

Ancient Epistemologies

Edited by
JAN DIETRICH,
ANNETTE SCHELLENBERG-LAGLER,
and THOMAS WAGNER

*Orientalische Religionen
in der Antike*

58

Mohr Siebeck

Orientalische Religionen in der Antike
Oriental Religions in Antiquity

Ägypten, Israel, Alter Orient
Egypt, Israel, Ancient Near East

Herausgegeben von / Edited by

Angelika Berlejung (Leipzig)
Nils P. Heeßel (Marburg)
Joachim Friedrich Quack (Heidelberg)

Beirat / Advisory Board

Uri Gabbay (Jerusalem)
Michael Blömer (Aarhus)
Christopher Rollston (Washington, D.C.)
Rita Lucarelli (Berkeley)



Ancient Epistemologies

Edited by

Jan Dietrich, Annette Schellenberg-Lagler,
and Thomas Wagner

Mohr Siebeck

JAN DIETRICH, born 1974; 2009 Dissertation; 2016 Habilitation; Professor of Old Testament Literature and Religious History at the University of Bonn.

orcid.org/0000-0003-3671-3398

ANNETTE SCHELLENBERG-LAGLER, born 1971; 2002 Dissertation; 2011 Habilitation; 2007-15 Assistant/Associate Professor of Old Testament at San Francisco Theological Seminary and the Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley; Professor of Old Testament Studies at the University of Vienna.

orcid.org/0000-0002-9714-9527

THOMAS WAGNER, born 1971; 2002 Dissertation; 2011 Habilitation; 2000-03 Assistant Vicar at the Chair of Old Testament and Biblical Archaeology at the Protestant University of Wuppertal; 2004-11 Research Assistant at University of Wuppertal; 2013-21 Academic Councillor at the University of Wuppertal; Senior Academic Councillor at the University of Wuppertal.

orcid.org/0000-0002-4076-5134

ISBN 978-3-16-163866-4 / eISBN 978-3-16-163867-1

DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-163867-1

ISSN 1869-0513 / eISSN 2568-7492 (Orientalische Religionen in der Antike)

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

Published by Mohr Siebeck Tübingen, Germany, 2024. www.mohrsiebeck.com

© Jan Dietrich, Annette Schellenberg-Lagler, Thomas Wagner (ed.); chapter: respective author.

This publication is licensed under the license “Creative Commons Attribution – ShareAlike 4.0 International” (CC BY-SA 4.0). A complete Version of the license text can be found at: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>.

Any use not covered by the above license is prohibited and illegal without the permission of the respective author.

Printed in Germany

In memoriam
JAN ASSMANN (1938–2024)

Foreword

Has democracy been invented in Europe? “Barely,” say David Graeber and David Wengrow in their book *The Dawn of Everything*, “since Greece at the time was much closer culturally to North Africa and the Middle East than it was to, say, England.”¹ The same goes for philosophical and scientific thinking. Juxtapositions between Athens, Babylon, and Thebes, i.e., between ancient Greece and the “despotic empires” of the ancient Near East, are out of place. Ancient Greece was closely connected to ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia in many aspects, also regarding thinking modes.

This connection is not self-evident. Typically, if someone wants to study history, philosophy, the history of ideas, or the history of science, they begin with ancient Greece and leave out Egypt and the ancient Near East entirely. Regarding thinking, according to a common view, the “dawn of everything” begins in ancient Greece, more specifically with early Greek philosophy and science. How do we include ancient Israel and the Hebrew Bible in this picture? In Hebrew Bible scholarship, the juxtaposition between Athens and Jerusalem has ruled supreme. However, juxtapositions like these are too simplified and do not fit with the historical data.

If ancient Greece was part of the wider ancient Mediterranean, where do we stand with the ancient Near East and the Hebrew Bible from an epistemological perspective? Attempts to determine the significance of ancient Egypt, ancient Mesopotamia, and ancient Israel for developing early philosophy have remained elusive and opaque. Even the possibility of such significance has often been neglected, and some scholars have dismissed it completely.

Especially concerning philosophy and science, many consider ancient Greek philosophy and science to be the dividing line between “primitive thinking” on the one hand and the development of early “scientific thinking” on the other. Paradoxically, in this binary either/or perspective (“primitive thinking” vs. “Greek-scientific thinking”), the so-called “high cultures” of ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia, including the Hebrew Bible, are mainly ascribed to “primitive” modes of thinking. Consequently, from the perspectives of a history of ideas and science, they do not receive due attention. To change these shortcomings, novel approaches are required. It is necessary to include the ancient Near Eastern cultures in the history of ideas and to reconstruct early thinking modes that existed before and concurrent with ancient Greece. This conference volume adds to this endeavor. Its contributions tackle the question of epistemology and thinking from different perspectives, thereby illustrating the complexity of the question.

The initial steps for the present book were taken in Aarhus, Denmark. In 2017, we organized a conference on whether ancient Near Eastern sources exhibit forms of second-order thinking, i.e., attest to the ability to think about thinking. Later, in 2020, a Hebrew Bible subgroup met in South Africa to deal specifically with different epistemologies in the Book of Job. Finally, after several Corona-displacements, we were happy to broaden

¹ D. Graeber / D. Wengrow, *The Dawn of Everything: A New History of Humanity* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2021), 17.

the scope and conduct a conference on epistemologies in ancient Egypt, Mesopotamia, Israel, and Greece at the University of Wuppertal in June 2022. The present book results mainly from this conference and includes a few additional papers that could not be presented there. Our thanks go to all our authors for their stimulating contributions. In addition, we thank the *Danish Agency for Science, Technology and Innovation* for providing financial support for the 2017 conference at Aarhus University, the *North-West University* for providing financial support for the 2020-workshop in Potchefstroom, and the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* for providing financial support for the 2022 conference at the University of Wuppertal. Last but not least, our thanks go to Dr. Søren Lorenzen (Bonn) and Niklas von Hülsen (Vienna) for their help with editing this volume and to the editors of the ORA series for accepting the volume.

Several other colleagues contributed to the fruitful exchange at the 2017 conference in Aarhus and the 2022 conference in Wuppertal. We would like to thank Jan Assmann, Sebastian Fink, Hans Jørgen Lundager Jensen, Bernhard Lang, Alexandra von Lieven, Hindy Najman, Thomas Schwarz Wentzer, and Douglas Yoder particularly for their contributions. At the 2017 conference on *Second Order Thinking in the Ancient Fertile Crescent*, Jan Assmann gave the keynote lecture “*Allegory and Commentary as ‘Second Order Thinking’ in Ancient Egypt.*” His paper was exciting and stimulating for all colleagues and students who filled the grand *Nobel Auditorium* at Aarhus University. As usual, Jan Assmann contributed with many gentle and prolific comments and ideas during the conference. In February 2024, as we were finalizing this book, Jan Assmann passed away. We are most thankful that he took part in the 2017 conference at Aarhus University, and we gratefully dedicate this book to his memory.

