primary historical concern of our author. However, in the Apocalypse of Weeks this is pushed to an even greater extreme: there is no concern with speci c foreign monarchs, the succession of empires, or even foreign dominance over Jerusalem. Rather, the main historical players are abstracted to violence, deceit, and wickedness on one side, and righteousness on the other. Not only are the formal literary elements far removed from those found in the Akkadian works, but the complete lack of concern with kingship, be it foreign or native, removes the Apocalypse of Weeks even farther from the Mesopotamian ideological context. The driving thematic element of righteousness against wickedness is completely foreign to the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts.

Conclusion

The claim that Judean apocalyptic literature is derived from the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts is extremely problematic. Even if we ignore the fact

---

88. See VanderKam, *Enoch*, 144–46; Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91–108*, 60–62. A notable alternative to such dating is advanced by Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 255–56, wherein he advocates for a late-second- or early- rst-century date, following on the work of Charles (*Book of Enoch*, liii), who sought to place the composition of the Apocalypse of Weeks in the early rst century.

89. See VanderKam, *Enoch*, 148; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 440–41.

90. Although angelic mediators do not appear in the recounting of the vision proper, 93:2 reads: "The vision of heaven was shown to me, and from the words of the watchers and the holy ones I have learned everything."

that a large proportion of the literature commonly designated "apocalyptic" does not even contain any *vaticinia ex eventu*,[91] the claim that the *ex eventu* passages in Daniel must be dependent on Mesopotamian models strains the evidence. As we have seen, the *ex eventu* predictions of Daniel and *1 Enoch* are structurally quite distinct from the Akkadian works. All the passages from these Second Temple Judean compositions are framed as first-person narrations within broader narrative contexts; among the Akkadian texts, only the Marduk and Shulgi texts clearly present a first-person revelation. Even these two works, however, are formally quite distinct from the texts of Daniel and *1 Enoch*, as they do not situate the spoken revelation within a larger narrative.

In addition to the structural differences outlined, there are major discrepancies between the Judean and Mesopotamian corpora in terms of theme and content. As has often been emphasized in the scholarly literature, the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts lack eschatology of the type found in the sections of Daniel and *1 Enoch* surveyed above. The passages in Daniel all argue for an end to Seleucid domination and the institution of an everlasting kingdom of God's people (e.g., Dan 7:27); similarly, both the Animal Apocalypse and the Apocalypse of Weeks look forward to an idyllic age in which there will be no more violence or sin on the earth. The passages in both these books therefore look forward to a definitive change in the nature of human existence in the world. Among the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts, only two present ideas at all similar. First, the Marduk Speech ends with a very lengthy proclamation of an idyllic age. However, as argued in Chapter 2, this lengthy pericope serves as laud and praise for the then-reigning monarch, Nebuchadnezzar I; furthermore, it fails to convey any sense that there is a definitive change in human existence, but rather points to a single reign of extreme prosperity and peace. Second, the Uruk Prophecy culminates in a prediction of an everlasting dynasty: "He will exercise rulership and kingship in the midst of Uruk; his dynasty will be established forever. [The king]s of Uruk will exercise rulership like the gods" (r. 17–18). It must be admitted that this theme approaches the ideology of the Judean texts: the rise and fall of dynasties carefully cataloged in the Mesopotamian historiographic tradition will come to an end. What is more, the rule of this dynasty will be "like the gods." It cannot be denied that the Uruk Prophecy's "eschatology," such as it is, does not solve problems of theodicy nor address post-mortem reward and punishment as do the eschatologies found in Daniel and *1 Enoch*; it nevertheless predicts a definitive and permanent change in the way that human history will unfold. No longer will the seat of kingship hop from city to city. This notion is the closest thematic element in any of the Akkadian works surveyed to the eschatological views

---

91. See, e.g., Collins, "Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre"; D. S. Russell, *Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964), 36–69.

of history we nd in Daniel and *1 Enoch*; nonetheless, it cannot in any real sense be termed "eschatological," unless human existence continuing just as it always has, but without dynastic change, be viewed as some sort of eschaton. There is no reason to view this fascinating quirk of the Uruk Prophecy as the seed of Judean eschatology.

A second, more pressing difference between the Judean and Mesopotamian texts relates to the presentation of kingship. As has already been demonstrated, the succession of kingship is the major ideological issue in the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts. All ve of the texts relate the rise and fall of monarchs, some good and some wicked. And, as argued in Chapter 2, all of the texts likely culminated in the prediction of the rise of a legitimate native ruler who would drive out foreign overlords, rule justly, and initiate a period of general weal. As can be seen in the above survey, the *ex eventu* predictions of Daniel and *1 Enoch* display no interest whatsoever in the establishment of a native monarch. In the case of the visions of Daniel it is clear that rule will reside with God, God's people, or with God's angelic representatives; the situation in the Animal Apocalypse and Apocalypse of Weeks is analogous. Judean apocalypses containing *vaticinia ex eventu* and composed prior to the Roman destruction of Jerusalem in 70 c.e. are notable for their lack of messianic expectation; the texts look forward to heavenly rule on earth, not to the restoration of the Davidic dynasty to the throne in Jerusalem.

It may be argued that the reason for this is that by the period in which these apocalyptic visions took shape—roughly 170–163 b.c.e.—Judah had already been without a claimant to the throne for nearly three and a half centuries, since the rebuilding of the temple under the civic leadership of Zerubbabel. However, the fact that the Hasmoneans would claim the title of king before the close of the century is su cient evidence to illustrate that the thought of re-instituting a monarchy in Judah was not out of the realm of possibility. Instead, Daniel and *1 Enoch* are obsessed with restoring proper functioning of the cult, to the point that institutions of civic rule are completely disregarded.

Further complicating claims of dependence on Akkadian literary prototypes is the problem of transmission, recognized by Lambert. How would the authors of the relevant portions of Daniel and *1 Enoch* ever have come into contact with the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts? It should be noted that there have been other scholarly claims for in uence from Akkadian literature on the composition of Daniel and *1 Enoch*. These date back at least to Hermann Gunkel, who saw in the four beasts rising from the sea in Daniel 7 an echo from the *chaoskampf* myth as recorded in the *Enuma Elish*.[92] More recently, Helge Kvanvig has claimed that Daniel

92. Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos*, 328–33.

7 is dependent on Akkadian dream visions, in particular the *Vision of the Netherworld* (VAT 10057).[93] Both of these claims have been widely criticized by scholars.[94] There is, however, general scholarly agreement that mythological motifs known from Ugaritic and Mesopotamian texts did survive down to the period of Daniel and *1 Enoch* and re-emerge there in written form.[95] It is also worth noting that those elements of Daniel for which the strongest arguments have been made connecting them to Babylonian texts and motifs occur precisely in those tales that lack extended historical reviews in the guise of prediction.

The case for Mesopotamian influence on the Enochic corpus is stronger by far. James VanderKam has been particularly instrumental in demonstrating that the figure of Enoch and the kinds of material written under his name exhibit affinities with Mesopotamian traditions about the antediluvian sage Enmeduranki.[96] In Mesopotamian literature, Enmeduranki is presented as the seventh ante-diluvian sage, just as Enoch is the seventh from Adam; furthermore, both have explicit links to the sun, which emerge in the Enochic corpus most notably in the patriarch's age at the time he leaves earth (365 years [Gen 5:23]), and the insistence of the Enochic corpus on a solar-based cultic calendar. Not only does the claim of Mesopotamian influence boast strong evidence, but it has the further benefit of not requiring direct textual dependence. Rather, it requires only that one posit a very general familiarity with traditions, be they transmitted orally or in written form, on the part of authors writing about an antediluvian hero in the name of, and about, Enoch.

The claim that the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts influenced the writing of Judean apocalypses, by contrast, does not involve a familiarity with traditional mythological or folkloric material, but instead involves a claim of direct structural literary dependence. As already stated, the claim is quite unlikely. This is underscored by the paucity of Mesopotamian textual material, both in terms of the number of Akkadian *ex eventu* texts and, more important, in terms of the small number of copies found. As has already been discussed, as far as may be determined, the texts do not appear by name in catalog texts, and only the works attributed to

---

93. Helge Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and the Son of Man* (WMANT 61; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988), 355–555.

94. See, e.g., Collins, *Daniel*, 280; 283–86.

95. See, e.g., Richard J. Clifford, "The Roots of Apocalypticism in Near Eastern Myth," in *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism,* Vol. 1: *The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. John J. Collins; New York: Continuum, 1998), 1.3–38; Shalom Paul, "The Mesopotamian Background of Daniel 1–6," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (ed. John J. Collins and Peter Flint; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 1.55–68; and Karel van der Toorn, "Scholars at the Oriental Court: The Figure of Daniel against Its Mesopotamian Background," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (ed. Collins and Flint), 1.37–54.

96. VanderKam, *Enoch*, 33–51. See also Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic*, 214–69.

Marduk and Shulgi appear in multiple copies. The Akkadian *ex eventu* texts seem to have existed on the periphery of the Mesopotamian literary and scholarly canons, hardly the sort of material one would expect Judean authors of the mid-second century b.c.e. to have encountered. Any claims of transmission to Judean authors of the Hellenistic age must first tackle the question of how plausible it would be for any third- or second-century scribe—Judean or otherwise—to have read any of the five Akkadian *ex eventu* texts at all.

That being said, one must not underestimate the similarities between the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts and the sections of Daniel and *1 Enoch* discussed above. First and foremost, the member texts of both corpora can be described as mantic compositions that have consciously mined historiographic material to manufacture audience trust for the oracles contained in the individual works. Second, just as the authors of the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts have consciously leveraged the vocabulary, orthography, and style of the Mesopotamian omen tradition, so, too, did the authors of the *ex eventu* passages in Daniel and *1 Enoch* consciously employ prophetic language, sometimes implicitly and sometimes—most notably in Daniel 9—explicitly. Both corpora thereby seek to evoke native, authoritative mantic traditions, and associate themselves with the prestige accorded to those traditions, thus enhancing their own claims to authority. Finally, all the texts exhibit the perspective of a native populace fighting against outside rule. To turn the traditional tenets of *Gattungsgeschichte* on their head, the texts ought to be grouped into different genres based on formal literary criteria, but nonetheless seem to have arisen from similar social milieus based on content.

Furthermore, the passages in Daniel and *1 Enoch* considered above share with the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts the unique merger of historiographic and mantic discourses. Certainly, older historiographic texts from ancient Israel and Judah incorporate certain mantic elements: the use of a prophecy-fulfillment scheme in Kings has already been mentioned. And the books of the prophets clearly at times show awareness of Israel's past and can dwell at length on recent and current events (such as the Assyrian crisis in First Isaiah). However, nowhere earlier than these texts do we find compositions that are presented first and foremost as works concerned with revealing divinely transmitted information about the future to the audience, while simultaneously engaging in a recitation of past events that leads to the author/audience's present circumstance. This mantic-historiographic interplay, so similar to what we find in the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts, is evinced in a Judean context in the books of Daniel and *1 Enoch* for the first time.

At this point, these conclusions must be regarded as provisional. Daniel and *1 Enoch*, while containing the earliest Judean *ex eventu* historical reviews, do not exhaust our catalogue of such Second Temple texts. There-

fore, the claims of the preceding paragraphs need to be tested by investigating the appearance and function of *vaticinia ex eventu* in additional Second Temple compositions. Therefore, we will now turn rst to the occurrences of *ex eventu* prediction among the Dead Sea Scrolls (Chapter 5), and then to the *ex eventu* passages preserved in the pre-Christian strata of the *Sibylline Oracles* (Chapter 6).

5

Ex Eventu Prediction
in the Dead Sea Scrolls

The discovery and publication of the Dead Sea Scrolls from eleven caves near the site of Khirbet Qumran (and a few other sites in the Judean desert) has thrown wide open a long-shuttered window on the religion and writings of Hellenistic- and Roman-era Judeans outside the preserved literary canons of Judaism and Christianity. Among these finds we may differentiate two types of material. On the one hand are documents that exhibit clear signs of being the products of a specific sect within Second Temple Judea (whether or not that group was the Essenes, or located at Khirbet Qumran, etc.). Among these are the famous "rule" scrolls such as 1QS (the *Serekh ha-Yaḥad*, the Community Rule), 1QM (*Serekh ha-Milḥamah*, the War Rule), as well as the Damascus Document (known both from multiple copies found in the caves near the Dead Sea and from a medieval manuscript found in the Cairo Genizah) and the pesharim. On the other hand, the majority of documents indicate no conformity to the sectarian ideas that dominate in the rule scrolls and pesharim; among these are familiar texts (e.g., the large number of biblical manuscripts, copies of *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*, etc.), as well as heretofore unknown compositions.

In those documents that show no clear signs of sectarian authorship as well as those that do, the reader encounters numerous incidents of prophetic and historiographic traditions melded together in the service of addressing contemporary religious and political events and concerns. The present chapter will therefore deal with the Dead Sea materials in two separate sections. In the first, I turn my attention to non-sectarian documents that employ *ex eventu* historical reviews quite similar to those already surveyed. In the second section, I turn to the likely sectarian materials, wherein we find texts functioning in very similar ways, though expressed in a distinct literary form.

A. Non-Sectarian Texts

Pseudo-Daniel and Related Literature

Among the Dead Sea Scrolls, a number of compositions exist that exhibit clear a nity to the book of Daniel.[1] Chief among these are the Prayer of Nabonidus (4Q242),[2] Pseudo-Daniel (4Q243–245),[3] and the so-called Son of God Text (4Q246), sometimes referred to in scholarly literature as an Aramaic Apocalypse or the Daniel Apocryphon.[4] The last two of these are widely recognized as containing *ex eventu* historical reviews.

1. Pseudo-Daniel[a-b] (4Q243–244)

Of the three manuscripts that bear the name "Pseudo-Daniel," it is clear that 4Q243 (pseudo-Dan[a]) and 4Q244 (pseudo-Dan[b]) contain portions of the same composition; there is an overlap of 4Q243 fragment 13 and 4Q244 fragment 12. It appears unlikely that 4Q245 (pseudo-Dan[c]) constitutes a further copy of this composition, though the possibility cannot be excluded.[5]

Unfortunately, 4QPseudo-Dan[a-b] has survived in an extremely poor state of preservation; few of the fragments contain so much as three consecutive words. Nonetheless, this Aramaic work is all but certain to have contained an *ex eventu* review of history. In part this may be inferred from the close relationship of the document to the canonical book of Daniel:

---

1. For a general overview of this material, see Peter Flint, "The Daniel Tradition at Qumran," in *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. C. A. Evans and P. W. Flint; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 41–60; also George J. Brooke, "Parabiblical Prophetic Narratives," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years* (ed. Peter Flint and James VanderKam; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 1.271–301; esp. 290–97.

2. The o cial edition is John J. Collins, "Prayer of Nabonidus," in *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (DJD 22; ed. J. VanderKam et al.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 83–93 and plate VI. Fragments 1–3 were originally published by J. T. Milik, "'Prière de Nabonide' et autres écrits d'un cycle de Daniel," *RB* 63 (1956) 407–15. This initial publication initiated a spate of studies preceding the o cial DJD edition; see the bibliography in DJD 22.83.

3. J. T. Milik originally published fragments of 4Q243–245 in "'Prière de Nabonide.'" All the fragments were published in a preliminary edition by John J. Collins, "Pseudo-Daniel Revisited," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 111–35. The o cial publication was edited by John J. Collins and Peter Flint, "4Qpseudo-Daniel[a-c] ar," in DJD 22.96–164 and plates VII-X.

4. The contents of this text were rst made known in a public lecture by J. T. Milik at Harvard University in 1972; several studies followed. A preliminary edition was published by Émile Puech, "Fragment d'une Apocalypse en Araméen (4Q246 = pseudo-Dan[d]) et la 'Royaume de Dieu,'" *RB* 99 (1992): 98–131. The o cial edition has since been published by Puech as "4QApocryphe de Daniel ar," in DJD 22.165–84 and plate XI.

5. See Collins and Flint, DJD 22.154–55. Their preliminary conclusions regarding these texts, including publication of photographic plates of the fragments, appeared in two articles from 1996: John J. Collins, "*Pseudo-Daniel* Revisited," 111–35; and Peter Flint, "*4Qpseudo-Daniel ar[c] (4Q245)* and the Restoration of the Priesthood," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 137–49.

Daniel is clearly the protagonist (see, e.g., 4Q243 2; 4Q244 4); the name Belshazzar appears (4Q243 2); and the beginning of the work seems to take place in a court setting (4Q243 3).

Further reason for suspecting the existence of an *ex eventu* historical review derives from content. It must be admitted that, because of the extremely fragmentary state of the text, there is little else on which to base an ordering of the fragments. Nonetheless, the composition may be summarized as follows, in what is a best-guess approximation of the original order:

- The seer Daniel at the Babylonian court (ordered in DJD 22 as 4Q243 2; 4Q244 1–3; 4Q244 4; 4Q243 1; 4Q243 3; 4Q243 5; 4Q243 6)
- A review of primeval history (4Q243 9, mention of Enoch; 4Q244 8, mention of Noah and the ood; 4Q244 9, 4Q244 10, and 4Q244 13, possibly referring to the Tower of Babel)[6]
- History from the patriarchs through the exile (4Q243 35; 4Q243 11 ii and 4Q243 12, seeming to deal with the exodus from Egypt; 4Q243 28; 4Q243 34; 4Q243 13 + 4Q244 12, containing an account of Israel's apostasy and God's decision to give the land to Nebuchadnezzar; 4Q243 14; 4Q243 7; 4Q243 8)
- References to the Hellenistic period (4Q243 21, containing the Greek name בלכרוס, Balakros; 4Q243 19, which seems to contain the end of a Greek name, written רהוס; 4Q243 22; 4Q243 20)
- A prediction of the eschatological age (4Q243 16; 4Q243 25; 4Q243 33; 4Q243 24; 4Q243 26).

The key for detecting an *ex eventu* historical review among the preserved fragments is the presence of Greek names in the composition. The identity of Balakros is uncertain, and the name appears to have been common in the Hellenistic period.[7]

The use of historical review here may be likened to that found in the Damascus Document.[8] However, the review in CD is framed entirely as events of the past. Since the historical review of 4Q243 + 4Q244 is placed in the mouth of Daniel during the sixth century b.c.e., any references to the Hellenistic era must necessarily be framed as prediction. Assuming

---

6. Milik was rst to suggest identifying the pericope as relating to the Tower of Babel; see "Prière de Nabonide," 642.

7. See Collins and Flint, DJD 22.137. Milik, "'Prière de Nabonide,'" suggests an identi cation with Alexander Balas, but there is little to support this. The ending רהוס is odd; Collins and Flint suggest that this indicates a Greek name ending in -XXXX, and offer Pyrrhus as a possibility.

8. See Part B (sectarian texts) of the present chapter for the use of historical allusions in CD.

the work was actually written during the Hellenistic period, the prediction must be a *vaticinium ex eventu*. As such, it is more similar to something like the Animal Apocalypse of *1 Enoch*, which likewise begins its historical review with the primeval period. Like both CD and the Animal Apocalypse, the purpose of 4QPseudo-Dan[a-b] appears to be to situate the rise of an elect group of Israelites at the onset of the eschatological period: thus we read in 4Q243 24 2, יתכנשון קריאי]ן, "the elect will be assembled."[9]

Beyond this, however, there is precious little information by which either to situate the text historically or to determine the text's particular aim and function. It is lacking in distinctively sectarian terminology, and it is unlikely that the text was composed by the group responsible for the rule scrolls and the pesharim.[10] Although it is likely that Danielic literature began to be produced in the third century b.c.e.,[11] there are no known Judean *ex eventu* historical reviews (Danielic or not) prior to the mid-second century. For this reason, Collins and Flint place the *terminus post quem* in this period. The *terminus ante quem* ought most likely to be set at the invasion of Pompey in 63 b.c.e.[12]

2. Pseudo-Daniel[c] (4Q245)

As stated above, it is possible that 4Q245, or 4QPseudo-Daniel[c], is part of the same composition as 4Q243–244; however, together with the editors of the o cial editions of these texts, I regard the possibility as somewhat unlikely. 4Q245 1 i 3 does mention the name Daniel, and the following line mentions a writing or book (כתב). However, if this composition is independent of 4QPseudo-Dan[a-b], it should not be taken for granted that it be regarded as a Danielic composition. There does seem to be an eschatological passage in 4Q245 2, but this obviously need not imply Danielic attribution. Most puzzling is the fact that the bulk of 4Q245 1 i consists of a list of high priests followed by a list of kings, the latter beginning in line 12 with David and Solomon. The earliest preserved name of a priest is Qehat in line 5; line 9 preserves the name Onias (חוניה); and line 10 ends the list with the names Jonathan (mostly reconstructed) and Simon (יונ]תן שמעון). The names almost certainly refer to the Hellenistic high priests Onias (plausibly but not de nitively Onias III), followed later by the Hasmoneans Jonathan and Simon.[13] Were this composition indeed written from the point of

---

9. Collins and Flint, DJD 22.137.

10. On the distinctive terminology of the Qumran sectarians and the identi cation of speci c texts as composed by members of the sect, see, e.g., Carol Newsom, "'Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran," in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters* (ed. William H. Propp et al.; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 167–87.

11. See, e.g., Montgomery, *Daniel*, 96.

12. Collins and Flint, DJD 22.137.

13. On the reconstruction of the list, see Michael O. Wise, "4Q245 (psDan[c] ar) and the High Priesthood of Judas Maccabeus," *DSD* 12 (2005): 313–62.

view of Daniel, then this must be regarded as an *ex eventu* prediction of the Hellenistic high priests, similar to—but clearly distinct from—the *ex eventu* historical review of 4Q243–244.

Because so much is lost to us, it is unclear precisely how these lists functioned within the composition. It is possible that the separate lists of high priests and kings of Israel are intended to underscore the legitimacy of a diarchic government (as, for example, apparently embraced by the prophet Zechariah in the   gures of Zerubbabel and Joshua) against the combination of the two o   ces into one. This combination of sacral and civil leadership was to take place in Judah under the Hasmoneans; the document could therefore plausibly be read as an anti-Hasmonean tract. Though indeed possible, this reading is highly speculative. It is perhaps equally plausible, yet equally speculative, to surmise that the list of high priests and kings was never a part of the composition mentioning Daniel but merely shares space on the same roll of parchment.

As with Pseudo-Daniel[a-b], the preserved text is far too fragmentary to allow any certainty as to what the purpose of a possible *ex eventu* prediction might actually have been. We are simply left with tantalizing names from a period far later than the period in which the presumed author, the seer Daniel at the Babylonian/Persian court, was thought by the audience to have lived. A noteworthy difference when comparing both Pseudo-Daniel[a-b] and Pseudo-Daniel[c] to the materials already surveyed is that these works include actual personal names. This is a feature absent from the predictions of canonical Daniel, *1 Enoch*, and the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts; all those texts stringently avoid the naming of individuals, preferring ciphers and historical allusions to clue the audience in as to the identity of individuals.

3. Son of God Text (4Q246)

When J. T. Milik made public the contents of this composition in 1972, no small amount of excitement was generated by the fact that an Aramaic Qumran document contained the titles "son of God" and "son of Elyon/the Most High." Whether this composition contains an *ex eventu* review of history depends on how one interprets the "son of God"   gure. The titles occur in column 2 of the composition, presented below.

1	ברה די אל יתאמר ובר עליון יקרונה כזיקיא
2	די צזותא כן מלכותהן תהוה שני[ן] ימלכון על
3	ארעא וכלא ידשון עם לעם ידוש ומדינה למדי[נ]ה
4	*vacat* עד יקום עם אל וכלא ינוח מן חרב
5	מלכותה מלכות עלם וכל ארחתה בקשוט ידי[ן]
6	ארעא בקשט וכלא יעבד שלם חרב מן ארעא יסף
7	וכל מדינתא לה יסגדון אל רבא באילה

<div dir="rtl">

8   הוא וֹעבר לה קרב עממין ינתן בידה וכלהן

9   ירמה קדמוהי שלטנה שלטן עלם וכל תהומי

</div>

The following constitutes a viable translation that would support locating an *ex eventu* prediction in this text:

> **1** He will be called the son of God, and the son of the Most High they will call him. Like sparks **2** which you saw, so their kingdom will be. (For) years they will rule over **3** the earth, and they will trample everything: people will trample people, city (will trample) city, **4** [*vacat*] until the people of God will arise and everything will have rest from the sword. **5** Its kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all its ways are truth. It will judge **6** the earth with truth and all will make peace; the sword will cease from the earth **7** and all the cities will pay it homage. The great God will be its strength: **8** he will wage war on its behalf, he will give peoples into its hand, and all of them **9** he will cast down before it. Its rule is an everlasting rule and all the depths….

In the above translation, the many instances of the pronoun "it" all refer to the "people of God" in line 4. However, this is a matter of interpretation; the pronoun could equally well be understood as referring to the son of God in line 1. This latter position has commanded the lion's share of scholarly support. Joseph Fitzmyer, for example, interprets the son of God gure as an eschatological royal gure, though he avoids the term "messiah."[14] Florentino García Martínez essentially agrees with the analysis of Fitzmyer but identi es the gure not as a human king but rather as an angelic gure akin to the son of man in Daniel 7 or the gure of Melchizedek in 11QMelch.[15] Both Frank Moore Cross and John Collins regard the gure as the eschatological king of Israel, that is, the (royal) messiah.[16]

---

14. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament," *NTS* 20 (1973): 382–407; reprinted in idem, *A Wandering Aramaean: Collected Aramaic Essays* (SBLMS 25; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1979), 85–113.

15. Florentino García Martínez, "The eschatological gure of 4Q246," in idem, *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 162–79. The article originally appeared as "4Q246: Tipo del Anticristo o Libertador Excatologico?" in *El Misterio de la Palabra* (ed. Vicente Collado and Eduard Zurro; Madrid: Ediciones Cristiandad, 1983), 229–44.

16. Frank Moore Cross, "Notes on the Doctrine of Two Messiahs at Qumran and the Extracanonical *Daniel Apocalypse* (4Q246)," in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. D. W. Parry and S. D. Ricks; STDJ 20; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 1–13; John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1995), 154–72. That chapter is a reworking of his earlier article, "The *'Son of God'* Text from Qumran," in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge* (ed. M. de Boer; She eld: JSOT Press, 1993), 65–82. See also, John J. Collins, "Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years*, 2.403–30; esp.

The original editor of the text, J. T. Milik, has offered a decidedly different interpretation of the gure. He argues that the title stems not from Judean messianic ideology but from Hellenistic royal titulature. Behind the Aramaic phrase ברה די אל Milik locates known epithets of Seleucid kings—speci cally, the use by Alexander Balas of 𝕏𝕏𝕏𝕏𝕏𝕏𝕏𝕏 or *Deo patre natus* on coins.[17] The son of God, by this reading, functions not as Israel's savior but as Israel's chief enemy. David Flusser, like Milik, views the son of God gure as an enemy of Israel, against the majority stream of scholarship on this text. Unlike Milik, Flusser argues that the title designates an eschatological "Antichrist" gure, rather than associating the gure with a historical adversary of Israel.[18]

In his initial publication of the text, Émile Puech entertained both the notion that the unknown gure is a savior and the possibility that the "son of God" gure referred to an actual historical king.[19] However, in the extensive discussion accompanying his o cial edition of the text in the DJD series, Puech came to favor a position much like Milik's.[20] Instead of Alexander Balas, however, Puech there favors identifying the son of God gure as Antiochus IV Epiphanes: "L'explication de la vision viserait essentiellement la prétention de Séleucide Antiochus Épiphane à la divinisation ou déi cation, prétention à vouloir tout gouverner, tel Zeus olympien, dans une arrogance blasphématoire et choquante pour l'auteur juif."[21] Puech's position as expressed in DJD 22, which involves a heavy reliance on passages in the canonical book of Daniel as a likely literary template for 4Q246, seems quite plausible. The son of God gure is probably best understood as a historical king, and Antiochus IV is the most probable candidate.[22] The translation offered above supports such an interpreta-

---

414–15. The messianic interpretation must, of course, receive very serious consideration, if only because of the parallel of Luke 1:32, 35. There it is said of Jesus, "he will be called son of the Most High" (𝕏𝕏𝕏 𝕏𝕏 𝕏𝕏𝕏𝕏𝕏 𝕏𝕏𝕏𝕏𝕏𝕏𝕏𝕏𝕏, vs. 32), and "he will be called son of God" (𝕏𝕏-𝕏𝕏𝕏𝕏𝕏𝕏𝕏𝕏𝕏 𝕏𝕏𝕏, vs. 35). These are quite literal Greek equivalents of the Aramaic terms of 4Q246, in what is the quintessential rst-century Judean messianic context. The messianic interpretation has most recently been argued by Karl A. Kuhn, "The 'One Like a Son of Man' Becomes the 'Son of God,'" *CBQ* 69 (2007): 22–42.

17. See the discussion of Milik's Harvard presentation in Fitzmyer, "Contribution."

18. David Flusser, "The Hubris of the Antichrist in a Fragment from Qumran," *Immanuel* 10 (1980): 31–37.

19. Puech, "Fragment," 114–16, 126–31. See also idem, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: Immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle?* (2 vols.; Paris: Gabalda, 1993), 2.570–72.

20. Note, however, that Puech has since changed his position again, and most recently has come out in favor of seeing the son of God gure in messianic terms. See Puech, "Le ls de Dieu, le ls du Très-Haut, messie roi en 4Q246," in *Le jugement dans l'un et l'autre Testament, I: Mélanges o erts à Raymond Kun mann* (ed. Eberhard Bons; Lectio Divina 197; Paris: Cerf, 2004), 271–86.

21. Puech, "4QApocryphe de Daniel ar," DJD 22.183–84.

22. See, e.g., Dan 11:37, where the text states that Antiochus IV "will magnify himself above all" gods.

tion of the text. The *ex eventu* prediction then comes into the text at ii 2–3, where the destruction mentioned is understood as the violence of Antiochus IV, notably against Jerusalem. Presumably, the missing portions of text preceding this column would have contained further elements of an *ex eventu* historical review, similar to what we nd in Daniel 10–12. The text culminates with a prediction of an everlasting kingdom and the rule of God's people; this is similar to Daniel 7 in which the eschatological reward is an eternal kingdom "of the people of the holy ones of the Most High" (לעם קדישי עליונין; Dan 7:27).

Edward M. Cook has likewise contributed an important study of this enigmatic text.[23] Cook's work is notable for two main features. First, Cook offers a stichometric reconstruction of the text, viewing it as a thoroughly poetic work, each line composed of two balanced hemistichs. By so arranging the text, Cook arrives at a somewhat different syntactic understanding of certain terms at several points in the text. Second, Cook engages in serious comparison of this Aramaic work to the Akkadian *ex eventu* compositions (which he terms "Akkadian prophecies").

Cook's analysis differs mostly in his treatment of the rst column of the text, which is heavily broken. In particular, he restores in the missing portion of column i line 9 the word ברה, "his son," yielding "[likewise his son] will be called the Great / and by his name he will be designated."[24] Cook interprets this as a reference to Antiochus IV, known by the same name as his father, Antiochus III.[25] In Cook's interpretation, the "son of God" is Antiochus IV, and the true protagonist of the piece is the "people of God," a position supported by the translation offered above. However, Cook grossly overstates the similarities between 4Q246 and the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts. His claim that "the Aramaic text is an adaptation of the Akkadian genre for a particular purpose" is fraught with di culties.[26] Not least among these are his contention that the Akkadian texts to which he refers do indeed constitute a "genre"; his contention that the author of 4Q246 would have had access to these cuneiform texts; his gross minimizing of the differences among the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts, when his most speci c points of comparison come solely from the Uruk Prophecy; and, most especially, his claim that 4Q246 represents a text "predicting" the rise of speci ed successive kings. At most, Cook has demonstrated that reference is made to Antiochus III as the father of Antiochus IV. However, not even this much is certain, as the key passage supporting this view of the text (that is, the element "his son") is entirely restored by Cook.

While the state of preservation of 4Q246 does not allow for any cer-

---

23. Edward M. Cook, "4Q246," *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 5 (1995): 43–66.
24. Cook, "4Q246," 45–47.
25. Cook, "4Q246," 64.
26. Cook, "4Q246," 64.

tainty in the matter, I am sympathetic to Puech's early reading of the text, as he presents it in DJD 22, discussed above, despite the fact that Puech has subsequently abandoned this view. The position does rely heavily on the supposition that the similarities between 4Q246 and canonical Daniel are not wholly accidental—there is probably some direct literary influence between the texts (or, better, between these texts and other Danielic traditions in circulation in the second century b.c.e.). Given the great similarity between 4Q246 and canonical Daniel, it should come as little surprise that this text seems partially to preserve an *ex eventu* historical review culminating in a judgment against Judah's Seleucid overlords in the time of Antiochus IV. By this reading, the historical background surrounding the composition of the text, as well as the purpose to which it was composed, falls in line with those of the second half of canonical Daniel.

4. 4QFour Kingdoms (4Q552–553)

This tantalizing document survives in two brief, overlapping manuscripts. Though very fragmentary, it clearly contained a schematization of history as four successive kingdoms, reminiscent of Daniel 2, 7, and *Sibylline Oracles* 4. A composite reconstruction of the combined text of 4Q552 1 ii 1–8 and 4Q553 2 ii 1–6 reads in part as follows:[27]

וחזית [...] די עלוהי נוגהא קאם וארבעה אלנין [אמרי]ן
לה וקאם אילנא[28] ורחקו מנה ואמר[לי התחזא] צורתא
ואמרת אן אחזה ואתב[וּנ[ון בה וחזית אילנא די קאם
הוא שים במ[דנחא לה] ושאלתה מן שמד ואמר לי בבל
ואמרת לה אנתה הוא די שליט בפרס ו[חזית אי]לנא
אחרנא[29] [די נ]חית למערבא ל[משלט ...] למשנֹק
ושאלתה ואמרת לה מן שמד

And I looked … upon which the dawn rose. And four trees [*spoke*] to him. And the tree arose and turned away from it/him. And it said [to me], "Do you see the image?" And I said, "Indeed, I see and understand [it]." [And I saw] the tree which arose, which was set e[ast of it]. And I

---

27. The official DJD edition was published by E. Puech, *Qumran Cave 4.XXVII: Textes araméens, deuxième partie* (DJD 37; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 59–90. Of particular note, Puech has changed the sigla previously assigned to some of the fragments, dividing the lot previously assigned to 4Q553 between two different manuscripts, 4Q553 (= 4QFourKingdoms^b) and 4Q553a (= 4QFourKingdoms^c), resulting in the renumbering of previous 4Q553 fragments. In the above transcriptions, restored text follows Puech's suggestions in DJD 37. 4Q552 1 ii 7 (and the first word of line 8) is included in the above combined text, but is absent in the parallel passage in 4Q553.

28. 4Q552 1 ii 2 reads the singular, as written above; 4Q553 3 2 contains the plural, אלניא.

29. This word appears as a surpalinear addition in 4Q552; it is unclear if it was intended as a correction or addition to the text. See Puech, DJD 37.66.

asked it, "What is your name?" And it said to me, "Babylon." [And I said to it], "It is you who rules over Persia." And I saw (another) tree which rested to the west to [*rule*(?) …] and to trouble. And I asked it, "What is your name?"

This symbolic vision has clear affinities to the visions of Daniel 2 and 7; here, however, the four kingdoms of world history are represented by trees. The earliest kingdom is Babylon, just as in Daniel. References to the second and third tree are fragmentary and do not include their names, and the fourth tree is completely absent from the surviving fragments.[30] The vision must have included the Hellenistic kingdoms (most likely Seleucid Syria, but possibly Ptolemaic Egypt) or possibly Rome, as the Greek name Makarios (מאכריוס) is preserved in 4Q553 1 4. If the text contained an eschatological section, it is now lost. However, the affinities of this text to others in the Danielic tradition—noting especially the fact that the first kingdom is Babylon—strongly hint that it may have been a Daniel pseudepigraphon.[31]

The identification of the four kingdoms is difficult. While in Daniel 7 Babylon and Persia are separate kingdoms, it seems here that they are combined into a single kingdom represented by the first tree. The text goes on to state that the second kingdom rules over the sea, which implies Greece. It is possible, however, that Ptolemaic Egypt and Seleucid Syria are here considered consecutive kingdoms.[32] This would at least make sense from a Judean point of view. The possible identifications of the fourth kingdom are then (1) Rome or (2) the eschatological kingdom of Yahweh's people. The latter position seems by far the less likely given the usage of the four-kingdoms pattern in other texts. Though it is impossible to say with certainty, it is most plausible that this text was modeled on the visions of Daniel 2 and 7, with the replacement of Rome for Greece as the last earthly kingdom before the intervention of God and the permanent removal of foreign rule from Israel.

Summary

From the above survey it should be apparent that numerous texts intimately linked by content, themes, and concerns with the canonical book of Daniel circulated within Judean communities of the later Second Temple period.[33] Of such works recovered among the Dead Sea Scrolls, 4QFour

---

30. Flint ("The Daniel Tradition," 363) plausibly reconstructs the fourth tree in 4Q553 4 1, following the suggestion of E. Cook in M. Wise, M. Abegg, and E. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1996), 441.

31. See Flint, "The Daniel Tradition," 363.

32. See Cook's remarks in *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 440; likewise Collins, "Apocalypticism and Literary Genre," 416.

33. See Lorenzo DiTommaso, "4Q*Pseudo-Daniel*[a-b] (4Q243–4Q244) and the Book of Daniel," *DSD* 12 (2005): 101–33.

Kingdoms and 4Q246 are arguably the most similar to sections of canonical Daniel. Equally apparent, however, is that none of these texts preserves anything *quite* analogous to the historical reviews preserved in the second half of Daniel. 4Q246 possibly preserves part of such an extended *ex eventu* historical survey, but this must still be regarded as a tentative reading of the text.

4QPseudo-Daniel[c], however, presents an interesting case. It is explicitly interested in and names the leaders of Israel, both high priests and kings. This concern with the past political leadership of Israel sets the text apart from the other Judean *ex eventu* literature surveyed, and is a potential point of similarity with the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts. However, as remarked above, it is unclear whether or not these lists are actually part of a "prediction" put in the mouth of the seer Daniel. Even if we are to regard the lists as part of an *ex eventu* composition, it still is something quite different from what we nd in the Akkadian works, as the latter consistently refrain from naming the rulers that gure in the "predictions."

The 4Q Jeremiah and Ezekiel Pseudepigrapha (4Q383–391)

The history of the scholarship on 4QApocryphon of Jeremiah and 4QPseudo-Ezekiel, brief though it is, deserves special attention.[34] The fragments of these works were originally allotted to John Strugnell for publication. In the 1980s, Strugnell enlisted the aid of Devorah Dimant, with whom he co-authored a few articles on the fragments. Later, the task of publishing the fragments was handed over entirely to Dimant, who published a handful of further studies before the o cial publication nally appeared in DJD 30.[35] It appeared some forty- ve years after Strugnell's rst published reference to 4Q389 as part of "un écrit *pseudo-jérémien*."[36]

---

34. This is especially the case because of the numerous re-assignments of fragments to various (necessarily hypothetical) compositions. In addition, the o cial DJD edition of these texts renumbers the fragments, making it di cult to correlate previous studies with the material as it is now organized.

35. Devorah Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4. XXI; Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts* (DJD 30; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001). 4Q384 and 4Q391, both papyri, were published by Mark Smith in *Qumran Cave 4. XIV; Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (ed. Emanuel Tov; DJD 19; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995).

36. John Strugnell ("Communication de J. Strugnell") in M. Baillet et al., "Le travail d'édition des manuscrits de Qumrân," *RB* 63 (1956): 65. In a subsequent publication ("The Angelic Liturgy at Qumran—4Q Serek Šîrôt ʿÔlat Haššabb t," in *Congress Volume* [VTSup 7; ed. G. W. Anderson et al.; Leiden: Brill, 1960], 318–45), Strugnell defended this designation for part of the material, but concluded that "the work was vaster and contained a notable pseudo-Ezekiel section" (244).

A survey of the material contained in 4Q383–391, as well as the early attempts to sort it by Strugnell and Dimant, goes a very long way toward explaining the great delay in publication. Between Strugnell's initial mention of the material and the publication of DJD 30, the understanding of these materials has gone through several signi cant transformations. In the two joint publications of Dimant and Strugnell, in 1988 and 1990, the authors assumed that all the fragments of 4Q385–390 belonged to a single work that they termed Second Ezekiel.[37] By 1992, Dimant had determined that the fragments in question derived from three different compositions, which she termed Pseudo-Ezekiel, Pseudo-Moses,[38] and an Apocryphon of Jeremiah.[39] In a paper published in 1994, Dimant had moved substantially closer to the organization of the fragments she presents in DJD 30—particularly in regard to assigning previous "Second Ezekiel" material to a Jeremiah composition.[40] In the most extensive study of the fragments thus far, an unpublished dissertation by Monica Brady, this position has been seriously questioned.[41] Brady asserts that the fragments constitute multiple copies of a single composition, as originally surmised by Strugnell and Dimant. When DJD 30 appeared in 2001, Dimant had changed her mind about the existence of a "pseudo-Moses" text, and therein assigns all of the fragments to one of two documents: 4QPseudo-Ezekiel and 4QApocryphon of Jeremiah C.[42]

37. J. Strugnell and D. Dimant, "4Q Second Ezekiel," *RevQ* 13 (1988): 45–56 (includes a preliminary publication of 4Q385 2–3); D. Dimant and J. Strugnell, "The Merkabah Vision in Second Ezekiel," *RevQ* 14 (1990): 330–48.

38. On other Moses pseudepigrapha at Qumran, and the possibilities of a "Pseudo-Moses circle" akin to an "Enochic circle," see J. Strugnell, "Moses-Pseudepigrapha at Qumran: 4Q375, 4Q376, and Similar Works," in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (JSPSup 8; ed. L. Schiffman; She eld: JSOT Press, 1990), 221–56.