Bonn, Vienna, Wuppertal, February 2024

Jan Dietrich, Annette Schellenberg-Lagler & Thomas Wagner

Contents

JAN DIETRICH	
Ancient Epistemologies: Some Preliminary Remarks on Common Features and Local Differences	1
MARC VAN DE MIEROOP	
What is Knowledge? A Babylonian Answer.....	35
EVA CANCIK-KIRSCHBAUM	
Epistemic Things and Epistemic Infrastructures: Writing as an Experimental System in Ancient Mesopotamia.....	51
FRANCESCA ROCHBERG	
Cuneiform Knowledge and Natural Knowledge	67
LUDWIG D. MORENZ	
Reader's Questions: Of the Art of Reading and Pilgrimage in the 12th Dynasty (Stele Liège I/630).....	77
AMR EL HAWARY	
Ancient Epistemologies? "Never Did I Know That Which is Not" – On Egyptian Onto-Epistemology	87
NILI SHUPAK	
"Would I Had Unknown Phrases ... Not Maxims of Past Speech, Spoken by the Ancestors": Tradition versus Criticism in Egyptian Wisdom Literature and the Hebrew Bible.....	105
KAREN GLOY	
Hypotaxis versus Parataxis.....	135
CHRISTOPH HORN	
The Epistemology of Wisdom in Ancient Neoplatonism.....	151
ANNETTE SCHELLENBERG-LAGLER	
"For the Lord Gives Wisdom" (Prov 2:6): God's Involvement in the Cognitive Processes of Humans according to the Hebrew Bible.....	165

KATHARINE J. DELL

“Even Though Those Who Are Wise Claim to Know, They Cannot Find It Out.”
(Ecc 8:17): A Pendulum of Epistemological Perspectives in Ecclesiastes, as
Contextualized in Greek Culture205

MARK SNEED

The Relationship Between Qoheleth’s Pessimistic Anthropology and His Skeptical
Epistemology215

THOMAS WAGNER

Gaining Knowledge of Eternity: Cognition Processes in Mourning Rituals227

DRU JOHNSON

Ritual and Pediatric Epistemology in the Hebrew Bible243

ESTHER HEINRICH-RAMHARTER

The Deed-Consequence-Relation in the Poetic Part of the Book of Job: General
Law, Forward and Backward Principle – Some Logical Aspects255

JACO GERICKE

“Come Let us Reason Together” (Isa 1:18): Belief Justification in the Hebrew
Bible’s Religious Language and the Comparative-Philosophical Question of
Epistemological Commensurability277

List of Contributors301

Index of Ancient Sources (Selection)303

Index of Names311

Index of Subjects317

Ancient Epistemologies

Some Preliminary Remarks on Common Features and Local Differences

Jan Dietrich

Ancient Greece, ancient Israel, ancient Egypt, and ancient Mesopotamia were located in the closely connected Mediterranean and Middle Eastern region. In recent years, in Assyriology and Egyptology, important steps have been taken to interpret the relevant sources from an epistemological perspective and include them in a history of science.¹ However, the history of science remains poorly articulated within Hebrew Bible studies, pertaining both to thinking modes in general and developments within specific fields of knowledge. With this conference volume, we aim to connect Hebrew Bible studies with studies in Assyriology, Egyptology, and ancient philosophy of Greek culture to excavate the Hebrew Bible's ancient epistemologies and to show its relevance from the perspective of ancient philosophy and the history of ideas and science.

In doing this, we are not overly interested in highlighting concrete ideas or single advances in science but in excavating the basic epistemologies, the “episteme” in Foucault's terminology, that lie behind concrete ideas and scientific inventions. Therefore, we do not aim to focus on a history of single forms of knowledge for its own sake, nor on a history of concrete sciences for its own sake. Instead, we are interested in the cultural-historical ways of thinking, “Denkstil” in the terminology of Ludwik Fleck (1935) or “Denkform” in the terminology of Karen Gloy (2016), i.e., modes of thinking that form the basis for concrete forms of knowledge and science.² We want to reconstruct the elementary thinking modes with their “paradigms,” in the terminology of Thomas Kuhn (1962), their “discourses” and “episteme,” in the terminology of Foucault (1966; 1969),³ i.e., epistemolo-

¹ E.g., Cancik-Kirschbaum, “Gegenstand”; Imhausen/Pommerening, *Writings*; Van De Mierop, *Philosophy*; Rochberg, *Nature*; Bawanypeck and Imhausen, “Mesopotamien und Ägypten,” 108–117. Cf. also developments within special fields of knowledge, e.g., for philology, Cancik-Kirschbaum and Kahl, *Philologien*; for commentaries, Frahm, *Commentaries*; Gabbay, *Terminology*; Johnson, “Origins,” 11–55; for “list science” (*Listenwissenschaft*), Veldhuis, *History*; Deicher and Maroko, *Liste*; for astronomy, Watson and Horowitz, *Writing Science*; Rochberg, *Nature*; Brown, *Interactions*; for divination, Heeßel, “Divination”; Maul, *Wahrsagekunst*; for mathematics, Robson, *Mathematics*; Imhausen, *Mathematics*; for medicine, Heeßel, “Babylonische Wissenschaft”; Scurllock, *Sourcebook*; Westendorf, *Handbuch*; for technology, Baker, *Technology*; Renn et al., *Wissensgeschichte*. This footnote lists mainly anthologies and monographs. However, several additional and important articles have been published, revealing the relevance of the history of science in Assyriology and Egyptology. In the subsequent footnotes, further references to articles are provided.

² Cf. Fleck, *Entstehung*; Gloy, *Denkformen*.

³ Cf. Kuhn, *Structure*; Foucault, *Mots*; idem, *L'Archéologie*.

gies which developed in the ancient Mediterranean and which formed the conditions for developing more distinct forms of cultural and scientific knowledge. We do not understand “knowledge” as limited to the natural sciences but as including different kinds of knowledge – everyday knowledge, technical knowledge, artistic and literary and religious knowledge,⁴ including first- and second-order knowledge⁵ in all of these domains. We understand knowledge, science, and the thinking human being not as timeless but as bound to constitutive cultural-historical conditions.⁶ If there are eternal elementary ideas, as Arthur Lovejoy would have, the way humans try to grasp these ideas or produce new ones is historically and culturally bound.

In the following, I dare to give a tentative overview of the four main regions of knowledge – ancient Egypt, Mesopotamia, Israel, and Greece – and I will try to show important similarities and differences. I will unfold some main strands of the history of research in regard to the first region, ancient Mesopotamia – to get things settled – but will thereafter only pinpoint to important aspects of research history in regard to the other ancient cultures.

1. Common Grounds

Though I want to focus mainly on cultural differences in the following, let me name just two mutual thinking modes, i.e., *synthetic thinking* and *taxonomic thinking*: Synthetic thinking is typical for poetic texts but can also be found in many more textual genres, implying a ubiquitous thinking mode in these regions. It includes a stereometric or synthetic way of thinking, combining important aspects of an entity into a synthetic whole. In ancient Greece, this kind of thinking shows itself in the use of polarities that express a unity, as Geoffrey Lloyd has shown preeminently.⁷ In the Hebrew Bible, as well as in ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia, this kind of thinking is especially expressed in the use of the so-called *parallelismus membrorum*.⁸ Using concrete images and metaphors, notions are often described analogically, associatively, and paratactically by either combining or opposing two or more important facets to form the notion of a differentiated unity. Here are some examples with different contents.

Isa 1:2aa (ancient Israel):

Hear, O heavens
and listen, O earth!⁹

Hesiod, Works and Days 101 (ancient Greece):

The earth is full of evils, and so is the sea.¹⁰

⁴ Cf., e.g., Brandt, “Kulturwissenschaften,” 97.

⁵ Cf., e.g., Elkana, “Emergence”; Dietrich, “Denken.”

⁶ Cf., e.g., Rheinberger, “Epistemologie,” 34.

⁷ Cf. Lloyd, *Polarity*.

⁸ Cf. Wolff, *Anthropology*, 8, 30; Wagner, *Parallelismus*, 1–26.

⁹ All Bible translations given in this article follow NRSV.

¹⁰ Lloyd, *Polarity*, 91.

Councils of Wisdom (ancient Mesopotamia):

Give food to eat, beer to drink¹¹

Sinuhe 10 (ancient Egypt):

The messengers found him on the road.

They reached him at the time of night.¹²

These texts use polarities to express an all-embracing notion. Instead of saying, “Listen, everyone!,” the Hebrew text uses the opposites heaven and earth meaning “all.” Instead of saying, “Everywhere there is evil,” the Greek text uses the opposites land and sea. Instead of saying that you should provide meals, the Mesopotamian text uses the couplet food and drink. Instead of saying only once that Sesostris had been found, the Egyptian text uses two sentences with expressions of place and time respectively to form a precise unity. This use of polarities is part of *synthetic thinking*, and it is typical for the ancient Near East as a whole, including ancient Greece.

Another common mode of ancient high cultural thinking is *taxonomic thinking*: In many text genres – economic, law, wisdom,¹³ and Priestly texts – the ancient ability for taxonomy includes abstraction, accuracy, classification, discrimination, and validation. Taxonomy uses formal language and the mode of repetition, exact terms, and precise categories. It has a special interest in list science which is most prominent in Mesopotamia but prominent in other ancient cultures as well – compare, e.g., the catalog of ships in Homer’s *Iliad*, the lists of clean and unclean animals in the Bible, the lists of offerings in Egyptian graves, or the iconographic listings of plants at the temple walls of Karnak in Egypt.

Much more could be said about the ancient Near East and the ancient Mediterranean forming a common background of mutual thinking from where the regional cultures with partly specific thinking modes emerged. In the following, I want to highlight some of the more specific forms.

2. Regional Peculiarities

2.1. Mesopotamia

In Assyriology, research on the history of knowledge and science has become a blossoming field. Important steps have been undertaken to excavate the history of thinking and science, and these advances will be important to compare with the epistemic regions of Egypt, Greece, and Israel.

In Assyriology, research has moved away from attributing primitive thinking, “mythopoetic thought,”¹⁴ and a “Mesopotamian lukewarm mind”¹⁵ to the ancient “high cultures.” This is no self-evident move, but it involved shifting the focus away from basic thinking

¹¹ Lambert, *Wisdom*, 103.

¹² Jay, “Parallelism,” 167.

¹³ Cf. Alt, “Weisheit”; von Rad, “Hiob.”

¹⁴ Cf. Frankfort and Frankfort, “Myth,” *passim*.

¹⁵ Cf. Larsen, “Lukewarm Mind.”

modes – influenced by or dependent on language – to the quest for text-based philosophical thinking,¹⁶ philological meta-thinking,¹⁷ “list science”¹⁸ as well as for world views and natural observation.¹⁹ It has also been applied to more specialized topics such as architecture,²⁰ astronomy,²¹ commentaries,²² divination,²³ mathematics,²⁴ medicine,²⁵ and technology.²⁶ But this has not always been the case.

In their once famous book, *The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man* (1946), Henri and Henriette A. Frankfort ascribed speculative thought, tainted with fantasy, to early Mesopotamian, Egyptian, and Hebrew thinking:

If we look for “speculative thought” in the documents of the ancients, we shall be forced to admit that there is very little indeed in our written records which deserves the name of “thought” in the strict sense of that term. There are very few passages which show the discipline, the cogency of reasoning, which we associate with thinking. The thought of the ancient Near East appears wrapped in imagination. We consider it tainted with fantasy. But the ancients would not have admitted that anything could be abstracted from the concrete imaginative forms which they left us.²⁷

Against ancient Greek and modern Western thinking, in the Frankforts’ view, no abstract thought has emerged in the ancient Near East. What Merlin Donald calls “theoretic attitude”²⁸ – an attitude that involves the ability to stand back and reason in a more abstract way, i.e., to reflect and self-reflect, to criticize and transcend the given, and to anticipate new realms by thinking “outside the box” – seems impossible for the people of the ancient Near East:

In the immediacy of primitive experience, however, there is no room for such a critical resolution of perceptions. Primitive man cannot withdraw from the presence of the phenomena because they reveal themselves to him in the manner we have described. Hence the distinction between subjective and objective knowledge is meaningless to him. Meaningless, also, is our contrast between reality and appearance. Whatever is capable of affecting mind, feeling, or will has thereby established its undoubted reality. There is, for instance, no reason why dreams should be considered less real than impressions received while one is awake.²⁹

¹⁶ Cf. Van De Mieroop, *Philosophy*; idem, “Theses”; and the article by Marc Van De Mieroop in this volume.

¹⁷ Cf. Cancik-Kirschbaum, “Gegenstand”; Cancik-Kirschbaum and Kahl, *Philologien*, passim, as well as the article by Eva Cancik-Kirschbaum in this volume.

¹⁸ Cf., e.g., Hilgert, “Listenwissenschaft”; Veldhuis, *History*; Cancik-Kirschbaum, “Stabilität.”

¹⁹ Cf. Rochberg, *Nature*; Schmid and Uehlinger, “Laws,” and the article by Francesca Rochberg in this volume.

²⁰ Cf. Renn et al., *Wissensgeschichte*.

²¹ Cf., e.g., Steele and Imhausen, *Sky*; Watson and Horowitz, *Writing Science*; Rochberg, *Nature*.