39. Devorah Dimant, "New Light from Qumran on the Jewish Pseudepigrapha—4Q390," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Madrid 18–21, 1991* (ed. Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner; 2 vols.; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill 1992), 2.405–48. The article contains a preliminary edition of 4Q390 with extensive commentary (without photographs). See also her brief comments in "Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha from Qumran," *DSD* 1 (1994): 151–59, esp. 157–59.

40. D. Dimant, "An Apocryphon of Jeremiah from Cave 4 (4Q385ᴮ = 4Q385 16)," in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992* (ed. G. J. Brooke; STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 11–30.

41. Monica Brady, "Prophetic Traditions at Qumran: A Study of 4Q383–4Q391" (Ph.D. diss., University of Notre Dame, 2000). Likewise, B. Z. Wacholder considers 4Q384–391 a single work ("Deutero Ezekiel and Jeremiah [4Q384–4Q391]: Identifying the Dry Bones of Ezekiel 37 as the Essenes," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery* [ed. Lawrence Schiffman et al.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000], 445–61).

42. 4Q383 is known as Pseudo-Jeremiah A; the papyrus scroll edited by Mark Smith, 4Q384, is designated Pseudo-Jeremiah B(?); the rest of the fragments from 4Q385–390 which Dimant judges to be Jeremianic are considered different copies of a single composition labeled Apocryphon of Jeremiah C. For a fuller review of opinions on these fragments

Needless to say, the task of reconstructing an original text or texts from these fragments is daunting. The most obvious reason for supposing separate pseudepigraphic compositions is the occurrence of the names Jeremiah (ten times; 4Q383 1 2; 4Q385a 16 i 2, 6, 8; 16 ii 3, 4, 6; 25 1; 39 2; 4Q389 3 5) and Ezekiel (three times; 4Q385 1 1; 3 4; 4 5). Typically, works pseudepigraphically ascribed to a biblical gure feature the revelatory powers of only one such gure; they tend not to place predictions in the mouths of multiple seers.[43] In addition, certain passages clearly re-work episodes found in the books of Jeremiah and, especially, Ezekiel.[44] Dimant divides the material in the following way in DJD 30:

- 4QPseudo-Ezekiel[a] = 4Q385 (six fragments), formerly 4Q385 fragments 1, 2, 12, 3, 5, and 4
- 4QPseudo-Ezekiel[b] = 4Q386
- 4QPseudo-Ezekiel[c] = 4Q385b, formerly 4Q385 fragment 24
- 4QPseudo-Ezekiel[d] = 4Q388 (seven fragments), formerly 4Q388 fragments 11, 10, 12, 13, 14, 9, and 8
- 4QPseudo-Ezekiel unidenti ed fragments = 4Q385c, formerly 4Q385 fragments 19, 25, 26, 27, 38, and 30[45]
- 4QpapPseudo-Ezekiel[e] = 4Q391 (edited by Smith, DJD 19)
- 4QPseudo-Jeremiah A = 4Q383
- 4QpapPseudo-Jeremiah B? = 4Q384 (edited by Smith, DJD 19)
- 4QApocryphon of Jeremiah C[a] = 4Q385a (eighteen fragments), formerly 4Q385 fragments 43 + 13, 15, 42 + 14, 41, 40 + 44, 39, 23, 21, 20, 18, 17, 10, 11, 8, 7, 9, 6, and 16
- 4QApocryphon of Jeremiah C[b] = 4Q387
- 4QApocryphon of Jeremiah C[c] = 4Q388a (seven fragments), formerly 4Q388 fragments 4, 5, 6, 17, 2 + 3, 15 + 7, and 1

---

shortly prior to Dimant's edition in DJD 30, see Brooke, "Parabiblical Prophetic Narratives," 273, 278–90; idem, "The Book of Jeremiah and Its Reception in the Qumran Scrolls," in *The Book of Jeremiah and Its Reception* (BETL 128; ed. A. H. W. Curtis and T. Römer; Leuven: University Press, 1997), 183–205, esp. 188–92; idem, "Ezekiel in Some Qumran and New Testament Texts," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, 1.317–37, esp. 322–26.

43. An obvious exception to this rule would be composite texts, such as the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. It is, of course, possible (more so regarding the Jeremiah material) that the works preserved in 4Q385–390 were not ascribed to the biblical prophet concerned. However, works that do concern multiple biblical personages, such as *2 Baruch*, *Jannes and Jambres*, *Joseph and Aseneth*, *Life of Adam and Eve*, etc., almost always speak of characters who appear together in the biblical narrative. An exception is the Christian work *The Lives of the Prophets*, which is primarily concerned with reporting the nal resting places of various biblical prophets. There is nothing in that composition comparable to the extensive oracles preserved in 4Q385–390.

44. See the summary of Brady, "Prophetic Traditions," 536–39.

45. A seventh fragment, labeled Fragment E, is not correlated with an original 4Q385 fragment number.

- 4QApocryphon of Jeremiah C^d = 4Q389
- 4QApocryphon of Jeremiah C^e = 4Q390
- 4QApocryphon of Jeremiah C^f = 4Q387a (nine fragments), formerly 4Q387 fragments 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15
- 4Q385 Unidenti ed Fragments A-K, formerly 4Q385 fragments 22, 28, 30, 31, 35, 36, 45, and 47[46]

While it is most probable that 4Q385–390 contain the remains of (at least) two compositions, one pseudepigraphically attributed to Ezekiel and the other to Jeremiah, Brady's position—which, again, recapitulates an early position held by Strugnell and Dimant—cannot be ruled out.[47]

An additional consideration has been raised by Hanan Eshel. Eshel points out that 4Q390 shares no overlap with the rest of the Apocryphon of Jeremiah and Pseudo-Ezekiel material treated by Dimant, and quite possibly represents an independent composition.[48] While Eshel raises an important caution, stylistic similarities (such as the shared preference of "Mastemot" against the expected "Mastema" in 4Q390 as well as 4Q387) lead me to lean toward Dimant's position that 4Q390 belongs with the Apocryphon of Jeremiah material. By and large, however, the question of the macro-structure of the composition(s) represented by these fragments is not a primary concern for the present study. In investigating the *ex eventu* historical reviews preserved in these fragments the reader should bear in mind the competing theories regarding the larger compositions of which these passages are a part.

1. Apocryphon of Jeremiah C

Of the three pseudepigraphic works attributed to Jeremiah by the editors of the DJD series, the work that Dimant identi es as Apocryphon of Jeremiah C preserves extensive historical reviews in the guise of prophecy. The composition was originally quite sizable; Dimant reports that

---

46. Dimant's fragments I, J, and K are not correlated by her to original 4Q385 fragment numbers.

47. In support of Dimant's reconstruction of two separate compositions, coupled with an argument for considering them both "historical apocalypses," see Matthias Henze, "4QApocryphon of Jeremiah C and 4QPseudo-Ezekiel: Two 'Historical' Apocalypses," in *Prophecy after the Prophets? The Contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls to the Understanding of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Prophecy* (ed. Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange; Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 25–42. Note, however, that Henze contends that "the two texts overlap to a greater extend [*sic*] than Dimant is willing to accept" (40).

48. See Hanan Eshel, "4Q390, the 490–Year Prophecy, and the Calendrical History of the Second Temple Period," in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (ed. Gabriele Boccaccini; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005), 101–10. See also Cana Werman, "Epochs and End-Times: The 490 Year Scheme in Second Temple Literature," *DSD* 13 (2007): 229–55.

4Q385a contains remnants of at least twenty-four columns of text.[49] Further, other manuscripts contain material not extant in 4Q385a, indicating that the text was quite probably longer than even this. The number of overlaps in the fragments indicates that there are at least six separate copies of this composition; further, variation among the copies indicates that different recensions were in circulation. The pertinent passages are presented below, drawn from various of the manuscripts, in what amounts to a best guess at original order.

4Q390 1.   Fragments 1 and 2 of 4Q390 are among the best-preserved fragments of Apocryphon of Jeremiah C (keeping in mind, however, Eshel's quite plausible suggestion that 4Q390 constitutes an independent composition). According to Dimant (following Hartmut Stegemann), it is likely that there were four columns, now all missing, intervening between the two fragments. There has been some debate as to the proper ordering of the fragments,[50] but Dimant is likely correct that fragment 1 should come first on grounds of content.[51] The primary justification for placing this fragment earlier in the composition than 4Q387 2 ii-iii and parallels is content. Following is the text of 4Q390 1 2–12 and my translation.

2   [ ] שבעים שנה [ביד בני אהר]ון ונתחים [ש]וב[וא ו]מפ[ני

3   ומשלו בני אהרון בהמה ולא יתהלכו[בדר]כי אשר אנוכי מצוֹךְ אשר

4   תעיד בהם ויעשו גם הם את הרע בעיני ככל אשר עשו ישראל

5   בימי ממלכתו הריׁשונים מלבד העולים רישונה מארץ שבים לבנות

6   את המקדש ואדברה בהמה ואשלחה אליהם מצוה ויבינו בכל אשר

7   עזבו הם ואבותיהם ומתום הדור   ההוא ביובל השביעי

8   להרבן הארץ ישכחו חוק ומועד ושבׁת וברית ויפרו הכול ויעשו

9   הרע בעיני והסתרתי פני מהמה ונתתים ביד איביהם והסגרת[י]ם

10   לחרב והשארתי מה[ם פליטים למע]ן[ ] אשר לא יׁ[כ]ל[ו] [ב]חמתי [ו]בׁהסתר פׁ]ני[

11   מהם ומשלו בהמה מלאׁכי המשׁ[ט]מות ומׁ[ ] ו[ישוׁב]ו[

12   וׁﬠׁשו [את] הרֹﬠ בׁﬠיׁנ[י] ויתהלכו בשרﬞ]ירות לבם...

49. Dimant, DJD 30.131.

50. Both Florentino García Martínez ("Nuevos textos no biblicos procedentes de Qumrán," *EsBib* 49 [1991]: 97–134; 131) and Michael Knibb ("A Note on *4Q372* and *4Q390*," in *The Scriptures and the Scrolls: Studies in Honour of A. S. Van der Woude on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* [ed. F. García Martínez, A. Hilhorst, and C. J. Labuschagne; Leiden: Brill, 1992], 164–77; 173–74) argue that fragment 2 should be placed before fragment 1.

51. Dimant, DJD 30.235–36, 244.

2 [and] before [me I ag]ain[gave them] into the hand of the sons of Aar[on] seventy years [ ] **3** And the sons of Aaron ruled over them; but they did not walk [in] my [wa]ys, which I commanded you, that **4** you would warn them. As for them, they too will do what is evil in my eyes, according to all that Israel did **5** formerly in the days of its kingdom, except for those who will come up first from the land of their captivity to build **6** the temple. I will speak to them and I will send a command to them; they will understand everything which **7** they and their fathers abandoned. But when that generation dies (*vacat*) in the seventh jubilee **8** of the destruction of the land, they will forget statute and festival, Sabbath and covenant. They will violate everything, and they will perform **9** evil in my sight, and I will hide my face from them. I will give them into the hand of their enemies, and I will give [them] up **10** to the sword and I will cause there to remain refugees among them, in ord[er] that [they] not [be dest]roy[ed] in my wrath. [And] when [my] fa[ce] is hidden **11** from them, the Angels of Mastemot[52] will rule over them and *m*[and they] will again **12** perform evil in [my] sight, and they will walk in the will[fullness of their heart …].

The text offers a clear instance of *vaticinium ex eventu*, recounting Israel's history starting from the restoration in the late sixth century b.c.e. The text goes on to indicate the failure of Israel to follow Yahweh's will after that, but lacks any clear historical allusions. However, as will be seen in the discussion of 4Q387 2 below, there is reason to suspect that the rule of the Angels of Mastemot—that is, demonic figures—refers to the Hellenistic period.

The reasoning for treating this passage first rests on the reference to the former kingdom of Israel in line 5, as well as the remarks concerning the restoration immediately following the exile in line 6. Additionally, there is the reference to the seventh jubilee. This clearly indicates a periodization of history into jubilees along the lines of texts such as *Jubilees*, *Testament of Levi*, and 11QMelch. Specifically, it is interesting to note that *Testament of Levi* 17 states that the greatest debasement and corruption of the priesthood occurs in the seventh jubilee (specifically, in the seventh "week" of the seventh jubilee). It is possible that the two compositions are counting from the same event and refer to the same historical period. However, it must also be noted that the choice of the *seventh* jubilee may be purely rhetorical.

I do not agree with Dimant that the references here must necessarily be correlated to the jubilee scheme of the book of *Jubilees* combined with

---

52. The occurrence of the plural form Mastemot is unique to the material assigned to Apocryphon of Jeremiah C; it also appears at 4Q390 2 i 17 and 4Q387 2 iii 4. One would expect the singular, Mastema, such as one finds in *Jubilees*. Cf. CD 4:13, 15; 1QS 1:18, 24; 2:19.

the ten-week scheme of the Apocalypse of Weeks in *1 Enoch*.[53] Dimant
identi es the "seventh jubilee" of our text as the seventh jubilee of a sev-
enth Week of Jubilees, within a scheme of ten weeks of ten jubilees each,
drawn from the Apocalypse of Weeks.[54] Based on this, she contends that
this should be dated to the jubilee cycle between 289/288 and 241/240 b.c.e.
I do not believe it is prudent to read such chronographic speci city into
a fragmentary text such as this, impressive though Dimant's reconstruc-
tion is. Rather, it is most reasonable to assume we are here dealing with a
traditional gure of 490 years until the eschaton, which may be referred to
either as a period of ten jubilees or as a series of seventy weeks. The com-
bination of weeks and jubilees in Apocryphon of Jeremiah C should not
be taken as necessarily indicating a meshing of the schemas of *Jubilees* and
the Apocalypse of Weeks, but rather as a merging of terminology used to
speak about a traditional, symbolic number of years. As Michael Knibb
has remarked concerning the "week of years" and seventy years of 4Q390
2 i 4, 6, "In either case the 'week of years' of line 4a and the 'seventy years'
(or 'two weeks [of years]') of line 6a are conventional, not precise, periods
of time within the overall chronological scheme of *4Q390*."[55]

The events described in 4Q387 2 pertain to the tenth jubilee, leading to
the present ordering of the fragments. However, the placement of 4Q390
1 prior to 4Q387 2 must be regarded as extremely tentative. The latter pas-
sage covers some of the same history as does this passage. Further, it must
be kept in mind that many similar pseudepigraphic compositions include
multiple visions and multiple reviews of the same historical events (e.g.,
the multiple visions of both *1 Enoch* and Daniel covered in the previous
chapter). Therefore, it is entirely possible that the present fragment, even
if it belongs to the same composition as 4Q387 2, does not come from the
same *vision* within that work.

The fact that the text breaks off without including any speci c histori-
cal references to the period after the restoration community of Judah is
most unfortunate; we are left with no data by which to locate the author-
ship of this passage. However, as is the case with Daniel and *1 Enoch*, it is
most likely that the *ex eventu* passages in Apocryphon of Jeremiah C stem
from the same historical circumstances, even if they come from separate
(even originally independent) visions.

---

53. Dimant, "The Seventy Week Chronology (Dan 9,24–27) in the Light of New Qum-
ranic Texts," in *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings* (BETL 106; ed. A. S. van der
Woude; Leuven: University Press, 1993), 57–76; esp. 66–67. This notion was rst suggested in
more cautious form, with appeal to 4QMishmarot (4Q320–330), in idem, "New Light," 437.
In my view, the idea that each "week" of the Apocalypse of Weeks is intended to designate a
period of ten (not seven!) jubilee cycles is highly dubious.

54. Dimant, "Seventy Week Chronology," 69.

55. Michael Knibb, "A Note on *4Q372* and *4Q390*," 174. See further the discussion of
4Q387 2 below.

4Q387 2 ii-iii (composite with overlapping fragments); 4Q387 3 (composite).   Among the fragments assigned to Apocryphon of Jeremiah C in DJD 30, we are fortunate enough to have preserved substantial parts of two consecutive columns of text. These columns preserve a lengthy *ex eventu* prediction. The section in question is a composite of 4Q387 2 ii-iii, 4Q385a 4, 4Q388a 7 ii, and 4Q389 8 ii, and is transcribed below.[56] Since 4Q387 2 preserves text from three consecutive columns, the column and line enumeration of that fragment is used below.

<div align="center">

column ii

</div>

1	]ותחזקֹו לעבדני בכל לבבכם [כסֹ] [ ]°[יעֹ] [ ]
2	בכֹ]ל נפשכם ובק[ש]ו[ֹ] פ̇[נ]י̇ בצר להם ולֹא אדרש להם
3	בעבור מעלֹם [א]שֹר מעל[י [ ]בֹ̇ י̇]עד שלמות עשרה
4	יבלי שנים והתה[ל]כתם בֹשֹׁ[געון] ובעורון ותמהן
5	הלב ומתֹ ומתֹ הדור[ ]ההוא א[ֹ]קרע]אֹת הממלכה מיד המחזקים
6	אתה וֹ֯]קֹימותֹי̇ עֹליה אחרים מעם אחר ומשל
7	חזדון בכֹלֹ] האֹ]רץ וממלכת ישראל תאבד בימים
8	ההמה֯] יֹֹ֯]ֹה מלך וה֯]ֹוֹא גדפן ועשה תעבות וקרעתי
9	[את]ממלֹכֹ]תו והמלך [ההוא למכלים ופני מסתרים מישראל
10	[ ]ללֹ} [ ] תשוב לגוים רבים ובני ישראל זעקים
11	[מפ]ֹנֹי על כבד בארצות שבים ואין משיע להם
12	יען ביען חקתי מאסו ותרתי געלה נפשם על כן
13	חסתרתי פני מ[הם עד] אשר ישלימו עונם וזה להם
14	האות בשלם עונם [כי] עזבתי את הארץ ברום לבבם
15	ממני ולא ידעו [כ]ֹי מא[ס]ֹתים ושבו ועשו רעה רֹ[ב]ֹה
16	מן הרעה הֹראשנה [והפרו את] הברית אשר כֹ]רתי̇[
17	עֹם אברהם ועם יצחק ועם [יעקוב בימים] ההמה
18	יקום מלֹך לגוים גדפן ועשה רעות ובֹ֯֯מֹ]ו̇ אעביר[

<div align="center">

column iii

</div>

1	את ישראל מעם בימו אשבור[57] את מלכות מצרים
2	[ ] [ ] את מצרים ואת ישראל אשבר ונתתו לחרב
3	[וחש]מותי א[ת]הֹ[א]ֹרֹץ ורחקתי את האדֹם[ו]עֹזבתי

---

56. Dimant presents the composite text of these fragments in DJD 30.190–91. Here, however, brackets are used to indicate only those lacunae that are not lled in by any of the extant manuscripts, not speci cally the lacunae in 4Q387.

57. As written in 4Q388a 7 ii 4; 4Q387 2 iii 1 contains אשבר added as a supralinear addition.

4 את הארץ⁵⁸ ביד מלאֿכי המשטמות והסתרתי [פני]

5 [מיש]רֿאל וזה להם האות ביום עזבי את הארץ בה[שמה]

6 [ושב]וֿן כהני ירושלים לעבוד אלהים   אחרים [ולעשו]תֿ

7 כתעֿבות הֿ[גוים   ] שלשה אשר ימלכֿ[ו   [

4Q387 3 4–9 + 4Q385a 5 7–9⁵⁹

4]יֿמ כהנֿים שלושה אשר לא יתהלכו בדרכֿ[[

5 [הכהנים ה]רֿֿאשנים על שם אלהי ישראל יקראו

6 והורד בימיהם גאון מרישיעי ברית ועבדי נאכר

7 ויתקרע ישראל בדור הה[וא] להלחם אֿ[י]ֿש ברעהו

8 על התורה וֿעל הברית וֿשֿלחתי רעב בֿ[אר]ץ ולא

9 לל[ח]ֿם וצמא ולֿ[א] למֿים[כי] אם ל[[

Translation: columns ii-iii

1 [ ]*y*/[ ] your[ ] and you will be resolute in serving me with all your heart **2** and with a[ll your soul. And they will se]ek [my pres]ence in their distress; but I will not seek them out **3** on account of their transgression [wh]ich they transgressed [against me], until the completion of the tenth **4** jubilee of years. You will be wa[l]king about in ma[dness] and blindness and confusion **5** of mind. When that generation is complete, I will tear away from the hand of those who seize **6** it, and [I wi]ll raise over it others, from another people, and [inso]lence will rule **7** over all [the la]nd, and the kingdom of Israel will perish. In those days **8** [there will] b[e a king, and h]e will be a blasphemer and perform abominations. I will tear away **9** [his] king[dom] and that [king] will belong to the destroy[er]s.⁶⁰ My face will be hidden from Israel **10** [ ]*ll*[ ] will return to many nations. The Israelites will cry out **11** [befo]re me because of the burden in the lands of captivity, but no one will save them⁶¹ **12** because they rejected my

---

58. The text of 4Q387a iii from this point in line 4 through the end of line 5 is absent from the parallel text in 4Q388a 7 ii 6. This is one of several indications that the Qumran fragments preserve not merely multiple copies of this work, but multiple textual recensions. The longer text of 4Q387a is best regarded as the original reading. Most likely, the lines in question dropped out of 4Q388a due to haplography; the scribe copying 4Q388a likely skipped accidentally from אזבתי את הארץ immediately preceding the missing passage to הארץ את אזבי approximately two lines later.

59. Dimant has convincingly argued that this fragment must come after the two columns of text partially preserved in 4Q387 2 (DJD 30.130–31, 192).

60. Reading, with Dimant, a piel (D stem) masculine plural participle of כלה (DJD 30.183). Alternately, the phrase could be rendered "That king will be among the destroyed ones," reading מכלים as a pual (D-passive) participle. Neither form is attested in the Hebrew Bible. The reading למכלים is to be preferred over the variant in 4Q385a 4 7 למלכים, "to kings."

61. Or, "They will have no savior."

statutes and their soul abhorred my Torah. Because of this **13** I have hidden my face from [them until] they complete their iniquity. And this **14** is a sign for them when their iniquity is complete, [that] I have abandoned the land because of their arrogance **15** toward me. They will not know [tha]t I have rejected them, and they will return to doing evil, **16** greater than the former evil, and they will violate the covenant which [I] m[ade] **17** with Abraham and with Isaac and with [Jacob. In] those [days] **18** a king of the nations will arise, a blasphemer and an evil-doer. In [his] days [I will remove] **Col. iii 1** Israel from being a people. And in his days I will break the kingdom of Egypt [ ] **2** [ ] Egypt, and I will break Israel and turn it over to the sword. **3** And I will [deva]state [the] l[a]nd and drive humankind away, [and] I will abandon **4** the land into the power of the angels of Mastemot; I will hide my face **5** [from Is]rael. This will be the sign for them on the day when I abandon the land in de[solation]: **6** the priests of Jerusalem [will return] to worshiping other gods [and act]ing **7** according to the abominations of the [nations…] three who will rul[e…].

<div align="center">Translation: 4Q387 3 4–9 + 4Q385a 5 7–9</div>

4 [ ]*ym* three priests who will not walk in the ways **5** of [the] former [priests], who were called by the name of the God of Israel.[62] **6** In their days will be brought low the arrogance of those who do evil against the covenant and the servants of foreign things. **7** And Israel will be torn in that generation, each m[a]n ghting against his neighbor **8** concerning the Torah and concerning the covenant. I will send hunger into the [lan]d, but not **9** for f[oo]d, and thirst, but no[t] for water; [but] rather for […].

The language of these passages is reminiscent of biblical prophetic literature in general. Several points are of particular interest.

The rst point to consider is the mention in 4Q387 2 ii 3–4 of "the tenth jubilee of years." As was touched upon in the discussion of 4Q390 1, it is apparent that the author of Apocryphon of Jeremiah C envisioned a periodization of history into ten jubilees, just as does the author of 11QMelch (see below). Such periodization is a common feature of Second Temple *ex eventu* works. Once again, the period covered is equal to 490 years, probably based on the interpretation in Daniel 9 of Jeremiah's prophecy of seventy years. The end of the tenth jubilee signals the onset of the eschaton, since only then will God again seek out Israel (4Q387 2 ii 2–3).

In contrast to Dimant, I see little reason to suspect that the author of the present text was attempting to predict a speci c date (see above). It is true that the calendrical texts from Qumran (e.g., 4QMishmarot =

---

62. Reading the verb as a niphal (N stem) imperfect, with Dimant (DJD 30.193); note the similarity to 1QpHab 8:8–9, הכוהן הרשע אשר נקרא על שם האמת, "the Wicked Priest who was called by the name of truth."

4Q320–330) exhibit a concern with both accurate dating and a reckoning of years patterned on sabbatical (seven year) and jubilee (forty-nine year) schemes.[63] The system, however, is not a Qumran innovation; it derives from the list of twenty-four priestly courses in Chronicles. Each of twenty-four priestly houses is to serve at the temple for one week, beginning either on the Sabbath or the day after the Sabbath. With twenty-four members in the rotation, the same Sabbath will fall to the same priestly course every seven years. This is quite likely the purpose behind the selection of precisely twenty-four priestly families: the rotation of twenty-four priestly families results in a repetitive cycle of seven years.[64] It should hardly be necessary here to rehearse the signi cance of the number seven in Israelite/Judean (and speci cally priestly) literature. Texts whose calculations of time speak in units of seven (a week of years), ten sevens (seventy years), seven sevens (a jubilee), seventy sevens (490 years), or ten groups of seven sevens (ten jubilees, 490 years) should all be regarded as indulging in a traditional, arti cial schema for the reckoning of time. Even if one were able to determine precisely the starting point of the counting for a text such as ours (which we certainly are unable to do), it would be foolhardy to count precisely 490 years from that date and attribute that precise time as the intended moment of the onset of the eschaton.

A second key point is the motif of God giving Israel into the hands of foreign rulers as a punishment for the sins of the Israelites. The motif is perhaps most closely associated with Deuteronomistic literature. Here, however, the exile is not recounted as a punishment that has already been visited on Yahweh's people but one that still lies in the future. 4Q387 2 ii 5–8 almost certainly refers to the destruction of the southern kingdom by Nebuchadnezzar, who in turn is the blaspheming king of line 8. The notice in line 9 that Yahweh will tear his kingdom away is undoubtedly a reference to the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus and the institution of Achaemenid rule. The actions of foreign adversaries are clearly portrayed as the expression of a wrathful Yahweh's will. This marks the beginning of the *ex eventu* historical review.

A third point is the apparent disapproval of the Second Temple cultus. What comes next in the historical review are some of the author's views on Persian period Judah. One cannot help but note that the author's assessment is unabashedly negative. The comment "They will not know that I have rejected them" (ii 15) almost surely refers to the priesthood of

63. On the use of these texts to date speci c events, see, e.g., Michael O. Wise, "*Primo Annales Fuere*: An Annalistic Calendar from Qumran," in idem, *Thunder in Gemini and Other Essays on the History, Language and Literature of Second Temple Palestine* (JSPSup 15; She eld: JSOT Press, 1994), 186–221.

64. See, generally, James VanderKam, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time* (New York: Routledge, 1998), esp. 52–109.

the restored temple; that is, upon the return from exile, the restoration community assumes that with the rebuilt temple Yahweh has returned to their midst. Not so, according to our text. Rather, Yahweh has continued to reject his people, despite the restoration of the temple, on account of Israel's rejection of his instruction. It cannot be stated that Apocryphon of Jeremiah C regards the temple itself as illegitimate; as was seen above, 4Q390 1 (again, likely but not certainly from the same composition) praises the generation of Zerubbabel the governor and Joshua the high priest, and of the prophets Haggai and Zechariah, which rebuilt the Jerusalem temple upon returning from exile in Babylonia. However, the people's immediate reversion to wickedness implies that the functioning of the cult—primarily to be understood as the priesthood—was corrupt/illegitimate.

A fourth noteworthy element is the veiled mention of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Following the interpretation introduced above, the second blaspheming king (ii 18), who "removes Israel from being a people," is almost assuredly a reference to Antiochus IV. The mention of Egypt in iii 1–2 likely refers to Antiochus's campaigns against Ptolemaic Egypt. It is interesting to note, however, that there is no speci c mention of disrupting the cult. This may be the result of viewing the entire temple cultus following the restoration as illegitimate, as suggested above. On the other hand, it is possible that the reference to Jerusalem's priests again worshiping foreign gods refers to the implementation of a cult to Olympian Zeus in the Jerusalem temple, an act that should be correlated directly to the Antiochene desecration.

Finally, of particular interest is the inclusion of intra-Judean strife as part of the historical review. At this point in the historical review Yahweh goes even further in his punishment of Israel, turning the land over to the power of demonic forces, "the angels of Mastemot." The priesthood is criticized for serving foreign gods (iii 6). The notice that they "act according to the abominations of the nations" (iii 7) is possibly to be interpreted as an indictment of hellenizing on the part of the Jerusalem priesthood, although certainty in the matter is not possible; the language is reminiscent, most especially, of Deuteronomistic literature. The contents of 4Q387 3 + 4Q385a 5 most certainly refer to events of the immediate pre-Maccabean or the post-Maccabean period—that is to say, the second century b.c.e. The text speci cally points to three priests—presumably high priests—whose tenures indicate the eschatological turning point; for, during their time "the arrogance of those who do evil against the covenant will be brought low" (4Q387 3 6). Further, the time is marked as one of factionalism and strife among the people, who ght with one another over the Torah and the covenant (lines 7–8); that is, different Judean groups are struggling against one another over issues of both orthopraxy and orthodoxy. People will be hungering and thirsting not for food and water but for the true path.

Can the historical references be pinned down with any further speci-
city? Dimant offers two alternatives for the identi cation of the three
priests: (1) the pre-Maccabean high priests Jason (174–171 b.c.e.), Menel-
aus (171–167), and Alcimus (162–161); or (2) the Hasmonean high priests
Simeon (142–134), John Hyrcanus (134–104), and Alexander Jannaeus
(103–76).[65] However, if we are correct that 4Q387 2 refers to Antiochus
IV, and we are correct in following Dimant by placing 4Q387 3 after that,
it would seem most probable that the reference to three wicked priests
refers to individuals of the Maccabean period, not earlier. Given the focus
on internal Judean strife, it seems even more likely that Simeon, Hyrcanus
I, and Jannaeus are the targets of our text. True, it takes only a cursory
glance at the books of 1 and 2 Maccabees or Josephus to see that internal
party strife abounded throughout both the periods before and following
the Maccabean revolt. However the reign of Alexander Jannaeus was not
merely a period of rivalry among Judean parties but a period of extreme
violence and bloodshed (see further the discussion of 4QpesherNahum
below). There seems to have been a erce rivalry between Pharisaic and
Sadducean factions, the latter backed by the king for the bulk of Jannae-
us's reign, the former courted after his death by Salome Alexandra in an
effort to quell rebellion. This seems the most likely candidate for a period
in which "Israel will be torn apart … each man ghting against his neigh-
bor" (4Q387 3 7). A date of composition sometime during the reign of Jan-
naeus or shortly after therefore seems probable.

4Q390 2 i.   As stated above, Dimant has deduced that there are likely
four missing columns between fragments 1 and 2 of 4Q390. Therefore,
there is more than enough space to accommodate the passages preserved
in 4Q387 2 and 3 between the two major fragments of 4Q390. However,
I must again stress that the ordering of these passages is highly tenta-
tive; one must entertain the real possibility that Apocryphon of Jeremiah
C contained multiple *ex eventu* reviews that, like the reviews of Daniel,
are not arranged in chronological order, as they repeat the same history.[66]
Further, the real possibility of repetition within a single *ex eventu* report
should warn us against being too sure of ordering fragments based on
consecutive recitation of historical allusions. This is, of course, to say noth-
ing of the possibility argued by Eshel that 4Q390 represents a manuscript
of a distinct composition. Nonetheless, one is forced to present the pas-
sages in some order, and it seems as likely as not that the present passage
should appear later in the composition than those already discussed.

---

65. Dimant, DJD 30.193.
66. Cf. Henze, "Two 'Historical' Apocalypses," 38.

2   [וא]תֿ[ ] בית[ֿ]י ומזבחי וא[ת מקדש הקדֿ]ש [

3   נעשה כן [ ]° [   ]° כי אלה יבואו עליהם[   ]וֿ[ת]הי

4   ממשלת בליעל בהם להסגירם לחרב שבועֿ שניםֿ [   ]וֿבֿיֿובל ההוא יהיו

5   מפרים את כול חקותי ואת כל מצותי אשר אצוה אֿ[ותם ואשלח בי]ֿד עבדי
הנביאים

6   וי[ח]ל[וֿ] להריב אלה באלה שנים שבעים מיום הפר ה[אלה וה]ברית אשר
יפרו ונתתים

7   [ביד מל]אֿי המשטמות ומשלו בהם ולא ידעו ולא יבינו כי קצפתי עליהם
במועלם

8   [אשר עז]בוני ויעשו הרע בעיני ובאשר לא חפצתי בחרו להתגבר להון ולבצע

9   [ולחמס ואי]שֿ אשר לרֿ[ע]הו יגזולו ויעשוקו איש את רעהו את מקדשי יתמאו

2 [and my]house[and my altar and]the Holy of Holi[es…] **3** so it was done. [ ] for these will come upon them […]*n* and th[ere will b]e **4** the rule of Belial over them in order to deliver them over to the sword for a week of years[…and] in that jubilee they will be **5** violating all my statutes and all my commandments which I command th[em and sent by the ha]nd of my servants the prophets **6** and [they] will be[gin] to contend, these against those, for seventy years, starting from the day of the violation of the oath and the covenant which they violated. And I will give them **7** [into the hand of the An]gels of Mastemot; they will rule over them, and they will neither know nor understand that I was angered against them because of their wrongs **8** [when] they [aban]doned me. They performed evil in my sight, and they have chosen what I did not want: to pursue wealth, gain, **9** [and violence, eac]h stealing from his nei[gh]bor and each oppressing his neighbor. They will reject my temple….

Dimant also offers the following transcription of line 10:

[את שבתותי יחללו]את[מו]עדי יֿשֿ[צח]וֿ ובבני[נכר] יֿחֿללֿוֿ]אֿת זר[א]ם
כוהניהם יחמסו[67]

[…and my Sabbaths they will profane], my [fest]ivals they will for[get]; [they] will profane their seed with the [foreign]ers. Their priests will do violence….[68]

---

67. The scribe ran out of room at the end of the line and wrote this word in small letters in the margin.

68. Very little of this line remains, and Dimant's restoration must be regarded cautiously. In the photographs published in DJD 30 I can detect no traces of the *yod* or *ḥet* in the word Dimant transcribes וֿיֿחֿללֿ, but the reading seems likely. Likewise, only the barest ink marks are visible for the ﬁrst two letters of זר[ע]ם, though they are consistent with Dimant's reading.

The themes contained here are already familiar: Israel will be handed over to demonic forces (the Angels of Mastemot, Belial); history is divided into jubilees; the sequence of jubilees (totaling 490 years) may also be organized in seven-year periods or "weeks of years"; the Jerusalem priesthood is singled out for wickedness. There is little additional historical information here. The major exception is line 10, which is in extremely poor condition. If Dimant's reconstruction is accepted, then the passage would seem to refer to the early Persian period. It is at this time that exogamy seems to have first become a major issue for the Judean community; there is obvious resonance with the book of Ezra.[69] However, even if properly reconstructed, the author of 4Q390 may simply be drawing on yet another vein of biblical language in order to condemn his contemporaries.

Apocryphon of Jeremiah C: Summary.   Apocryphon of Jeremiah C represents the fullest example of *ex eventu* prediction among the previously unknown texts unearthed in the Judean desert. It was most likely a historical apocalypse very much in the tradition of Daniel and *1 Enoch*. However, it seems to stem not from the period of the Maccabean revolt but sometime later in the Hasmonean period. Though consonant with much of the sectarian literature—particularly on the illegitimacy of the Jerusalem priesthood—there are no clear indications of sectarian authorship.[70] It is best viewed, like *1 Enoch*, as a text produced independently of the Qumran sectarian movement but embraced because of compatibility in ideology.

If the above analysis is correct, then a date of composition in the first third of the first century b.c.e. seems likely. Were the composition later, we would expect some clear reference to Pompey and/or Rome. On the other hand, the references to factionalism and violent struggle among Judean groups seems most at home some generations removed from the Maccabean revolt; hence, the suggestion of situating the text's composition during the reign of Alexander Jannaeus. In this regard, Apocryphon of Jeremiah C could be regarded as something of an extension of the concerns that lie behind the authorship of canonical Daniel. While the Antiochene persecution is definitely a key element in this work, it seems as if the resolution of the conflict has proved unsatisfactory for the individual or group that produced the Apocryphon of Jeremiah. Therefore, we have a text that does not look for the inception of an eschatological age upon the death of the Seleucid king, but instead presents as the final trial the continued corruption of the Jerusalem cultus and the internecine bloodshed of the early Hasmonean period.

---

69. See especially Ezra 9–10.
70. Cf. the remarks of F. García Martínez, "Tradiciones apocalípticas en Qumran: *4QSecondEzekiel*," in *Biblische und judaistische Studien: Festschrift für Paolo Sacchi* (Judentum und Umwelt 29; ed. A. Vivian; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1990), 302–21, esp. 305–06.

2. Pseudo-Ezekiel

More so than the material assigned by Dimant to Apocryphon of Jeremiah C, the fragments that make up Pseudo-Ezekiel have been subjected to a fair amount of scholarly scrutiny. In part this is owing to the fact that excerpts of an Ezekiel pseudepigraphon are known in Greek from citations in patristic literature;[71] there have been several attempts to correlate the Qumran Pseudo-Ezekiel material with these and other citations in early Christian works.[72] Also, the Pseudo-Ezekiel material consciously reworks several key passages in the biblical book of Ezekiel; in this regard, Pseudo-Ezekiel provides a wealth of information regarding the interpretation and reworking of the biblical text in the Second Temple period.[73]

Of the Pseudo-Ezekiel fragments, only one appears to preserve a section of *ex eventu* prediction. The fragment 4Q386 1 ii seems to refer to events in the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.

4Q386 1 ii

[אר]ץ וידעו כי אני יהוה ויאמר אלי החבונן	1
בן אדם באדמת ישראל ואמר ראיתי יהוה והנה חרבה	2
ומתי תקבצם ויאמר יהוה בן בליעל יחשב לענות את עמי	3
ולא אניח לו ומשרו לא יהיה והמן הטמא זרע לא ישאר	4

71. An English translation and introduction by J. R. Mueller and S. E. Robinson is available in *OTP* 1.487–95. A more extensive treatment by Mueller has since appeared: *The Five Fragments of the* Apocryphon of Ezekiel*: A Critical Study* (JSPSup 5; She eld: She eld Academic Press, 1994).

72. E.g., Benjamin G. Wright, "The Apocryphon of Ezekiel and 4QPseudo-Ezekiel," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery* [ed. Lawrence Schiffman et al.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000], 462–80; idem, "Qumran Pseudepigraphy in Early Christianity: Is 1 Clem. 50:4 a Citation of 4QPseudo-Ezekiel (4Q385)?" in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 31; ed. Esther G. Chazon and Michael Stone; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 183–93; Richard Bauckham, "A Quotation from *4Q Second Ezekiel* in the *Apocalypse of Peter*," *RevQ* 15 (1992): 437–45; Menahem Kister, "*Barnabas* 12:1; 4:3 and 4Q*Second Ezekiel*," *RB* 97 (1990): 63–67. For more on the likely quotation in *Barnabas* of 4Q385 2 10, see M. Kister and Elisha Qimron, "Observations on *4QSecond Ezekiel* (4Q385 2–3)," *RevQ* 15 (1992): 595–602; M. Philonenko, "Un arbre se courbera et se redressera (4Q385 2 9–10)," *RHPR* 73 (1993): 401–4; Émile Pueche, "L'image de l'arbre en 4QDeutéro-Ézéchiel (4Q385 2, 9–10)," *RevQ* 16 (1994): 429–40; Alison Jack, "An Arboreal Sign of the End-Time (4Q385 2)," *JJS* 47 (1996): 337–44.

73. E.g., Dimant and Strugnell, "The Merkabah Vision"; Dimant, "The Apocalyptic Interpretation of Ezekiel at Qumran," in *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity Presented to David Flusser on the Occasion of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday* (ed. I. Gruenwald, S. Shaked, and G. Stroumsa; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1992), 31–51, esp. 49–50; M. Philonenko, "De Qoumrân à Doura-Europos: La vision des ossements desséchés (*Ézéchiel* 37,1–4)," *RHPR* 74 (1994): 1–12;

5 ומנצפה לא יהיה תירוש ותזיז⁷⁴ לא יעשה דבש [ ]   ואת

6 הרשע אהרג במף ואת בני אוציא ממף ועל ש[א]רם אהפך

7 כאשר יאמרו היה השל[ו]ם והשדך ואמרו תֹה[י]ֹה הֹארץ

8 כאשר היתה מימי   [ ]   קדם בכן אעיר עֹ[ל]יהם חמ[ה]

9 מֹ[אר]בע רחות השמי[ם] לֹ[ ] את [

1 [lan]d and they will know that I am Yahweh." *vacat* And he said to me, "Consider, **2** son of man, the land of Israel." I said, "I have seen, Yahweh, and indeed! it is desolate. **3** When will you gather them?" Yahweh said, "A son of Belial will scheme to oppress my people **4** but I will not allow him. None will remain from his lineage,⁷⁵ and there will not remain to the impure one any offspring. **5** And from the caperbush there will be no new wine, nor will a hornet make honey. But **6** the wicked one I will slay in Memphis, and my children I will bring forth from Memphis and I will return their remnant. **7** Just as they say "P[e]ace and quietude have come," so they will say "The land w[i]ll be **8** just as it was in the old days." Then I will rouse ang[er] again[st] them **9** from the [fo]ur winds of heave[n]….