²² Cf. esp. Frahm, *Commentaries*; Gabbay, *Terminology*; Johnson, “Origins.”

²³ Cf., e.g., Heeßel, “Divination.” See also Maul, *Wahrsagekunst*.

²⁴ Cf. esp. Robson, *Mathematics*.

²⁵ Cf., e.g., Heeßel, “Babylonische Wissenschaft.” See also Scurlock, *Sourcebook*.

²⁶ Cf., e.g., Baker, *Technology*.

²⁷ Frankfort and Frankfort, “Myth,” 3.

²⁸ Cf. Donald, *Modern Mind*, passim.

²⁹ Frankfort and Frankfort, “Myth,” 11–12.

This inability to habituate a “theoretic attitude” is the reason why, for example, Mogens Trolle Larsen spoke about the “Mesopotamian lukewarm mind.”³⁰

In 1926, Benno Landsberger proposed a strong connection between language and thought:

Erkennen wir die sprachliche Struktur, so haben wir damit unmittelbar auch die geistige Struktur eines Volkes und damit eine der wichtigsten Determinanten der Kultur, soweit sie eine geistige Schöpfung darstellt, gegeben.³¹

This was all too close to the problems of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, but one line of thought still seems to be relevant: The close connection not between language and thinking but between writing and thinking. Wolfram von Soden followed in the steps of his teacher Landsberger. He also came up with one important aspect still relevant in Assyriology today, i.e., linguistic “bi-culturality,” the epistemic challenge to handle two different languages and their writing systems and to understand and interpret Sumerian from the perspective of Akkadian (including the Eblaite dialect):

Die Zweisprachigkeit als ein wesentliches Kennzeichen der geistigen Kultur bestimmter Völker ist m.W. von der Geschichts- und Sprachforschung noch nicht ausreichend gewürdigt worden. ... Der hier nur angedeuteten, sehr großen Verschiedenartigkeit beider Sprachen entsprach die Verschiedenartigkeit der geistigen Welt von Sumerern und Akkadern. Es kann demnach nicht erwartet werden, daß die zweisprachige Kultur Babyloniens als Folge der Symbiose beider Völker in sich sehr geschlossen und einheitlich war. Vielmehr wurde die große Bereicherung der geistigen Kultur durch dieses so mannigfaltige Erbe mit dem Verzicht auf jene Einheitlichkeit erkauft, die uns etwa in Ägypten bei ähnlichen natürlichen Bedingungen so beeindruckt. ... Die anderen zweisprachigen Listenwerke der Babylonier waren vor allem anderen philologische Hilfsmittel für das Verständnis der sumerischen Literatur und sind für uns das bei weitem früheste Zeugnis für philologische Bemühungen um fremde Sprachen, die sich nicht mit der Aneignung einer Fremdsprache für den praktischen Gebrauch zufriedengeben. Die über tausend Jahre später einsetzenden Bemühungen der Inder und Griechen galten den eigenen Sprachen ...³²

Recently, Marc Van De Mieroop has shown that the ancient Babylonians had a distinct “philosophy” of their own, different from the ancient Greeks. It is related especially to what Assyriology calls “list science.”³³ Why is this the case? Because of the invention of

³⁰ Larsen, “Lukewarm Mind.” However, the article by Larsen is much more differentiated than just ascribing a “lukewarm mind” to the ancient Near East, as the title would suggest.

³¹ Landsberger, “Eigenbegrifflichkeit,” 365.

³² Von Soden, *Zweisprachigkeit*, 3, 12, 19. This phenomenon of linguistic “bi-culturality” is present in Egypt (Old Egyptian, Middle Egyptian, New Egyptian, Demotic) and Israel (Paleo-Hebrew, square-script Hebrew, and Aramaic) as well but not as strong as in Mesopotamia, where the scribes had to deal with two radically different languages (Akkadian and Sumerian).

³³ “The list was not just a device of fictional literary creativity, it was the foundation of intellectual creativity in general. Everything could be and was explored in lists, using a methodology that was fully coherent within the list structure. Details were altered, specifications added, and the polysemy of the elements used to write them down was investigated in all its possibilities. The Babylonians did not create order in the universe by investigating its component parts; they created order in lists and applied the results to the universe. The text preceded reality. It had a primary status. Moreover, lists generated entries according to their internal principles and allowed for an almost unbounded creativity. They functioned in the same reality as the world outside them, naturally, but they were not limited by the parameters of that reality. In lexicography, written words were invented that were meaningless outside the list but completely valid within its structure. In divination, occurrences were explored that were physically impossible but

writing, especially in the form of lists. This led to the emergence of a kind of “coercion” to think systematically, especially by comparing two radically different languages.

As for the invention of writing, Jack Goody points to the fact that writing does something new to human thinking, something which oral language cannot do. Writing was invented to oversee economic transactions in the form of lists. To compose a list is something

that takes words out of their speech context and places them, so abstracted, in a unilateral³⁴ relationship with words ... deemed to be of a similar “class,” i.e., possessing certain common features which may relate to the concrete world outside (i.e. animals, trees) or to some other ordering concern.³⁵

A list has to establish borders to clarify if things belong to a kind of category or not. It involves the first paratactic move to what Plato later invented as a hierarchical pyramid of terms.³⁶ Much more so than in oral language, there is a compulsion, a thinking-necessitation, when setting up a list that demands a decision, often of a binary choice, as to whether or not an item of a kind may appear on a list or not.

But the question, is a tomato a fruit or a vegetable? is the kind that would seem pointless in an oral context (and indeed trivial to most of us) but which may be essential to the advance of systematic knowledge about the classification and evolution of natural species. And it is the kind of question generated by written lists.³⁷

This “thinking-coercion” to order things on lists and think systematically is further developed by the typical Mesopotamian need to compare Sumerian and Akkadian. It led to a full-blown philology, including an awareness of methods and schooling. Especially important was lexicography:

One can see lexicography as the purest of Babylonian sciences, the most theoretical in that it established the rules and possibilities for interpretation that could be used elsewhere. It asserted that elements that contained any of the relationships just mentioned could be compared to one another. Lexicography’s approach was theoretical in that it was bounded by anything except the written elements it studied. It was pure science. Every student of Babylonian writing was exposed to this type of reasoning ...³⁸

List science makes it necessary to order things on a list, enhancing the ability to order and categorize things. How about summarizations of these long lists? The ability to summarize

again wholly meaningful within their list context. In law, the list-making behavior may have been more sober but the same underlying principles governed, and entries were created within the codes according to their internal logic.” Van De Mierop, *Philosophy*, 221.

³⁴ The term and meaning of “unilateral” is wrong in regard to elaborated list science since Assyriology has shown that philological experts did not compose lists unilaterally but in regard to “rhizome-like thinking,” see further below. More simple lists of economic bookkeeping, however, may apply the thinking necessity to list things unilaterally according to “classes.”