It has been recognized that the "son of Belial" in line 3 likely refers to a speci c individual. The most likely identi cation of this gure is, once again, Antiochus IV Epiphanes.⁷⁶ It could be argued that the gure is intended instead to be Nebuchadnezzar; however, the notice that the son of Belial will have no offspring makes little sense if, indeed, the reference is to Nebuchadnezzar and past events. Rather, this stereotypical curse is more likely intended as an address to a roughly contemporary gure. The mention of a death in Memphis could be taken as an indication that the son of Belial is to be understood as a Ptolemy. However, predicting that a Ptolemy will die in Egypt is not an overly impressive prediction. Rather, this may plausibly be read as a reference to the Egyptian campaigns of Antiochus IV. Like Dan 11:45, Pseudo-Ezekiel here is likely attempting, legitimately, to predict the death of Antiochus; the only difference between the present text and Daniel 11 is the precise locale of his defeat.⁷⁷

---

74. On the translation of this term, see Dimant, "4Q386 ii-iii—A Prophecy on Hellenistic Kingdoms?" *RevQ* 18 (1998): 511–29; here 514.

75. The term is ambiguous. As Dimant notes, the word is likely a defective spelling of שְׁאֵר. This could either refer to "his esh," indicating that the son of Belial will soon die, or, it could refer to "his kin," indicating his lineage will cease (see Dimant, DJD 30.64). Given the second part of the line, the latter interpretation is to be preferred.

76. Likewise Dimant, "4Q386 ii-iii," 523–25.

77. Dimant speculates further that the very fragmentary passage in 4Q386 iii may refer to Antiochus IV, or possibly the Parthians ("4Q386 ii-iii," 527–28). However, very little of the column remains, and while it seems reasonable to associate the term "Babylon" in the column with a second-century power, the reference cannot be situated in any larger context.

Even if the above analysis is correct, however, this does not mean that Pseudo-Ezekiel contains an extended historical review on par with those in Daniel and *1 Enoch*. In fact, given the preserved contents of the immediately preceding column, it is almost certain that this particular *ex eventu* prediction is not part of a larger historical review.[78] Conversely, this cannot lead to a de nitive conclusion that such a review did not at one point exist in the composition—especially considering the apocalyptic tenor of the text.

B. Sectarian Texts

The Damascus Document

The Damascus Document came to light approximately half a century earlier than the Dead Sea documents from the eleven caves in the vicinity of Khirbet Qumran, having been found among the treasure trove of documents in the genizah of a Karaite synagogue in Cairo (hence the abbreviation CD = Cairo Damascus).[79] Already in 1922 Louis Ginzberg recognized this text, earlier published by Solomon Schechter as a component of a "Zadokite work," as a foundational document belonging to a Judean sectarian group of the Second Temple period. CD itself represents two copies of the text (A and B) in a state of some disorder. No fewer than ten copies of this document were recovered from Qumran: eight from Cave 4 (4Q266–273), one from Cave 5 (5Q12), and one from cave 6 (6Q15). The complicated issue of the relationship of the Damascus Document to the rule scrolls and other sectarian documents found at Qumran need not distract us here; I presume only that there is *some* connection, and that the multiple copies of the text were collected and preserved by the sectarians of the *yaḥad* mentioned in other Qumran documents.

The contents of the Damascus Document can be divided in two: the Admonition and the Laws. Within the Admonition, the document recounts the origins of the sect of Judeans behind the document, making special

---

78. 4Q386 i contains a reworking of the valley of dry bones vision.

79. For a convenient presentation of photographic plates opposite transcriptions of CD, see Magen Broshi, ed., *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society / Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 1992). See also the editions of CD by Joseph M. Baumgarten and Daniel R. Schwartz, "Damascus Document (CD)," in PTSDSSP 2.4–57; also, the cave 4 fragments by Joseph M. Baumgarten in *Qumran Cave 4.XIII. The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)* (DJD 18; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996); and again the 4Q fragments by Baumgarten et al., "Damascus Document 4Q266–273 (4QD^a-h)," in PTSDSSP 3.1–185. For a useful introduction to the manuscripts, their contents, and reconstruction, see Charlotte Hempel, *The Damascus Texts* (CQS 1; She eld: She eld Academic Press, 2000), esp. 19–53.

reference to the group's leader, whom it terms the "Righteous Teacher" (מורה צדק; 1:9). It could fairly be said that the entirety of the Admonition is framed within historical boundaries. In the first column of CD we find the author determining that 390[80] years after the exile to Babylon, God caused a "root of planting" (שורש מטעת) to grow forth from Israel; reminiscent of year totals we have already seen, this seems less the product of precise chronological record keeping than the product of exegesis, the figure having been taken from Ezekiel 4:5. Twenty years after that, we find, God raises up the Righteous Teacher to guide this group. Starting at column 2 line 18 the text recounts the history of Israel from the fall of the Watchers through the deluge, the period of the patriarchs, the monarchy, etc., detailing how the people of Israel throughout history have fallen either into the lot of the good, "who act according to the meaning of the Torah" (4.8), or the evil, who depart from God's path, ensnared by the "three nets of Belial" (4.15).

The rhetoric of the Admonition is not entirely dissimilar from what we have already seen in texts such as Daniel and *1 Enoch*: the history of the world is portrayed as a history of constant backsliding, with a chosen remnant that has remained true to the path of God. The community behind the text can look to the few heroes of the past as those whose tradition the community continues. However, unlike the *ex eventu* sections of Daniel and *1 Enoch*, and unlike the sections of the Qumran texts already discussed in this chapter, the historical reminiscences in CD, though firmly within an eschatological framework, nonetheless appear as memories of Israel's *past*. Never are they presented as a prediction of things yet to manifest. In fact, the historical placement of the author is rather clearly stated in CD 20.13–15, which refers to the onset of the eschaton within "about forty years" of the death of the Teacher, an event that has already happened from the text's point of view. Furthermore, the use of authoritative texts is vastly different in the Damascus Document: prophetic passages of Hebrew Scriptures are not alluded to obliquely, nor are they recalled for the purpose of updating, as in Daniel; rather, there is constant prooftexting throughout the document, with citations of biblical passages being used to sustain the author's admonition to his audience. In short, while the Damascus Document represents yet another text from Qumran that displays a keen interplay between a recitation of history and a thorough, forward-looking eschatology, it completely lacks the form of a mantic text. It does serve, however, as yet another example of the interest among Judeans in the Second Temple period in locating themselves along an immutable, inevitable progression of history culminating in the punishment of the many and the salvation of the few.

---

80. See, e.g., Albert I. Baumgarten, "Perception of the Past in the Damascus Document," in Joseph M. Baumgarten et al., eds., *Damascus Document Reconsidered*, 1–15; esp. 13.

The Pesharim

As a community devoted to the study of scripture, the Qumran sectarians were convinced that sacred writings of the past, properly interpreted, spoke of the events of the community's own time. I refer, of course, to the well-known pesharim, commentaries on authoritative books that identify the oracles of earlier generations with current political events.[81] The pesharim have been subject to a great deal of scholarly scrutiny. It is among these works that the sectarians speak so often about key figures in the history of the sect: the Teacher of Righteousness, the Wicked Priest, the Seekers after Smooth Things, the Man of the Lie. Almost all attempts to reconstruct the origin of the group responsible for the sectarian scrolls focus heavily on the data culled from the pesharim.[82]

These texts have also excited a great deal of interest in that they represent the earliest attestation of line-by-line biblical commentary—a religious practice that was to become so important in the early rabbinic and Christian communities soon to emerge. Much of the scholarship on the pesharim has been devoted to understanding the exegetical methods and hermeneutical techniques employed by the sectarian commentators.[83] Somewhat less attention has been paid to the fact that the pesharim themselves function as mantic texts.[84] Armin Lange has convincingly argued

---

81. The works are, of course, not "commentaries" in the modern sense. The relationship of the pesharim to mantic texts and practices is discussed below.

82. See, e.g., James H. Charlesworth, *The Pesharim and Qumran History: Chaos or Consensus?* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002).

83. See William H. Brownlee, "Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *BA* 14 (1951): 54–76; idem, "The Background of Biblical Interpretation at Qumran," in *Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie, et son milieu* (ed. M. Delcor; BETL 46; Paris: Duculot, 1978), 183–93; idem, *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979), 23–36; Eva Osswald, "Zur Hermeneutik des Habakuk-Kommentars," *ZAW* 68 (1956): 243–25; Maurya P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (CBQMS 8; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979), 237–59; George J. Brooke, "Qumran Pesher: Towards the Redefinition of a Genre," *RevQ* 10 (1981): 483–503; idem, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in Its Jewish Context* (JSOTSup 29; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 279–323; Michael Fishbane, "Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran," in *Mikra: Text Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Christianity* (ed. J. Mulder; CRINT 2/1; Assen: Van Gorcum 1988), 339–77, esp. 351, 373–75; Timothy H. Lim, *Pesharim* (CQS 3; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 44–53. Bilhah Nitzan has highlighted the importance of understanding the pesharim not merely as interpretations of biblical texts but as works that functioned pedagogically ("The *Pesher* and Other Methods of Instruction," in *Mogilany 1989: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of Jean Carmignac* [pt. 2; ed. Zdzislaw J. Kapera; Cracow: Enigma Press, 1991], 209–20).

84. Among the more important studies that have emphasized the mantic character of the Qumran pesharim are Isaac Rabinowitz, "'Pesher/Pittārōn': Its Biblical Meaning and Its Significance in the Qumran Community," *RevQ* 8 (1973): 219–32; Michael Fishbane, "The Qumran Pesher and Traits of Ancient Hermeneutics," in *Proceedings of the Sixth World Con-*

that the practice of pesher at Qumran corresponds quite well with comments of Josephus concerning the Essenes.[85] The passage in question comes from *Jewish War* 2.159:

,   ,

,

.

> There are some among them who—being schooled in the holy books, different types of puri cation, and the sayings of the prophets—take it upon themselves to perceive things to come. They are rarely deceived in their predictions.

Lange, quite rightly in my opinion, interprets this passage as indicating that the ability of certain of the group to practice divination rests on their expertise in manipulating and interpreting scripture. This description by Josephus of Essene divination is manifest in the pesharim of the Qum-

---

gress of Jewish Studies (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1977), 1.97–114; Gregory L. Doudna, *4Q Pesher Nahum: A Critical Edition* (JSPSup 35; London: She eld Academic Press, 2001), 58–61; and, especially, Martti Nissinen, "Pesharim as Divination. Qumran Exegesis, Omen Interpretation, and Literary Prophecy," in *Prophecy after the Prophets? The Contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls to the Understanding of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Prophecy* (ed. Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange; Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 43–60. Asher Finkel, though emphasizing the relationship between Qumran pesharim and oneiromancy in the Judean tradition, treats both as basically literary phenomena ("The Pesher of Dreams and Scriptures," *RevQ* 4 [1963]: 357–70). Along similar lines, Ida Fröhlich understands the pesharim as a continuation of the Danielic apocalyptic tradition, and thereby revelatory literature ("Pesher, Apocalyptical Literature and Qumran," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Madrid 18–21, 1991* [ed. Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner; 2 vols.; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill 1992], 1.295–305). On pesher, apocalyptic literature, and indirect revelation, see John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel* (HSM 16; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977), 74–82.

85. Armin Lange, "The Essene Position on Magic and Divination," in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Cambridge 1995* (ed. M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen; STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 424. Later in the article, Lange states, ". . . no real prediction of the future can be found in the pesharim. When predicting the history of the *yaḥad*, the pesharim are always *vaticinia ex eventu*." As will be seen below, I disagree with Lange on this account. For one, details of the community's history vis-à-vis inner-Judean con ict is usually not presented as *ex eventu* prediction in the pesharim; rather, the sect's history is typically recounted in the past tense and not presented as a prophecy yet to be ful lled (e.g., 1QpHab 2:3–10; 8:8–13; 10:9–13; 11:4–8; and 12:6–10; 4QpHosᵃ 2:12–13; 4QpIsᵃᵇ 2:5–6; 4QpPsᵃ 1–10 i 26–27). Second, the pesharim do indeed include authentic attempts to predict the future; however, these predictions take the form of general descriptions of the downfall of the sect's enemies in the hoped-for eschaton of the immediate future. Third, 1QpHab and 4QpNah contain passages that may legitimately be interpreted as instances of *ex eventu* prediction concerning the international politics of Judea; these, however, are the exception and not the rule.

ran community. The Habakkuk Pesher from Qumran Cave 1 includes a famous passage on the practice of pesher, in which the Teacher of Righteousness was uniquely quali ed to engage:[86]

וידבר אל אל[87] חבקוק לכתוב את הבאות על   1

עַל[88] הדור האחרון ואת גמר הקץ לוא הודעו   2

[*vacat*] ואשר אמר למען ירוץ הקורא בו   3

פשרו על מורה הצדק אשר הודיעו אל את   4

כול רזי דברי עבדיו הנבאים   5

1 And God told Habakkuk to write the things that are about to come upon **2** the last generation, but he [i.e., God] did not make the ful llment of the period known to him. **3** And when it says, "so that he can run who reads it" [Hab 2:2] **4** its interpretation concerns the Teacher of Righteousness to whom God made known **5** all the mysteries of the words of his servants the prophets. (1QpHab 7:1–5)

To call these texts "mantic" is, of course, not to make a particular claim related to form, structure, or even genre. It is purely dependent on content, from which we may deduce function. The fact of the matter is that the author of the pesher claims mantic powers: he can divine the future by manipulation/consultation of some object—in this case, a text. To encourage belief in the e cacy of his predictive powers, the author of the pesher relies on several factors: (1) the audience of the text is expected to accept that the words of Habakkuk (or any given lemma from one of the pesharim) are authoritative, reliable, and guaranteed to come to fruition; (2) it is most likely that the authors of the pesharim were people who already were highly regarded within the community;[89] (3) the pesharim employ a technique akin to *vaticinium ex eventu* as a means to encourage belief in the accuracy of the interpretation.

---

86. On the role of the Teacher as mantic practitioner, see George J. Brooke, "Was the Teacher of Righteousness Considered to Be a Prophet?" in *Prophecy after the Prophets? The Contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls to the Understanding of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Prophecy* (ed. Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange; Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 77–98.

87. The reason for the supralinear addition of אל is unclear; it may be meant as the preposition "to," clarifying that the   rst אל must be read as the subject of the verb, "god".

88. The repetition of על is apparently a dittography.

89. On these   rst two points, and on interpretive authority within the Qumran community generally, see Steven D. Fraade, "Interpretive Authority in the Studying Community at Qumran," *JJS* 44 (1993): 47–69. Note, however, that Fraade's primary focus here is legal exegesis, especially within 1QS and CD.

1. 1QpHab

The Habakkuk Pesher is the earliest published, best preserved, and most thoroughly studied of the Qumran pesharim.[90] 1QpHab is one of the so-called continuous pesharim—that is, it proceeds verse by verse through the biblical text, offering interpretation on the rst two chapters of the prophetic book.[91] The oracles of Habakkuk are interpreted as relating to two different con icts: (1) the foreign oppression of Judea by the Kittim (כת[י]ם);[92] (2) inner-Judean con icts between the sectarians, notably the Teacher of Righteousness ([ה]מורה הצדק, e.g. at 1:13) and the Poor Ones (אביונים, e.g., in 12:3), and their religio-ideological opponents, such as the Wicked Priest (הכוהן הרשע, e.g., in 8:8), the Spouter of the Lie (מטיף הכזב, 10:9), the Man of the Lie (איש הכזב, e.g., in 2:1–2), the traitors (הבוגדים, 2:1), and the ruthless ones of the covenant (עריצ[י] הבר[ית, 2:6; cf. 4QpPs^a 1–10 ii 14).

The material focused on the Kittim comes in a block in 1QpHab 2:10 through 1QpHab 6:12. We read that the Kittim are "swift and strong in battle, so as to destroy many" (1QpHab 2:12, 13); they "will come to strike and loot the cities of the land" (3:1); the Kittim "will trample the land with [their] horses" (3:10) and come "to devour all the peoples like an eagle, and there is no satiety" (3:11, 12); they will capture the fortresses of the peoples, who are to be given into their hand (4:5–8); they "sacri ce to their standards, and they revere their war implements" (6:4–5);[93] and nally they "will destroy many with the sword … and will have no compassion" (6:10–12). 1QpHab paints a picture of an insatiable, unstoppable war machine.

One of the interesting aspects of the document is that the discussions of the sect's history vis-à-vis their Judean rivals universally employ per-

---

90. The *editio princeps* was published by William H. Brownlee, "The Habakkuk Commentary," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*, vol. 1: *The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary* (New Haven, CT: ASOR, 1950). Brownlee later published a revised edition with commentary, *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk*. Other notable editions include Maurya Horgan in *Pesharim*, 10–55; and eadem, "Habakkuk Pesher (1QpHab)," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Text with English Translations, Vol. 6B: Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents* (ed. James Charlesworth; PTSDSS 6B; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2002), 157–85.

91. The distinction between "continuous" (*pesher continu*) and "thematic" (*pesher thématique*) pesharim was introduced by Jean Carmignac, "Le document de Qumrân sur Melchisédeq," *RevQ* 7 (1970): 343–78, esp. 360–61.

92. Hebrew כתים refers originally to the inhabitants of Cyprus (speci cally, Kition). In Judean literature of the Hellenistic and Roman eras, it is used as a general cipher for various foreign enemies. In the case of the sectarian texts from Qumran, there is general agreement that the term refers to the Romans, whose presence in Judea became permanent with Pompey's conquest of Jerusalem in 63 b.c.e.

93. Note that, uniquely, the verbs here are active participles, not nite verbs in the imperfect, as elsewhere.

fect verbs—that is, the interpretations are clearly discussing *past* events.[94] However, the destruction wreaked by the Kittim is described throughout using imperfect verb forms.[95] There are a number of ways in which this could be interpreted. It is possible to translate these verbs as present tense: for example, "Its interpretation concerns the Kittim, who destroy (יאבדו) many with the sword …" (1QpHab 6:10). In fact, Maurya Horgan translates every such occurrence of an imperfect verb with the Kittim as subject with a verb in the present tense.[96] The form could equally well—one could argue even more likely—be understood as indicating future time.

The decision of whether to translate with a present or a future tense depends on how one understands the historical actions of the Romans in Palestine in relation to the production of the Habakkuk Pesher. Speci - cally, is the author of 1QpHab writing before or after the siege of Jeru- salem by Pompey in 63 b.c.e.? If the author is writing after 63 b.c.e., is it possible that he is employing *vaticinia ex eventu* to instill con dence in the accuracy of the text? Or is the author perhaps writing in the years leading up to 63, during which Rome's ascendance and eclipse of the Seleucids was all too apparent? If the latter is the case, then one can understand the Kittim passages in 1QpHab as simply describing "typical" Roman behav- ior; there need not be any knowledge of Pompey's conquest of Jerusalem behind the references to Roman brutality.

Should these references be understood as *ex eventu* "predictions" of the Roman conquest of Judea? It seems improbable. It should be noted that the references to the Kittim in the interpretations are limited to comments on passages in Habakkuk that contain references to the Chaldeans.[97] The reason for the use of imperfect verbs is likely the in uence of the biblical prophetic and historical corpora. Along these lines, it is noteworthy that the Kittim, despite their brutality, are not portrayed as necessarily wicked in 1QpHab.[98] Rather, they are invoked as a dominant foreign power about to loose incredible violence against Yahweh's people as a consequence of their impiety; they are an instrument of Yahweh's punishment. However,

---

94. The only exception to this is where the pesher speaks of the eschatological comeup- pance of the sect's rivals: e.g., "all the wicked ones of his people will be found guilty (יאשמו)" (1QpHab 5:5).

95. It makes sense that the practice of sacri cing to standards should be discussed as an ongoing act of the present (participles in 1QpHab 6:4, 5), whereas speci c acts of the Roman conquest of Jerusalem are in the imperfect, seemingly implying future events.

96. Horgan, "Habakkuk Pesher," PTSDSSP 6B.163–71.

97. Timothy H. Lim, *Pesharim* (CQS 3; London: She eld Academic Press, 2002), 36, 67.

98. Lim, *Pesharim*, 66. The situation is different in 1QM, which puts the king of the Kit- tim at the head of the hosts of Belial (1QM 15:2). This need not imply anything about the relative dating of the two compositions (contra Lim, *Pesharim*, 67). The comment that "all their plans are for evil" (1QpHab 3:5) is a comment on their violent ambitions, not on being ontologically linked to the forces of darkness as in 1QM.

the pious will be saved: "God will not destroy his people by the hand of the nations" (1QpHab 5:3). The Kittim function in the Habakkuk Pesher just as do the Chaldeans in Habakkuk, the Assyrians in Isaiah, and the Babylonians in the Deuteronomistic History, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel: they are a foreign nation who will bring destruction on Israel/Judah as a punishment; the righteous, however, will ultimately be saved. 1QpHab's discussion of the Kittim/Romans is too general to be considered *ex eventu* historical review of the type found in Daniel and *1 Enoch*. There is nothing specific in the descriptions that can be confidently linked to any reported action of the Romans.

2. 4QpNah (4Q169)

Along with the Habakkuk Pesher, the Nahum Pesher serves as one of the hallmark examples of the continuous pesharim.[99] Furthermore, the Nahum Pesher is particularly rich in historical allusions. For the present study, fragments 3–4, containing the remains of four columns of text, are of most pressing interest. Column 1 begins with the following passage.

1	[...][100] מֹדור לרשעי גוים אשר הלך ארי לבֹוא[101] שם גור ארי[ ]
2	[ואין מחריד פשרו על דמי]טרוס מלך יון אשר בקש לבוא ירושלים בעצת דורשי החלקות
3	[...]בֹיד מלכי יון מאנתיכוס עד עמוד מושלי כתיים ואחר תרמס
4	[...] ארי טורף בדי גוריו ומחנק ללביותיו טרף
5	[...] על כפיר החרון אשר יכה בגדוליו ואנשי עצתו

---

99. The official publication by John Allegro appeared as "Commentary on Nahum," in J. Allegro and A. A. Anderson, *Qumrân Cave 4. I (4Q159–4Q186)* (DJD 5; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 37–42 and plates XII–XIV. Allegro published several studies prior to this, notably, "Further Light on the History of the Qumran Sect," *JBL* 75 (1956): 89–95; and idem, "*Thrakidon*, the 'Lion of Wrath' and Alexander Jannaeus," *PEQ* 91 (1959): 47–51. The shortcomings of DJD 5 are legendary in the field of Qumran studies. John Strugnell essentially offered a re-edition of the texts in his scathing review, "Notes en marge du volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan,'" *RevQ* 7 (1970): 163–276 (the "review" is in fact longer than the publication it reviewed!); 4QpNah is treated on 204–10. The readings of Strugnell are by and large followed in the editions of Horgan, *Pesharim*, 158–91, and eadem, "Nahum Pesher (4Q169=4QpNah)," in PTSDSSP 6B.144–55. Two books published since 2000 have offered a re-edition of the text: Gregory Doudna, *4Q Pesher Nahum* (JSPSup 35; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press: 2001), and Shani Berrin, *The Pesher Nahum Scroll from Qumran: An Exegetical Study of 4Q169* (STDJ53; Leiden: Brill, 2004). My transcription follows the edition of Horgan in PTSDSSP 6B.

100. Note that, in the present transcription, the length of the lacunae at the beginning of each line is not indicated; see the restoration beginning line 2 for the approximate amount of text missing from each line.

101. Reading לבוא as a G-stem infinitive of בוא; MT has לביא, "lion". The manuscript could be read either way; reading לבוא, however, corresponds to the interpretation given later in the pesher (as well as to the rendering in LXX, ☒☒☒ ☒☒☒☒☒☒☒☒☒).

6   [... וימלא טרף]חֹורה ומעונתו טרפה   פשרו על כפיר החרון

7   [... משפט [מות¹⁰² בדורשי החלקות אשר יתלה אנשים חיים

8   [...] בישראל מלפנים כי לתלוי חי עֿל הֿעֵׂץ [י]קֹרא הנני אלי[כה]

1 […] a dwelling for the wicked ones of the nations. *Where the lion went to enter, the lion's cub* […] **2** [*and no one to disturb* [Nah 2:12b]. Its interpretation concerns Deme]trius, King of Greece, who sought to enter Jerusalem on the counsel of the Seekers after Smooth Things, **3** […] into the hand of the kings of Greece from Antiochus until the rise of the rulers of the Kittim; but afterwards […] will be trampled **4** […]. *The Lion tears enough for his cubs and strangles prey for his lioness* [Nah 2:13a]. **5** […] against the Lion of Wrath, who will strike with his great ones and the men of his counsel, **6** […. *And it lls up] its cave* [*with prey,*] *and its den with torn esh* [Nah 2:13b]. Its interpretation concerns the Lion of Wrath, **7** [… a judgment of] death against the Seekers after Smooth Things; he will hang men alive **8** […] in Israel before. Concerning one hanged alive on a tree, one reads: *Indeed I am against* [*you,…*]. [Nah 2:14; the quotation continues through line 10]

The key to the passage is the identi cation of "Demetrius, King of Greece" in line 2. With the majority of scholars, I understand the reference to be to the Seleucid king Demetrius III Eukairos.[103] The events surrounding this king's involvement in Judea, as described by Josephus, may be summarized as follows: Alexander Jannaeus, after ghting foreign wars, was faced with revolt in Judea (*A.J.* 13.372; *B.J.* 1.88), ostensibly because he was un t to perform the duties of (high) priest (only in the account of *A.J.*). Accordingly, he put six thousand of his own people to the sword (*A.J.* 13.373; *B.J.* 1.89). Following wars in Transjordan, he was faced with open revolt, whereupon he made war upon "the nation" (אם אמאמם), and within six years had slaughtered fty thousand of his countrymen (*A.J.* 13.376; *B.J.* 1.90–91). At this point, the insurgents are said to have made appeal to Demetrius III Eukairos to intervene (*A.J.* 13.376; *B.J.* 1.92). Demetrius obliged and bested Jannaeus on the battle eld; however, Demetrius did not proceed on to Jerusalem but instead went back to Syria, because (according to Josephus) the Judeans suddenly swung their support back to Jannaeus (*A.J.* 13.377–79; *B.J.* 1.92–95). The attack of Demetrius is dated to ca. 88 b.c.e. Jannaeus did not enjoy this popular support long; Josephus tells us he was soon at war with his fellow Judeans again. He captured eight hundred of his most powerful opponents (אמאמ אמאמאמ אמאמאמ אמאמ, *A.J.* 13.380), took them back to Jerusalem, and had them cruci ed (*A.J.* 13.380; *B.J.* 1.97).

---

102. Following the suggested restoration of Yigael Yadin, "Pesher Nahum (4Qp Nahum) Reconsidered," *IEJ* 21 (1971): 1–12.

103. This was rst suggested in 1956 by Allegro ("Further Light").

It has long been assumed that Alexander Jannaeus's opponents, and specifically those eight hundred crucified, were Pharisees. Lester Grabbe has objected to this claim, noting that nowhere in either *Jewish Antiquities* or *Jewish War* does Josephus specifically name the opponents of Alexander Jannaeus as Pharisees.[104] The reason for the association comes from a passage in *Antiquities* that has Jannaeus, having drunk himself to death's door,[105] tell his queen, Alexandra Salome, to be sure to placate the Pharisees, thus leading to a more stable reign (*A.J.* 13.398–404). The implication is clear: the Pharisees (1) were alienated from Jannaeus and (2) constituted a very powerful group; good relations with the Pharisees would prevent insurrections.

The identity of the Demetrius of 4QpNahum with Demetrius III Eukairos hinges on the notice that the Seekers after Smooth Things invited Demetrius to enter Jerusalem. The sobriquet "Seekers after Smooth Things" is widely understood to refer to the Pharisees;[106] the Pharisees, in turn, are understood as having invited the invasion of Judea by Demetrius III. Furthermore, the column later mentions the act of crucifixion ("hanging men alive upon trees"). The sobriquet "Lion of Wrath" then maps to Alexander Jannaeus who, after surviving the episode with Demetrius III, crucified some eight hundred Judeans (understood to be Pharisees).[107]

It is important to emphasize that this reconstruction of 4QpNah 3–4 i 2–8 does not depend on the historical factuality of all the events in Jose-

---

104. L. Grabbe, *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian* (2 vols.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 1.304. Grabbe here builds on the work of Chaim Rabin, "Alexander Jannaeus and the Pharisees," *JJS* 7 (1956): 3–11.

105. Apparently blood was not the only thing for which Jannaeus had a thirst: ◻ ◻◻◻◻◻◻◻ ◻◻◻◻◻◻◻◻ ◻◻ ◻◻◻◻ ◻◻ ◻◻◻◻ ◻◻◻◻◻◻◻ (*A.J.* 13.398).

106. See James VanderKam, "Those Who Look for Smooth Things, Pharisees, and Oral Law," *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. Shalom Paul et al.; 2 vols.; VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 465–77. See also the important studies of David Flusser, "Pharisäer, Sadduzäer, und Essener im Pescher Nahum," in *Qumran* (ed. Karl Erich Grözinger et al.; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1981), 121–66; and Lawrence Schiffman, "Pharisees and Sadducees in *Pesher Naḥum*," in *Minḥah le-Naḥum: Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honour of his 70th Birthday* (ed. Marc Brettler and Michael Fishbane; JSOTSup 154; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 272–90.

107. See Berrin, *Pesher Nahum*, 104–19; note especially the overlap she cites regarding 4QpHos^b. See also the classic studies of Joseph Amusin, "The Reflection of Historical Events of the First Century B.C. in Qumran Commentaries (4Q 161; 4Q 169; 4Q 166)," *HUCA* 48 (1977): 123–52; idem, "Éphraïm et Manassé dans le Péshèr de Nahum," *RevQ* 4 (1963): 389–96. More recently, an additional text has been brought to bear on the issue: the prayer for the well-being of Alexander Jannaeus (4Q448) makes excellent sense in the context of the crucifixion of the Seekers after Smooth Things by the Lion of Wrath; see Esther Eshel, Hanan Eshel, and Ada Yardeni, "A Qumran Composition containing Part of Ps 154 and a Prayer for the Welfare of King Jonathan and His Kingdom," *IEJ* 42 (1992): 199–229. Were Jannaeus indeed viewed as having been anti-Pharisee, it fits that members of the sect should have celebrated his oppression of their ideological enemies.

phus. Even if one were to discard entirely the accounts of Josephus in terms of factual reliability, this would not impugn the reconstruction of events in 4QpNah here laid out. This reconstruction need only assume that there was a living tradition, be it accurate or not, of the Pharisaic plea to Demetrius for help, the failure of Demetrius, and the cruci xion of Pharisees by Alexander Jannaeus. The fact that the two sources, Josephus and 4QpNah, align so well speaks strongly in favor of the existence of such a tradition prior to the authoring of the accounts, upon which both the pesherist and Josephus drew.

Recently, G. Doudna has challenged the identi cation of Alexander Jannaeus with the Lion of Wrath.[108] He argues that the Lion of Wrath must be a gure of the mid- rst century b.c.e. related to the Roman conquest of Judea. Doudna states that the Lion of Wrath "*carries out the conquest of the rulers of the Kittim*" ([italics his] 605), which is to say, the Lion of Wrath is Pompey. Doudna bases this on the use of imperfect verbs in describing the actions of this gure. This implies that the action lies in the future of the implied author of the pesher. As Doudna has noted, this use of imperfect verbs has troubled many translators, who, quite oddly, render the verbs in the past tense.[109] The reason for this is that the actions of Jannaeus, like those of Demetrius, are presumed to have taken place in the past from the implied author's perspective. Grammatically, however, there is little defense for this rendering.

If these verbs are rendered correctly as future tense, what then does this mean for the interpretation of 4QpNah 3–4 i? Doudna assumes that the reference to cruci xions must refer to an act that has not yet happened. This is because he denies the presence—and, apparently, even the possibility of the presence—of *ex eventu* prediction anywhere in the pesharim. Certainly Doudna's reconstruction is possible; however, it is far from satisfying. The proximity of the references to Demetrius and the Lion of Wrath, coupled with the excellent t to the account in Josephus, speaks strongly in favor of the consensus opinion, as argued above. However, if the consensus interpretation is right, then one must seriously consider whether the Lion of Wrath episode is an occurrence of *vaticinium ex eventu*.

It must be stated that Doudna is quite right that *ex eventu* prediction, despite occasional comments to the contrary in the secondary literature, is scarce in the pesharim, if it is to be found at all. But that does not a priori exclude the possibility of there being any *ex eventu* passages. The present passage is the strongest candidate in the continuous pesharim. If this passage is understood as *ex eventu*, the text would then imply an authorship between the time of the invasion of Demetrius and the vengeance exacted by Alexander Jannaeus on his Judean adversaries. In fact, there is noth-

---

108. Doudna, *4Q Pesher Nahum*, 604–7
109. Doudna, *4Q Pesher Nahum*, 395–97.

ing in the text of 4QpNah that rules out an implied authorship in this period: there are no identi able events mentioned in the rest of the text that both can be shown to have happened after the purge by Jannaeus and are cached in the past tense. Reading the passage as an *ex eventu* prediction is entirely defensible; nothing about the text rules out this possibility.

Whether or not this passage should be read as *vaticinium ex eventu*, the pesharim are, in fact, functionally very similar to *ex eventu* predictions. That is, they employ mantic techniques to make predictions about the (eschatological) future. These predictions are tied to the authority of the texts of which the predictions are interpretations. The fact that the same texts are shown by the pesherist to have "predicted" accurately past events enjoins faith in the accuracy of the predictions of future events. In a work such as Daniel 10–12, the entire historical review is cast as *ex eventu* prediction, since the implied author lived before the time of the events described. The pesharim are different in that they have dual authorship— the prophet (or psalmist, or "Moses", etc.) and the author of the pesher. The prophet lived prior to the pesherist; he did not know the true import of the words he transmitted. The pesherist comes somewhere in the middle of the prophet's "true" encoded predictions. Therefore, in explicating what the base text *really* means, the pesherist may refer to events in his past as being complete, while some of the events encoded in the base text are still in the pesherist's future. By demonstrating that recent past events are the true meaning of the base text, the pesherist instills con dence in his prediction of the future, which is likewise tied to the base text. Though a distinct literary phenomenon, the Qumran pesharim and *ex eventu* predictions such as those found in Daniel and *1 Enoch* are nearly identical in function.

11QMelchizedek (11Q13)

The Melchizedek text from Qumran cave 11 has been the source of intense scrutiny since it rst came to light,[110] largely because of the appearance of the heavenly gure Melchizidek, who likewise appears in the New Testament epistle to the Hebrews. The composition has been termed a thematic pesher; it draws on verses from throughout the biblical corpus and provides an eschatological interpretation. In column 2, the only substantially preserved column, one nds the following interpretation of Deut 15:2:

---

110. The text was rst published by Adam S. van der Woude, "Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XI," *OTS* 14 (1965): 354–73. The o cial edition was edited by F. García Martínez, A. S. van der Woude, and E. J. C. Tigchelaar in *Qumran Cave 11 Part II: 11Q2–18, 11Q20–31* (ed. F. García Martínez et al.; DJD 23; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998).

5 מֹוֹרֹיֹהֹמֹהֹ °°° הֹ °°°°° ומנחלת מלכי צדק כי[א °°°°] וֹהמֹהֹ נחֹלֹ]ת מלכי
צ[דֹק אשר

6 ישיבמה אליהמה וקרא להמה דרור לעזוב להמה [משא] כול עוונֹותיהמה ו[כן
יהי]ה הדבר הזה

7 בֹשֹבֹוֹעֹ היובל הֹראישון אחר תש[את ה]יֹובלים וֹ[יֹום הכפ]ורם ה[וא]ה סֹוֹף
[היו]בל הֹעֹשירי

8 לכפר בו על כול בני [אור ו]אֹנשׁ[י] גורל מֹל[כי] צדׁק] וֹם עלׁי[המ]ה   [וֹם עלׁי[המ]ה
התֹ]   [לפֹ]י כול עש[ו]תמה כיא

9 הואה הקֹץֹ לֹשנת הרצון למלכי צֹ[דֹ]קֹ] [°°°] [ ]°קדושי אל לממֹשלת
משפט כאשר כתוב

… **5** their teachers … and from the inheritance of Melchizedek, fo[r…] … but they are the inheri[tance of Melchize]dek who **6** will bring them back to them and proclaim release to them from the burden of all of their sins; and [thus] this matter will happen **7** in the first week of the jubilee after [the] ni[ne] jubilees. And the d[ay of atone]ment [i]s the end of [the] tenth [ju]bilee **8** to atone during it for all the sons [of light and] the me[n of] the lot of Mel[chi]zedek […]*wm* upon [th]em *ht*[…] accord[ing to all] their [work]s, because **9** it is the period for the year of favor for Melchize[de]k […] … […] the holy ones of God for the dominion of judgment, as it is written…[111]

The remainder of the column makes predictions about the eschatological period, using dualistic language reminiscent of 1QS and 1QM. What suggests that the text may have originally contained *ex eventu* predictions is the reference to the "ninth jubilee" and "tenth jubilee." The use of the biblical jubilee as a unit of periodization is, of course, now well familiar to the reader. Even more pertinent are those *ex eventu* texts that divide history into ten periods: in addition to those Qumran documents already surveyed in the present chapter, *Sibylline Oracles* 1–2 and 4; *Zand- Vohu-man Yasn* 1; and the Apocalypse of Weeks in *1 Enoch*. Another Qumran text, 4Q180–181, known as the Pesher on the Periods, divides history from Noah to Isaac into ten generations. In fact, J. T. Milik has claimed that 4Q180–181 and 11QMelchizedek are copies of the same work.[112] This claim, however, lacks any direct textual support.

The fact that 11QMelchizedek exhibits a concern for the periodization of history and culminates with a prediction of the eschaton in the final

---

111. 11QMelch 2:5–9. The Hebrew text presented here is based on the edition of J. J. M. Roberts, "Melchizedek (11Q13=11QMelchizedek=11QMelch)," PTDSS 6B.264–73. The DJD edition is far more liberal with restorations and confident in the reading of partially legible letters.

112. J. T. Milik, "*Milkî-ṣedeq* et *Milkî-rešaʿ* dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens (1)," *JJS* 23 (1972): 109–24, 110.

period strongly suggests that this work may have originally contained an *ex eventu* historical review. Unfortunately, the text's poor state of preservation prevents any certain conclusions. What is of interest is that this thematic pesher, which seems particularly beholden to terminology and ideas from clearly sectarian compositions, likely contained a Daniel-style *vaticinium ex eventu* unlike what we nd in the community's continuous pesharim.

Conclusions

As can be seen from the preceding, the caves of Qumran have yielded several documents that further our evidence for the use of *ex eventu* historical reviews among Hellenistic- and Roman-era Judeans. Several points, however, are worth noting:

1. Most of the texts that indisputably contain such reviews (Pseudo-Daniel[a-b], Apocryphon of Jeremiah C) and those that likely contain such reviews (the Son of God Text, Pseudo-Ezekiel[?]) are almost certainly non-sectarian compositions. The main outlier to this is 11QMelch, which likely contained such a review and is most likely sectarian (although its status as sectarian is open to some debate).

2. The use of the gure of 490 years—seventy weeks of years, ten jubilees, or some combination of jubilee and year-week reckoning— leading up to a decisive moment in human history is even more widespread than was thought prior to the discovery of the Qumran texts (11QMelchizedek, Apocryphon of Jeremiah C). Further, these gures cannot be taken literally, but rather must be seen as an arti cial schematic, drawn from and in conversation with earlier biblical literature (especially the pentateuchal source P and the book of Chronicles).

3. While there may be isolated instances of *ex eventu* prediction in clearly sectarian documents (4QpNahum), these sectarian historical reviews (e.g., in the continuous pesharim, CD) are, as a rule, written from the temporal perspective of the text's real author, and thus are not cast as predictions.

Point (3) above is especially illuminating, because it points at the necessary relationship between *ex eventu* historical reviews and pseudonymous or anonymous authorship. If texts such as the pesharim were attributed to the Teacher of Righteousness or some other speci c individual within the history of the group, then such texts de facto cannot pretend to be

predictive works of great antiquity. Thus, the pesharim alternate between past-tense recitation of events relating to Judea and the sectarians and future-tense narration of the eschatological judgment.

Unsurprisingly, the *ex eventu* literature from Qumran demonstrates especially close ties to the Danielic tradition. This is perhaps to be expected, given the composite nature of the canonical book of Daniel in both its Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek incarnations: numerous Daniel stories were in circulation, of which MT Daniel and LXX Daniel are but selective compilations. Similarly, the fragments of 4Q383–391 indicate that there were at least two hitherto-unknown compositions expanding on the biblical prophets Ezekiel and Jeremiah, leveraging their status to bolster end-time predictions of the Hellenistic era very similar to those of Daniel and *1 Enoch*. Especially noteworthy is the fact that they, like other Judean apocalypses employing *ex eventu* predictions, seem uninterested in the restoration of the Davidic monarchy. This lack of interest evinced by these texts in legitimating a native king contrasts drastically with the ideology of the Akkadian *ex eventu*.

More distinctive, however, are the pesharim. As argued, there is little or nothing in the continuous pesharim that can accurately be called an *ex eventu* prediction; there is certainly nothing that can be called an *ex eventu* historical review of the type familiar from Daniel and *1 Enoch*. However, the issue is complicated by the fact that the pesharim "re-manticize" Scripture; that is to say, the pesherist produces a mantic text by reworking a mantic text whose predictive accuracy and authority is already taken for granted by the intended audience. The pesharim therefore are very like both the Judean works discussed and the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts in that they show clear traces of being born out of a melding of native mantic and historiographic traditions. Further, these pesharim exhibit interest in two separate historical progressions: (1) political history vis-à-vis foreign imperial domination; (2) the history of intra-Judean sectarian strife. It is interesting to note that the texts themselves seem to distinguish these two facets of history: although intermingled throughout the pesharim, the authors have distinct modes of speaking about each. This dual concern with macro-(political) history and micro-(factional) history, though not at the fore in Daniel, is clearly present in Apocryphon of Jeremiah C and the Animal Apocalypse. Like the texts that incorporate the trope of *vaticinium ex eventu*, the pesharim similarly take part in forging a novel mantic-historiographic discourse within their particular social and cultural milieu.

6

Ex Eventu Prediction in Greek Dress:
The Case of the *Sibylline Oracles*

The Judean texts discussed so far share much in common: all were originally composed in either Hebrew or Aramaic; where the literature survives complete only in translation (e.g., *1 Enoch*), we still possess some of the work in its original language of composition. Furthermore, all the texts can be identified with a fairly high degree of probability as documents originating in or around Judea. For the final group of historical reviews cast as predictions after the fact, we now turn to a quite distinct literary phenomenon: sibylline oracles, in particular, those preserved in the "canonical" *Oracula Sibyllina*.[1] These are texts not only composed in Greek during the Hellenistic and Roman periods but composed in conscious mimicry of a Hellenic literary type. In addition, where there is evidence that strongly suggests provenance, it points to locations far from Jerusalem, among Judean diaspora communities.

Unlike the texts already considered, the *Sibylline Oracles* are easily recognizable generically by both modern and ancient audiences.[2] Given the

---

1. The collection as it now stands is a Christian compilation; it is commonly held among scholars, and will be argued below, that much of the material pre-dated the adoption of sibylline verse by the Christian church and originated among (diasporic) Judean communities. In the discussions of *OrSib* to follow, I generally follow the edition of Johannes Geffcken, *Die Oracula Sibyllina* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902). Note also Alois Rzach, *Oracula Sibyllina* (Leipzig: Freytag, 1891). Rzach's text exhibits, on the whole, a heavier editorial hand with greater recourse to emendation. The modern study of the *Sibylline Oracles* began in earnest with the edition of the text (with Latin translation and notes) of C. Alexandre, *Oracula Sibyllina* (2 volumes in 3 parts; Paris: Didot, 1841–1856). Additionally, a Greek text (without apparatus) and German translation of books 1–11 appear in Alfons Kurfeß, *Sibyllinische Weissagungen* (Munich: Heimeren, 1951). This volume has been updated (but still without critical apparatus) by Jörg-Dieter Gauger, *Sibyllinische Weissagungen* (Düsseldorf: Artemis & Winkler, 1998). For a modern translation of the entire *Oracula Sibyllina*, see John J. Collins, "Sibylline Oracles," in *OTP* 1.317–472; see also the recent translation of books 3–5 by Helmut Merkel, "Sibyllinen" (*Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit* [Band V; Lieferung 8; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1998]).

2. Besides the generic cues that oracular verse was cast in hexameter in an archaizing, pseudo-Homeric dialect, the Sibyl was renowned for a certain thematic negativity in her

fair amount of primary and secondary information preserved in ancient sources regarding the production, recording, and spread of Greek oracular verse, we first turn to the phenomenon of sibylline prophecy from its earliest recorded appearance through the early years of the Roman Empire.

Sibylline Prophecy in the Ancient World

The phenomenon of sibylline prophecy far antedates the adoption of the genre by Judean and, later, Christian authors.[3] Unfortunately, very little sibylline material outside the twelve books collected by Christian scribes in late antiquity into the *Oracula Sibyllina* has survived;[4] much of what is known about sibylline texts from an earlier period comes down to us as citations and descriptions of sibylline prophecy in classical and early Christian authors.[5]

Our earliest reference to the Sibyl comes from a fragment of Heraclitus, who wrote in the late sixth and early fifth centuries b.c.e. Plutarch attributes to Heraclitus the following description: "Sibylla, with raving mouth, uttering words with no laughter, no adornment, no perfume, reaches a thousand years by her voice through the god."[6] From this one line, three aspects of the Sibyl may be discerned: (1) there was an early

---

oracles; see, e.g., the case of the popular oracle in the time of Tiberius, discussed below. One can add the fact that the Sibyl would insert her name in her verses, thus distinguishing sibylline verse from the oracles of cult shrines, wherein the *mantis*, such as the Pythia, casts the oracles in the voice of the god of the shrine, most often Apollo.

3. On the phenomenon of sibylline prophecy generally in the Greco-Roman world, and especially on the early attestations of the Sibyl in classical authors, see H. W. Parke, *Sibyls and Sibylline Prophecy in Classical Antiquity* (London: Routledge, 1988). See also David Potter, *Prophets and Emperors: Human and Divine Authority from Augustus to Theodosius* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994), 71–92.

4. Note that, although there are twelve books in the collection, scholars traditionally number them 1–8 and 11–14, with 9 and 10 being omitted. This is due to the complexities of the manuscript tradition and differences in numbering and content among the different manuscript families. On the issue of the manuscripts of *OrSib*, see Geffcken, *Oracula Sibyllina*, XXI–LIII; Rzach, "Sibyllinische Orakel," *Pauly-Wissowa* 2A, cols. 2119–22; and Collins, "Sibylline Oracles," *OTP* 1.321.

5. On the *Sibylline Oracles* in early Christian literature, see G. J. M. Bartelink, "Die *Oracula Sibyllina* in den frühchristlichen griechischen Schriften von Justin bis Origenes (150–250 nach Chr.)," in *Early Christian Poetry* (ed. J. den Boeft and A. Hilhorst; Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 22; Leiden: Brill, 1993), 23–33.

6. Plutarch, *Moralia*, 397A (= *De Pythiae oraculis*, section vi): Σίβυλλα δὲ μαινομένῳ στόματι ἀγέλαστα καὶ ἀκαλλώπιστα καὶ ἀμύριστα φθεγγομένη χιλίων ἐτῶν ἐξικνεῖται τῇ φωνῇ διὰ τὸν θεόν. The exact extent of the quotation that Plutarch intends to attribute to Heraclitus is unclear; it may be as little as the phrase "Sibylla, with raving mouth." Parke, however, is inclined to the position that the entire line should be attributed to Heraclitus (*Sibyls*, 63).

tradition of the Sibyl prophesying in a mad or ecstatic state; it calls to mind the Old Babylonian *muḫḫûm*, and, especially, the Neo-Assyrian *maḫḫû* —literally, the "ecstatic" proclaimer of prophetic oracles.[7] (2) The Sibyl was renowned for delivering oracular messages "without laughter"—her fame would spread as one whose words portended woes and ills. (3) The Sibyl is associated with vast stretches of time; this already hints at the traditions both of her temporal location in the deepest recesses of human history and her exceedingly long life.

Although certainly not a favorite topic of classical Greek authors, the Sibyl was clearly well known and appears, albeit often tangentially, frequently enough in early literary sources to make certain her fame. Thus one finds the Sibyl familiar enough in late-fifth-century Athens that her name could be casually dropped in the comedies of Aristophanes (e.g., *Equites* 61; *Pax* 1095); she is also mentioned in a fragment of the lost satyr-play *Busiris* by Euripides.[8] A generation or so after Aristophanes, Plato reckons the Sibyl among those who, via prophetic madness, speak truly and benefit humankind thereby (*Phaedrus* 244b).[9]

In these early attestations, our sources treat the Sibyl as a single individual, named Sibylla. The picture begins to change in the fourth century, notably in the work of Heraclides of Pontus, a younger contemporary of Plato. Although his work does not survive, several classical and early Christian authors quote a composition attributed to Heraclides titled *On Oracle Centers*. The work apparently contained information regarding various oracular installations throughout the Greek world, those to Apollo as well as others, such as the oracles of Zeus at Dodona and Olympia. This work was of particular interest to later authors who quoted the foundation stories of various oracular sites according to the account of Heraclides.[10] Among the oracle centers he catalogs, Heraclides distinguishes

---

7. Walter Burkert has suggested that the rise to prominence of the Pythia as a female proclaimer of ecstatic oracles in the eighth century b.c.e. could possibly be tied to Assyrian influence during the "orientalizing" period ("Itinerant Diviners and Magicians: A Neglected Element in Cultural Contacts," in *The Greek Renaissance of the Eight Century B.C.: Tradition and Innovation* [ed. Robert Hägg; Stockholm: Paul Åströms Förlag, 1983], 115–19). Although admittedly speculative, it is just as likely, perhaps even more so, that itinerant specialists bringing Assyrian oracular traditions should have influenced the earliest image of the Sibyl in Asia Minor, as Burkert later suggests in *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992), 79–81. For Mesopotamian influence on Greek tradition more generally, see, especially, M. L. West, *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997); Walter Burkert, *Babylon, Memphis, Persepolis: Eastern Contexts of Greek Culture* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004).

8. See Parke, *Sibyls*, 104–5.

9. Interestingly, the other two examples named by Plato alongside the Sibyl are the Pythia of Delphi and the priestesses at Dodona—all female mantic practitioners.

10. Parke, *Sibyls*, 24–25.

three different sibyls: one from Marpessus, in the Troad; one from Ery-
thraea, whom he names Herophile; and one from Phrygia, who would
later be identi ed as a Delphic sibyl.[11] Clement of Alexandria likewise
preserves the tradition naming these three as sibyls, but also attributes
to Heraclides the statement that the Sibyl (like Moses, Clement tells us) is
older than Orpheus.[12] Later in the same passage, Clement acknowledges
both an Egyptian and an Italian sibyl, though it does not seem that he
attributes knowledge of them to Heraclides.

Well before Clement, by the time of Marcus Terentius Varro, writing
in rst-century b.c.e. Rome, the Sibyl had undergone further multiplica-
tion. Varro's famed list, preserved by Lactantius, records no fewer than
ten sibyls, each associated with a particular locale: Persia, Libya, Delphi,
Campania (a "Cimmerian" Sibyl), Erythraea, Samos, Cumae, Marpes-
sus, Phrygia, and Tibur.[13] As Hellenistic culture spread throughout the
Mediterranean, so did the fame of the Sibyl; it seems likely that oracular
verses attributed to the Sibyl were produced and/or preserved in different
regions, and were, to a certain degree, understood in a manner similar to
the production of verses of Apolline oracle centers. Just as Apollo could
provide oracular knowledge through any number of cult-oracle sites, so
too did the name Sibyl adhere to oracular phenomena speci cally tied to
different locales, as if Sibylline verses, by analogy, were also produced by
cultic functionaries at shrines renowned for divination.

One of the intriguing aspects of the spread of the Sibyl throughout the
hellenized world is that she is associated almost exclusively with regions
outside of mainland Greece. Parke has argued convincingly that the earli-
est traditions locate the Sibyl in westernmost Asia Minor, most notably at
Marpessus, Erythraea, and the island of Samos.[14] Later, the Sibyl rose to
great importance in Italy and especially Rome, with the Cumaean Sibyl
becoming the most important such oracular source to bear the name.[15]
When the sibylline books kept in Rome were destroyed by re, Lactantius
reports, the senate resolved during the consulship of Gaius Curio to send

---

11. Parke, *Sibyls*, 26. See Lactantius, *Divinae Institutiones* 1.6.

12. *Stromata* 1.21.384. The passage also includes the note that the Sibyl, before coming
to Delphi, was Phrygian by birth and known by the name Artemis.

13. *Divinae Institutiones* 1.6. This list is reproduced in the prologue of *OrSib*, and in the
fragment of the early-sixth-century *Theosophy* preserved in Codex Ottobonianus Gr. 378, and,
in a less full form, in the Tübingen text of the *Theosophy* (see Emil Schürer, Emil, *The History
of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (3 vols. in 4 parts; rev. and ed. G. Vermes, F. Millar,
and M. Goodman. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1973–1987), 3.1.629).

14. Parke, *Sibyls*, 51–70. Two of our earliest sources on the Sibyl, Heraclitus of Ephesus
and Heraclides of Pontus, were, of course, themselves natives of Asia Minor.

15. Beyond being the Sibyl responsible for the Roman state's o cial collection of sibyl-
line verse, the tradition of a Sibyl at Cumae is not uncommon in Latin literature. See, e.g.,
the mention of the Cumaean Sibyl in Virgil, *Aeneid* 3.441; *Eclogues* 4.4; Ovid, *Metamorphoses*
14.104 and following; etc.

ambassadors to Erythraea, that they should return with a thousand sibyl-line verses.[16] In mainland Greece, legendary gures such as Bacis, Musaeus, Epimenides, and others remained the most important oracular gures divorced from speci c cultic shrines; most of all, however, the oracles of renowned cult centers, such as those at Delphi, Dodona, or Didyma, continued to occupy a place of privilege. The Sibyl, though a gure of renown throughout the hellenized Mediterranean, remained throughout a gure fundamentally associated with the periphery of Hellas.

The Sibyl between mantis and chrēsmologos

Lactantius informs us that there were many books in circulation during his time that bore the name Sibyl, often without further distinction or notice of place of origin.[17] The circulation of oracular compendia was not restricted to sibylline verse; the words of respected issuers of oracles, *manteis*, were accorded a fairly high status, respected as well as feared. Thus in 12 b.c.e., Augustus issued an edict that all books of prophetic verse should be collected and inspected, and if found false destroyed, "since many groundless things spread among the multitude under a famous name" (*quia multa vana sub nomine celebri vulgabantur*).[18] Tacitus has occasion to relate this edict when discussing an episode in which one of the *quindecimviri* acquired a new sibylline book to be included in the o cial state collection but failed to have it approved by the proper authorities.[19]

A similar incident occurred during the reign of Tiberius some thirty years later. According to the history of Cassius Dio, the people of Rome were taken with a verse, claimed to be of the Sibyl, declaring impending civil war in Rome. The verse runs as follows:

> ⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚, ⬚⬚
> ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚.

> When three times 300 cyclic years come round, discord among people will destroy Rome, and also Sybaris's folly. (Cassius Dio 57.18.5)

As Parke notes, the oracle actually ends at the beginning of a new poetic line, indicating almost certainly that this particular prediction

---

originated within a larger collection of oracular verse.[20] The popularity of the verse and the unrest it was wont to cause were apparently such that Tiberius followed Augustus's earlier example and rounded up all such books of prophecy as proved potentially dangerous and had them destroyed:

> [illegible].
>
> Now, Tiberius denounced these verses as being false, and he investigated all the books that contained any prophecy, rejecting some as worthless and accepting others. (57.18.5)

Cassius Dio further reports that the sibylline verse in question enjoyed revived popularity in the time of Nero, who sought to silence his critics by demonstrating that the verse could not be found in the official collections of sibylline predictions (62.18.3–4). His opponents responded by reciting a different verse, one that they claimed to be an authentic prophecy of the Sibyl: [illegible], "Last of Aeneas's line, a mother-killer will rule" (62.18.4).

These episodes of the early Roman Empire are instructive: they demonstrate that Greek hexameter oracular verse was in wide circulation, at the very least in Rome; furthermore, there appears to have been a great number of written collections of oracles in circulation, aligning with the later comments of Lactantius regarding the large number of such books current in his own time. The efforts to destroy books containing potentially dangerous oracles obviously did not diminish their popularity. Additionally, the episodes during the reigns of Tiberius and Nero show especially that such verses circulated popularly, likely at times independently of any actual written source of the oracle(s) in question.

In an earlier period, the circulation of oracular utterances was the domain of a specialist, called a *chrēsmologos*.[21] The *chrēsmologos* was distinct from the *mantis*; he did not, as a general rule, possess the art or skill required for producing original oracles.[22] Rather, a *chrēsmologos* was a collector of oracles from various sources, not limited to working in any one place, who could provide the appropriate oracle for a given occasion in exchange for remuneration. Providing oracles on demand for pay, these professionals became a favorite target of classical authors; they are, for

---

[20] Parke, *Sibyls*, 142.

[21] See the recent treatment of *chrēsmologoi* in Michael Attyah Flower, *The Seer in Ancient Greece* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008), 58–65.

[22] However, on the overlap of the roles of the *chrēsmologos* and the *mantis*, see Sarah Iles Johnston, *Ancient Greek Divination* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2008), 137–41.

example, skewered venomously by the acerbic wit of Aristophanes on more than one occasion. Perhaps most famously, *The Birds* contains a character lacking any name other than his profession: *chrēsmologos*. Making his entrance at line 959, the *chrēsmologos* offers an oracle of Bacis, prescribing the correct sacri cial rite for the situation at hand. his supposed oracle of Bacis further declares that the one to whom the oracle is delivered must provide the *chrēsmologos* (in the oracle called a *prophētēs*, to be taken as "expounder" of oracles) with a " awless cloak and new shoes" (□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□, 973). The *chrēsmologos* continues speaking this oracle, against protest, indicating he is additionally due a cup of wine and a share of the sacri ced animal. When asked repeatedly if the oracle really says all these things, the *chrēsmologos* responds simply: □□□□ □□ □□□□□, "Look at (literally: take) the book" (974, 977, etc.). This clearly indicates that such a gure might typically be expected to possess a written copy of the oracles he expounded.[23] In addition to interpreting oracles of legendary gures such as Bacis from their own private collections, such as we see in *The Birds*, there are reports of *chrēsmologoi* interpreting, for example, oracles delivered by the Pythia at Delphi.[24]

As Michael Flower argues, *chrēsmologoi* seem to disappear from the historical record around the close of the fth century b.c.e.; they appear to have undergone a sustained period of decreasing prestige, underscored by the involvement of individual *chrēsmologoi* in certain political and military failures, such as supporting the disastrous Athenian expedition to Sicily in the last quarter of the fth century b.c.e.[25] Perhaps the most famous—or, rather, infamous—*chrēsmologos* named in classical literature is Onomacritus. He was charged with collecting the oracles of Musaeus in Athens around 520 b.c.e.; he was found to have inserted an oracle of his own invention, and was banished from the city.[26] Later employed at the Persian court in Susa, Onomacritus is accused by Herodotus of selecting only those oracles that would be pleasing to the king for recitation, omitting any that portended ill for Persia.[27] While authors such as Herodotus maintained a great respect for authentic oracles themselves and the *manteis* who issued them (such as Bacis), the *chrēsmologoi* who collected,

---

23. On this hilarious passage of oracular one-upmanship in the context of the emergence of written religious documents in the Greek polis, see Albert Henrichs, "Writing Religion: Inscribed Texts, Ritual Authority, and the Religious Discourse of the Polis," in *Written Texts and the Rise of Literate Culture in Ancient Greece* (ed. Harvey Yunis; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 38–58.

24. See Flower, *Seer in Ancient Greece*, 60.

25. Flower, *Seer in Ancient Greece*, 64.

26. The episode is recounted in Herodotus, *Histories* 7.6.3; see Walter Burkert, *Greek Religion* (trans. John Raffan; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985), 117–18. Onomacritus is further accused by Pausanius of forging poems attributed to Musaeus (*Description of Greece* 1.22.7).

27. Herodotus, *Histories* 7.6.4.

recited, and interpreted those oracles often appear suspect in motive and ethics.

Prominent blunders aside, there were certainly other forces at work in the decline of the *chrēsmologos* as an institution. As Flower suggests, a likely contributor to this decline was the increased production of, access to, and circulation of books that contained collections of oracles—collections such as a *chrēsmologos* might have been expected to provide.[28] The availability of written collections made super uous the living collectors; it paved the way toward the situation evinced in the time of Augustus and after, wherein books of oracular verse abounded, and individual prophecies could sweep through the populace, capturing the imagination and spirit of the time.

It is against this backdrop, the long history of Greek oracular verse and its dispersal throughout the hellenized world, that the verses of the extant *Oracula Sibyllina* ought rst and foremost to be set. Regardless of whether certain of the *Sibylline Oracles* represent an early Judean adoption of the form, as will be argued, one must begin by understanding the existence of these oracles as part of a culture in which collections of oracular verse circulated broadly and appear to have been widely accessible. The books of the *Sibylline Oracles* that have come down to us owe their existence to a Hellenistic literary culture in which prophetic oracles of long ago or legendary gures were compiled, circulated, copied, recompiled, and recirculated—a culture in which the distinction between the *mantis* as originator of oracles and a new-style literary *chrēsmologos,* who compiled and edited oracle compendia, had turned impenetrably murky.

Oracula Sibyllina Book 3

Book 3 of the *Sibylline Oracles* does not contain *ex eventu* passages as full and as comparable to the material already surveyed as do books 1–2 or book 4. Nonetheless, it is in many ways the logical book with which to begin our investigation, not least because it is widely regarded as containing the oldest Judean material preserved in the corpus.[29] The book is both the most thoroughly studied section of the *Sibylline Oracles* as well as perhaps the most hotly debated when it comes to issues of date and provenance. The frequent reference in book 3 to biblical and non-biblical Judean traditions, mention of numerous lands and peoples, cryptic nods to historical events, and pronounced interests in kingship and in Egypt

---

28. Flower, *Seer in Ancient Greece*, 65.

29. See, e.g., Collins, *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism* (SBLDS 13; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1974), 21; J. L. Lightfoot, *The Sibylline Oracles with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary on the First and Second Books* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 94.

have served as triggers to both the scholarly attention and the disagreement surrounding the work. Sorting through such complicated issues of provenance and sources of in uence in the case of *OrSib* 3 will establish the groundwork and methodological template for approaching the fuller *ex eventu* passages to be found in books 1–2 and 4.

Sibylline Oracles 3 contains over eight hundred lines of oracular verse, and includes numerous changes in tenor and topic. It is, therefore, perhaps most prudent to begin by offering an outline and summary of the contents of book 3.

- Lines 1–92/96.[30] Only Nikiprowetzky mounts a serious, if ultimately unconvincing, argument for considering these verses to be integral to the composition of book 3.[31] The material does not seem of a piece with the rest of the book; more pressing is that the manuscript evidence itself points to discrepancies in the division of the material in *OrSib* at this point: book 3 contains a somewhat confusing heading in the manuscripts, labeling it ⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ("from the second *logos*, concerning God"), and witnesses of the ⬚ manuscript family include the notation following line 92, ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ("here seek the remainder from the second *logos* and the beginning of the third"). Lines 1–92 are probably best understood as a fragment from a largely lost and/or displaced second *logos*, not belonging to the rest of book 3.[32]
- Lines 97–161. This section contains an account of the Tower of Babel as well as a euhemeristic account of the titanomachy.
- Lines 162–95. A prophecy of world kingdoms; most notable is the mention of a king of Egypt, ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ("of the Greeks by race"), the seventh such from the time of the Macedonian conquest (192–93).
- Lines 196–294. This section generally lacks the eschatological outlook of much of the rest of the book, comprising an account of the Babylonian exile.
- Lines 295–349. A collection of woes against various peoples; the tribulations are dated to "the seventh reign of kings" (318).
- Lines 350–80. An oracle concerning the fall of Rome to Asia.

---

30. Scholars are nearly unanimous in bracketing off 1–92 as a distinct unit that does not belong with the rest of the material in *OrSib* 3. Lines 93–96 comprise a distinct fragment, neither belonging to what precedes nor a part of the oracle to follow; they seem nonetheless to be at home with much of the rest of book 3's content. What is left of the oracle preceding line 97, though, is only a snippet out of context.

31. Valentin Nikiprowetzky, *La Troisième Sibylle* (Paris: La Haye, Mouton, 1970), esp. 60–66.

32. See, e.g., Schürer, *History* 3.1.630–31.

- Lines 381–400. Oracles concerning Alexander the Great and his descendants.
- Lines 401–88. A lengthy section containing numerous oracles against a variety of nations; most are located in Asia Minor.
- Lines 489–544. This section again contains a list of woes against various peoples; cf. 295–349.
- Lines 545–656. This section constitutes an oracle to the Greeks, extolling Judeans as a race of pious men (573), mentioning a "seventh king" (608), warning of the eschaton, and culminating in the promise of a savior king "from the sun" (⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚, 652).
- Lines 657–808. This section deals explicitly with the period immediately leading up to the eschaton.
- The book closes in lines 809–29 with a concluding statement by the Sibyl in the rst person.

This division into units is based primarily on considerations of content. With the exception of the separation of lines 1–92 from the rest of the work, this summary is not intended to communicate any information about the authoring or origin of any part of the book in relation to any other. Considerations of deeper structure, authorship, editorial activity, and other elements of the text's construction are engaged in the discussion below.

The Unfolding of History in the Third Sibyl

Setting aside the rst 92 lines of book 3, it is immediately following the euhemeristic account of the titanomachy that the Third Sibyl rst exhibits its interest in the unfolding of history. Lines 156–61 constitute something of a bridge between the euhemeristic account immediately preceding and the prophecy concerning world kingdoms that follows, beginning in 162. Lines 156–61 read as follows:

> ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚,
> ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚ ⬚⬚⬚ ⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚
> ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚. ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚
> ⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚, ⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚ ⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚
> ⬚ ⬚⬚⬚ ⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚ ⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚,
> ⬚⬚⬚ ⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚, ⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚, ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚.

Then God set evil upon the Titans,
and all the offspring of the Titans and of Cronos
died. But, thereafter, as time came 'round,
the kingdom of Egypt arose, then that of the Persians,
the Medians, the Ethiopians, and also Assyrian Babylon,
then that of the Macedonians, of Egypt again, then Rome.

Here we once again encounter the theme of successively appearing empires, kingdoms, or dynasties. However, the order, number, and some of the names of the kingdoms presented here differ from the standard list of four (or five when expanded to include Rome) we have already encountered. Nonetheless, the list is clearly schematic: taking the Titans as representing the first kingdom of world history and assuming an eschatological kingdom to replace Rome (as will become clear later in *OrSib* 3), we find ourselves faced with the familiar division of world history into ten units.[33] Similar to what we find in Judean works such as the Apocalypse of Weeks and *Jubilees*, this history begins not with a particular kingdom or empire, but with the Titans at the beginning of human history altogether. Also important to note is the hint already of the importance of Egypt to the Sibyl of book 3: not only is Egypt the very first kingdom to arise in the wake of the Titans, but only Ptolemaic Egypt appears as a legitimate successor kingdom to Alexander. The inclusion of Ethiopia as a world dominating power likewise points toward an Egyptian provenance.

It must be admitted that the enumeration of ten world powers—if, indeed, it is right to see it in the passage above—is not consistent throughout the book. Thus we find the Sibyl asking in line 166, "How many kingdoms of men will be raised up?" An entirely different list then follows, beginning with the House of Solomon, which "will rule first of all." It is followed by the Phoenicians, Pamphylians, Persians, Phrygians, Carians, Mysians, Lydians, Greeks, Romans—here referred to simply as "another kingdom, white and many headed from the western sea" (175–76)—leading to a "seventh reign," a king of Egypt, Greek by race, whose rule will signal a time of strength and ascendance for "the people of the Great God" (192–95), a figure to whom we shall return. From Solomon to the Romans we do in fact have ten kingdoms; however, the addition of the Egyptian king yields a total of eleven; if the Egyptian king does not represent the post-eschatological kingdom of everlasting peace and prosperity encountered elsewhere in Judean literature, we are then left with a total of twelve kingdoms from Solomon to the eschatological age.[34] What is retained, however, is the anchoring of an eschatological outlook within a historical framework, typical of the sibylline books overall.

The Third Sibyl next expressly returns to a sequence of past events in lines 265–90.[35] This passage centers on the exile of Israel to Babylon; it

---

33. Collins, *The Sibylline Oracles*, 26.

34. It may be argued, however, that the number twelve is, of course, not without significance, perhaps intended to resonate with the notion of the twelve tribes of Israel, the twelve disciples of Jesus, etc.

35. There are several noteworthy mentions of past events in the intervening material, such as the Sibyl's prediction of the Trojan War in 206, and the exodus event, based closely on the biblical account, in 248–58.

evinces not merely familiarity with accounts of the exile and restoration such as are found in Deutero-Isaiah and Jeremiah (the Jeremianic total of seventy years of exile is explicitly referenced in line 280), but also seems to have been composed in conversation with the covenant curses of Deuteronomy 28 and 29. What is perhaps most interesting in this passage is the notion that "the heavenly God will send a king" (286), and the Persians generally will supply aid to Judah for the rebuilding of the temple in Jerusalem. The unnamed king is certainly meant to be Cyrus; invoking him as an agent of God working for the people of Judah is, of course, a pivotal feature of Deutero-Isaiah (see Isaiah 44:27–45:1). The Isaianic portrait of Cyrus almost certainly serves as a foundational touchstone for the composition of this passage, and points strongly toward an important theme for the Judean strata of *OrSib* 3. While the bulk of the book is devoted not to recitations of history but rather to lists of woes and sins and coming eschatological travails, the Isaianic portrait of Cyrus's involvement in the deliverance of Judah from exile provides an important historical precedent for the book: Cyrus is the foreign king, anointed by God, who will deliver God's people. For the sibyllist, this is a matter of the utmost importance; as will be argued below, Cyrus should be understood as precursor to the "king from the sun" later in the book.

The section immediately following, lines 295–349, consists of predictions of woe and destruction for a wide array of peoples and places. These lines are concerned with eschatological travails, and don't exhibit any particular interest in a sequence of events. The section does, however, include the second of the three references in *OrSib* 3 to a seventh reign or king (318). The reference to the "seventh generation of kings" is used explicitly as a dating formula for the "great affliction" that will come against Egypt according to lines 314–18, and should, in all probability, be taken as the designated time period for the disasters afflicting other nations in this passage.

In the next section, 350–80, the Sibyl returns to more concrete matters, albeit still viewed within an eschatological horizon. The passage begins by stating that however much tribute Rome exacted from Asia, Asia will exact thrice that from Rome. Lines 356–63 turn their attention to an enigmatic figure termed "virgin" and "mistress." This figure is said to wed Rome, whom she will cast from heaven down to earth and from earth raise again to heaven. The passage is likely a reference to Cleopatra and her dealings with Rome, although this is disputed.[36] At 367, the passage

---

36. See, e.g., Collins, *The Sibylline Oracles*, who dates the whole of 350–80 to the reign of Cleopatra (57–62). The identification of the individual as Cleopatra is rejected by Erich Gruen, who argues that the veiled references are far too vague, and at points ill-fitting, to point definitively to Cleopatra anywhere in book 3 (*Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* [Hellenistic Culture and Society 30; Berkeley: University of California Press,

returns to its focus on Asia. The major theme of the passage is a reversal of
Asian subjugation; when those from the east rise up and overthrow Rome,
a period of perfection and peace will reign over both Asia and Europe,
wherein "every evil" will ee from the world (367–80). The section clearly
stands apart from what comes before and after. The concern for Asia and
for Egypt (in the person of Cleopatra) are oddly juxtaposed; it is certainly
possible that the references to Cleopatra are a later insertion into a pre-
existing oracle concerning Rome and Asia. Anti-Roman sentiment binds
the verses thematically.

Lines 381–400 revert to a more straightforward concern with political
events. The rst seven lines predict the coming of Alexander the Great,
his vast conquests, and his untimely death. Line 388 begins a new oracle
concerning Alexander, and again we nd a certain sympathy for Asia and
a fairly hostile attitude toward Alexander. Lines 396–400 appear to be a
Judean addendum to this oracle; alternately, it is possible only 396–97
and 400 are Judean supplements, with 398–99 belonging to the rest of the
oracle. The mention of bloody-succession intrigues recorded in these lines
shows clear in uence from the book of Daniel; the mention of the "ten
horns" is almost certainly taken from Daniel 7. This clearly points to a date
sometime after ca. 163 b.c.e. for at least this citation; it is probably impos-
sible to determine if the entire oracle originated at this time, or if instead
an older oracle concerning Alexander has been reworked.

Following on these passages that touch brie y on political events
comes a lengthy section extending from 401–88 listing catastrophes that
will befall various places, mostly in Asia; once again we encounter a pas-
sage that evinces some interest in particular localities, but no real interest
in the unfolding of historical events. Likewise, 488–544 contains a series
of predicted woes, culminating in the statement that only one-third of
humanity will survive (543–44). Again, there is no interest in past events;
rather, the sibyllist is interested merely in laying out future horrors yet to
be visited upon the peoples of the world. The exhortation to the Greeks
to turn to the worship of the one true god (545–72) and the praise of the
Judean people (573–600) are similarly devoid of any real interest in events
of the past.

The Third Sibyl returns to her concern with historical events, albeit in
a limited form, only once more in the work. We nd the onset of eschato-
logical woes dated to the reign of the seventh king of Egypt as "num-

---

1998], 279–81). While Gruen's objections certainly sound an important note of caution, I am
not nearly so pessimistic as he regarding the possibility, generally, of identifying historical
referents in the *Sibylline Oracles*. Rieuwerd Buitenwerf (*Book III of the Sibylline Oracles and Its
Social Setting* [SVTP 17; Leiden: Brill, 2003], 223) identi es the mistress as Asia personi ed,
which, while less likely, is not impossible given the larger context in which the passage is
situated.

bered from the Greeks" (608–9). The passage ips on its head what we found earlier in book 3: here, the Macedonians are "unspeakably great men" (▨▨▨▨▨▨▨▨▨▨▨, 610). The bringer of evil in this oracle is not Rome but rather a king who comes from Asia (611–14), completely inverting the anti-Alexander, pro-Asia passages earlier in the work.[37] The eschatological woes will end, the oracle tells us, when God sends a "king from the sun" (652), who will end war on earth forever.   ore will be said on this gure below. The remainder of the book exhibits little if any interest in the unfolding of history; the text is concerned instead with further rumination on coming disaster, on the elect living in the eternal kingdom that accompanies the de nitive social and cosmological changes of the eschaton, and exhortations to turn to the God of the Judeans.

The "Jewishness" of Book 3, Its Provenance and Composition

In considering the provenance of *OrSib* 3, attention should be paid to the question of how clearly within the work one can detect Judean ideological in uence. While the "Jewishness" of book 3 is not seriously questioned by scholars, it must be borne in mind that our collection of *Sibylline Oracles* was compiled and preserved by members of the early Christian church; even in supposedly early sections of the *Sibylline Oracles*, one comes across obviously Christian passages. Book 3 is surprisingly free of such patently Christian material, with only one likely Christian verse, a fairly obvious secondary insertion at 776.

The evidence for considering *OrSib* 3 a "Jewish" work, or at least in large part deriving from diasporic Judean circles, comes early on in the work and reappears throughout. The section on the Tower of Babel in 97–109 clearly follows closely upon the account in Gen 11:1–9. The manner in which the book often invokes divinities here and throughout points toward an origin among Judean monotheists; the Sibyl ascribes authority to "the great god," "the immortal one," etc.; in line 629 the Sibyl exhorts her audience to propitiate God, "for he alone is God and there is no other," sounding very much like Deutero-Isaiah. Insofar as Greek divinities appear at all, they are limited primarily (although not exclusively) to the euhumeristic titanomachy in 110–55, a passage whose very purpose is to demonstrate that Zeus, Poseidon, Aphrodite, and the rest are no real gods at all.[38]

---

37. On the king from Asia, see further below.

38. On the presence of Greek mythic traditions in general within the *Sibylline Oracles*, see Jesus-M. Nieto Ibanez, "Los Mitos Griegos en el Corpus de los Oraculos Sibilinos," in *Sibille e Linguaggi Oraccolari: Mito, Storia, Tradizione* (ed. Ileana Chirassi Colombo and Tullio Seppilli; Pisa: Istituti Editoriali e Poligra ci Internazionali, 1998), 389–410.

Further textual interplay with Judean literature comes in 213–64, a section devoted entirely to extolling the virtue of the people of Judah. It is bracketed with direct mentions of the Temple of Solomon (214) and of Moses leading Israel out of Egypt (253–58).[39] Lines 265–94 recount the fall of the Judean people into sin, the subsequent exile to Mesopotamia, and the restoration, including the rebuilding of the Jerusalem temple, under Cyrus; line 280 specifically invokes the seventy years of exile mentioned in Jer 25:11. A Judean hand is likewise discernable in the list of woes in 295–380, if only in the reference to Gog and Magog in 321, the names clearly taken from Ezek 38–39. These twin typologically evil nations appear again at 512, in the midst of another list of woes; here, however, the reference stands rather isolated within a larger section almost entirely devoid of specifically Judean content.

As mentioned, line 629 includes a statement of monotheism: "he alone is God, and there is no other." The entire exhortation to worship this sole deity, 624–34, must almost certainly stem from Judean circles; likewise, lines 656–68, describing the eschatological assault on the "Temple of the great God" should be so understood. Similarly, the passage in 702–31 on the salvation of a people by the hand of the creator and (sole) ruler (□□□□□-□□□, 704) deity, a people who then congregate around his (sole) temple, must certainly be understood as Judean. Finally, the statement at the very end of the book that the sibyl was the daughter-in-law of the flood hero (827) echoes *OrSib* 1.289 (Noah is mentioned by name throughout the narrative there, the nearest occurrence coming at 1.280), as well as line 33 of the Prologue, which has the Chaldean/Persian/Hebrew Sibyl as a member of Noah's family. While it is possible that a tradition linking the Sibyl to the flood hero arose independently of and prior to the Judean adaptation of sibylline verse, this seems the unlikelier option.

James Davila has suggested that the author of this material need not be understood as ethnically Judean, but perhaps could be among the group of non-Judeans who sympathized with and partook of elements of Judean culture, known as "God-fearers" (see, e.g., the □□□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□ in Josephus, *A.J.* 14.110).[40] It is probably impossible to differentiate between the possibilities that certain verses were written by a diasporic Judean over and against a non-Judean sympathetic to Judean traditions and moral/ethical teachings. In truth, I am not sure that it amounts to a great deal of difference, since a God-fearer in this scenario would be working within a diasporic Judean cultural context; texts can betray the cultural milieu

---

39. The passage is notable for direct disagreement with other works of Second Temple authors, specifically in relation to Judean mantic practices; e.g., *1 Enoch* shows deep interest in astronomical phenomena, as do the physiognomic/astrological texts from Qumran.

40. James Davila, *Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian, or Other?* (JSJSup 105; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 185.

of authors and audiences, but, absent explicit notice, not ethnicity. In the absence of obvious evidence pointing to a God-fearer over and against Judean authorship, the position that the verses stem from a Judean working in Judean circles is to be preferred as the simpler explanation.

The notice of these passages is meant only as a brief, conservative sketch of those places within *OrSib* 3 in which an origin for the material within Judean circles is all but certain. Numerous other passages resonate strongly with imagery familiar from biblical texts (e.g., 787–89 with Isa 11:6–8), although direct dependence of the sibyllist on the biblical passages cannot be proved. Regardless, the evidence adduced above should be more than sufficient to establish that much of the verse contained in *Sibylline Oracles* 3 is to some degree the product of Hellenistic Judean authors/editors who composed and/or incorporated uniquely Judean elements into the book. The question now remains: is it possible to pin down its time and place of origin beyond a general statement of Judean influence on its composition?

Two monographs devoted entirely to book 3 of the *Sibylline Oracles*, one by Valentin Nikiprowetzky[41] and the other by Rieuwerd Buitenwerf,[42] have offered arguments in favor of considering the whole book (or quite nearly all of it) a single, unified Judean composition. Although their proposals are quite similar, there remain a number of differences between them, including what verses each ascribes to the "original" *OrSib* 3, over and against what appears in the manuscript tradition.

Nikiprowetzkey presents the most extreme interpretation of the authoring of *Sibylline Oracles* 3. Like most scholars before him, Nikiprowetzky sees *OrSib* 3 as stemming from the Judean community in Egypt. By his reading, however, the book is a unified composition; in his words, quite simply, "Le *Troisième Livre* est dû à un auteur unique."[43] Nikiprowetzky means more by this statement than a first glance might intimate: not only does he account the entirety of book 3 as preserved in the manuscripts as constituting a unified work from a single authorial hand, including lines 1–92; he further considers sibylline fragment 1 and fragment 3, preserved in Theophilus, to be part of the "original" book, as well as the expansive interpolation of verses from the *Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides* that appears in certain of the manuscripts as part of book 2. As

41. Nikiprowetzky, *La Troisième Sibylle*. See also Nikiprowetzky, "La Sibylle juive et le Troisième Livre' des Pseudo-Oracles Sibyllins depuis Charles Alexandre," *ANRW* II.20.1 (1987): 460–540.

42. Buitenwerf, *Book III*. On the history of scholarship, see the excellent review offered by Buitenwerf on pp. 5–64.

43. Nikiprowetzky, *Troisième Sibylle*, 196; see also 60–66. However, Nikiprowetzky still allows for two instances of later, secondary insertions: at 3.736, a Delphic oracle concerning Carmina (207); and, at line 63, a mention of Beliar coming from the inhabitants of Sebaste, which he takes as Samaria, so renamed in 25 b.c.e. (225).

to the inclusion of sibylline fragments 1 and 3, Nikiprowetzky is not alone in seeing them as akin to the material at the beginning of book 3;[44] however, his insistence that the material from *Pseudo-Phocylides* be ascribed to some "original" form of the Third Sybil is completely without warrant. Nikiprowetzky's motivation for the claim is to try to bring the number of verses in *OrSib* 3 up to the total of 1,034 verses for the third *logos*; this figure appears as a scribal notation in certain of the manuscripts. However, he does not consider when that editorial notice might have been made, nor does he question how much weight should be given to it; his decision to include the material from *Pseudo-Phocylides* is based almost solely on consideration of verse count. Its inclusion as part of *OrSib* 3 should be utterly rejected.[45]

Because Nikiprowetzky sees the book as stemming from a single authorial hand, the dating of the book becomes for him a simple matter of locating the latest possible identifiable historical reference in the book. Of particular import to him are the direct allusions to Cleopatra in lines 75 and following (which, as noted above, I and nearly all other scholars take as a later addition to the bulk of book 3, quite likely attached owing to scribal confusion in the transmission of the work), and what he perceives as the negative attitude toward Rome, for example, at 175–90, an attitude he deems impossible earlier than the mid-first century b.c.e. This leads him to place the composition of the entire work in the time of Cleopatra VII (whom he, straining all credulity, identifies as the "seventh king") and the Second Triumvirate, specifically around the year 42 b.c.e.[46] While Nikiprowetzky offers much on individual points of interpretation, his overall argument falls far short of convincing. In particular, the claim of a single authorial hand strains both the evidence of the verses themselves (as even he himself identifies two passages that must be regarded as secondary; see note above) and also runs counter to everything we know and might expect about the circulation of oracular verse in the Hellenistic period.[47]

Buitenwerf's work on book 3 falls prey to this very same critique. He sees the entire work, including fragments 1 and 3, but excluding lines 1–92, as the work of a single author.[48] More so than the treatment of Nikiprowetzky, this proposal lacks conviction; Buitenwerf offers little sustained argument for viewing the work as the product of a single author, but often relies on statements such as " Our analysis of the third Sibylline book, however, shows that the work can, and therefore should, be taken

---

44. See, e.g., Schürer, *History*, 3.1.638.
45. See, e.g., Collins, *Sibylline Oracles*, 24–25.
46. Nikiprowetzky, *Troisième Sibylle*, 216–17
47. See, e.g., Schürer, *History*, 3.1.635.
48. Buitenwerf, *Book III*, 133–34.

as a literary unity."[49] Such a statement is fraught with problems: by what quantitative or qualitative standards might one determine if the contents of a book or scroll *can* be read as a unity? The author does not say. Further, it should be obvious that Buitenwerf's contention that if a work of literature *can* be read one way that it *should* be read that way is completely unconvincing. His project of presenting *Sibylline Oracles* 3 as a uni ed composition is further undermined by statements such as the following:

> Obviously, the author has drawn on earlier sources, and it may occasionally be useful to distinguish them in order to interpret the text adequately. In establishing the meaning of the author's nal text, however, it is methodologically unwarranted to separate passages which can be seen to be based on earlier sources from other passages, since from the author's point of view all of these passages formed an integral part of the literary unity he was creating.[50]

So, according to Buitenwerf, not only is it possible to isolate passages that were composed prior to the time of his putative author (i.e., his "earlier sources"), but it is at times "useful" to do so. Yet, he says, it is methodologically unwarranted to see such earlier sources incorporated in book 3 as "separate." As if this were not self-contradictory enough, it becomes clear through passages such as these that Buitenwerf is attempting to identify the author of a uni ed text that actually nowhere exists.[51] That is to say, he acknowledges that book 3 incorporates oracular verse not actually *composed* by his "author" but simply used by him. Further, he acknowledges that some sections of book 3 as preserved in the manuscripts post-date and are extraneous to the "uni ed" work of his "author," while simultaneously assigning to the work fragments 1 and 3, which nowhere appear in the manuscript tradition of *OrSib* 3. Therefore, Buitenwerf seeks to treat a work that he admits is not solely created by his putative "author," nor is it contiguous with the nal form of the text as preserved in any of the manuscripts. Rather, he is concerned with identifying an intermediate form of the text, for which there is no manuscript evidence, and claims that this is a "uni ed" composition, put together by an "author" who, in addition to actually authoring material, collects and redacts material.