³⁵ Goody, *Domestication*, 104–105.

³⁶ For Plato and the invention of the hierarchical pyramid of terms, cf. Leisegang, *Denkformen*, 215–221, and Gloy, *Denkformen*.

³⁷ Goody, *Domestication*, 105. These aspects of writing carried along the possibility to structure and therewith also to get power over world and society: “writing facilitated the creation of categories and ranks, extending control over nature and civic society by enumerating different species within each group or category. The more categories and species that could be named, measured and tracked, the more could be brought under control” (Hudson, “Introduction,” 8).

³⁸ Van De Mierop, *Philosophy*, 188.

complex lists shows itself in many complex texts. For example, a later editor added sub-headings between laws of the Codex Hammurapi, grouping the laws by the subheading DI.DAB₅.BA “(kingly) ordinance.”³⁹ Lexicography included palaeographic interests, especially when explaining ancient signs using the analytic-anatomizing methods of “etymography” and “notariqon,”⁴⁰ or by listing archaic signs and their contemporary equivalents.⁴¹ The main epistemic mode of thought and of interpreting the world was a philological one, doing exegesis with written texts and single signs as well as interpreting the whole world as a text, e.g., interpreting the signs of the heavens (the stars) or the world (liver omina and terrestrial omina) as the writings of the gods:

The universe was seen as a text and could be interpreted as if it was a piece of writing. Physical reality was a written representation of the truth. In that sense Babylonian thought can be seen to resemble Plato’s theory of the ideal types that lay behind the realities we observe. But while Plato and his teacher Socrates considered writing as even further removed from the truth than what we perceive through the senses, the Babylonians regarded it the key to understanding reality.⁴²

List science is most developed in ancient Mesopotamia but not unfamiliar or dissimilar in ancient Egypt. The Egyptians were not interested in the reasons for the Nile’s rise in summer from an interest in nature for theoretical reasons – like Herodotus is when discussing reasons for the rise (Hdt II 20ff). This is why the Greeks thought of the Egyptians as utilitarian (*philochrematos*) and not, like the Greeks themselves, scientific (*philomathés*).⁴³ However, the Egyptian list science does show “precision of observation and description,” which “would do honor to a zoological textbook.”⁴⁴

What kind of thinking mode stood behind this creative production of lists? It is analogical and paratactic thinking, using the principle of similitudes, to form syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations in writing. On the tablet and in the world, things are ordered like a tableau. Associations and similitude connect all things in syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations.⁴⁵ There are relations between all things, and this goes for the text *and* the world, as can be shown by the following two examples:

³⁹ Cf. Oelsner, *Kodex Hammu-rāpi*, 85–87.

⁴⁰ Cf. Cancik-Kirschbaum and Kahl, *Philologien*, 324.

⁴¹ Cf. Cancik-Kirschbaum and Kahl, *Philologien*, 278.

⁴² Van De Mierop, *Philosophy*, 196.

⁴³ Cf. Assmann, *Search*, 54.

⁴⁴ Assmann, *Search*, 54. Cf. Sauneron, *Traité*: “leurs observations combinées nous ont valu un véritable manuel zoologique, tel que je ne crois pas que l’antiquité en ait produit un bien grand nombre” (138–139). “La lecture de ce papyrus laisse l’impression d’une précision étonnante dans la description des choses de la nature; on pouvait s’en douter; les artistes égyptiens qui ont su reproduire animaux et arbres avec la précision que l’on admire encore, devaient avoir d’abord été des observateurs très attentifs” (206–207).

⁴⁵ “And the ancient scholars explored its creative capacities on what I have called the syntagmatic and the paradigmatic levels to the fullest extent. Through their inferential reasoning they had the freedom to generate links horizontally in the syntagm, while the list form encouraged an exploration of possibilities by expressing new options paradigmatically. In principle there was no limit to how many new inferences could be made in the syntagm or how many new entries could be added to the paradigm, but a fundamental rule of logic governed: every connection required similitude. Elements had to be comparable. That similitude establishes logical connections is not such a strange idea. As I mentioned before, Foucault described

Examination Text A, line 12:

The scribal art is the bond between all things.⁴⁶

The Babylonian Ziggurat Etemenanki means:

É.TEMEN.AN.KI = The temple of the foundation between heaven and earth

Unlike the Platonic pyramid of terms, analogical and paratactic thinking was in the foreground, which is why Markus Hilgert and Marc Van De Mieroop use the metaphor of the rhizome to illustrate what the Mesopotamian list science implies in ways of “rational a-priori thinking.”⁴⁷

How about the ability to think hypotactically? Hypotactic thinking is neither missing nor unusual, as can be shown, for example, in the use of main cases and subcases in casuistic law. The institution of law requires abstraction from single events and provides society with legal rationales in the casuistic mode. What is more, commentaries show second-order thinking. The writers of commentaries were aware of hermeneutics and schooling, as Eva Cancik-Kirschbaum highlights⁴⁸ by presenting the following text on teaching the interpretation of liver omens:

Rm 2, 103:

If your teacher asks you: “A Weapon of the right that points upwards is unfavorable and a Weapon on the left which points upwards is favourable then why does a Weapon placed on the right plain of the Finger pointing upwards turn favourable? Why does a Weapon placed on the left plain of the Finger pointing

it as the key tenet of European intellectual history before the scientific revolution” (Van De Mieroop, *Philosophy*, 186).

⁴⁶ Translation building upon Sjöberg, “Praise,” 127; Maul, “Band,” 1.

⁴⁷ “The genealogical tree is neither the only nor the superior form of scientific representation. (...) The Babylonians would have grasped the coral metaphor immediately, as it resembles their lists as a representation of knowledge, with all its potential for change. Parts can be added and subtracted at any point; they seamlessly relate to all other parts of the structure. There are many more points of contact between the individual elements than in a taxonomy, each element having multiple resemblances. The overall structure of the list may look like a labyrinth, but all connections have a proper rationale. Where we may see chaos, the Babylonians saw order. To be convincing, the Babylonian lists, like any other metaphor of scientific representation, required adherence to rules of logic. This they did with remarkable consistency, not only in a massive textual record but also over an enormous length of time. The jarring element of Babylonian scholarship does not lie in its presentation but in what it presents: not realia but the written word. The study of the written word opened up exploration into realms otherwise unimaginable. Writing preceded reality. The list was the perfect environment to study the written word by looking for similitudes. It is at first confusing that the resemblances considered pertain to all of its aspects – meaning, sound, and shape. But once we get used to this approach, it makes perfect sense. It is there that we have to look for the Babylonians’ conceptual autonomy and the key to their philosophy” (Van De Mieroop, *Philosophy*, 223–224).