Such a position is intellectually untenable: one ought either to view the text as containing various strata that may be identi ed (when possible) as stemming from different hands or provenances, or, to approach the text in its manuscript form (including lines 1–92, and excluding the fragments in Theophilus) as a literary unity, redacted with care and intent, and to

---

49. Buitenwerf, *Book III*, 133.
50. Buitenwerf, *Book III*, 124–25.
51. In fairness, the same critique applies equally to Nikiprowetzky.

be read as a work of early Christian circles. Instead, Buitenwerf recognizes editorial activity and expansion, and insists it must be pruned away in order to reach a hypothetical mid- rst century b.c.e. Judean text, but simultaneously insists that this process of identifying different sources of the material should not be carried any further than this (despite the fact that passages predating the "author" may be identi ed). Even without diving into questions of authorial intent, how Buitenwerf might know what was in the head of his supposed author, and what the phrase "literary unity" might mean to such an author, it should be clear that Buitenwerf's approach to the composition of book 3 must be rejected as logically inconsistent.

Buitenwerf also diverges from nearly all other scholars, including Nikiprowetzky, by asserting that *OrSib* 3's place of origin is in Asia Minor, not Egypt. This argument rests heavily on the mention of locales in 381–488, a section that most scholars, myself included, regard as belonging to a stratum independent of the body of oracles that prominently features Egypt alongside Judean lore, teachings, and ethics. Buitenwerf's desire to nd unity prevents him from the simple conclusion that this section quite plausibly stems from Asia Minor, whereas other sections of the work do not. As to questions of date, Buitenwerf does not differ terribly from Nikiprowetzky, save that he rejects line 1–92 as integral to the work, and therefore the allusions to Cleopatra there are not central to his dating. For Buitenwerf, passages such as 175–90 (con ict between Rome and Macedon) point to events in the early rst century b.c.e.; as such he dates the composition to sometime after 80 b.c.e. but prior to 40 b.c.e.[52] It is di cult to escape the conclusion that Buitenwerf's historical arguments are fundamentally conditioned, and conditional, upon his primary desire to nd literary unity in *OrSib* 3.

It is largely in reaction to the atomistic approach of Johannes Geffcken in the late-nineteenth century that Nikiprowetzky and Buitenwerf have striven, and struggled, to articulate a case for literary unity. Geffcken treats the work, as I have advocated in this chapter, as a compilation of a number of short oracles that grew over time. He identi es four main stages in the growth of *Sibylline Oracles* 3.[53] Geffcken ascribes what he identi es as the earliest layers, 97–154 and 381–87, to a Babylonian and Persian Sibyl,

---

52. The year 40 b.c.e. serves as a terminus due to the paraphrase of lines 97–107 from *OrSib* 3 contained in the work of Alexander Polyhistor, as quoted in the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, in his treatment of the kings of the Babylonians, and in Josephus, *Antiquities* 1.118–19. Alexander Polyhistor is thought to have died ca. 40 b.c.e., providing Buitenwerf's *terminus ante quem*. Since Buitenwerf insists that book 3 is a uni ed composition by a single author, it is, for him, impossible that Polyhistor might know the verses from some source other than book 3 as it is known to us.

53. Johannes Geffcken, *Komposition und Entstehungszeit der Oracula Sibyllina* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902), 1–16.

respectively. It must be said that there is no warrant to ascribe these verses to such gures, nor even to surmise that there ever were Babylonian and Persian Sibyls.[54] He then sees expansion in the time of Antiochus IV, later additions taken from a collection attributed to the Erythraean Sibyl, and nally verses 36–62, with the very opening verses coming later still.[55]

Geffcken's con dence in isolating a very large number of independent oracles of differing origins often lacks rm evidentiary grounding. While I certainly agree with the method of Geffcken—treating *OrSib* 3 rst and foremost as one would treat any other oracle compendium of the Hellenistic era—and while I agree that various compositional strata can be discerned, Geffcken pushes his recovery of discreet units, at times mere single verses, further than the evidence allows. Nonetheless, Geffcken's analysis dominated discussions of the text through the early 1970s.

In the wake of Geffcken's work, John Collins has been one of the most proli c and in uential contemporary critics to work on those books of the *Sibylline Oracles* betraying Judean in uence. With the majority of scholars, Collins nds the evidence for ascribing much of the material in *OrSib* 3 to a diasporic Judean community in Egypt overwhelming. He also follows somewhat upon Geffcken's model for the structure and origin of the book, if more in general approach than in verse-by-verse detail. Collins's main contributions to the discussion of book 3 are fourfold. First, he argues for locating the compilation/composition of *Sibylline Oracles* 3 within Egypt, and more speci cally has pointed toward the Judean expatriate community established by the exiled high priest Onias IV at Leontopolis in Egypt, over and against the majority of critics who tend to identify the large Judean community in Alexandria as the place of origin. Second, Collins identi es what he refers to as a Judean "core" or "main corpus" of *Sibylline Oracles* 3, more expansive than Geffcken's earliest stratum yet sensitive to the composite nature of oracle compendia in a manner that neither Nikiprowetzky nor Buitenwerf exhibits. Third, Collins aggressively argues for the unity of the passages mentioning a seventh king or reign, and takes these to be the primary data on which his core text ought to be dated. Fourth and nally, he regards mention of the "king from the sun" as part of the core of the book, and, moreover, as deriving from traditional Egyptian motifs related to kingship.

The rst of Collins's points listed above is in many ways the most innovative, as well as the most di cult to prove; it must be admitted, however, that the question of whether book 3 originated in Alexandria, Leontopolis, or some other place in Egypt is largely tangential to the present study.

---

54. This was already shown, in regard to a supposed Babylonian Sibyl, by Paul Schnabel, *Berrosus und die babylonisch-hellenistische Literatur* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1923), 69–93; cf. Nikiprowetzky, *Troisième Sibylle*, 11–16.

55. Geffcken, *Komposition und Entstehungszeit*, 5–17.

Nonetheless, Collins is certainly right that there is nothing in *Sibylline Oracles* 3 that points to Alexandria specifically as the locus of composition for the Judean strata of the book; rather, Alexandria is often taken by scholars as the default location for any Greek literary work likely produced by Judeans living in Hellenistic/Roman Egypt. Among the hints that Collins finds pointing to an origin among Onias's group at Leontopolis is the concern at multiple places in the book with temple worship, atypical of what we find in Alexandrian sources.[56] Further, by Collins's reading, the Judean strata of *OrSib* 3 expect a savior king from the Ptolemaic line (this will be pursued below), an idea that Collins finds most amenable to Onias's circle and its close allegiance to Ptolemy VI Philometor.[57] Collins also finds the "archaic" eschatology of *OrSib* 3 and the combination of motifs of king and temple uniquely appropriate to the Onias-led community at Leontopolis.[58] Against this, it must be said, is the fact that we know very little about the community at Leontopolis beyond its basic foundation story; Collins himself in later work steps back from a specific claim of origin at Leontopolis to a more general claim of origin among the supporters of Onias in Egypt. Both John Barclay and Erich Gruen have offered numerous objections, of varying weight, to the Leontopolis proposal.[59] This is not to say that Collins's early position is untenable; indeed, although it lacks concrete evidence, the proposal is highly intriguing and very little speaks against it. It seems most prudent to agree with the cautious assessment of Martin Goodman in his revision of the *Sibylline Oracles* section in Schürer's *History*: "Within Egypt, Leontopolis provides a milieu as plausible as Alexandria."[60]

Points two and three above constitute the positions of Collins that have had the greatest impact on contemporary scholarship. Collins identifies the core of *Sibylline Oracles* 3 as lines 97–349 and 489–829; he dates this core text to the mid-second century b.c.e.—after the arrival in Egypt of Onias, but likely before the temple at Leontopolis was built.[61] He has since been followed with minor variation by a number of scholars on the question of date.[62] The dating of the core of the book for Collins, as for numerous scholars before and after, rests primarily on the three mentions of a seventh reign or seventh king of Egypt.

---

56. Collins, *Sibylline Oracles*, 44–53.

57. Collins, *Sibylline Oracles*, 52–53.

58. Collins, *Sibylline Oracles*, 53.

59. John Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora from Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 33; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), 225 n. 81; Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism,* 283–84 n. 158.

60. Schürer, *History*, 3.1.638.

61. Collins, *Sibylline Oracles*, 28; cf. Collins, "The Development of the Sibylline Tradition," *ANRW* II.20.1 (1987): 421–59, esp. 430–35.

62. See, e.g., Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 219–25; Louis H. Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 294.

The methodology is quite straight forward. At each mention of a seventh king or reign, at 192–93, 314–18, and 608, the text indicates that it will coincide with the onset of eschatological disasters. As Goodman writes in his revision of Schürer, "It is hard to believe that such an assertion could be made after the last king who could be described in this way had died."[63] If one counts the number of Ptolemaic rulers of Egypt (for the seventh king is "counted from the Greeks," 𒀀𒀀𒀀𒀀𒀀𒀀𒀀𒀀𒀀𒀀 𒀀𒀀 𒀀𒀀𒀀𒀀𒀀𒀀, 609), one has several options for identifying the reign in question, depending on whether one starts with Alexander the Great as the first king, how one deals with brief co-regencies, etc. One is left with the possibilities of Ptolemy VI Philometor, Ptolemy VII Philopator (least likely, given the brevity of his reign), or Ptolemy VIII Euergetes (also called Physcon), pointing to a time period from about 180–139 b.c.e.[64]

The reference at 608 is potentially more explicit than the other two, as it mentions a successful attack by a king of Asia during the reign of the seventh king. Many scholars have taken this as a reference to the campaigns of Antiochus IV Epiphanes against Egypt in 170 and again in 168 b.c.e.; and, indeed, this fits well the time period advocated by Collins. However, Collins prefers to view this reference as less tied to historical events and points out that an invading king from Asia served as a literary and political trope in Egypt since at least the time of the Hyksos invasions.[65] It seems most likely that traditional Egyptian political rhetoric about invaders from Asia was evoked by the invasions—imminent, current, or recent—of Antiochus IV, and the passage likely originated around the 160s.

Erich Gruen has offered the most stringent criticisms of Collins's proposals, particularly regarding the date and existence of a "core" text.[66] Gruen's discussion of the Third Sibyl generally portrays a very minimalist view as to the degree it might be possible to identify any historical referents in *OrSib* 3. He diligently enumerates passages that appear to refer to events stretching from the third century b.c.e. down to the latter years of the first century b.c.e.[67] For Gruen, this gives the lie to any claim of being able to identify a "core" of *Sibylline Oracles* 3 originating in the mid-second century. He specifically attacks the claim that the mentions of a seventh reign or king should be used to date passages. His objections are strongest in regard to the first of the three mentions, at 193, where he, like others before him, questions the likelihood that Rome should appear as a villain for an author writing under Ptolemy VI or Ptolemy VIII. He writes, "No

63. Schürer, *History*, 3.1.635.
64. Collins, *Sibylline Oracles*, 30; Schürer, *History*, 3.1.635–36.
65. Collins, *Sibylline Oracles*, 39–40. So also Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism*, 275.
66. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism*, 268–91.
67. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism*, 271–73.

ex eventu forecast could have set the fall of Roman power to that period, a time when its might was increasing and its reach extending. Nor can one imagine the Sibyl (or her recorder) making such a pronouncement in the reigns of Philometor or Euergetes themselves when it is patently false."[68] Furthermore, he denies that any historicity can be located behind the other two mentions of a seventh king, as the contexts for both are deeply "apocalyptic."

It seems, however, that Gruen has seriously misconstrued the nature of *ex eventu* prediction, be it eschatological in a narrow sense or not. Gruen's first point seems to me obvious: there is no reason any reader should assume that the reference to the collapse of Rome in 175–95 is *ex eventu*, nor am I aware of any scholars who press such a claim. The passage recalls most especially the muddled historical picture preserved in the penultimate column of the Dynastic Prophecy. There, it surely cannot be surmised that the author purposed to hoodwink an audience into thinking that Alexander had been defeated at Gaugamela; rather, the prediction of the Persian Great King's victory is not part of the *ex eventu* section proper but a prediction appended to the end of the *ex eventu* historical review. So it is here. The passage does indeed present itself as *vaticinium ex eventu*, but mention of Rome's fall is clearly an attempt at authentic prediction tacked on to a recitation of past events formulated as predictions.[69] Gruen's second point, that the fall of Rome would have been plainly "patently false" to an author during the reigns of Ptolemy VI Philometor or Ptolemy VIII Euergetes, fails to convince. This is underscored by the fact that the references to a seventh king occur in book 3, as Gruen himself strains to emphasize, in thoroughly "apocalyptic" (by which he means eschatological) contexts. It is not at all clear to me what political events would occur to an author as "patently false" or impossible if that author is utterly convinced of the impending eschaton, the fall of all potentially oppressive human regimes, and the hand of God active in the world to preserve and raise up his chosen people. An author working with such a mindset might even go so far as to advocate belief in the "patently false" idea that an imminent resurrection of the dead to receive either everlasting life or punishment was just around the corner.

Gruen's further objection to linking the seventh king to an actual historical figure is certainly fair as far as it goes: Ptolemaic monarchs were not, as a rule, known by numeral in the ancient world (although there are exceptions).[70] However, I am inclined to agree with Collins that, in his

---

68. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism*, 273.

69. So Collins, "The Third Sibyl Revisited," in idem, *Jewish Cult and Hellenistic Culture: Essays on the Jewish Encounter with Hellenism and Roman Rule* (JSJSup 100; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 82–98; see especially 87–94.

70. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism*, 277. Note, however, that Demetrius the Chronog-

words, "counting up to seven was well within the intellectual capability of ancient Jews."[71] Gruen's claim that the number seven is used solely in mystical or metaphorical ways in Judean apocalypses simply lacks evidence, and has been more than adequately refuted by Collins.[72]

The most probable conclusion is that the three references to a seventh king stem from the same stratum of *OrSib* 3 and should be viewed as the product of a shared *Si   im Leben*, if not the product of a single hand. Against the protestations of Gruen, it likewise seems most probable to view these mentions as pseudo-encrypted references to a speci c Ptolemaic king; a date in the mid-second century b.c.e. seems probable. Furthermore, the material unquestionably connected to these passages points   rmly to a Judean author/redactor working somewhere in Egypt. Whether or not one calls this the "core" of *OrSib* 3 is immaterial. Collins is almost certainly correct in identifying a Judean stratum, with a strongly indicated Egyptian provenance, having taken shape around the time of Ptolemy VI Philometor (be it as extensive as all the verses he assigns to the core composition or not).

This is not to say that *Sibylline Oracles* 3 was *written* at this time; as argued in the introduction to the present chapter, the best model for viewing the formation of book 3 is that of any ancient oracle collection, a model of authoring, borrowing, accretion, editing, etc. As one might expect of any oracle collection, *Sibylline Oracles* 3 does not have a single provenance; not only do verses stem from a potentially wide range of differing times and places, but older lines may be reworked by later collectors and redactors for an intent and function completely foreign to their original context. Certain sections or layers, however, may contain enough distinguishing information to place them temporally, locally, and culturally with a fair degree of con dence. The stratum identi ed here, stemming from a Judean community in Egypt in the mid-second century b.c.e., contains the signi cant *ex eventu* passages of the work.

Ex Eventu *Prediction and the Eschatological King of Book 3*

In truth, since the implied authorship of *OrSib* 3 is in the furthest recesses of human history—or at least, as book 3 tells us explicitly, after the   ood and prior to Homer—any and all references to actual historical people and events in the book are after the fact. However, as already sur-

---

rapher, in a fragment quoted in Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 1.141, makes reference to "Ptolemy the fourth."

71. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 86 n. 105.

72. See especially Collins, "Third Sibyl Revisited," 88–90.

veyed, the Third Sibyl's interest in presenting a progression of historical events, such as we have seen in the texts investigated in earlier chapters, is limited. We find a clear interest in the succession of kingdoms in 156–61, and again, in slightly less schematic form, in 162–95. Both lists emphasize the role of Egypt. Furthermore, as argued in the previous section, the mention of the seventh reign and king in 192–93 should be associated with either Ptolemy VI Philometor or Ptolemy VIII Euergetes. The move from recitation of past events to eschatological prediction takes place at line 191. It should be noted that the downfall of Rome is not tied explicitly to the actions of the Egyptian king of the seventh reign; rather, Rome's evil acts will merely take place until that time. The passage also predicts a turn in fortune for Judeans but does not attribute it to any specific mechanism or action: "And then the Great God's people will be strong again, / who will be guides in life for all mortal men" (⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏ ⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏ ⸏⸏⸏ ⸏⸏⸏ ⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏ ⸏⸏⸏, / ⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏ ⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏, 194–95).

What we have elsewhere in book 3 is not quite so analogous to the other texts discussed in this study. However, as argued above, it is most reasonable to assign the other mentions of the seventh (Greek) king of Egypt to the same stratum of literary formation; it is most probable that all three passages have the same figure in mind. Similarly, the later two mentions of the seventh king likewise place him in an eschatological context; it is clear that the Third Sibyl is presenting a view of history wherein the rise and fall of empires and kings, the waging of wars and the shifting of fortunes, are all foreordained and therefore reportable by a seer far ahead of time. The reign of the seventh king is highlighted as the definitive turning point in this historical process. As in the case of the first mention, neither the mention in 314–18 nor in 608 is terribly explicit about what the seventh king will do. The middle reference is perhaps the least clear; lines 314–18 read:

> ⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏ ⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏, ⸏ ⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏, ⸏⸏⸏⸏ ⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏,
> ⸏⸏⸏⸏ ⸏⸏ ⸏⸏⸏⸏ ⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏ ⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏ ⸏⸏⸏
> ⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏ ⸏⸏⸏ ⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏ ⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏ ⸏⸏⸏⸏,
> ⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏ ⸏⸏ ⸏⸏ ⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏ ⸏⸏ ⸏⸏⸏
> ⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏ ⸏⸏⸏⸏ ⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏, ⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏⸏ ⸏⸏⸏⸏.

A great blow will come upon you, Egypt, upon your homes,
a terrible one that you never expected to come to you.
For a sword will pass through your midst;
scattering and death and famine will reach out for you
in the seventh generation of kings, and then you will rest.

The oracle is situated amid a lengthy section of woes; the mention of the seventh *generation* of kings is somewhat odd. Yet, the circumlocution avoiding specifying the seventh king personally could simply have been

chosen for the sake of variety, or for metrical reasons. However, it is worth noting that the passage is really interested only in naming the time for eschatological travails.[73] What is perhaps most intriguing is that the very end of the oracle intimates that, at least in Egypt, the disasters of the end time will cease in the very same generation during which they began.

The mention of the seventh king in 608 is likewise meant as a temporal marker: speci cally, it is during the time of the seventh king that men will cast away the idols they had made (606); presumably this is to signify a turning to the god of the Judeans. Earlier in this oracle, the occurrence of eschatological woes is tied directly to the failure of people to "honor piously the immortal begetter of all men" (604–5). The king from Asia is introduced immediately following this mention of the seventh king of Egypt. As argued, his appearance should simply be taken as yet another eschatological woe, drawing on Egyptian tradition while likely casting an eye toward the uneasy relations between Ptolemaic Egypt and Seleucid Syria.[74]

Unlike most of the texts examined in earlier chapters, the precise historical situation that prompted the author(s) of this stratum of *Sibylline Oracles* 3 to look for the eschaton on the immediate horizon, sometime around the mid-second century, is largely unclear. Scholars cannot even agree as to what the attitude of Judeans in Egypt during this period would be toward the Ptolemaic leadership. Collins argues that it would be on the whole positive in the time of Ptolemy VI, accounting for the predictions that the world will undergo a fundamental change at the time of the seventh Ptolemaic king. Barclay, along with Arnaldo Momigliano, read precisely the opposite attitude in the texts. According to Barclay, the passages that speak of a seventh Ptolemy are not at all favorable to Egypt, as the text is likely infused with a "revival of Jewish nationalist sentiment in the wake of the Maccabean revolt."[75] However, the fact that *OrSib* 3 promotes the general "greatness" of the Judean people is scarcely evidence that the sibyllist is sympathetic to the Maccabean movement. Moreover, the stratum of book 3 here isolated, while indeed predicting destruction for the oppressors of Judeans, nowhere identi es Egypt's rulers as particularly wicked. Rather, we have seen repeated mentions of Egypt that would imply an exalted status among contemporary world powers; and, while the mentions of the seventh king might be regarded as neutral chronologi-

---

73. Barclay lays stress on the point that the three mentions of a seventh king or reign serve only to mark time in *OrSib* 3; see *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora,* 222–23.

74. Aurelio Perreti attempts to relate this and other passages in *OrSib* 3 to the Oracle of Hystaspes and sees in the king from Asia a messianic gure; see Peretti, *La Sibilla Babilonese nella propaganda ellenistica* (Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1943), 392. This interpretation is quite unlikely; see Collins, *Sibylline Oracles*, 39–40 for a critique.

75. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 223. Cf. Arnoldo Momigliano, "La portata storica dei vaticini sul settimo re nel terzo libro degli Oracoli Sibillini" (*Sesto Contributo Alla Storia degli Studi Classici e del Mondo Antico* [Rome: Storia e Letteratura, 1980], 2.551–59).

cal markers, grounds are lacking for regarding the passages as negative in any way. On the whole, Barclay's position fails to convince; Collins's arguments for a positive relationship between Egyptian Judean communities and Ptolemy VI are far more consonant with the depictions of Egypt in the text.[76] Additionally, this positive attitude toward Egypt's Ptolemaic rulers is supported by the last mention of an Egyptian king in book 3.

In addition to the three places where our sibyllist makes mention of a seventh king, there is also the mention of the "king from the sun" at 652. Lines 652–56 run as follows:

> 𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀 𐤀𐤀𐤀 𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀 𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀,
> 𐤀𐤀 𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀 𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀 𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀 𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀
> 𐤀𐤀𐤀 𐤀𐤀𐤀 𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀, 𐤀𐤀𐤀 𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀 𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀 𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀.
> 𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀 𐤀𐤀 𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀 𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀 𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀 𐤀𐤀𐤀 𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀 𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀,
> 𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀 𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀 𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀 𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀 𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀 𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀.

And then God will send a king from the sun[77]
who will stop all the earth from wicked war,
there and then killing some, but imposing oaths of faithfulness on others.
He will not do all of these things by his personal counsels,
but trusting in the Great God's good teachings.

Here we have something unique in book 3: in contrast to the three mentions of a seventh king earlier in the text, this king is explicitly an agent of God, schooled in his teachings, who will cause war to disappear from the earth, ushering in an idyllic age. The comparison to Judean messianic ideologies presents itself. But is this a reference to a Judean messianic figure?

This seems unlikely; at least, the figure is not a messiah as the term is most often understood. There is no indication here that the king from the sun is to be understood as a Davidide restoring the monarchy in Jerusalem. Numerous scholars disagree, and would apply the term "messiah" to this figure, as well as to others in book 3.[78] John Nolland has gone so far as to identify *Sibylline Oracles* 3.265–94 as a "messianic oracle."[79] This is the passage that mentions the positive intercession of the kings of Persia following the Babylonian exile. As argued above, the referent of this oracle must surely be taken as Cyrus and his successors, who allowed for

---

76. See Collins, *Sibylline Oracles*, 43–44, and the literature cited there.

77. On the literal translation "from the sun" as opposed to the looser "from the east" (as advocated, e.g., by Buitenwerf) see Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 93; idem, " Third Sibyl Revisited," 95.

78. See, e.g., Nikiprowetzky, *Troisième Sibylle*, 134–36; Momigliano, "La portata storica"; Peretti, *La Sibilla Babilonese*, 652.

79. John Nolland, "Sib Or III:265–94: An Early Maccabean Messianic Oracle," *JTS* 30 (1979): 158–66.

the repatriation of the Judean exiles and sponsored the rebuilding of the Jerusalem temple. Nolland's metaphorical reading of the gure is near the mark, but ultimately misconstrues the inclusion of these lines in this stratum of the Third Sibyl: the mention of the Persian king is not to be understood metaphorically but typologically. Just as Cyrus, according to Deutero-Isaiah, was anointed by God to perform acts on behalf of the people of Judah, so too will the king of Egypt at the eschaton be ordained.[80] This brings us to the gure of the king from the sun. There is nothing in the text to imply that the king from the sun would be a Judean king, a restorer of David's line. Rather, it is almost certainly a non-Judean king who, like Cyrus, will be used as a positive instrument of Yahweh. All the evidence of the text points to this being an Egyptian king.

Collins has labored diligently in demonstrating that the title "king from the sun" constitutes a native Egyptian concept applied to a hoped-for king of the future.[81] In particular, the title is used in the late Egyptian text known as the *Potter's Oracle* (on which, see the Excursus below). The objection that in the *Potter's Oracle* the king from the sun is to be identi ed as a native Egyptian over and against a Ptolemy does not impact the argument that this title in *OrSib* 3 draws on Egyptian tradition. More pressing is the question of the relationship between this gure and the seventh king.

It must be admitted that there is nothing explicitly connecting the seventh king and the king from the sun in the text. Where a seventh king or seventh reign is mentioned, we have only a temporal marker, specifying the time in which the audience should expect eschatological travails. However, it is worth noting that the mention of the seventh king at 314–18 implies not only that the travails will begin during his reign but also that they will stop during the same reign (or, more literally, during the seventh king's generation). This lends some support to the position, championed most notably by Collins, that the sibyllist intended the same gure when referring to a seventh king or a king from the sun.[82] Both signify the ruling monarch of Egypt at the time eschatological war and misfortune cease from the land. On balance, it is most probably correct to view the sibyllist as indicating a single gure by the two different designations: the rise and fall of human kingdoms will culminate in the reign of the seventh Ptolemaic ruler of Egypt, the king from the sun, during whose tenure eschatological travails will lay low the peoples of the earth but ultimately resolve themselves in a period of everlasting peace.

---

80. Similarly, Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 91–92.

81. Against, e.g., claims that the term is derivative of Deutero-Isaiah. See Collins, *Sibylline Oracles*, 40–43; idem, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 92–95.

82. For Collins's arguments on the identity of the gures, see, e.g., "The Sibyl and the Potter: Political Propaganda in Ptolemaic Egypt," in idem, *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism* (JSJSup 54; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 199–210.

Excursus: *Ex Eventu* Prediction
in Late Egyptian Literature

Since one of the major tasks of the present investigation is the assessment of claims that Judean *ex eventu* literature is dependent on Babylonian prototypes, it is only reasonable to consider if Egyptian literature might have exerted some influence, particularly in the case of literature that most likely emerged out of the Judean diaspora communities in Egypt.[83] Mention has already been made of the *Potter's Oracle* in regard to the figure designated the "king from the sun" in *Sibylline Oracles* 3. This, along with late Egyptian texts such as the *Demotic Chronicle* and the *Lamb of Bocchoris*, indeed illustrates that Egypt possessed a native literary-mantic tradition that employed *vaticinia ex eventu* and similar historical/mantic literary constructions in a manner analogous to those texts we have investigated from Mesopotamia and Judea.[84]

The *Potter's Oracle* is a text originally composed in Demotic but which survives only in Greek translation. [85] The work is known from five fragmentary papyri preserving two distinct recensions of the text, dating from the second and third centuries c.e.[86] Although our copies are quite a bit later, there is good evidence to place the composition of the work sometime between 130 and 119 b.c.e.[87] While we need not dive headlong into papyrological quandaries of original readings, it is worth noting that the presence of multiple recensions indicates a process of reuse and adapta-

---

83. The suggestion that Egyptian literature influenced Judean prophetic and apocalyptic texts is hardly new. The influence of texts from Egypt on the prophetic books of the Hebrew Bible, and a connection between, especially, late Egyptian works (such as the Demotic Chronicle) and the book of Daniel was argued already in the mid-1920s by C. C. McCown. See his classic treatment, "Hebrew and Egyptian Apocalyptic Literature," *HTR* 18 (1925): 357–411. It is unquestioned that various aspects of Egyptian culture strongly influenced ancient Israel and Judah; note, e.g., the portrayal of Yahweh as a winged sun disk as found in several psalms as well as in the book of Malachi (see especially Joel LeMon, *Yahweh's Winged Form in the Psalms: Exploring Congruent Iconography and Texts* [OBO 242; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010]).

84. See, e.g., the recent collection of essays edited by A. Blasius and B. U. Schipper, *Apokalyptik und Ägypten: Ein kritische Analyse der relevanten Texte aus dem griechisch-römischen Ägypten* (OLA 107; Leuven: Peeters, 2002), in particular the three introductory essays written by the editors.

85. For an edition of the Greek text, see Ludwig Koenen, "Die Prophezeiungen des 'Töpfers,'" *ZPE* 2 (1968): 178–209. Citations of the text correspond to Koenen's edition and sigla for the papyri. On the probability of a Demotic original, see Alan B. Lloyd, "Nationalist Propaganda in Ptolemaic Egypt," *Historia* 31 (1982): 33–55, esp. 50.

86. For a detailed analysis of the different recensions, see Ludwig Koenen, "Die Apologie des Töpfers an König Amenhopis oder das Töpferorakel," in Blasius and Schipper, eds., *Apokalyptik und Ägypten*, 139–87.

87. Ludwig Koenen, "A Supplementary Note on the Date of the Oracle of the Potter," *ZPE* 54 (1984): 9–13.

tion of the *Potter's Oracle.* Indeed, there is even ample evidence of interpolation and expansion predating the differentiation of the two recensions preserved in the manuscripts; as Ludwig Koenen writes, this work could well be described as an "ever changing oracle."[88]

The oracle presents itself as the words of a potter, who is to be understood as an incarnation of the creator god Khnum, given to the king Amenophis at Heliopolis. The prophecy itself mentions the coming of an evil new king to Egypt and the creation of a new city; these correspond to Alexander and Alexandria.[89] The Greek inhabitants are called "belt-wearers" and are said to belong to the chaos deity Typhon-Seth. A slew of disasters then befall Egypt, including an invasion from Syria (P_2 I.16), another example of the Egyptian tradition of an invasion from Asia as already encountered in *OrSib* 3. Finally, the protective *daimon* of Alexandria leaves, and the inhabitants destroy themselves amid the myriad catastrophes afflicting the land. At this time, a new king will appear and rule for fifty-five years with the help of Isis, inaugurating a paradisiacal age of peace and prosperity. It is noteworthy that this ruler is said to come ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙ ⲡⲣⲏ, "from the sun" (P_3 III.65). The king is the son of Re; the role of the legitimate king, as son of Re, is to preserve the proper order of world and society and banish the forces of chaos.[90] In the *Potter's Oracle*, this traditional understanding of Egyptian kingship is cast into a text hoping for the removal of Egypt's Ptolemaic rulers in favor of a native Egyptian dynast.[91]

While there are clear points of resonance between the *Potter's Oracle* and *Sibylline Oracles* 3, there are important differences. The *Potter's Oracle* nowhere exhibits an interest in the succession of kings or empires; rather, it is very much a statement on the role of kingship in Egypt, an indictment of Greek rule, and a projection of an ideal world into an indeterminate future.[92] The work does not contain an *ex eventu* prediction of the type we have investigated.[93] The similarities are nonetheless striking: the text blends historiographic tradition with a mantic literary framework and

---

88. Koenen, "Supplementary Note," 13.

89. See Koenen, "Prophezeiungen des 'Töpfers,'" 187.

90. See Koenen, "The Prophecies of a Potter: A Prophecy of World Renewal Becomes an Apocalypse," in *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of Papyrology* (ed. D. H. Samuel; American Studies in Papyrology 7; Toronto: A. M. Hakkert, 1970), 249–54.

91. Koenen argues that the earlier recension was likely composed in the context of the rebellion of Harsiesis; see "Supplementary Note," 11–12; "Prophezeiungen des 'Töpfers,'" 188.

92. See further Koenen, "Die Adaptation ägyptischer Königsideologie am Ptolemäerhof," in *Egypt and the Hellenistic World* (ed. E. Van 't Dack et al.; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1983), 143–90.

93. Cf. F. Dunand, "L'Oracle du Potier et la formation de l'apocalyptique en Egypte," in *L'Apocalyptique* (ed. F. Raphael et al.; Paris: Guenther, 1977), 39–68; esp. 47–48.

looks toward a beati c future conditioned on the fall of foreign rule and
the coming of a native dynast who will reign with the blessings and sup-
port of the gods. Like *OrSib* 3, the *Potter's Oracle* is similar to the Akka-
dian *ex eventu* texts in displaying a clear concern for kings and kingship,
over and against the Hebrew and Aramaic *ex eventu* texts likely authored
within the land of Israel.

   The Lamb of Bocchoris presents us with a similar case; indeed, at some
point in the manuscript tradition of the *Potter's Oracle*, a quotation from
the *Lamb of Bocchoris* found its way into that text.[94] The composition sur-
vives in a single Demotic papyrus; it presents, as its name might imply, the
prophecy of a lamb delivered to the Pharaoh Bocchoris.[95] This tradition, if
not this very text, was known to Manetho in the second century b.c.e.[96] The
text of the prophecy, however, is far more poorly preserved than the *Pot-
ter's Oracle*. Egypt is a icted by a time of great misfortune, and column II
of the text seems to imply that this corresponds to a period in which there
is no king in Egypt.[97] The text makes explicit reference to tribulation under
the Persians (called Medes).[98] A native king is mentioned, who appears to
be set up by the text as legitimate in distinction to other rulers and who
will reign for the same fty- ve years we nd in the *Potter's Oracle* (II.5).
It seems possible that the *Lamb of Bocchoris* contains encrypted references
to actual rulers of Egypt, signi ed by length of reign, and thus would
correspond more closely to the *ex eventu* texts surveyed earlier. However,
the text is both too generalizing and too poorly preserved to afford such
readings rm foundation.

   A more interesting text for our purposes is the so-called *Demotic
Chronicle*.[99] The text is not really a chronicle at all but a series of interpreta-
tions of older oracles. In this regard, the text is especially reminiscent of
the Qumran pesharim. The text, insofar as it is preserved, contains oracu-

---

94. Koenen argues persuasively that the insertion of the oracle in question took place
well after the composition of the surviving recensions ca. 130–119 b.c.e. (Koenen, "Supple-
mentary Note," 11–13).

95. For the text, with German translation, see the edition of Karl-Theodor Zauzitch, in
*Festschrift zum 100–jährigen Bestehen der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbiblio-
thek: Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer (P. Rainer Cent.)* (Vienna: Verlag Hollinek, 1983). A German
translation also appears in Heinz Josef Thissen, "Das Lamm des Bokchoris," in Blasius and
Schipper, eds., *Apokalyptik und Ägypten*, 113–38.

96. For the appearance of the tradition in Manetho and elsewhere, see Thissen, "Das
Lamm des Bokchoris," 137. See also the discussion in ibid, 119–20.

97. So Koenen, "Supplementary Note," 10.

98. See Thissen, "Lamm des Bokchoris," 120–23.

99. For text and German translation, see Wilhelm Spiegelberg, *Die sogenannte Demo-
tische Chronik des Pap. 215 der Bibliothèque Nationale zu Paris* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich'sche, 1914).
See also the recent translation and discussion in Heinz Felber, "Die Demotische Chronik," in
Blasius and Schipper, eds., *Apokalyptik und Ägypten*, 65–111.

lar statements that are interpreted according to political events in Egypt following 404 b.c.e.[100] In the words of Janet Johnson,

> But the purpose of the Demotic Chronicle was neither the presentation of the oracles nor the discussion of Egyptian history under the last independent native rulers. The main purpose was to predict the coming of another native Egyptian ruler, from Herakleopolis, who would save Egypt from the foreigners, in this case the Ptolemies, as is clearly indicated in II, 24–III, 1.[101]

More clearly than either the *Potter's Oracle* or the *Lamb of Bocchoris*, the *Demotic Chronicle* is interested in wedding events of Egypt's recent past to received mantic traditions in the form of oracles that are given new, contemporizing interpretations.

Johnson has sought to emphasize that the text is not nearly as anti-Greek as many have assumed (although it is quite clearly anti-Persian); rather, it is interested in expressing a cogent account of right and proper kingship through the person of the king to come from Herakleopolis.[102] This is a theme we have already seen in the later *Potter's Oracle*; however, I would be wary of separating in any way the notion of advocating a proper model for kingship and the desire to replace the Ptolemies with a native dynast.[103] The constellation of the themes of kingship, foreign rulers, historiographic traditions, and mantic traditions links these Egyptian works to the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts in terms of ideology and the development of predictive literature as conditioned by political circumstance.

The focus on the restoration of a native Egyptian dynast continued beyond the texts mentioned. Nectanebo, the last Egyptian pharaoh, becomes an important gure in late Egyptian traditions, such as in the text known as *Nectanebo's Dream*, as well as in the *Alexander Romance*.[104] This

---

100. See Janet Johnson, "The Demotic Chronicle as an Historical Source," *Enchoria* 4 (1974): 1–17. The year 404 b.c.e. was the year in which Darius II died, restoring (for a time) Egyptian autonomy; the years 404–343 correspond to what Manetho numbers dynasties 28–30. In 343, Egypt again fell under Persian dominion.

101. Johnson, " Demotic Chronicle," 5. Cf. the classic study by Eduard Meyer, "Eine eschatologische Prophetie über die Geschichte Ägyptens in persischer und griechischer Zeit," in idem, *Kleine Schriften von Eduard Meyer* (Halle: Max Niemeyer 1924), 69–91; and Lloyd, "Nationalist Propaganda," 41–45.

102. Janet Johnson, "Is the Demotic Chronicle an Anti-Greek Tract?" in *Grammata Demotika: Festschrift für Erich Lüddeckens zum 15. Juni 1983* (ed. H.-J. Thissen and K.-T. Zauzich; Würzburg: Zauzich Verlag, 1984), 107–24; eadem, "The Demotic Chronicle as a Statement of a Theory of Kingship," *JSSEA* 13 (1983): 61–72.

103. For a detailed investigation of the literary techniques employed in the text to advocate these dual themes, see Janet Johnson and Robert K. Ritner, "Multiple Meaning and Ambiguity in the 'Demotic Chronicle,'" in *Studies in Egyptology Presented to Miriam Lichtheim*, vol. 1 (ed. Sarah Israelit-Groll; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1990), 1.494–506.

104. On *Nectanebo's Dream*, see the recent studies in Blasius and Schipper, eds., *Apo-*

focus is echoed strongly in the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts, as well as *OrSib* 3, but is noticeably absent from the Judean texts surveyed in Chapters 4 and 5. This tradition in Egypt can hardly be considered an outgrowth of exposure to texts such as the Akkadian *ex eventu* compositions. A clarion resonance between these late Egyptian works and far earlier Egyptian texts, such as the *Admonitions of Ipuwer* and the *Prophecy of Neferti*, sounds clear and loud.[105] These texts serve once more as an example of the outgrowth of compositions such as Daniel from a merging of native historiographic and mantic literary traditions under heightened conditions of social and political unrest caused primarily by suzerainty or subjugation to a non-native power. Book 3 of the *Sibylline Oracles* presents the case of a Judean work that exhibits a threefold version of this in uence, drawing on Judean literary works, Greek oracular verse, and Egyptian traditions of a coming native dynast whose reign will inaugurate a period of restoration and perfection.

Oracula Sibyllina Books 1–2

Books 1–2 of the *Sibylline Oracles* have received relatively little scholarly attention compared to book 3; however, they are the subject of recent, thorough commentaries by J. L. Lightfoot and Olaf Waßmuth.[106] Books 1 and 2 are not independent compositions but together comprise a single *logos*, as is indicated in the manuscripts.[107] Further, it has been the consensus since the time of Geffcken that this *logos* is comprised of two main blocks of material: one, an earlier Judean stratum, and the second, a later sizable Christian addition.[108] The possibility that the entire composition is of Christian origin cannot, however, be ruled out.[109] Most recently,

kalyptic und Ägypten: Jörg-Dieter Gauger, "Der 'Traum des Nektanebos'—die griechische Fassung," 189–220; and Kim Ryholt, "Nectanebo's Dream or the Prophecy of Petesis," 221–42. On the Nectanebo traditions in the *Alexander Romance*, see Lloyd, "Nationalist Propaganda," 46–50.

105. See, e.g., Jan Assman, "Königsdogma und Heilserwartung. Politische und kultische Chaosbeschreibungen in ägyptischen Texten," in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (ed. David Hellholm; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1983), 345–77; McCown, "Hebrew and Egyptian Apocalyptic Literature."

106. J. L. Lightfoot, *Sibylline Oracles*. For the Greek text of books 1–2, I follow the re-edition of the text in Lightfoot. I regret that the work by Olaf Waßmuth (a revised version of his doctoral dissertation at Bern) came to my attention too late to be incorporated into this study; see now Olaf Waßmuth, *Sibyllinische Orakel 1–2: Studien und Kommentar* (Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 76; Leiden: Brill: 2011).

107. See Geffcken, *Komposition und Entstehungszeit*, 47.

108. Geffcken, *Komposition und Entstehung*, 47–48. Cf. Alfons Kurfeß, "Oracula Sibyllina I/II," *ZNW* 40 (1941): 151–65; Collins, "Development of the Sibylline Tradition," 441–44.

109. See, e.g., Goodman in Schürer, *History*, 3.1.645.

Lightfoot has championed viewing the entirety of books 1–2 as a Christian work, a thoroughgoing composition that she attributes to a Christian author of the second century c.e.[110]

Lightfoot, however, is in fact considerably more nuanced regarding the composition of *OrSib* 1–2 than this bald statement of her fundamental conclusions might seem to indicate. As she writes, "The person who put this oracle together has drawn on material of widely differing character."[111] In particular, Lightfoot sees the direct use of both the *Apocalypse of Peter* and *1 Enoch* by the compiler of *OrSib* 1–2, along with important intertextual relationships with *OrSib* 3. Before we can begin to assess such claims, we must first turn to the structure of the books.

The overriding structural feature of books 1–2 is a recitation of history beginning in 1.1–1.86 with a recapitulation of the creation of birds, beasts, and humankind; the period is referred to as "articulate humanity's first generation" (⬛⬛⬛ ⬛⬛⬛ ⬛⬛⬛⬛⬛ ⬛⬛⬛⬛⬛ ⬛⬛⬛⬛⬛⬛, 1.1). The passage follows closely on the Eden narrative in Genesis 2–3, extending up to the spread of humanity across the earth and the proliferation of cities. In line 86, the Sibyl introduces the second race, or generation, derived of the most just survivors of the first. Of greatest interest in this generation is the notice that then it was that the Watchers were bound in Tarturus (1.98–101), which recalls the narrative from the Book of the Watchers in *1 Enoch*. A third race is introduced in 1.105, of which little is mentioned beyond their arrogance; lines 109–11 then introduce the fourth race, comprised of impious men whom God consigned to the underworld. Following them, a fifth race, "much worse" (⬛⬛⬛⬛ ⬛⬛⬛⬛ ⬛⬛⬛⬛⬛⬛⬛⬛), is introduced in 1.120. The text then pauses from its theme of successive generations to give a lengthy account of Noah, the lone righteous man of the fifth generation, and the flood story, comprising 1.125–82.[112]

At the conclusion of the Noah interlude, the Sibyl returns to her sequence of generations of world history: lines 283–84 state that a new, sixth generation then appeared following the flood. Moreover, this generation is described as "golden," which hearkens to Hesiod's four ages of humanity, each likened to a metal, in *Works and Days* 109–201. It is clear that the sibyllist intends for the generation following the flood to be a new, perfect generation, likening it to the first after which the reader saw the continuous diminution of humanity: this sixth generation is meant to recall Hesiod's first, most perfect, Golden Age of humanity. The next, sev-

---

110. Lightfoot, *Sibylline Oracles*, 149–50.

111. Lightfoot, *Sibylline Oracles*, 149.

112. It has long been noted that the traditions here are not solely derived from (LXX) Genesis, but seem to include elements that otherwise only appear in the Babylonian version of the flood narrative. Rzach has suggested that the sibyllist may have had access to the writings of Berossus. See Rzach, "Sibyllinische Orakel," cols. 2146–48.

enth generation is described in 1.307–23, and it is said to be the generation of the Titans, during which the Tower of Babel episode occurs. The mention of the Titans is odd, as it corresponds neither to the major appearance of the giants (e.g., *rephaim*, *nephilim*) in Genesis 6 *prior* to the flood, nor to the Silver Age in Hesiod, which is the first age of mortals to live under the reign of Zeus and not Kronos, thus pointing away from the Titans. However, the inclusion of the Tower of Babel episode, the paradigmatic act of human hubris and disrespect toward the divine in Second Temple literature, might possibly be intended as a nod to Hesiod's claim that the people of the Silver Age refused to serve the gods by offering sacrifice.

At this point it should be obvious that the structure of books 1–2 of the *Sibylline Oracles* differs substantially from book 3. The first 120 lines of book 1 exhibit a unified progression of thought found nowhere in book 3 over anything near a comparable number of verses. The collection of oracles of much shorter length that read as intelligible, coherent oracles absent their context as part of book 3 is completely at odds with the lengthy narrative we have surveyed so far in book 1. Along similar lines, book 1 makes far more extensive and concrete use of biblical material than one finds in book 3. However, after the extensive treatment of the flood story and the brief notice of generations six and seven at 1.323, book 1 abruptly changes direction, departing from the scheme of successive generations it had been following.

While little if anything in the first 323 lines of book 1 suggests itself as stemming from early Christian circles, the Sibyl at line 324 takes a radical Christological turn and announces: "Then the Great God's Son will come to humankind / clothed in flesh as a mortal on earth" (□□ □□□□ □□□□□□-□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□ / □□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□ □□). Book 1 then continues until its end at line 400 to ruminate on the incarnation and life of Christ, including a vicious attack on Judeans for not following Jesus (360–371),[113] and on the ultimate dispersion of Judeans following the destruction of the Jerusalem temple (393–400). There can be no entertaining the notion that non-Christian Judean circles lie behind the composition of this section of the oracle.

As book 2 opens, the reader is again jarred by discontinuity in the text. Whereas the recitation of successive generations had trailed off after the mention of the seventh and turned to a full-blown tale of the career of Jesus, 2.15 announces the tenth generation of humanity. There has been no mention in any of the intervening material of generations eight or nine. The tenth generation is a time of earthquakes (2.6), free men bound as slaves (2.11), and blood raining from the sky (2.20), among a bevy of other eschatological unpleasantnesses; in short, the natural and social orders are

---

113. Contrast the positive appraisal of the "Hebrews" at the time of the eschaton at 2.155–76.

thrown into complete disarray and begin to self-destruct. However, God then is predicted to intervene, "a savior of pious men in every way" (▨▨▨▨ ▨▨▨▨▨ ▨▨▨▨ ▨▨▨ ▨▨▨▨▨▨▨ ▨ / ▨▨▨▨▨ ▨▨▨▨▨▨ ▨▨ ▨▨▨ ▨▨▨ ▨▨▨▨ ▨▨▨▨▨. 2.27–28). It is interesting to note that in this passage, 2.27–33, there is no mention of the return of Christ to earth, nor is there any eschatological agent other than God alone.

This passage marks the end of the lengthy, ten-generation histori- cal review in *OrSib* 1–2. Following immediately is a Christian passage on the contest to gain entry into heaven (2.34–55). After this, a lengthy excerpt from the *Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides* has been inserted into the text, including several extraneous verses not otherwise found as part of that work (2.56–148).[114] In general, these verses offer advice on ethics and behavior typical of Near Eastern wisdom traditions. Lines 149–53 then resume the previous section, providing the ending to the contest dis- cussed in 2.34–55.

The remainder of book 2 focuses on the eschaton, from a list of signs of the end (2.154–73; 2.187–95), through the destruction of the earth by fire (2.196–213), judgment and resurrection (2.214–82), and the rewards and punishments awaiting humanity at the end time (2.283–338). As is the case with book 3, book 2 closes with a brief statement by the Sibyl in the first person, here reflecting on what will await her at the eschaton (2.339–47).

Given the above outline of contents, the reader can certainly guess at the division between Judean and Christian strata advocated by Geff- cken and numerous scholars since: the Judean stratum consists of places in the text where the ten-generation scheme of history is preserved intact, comprising roughly 1.1–1.323 and 2.1–2.34. The meditation on the career of Jesus in book 1 and the bulk of the eschatological material in book 2, beginning with the contest for entry to heaven, represent a later Chris- tian overlay. The insertion of the material from *Pseudo-Phocylides* is clearly extraneous; the point in the development of books 1–2 at which it was inserted is unclear.

Lightfoot has offered a significantly different reconstruction. By her reading of the text, the whole was compiled/authored by a Chris- tian of the second century c.e., quite possibly including the insertion of the *Pseudo-Phocylides* material as part of the original composition.[115] In the outline of history as a sequence of ten generations, she sees direct

---

114. The material from *Pseudo-Phocylides* is not present in all manuscripts. On *Pseudo-Phocylides* itself, see Pieter W. van der Horst, *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides with Introduction and Commentary* (SVTP 4; Brill: Leiden, 1978); Walter T. Wilson, *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides* (CEJL; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005).

115. Lightfoot, *Sibylline Oracles*, 149. She concedes that such a position raises its own set of problems, since the *Pseudo-Phocylides* material is present in the ▨ manuscript family and not others.

dependence on the Apocalypse of Weeks in *1 Enoch*; in the ery eschatology of book 2.196 and following she sees direct dependence on the Christian *Apocalypse of Peter*, reviving a position championed by M. R. James.[116] Lightfoot's case is indeed strong for the correspondence of certain aspects of the clearly Christian sections of book 2 with the eschatological scenario depicted in *Apocalypse of Peter*. Lightfoot is fairly dismissive of earlier commentators, such as Rzach, who prefer to see here mutual dependence on traditional material.[117] While the correspondences between the two texts are notable, it does not seem to me quite so conclusive that there is direct literary dependence of the Sibyl on the *Apocalypse of Peter* as Lightfoot would have it. In any event, the argument is concerned more with details in the development of eschatological ideas than with the *ex eventu* portion of books 1–2.

The question of dependence of *Sibylline Oracles* 1–2 on sections of *1 Enoch* is a more complicated matter. The division of history into ten periods is not so limited as Lightfoot would appear to have it. The same division is apparent in book 4, as we shall see below; it may also be implicit in book 3.156–61. Further, Servius's commentary on Virgil's Fourth Eclogue attributes to the Cumaean Sibyl a tradition that divided world history into ten segments.[118] We have already seen that this division of history into ten periods is common in Second Temple period compositions from Qumran, appearing in 4Q180–181, 4Q387, 4Q390, and 11QMelchizedek. A partition of history into ten discrete units by itself does not point speci cally to the Apocalypse of Weeks.[119]

Lightfoot's claim that Jesus's appearance in book 1 after the seventh generation might correspond to the seventh week in the Apocalypse of Weeks is slightly more compelling. However, this, too, in the end fails to convince one of a supposed dependence of the Sibyl on *1 Enoch*. In book 2 we nd the tenth generation one in which the world is still very much in disarray; the eschatological disasters and their resolution by the hand of God take place in the space of a single generation. In the Apocalypse of Weeks, it is in the seventh week that God bestows wisdom upon his elect, and in the eighth week that a "sword" will be given to God's people so that they can overthrow the wicked and rebuild the temple. In the ninth week, God's righteousness is revealed to all humanity, and in the tenth week the

---

116. See Lightfoot, *Sibylline Oracles*, 131–40; M. R. James, "A New Text of the Apocalypse of Peter," *JTS* 11 (1910): 36–54; idem, "A New Text of the Apocalypse of Peter II," *JTS* 12 (1911): 362–83; idem, "A New Text of the Apocalypse of Peter III," *JTS* 12 (1911): 573–83.

117. Rzach, "Sibyllinische Orakel," col. 2151.

118. See Flusser, "Four Empires," 163.

119. A division of history into ten periods may possibly be found in *4 Ezra* 14:11–12, as attested in the Ethiopic version. However, the passage as a whole is something of a text-critical quagmire, with differing versions containing different gures, or omitting the verses entirely. See Michael Stone, *Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 414.

nal judgment occurs, and the heavens pass away and are replaced by a new heaven. The Sibyl's placement of the coming of the messiah in the seventh generation (by Lightfoot's reading) does not, in fact, correspond to the Apocalypse of Weeks; if one were to read a messiah gure into the text of the Apocalypse of Weeks it would be the "sword" of the eighth week. The closest possible correspondence would be perhaps the notion that wisdom is revealed during the seventh part of history. However, to anticipate my conclusions regarding the composition of books 1–2, even this seems unlikely.

The evidence for dependence elsewhere in *OrSib* 1–2 on *1 Enoch* is similarly slight. Lightfoot reads the Sibyl's second generation as a recasting of *1 Enoch* 6–11, the fall of the Watchers. While the widespread tradition of the fall of the Watchers undoubtedly informs the passage in *OrSib* 1, there is scant evidence on which to argue any sort of direct borrowing from *1 Enoch*. It is certainly possible that the sibyllist of this passage had read the Book of the Watchers; however, it is every bit as likely that the sibyllist knew the legend of the Watchers in some other form.[120] In either event, the passage does not seem to be modeled closely on *1 Enoch* 6–11; the euhemeristic aspect of the account in *Sibylline Oracles* 1 is, of course, totally absent from *1 Enoch*. The correspondences between Enochic literature and *OrSib* 1–2 that Lightfoot identi es are, on the whole, of a very general sort and do not indicate any direct dependence on the text of *1 Enoch* by the sibyllist.[121]

The use of Greek authors by the Sibyl in books 1–2 is a far more signi cant in uence on the work. As suggested above, Hesiod looms large at several points in the composition;[122] it seems most likely that the Sibyl has adapted the Hesiodic theme of four declining ages of humankind resulting in a fth period of destruction. Collins has suggested that the double cycle of the world, such as one nds in Plato's *Politicus* 269–74, serves as a possible touchstone for the doubling of the Hesiodic scheme and results in the ten-generation outline of our Sibyl.[123] Further, one may point to tra-

---

120. On the origin and diversi cation of the Watchers legend, see Amar Annus, "On the Origin of the Watchers: A Comparative Study of the Antediluvian Wisdom in Mesopotamian and Jewish Traditions," *JSP* 19 (2010): 277–320.

121. For Lightfoot's take on the correspondence between the works, see *Sibylline Oracles*, 70–77. She states, "The parallels that I seek to draw between Enoch and the Sibyl involve the substance of their prophecies, but still more the way the seers are imagined" (77). It may be granted that there are certainly similarities in the ways that "the seers are imagined," but one wonders if the sibyllist of books 1–2 was in any way aware of this.

122. See, generally, Alfons Kurfeß, "Homer und Hesiod im 1. Buch der Oracula Sibyllina," *Philologus* 100 (1956): 147–53.

123. Collins, "Sibylline Oracles," *OTP* 1.332. See also the Fourth Eclogue of Virgil, wherein it is stated that after the end of the age of iron, an age of gold will rise up. Whether or not Virgil intended to attribute this notion to the Sibyl mentioned in the poem is unclear;

ditions about Prometheus and other Greek culture heroes as a potential background to the material in *OrSib* 1.87–103, alongside Judean traditions about the Watchers.[124] Certainly the description of the Watchers, "gigantic" and "vast of form," being bound in Tartarus, recalls Hesiod's defeated Titans in *Theogony* 713–35 (cf. *OrSib* 1.307–16).

Despite Lightfoot's impressive erudition and careful attention to detail, her claim of unified authorship ultimately is not convincing. The sections of the text that portray a ten-generation scheme of history from the creation to the eschaton are consistent in their lack of any clearly Christian content; in contrast, the Christian material that begins at 1.323 is jarring in a text that, until that point, proceeded as a very clean and systematic narrative. It seems highly improbable that the author who cast this version of history into sibylline verse was the same author responsible for the interlude on the career of Jesus at this point. The textual fissures are even more jarring when the text resumes with the ten-generation history, having completely failed to mention generations eight and nine. Furthermore, the tenth generation is notable for including eschatological catastrophes as well as their resolution, without any reference to Christ or his followers. And yet, immediately upon the conclusion of this section, overtly Christian material again appears in the text. Lightfoot's contention that the lengthy discourse on the judgment should be seen as part of the tenth week and that it was constructed as a balance to the lengthy treatment of Noah and the deluge in the fifth generation is unconvincing. There does not appear to be any such careful balancing of material: certainly the mention of the sixth generation lacks any extended discourse similar to the version of the Eden story contained in the description of the first generation; one could easily envision a prolonged excursus on Abraham at this point in the narrative if the sibyllist were so interested in mirroring content on either side of the flood.

Rather, the position of Geffcken, Kurfeß, and others seems far more likely; that is, a Judean oracle that divided history from Adam to the eschaton into ten generations was taken over by a Christian sibyllist who interrupted the sequence with the insertion of material on the career of Jesus following the seventh week, completely eliminating weeks eight and nine, and supplemented the oracle with a significant quantity of eschatological material following the tenth week. How much of the remainder of book 2 after line 38 is of Christian or Judean authorship is difficult to say; there are certainly some passages which are plausibly, if not likely, of

see Collins, "The Jewish Transformation of Sibylline Oracles," in idem, *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 187–97; see esp. 192–93.

124. Indeed, some Enoch scholars see influence of Greek Prometheus traditions on *1 Enoch* 6–11; see, e.g., VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*, 127–28.

pre-Christian Judean origin. However, it is most likely ultimately impossible to disentangle the textual history of these passages. As regards the ten-generation *ex eventu* oracle, we can agree with the assessment of Collins: "The Christian redactor did not seriously modify the contents of the Jewish work but enlisted the authority of the Sibyl in the proclamation of Christ."[125]

It must be said that the historical review in *Sibylline Oracles* 1–2 is quite different from most of the others surveyed; even in comparison to *Sibylline Oracles* 3, there is precious little interest in historical events. Rather, the Sibyl recounts, primarily, Judean traditions about pre-history in a schematic form. This makes determining a provenance for books 1–2 quite difficult. In terms of place of origin, Geffcken's assessment that the Judean stratum stems from Phrygia has been oft repeated.[126] However, the evidence for this is slight at best and rests, ultimately, solely on the reference to the location of Mt. Ararat in the land of Phrygia (1.196–98; 1.261).[127] It is certainly true that most ancient authorities located Ararat in Armenia, but on this there is some disagreement and different authorities preferred different traditions.[128] Ararat in the biblical account is, in essence, a way of indicating a distant land of the north; it is almost certainly a reflex of the land of Urartu, which appears beginning in the late second millennium in Assyrian texts as the designation for lands beyond Assur's northern borders; only later does the designation obtain the additional connotation of a specific political entity in the region of Lake Van. While this brief notice in *OrSib* 1 might indicate a location of the Judean sibyllist in Phrygia, a setting for the sibyllist among Judean communities elsewhere in Asia Minor, in Palestine, or in Egypt is equally plausible.

The question of date is similarly muddy. The fact that the description of the tenth generation singles out only Rome as a world power points to some time after the middle of the first century b.c.e. The fact that the destruction of the temple is nowhere mentioned within the description of world history (appearing only in the interpolation on the career of Jesus) strongly suggests that it was written before 70 c.e. With Kurfeß, I find a date sometime around the turn of the era likely. The fact of the matter is that the text, as it stands, contains no mention of identifiable historical events that would allow a more precise dating; nor, for that matter, are there clear references that point to any particular social or political situation that the text might be seeking to address. Given the structure of other extended historical reviews cast as predictions, we would expect to find

---

125. Collins, "The Development of the Sibylline Tradition," 455.

126. Geffcken, *Komposition und Entstehung*, 50.

127. *OrSib* 1.196–98 does not name Ararat, but clearly has it in mind when stating that Phrygia is the land first to appear as the flood waters recede.

128. See Collins, "Sibylline Oracles," *OTP* 1.341 note u.

such historical detail at the point at which the author transitions from *ex eventu* prediction to an actual attempt to predict the future; due to the interruption of Christian material, apparently displacing two generations, *OrSib* 1–2 proceeds directly from the second post-diluvian generation to the eschaton. At most, one could speculate that the missing eighth and ninth generations might have contained the pivot at which the sibyllist transitioned from recitation of the past to an attempt to predict the outcome of contemporary events that in uenced the author's eschatological outlook. Such speculation, however, gets us no nearer to an answer, and we must ultimately leave the Sibyl of books 1–2 unsatis ed as regards the circumstances of authorship.

Oracula Sibyllina Book 4

In many ways, *Sibylline Oracles* 4 is a signi cantly less complicated work than either books 1–2 or book 3. In part, this is simply a result of size: Book 4 is roughly one quarter the length of either of the rst two sibylline *logoi* investigated, comprising a mere 192 verses. Furthermore, Book 4 exhibits no obvious Christian insertions, and there is little reason to doubt that the work as it now stands is essentially a Judean composition.

There are two references to historical events that serve as criteria by which to date the composition: the rst is the mention of the destruction of the Jerusalem temple at 125–27; the second is a slightly less explicit but still clear reference to the eruption of Vesuvius in 79 c.e., which the text reckons as divine punishment on Rome for the destruction of Jerusalem (130–36). The text also contains the tradition of Nero's ight across the Euphrates and his expected return (137–39). All this necessitates a dating of the oracle after 79 c.e., but likely very soon after; an approximate date of 80 c.e. cannot be far off.[129] The place of composition is far more di cult to determine; the mention of the practice of baptism in rivers (165) has suggested to some the practice of John the Baptist, and therefore a location somewhere in the Jordan Valley.[130] This seems to me to be slim evidence, indeed; as in the case of books 1–2, no obvious conclusion presents itself regarding the place of composition, although a locale in or around Judea seems likely enough.

---

129. Thus, e.g., Collins, "Sibylline Oracles," *OTP* 1.382; Geffcken, *Komposition und Entstehung*, 20; Gauger, *Sibyllinische Weissagungen*, 451–54; etc.

130. This was rst argued by Joseph Thomas, *Le Mouvement Baptiste en Palestine et Syrie* (Gembloux: Duculot, 1938), 48–60; this position has been endorsed by Collins, "Sibylline Oracles," *OTP* 1.382

The *ex eventu* passage of book 4 is organized by an arti cial histori-cal schema, much as we found in books 1–2. Following an introduction, polemic against idolatry, praise for the pious, and a threat of coming judg-ment, the book begins its *ex eventu* historical review at line 49:

⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚ ⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚
⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚ ,
⬚⬚ ⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚
⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚
⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚

First the Assyrians will rule over all mortals
for six generations, mastering the world in dominion,
from when Heavenly God was lled with wrath
for the cities themselves and all humanity
(and) the sea covered the earth when the deluge blasted forth.

Book 4 here employs a ten-generation scheme of history, similar to books 1–2; however, in the latter, the generations began with creation, but here they begin following the ood. That the totality of history will last exactly ten generations is con rmed in the immediately preceding section, at 47, where the Sibyl states that the nal judgment will occur in the tenth gen-eration.

The innovation of the Fourth Sibyl is the marriage of this ten-genera-tion outline of history to the four-kingdom scheme we encountered earlier in the discussions of the Dynastic Prophecy and the book of Daniel. Thus, in 54–55 the Sibyl predicts the Medes will supplant the Assyrians and hold sway for two generations; 65–66 states that the Persians will overthrow the Medes, and rule for one generation. This brings the total to nine genera-tions and three kingdoms. Line 88 introduces the Macedonians, but the text fails to indicate the length of time during which they will hold sway over the world; the career of Alexander is clearly envisioned, as Macedon is said to sweep through Thebes and Tyre, Babylon and Bactria, among other places (4.89–96). Lines 97–101 seem to be moving the text toward some sort of eschatological cataclysm, as there is mention of cities sliding away because of earthquakes and of a coming nal great disaster.

This, however, is where the progression of the oracle is sidetracked. While the series Assyria–Media–Persia took us through nine of the Sibyl's ten generations of history, and while we have seen already multiple attes-tations of the historiographic trope of Assyria–Media–Persia–Macedon/Greece as four successive world empires,[131] the text swerves away from

---

131. See again Joseph Ward Swain,"The Theory of Four Monarchies: Opposition His-tory under the Roman Empire," *CP* 35 (1940): 1–21; Flusser, "Four Empires."

the seeming inevitable appearance of Greece/Macedon as the fourth king-
dom in the tenth and last generation of history. Instead, Rome is intro-
duced at 102 as the power that will conquer Macedon and, in lines 115–27,
destroy Jerusalem and its temple.

This disjuncture in the text was already hypothesized by Geffcken to
be the result of a Judean adaptation of a pre-existing anti-Macedonian ora-
cle, updated in the wake of the loss of the Jerusalem temple.[132] This posi-
tion is almost certainly correct. It is interesting to note that there is nothing
in the schematic historical review that would point necessarily to Judean
authorship of the reused anti-Macedonian oracle; it is quite plausible that
the oracle ending with Macedon originated in non-Judean circles. As in
the case of books 1–2, the truncation of the historical review prior to the
text moving on to the eschaton prohibits us from knowing much about
the circumstances surrounding the composition of this earlier oracle. The
circumstances of the author of the revised oracle are clear enough: a sib-
ylline review of history has been taken up by a Judean author, likely but
not definitively living in or around Judea, and reworked to cast Rome,
not Macedon, as the last earthly empire before the world succumbs to
cataclysm.

Conclusion

As the present chapter should make clear, the Judean Sibyllina first
and foremost owe a literary debt to Greek oracular verse. The term
"sibylline oracle" itself denotes a clearly defined literary genre, based
on considerations of form (hexameter verse), language (an archaizing
pseudo-Homeric Greek), and thematic content. The adoption and adapta-
tion of sibylline verse by Judeans and later Christians speak to the univer-
sality and accessibility of the form within the Greco-Roman world.

As with the Hebrew and Aramaic Judean texts investigated earlier,
there are several points in the first four books of the *Sibylline Oracles* at
which striking similarities to the Akkadian *ex eventu* works present them-
selves. Already in Chapter 2, I discussed book 4 in relation to the Dynastic
Prophecy. Indeed, these two texts are striking in their presentation of suc-
ceeding world empires, a trope well known from Daniel. Whereas Daniel
envisions a sequence of Babylon–Persia–Media–Greece, we find in *OrSib*
4 the more common succession scheme of Assyria–Media–Persia–Greece.
Indeed, as discussed in previous chapters, it is probably best to see this
constellation of empires as the older template; it appears numerous times

---

132. Geffcken, *Komposition und Entstehungszeit,* 18–19. So also Collins, "The Place of the
Fourth Sibyl in the Development of the Jewish Sibyllina," *JJS* 25 (1974): 365–80;

in Hellenistic literature, and the succession of Assyria–Media–Persia is found in the histories of both Herodotus and Ctesias.[133]

The date at which this scheme entered into Roman historiography has been the subject of some debate.[134] D. Mendels in particular has argued that the occurrence of this topos in *OrSib* 4 ought to be dated to the period of nal composition, around 80 c.e., and that it was overlaid on top of an older scheme of ten generations. As argued above, precisely the opposite redactional process seems far more plausible: the appearance of Rome is a later intrusion upon an older, likely non-Judean oracle containing a schematic presentation of history as a succession of four empires. Both of the book's schemes, that of four empires and that of ten generations, are disturbed. This later updating/reuse of an earlier oracle, typical of the sibylline corpus (and oracular verse generally in the Greco-Roman world), is paralleled by the secondary expansion in column IV of the Dynastic Prophecy. Indeed, the reuse, in a variety of forms, of earlier mantic texts is something that nearly all the compositions surveyed in this study share.

More distinct is the schematic presentation of history as a sequence of ten generations, shared by books 1–2 and book 4 (and found again in book 8). As Flusser has pointed out, the division of history into ten parts occurs elsewhere in Judean literature, not only in the Apocalypse of Weeks and the Qumran texts discussed in the present study but also in later texts such as the *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* and the second Esther Targum.[135] Flusser suggests that this schematic presentation of history is ultimately Persian in origin; his argument rests primarily on his assessment of the sibyl cited in Servius's commentary on Virgil's Fourth Eclogue as an authentically old "pagan" sibyl.[136] Servius's sibyl has the tenth ruler as the sun, which Flusser identi es with *Sol Invictus*, a title sometimes applied to Mithras in Roman cults.[137] The association with Mithras, in turn, implies to Flusser Persian origin. While it is certainly possible that the scheme of ten divisions of world history originated within Persian/Zoroastrian circles, direct evidence for this is lacking. If the scheme were imported to the West from Persian sources, it appears to have left no impact on Roman historiographic traditions. Servius's notice merely implies an association of the ten-generation scheme with the Sibyl by the late fourth century c.e. For all we know, Servius had in mind oracles identical to, or very similar to,

---

133. See Swain, "Theory of Four Monarchies."

134. For a critique of Swain's position that the trope passed from eastern historiographic traditions into the Roman sphere in the mid-second century b.c.e., see D. Mendels, "The Five Empires: A Note on a Propagandistic *Topos*," *American Journal of Philology* 102 (1981): 330–37.

135. Flusser, "Four Empires," 162.

136. Flusser, "Four Empires," 163–64.

137. The title was, of course, associated with deities other than Mithras (e.g., Elagabulus).

the ones preserve in *OrSib* 1–2 and 4. The source of the tradition in these oracles is thoroughly opaque; as argued above, it is as likely as not derived from a reduplication of the Hesiodic scheme of four ages of history followed by a fth period of destruction.

The emergence of historiographic schemes based on ten units in the Apocalypse of Weeks and later Hebrew/Aramaic Judean works is probably best regarded as an instance of polygenesis. While the melding of historiographic and mantic traditions that we have traced certainly does not necessitate tting historical recitation into an arti cial scheme, no great leap is necessary to imagine authors arriving at the number ten to serve as the backbone of a formulaic presentation of events. True, in Judean texts, one would perhaps expect seven or twelve as more likely gures; however, as we have seen in the texts from Qumran investigated above, as with the Apocalypse of Weeks, a schematic presentation based on ten divisions is combined with a scheme based on units of seven. Further, the incongruities between the events of the periods as found in the Apocalypse of Weeks and *OrSib* 1–2, as discussed above, speak against direct modeling by the Sibyl. Absent additional evidence regarding a periodization of history into ten units, it is most likely that the schemes of ten generations in the sibylline corpus and the ten units of seven/seven-sevens, etc., in the Hebrew and Aramaic Judean texts arose independently or were borrowed from a common, independent source. Insofar as the division of history into ten periods is concerned, there is little reason to follow Lightfoot's insistence that *OrSib* 1–2 is in any way dependent on the Apocalypse of Weeks.

While the sibylline presentation of history as a sequence of kingdoms and/or generations can be viewed as a rough parallel to the succession of kings found in the Akkadian *ex eventu* works, the case of *OrSib* 4 and the Dynastic Prophecy presents by far the closest analogy. More interesting, however, is the particular interest in kingship found in the second century b.c.e. Judean stratum of *OrSib* 3. Alone of the Judean works investigated in this study, book 3 explicitly looks forward to the coming of a legitimate dynast whose appearance will signal the support of the gods and a period of unparalleled peace and prosperity on earth. The king from the sun nds his nearest parallel in these texts with the nal king of the Uruk Prophecy. It is interesting to note that in both *OrSib* 3 and in the Uruk Prophecy, it seems that the coming dynast is not actually native to the people that so looks forward to his coming. Book 3 almost certainly looks toward a Ptolemy in Egypt, whereas the king of the Uruk Prophecy is likely not a king native to Uruk itself (despite being said to arise *ina qereb Uruk*, in the midst of Uruk), but one who restores the proper functioning of the city's cult.

The very question of cult underscores another peculiarity of the books of the *Sibylline Oracles* under consideration. While there are several comments, particularly in book 3, regarding the temple in Jerusalem, little is

said that would betray concern for the proper functioning of the cult. In the case of *OrSib* 3, this may be due to the simple fact that the sibyllist is writing in Egypt, and as such does not actually patronize the Jerusalem cult site—at least not with any great frequency. If indeed waves of pro-Maccabean nationalism infuse the text, as suggested by Barclay and Momigliano, it is quite strange that the sibyllist does not voice any concern for the interruption of the *tamîd* offerings and the desecration of the altar that lie at the heart of the visions of Daniel. In this regard, books 1–4 of the *Sibylline Oracles* stand apart not only from their fellow Judean works but similarly from the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts (in particular the Uruk Prophecy and the Marduk Prophecy). While it would be incorrect to say that our sibyllists viewed traditional Near Eastern style temple cults as super uous to the proper ordering of the world and human society, the texts nowhere exhibit anything like the positions of Daniel, the Qumran texts, *1 Enoch*, and indeed the Akkadian *ex eventu* works, wherein the proper functioning of cult constitutes the *sine qua non* for the wellness of both nature and society. Corruption of the cult does not gure into the sibylline concern for historical progression, save in the mentions of the Roman destruction of the temple; but even here, this is more akin to a lament over the destruction of one's native land than it is to the Danielic desire to restore the *tamîd* offerings.

Finally, Lightfoot's contention that the composition of *OrSib* 1–2 depends fundamentally on Judean apocalyptic texts, especially *1 Enoch*, simply strains the evidence of the texts to the breaking point. While the second generation of the historical review is likely in uenced to some degree by Enochic Watcher traditions, these must be understood as ideas in broad circulation well beyond the boundaries of *1 Enoch* 6–11. The tradition of ancient culture bringers was not limited to an Enochic strand of Judean thought, but appears fully formed in the *apkallu* traditions of Mesopotamia and the Prometheus traditions of Hellas. It is not impossible that the author of the ten-generation stratum of *OrSib* 1–2 knew of the Enochic Book of the Watchers; but neither is the textual similarity so great as to necessitate direct borrowing. Indeed, Hesiodic Titans seem to cast as great a shadow, if not greater, over the composition of *OrSib* 1–2 than do Enochic Watchers.

Furthermore, Lightfoot glosses over important differences in the eschatology of *OrSib* 1–2 and the early Judean apocalypses.[138] There is no role for angelic mediation of divine knowledge in the Sibyl; this is, of course, a hallmark of Judean apocalypses. Moreover, the theme of resurrection of the dead does not seem to have been part of the Sibyl's message,

---

138. See John J. Collins, "The Sibyl and the Apocalypses: Generic Relationships in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity," in *Greco-Roman Culture and the New Testament* (ed. D. Aune and F. Brenk; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 185–202.

whereas it is indispensable to the eschatological visions of Daniel 12 and *1 Enoch* 22. The scenes of ery destruction that we nd in the *Sibylline Oracles* owe perhaps more to the Stoic ⌧⌧⌧⌧⌧ ⌧⌧ than to Enochic traditions of the place of eternal punishment.

It is clear that there is certainly no reason to suspect in uence of the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts on the composition of the early Judean strata of the *Sibylline Oracles*. It is true that some classicists, such as Burkert (see above), have found reason to suspect that, as Assyrian hegemony crept farther and farther west, cultural contacts with Greeks and Etruscans that resulted in, for example, the introduction of Mesopotamian liver divination, may have also resulted in the transmission of ideas about female ecstatic prophecy as practiced in Assyria (see Chapter 3). However, even here there is no question of literary dependence; rather, the in uence comes in the practice of mantic professionals, practice that may have in u-enced the later image of the Sibyl in the hellenized world. While there may have been cultural contact affecting the development of Hellenic female ecstatic oracular utterance, such as we see attributed to the Pythia, the Sibyl, and the priestesses at Dodona, there is simply no evidence linking the literary creations of the late Hellenistic and early Roman periods with Akkadian *ex eventu* (or other mantic) compositions.

Indeed, there is little reason to view the traditional Judean apocalypses such as Daniel and *1 Enoch* as important literary in uences on the rst four books of the *Sibylline Oracles*. Lightfoot presses the case the rmest, and that in regard to books 1–2 and the Apocalypse of Weeks in *1 Enoch*. As discussed above, I nd the association less than compelling; there is no good textual evidence that would lead one to conclude there was direct lit-erary borrowing on the part of the Sibyl. In fact, aside from the interest in eschatology, there is not much at all in the Sibylline corpus that is like the Judean apocalypses; the very form of sibylline verse precludes a certain amount of similarity. In uence is more apparent, for example, in the clear use of Hesiod and in the adoption of traditional Egyptian themes in the Third Sibyl, themes that appear in near-contemporary Egyptian composi-tions such as the *Potter's Oracle*.

However, we seem once again to nd great overlap among our texts when we look at social conditions in which the sibyllists appear to have labored. That is, the oracles of *OrSib* 1–4 seem very much to be the prod-ucts of authors writing from a position at the margins of power, wherein the right and proper order of the universe has been disrupted. Even in the second-century stratum of book 3, wherein the text betrays a posi-tive appreciation of the current Ptolemaic ruler, the stability of the social order is portrayed as precarious; warfare and cataclysm lie on the imme-diate horizon, and only the intercession of the king from the sun, as the chosen agent of God, will bring a lasting peace. Just as in the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts with which this study began, we nd here texts whose

authors paint the chaos of the present as part of an immutable unfold-
ing of history, ultimately ending in redemption for the author and his
audience.

There is no reason to attribute the appearance of *ex eventu* historical
reviews in the Judean Sibyllina to instances of literary borrowing from
non-Hellenic sources. Oracular verse generally, and sibylline verse spe-
cifically, had a long history of transmission before the Judean adoption of
the form. That this Greek mantic tradition, with its reputation for dealing
with gloomy subjects such as war and natural disaster, should sometimes
manifest itself in compositions that wed such predictions to historio-
graphic traditions is not at all remarkable. Indeed, in our brief foray into
late Egyptian literature, we see that this same process appears to have
occurred there internally without any need to posit outside influence as
an explanation. Although scholars of the Near East have for a long time
associated the phenomenon of extended historical review in the form of
a *vaticinium ex eventu* almost solely with the book of Daniel, and Daniel,
in turn, with "apocalypse," it should now be clear that not only are *vati-
cinium ex eventu* and apocalypse not coterminous but, further, that the use
of such predictions after the fact is far more widespread than is often pre-
sented. The combination of historiographic and mantic traditions appears
throughout the literatures of west Asia and the eastern Mediterranean in
the first millennium b.c.e.

Literary Tropes and Analytical Categories: Mantic Historiography in the Ancient Near East

> The discovery that two events, symbols, thoughts, or texts, while so utterly separated by time and space that they could not "really" be connected, seem, nevertheless, to be the same or to be speaking directly to one another raises the possibility of a secret interconnection of things that is the scholar's most cherished article of faith. The thought that the patterns and inter-relationships that he has patiently and laboriously teased out of the data might, in fact, exist is the claim he makes when his work is completed as well as the claim that appears to be denied by the fact that he has had to labor so long.
>
> Jonathan Z. Smith.[1]

This study began with a proposition, put forth by several notable Assyriologists over the past half century: the book of Daniel, as the representative of Judean apocalypses, was directly influenced by knowledge of a small corpus of Akkadian compositions. Through consideration of the Akkadian texts themselves, scholarly studies of the texts, and the book of Daniel, it was determined that the similarities between the Akkadian works and Daniel amount almost exclusively to the use of extended historical review in the guise of prediction, that is to say, the use of *vaticinia ex eventu* to place the author and audience of the text within a succession of historical events and to comment on the events of the author's own time.[2] My conclusions regarding the proposed direct influence of the Akkadian compositions on the book of Daniel are firmly negative: reviewing the occurrences of this type of *ex eventu* historical review in early Judean liter-

---

1. J. Z. Smith, "The Bare Facts of Ritual," in idem, *Imagining Religion: From Babylon to Jonestown* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 53.

2. Moreover, it is almost solely the shared use of *vaticinium ex eventu* that has led scholars to group the Akkadian works together.

ary works (be the texts apocalypses or something other), I nd there is no indication of literary in uence of the Mesopotamian works on the Judean.

In truth, the indication of non-dependence is considerably more interesting than the reverse would have proved to be. Let us imagine that we had compelling evidence to conclude that the author of Daniel 10–12 used as a template one of our Akkadian *ex eventu* works—say, for the sake of argument, Text A. What should we have learned? Primarily that the author had access to texts composed in Akkadian, whether in the original or in translation (most likely Aramaic). This would indeed be illuminating; I know of no other Judean text of such late date that exhibits direct dependence on a cuneiform prototype. However, this is not altogether a revelation. It seems a certainty that elements of earlier Israelite writings drew directly on Akkadian narratives (e.g., in the case of the   ood story). We know that in the monarchic period, at least, there were scribes living in the Levant trained in Akkadian cuneiform; from a slightly earlier period, copies of literary texts in Akkadian have been found in what would become Israel/Judah dating to the late Bronze Age.[3] Our hypothetical case of Daniel depending on Akkadian prototypes would either (1) indicate that this presence and knowledge of cuneiform literature simply continued for longer in the land of Israel and Judah than was previously assumed, or (2) that knowledge of cuneiform *ex eventu* compositions survived in Israel and Judah from an earlier period,   nally to be adapted in a Judean composition of the mid-second century b.c.e. that had the fortune to survive down to the present.

The actual situation is far more complex and far more telling. As has been argued, the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts do *not* represent a single literary genre when judged by traditional formal and structural criteria—those criteria that scholars working on these texts have tended to invoke. At the very least, the Marduk and Shulgi prophetic speeches are generically distinct from the rest of the group on formal grounds. There is even some evidence that this may have been an emic distinction of type made by Mesopotamian scribes. In truth, there may be su   cient textual differentiation to further distinguish these two by literary type, despite the fact that Assyrian library copyists chose to link our copies of the works as part of a tablet series. This fact suggests that any claim of Judean familiarity with this "genre" of Akkadian literature is already on uneasy footing. The texts are themselves not identical in form or structure; however, there is certainly a logic at work when modern scholars have grouped these texts together: the use of extended *vaticinia ex eventu* in the group is striking,

---

3. For the corpus of cuneiform texts discovered in the land of Israel, see Wayne Horowitz and Takayoshi Oshima (with Seth Sanders), *Cuneiform in Canaan: Cuneiform Sources from the Land of Israel in Ancient Times* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2006).

and fundamentally unlike any other known works of Akkadian literature. What links these texts together is a conscious merging of historiographic traditions with mantic traditions. On the historiographic side, there is textual evidence that suggests direct knowledge of Mesopotamian king lists and similar chronographic compositions. On the mantic side, the style, both orthographic and literary, indicates authorship deeply steeped in the scholarly scribal tradition that compiled and copied massive collections of omens (with notable in uence from astrological omina).