⁴⁸ Cf. Cancik-Kirschbaum and Kahl, *Philologien*, 60, and the article by Eva Cancik-Kirschbaum in this volume. Awareness of the mode of exegesis shows also the fact that Akkadian has a term of its own for “explanation,” i.e., *mukallimtu*. In addition, irony reveals second order thinking in that the scribes detach themselves from given traditional values and reflect, criticize and make fun of given traditional (economic, social, or cultural) realities, to be found, e.g., in ironic school texts like the debate between copper and silver, or the pessimistic dialogue.

upwards turn unfavourable?” The Feature is placed thus in the living sheep [- - -], the top of the Finger points down, that is how the (example) of the right side is favourable of the left side unfavourable.⁴⁹

We even have an awareness of the fact that interpretations may vary, be difficult, and not be correct. For example, in the text SAA 10,60, the scholar Balasi writes to the Assyrian king that a passage in *šumma izbu* may have been misinterpreted by the person reading the text in front of the king, and Balasi exclaims:

SAA 10 No. 60:

šumma izbu is difficult to interpret.⁵⁰

Commentaries on all kinds of texts, especially casuistic texts like law and omina, were typical for the Mesopotamian culture of knowledge. Lists and commentaries show that a standardized technical vocabulary had developed.⁵¹ The combination of texts into series also reveals the ability to systematize.⁵² Here, different and sometimes even contradicting versions were compiled together. These editions show an awareness of and a tolerance towards contradictory textual traditions. It is biased to state that the ancient Mesopotamians had a “lukewarm mind” in the sense that they were unable to realize contradictions as such. Though a formal logic and the law of noncontradiction in a strict philosophical sense had not been invented before the time of Aristotle, reflections about the combination of contradicting textual versions were present. For example, in a compilation of contradicting ritual incantations against slander, the editor adds to the variant the following note:

A tablet of incantations against slander, line 21:

Alternatively, according to the reading (“mouth”) of another tablet.⁵³

Second-order reflections about hermeneutics and the processes of text formation can be found in colophons stating the systematization of textual variants in larger editions and in commentary statements about the interpretative task of difficult texts. In Mesopotamian philology, as Eva Cancik-Kirschbaum highlights, we find much older examples of what Glenn W. Most, in his *Disciplining Classics*,⁵⁴ has shown for ancient Greece: disciplining, institutionalizing, professionalizing. Long before the advent of ancient Greek philosophy and philology, we find the process of a social differentiation (in the Luhmannian sense) of philology as a scientific system of thought in the ancient Near East.

⁴⁹ Rm 2, 103. Koch-Westenholz, *Babylonian*, 136–137. For a kind of theoretical attitude and second order reflection, cf. also the last chapter of the *bārūtu*-series (called *multābiltu*) with its explanations und hermeneutics: “These texts can be viewed as a step towards more abstract thinking, though still couched in traditional list form. They are an example of what may be called the scientific aspect of divination, a search for precision and clarity divorced from the everyday practice of extispicy” (Koch, *Secrets*, xi).

⁵⁰ Parpola, *Letters*, 44; cf. Cancik-Kirschbaum and Kahl, *Philologien*, 295.

⁵¹ Cf., e.g., Cancik-Kirschbaum and Kahl, *Philologien*, 289, and the article by Eva Cancik-Kirschbaum in this volume.

⁵² Cf., e.g., Finkel, “Esagil-kīn-apli”; Frahm, *Commentaries*; Heeßel, “Standardisierung.”

⁵³ Transliteration Gurney, “Tablet,” 224; cf. Cancik-Kirschbaum and Kahl, *Philologien*, 214.

⁵⁴ Cf. Most, *Classics*.

2.2. Egypt

For Egypt, Emma Brunner-Traut used to speak of “aspective thinking,” taking up insights from ancient Egyptian art history, especially from Heinrich Schäfer, and transferring these onto cultural thinking modes in general.⁵⁵ According to Heinrich Schäfer and Emma Brunner-Traut, aspective art means that the Egyptians added the facets of a phenomenon together, combining the facets of a scene on a planar surface without using the device of focal perspective. Emma Brunner-Traut and others conceived aspective thinking as an inferior way of thinking: The Greeks could take on a perspective, being able to think organically, but the ancient Egyptians thought of things not organically but regarded everything, including human beings, as stuck together as if ball-jointed composites. However, you can also turn the tables: By combining the facets of a scene on a planar surface, without using the device of focal perspective, the Egyptians were able to highlight those aspects most important to them at the same time – without relegating others to the background by use of a three-dimensional perspective.

In addition, aspective thinking does not mean that Egypt was unable to think organically or systematically from a focused perspective.⁵⁶ The most obvious example is the idea of the heart as the center of the human being. Unlike the entrails, which could be removed from the mummy and mummified by themselves in canopies, the heart, as the human being’s center, had to be mummified and put back into the mummy since out of the heart came thinking, speech, volition, and, finally, action imperatives for the limbs:

Memphite Theology:

(53) There took shape in the heart, there took shape on the tongue the form of Atum. For the very great one is Ptah, who gave [life] to all the gods and their kas through this heart and through this tongue, (54) in which Horus had taken shape as Ptah, in which Thoth had taken shape as Ptah. ... Thus heart and tongue rule over all the limbs in accordance with the teaching that it (the heart, *or*: he, Ptah) is in every body and it (the tongue, *or*: he, Ptah) is in every mouth of all gods, all men, all cattle, all creeping things, whatever lives, thinking whatever it (*or*: he) wishes and commanding whatever it (*or*: he) wishes.⁵⁷

Next to aspective thinking, we have “organic thinking” that could integrate single elements into a bigger picture in an organic way. Therefore, it does not seem unnatural that Akhenaten, like a pre-Socratic philosopher, was able to think of the sun as the one principle behind all things and giving life to all things.⁵⁸

As noted above, associative, additive, paratactic thinking was typical for ancient Mesopotamian list science and “rhizome-like thinking.” Although not as prominent, this kind of thinking was found in ancient Egypt, Israel, and Greece as well. However, in Egypt, a special *identificatory thinking mode* can be found, and it seems to be stronger here than elsewhere.⁵⁹ In Egyptian myth and ritual, as well as in magical texts, we find complex

⁵⁵ Cf. Brunner-Traut, *Frühformen*. For a critique worth considering, cf., e.g., Quack, “Gliederpuppe.”

⁵⁶ For “organ-related classification” in medical texts, see Radestock, *Prinzipien*, 283 and passim.

⁵⁷ Translation Lichtheim, *Literature*, 54.

⁵⁸ Cf. Allen, “Akhenaten.”

⁵⁹ True, also in Mesopotamia, we have texts where things are identified with each other. Most interesting are henotheistic texts where Marduk or another god is identified with other gods. Cf., e.g., Fadhil and Jiménez, “Texts.”

Index of Ancient Sources (Selection)

Israel

Genesis

2:16–17	247
3	17, 247, 261
3:15	250
6:5	128
9:12	250
15	248
15:16	250
18:21	249
22	249
22:1	249
22:12	249

Exodus

4:1	176, 294
4:5	295
4:11	166–167, 176
4:16	177
6:6–7	171
7:1–5	177
7:5	171–172, 194
10:1–2	177, 178
12	251
13:14	251
14:4	172, 177–178
14:16–18	177–178
16:32–33	251
18:11	286
28:3	167–169
31:13	227, 248

Leviticus

23	244
23:43	227, 248

Numbers

5:11–31	250
15	221
15:39	220
16:28–30	250
17:3	250
22:22–31	170

Deuteronomy

4	17
6	251
6:20–21	251
9:7	244

10:16	191
15:15	19
16:19–20	20–21
23:22–23	220
28:28–29	184
29:3	184
29:23–27	289
30:6	191–192
31:13	248

Joshua

4:6–7	251
11:19–20	179
22:31	286

Judges

3:1–2	249
3:4	249
9:23–24	179
17:13	286

1 Samuel

2:25	179
3:6–9	170
14:13	272
15:22	109, 121–122
16:14–23	176
17:46	249

2 Samuel

17:14	179–180
-------	---------

1 Kings

2:8	43
3:9	18, 169
4:29–34	210
5:9–11	167
6	236
8:12	236
8:59–60	194
9:9–10	290
12:15	179
18:37	249
20:13	172
22:20–23	178, 198
22:22	179

2 Kings

17:7	259
17:26	288

<i>Isaiah</i>		44:18	183, 259
1:2	2	46:15	290
1:5	222	51:7	186
1:10–17	121	51:39	186
1:18	283	51:57	179, 186
6:1–13	177, 182–183, 236		
6:9–10	179, 181–183, 222	<i>Ezekiel</i>	
8:16–17	188–189	1:4	236
11:1–10	195–196	11:19–20	192–193, 222
11:3–4	17, 25	17:24	194
19:2–14	185	18:31	192–193
19:3	179–180, 185	20:26	172
19:14	184–186	20:42–44	194
19:18–22	195, 198–199	30:26	172
28:26	168	36:26–27	192–193
28:29	168	37:12–14	193–194
29:9–10	181–186	39:24	187
29:11–12	183, 186–188	39:28–29	193–194, 197
29:13–14	183, 186–187	<i>Hosea</i>	
29:17	191	6:6	20, 121–122, 130
29:18	189–190	11:9	25
30:19–21	197		
32:3–4	189–191	<i>Joel</i>	
35:5–6	189–190	3:1–2	193, 198
37:20	194		
40:28	174	<i>Amos</i>	
41:18–20	193	5:21–25	121
42:1–7	195–196	9	236
42:6–7	189–191	<i>Micah</i>	
42:7	222	3:6–7	188
42:16	190–191	6:6–8	121
42:18	190		
43:8–10	189–191	<i>Haggai</i>	
44:9	19	1:9–10	290
44:18	19, 183		
44:25	179–180, 186	<i>Zecharia</i>	
45:1–6	195	3	236
45:15	174		
48:16–17	197	<i>Maleachi</i>	
55:8–9	19, 174	2:10	291
57:17	187	2:14–15	291
60:15–22	222	1:10	121
63:17	183–184		
66:18–23	198–199	<i>Psalms</i>	
		22:3	188
<i>Jeremiah</i>		73:11	291
2:21	292	89	288
2:23	293	94	167
8:8	293	94:9–11	166
10:2	19	94:10	167–169
19:7	180, 185	143:7–8	187–188
24:7	191, 192, 222	145:3	174
25:15–16	186		
31:33–34	191–192, 198	<i>Job</i>	
32:39–40	191–192	4:6–9	262
		4:7–11	263
		4:13–16	170

5:9	111, 173	20:12	166
5:12–14	176, 180	20:24	292
7:20	269	20:25	220
8:2	264	21:3	121, 130
8:5–6	259, 263	21:27	121
8:13–20	263	23:26	18
9:10–11	127, 174	30	222
9:21–23	265		
9:22	287	<i>Ecclesiastes</i>	
11:13–19	263	1:5–7	210
12:17–25	180	1:8	210
12:25	186	1:10	210
13:24	187–188	1:12–18	228
15:20	258	1:13–15	219
15:28	258–259	1:13	112, 173, 206, 210, 228
17:4	176	1:16–18	112
20:14	287	1:16	210
21:7	265	1:17	228
21:13	265	2:1–11	210
22:5–9	264	2:12–16	210
22:21–28	263	2:18–21	210
23:8–9	187–188	2:24	116, 128, 221, 228
23:14	283	2:26	168, 175, 211
25:4	291	3:1–10	228
28	20, 110, 127, 173, 261	3:1–8	211
30:20	127, 188	3:10	211
32:8	168–169	3:11	20, 112, 173, 211, 215, 223, 228
33:15–16	170	3:12	211
34:29	174	3:13	128, 228
35:11	168–169	3:14	211
36:26	173–174	3:15	211
37:5	173–174	3:17	217
38–41	173	4:1–3	218
38:12–13	264	4:17	109, 121–122
38:15	264	5:1	211
40:2	283	5:3–4	220
		5:17	228
<i>Proverbs</i>		6:10	211
1–9	18, 205–206	7:1–4	228
1:1–7	205	7:2	227, 237
1:22	205	7:3	229, 238
1:29	205	7:4	228
2:1–7	168	7:15–18	219, 221
2:4	112, 128	7:20	215
2:5	205	7:22	211
2:6	167, 169, 205	7:23–29	112
2:10	205	7:29	128, 173
3:20	205	8:1	212
8:10	205	8:3	212
9:1–5	110	8:5–6	212
9:10	205	8:7	212
10:3	258	8:12	212, 217
11:25	258	8:15	221, 228
12:14	258	8:16–17	112, 173
15:8	121		