This phenomenon stands at the root of the present study: the merging of historiographic and mantic practices in the formation of a new type of mantic text. This merger is clearly seen in the book of Daniel. The authors of the various visions were clearly working in conversation with certain castings of Near Eastern and, especially, Seleucid history from the early sixth century through the mid-second century. Certainly, for the earlier portions of this history, our Danielic authors drew on the native written accounts available to them, such as are found in the books of Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, etc. Whether the historiographic traditions that informed later portions of the historical reviews were written or oral is probably impossible to determine. However, Daniel is clearly invested in grounding these historiographically focused oracles within a framework of Judean mantic practice, drawing heavily on the language and style of the biblical prophets, invoking them both implicitly and explicitly. As in the case of the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts, this serves to trigger in the audience a recognition of macro-genre: this text is about communicating with the divine, about *predicting*. Moreover, this text, while formally distinct, nonetheless sounds like those texts the audience already deems authoritative and normative for their own mantic tradition. The form of the text, Akkadian or Danielic, is different from the particular types of mantic works invoked by the authors; nevertheless, it is clearly literarily marked as something similar, something drawing on a tradition recognized as authoritative and normative.

The same holds true for the other major exemplars of early Second Temple *ex eventu* passages found in *1 Enoch*. The Apocalypse of Weeks and the Animal Apocalypse are no less than Daniel enveloped in the echoes of the biblical prophets while simultaneously leveraging their prestige in the promulgation of a new mantic message in a new mantic form. As with the choice of Daniel, the decision to put such historiographic-mantic discourse in the mouth of Enoch, an antediluvian sage who Judean culture already celebrated for his manifestly unique relationship with the divine, only serves to reinforce the textual interplay with authoritative Judean mantic compositions.

The several texts from among the Qumran scrolls investigated in Chapter 5 bear witness to this phenomenon yet again. The melding of history and prophecy in the texts that explicitly encode *vaticinia ex eventu* of

the type found in Daniel (Pseudo-Daniel[a-b], Apocryphon of Jeremiah C) as well as other texts that don't include actual *ex eventu* predictions (certain of the continuous pesharim) speaks to a broader move within society that had begun to conceive of history as an unfolding of pre-ordained events. Furthermore, this fatalistic notion of history became viewed as inseparable from those practices by which humans could obtain information from the divine realm. If the unalterable future can be predicted by whatever mantic arts are privileged, then surely one can predict the past in the formation of a seamless historiographic-mantic narrative.

This takes a fascinating generic twist in the form of the pesharim, texts that endeavor (through the mantic skill of the practitioner of pesher, most notably the Teacher of Righteousness) to tell an audience what the words of long-ago prophets *really* mean for the recitation of past events, the description of the present, and for the eschatological future that lies just beyond the day's horizon. These texts do not contain *ex eventu* predictions of the type found in, for example, Daniel or the Uruk Prophecy, but they do exhibit the same interplay between historiographic and mantic traditions, albeit in a distinct literary form. This simply serves to demonstrate that there were multiple formal possibilities open to authors who sought to express this historiographic-mantic interplay textually. The function executed by this interplay within the continuous pesharim from Qumran is for all intents and purposes identical to what we nd in the early *ex eventu* passages of Daniel and *1 Enoch*: the author and audience locate themselves at a uniquely privileged position in the unfolding of human events over time, culminating in the promise of vindication and exaltation.

The Judean adoption of sibylline prediction yields but one more example of the merging of historiographic and mantic literary traditions resulting in extended *vaticinia ex eventu*. Here, however, the situation is complicated by the fact of the simple multiplicity of traditions on which the sibyllists drew. On the one hand, Judean traditions loom large (e.g., the ood, the Tower of Babel, etc.) in the strata isolated and discussed in Chapter 6; on the other hand, the sibyllists have chosen to cast their oracles in a decidedly non-Judean form and have clearly drawn heavily both on Greco-Roman oracular verse in particular and Hellenic literature more broadly. Perhaps the strongest example of the ability of authors to draw on their local traditions is the case of the second-century Judean stratum of the Third Sibyl. Here the sibyllist evinces immersion in, and willingness to use, native Egyptian traditions about a liberator king in composing his oracular account of the end of history. The question of what is a "native" tradition for our Judean-Egyptian sibyllist is incredibly complex. Here, perhaps, it is better to think in terms of what is "local" to our sibyllist—those cultural elements that are part of his Judean background com-

bine with what is clearly an emersion in educated Hellenistic circles and further incorporate Egyptian cultural elements with which the sibyllist is surrounded. Those cultural and literary elements that might speak to the text's intended audience are all potential fuel for the recasting of history as prediction.

Ideological Divergence

In the face of the similarities between the Judean and Akkadian works surveyed in this study, a number of pronounced ideological differences come to the fore. Perhaps the most straightforward difference in the manner by which our authors constructed their after-the-fact historical reviews is in the pronounced Judean interest in numbers: four kingdoms, ten generations, seventy years or weeks of years, ten jubilees, 490 years, etc.[4] To be sure, numbers appear in the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts. However, as was seen in Chapter 2 of this study, the use of numbers there seems to reflect familiarity with Mesopotamian chronographic traditions, and no artificial, schematic use of numbers is detectable. The situation is precisely the reverse when we look at the Judean texts. There one finds no concern with regnal lengths or precise reckonings of past time; instead, the events of the past are made to snap onto a preformed chronological template. The past is not merely a series of kings who reigned according to the vicissitudes of human nature and chance; rather, all of history is structured on numerical patterns foreordained by the divine and about to culminate in the author's own time.

A second and more crucial difference between the Judean and Akkadian texts involves the role of the king.[5] The Akkadian *ex eventu* texts are thoroughly infused with traditional Mesopotamian notions of kingship, such as those encapsulated in the famed Sumerian King List. There, kingship is understood as an abstract principle, bestowed on humanity by the gods. Kingship seems to be unique; there can be only one king at a time. The official historiographic traditions smooth over royal rivalries and competing claims to hegemony and present instead a picture of consecutive kings, one after another. Sometimes, kingship abandons a city and relocates at another in Mesopotamia, and new dynasties are born. Kingship remains, regardless, and the sequence of monarchs marches apace. This

---

4. See Adela Yarbro Collins, "Numerical Symbolism in Jewish and Early Christian Apocalyptic Literature," in eadem, *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 55–138; esp. 64–89.

5. See Matthew Neujahr, "Royal Ideologies and Utopian Futures in the Akkadian *ex eventu* Prophecies," in *Utopia and Dystopia in Prophetic Literature* (ed. Ehud Ben Zvi; PFES 92; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2006), 41–54.

ideology is most clearly represented in the Dynastic Prophecy, although it surely undergirds all the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts.

The simple narrative facts of Judean history do not allow for such a notion of kingship to have developed and become normative. The territories known in the first half of the first millennium b.c.e. as the kingdoms of Israel and Judah were, from the late second millennium onward, clients of the Neo-Hittite states, Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Persia, Alexander and his successor kingdoms, and Rome. As such, it perhaps should not surprise us that the bulk of the Judean *ex eventu* historical reviews considered do not culminate in the appearance of a native legitimate dynast who will establish an unquestioned, universal rule. Rather, the situation in Daniel is typical: the post-eschaton polity will simply be a kingdom of God and his people; kingship and other human institutions of governance have seemingly passed away as relics of an earlier, less perfect age.

There was certainly an ideological strain of Judean literature opposed to this point of view. Drawing on the ideology of texts such as 2 Samuel 7 and evinced early on in the oracles of Haggai and First Zechariah, there was a stream of tradition that looked forward to the re-establishment of the Davidic dynasty in Jerusalem. The earliest Judean texts containing *ex eventu* historical reviews are fairly remarkable, from a modern point of view, in that they seem to contain no expectation of the restoration of the monarchy under a legitimate native dynast. Indeed, where we have encountered kingship explicitly, *Sibylline Oracles* 3, the hoped-for king seems unquestionably to be a king of Egypt, not a Davidide in Jerusalem. The situation changes with time, and it is not uncommon in Judean apocalypses dating from after the destruction of the Jerusalem temple in 70 c.e. to find Davidic messianic expectation worked into an *ex eventu* scheme derivative of Daniel (as in, e.g., *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*). Moreover, several documents among the Dead Sea Scrolls clearly look forward to the appearance of a royal messiah, yet never combined with an extended historical review cast as prediction.[6]

A third key ideological difference between the Judean and the Mesopotamian texts investigated herein is that the Akkadian scribes lacked the eschatological worldview of their Judean counterparts. The scribes that produced the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts were rather writing within an ideological framework determined by traditional Mesopotamian dogma about kingship, expressed through clichés of paradigmatically good and bad reigns. With their Judean counterparts, these scribes envisioned a world in which an ideal future was inseparably linked to divinely approved lead-

---

6. See generally John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010); Johannes Zimmerman, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran: Königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftfunden von Qumran* (WUNT 104; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998).

ership on earth: those whose actions work against the political wishes of the divine will ultimately be destroyed. For the Judean scribes, however, this triumph was to be everlasting; the clichéd fructi cation of the earth and well-being of the people were envisioned not simply as elements of a future king's reign but permanent and decisive changes to the very nature of existence.

Functional Con uence

The differences among the texts here considered speak for themselves. Still, however, one must make some attempt to explain the similarity in the use of *vaticinium ex eventu* as a literary trope to place both Judean and Mesopotamian scribes within a progression of divinely determined historical events. The key for understanding this shared, cross-cultural interest in mixing literary re ections of native mantic practices with historiographic traditions is an issue of historical circumstance. The loss of native political autonomy, particularly in the face of military defeat, led scribes to fuse predictive traditions to a fatalistic notion of history that culminates in the redemption and ultimate supremacy of the scribe and his audience. These texts arose in different times and places through a process of polygenesis, triggered by the social realia of the scribe; an evolutionary model of development, consisting of literary borrowing and adaptation, is simply not indicated by the evidence.

Instead, what one nds is an unwillingness to abandon the normative mantic traditions of the culture in which the scribe was situated. Indeed, this makes simple, practical sense: to reach an audience, playing to the expectations of that audience will greatly increase one's accessibility and the likelihood of positive reception. The Akkadian texts are therefore constructed using the clichés, language, orthography, and phraseology of the massive corpora of omens that featured so prominently in the activities of a Mesopotamian scholar-scribe; the Judean texts, for their part, are steeped in the ideologies and language of earlier authoritative compositions such as the books of the prophets. By itself, this reality of scribes beholden to differing mantic traditions helps explain the fact that our texts are formally different—giving the lie to any theories of formal generic interdependence—despite being structured around the same literary trope of *vaticinium ex eventu*.

It is useful to keep in mind the differentiation of literary forms while one considers aspects of functional overlap and nuanced difference. In regard to the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts, it is clear that by formal and structural criteria they constitute at least two distinct literary forms. Those texts that seem to have had the greatest cultural currency are the Marduk and

Shulgi texts. These alone survive in multiple copies; ancient palace scribes in Assyria linked them generically as part of a series of tablets to be copied together. In the case of the Marduk Prophecy, we have explicit evidence that the text was selected for copy from tablets in Babylon by Assyrian scribes for inclusion in the library of Ashurbanipal. Perhaps not surprisingly, these works exhibit a certain "literary" avor lacking in the others; there is at least one named character, the divine narrator of each text. Further, the Marduk and Shulgi prophecies contain far more past-tense narrative than our other compositions, even in their now-lost complete states, if we are to judge by considerations of space and sparse textual clues. The Marduk Prophecy, in particular, presents itself as a propaganda piece of a reigning monarch, one that certainly would please the ears of rulers long after the time of Nebuchadnezzar I: do what is right in the eyes of the gods, the text tells them, and your reign will be more glorious than any before. While I hold with most critics that the weight of evidence for time of composition of these two texts tips in the direction of the late second millennium, it occasions no surprise that Neo-Assyrian monarchs of the rst millennium should have had such texts copied, and perhaps have seen themselves in these mantic recitations of history so keen to support traditional notions of Mesopotamian monarchy.

The other three compositions—particularly the Uruk and Dynastic prophecies—seem to be speaking from privileged positions on the periphery of the power structures of the authors' times. The Dynastic Prophecy strains to advocate faith in the prospect that the recent status quo will shortly be restored, that the invading *Ḥanû* will be repulsed. The author of the Uruk Prophecy is writing within the context of a literate elite in a city that, despite its important position in Mesopotamian religion and lore, is not a seat of kingship; its protective deity has been pilfered, kings have treated the city with contempt, and its citizenry, common and elite, is powerless to do anything about it. Into this picture comes a benevolent king, celebrated as arising within Uruk, who will restore the proper functioning of the city's cult. Thus placating the god, this king's dynasty is blessed with divine favor, promising the scribe and his audience the continued proper functioning of the local cult under the aegis of a divinely approved monarch. Both the Uruk and Dynastic prophecies press the claim that traditional Mesopotamian kingship will ultimately win out, to the bene t of the circles within which the works were composed and read.

The Judean texts universally present themselves as works stemming from without the dominant power structures. Several of the texts, such as the visions of Daniel, share with the Uruk Prophecy and Marduk Prophecy, in particular, the linking of cultic restoration to proper polity. However, while the use that all these texts make of *vaticinium ex eventu* is similar, it is by no means identical. In particular, the Akkadian texts seem uniform in applying this trope to a bolstering and reinforcement of tradi-

tional Mesopotamian kingship, as outlined above. The Judean texts (with the exception of *OrSib* 3), on the other hand, meld historiographic recitation with prediction in the service of advocating the downfall and elimination of human institutions of rule. Here, the divinely ordained unfolding of events marches relentlessly toward the elimination of human kingship in favor of direct rule by the heavenly realm. Nonetheless, all the texts employ this trope to advocate some vision of the undoing of the (recent or current) political status quo.

Ultimately, regardless of questions of formal similarity or distinction, the texts grouped together in this study may be viewed as all taking part in a cultural discourse of "mantic historiography."[7] The particular type of *ex eventu* prediction studied in the preceding pages is a fairly widespread phenomenon, emerging in Assyria, Babylonia, Judea, Egypt, and the hellenized Mediterranean. As I have sought to emphasize, through this trope scribes combined elements of their locally authoritative and normative mantic literary traditions with locally available historiographic traditions. This is possible only insofar as the authors and audiences of our various texts viewed such historiographic traditions to be part of a fatalistic, forward moving course of human events, preordained by the divine and fundamentally immutable. This marks a major ideological distinction between the Akkadian *ex eventu* texts and, for example, traditional Mesopotamian omina. What is more, this mantic historiography is not marked by a single literary form, nor even does it necessitate the presence of *vaticinium ex eventu*. As argued in Chapter 5, the continuous pesharim from Qumran do not employ the particular literary trope with which the bulk of this study has been occupied, yet they execute almost precisely the same ideological maneuver of incorporating historiographic tradition as a structuring element into what is, fundamentally, a mantic text. In all the different cultural contexts surveyed, this presentation of historiographic tradition within a mantic composition functions as a means by which scribes and audiences locate themselves at a position of privilege within a divinely determined progression of history.

Future Prospects: Analytical Taxa and Framing Scholarly Discourse

The implications for the study of Judean *ex eventu* works are signi - cant. In particular, I would like to emphasize the limitations of studies that seek to argue for this work or that as being an "apocalypse" or belong-

---

7. Credit goes to John Collins for coining this pithy phrase to denote the phenomenon I describe.

ing to some "apocalyptic" thing, when judged by formal literary criteria. From a religio-historical perspective, the greater advancement to be made in the study of such works is to see them not in literary terms of apocalyptic genre but rather in functional terms of mantic texts that exhibit active awareness and use of historiographic tradition. While the Judean and Akkadian works here surveyed should not be said all to belong to some genre "apocalypse," they may be said to belong to an analytical category that groups texts based on the ways that they express a historiographically oriented message in mantic dress, what I have called mantic historiography. Such an analytical category cuts across the traditional category of apocalypse: the principle texts investigated in this study lie inside, but apocalypses such as *2 Enoch* or, indeed, Revelation lie outside. Such partial overlap between historical and literary-formal categories points to the ways in which similar literary forms brought together different cultural discourses for various purposes; and, reciprocally, it points to the ways in which identical discourses may be communicated using differing literary forms. Consideration of the multiple formal options for engaging in particular cultural discourses and the ways in which those discourses may be adapted to different forms constitutes an avenue of future investigation that promises rich reward.

Categorizing texts for analysis as I have advocated requires investigating texts such as Daniel not within traditional, well-worn categories of biblical studies, but rather situating them within broader, non-literary categories of mantic and historiographic practice. I would like to suggest that the most potentially rewarding approach to these ancient works aligns them with texts and traditions from the Near East and Mediterranean world with which they overlap in outlook and function, regardless of literary similarity. Such work is, of course, nothing particularly new.[8] Breaking with traditional categories that emphasize formal similarity of texts in a shift that seeks to analyze and categorize literary works in terms of function and participation in various cultural discourses (whether we call such categories "genres" or something other) represents a promising turn for the study of apocalypses and apocalypse-like texts.

While Daniel and *1 Enoch* may be apocalypses, they are no less mantic texts, artifacts that record the practice of divine-human communicative crafts; these literary manifestations of predictive arts ought to be set alongside other works that similarly present themselves as legitimately

---

8. For the sake of a recent example, see Martti Nissinen, "Pesharim as Divination. Qumran Exegesis, Omen Interpretation, and Literary Prophecy," in *Prophecy after the Prophets? The Contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls to the Understanding of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Prophecy* (ed. Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange; Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 43–60. Nissinen undertakes a thorough examination of the hermeneutics of the Qumran pesharim vis-à-vis Mesopotamian omen literature.

and authoritatively received information from the divine realm. In the case of the texts studied in this investigation, the intersection of historiographic and mantic traditions marks new mantic forms, striving for legitimacy by leveraging aspects of culturally normative predictive texts and practices.

Bibliography

Alexandre, Charles. *Oracula Sibyllina*. 2 vols. in 3 parts. Paris: Didot, 1841–1856.

Allegro, John. "Further Light on the History of the Qumran Sect." *JBL* 75 (1956): 89–95.

———. "*Thrakidon*, the 'Lion of Wrath' and Alexander Jannaeus." *PEQ* 91 (1959): 47–51.

———, and A. A. Anderson. *Qumrân Cave 4. I (4Q159–4Q186)*. DJD 5. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.

Amusin [Amoussine], Joseph. "Éphraïm et Manassé dans le Péshèr de Nahum." *RevQ* 4 (1963): 389–96.

———. "The Re ection of Historical Events of the First Century B.C. in Qumran Commentaries (4Q 161; 4Q 169; 4Q 166)." *HUCA* 48 (1977): 123–52.

Annus, Amar. "On the Origin of the Watchers: A Comparative Study of the Antediluvian Wisdom in Mesopotamian and Jewish Traditions." *JSP* 19 (2010): 277–320.

Aschim, Anders. "The Genre of 11QMelchizedek." Pp. 17–31 in *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments*. Edited by F. H. Cryer and T. L. Thompson. JSOTSup 290. She eld: She eld Academic Press, 1998.

Assman, Jan. "Königsdogma und Heilserwartung. Politische und kultische Chaosbeschreibungen in ägyptischen Texten." Pp. 345–77 in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*. Edited by David Hellholm. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983.

Baillet, Maurice, et al. "Le travail d'édition des manuscrits de Qumrân." *RB* 63 (1956): 49–67.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Edited by M. Holquist. Translated by C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas, 1981.

———. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Edited and translated by Caryl Emerson. Theory and History of Literature 8. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

Barclay, John. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora from Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE – 117 CE)*. Hellenistic Culture and Society 33. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.

Barstad, Hans M. "Prophecy at Qumran." Pp. 104–20 in *In the Last Days: On Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic and Its Period*. Edited by Knud

Jeppesen, Kirsten Nielson, and Bent Rosendal. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1996.

Bartelink, G. J. M. "Die *Oracula Sibyllina* in den frühchristlichen griechischen Schriften von Justin bis Origenes (150–250 nach Chr.)." Pp. 23–33 in *Early Christian Poetry*. Edited by J. den Boeft and A. Hilhorst. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 22. Leiden: Brill, 1993.

Barthélemy, Dominique, and J. T. Milik. *Qumran Cave 1*. DJD 1. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.

Bauckham, Richard. "A Quotation from *4Q Second Ezekiel* in the *Apocalypse of Peter*." *RevQ* 15 (1992): 437–45.

Baumgarten, Albert I. "Perception of the Past in the Damascus Document." Pp. 1–15 in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery*. Edited by Joseph M. Baumgarten, Esther G. Chazon, and Avital Pinnick. STDJ 34. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Baumgarten, Joseph M. *Qumran Cave 4. XIII. The Damascus Document (4Q266–273).* DJD 18. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.

———, and Daniel R. Schwartz, "Damascus Document (CD)." Pp 4–53 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. PTSDSSP 2. Louisville: Westminster John Knox 1995.

———, et al. "Damascus Document 4Q266–273 (4QD^{a-h})." Pp. 1–183 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. PTSDSSP 3. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006.

Beaulieu, Paul-Alain. "The Historical Background of the Uruk Prophecy." Pp. 41–52 in *The Tablet and the Scroll*. Edited by M. E. Cohen, et al. Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 1993.

———. *The Reign of Nabonidus, King of Babylon, 556–539 B.C.* YNER 10. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

Bernstein, Moshe. "4Q252: Method and Context, Genre and Sources." *JQR* 85 (1994): 61–80.

Berrin, Shani. *The Pesher Nahum Scroll from Qumran: An Exegetical Study of 4Q169*. STDJ 53. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Betz, Otto. "Past Events and Last Events in the Qumran Interpretation of History." Pp. 27–34 in *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, vol. 1. Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1977.

Bickerman, Elias. *The God of the Maccabees: Studies on the Meaning and Origin of the Maccabean Revolt*. Translated by H. R. Moehring. Leiden: Brill, 1979.

Biggs, Robert D. "The Babylonian Prophecies and the Astrological Traditions of Mesopotamia." *JCS* 37 (1985): 86–90.

———. "Babylonian Prophecies, Astrology, and A New Source for 'Prophecy Text B.'" Pp. 1–14 in F. Rochberg-Halton, ed., *Language, Literature, and History: Philological and Historical Studies Presented to Erica Reiner*. AOS 67. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1987.

———. "More Babylonian 'Prophecies.'" *Iraq* 29 (1967): 117–32.

———. "Šulgi in Simurrum." Pp. 169–78 in G. D. Young, M. W. Chavalas,

and R. E. Averbeck, eds., *Crossing Boundaries and Linking Horizons: Studies in Honor of Michael C. Astour on His 80th Birthday*. Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 1997.

Black, Matthew. *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*. Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece 3. Leiden: Brill, 1970.

———. *The Book of Enoch or I Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes*. SVTP 7. Leiden: Brill, 1985.

Blasius, Andreas, and Bernd U. Schipper, eds. *Apokalyptik und Ägypten: Eine kritische Analyse der relevanten Texte aus dem griechisch-römischen Ägypten*. OLA 107. Leuven: Peeters, 2002.

Block, Daniel Isaac. *The Gods of the Nations: Studies in Ancient Near Eastern National Theology*. Jackson, MS: Evangelical Theological Society, 1988.

Blum, Erhard. "*Formgeschichte*—A Misleading Category? Some Critical Remarks." Pp. 32–45 in *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century*. Edited by Marvin A. Sweeney and Ehud Ben Zvi. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003.

Boccaccini, Gabriele. *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.

Böck, Barbara. *Die Babylonisch-assyrische Morphoskopie*. AfOB 27. Vienna: Institut für Orientalistik der Universität Wien, 2000.

Boer, Roland, ed. *Bakhtin and Genre Theory in Biblical Studies.* Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007.

Bottéro, Jean. "Symptômes, signes, écritures en Mésopotamie ancienne." Pp. 70–197 in *Divination et rationalité*. Edited by J. P. Vernant, et al. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1974.

Borger, Rykle. "Geheimwissen." *RLA* 3. 188–91.

———. "Gott Marduk und Gott-König Šulgi als Propheten: Zwei prophetische Texte." *BO* 28 (1971): 3–24.

Brady, Monica. "Prophetic Traditions at Qumran: A Study of 4Q383–4Q391." Ph.D. diss., University of Notre Dame, 2000.

Briant, Pierre. *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire.* Translated by Peter T. Daniels. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2002.

Brinkman, John. *A Political History of Post-Kassite Babylonia 1158–722 B.C.* AO 43. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1968.

Brooke, George J. "The Book of Jeremiah and Its Reception in the Qumran Scrolls." Pp. 183–205 in *The Book of Jeremiah and Its Reception*. Edited by A. H. W. Curtis and T. Römer. BETL 128. Leuven: University Press, 1997.

———. *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium and Its Jewish Context*. JSOTSup 29. She eld: JSOT Press, 1985.

———. "Ezekiel in Some Qumran and New Testament Texts." Pp. 317–37 in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Madrid 18–21, 1991*, vol. 1. Edited by Julio

Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner. STDJ 11.1. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

———. "The Genre of 4Q252: From Poetry to Pesher." *DSD* 1 (1994): 160–79.

———. "The Kittim in the Qumran Pesharim." Pp. 135–59 in *Images of Empire*. Edited by Loveday Alexander. JSOTSup 122. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.

———. "Qumran Pesher: Towards the Redefinition of a Genre." *RevQ* 10 (1981): 483–503.

———. "The Thematic Content of 4Q252." *JQR* 85 (1994): 33–59.

———. "Was the Teacher of Righteousness Considered to Be a Prophet?" Pp. 77–98 in *Prophecy after the Prophets? The Contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls to the Understanding of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Prophecy*. Edited by Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.

Broshi, Magen, ed. *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society/Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 1992.

Brownlee, William H. "The Background of Biblical Interpretation at Qumran." Pp. 183–93 in *Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie, et son milieu*. BETL 46. Edited by M. Delcor. Paris: Duculot, 1978.

———. "Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls." *BA* 14 (1951): 54–76.

Bryan, David. *Cosmos, Chaos and the Kosher Mentality*. JSPSup 12. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

Buitenwerf, Rieuwerd. *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles and Its Social Setting*. SVTP 17. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Burkert, Walter. *Babylon, Memphis, Persepolis: Eastern Contexts of Greek Culture*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.

———. *Greek Religion*. Translated by John Raffan. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985.

———. "Itinerant Diviners and Magicians: A Neglected Element in Cultural Contacts." Pp. 115–19 in *The Greek Renaissance of the Eighth Century B.C.: Tradition and Innovation*. Edited by Robert Hägg. Stockholm: Paul Åströms Förlag, 1983.

———. *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.

Burrows, Millar, with John C. Trevor and William H. Brownlee. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*. 2 vols. New Haven: ASOR, 1950–1951.

Buss, Martin J. *Biblical Form Criticism in Its Context*. JSOTSup 274. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Caplice, Richard. *The Akkadian Namburbi Texts: An Introduction*. Sources and Monographs, Sources from the Ancient Near East vol. 1, fasc. 1. Malibu, CA: Undena, 1974.

Carmignac, Jean. "Le document de Qumrân sur Melchisédeq." *RevQ* 7 (1970): 343–78.

———. "Notes sur les Peshârîm." *RevQ* 3 (1962): 505–38.

Carr, David M. *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Casey, P. M. "Porphyry and the Origin of the Book of Daniel." *JTS* NS 27 (1976): 15–33.

Charles, R. H. *The Book of Enoch.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1893.

———. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1932.

Charlesworth, James H., ed. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Text with English Translations.* PTSDSSP. Multiple volumes. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995-.

———, ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha.* 2 vols. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983–1985.

Chavalas, Mark W., ed. *The Ancient Near East: Historical Sources in Translation.* Oxford: Blackwell, 2006.

Chazon, Esther. "*4QDibHam*: Liturgy or Literature?" *RevQ* 15 (1992): 447–55.

Clifford, Richard J. "The Roots of Apocalypticism in Near Eastern Myth." Pp. 3–38 in *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism, Vol. 1: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity.* Edited by John J. Collins. New York: Continuum, 1998.

Cole, Steven W. *Nippur IV: The Early Neo-Babylonian Governor's Archive from Nippur.* OIP 114. Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1996.

———, and Peter Machinist. *Letters from Priests to the Kings Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal.* SAA 13. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1998.

Collins, Adela Yarbro. "Numerical Symbolism in Jewish and Early Christian Apocalyptic Literature." Pp. 55–138 in eadem, *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism.* Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Collins, John J. "Apocalyptic Eschatology as the Transcendence of Death." *CBQ* 36 (1974): 21–43.

———. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature.* 2d edition. BRS. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.

———. *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel.* Harvard Semitic Monographs 16. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977.

———. *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls.* New York: Routledge, 1997.

———. *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora.* 2d edition. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

———. *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel.* Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994.

———. "The Development of the Sibylline Tradition." *ANRW* II. 20. 1 (1987): 421–59.

———. "The Jewish Transformation of Sibylline Oracles." Pp. 181–97 in idem, *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

———. "Jewish Apocalyptic against Its Hellenistic Near Eastern Environment." *BASOR* 220 (1975): 27–36

———. "The Place of the Fourth Sibyl in the Development of the Jewish Sibyllina." *JJS* 25 (1974): 365–80.

———. "Prophecy, Apocalypse and Eschatology: Re ections on the Proposals of Lester Grabbe." Pp. 44–53 in *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic, and Their Relationships*. Edited by L. L. Grabbe and R. D. Haak. JSPSup 46. London: T&T Clark, 2003.

———. "*Pseudo-Daniel* Revisited." *RevQ* 17 (1996): 111–35.

———. *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*. 2d edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010.

———. "The Sibyl and the Apocalypses: Generic Relationships in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity." Pp. 185–202 in *Greco-Roman Culture and the New Testament*. Edited by D. Aune and F. Brenk. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

———. "The Sibyl and the Potter: Political Propaganda in Ptolemaic Egypt." Pp. 199–210 in J. J. Collins, *Seers, Sibyls, and Sages in Hellenistic Roman Judaism*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

———. *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism*. SBLDS 13. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1974.

———. "Sibylline Oracles." *OTP* 1. 317–472.

———. "The Son of Man and the Saints of the Most High in the Book of Daniel." *JBL* 93 (1974): 50–66.

———. "The Third Sibyl Revisited." Pp. 82–97 in idem, *Jewish Cult and Hellenistic Culture: Essays on the Jewish Encounter with Hellenism and Roman Rule*. JSJSup 100. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

———, ed. *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre*. *Semeia* 14 (1979).

———, and Peter W. Flint, eds. *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Cook, Edward M. "4Q246." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 5 (1995): 43–66.

Cook, Stephen L. *Prophecy and Apocalypticism: The Postexilic Setting*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.

Coppens, J. "Le Fils d'Homme daniélique et les relectures de Dan VII, 13 dans les apocryphes et les écrits du Nouveau Testament." *ETL* 37 (1961): 5–51.

Crawford, Sidnie White. "The Rewritten Bible at Qumran." Pp. 173–96 in *The Hebrew Bible and Qumran*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. N. Richland Hills, TX: BIBAL, 2000.

Cross, Frank Moore. "The Development of the Jewish Scripts." Pp. 170–264 in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright*. Edited by G. E. Wright. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1965.

———. "Notes on the Doctrine of the Two Messiahs at Qumran and the Extracanonical *Daniel Apocalypse* (4Q246)." Pp. 1–13 in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by D. W. Parry and S. D. Ricks. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Cryer, Frederick H. *Divination in Ancient Israel and Its Near Eastern Environment*. JSOTSup 142. Sheﬃeld: JSOT Press, 1994.

Culler, Jonathan. *Structuralist Poetics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1975.

Davila, James. *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian, or Other?* JSJSup 105. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Delcor, M. "Melchizedek from Genesis to the Qumran Texts and the Epistle to the Hebrews." *JSJ* 2 (1971): 115–35.

Descamps, Albert-Louis. "Les genres littéraires du Psautier. Un état de la question." Pp. 73–88 in *Le Psautier: Ses origines, ses problèmes littéraires, son inﬂuence*. Edited by Robert de Langhe. Orientalia et Biblica Lovaniensia 4. Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1962.

Detaye, Cyrille. "Le cadre historique du Midrash d'Habacuc." *ETL* 30 (1954): 323–43.

Dexinger, Ferdinand. *Henochs Zehnwochenapokalypse und oﬀene Probleme der Apokalyptikforschung*. Studia Post-Biblica 19. Leiden: Brill, 1971.

Diakonoff, I. M. "A Political Pamphlet from about 700 B.C." Pp. 343–49 in *Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger on His Seventy-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by H.-G. Güterbock and T. Jacobsen. AS 16. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1965.

Dimant, Devorah. "*4Q386* ii-iii—A Prophecy on Hellenistic Kingdoms?" *RevQ* 18 (1998): 511–29.

———. "The Apocalyptic Interpretation of Ezekiel at Qumran." Pp. 31–51 in *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity Presented to David Flusser on the Occasion of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by I. Gruenwald, S. Shaked, and G. Stroumsa. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1992.

———. "Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha at Qumran." *DSD* 1 (1994): 151–59.

———. "An Apocryphon of Jeremiah from Cave 4 (4Q385[B]= 4Q385 16)." Pp. 11–30 in *New Qumran Texts & Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992*. Edited by G. J. Brooke. STDJ 15. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

———. "A New Apocryphon of Jeremiah from Qumran: A Presentation." *Henoch* 22 (2000): 169–96.

———. "New Light from Qumran on the Jewish Pseudepigrapha— 4Q390." Pp. 405–48 in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Madrid 18–21, 1991*. Edited by Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner. STDJ 11, vol. 2. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

———. *Qumran Cave 4. XXI; Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts*. DJD 30. Oxford: Clarendon, 2001.

———. "The Seventy Weeks Chronology (Dan 9:24–27) in the Light of New Qumranic Texts." Pp. 57–76 in *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*. BETL 106. Edited by A. S. van der Woude. Leuven: University Press, 1993.

———, and John Strugnell. "The Merkabah Vision in *Second Ezekiel* (4Q385 4)." *RevQ* 14 (1990): 331–48.

DiTommaso, Lorenzo. "4Q*Pseudo-Daniel*[a-b] (4Q243–4Q244) and the Book of Daniel." *DSD* 12 (2005): 101–33.

Dobbs-Allsopp, F. W. "Darwinism, Genre Theory, and City Laments." *JAOS* 120 (2000): 625–30.

———. *Weep, O Daughter of Zion: A Study of the City-Lament Genre in the Hebrew Bible*. BO 44. Rome: Pontiﬁcal Biblical Institute, 1993.

Doudna, Gregory L. *4Q Pesher Nahum: A Critical Edition*. JSPSup 35. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press: 2001.

Drijvers, Pius. *The Psalms, Their Structure and Meaning*. New York: Herder & Herder, 1965.

Dunand, F. "L'Oracle du Potier et la formation de l'apocalyptique en Egypte." Pp. 39–68 in *L'Apocalyptique*. Edited by F. Raphael, et al. Paris: Geuthner, 1977.

Dupont-Sommer, A. "Communication: Observations sur le Commentaire de Nahum découvert près de la Mer Morte." *CRAIBL* (1963): 242–43.

Durand, Jean-Marie. *Archives Épistolaires de Mari I/1*. ARM 26. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilizations, 1988.

———. "Les 'déclarations prophétiques' dans les lettres de Mari." Pp. 8–74 in *Prophétie et Oracles*. Edited by Jésus Asurmendi, et al. Supplément au Cahier Evangile 88. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1994.

———. *Les documents épistolaires du palais de Mari*. 3 vols. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1997–2000.

Ebeling, Erich. *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur religiösen Inhalts*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1919.

Eddy, Samuel K. *The King Is Dead: Studies in the Near Eastern Resistance to Hellenism 334–31 B.C.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.

Ellis, Maria de Jong. "The Goddess Kititum Speaks to King Ibalpiel: Oracle Texts from Ishchali." *MARI* 5 (1986): 235–66.

———. "Observations on Mesopotamian Oracles and Prophetic Texts: Literary and Historiographic Considerations." *JCS* 41 (1989): 127–86.

Eshel, Esther, Hanan Eshel, and Ada Yardeni. "A Qumran Composition Containing Part of Ps 154 and a Prayer for the Welfare of King Jonathan and His Kingdom." *IEJ* 42 (1992): 199–229.

Eshel, Hanan. "4Q390, the 490-Year Prophecy, and the Calendrical History of the Second Temple Period." Pp. 101–10 in *Enoch and Qumran*

Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005.

Fabry, Heinz-Josef. "Die frühjüdische Apokalyptik als Reaktion auf Fremdherrschaft. Zur Funktion von 4Q246." Pp. 84–98 in *Antikes Judentum und Frühes Christentum: Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by B. Kollman, et al. BZNW 97. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999.

Feldman, Louis H. *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Finkel, Asher. "The Pesher of Dreams and Scriptures." *RevQ* 4 (1963): 357–70.

Finkelstein, J. J. "The Genealogy of the Hammurapi Dynasty." *JCS* 20 (1966): 95–118.

———. "Mesopotamin Historiography." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 107, no. 6 (= *Cuneiform Studies and the History of Civilization*) (1963): 461–72.

Fish, Stanley. *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980.

Fishbane, Michael. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1985.

———. "The Qumran pesher and traits of ancient hermeneutics." Pp. 97–114 in *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, vol. 1. Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1977.

———. "Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran." Pp. 339–77 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading, and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by M. J. Mulder. CRINT 2. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1988.

Fishelov, David. *Metaphors of Genre: The Role of Analogies in Genre Theory*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1993.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament." *NTS* 20 (1973): 382–407.

———. *A Wandering Aramaean: Collected Aramaic Essays*. SBLMS 25. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1979.

Fleming, Daniel. "Prophets and Temple Personnel in the Mari Archives." Pp. 45–64 in *The Priests in the Prophets: The Portrayal of Priests, Prophets and Other Religious Specialists in the Latter Prophets*. JSOTSup 408. Edited by Lester L. Grabbe and Alice Ogden Bellis. London: T&T Clarke, 2004.

Flint, Peter W. "4Qpseudo-Daniel ar^c (4Q245) and the Restoration of the Priesthood." *RevQ* 17 (1996): 137–49.

———. "The Daniel Tradition at Qumran." Pp 41–60 in *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by C. A. Evans and P. W. Flint. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

Flower, Michael Attyah. *The Seer in Ancient Greece*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008.

Flusser, David. "The Four Empires in the Fourth Sibyl and in the Book of Daniel." *IOS* 2 (1972): 148–75.

———. "The Hubris of the Antichrist in a Fragment from Qumran." *Immanuel* 10 (1980): 31–37.

———. "Pharisäer, Sadduzäer, und Essener im Pescher Nahum." Pp. 121–66 in *Qumran*. Edited by K. E. Grözinger, et al. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1981.

Foster, Benjamin R. *Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature*. 3d edition. Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 2005.

———. "Mesopotamia and the End of Time." Pp. 23–32 in *Imagining the End: Visions of Apocalypse from the Ancient Middle East to Modern America*. Edited by Abbas Amanat and Magnus Bernhardsson. London: I. B. Tauris, 2002.

Fowler, Alistair. *Kinds of Literature*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Fraade, Steven. "Interpretive Authority in the Studying Community at Qumran." *JJS* 44 (1993): 46–69.

Frahm, Eckart. "Prophetie." *RLA* 11. 7–11.

Freedman, Sally. *If a City Is Set on a Height: The Akkadian Omen Series* Šumma lu ina mêlê šakin. Vol. 1. Occasional Publications of the Samuel Noah Kramer Fund 17. Philadelphia: Samuel Noah Kramer Fund, 1998.

Fröhlich, Ida. "Pesher, Apocalyptical Literature and Qumran." Pp. 1.295–305 in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Madrid 18–21, 1991*. 2 vols. Edited by Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner. STDJ 11. 1. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

———. "Themes, Structure, and Genre of Pesher Genesis: A Response to George Brooke." *JQR* 85 (1994).

Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism*. Princeton: Princeton University, 1957.

Fuchs, Andreas, and Simo Parpola. *The Correspondence of Sargon II*. 3 parts. SAA 1, 5, 15. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1987–2001.

García Martínez, Florentino. "Nuevos textos no biblicos procedentes de Qumran." *EsBib* 49 (1991): 97–134.

———. *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran*. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

———. "Las tradiciones apocalípticas en Qumrán: 4QSecond Ezekiel." Pp. 303–21 in *Biblische und judaistische Studien: Festschrift für Paolo Sacchi*. Edited by A. Viviano. Judentum und Umwelt 29. Frankfurt: Lang, 1990.

———. "Traditions communes dans le IVe Esdras et dans les manuscrits de Qumrân." *RevQ* (1991): 287–301.

———, et al., eds. *Qumran Cave 11 part II: 11Q2–18, 11Q20–31*. DJD 23. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.

———, and Adam S. van der Woude. "A 'Groningen' Hypothesis of Qumran Origins,' *RevQ* 14 (1990): 521–41.

Gauger, Jörg-Dieter, ed. *Sibyllinische Weissagungen: Griechisch-deutsch. Auf der Grundlage der Ausgabe von Alfons Kurfeß, neu überse t und herausgegeben von Jörg-Dieter Gauger*. Düsseldorf: Artemis & Winkler, 1998.

———. "Der 'Traum des Nektanebos'—die griechische Fassung." Pp. 189–220 in Blausius and Schipper, *Apokalyptik und Ägypten*.

Geffcken, Johannes. *Komposition und Entstehungszeit der Oracula Sibyllina*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1902.

———. *Die Oracula Sibyllina*. Der königl. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaft. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1902.

Geller, Mark J. "Babylonian Astronomical Diaries and Corrections of Diodorus." *BSOAS* 53 (1990): 1–7.

Genette, Gérard. *The Architext: An Introduction*. Translated by Jane E. Lewin. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.

Gera, Dov. *Judaea and Mediterranean Politics 219 to 161 B.C.E.* Brill's Series in Jewish Studies 8. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Ginsberg, H. L. *Studies in Daniel*. Texts and Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America 14. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1948.

Ginzberg, Louis. *An Unknown Jewish Sect*. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1976 [translation of *Eine unbekannte jüdische Sekte*, self published, 1922].

Glassner, Jean-Jacques. *Mesopotamian Chronicles*. WAW 19. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004.

Goldstein, Jonathan. *1 Maccabees.* AB 41. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976.

———. "The Historical Setting of the Uruk Prophecy." *JNES* 47 (1988): 43–46.

Goetze, Albrecht. "Historical Allusions in Old Babylonian Omen Texts." *JCS* 1 (1937): 253–66.

———. *Old Babylonian Omen Texts*. YOS 10. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947.

Goldingay, John E. *Daniel*. Word Biblical Commentary 30. Dallas: Word Books, 1989.

Grabbe, Lester. "Introduction and Overview." Pp. 2–43 in *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic, and their Relationships*. Edited by L. L. Grabbe and R. D. Haak. JSPSup 46. London: T&T Clark, 2003.

———. "Prophetic and Apocalyptic: Time for New De nitions—And New Thinking." Pp. 108–33 in *Knowing the End from the Beginning:*

The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic, and Their Relationships. Edited by L. L. Grabbe and R. D. Haak. JSPSup 46. London: T&T Clark, 2003.

———. *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian*. 2 vols. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

Grayson, A. K. "Assyria and Babylonia." *Orientalia* NS 49 (1980): 140–94.

———. *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles*. Locust Valley, NY: J. J. Augustin, 1975.

———. *Babylonian Historical-Literary Texts*. Toronto Semitic Texts and Studies 3. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975.

———. "The Babylonian Origin of Apocalyptic Literature." *Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti* 148 (1989–1990), 203–18.

———. "Divination and the Babylonian Chronicles: A Study of the Rôle Which Divination Plays in Ancient Mesopotamian Chronography." Pp. 69–76 in *La Divination en Mésopotamie Ancienne et dans les Régions Voisines*. RAI 14. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1966.

———, and W. G. Lambert. "Akkadian Prophecies." *JCS* 18 (1964): 7–30.

Gruen, Erich. *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition*. Hellenistic Culture and Society 30. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

Gruenwald, Ithamar. "A Case Study of Scripture and Culture: Apocalypticism as Cultural Identity in Past and Present." Pp. 252–79 in *Ancient and Modern Perspectives on the Bible and Culture: Essays in Honor of Hans Dieter Be *. Edited by Adela Yarbro Collins. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.

Gunkel, Hermann. *The Stories of Genesis*. Translated by John J. Scullion. Vallejo, CA: BIBAL, 1994.

Güterbock, Hans-Gustav. "Die historische Tradition und ihre literarische Gestaltung bei Babyloniern und Hethitern bis 1200." *ZA* 42 (1934): 1–91.

Hallo, W. W. "Akkadian Apocalypses." *IEJ* 16 (1966): 231–42.

———. "The Expansion of Cuneiform Literature." Pp. 307–22 in *Jubilee Volume of the American Academy for Jewish Research*. Proceedings 46–47. Jerusalem: American Academy of Jewish Research, 1980.

———, and K. L. Younger, eds. *The Context of Scripture*. 3 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997–2003.

Hanson, Paul D. *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology*. Revised edition. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

Hartman, Louis F., and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Book of Daniel*. AB 23. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1978.

Hasel, G. F. "The Four World Empires of Daniel 2 against Its Near Eastern Environment." *JSOT* 12 (1979): 17–30.

Heeßel, Nils. *Babylonish-assyrische Diagnostik*. AOAT 43. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2000.

Heimpel, Wolfgang. *Letters to the King of Mari: A New Translation with*

Historical Introduction, Notes, and Commentary. MC. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003.

Heintz, J.-G. "Note sur les origines de l'apocalyptique judaïque, à la lumière des 'Prophéties akkadiennes." Pp. 71–87 in *L'Apocalyptique*. Edited by F. Raphaël, et al. Paris: P. Geuthner, 1977.

———. "Royal Traits and Messianic Figures: A Thematic and Iconographical Approach (Mesopotamian Elements)." Pp. 52–66 in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* . Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

Hempel, Charlotte. *The Damascus Texts*. CQS 1. She eld: She eld Academic Press, 2000.

Henrichs, Albert. "Writing Religion: Inscribed Texts, Ritual Authority, and the Religious Discourse of the Polis." Pp. 38–58 in *Written Texts and the Rise of Literate Culture in Ancient Greece.* Edited by Harvey Yunis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Hellenistic Period*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.

Henze, Matthias. "4QApocryphon of Jeremiah C and 4QPseudo-Ezekiel: Two 'Historical' Apocalypses." Pp. 25–42 in *Prophecy after the Prophets? The Contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls to the Understanding of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Prophecy*. Edited by Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.

———. *The Madness of King Nebuchadnezzar: The Ancient Near Eastern Origins and Early History of Interpretation of Daniel 4*. JSJSup 61. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Hirsch, E. D. *Validity in Interpretation*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967.

Höffken, P. "Heilszeitherrschererwartung im babylonische Raum." *WO* 9 (1977): 51–71.

Horgan, Maurya P. *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*. CBQMS 8. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 1979.

Horowitz, Wayne, and Takayoshi Oshima. With Seth Sanders. *Cuneiform in Canaan: Cuneiform Sources from the Land of Israel in Ancient Times*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2006.

Horst, Pieter W. van der. *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides with Introduction and Commentary*. SVTP 4. Leiden: Brill, 1978.

Huffmon, Herbert B. "A Company of Prophets: Mari, Assyria, Israel." Pp. 47–70 in *Prophecy in Its Ancient Near Eastern Context: Mesopotamian, Biblical, and Arabian Perspectives*. Edited by Martti Nissinen. SBLSS 13. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000.

Hultgård, Anders. "Forms and Origins of Iranian Apocalypticism." Pp. 387–411 in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*. Edited by David Hellholm. Tübingen: Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983.

Hunger, Hermann. *Astrological Reports to Assyrian Kings*. SAA 8. Helsinki: University of Helsinki Press, 1992.

———. *Spätbabylonische Texte aus Uruk, Teil I*. Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft in Uruk-Warka, 9. Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1976.

———, and Steven A. Kaufman. "A New Akkadian Prophecy Text." *JAOS* 95 (1975): 371–75.

———, and David Pingree. *MUL. APIN: An Astronomical Compendium in Cuneiform*. Horn, Austria: Berger & Söhne, 1989.

Ibanez, Jesus-M. Nieto. "Los Mitos Griegos en el Corpus de los Oraculos Sibilinos." Pp. 389–410 in *Sibille e Linguaggi Oraccolari: Mito, Storia, Tradizione*. Edited by Ileana Chirassi Colombo and Tullio Seppilli. Pisa: Istituti Editoriali e Poligra ci Internazionali, 1998.

Isaac, E. "1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch." *OTP* 1. 5–89.

Jack, Alison. "An Arboreal Sign of the End-Time (*4Q385 2*)." *JJS* 47 (1996): 337–44.

Jacobsen, Thorkild. "The Battle between Marduk and Tiamat." *JAOS* 88 (1968): 104–8.

James, M. R. "A New Text of the Apocalypse of Peter." *JTS* 11 (1910): 36–54.

———. "A New Text of the Apocalypse of Peter II." *JTS* 12 (1911): 362–83.

———. "A New Text of the Apocalypse of Peter III." *JTS* 12 (1911): 573–83.

Jeyes, Ulla. *Old Babylonian Extispicy: Omen Texts in the British Museum*. Uitgaven van het Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul 64. Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul, 1989.

Johnson, Janet. "The Demotic Chronicle as a Statement of a Theory of Kingship." *JSSEA* 13 (1983): 61–72.

———. "The Demotic Chronicle as an Historical Source." *Enchoria* 4 (1974): 1–17.

———. "Is the Demotic Chronicle an Anti-Greek Tract?" Pp. 107–24 in *Grammata Demotika: Festschrift für Erich Lüddeckens zum 15. Juni 1983*. Edited by H.-J. Thissen and K.-T. Zauzich. Würzburg: Zauzich Verlag, 1984.

———, and Robert K. Ritner. "Multiple Meaning and Ambiguity in the 'Demotic Chronicle.'" Pp. 494–506 in *Studies in Egyptology Presented to Miriam Lichtheim*. Vol. 1. Edited by Sarah Israelit-Groll. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1990.

Johnston, Sarah Iles. *Ancient Greek Divination*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2008.

Kaiser, Otto, ed. *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments.* Gütersloh: Mohn, 1982-.

Kaufman, S. A. "Prediction, Prophecy, and Apocalypse in the Light of New Akkadian Texts." Pp. 221–28 in *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, vol. 1. Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1974.

Kister, Menahem. "*Barnabas* 12:1; 4:3 and 4Q*Second Ezekiel*." *RB* 97 (1990): 63–67.

———, and Elisha Qimron. "Observations on 4QSecond Ezekiel." *RevQ* 15 (1992): 595–602.

Klein, Jacob. "Shulgi of Ur: King of a Neo-Sumerian Empire." *CANE* 2. 843–57.

———. *Three Šulgi Hymns: Sumerian Royal Hymns Glorifying King Šulgi of Ur*. Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University, 1981.

Knibb, Michael A. "The Apocalypse of Weeks and the Epistle of Enoch." Pp. 213–19 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by G. Boccaccini. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005.

———. *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*. 2 volumes. Oxford: Clarendon, 1978.

———. "A Note on 4Q372 and 4Q390." Pp. 164–77 in *The Scriptures and the Scrolls: Studies in Honour of A. S. Van der Woude on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*. Edited by F. García Martínez, A. Hilhorst, and C. J. Labuschagne. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

Knierim, Rolf. "Criticism of Literary Features, Form, Tradition and Redaction." Pp. 123–65 in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Modern Interpreters*. Edited by Douglas Knight and Gene M. Tucker. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

Koch, Klaus. "Die mysteriösen Zahlen der judäischen Könige und die apokalyptischen Jahrwochen." *VT* 28 (1978): 433–41.

———. *Ratlos vor der Apokalyptik*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1970.

———. *Was ist Formgeschichte? Methoden der Bibelexegese. Mit einem Nachwort, Linguistik und Formgeschichte*. 3d ed. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1974.

Koch, Ulla Susanne. *Secrets of Extispicy: The Chapter* Mult biltu *of the Babylonian Extispicy Series and* Nişirti b rûti *Texts Mainly from Aššurbanipal's Library*. AOAT 326. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2005.

Koch-Westenholz, Ulla. *Babylonian Liver Omens: The Chapters* Manz zu, Pad nu, *and* P n t kalti *of the Babylonian Extispicy Series Mainly from Aššurbanipal's Library*. CNI 25. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum, 2000.

———. *Mesopotamian Astrology: An Introduction to Babylonian and Assyrian Celestial Divination.* CNI 19. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum, 1995.

Koenen, Ludwig. "Die Adaptation ägyptischer Königsideologie am Ptolemäerhof." Pp. 143–90 in *Egypt and the Hellenistic World*. Edited by E. Van 't Dack, et al. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1983.

———. "Die Apologie des Töpfers an König Amenhopis oder das Töpferorakel." Pp. 139–87 in Blasius and Schipper, eds., *Apokalyptik und Ägytpen*.

———. "The Prophecies of a Potter: A Prophecy of World Renewal Becomes an Apocalypse." Pp. 249–54 in *Proceedings of the Twelfth Inter-*

national Congress of Papyrology. Edited by D. H. Samuel. American Studies in Papyrology 7. Toronto: A. M. Hakkert, 1970.

———. "Die Prophezeiungen des 'Töpfers.'" *ZPE* 2 (1968): 178–209.

———. "A Supplementary Note on the Date of the Oracle of the Potter." *ZPE* 54 (1984): 9–13.

Kouwenberg, N. J. C. "Ventive, Dative, and Allative in Old Babylonian." *ZA* 92 (2009): 200–240.

Kuhn, Karl A. "The 'One Like a Son of Man' Becomes the 'Son of God.'" *CBQ* 69 (2007): 22–42.

Kuhrt, Amélie. "Survey of Written Sources Available for the History of Babylonia under the Later Achaemenids." Pp. 147–57 in *Achaemenid History I: Sources, Structures and Syntheses*. Edited by Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 1987.

Kurfeß, Alfons. "Homer und Hesiod im 1. Buch der Oracula Sibyllina." *Philologus* 100 (1956): 147–53.

———. "Oracula Sibyllina I/II." *ZNW* 40 (1941): 141–65.

———. *Sibyllinische Weissagungen*. Munich: Heimeren, 1951.

Kvanvig, Helge. *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*. WMANT 61. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988.

Labat, René. *Un calendrier Babylonien des travaux des signes et des mois (série iqqur puš)*. Paris: Champion, 1965.

Lambert, W. G. "Another Look at Hammurabi's Ancestors." *JCS* 22 (1968): 1–2.

———. *The Background of Jewish Apocalyptic*. London: Athlone, 1978.

———. "History and the Gods: A Review Article." *Orientalia* NS 39 (1970): 170–77.

———. "Kingship in Ancient Mesopotamia." Pp. 55–70 in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by John Day. JSOTSup 270. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

———. "The Reign of Nebuchadnezzar I: A Turning Point in the History of Mesopotamian Religion." Pp. 3–13 in *The Seed of Wisdom*. Edited by W. S. McCullough. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964.

———. "The Seed of Kingship." Pp. 427–40 in P. Garelli, ed., *Le Palais et la Royauté*. RAI 19. Paris: Geuthner, 1974.

Landsberger, Benno. "Studien zu den Urkunden aus der Zeit des Ninurta-tukul-Aššur." *AfO* 10 (1935–1936): 140–59.

———. "Der 'Ventiv' des Akkadischen." *ZA* 35 (1924): 113–23.

Lange, Armin. "The Essene Position on Magic and Divination." Pp. 377–435 in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Cambridge 1995*. Edited by M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen. STDJ 23. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Laubscher, F. du Toit. "God's Angel of Truth and Melchizedek: A Note on 11QMelch 13b." *JSJ* 3 (1972): 46–51.

Lehoux, Daryn. "The Historicity Question in Mesopotamian Divination." Pp. 209–22 in *Under One Sky: Astronomy and Mathematics in the Ancient Near East*. Edited by John M. Steele and Annette Imhausen. AOAT 297. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2002.

Leichty, Erle. *The Omen Series* Šumma Izbu. TCS 4. Locust Valley, NY: Augustin, 1970.

LeMon, Joel. *Yahweh's Winged Form in the Psalms: Exploring Congruent Iconography and Texts*. OBO 242; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010.

Lenzi, Alan. *Secrecy and the Gods: Secret Knowledge in Ancient Mesopotamia and Biblical Israel*. SAAS 19. Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2008.

Lightfoot, J. L. *The Sibylline Oracles with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary on the First and Second Books*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Lim, Timothy. "Eschatological Orientation and the Alteration of Scripture in the Habakkuk Pesher." *JNES* 49 (1990): 185–95.

———. *Pesharim*. CQS 3. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.

Lloyd, Alan B. "Nationalist Propaganda in Ptolemaic Egypt." *Historia* 31 (1982): 33–55.

Longman, Tremper, III. *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1991.

Lucas, Ernest C. "Akkadian Prophecies, Omens and Myths as Background for Daniel Chapters 7–12." Ph.D. diss., Liverpool University, 1989.

———. *Daniel*. Apollos Old Testament Commentary 20. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2002.

———. "Daniel: Resolving the Enigma." *VT* 50 (2000): 66–80.

Luckenbill, Daniel C. "The Black Stone of Esarhaddon." *AJSL* 41 (1924–1925): 165–73.

Lundbom, Jack R. *Jeremiah 21–36*. AB 21B. New York: Doubleday, 2004.

Lust, Johan. "Cult and Sacrifice in Daniel. The Tamid and the Abomination of Desolation." Pp. 671–88 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Volume 2. Edited by John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

———. "Daniel 7,13 and the Septuagint." *ETL* 54 (1978): 62–69.

Machinist, Peter. "The Transfer of Kingship: A Divine Turning." Pp. 105–20 in *Fortunate the Eyes That See: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Seventieth Birthday*. Edited by Astrid Beck, Andrew Bartlet, Paul Raabe, and Chris Franke. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995.

MacMillan, Kerr D. "Some Cuneiform Tablets Bearing on the Religion of Babylonia and Assyria." *Beiträge zur Assyriologie* 5 (1906): 531–712.

Malamat, Abraham. "A Forerunner of Biblical Prophecy: The Mari Documents." Pp. 33–52 in *Ancient Israelite Religion: Esssays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross*. Edited by P. D. Miller, P. D. Hanson, and S. D. McBride. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.

Marasco, Gabriele. "La 'Profezia Dinastica.'" *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 15/2 (1985): 529–37.

Martin, Francois. "Mélanges assyriologiques." *RT* 24 (1902): 96–108.

Mason, Steve. "Jews, Judeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History." *JSJ* 38 (2007): 457–512.

Maul, Stefan. "Omina und Orakel. A. Mesopotamien." *RLA* 10. 45–88.

———. *Zukunftsbewältigung: Eine Untersuchung altorientalischen Denkens anhand der babylonisch-assyrischen Löserituale (Namburbi)*. Baghdader Forschungen 18. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, 1994.

McCown, C. C. "Hebrew and Egyptian Apocalyptic Literature." *HTR* 18 (1925): 357–411.

Mendels, D. "The Five Empires: A Note on a Propagandistic *Topos*." *American Journal of Philology* 102 (1981): 330–37.

Merkel, Helmut. "Sibyllinen" = *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit*; Band V, Lieferung 8. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1998.

Meyer, Eduard. "Eine eschatologische Prophetie über die Geschichte Ägyptens in persischer und griechischer Zeit." Pp. 69–91 in *Kleine Schriften von Eduard Meyer*. Halle: Max Niemeyer 1924 (originally published in *Si ungsberichten der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 1915, pp. 287–311).

Michalowski, Piotr. "History as Charter: Some Observations on the Sumerian King List." *JAOS* 103 (1983): 237–48.

Mieroop, Marc van de. *A History of the Ancient Near East*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004.

Milik, J. T. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1976.

———. "*Milkî-ṣedeq* et *Milkî-reša*ᶜ dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens (1)." *JJS* 23 (1972): 109–24.

———. "'Prière de Nabonide' et autres écrits d'un cycle de Daniel." *RB* 63 (1956) 407–15.

Montgomery, James A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1927.

Momigliano, Arnaldo. "Biblical Studies and Classical Studies: Simple Re ections upon the Historical Method." Pp. 3–9 in idem, *Essays on Ancient and Modern Judaism*. Edited by Silvia Berti. Translated by Maura Mausella-Gayley. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

———. "Daniel and Greek Theory of Imperial Succession." Pp. 29–35 in idem, *Essays on Ancient and Modern Judaism*. Edited by Silvia Berti. Translated by Maura Mausella-Gayley. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

———. "La portata storica dei vaticini sul settimo re nel terzo libro degli Oracoli Sibillini." Pages 2. 551–59 in idem, *Sesto Contributo Alla Storia degli Studi Classici e del Mondo Antico*. Rome: Storia e Letteratura, 1980.

Mørkholm, Otto. *Antiochus IV of Syria*. Copenhagen: Gyldendalske Boghandel/ Nordisk Forlag, 1966.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. *Psalmenstudien*. 6 vols. Kristiana: Jacob Dybwad, 1921–1924.

Mueller, James R. *The Five Fragments of the* Apocryphon of Ezekiel*: A Critical Study*. JSPSup 5. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

Nelson, Richard D. "The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History: The Case Is Still Compelling." *JSOT* 29 (2005): 319–37.

Neujahr, Matthew. "Royal Ideology and Utopian Futures in the Akkadian *ex eventu* Prophecies." Pp. 41–54 in *Utopia and Dystopia in Prophetic Literature*. Edited by Ehud Ben Zvi. PFES 92. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, University of Helsinki, 2006.

———. "When Darius Defeated Alexander: Composition and Redaction in the Dynastic Prophecy." *JNES* 64 (2005): 101–8.

Newsom, Carol. *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

———. "'Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran." Pp. 167–87 in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters*. Edited by William H. Propp, et al. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

———. "Spying Out the Land: A Report from Genology." Pp. 437–50 in *Seeking Out the Wisdom of the Ancients: Essays Offered to Honor Michael V. Fox on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by R. L. Troxel, K. G. Friebel, and D. R. Magary. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005.

Nickelsburg, George W. E. *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.

———, and James VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation Based on the Hermeneia Commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004.

Nikiprowetzky, Valentin. "La Sibylle juive et le 'Troisième Livre' des 'Pseudo-Oracles Sibyllins' depuis Charles Alexandre." *ANRW* II. 20. 1 (1987): 460–540.

———. *La Troisième Sibylle*. Paris: La Haye, Mouton, 1970.

Niskanen, Paul. *The Human and the Divine in History: Herodotus and the Book of Daniel*. JSOTSup 396. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

Nissinen, Martti. "Neither Prophecies nor Apocalypses: The Akkadian Literary Predictive Texts." Pp. 134–48 in *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and their Relationship*. Edited by L. L. Grabbe and R. D. Haak. London: T&T Clark, 2003.

———. "Pesharim as Divination. Qumran Exegesis, Omen Interpretation, and Literary Prophecy." Pp. 43–60 in *Prophecy after the Prophets? The Contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls to the Understanding of Biblical and*

Extra-Biblical Prophecy. Edited by Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.

———. "Prophecy and Omen Divination: Two Sides of the Same Coin." Pp. 341–47 in *Divination and Interpretation of Signs in the Ancient World*. Edited by Amar Annus. Oriental Institute Seminars 6; Chicago: Oriental Institute, 2010.

———. *References to Prophecy in Neo-Assyrian Sources*. SAAS 7. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1998.

———. "What Is Prophecy? An Ancient Near Eastern Perspective." Pp. 17–37 in *Inspired Speech: Prophecy in the Ancient Near East*. Edited by John Kaltner and Louis Stulman. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

———, with contributions by C. L. Seow and R. K. Rittner. *Prophets and Prophecy in the Ancient Near East*. WAW 12. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

Nitzan, Bilhah. "The *Pesher* and Other Methods of Instruction." Pp. 209–20 in *Mogilany 1989: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls O ered in Memory of Jean Carmignac*, pt. 2. Edited by Zdzislaw J. Kapera. Cracow: Enigma Press, 1991.

Nötscher, Friedrich. *Die Omen-Serie* šumma lu ina mêlê šakin *(CT 38–40)*. Rome: Ponti cial Biblical Institute, 1930.

Nougayrol, J. "Note sur la place des 'presages historiques' dans l'extispicine babylonienne." *École Pratique des Hautes Études, Section des Sciences Religieuses, Annuaire* (1944–1945): 5–41.

Oppenheim, A. Leo. *Ancient Mesopotamia: Portrait of a Dead Civilization*. Revised edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977.

———. *The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East. With a Translation of an Assyrian Dream-Book*. TAPS 46.3. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1956.

———. "Zur keilschriftlichen Omenliteratur." *Orientalia* NS 5 (1936): 199–228.

Osswald, Eva. "Zur Hermeneutik des Habakuk-Kommentars." *ZAW* 68 (1956): 243–56.

Parke, H. W. *Sibyls and Sibylline Prophecy in Classical Antiquity*. London: Routledge, 1988.

Parpola, Simo. *Assyrian Prophecies*. SAA 9. Helsinki: University of Helsinki Press, 1997.

Paul, Shalom. "The Mesopotamian Background of Daniel 1–6." Pp. 1. 55–68 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Edited by John J. Collins and Peter Flint. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Pavel, Thomas. "Literary Genres as Norms and Good Habits." *New Literary History* 34 (2003): 201–10.

Peretti, Aurelio. *La Sibilla Babilonese nella propaganda ellenistica*. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1943.

Philonenko, Marc. "Un arbre se courbera et se redressera (4Q385 2 9–10)."
     RHPR 73 (1993): 401–4.

———. "De Qoumrân à Doura-Europos: La vision des ossements desséchés (Ézéchiel 37, 1–4)." *RHPR* 74 (1994): 1–12.

Pinches, T. *JRAS* 1 (1904).

Plöger, Otto. *Das Buch Daniel*. KAT 18. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1965.

———. *Theocracy and Eschatology*. Translated by S. Rudman. Oxford: Blackwell, 1968.

Poebel, Arno. *The Second Dynasty of Isin according to a New King-List Tablet*. AS 15. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.

Pongratz-Leisten, Beate. *Herrschaftswissen in Mesopotamien: Formen der Kommunikation zwischen Gott und König im 2. und 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr*. SAAS 10. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1999.

———. "'The Writing of the God' and the Textualization of Neo-Assyrian Prophecy." In *I Am No Prophet.* Edited by A. Lange. Leiden: Brill. Forthcoming.

Popovic, Mladen. *Reading the Human Body: Physiognomics and Astrology in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Hellenistic-Early Roman Period Judaism*. STDJ 67. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Portier-Young, Anathea. *Apocalypse against Empire: Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011.

Postgate, J. N. *Early Mesopotamia: Society and Economy at the Dawn of History*. London: Routledge, 1992.

———. "Royal Ideology and State Administration in Sumer and Akkad." *CANE* 1. 395–411.

Potter, David. *Prophets and Emperors: Human and Divine Authority from Augustus to Theodosius*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994.

Propp, Vladimir. *Morphology of the Folktale*. Translated by Laurence Scott. Bloomington, IN: Research Center, Indiana University, 1958.

Puech, Émile. *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: Immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d'une croyance dans le Judaïsme ancien*. 2 vols. Paris: Gabalda, 1993.

———. "Le ls de Dieu, le ls du Très-Haut, messie roi en 4Q246." Pp. 271–86 in *Le jugement dans l'un et l'autre Testament, I: Mélanges o erts à Raymond Kun mann*. Edited by Eberhard Bons. Lectio Divina 197. Paris: Cerf, 2004.

———. "L'image de l'arbre en 4QDeutéro-Ézéchiel." *RevQ* 16 (1994): 429–40.

Rabin, Chaim. "Alexander Jannaeus and the Pharisees." *JJS* 7 (1956): 3–11.

Rabinowitz, Isaac. "'P sher/Pitt r n': Its Biblical Meaning and Its Signi cance in the Qumran Community." *RevQ* 8 (1973): 219–32.

Reif, Stefan. "The Damascus Document from the Cairo Genizah: Its Discovery, Early Study and Historical Signi cance." Pp. 109–31 in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery*. Edited by Joseph M.

Baumgarten, Esther G. Chazon, and Avital Pinnick. STDJ 34. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Reiner, Erica. *Astral Magic in Babylonia. TAPS* NS 85, vol. 4. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1995.

———. "The Babylonian Fürstenspiegel in Practice." Pp. 321–26 in *Societies and Languages of the Ancient Near East: Studies in Honour of I. M. Diakano*. Edited by M. A. Dandamayev. Warminster, UK: Aris & Phillips, 1982.

———. "New Light on Some Historical Omens." Pp. 257–61 in *Anatolian Studies Presented to Hans Gustav Güterbock on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Edited by K. Bittel, Ph. H. J. Houwink Ten Cate, and E. Reiner. Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut in het Nabije Oosteen, 1974.

———, and David Pingree. *Babylonian Planetary Omens Part One: The Venus Tablets of Ammiṣaduqa, Enūma Anu Enlil Tablet 63*. Bibliotheca Mesopotamica 2,1. Malibu, CA: Undena, 1975.

———, and David Pingree. *Babylonian Planetary Omens Part Two: Enūma Anu Enlil, Tablets 50–51*. Bibliotheca Mesopotamica 2,2. Malibu, CA: Undena, 1981.

———, and David Pingree. *Babylonian Planetary Omens Part Three*. CM 11. Groningen: Styx, 1998.

———, and David Pingree. *Babylonian Planetary Omens Part Four*. CM 30. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Ringgren, Helmer. "Akkadian Apocalypses." Pp. 379–86 in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*. Edited by D. Hellholm. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983.

Roberts, J. J. M. "Nebuchadnezzar I's Elamite Crisis in Theological Perspective." Pp. 183–87 in M. de Jong Ellis, ed., *Essays on the Ancient Near East*. Hamden, CT: Archon, 1977.

Roberts, Michael. "Fürstenspiegel." Cols. 693–95 in *Der Neue Pauly*, vol. 4. Edited by H. Cancik and H. Schneider. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1996–2003.

Rochberg, Francesca. *Aspects of Babylonian Celestial Divination: The Lunar Eclipse Tablets of* En ma Anu Enlil. AfOB 22. Horn: F. Berger & Söhne, 1988.

———. *The Heavenly Writing: Divination, Horoscopy, and Astronomy in Mesopotamian Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Rosmarin, Adena. *The Power of Genre*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1985.

Rowland, Christopher. *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*. New York: Crossroad, 1982.

Rowley, H. H. "The Internal Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls." *ETL* 28 (1952): 257–76.

———. "The Unity of the Book of Daniel." *HUCA* 23 (1950–51): 233–73.

Russell, D. S. *Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic*. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964.

Rzach, Alois. *Oracula Sibyllina*. Leipzig: Freytag, 1891.

———. "Sibyllen." Cols. 2073–2102 in *Pauly-Wissowa* 2A (1923)

———. "Sibyllinische Orakel." Cols. 2102–2183 in *Pauly-Wissowa* 2A (1923).

Sachs, Abraham J., and H. Hunger. *Astronomical Diaries and Related Texts from Babylonia*, vol. 1. Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1988.

Saggs, H. W. F. *The Encounter with the Divine in Mesopotamia and Israel*. London: Athlone, 1978.

Sasson, Jack, ed. *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East.* 4 vols. New York: Scribners, 1995 (reprinted: 4 volumes in 2 parts; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2001).

Schiffman, Lawrence. "Pharisees and Sadducees in *Pesher Naḥum*." Pp. 272–90 in *Minḥah le-Naḥum: Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honour of His 70th Birthday*. Edited by Marc Brettler and Michael Fishbane. JSOTSup 154. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

Schmidt, Jürgen. *26 und 27. vorläufiger Bericht über die von dem Deutschen Archäologischen Institut und der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft aus Mitteln der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft unternommen Ausgrabungen in Uruk-Warka 1968 und 1969*. Abhandlungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 16. Berlin: Mann, 1972.

Schnabel, Paul. *Berrosus und die babylonisch-hellenistische Literatur*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1923.

Schniedewind, William. *How the Bible Became a Book: The Textualization of Ancient Israel*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Schulte, J. Manuel. *Speculum Regis: Studien zur Fürstenspiegel-Literatur in der griechisch-römischen Antike*. Antike Kultur und Geschichte 3. Münster: Lit, 2001.

Schürer, Emil. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*. 3 vols. in 4 parts. Revised and edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Goodman. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1973–1987.

Scurlock, JoAnn. "Prophecy as a Form of Divination; Divination as a Form of Prophecy." Pp. 277–316 in *Divination and Interpretation of Signs in the Ancient World*. Edited by Amar Annus. Oriental Institute Seminars 6. Chicago: Oriental Institute, 2010.

———. "Whose Truth and Whose Justice? The Uruk and Other Later Akkadian Prophecies re-Revisited." Pp. 449–67 in *Orientalism, Assyriology and the Bible*. Edited by Steven W. Holloway. Sheffield: Phoenix Press, 2006.

Sherwin-White, Susan. "Seleucid Babylonia: A Case Study for the Installation and Development of Greek Rule." Pp. 1–31 in A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin-White, eds., *Hellenism in the East: The interaction of Greek and*

Non-Greek Civilizations from Syria to Central Asia after Alexander. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.

———, and Amélie Kuhrt. *From Samarkhand to Sardis: A New Approach to the Seleucid Empire*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Sinding, Michael. "After De nitions: Genre, Categories, and Cognitive Science." *Genre* 35 (2002): 181–220.

Smith, Jonathan Z. *Imagining Religion: From Babylon to Jonestown*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.

———. *Map Is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religions*. Leiden: Brill, 1978.

———. *Relating Religion: Essays in the Study of Religion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Smith-Christopher, Daniel L. "Daniel and the Additions to Daniel." Pp. 19–194 in *The New Interpreter's Bible*, vol. 7. Nashville: Abingdon, 1996.

Soden, Wolfram von. "Eine babylonische Volksüberlieferung von Nabonid in den Danielerzählungen." *ZAW* 53 (1935): 81–89.

Soldt, Wilfred H. van. *Solar Omens of Enūma Anu Enlil: Tablets 23 (24)–29 (30)*. Uitgaven van het Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul 73; Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul, 1995.

Sollberger, Edmond. "Sur la chronologie des rois d'Ur et quelques problemes connexes." *AfO* 17 (1954–1956): 10–48.

Sparks, H. F. D., ed. *The Apocryphal Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1984.

Sparks, Kenton L. *Ancient Texts for the Study of the Hebrew Bible: A Guide to the Background Literature*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2005.

Speck, Robartus J. van der. "Darius III, Alexander the Great, and Babylonian Scholarship." Pp. 289–346 in *A Persian Perspective: Essays in Memory of Heleen Sancisi-Weerenburg*. Edited by Wouter Kenkelman and Amélie Kuhrt. Achaemenid History 13. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2003.

Spiegelberg, Wilhelm. *Die sogenannte demotische Chronik des Pap. 215 der Bibliothèque Nationale zu Paris*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1914.

Starr, Ivan. "Historical Omens concerning Ashurbanipal's War against Elam." *AfO* 32 (1985): 60–67.

———. "Notes on Some Published and Unpublished Historical Omens." *JCS* 29 (1977): 157–66.

Steinkeller, Piotr. "The Administrative and Economic Organization of the Ur III State: The Core and the Periphery." Pp. 19–41 in R. D. Biggs and M. Gibson, eds., *The Organization of Power: Aspects of Bureaucracy in the Ancient Near East*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 1987.

Stegemann, Hartmut. *The Library of Qumran*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

Stolper, Matthew. "Mesopotamia, 482–330 BCE." Pp. 234–60 in *Cambridge*

Ancient History. Second edition. Volume 4. Edited by D. M. Lewis, et al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Stone, Michael. *Ancient Judaism: New Visions and Views*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2011.

———. *Fourth Ezra*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

———. "Lists of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature." Pp. 414–54 in *Magnalia Dei, the Mighty Acts of God: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright*. Edited by F. M. Cross, W. E. Lemke, and P. D. Miller. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976.

———, ed. *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. CRINT section 2, vol. 2. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984.

Strawn, Brent. "Apocalyptic Texts. Marduk Prophecy." Pp. 168–74 in Chavalas, *The Ancient Near East: Historical Sources*.

Strong, S. Arthur. "Three Cuneiform Texts." *BOR* 6 (1892–1893): 1–9.

Strugnell, John. "The Angelic Liturgy at Qumran: 4Q Serek Šîrôt ʿÔlat Haššabb t." in *Congress Volume*. Edited by G. W. Anderson, et al. VTSup 7. Leiden: Brill, 1960.

———. "Moses-Pseudepigrapha at Qumran: 4Q375, 4Q376, and Similar Works." Pp. 221–56 in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*. Edited by Lawrence Schiffman. JSPSup 8. She eld: JSOT Press, 1990.

———. "Notes en marge du volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan'." *RevQ* 7 (1970): 163–276.

———, and Devorah Dimant. "4Q Second Ezekiel." *RevQ* 13 (1988): 45–58.

Stuckenbruck, Loren T. *1 Enoch 91–108*. CEJL. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007.

———. "The Book of Daniel and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Making and Remaking of the Biblical Tradition." Pp. 135–72 in *The Hebrew Bible and Qumran*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. N. Richland Hills, TX: BIBAL, 2000.

Swain, Joseph Ward. "The Theory of Four Monarchies: Opposition History under the Roman Empire." *CP* 35 (1940): 1–21.

Talon, Philippe. "Les textes prophétiques du premier millénaire en Mésopotamie." Pp. 97–125 in *Prophéties et oracles*. Edited by Jésus Asurmendi, et al. Supplément au Cahier Evangile 88. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1994.

Tcherikover, Victor. *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999 [reprint of the edition of 1959].

Thissen, Heinz Josef. "Das Lamm des Bokchoris." Pp. 113–38 in Blasius and Schipper, eds., *Apokalyptik und Ägypten*.

Thomas, Joseph. *Le mouvement baptiste en Palestine et Syrie*. Gembloux: Duculot, 1938.

Tiller, Patrick. *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch*. Early Judaism and Its Literature 4. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.

Todorov, Tzvetan. *The Fantastic: A Structural Approach to a Literary Genre*. Cleveland: Case Western Reserve University Press, 1973.

———. *Genres in Discourse*. Translated by Catherine Porter. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

———. *Introduction to Poetics*. Translated by Richard Howe. Theory and History of Literature 1. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1981.

Toorn, Karel van der. "Scholars at the Oriental Court: The Figure of Daniel against Its Mesopotamian Background." Pp. 1. 37–54 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Edited by John J. Collins and Peter Flint. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

———. *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007.

Tucker, Gene M. *Form Criticism of the Old Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.

Uhlig, Siegbert. "Das Äthiopische Henochbuch" = *Judische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit*. Band 5, Lieferung 6. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1984.

Ulrich, Eugene. "Daniel Manuscripts from Qumran: Part 1: A Preliminary Edition of 4QDan^a." *BASOR* 268 (1987): 17–37.

———. "Daniel Manuscripts from Qumran: Part 2: Preliminary Editions of 4QDan^b and 4QDan^c." *BASOR* 274 (1989): 3–26.

———, et al. *Qumran Cave 4. XI: Psalms to Chronicles*. DJD 16. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.

Van Seters, John. *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.

VanderKam, James. *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time*. New York: Routledge, 1998.

———. *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*. CBQMS 16. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1984.

———. "Prophecy and Apocalyptics in the Ancient Near East." Pp. 283–94 in *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*, vol. 4. Edited by J. Sasson. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2000.

———, et al. *Qumran Cave 4, XVII. Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*. DJD 22. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.

Vanstiphout, Herman. "'I Can Put Anything in Its Right Place': Generic and Typological Studies as Strategies for Analysis and Evaluation of Mankind's Oldest Literature." Pp. 79–99 in *Aspects of Genre and Type in Pre-Modern Literary Cultures*. Edited by B. Roest and H. Vanstiphout. Groningen: Styx, 1999.

Veldhuis, Niek. "On Interpreting Mesopotamian Namburbi Rituals," *AfO* 42/43 (1996): 145–54

Virolleaud, Charles. *L'astrologie chaldéen: Le livre intitulé "enuma (Anu) ^{il}Bel"*. Paris: Librairie P. Geuthner, 1908–1912.

———. "Nouveaux fragments inédits du Musée Britannique," *Babyloniaca* 1 (1906): 183-210.

Wacholder, Ben Zion. "Deutero-Ezekiel and Jeremiah (4Q384–4Q391): Identifying the Dry Bones of Ezekiel 37 as the Essenes." Pp. 445–61 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery*. Edited by Lawrence Schiffman, et al. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000.

Waßmuth, Olaf. *Sibyllinische Orakel 1–2: Studien und Kommentar*. Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 76. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Weidner, Ernst F. "Historisches Material in der babylonischen Omina-Literatur." *MAOG* 4 (1928–1929): 226–40.

Weidner, Ernst F. "Text-Wörter-Sachen." *AfO* 13 (1939–1940): 230–37.

Weippert, Manfred. "Aspekte israelitischer Prophetie im Lichte verwandter Erscheinungen des Alten Orients." Pp 287–319 in *Ad bene et deliter seminandum: Festgabe für Karlheinz Deller zum 21. Februar 1987*. Edited by G. Mauer and U. Magen. AOAT 220; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988.

———. "Assyrische Prophetien der Zeit Asarhaddons und Assurbanipals." Pp. 71–115 in F. M. Fales, ed., *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: New Horizons in Literary, Ideological and Historical Analysis*. Rome: Istituto per l'Oriente, 1981.

Wellek, René, and Austen Warren. *Theory of Literature*. 3d ed. New York: Harcourt Brace Javonovitch, 1977.

Werman, Cana. "Epochs and End-Times: The 490 Year Scheme in Second Temple Literature." *DSD* 13 (2007): 229–55.

West, M. L. *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.

Westermann, Claus. *The Psalms: Structure, Content and Message*. Translated by R. H. Gehrke. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1981.

Wills, Lawrence. *The Jew in the Court of the Foreign King: Ancient Jewish Court Legends*. Harvard Dissertations in Religion 26. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.

Wilson, Robert R. "The Biblical Roots of Apocalyptic." Pp. 56–66 in *Imagining the End: Visions of Apocalypse from the Ancient Middle East to Modern America*. Edited by Abbas Amanat and Magnus Bernhardsson. London: I. B. Tauris, 2002.

———. *Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.

Wilson, Walter T. *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides*. CEJL. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005.

Winckler, Hugo. *Sammlung von Keilschrifttexten II: Texte verschiedene Inhalts*. Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer, 1894.

Wise, Michael O. "4Q245 (psDan^c ar) and the High Priesthood of Judas Maccabeus." *DSD* 12 (2005): 313–62.

———. *Thunder in Gemini and Other Essays on the History, Language and*

Literature of the Second Temple Period. JSPSup 15. She eld: JSOT Press, 1994.

———, Martin Abegg, Jr., and Edward Cook. *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1996.

Wiseman, D. J. *Nebuchadrezzar and Babylon.* Schweich Lectures. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.

———, and J. A. Black. *Literary Texts from the Temple of Nabû*. CTN 4. British School of Archaeology in Iraq, 1996.

Woude, Adam S. van der. "Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XI." *OTS* 14 (1965): 354–73.

———. "The Apocryphon of Ezekiel and 4QPseudo-Ezekiel." Pp. 462–80 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery*. Edited by Lawrence Schiffman, et al. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000.

———. "Qumran Pseudepigrapha in Early Christianity: Is 1 Clem. 50:4 a Citation of 4QPseudo-Ezekiel (4Q385)?" Pp. 183–92 in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Edited by Esther G. Chazon and Michael Stone. STDJ 31. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Yadin, Yigael. "Pesher Nahum (4Qp Nahum) Reconsidered." *IEJ* 21 (1971): 1–12.

Zevit, Ziony. *The Religions of Ancient Israel: A Synthesis of Parallactic Approaches*. New York: Continuum, 2001.

Zimmerman, Johannes. *Messianische Texte aus Qumran: Königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftfunden von Qumran*. WUNT 104. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Index of Passages

ZOROASTRIAN TEXT

Index of Authors

Index of Subjects