8:16	212	<i>Incantations against Slander</i>	
8:17	112, 128, 212	21	9
9:5	112, 212, 228	<i>Rm</i>	
9:7–9	116	2,103	8, 9
9:9–10	212	<i>SAA</i>	
9:10	207, 212, 228	10,30:20–25	61
10:14	211–212	10,60	9
11:2	213	<i>Urra=hubullu</i>	
11:4	213	Tablet 1–24	137
11:5	127, 173	Egypt	
11:6	213	<i>Admonitions</i>	
11:7–9	213	1,1–6,10	118
11:9	220, 223	5,3	119, 127
11:10	213	5,7–9	124
12:5	227–228	5,9	127
12:9	111–112, 213	10,11–12,10	119, 124
<i>Lamentations</i>		11,10–12,12	124, 125
2:9	188	11,10–13	125
4:12–13	295	12,2–3	125
<i>Daniel</i>		12,5–6	125
4:10	171	12,11–12	125
12:4	188–189	13,11	125
12:9	188–189	13,14–15,9	127
<i>Sirach</i>		16,10–17,3	127
11:15–16	175	<i>ĀHG</i>	
17:6–7	166	139,1–5	12
17:7	167–168	<i>Ahiqar</i>	46
24:8–11	168	12:175–177	113
<i>Wisdom</i>		<i>Amenemhet's Berlin-inscription</i>	
2:22	168	15	14
<i>Ahiqar</i>		<i>Amenemope</i>	
12:175–177	113	4	118
Mesopotamia		5	118
<i>Codex Hammurapi</i>		9,5–8	124
196–202	140	10,12–15	118
268–270	42	10,14	124
<i>Councils of Wisdom</i>		11,2–3	118
61	3	18	123
<i>Enūma eliš</i>		19,14–17	124
VII 1–2	40	20	118
<i>Eduḫba riddle</i>	53	20,5–6	125
<i>Examination Text A</i>		20,21–21,4	21
1–7	56	21,5–6	124
12	8	22,5–6	123
<i>Gilgameš</i>		23,8–9	123
XI 219–230	53	25	124
		<i>Anksheshonk</i>	
		11,21–23	124

21,7–12	124	65	121
26,5–8	124	67	121, 123
<i>Any</i>		80	116
B 8,16	118	110	121
B 17,1–4	117	111	123
B 20,10–12	123	112	117
B 20,13–14	14, 117	128–129	20, 120, 121
B 20,16	118, 123	129–130	117, 123
B 20,17	118	130–138	123
B 21,14–16	123	130	123
B 22,13–23,17	113	131	125
B 22,15–17	108	133	123
B 22,19–23,7	112, 113	135	126
B 23,8–9	123	137–139	123
<i>Berlin Statue 2296</i>		138	123
	15	139	123
<i>Book of the Dead</i>		<i>Ostrakon Petrie 11</i>	
125	89,91	recto 4	114
<i>Book of Nut</i>		<i>Papyrus Anastasi</i>	
144	13	I	82
<i>Book of Thoth</i>	109	I 11,1–2	108
<i>Crossword-Stela</i>	13, 15, 87–100	III 4,1–2	113
<i>Harper's Songs</i>	107, 116, 129, 130	IV	107
<i>Instruction of a Man to His Son</i>		V 8,7–9,1	113
Prologue 3–4	108	<i>Papyrus Berlin 3023</i>	
<i>Kagemni</i>		B1 337,2	89, 99
Epilogue 2,5–6	108	<i>Papyrus Bologna 1094</i>	
<i>Khakheperré-Sonb</i>		3,9–10	113
verso 1–6	111	<i>Papyrus Carlsberg</i>	
verso 1,5–6	111	7,1	13
verso 6	111	<i>Papyrus Chester Beatty 4</i>	
recto 1	110	verso 2,3–5, 10	116
recto 2–4; 7	14, 111	verso 6,5–8	114
recto 10–12	111	verso 6,11–14	116
recto 12–14	111	recto 10,11–12	126
<i>Mathematical Papyrus</i>		<i>Papyrus Insinger</i>	
90		9,9	113
<i>Memphite Theology</i>		19,10–15	124
53–54	10	30,7–9	124
<i>Merikare</i>		<i>Papyrus Lansing</i>	
35–36	108	2,6–8	113
49–50	123	<i>Papyrus Oxyrhynchos 1381</i>	
51–52	108	174–181	15
53–57	120, 123	<i>Papyrus Sallier</i>	
58	116	I 7,11–8,2	113
63–67	117	<i>Papyrus Turin</i>	
64–66	117	XII 7	11

<i>Prophecy of Neferti</i>	82, 89	<i>Theogony</i>	158
<i>Ptahhotep</i>		Hippocratic Corpus	
30–31	108	<i>On the Sacred Disease</i>	
52–59	110	1, 14	24
115–116	123	Homer	
142	123	<i>Iliad</i>	
173	123	III 291–302	22, 23
186–189	116	XXIII 598	22
216–217	123	Iamblichus	
229	123	<i>On the Mysteries of the Egyptians</i>	
247	123	II.11, 96.13	163
545–546	123	<i>Vita Pythagorae</i>	
588–594	108	23.103–10	159
633	123	Parmenides	
L2 (P 197–214)	108	<i>Fragment 7</i>	25
<i>Shipwrecked Sailor</i>		Plato	
	79, 80, 81, 82, 107, 118	<i>Charmides</i>	135
<i>Sinuhe</i>		<i>Laches</i>	135
10	3	<i>Menon</i>	
<i>Spells for Mother and Child</i>		7b	135
	141	74b	135
<i>Stele Liège</i>		<i>Parmenides</i>	
I/630	78	137c–142a	157
<i>STG</i>		144e5	157
54	11, 12	155e5	157
<i>TT</i>		<i>Phaedo</i>	
81	14	76b	147
Greece		95d	147
Aristotle		100a	144, 146
<i>De interpretatione</i>	156	101d	147
Epicrates		<i>Phaedros</i>	
<i>Fragment</i>	144	247c–d	23
Damascius		<i>Politeia</i>	
<i>De principiis</i>		507b–509c	146
I.20,23	158	510b ff.	144
Heraclitus		510c ff.	146
<i>Fragment 107</i>	25	V.477a4	157
Herodotus		VI.509b9	155
<i>Histories</i>		<i>Theaetetos</i>	
II 20ff	7	207, 3a	136
II 33	25	<i>Thrasymachos</i>	135
Hesiod		<i>Timaeus</i>	135
<i>Works and Days</i>		<i>Sophistes</i>	
101	2, 22	221a ff.	145

Philostratus			
<i>Ep.</i> 73,77	157	V.8 [31] 4.4–11	159
		V.8 [31] 6.1–9	162
Plotinus		V.8 [31] 13.4	159
<i>Enneads</i>		VI.9 [9] 9	159
I.2 [19] 6.2–3	162	VI.9 [9] 9.33–34	162
II 9 [33] 1,1–8	155		
II.9 [33] 15,39 f.	162	Porphyry	
III.5 [50] 2	159	<i>Vita Plotini</i>	
III.5 [50] 9.24–29	159	10,35–36	161
IV.3 [27] 11	161		
IV.7 [2] 15	161	Proclus	
IV.8 [6] 1.1–11	162	<i>Platonic Theology</i>	
IV.9 [9] 9.33–34	162	I.5,25–26	162
V.1 [10] 7.30–31	159	I.25.113, 4–10	163
V.1 [10] 8	157	II.4.36	158
V.3 [49] 10.33–39	156	IV.9, 30	163
V.3 [49] 14.9	161		
V.5 [32] 1.38–43	153	Sextus Empiricus	
V.5 [32] 2.18–20	153	<i>Adv. Math.</i> 7, 49	157
		<i>PH</i> 1, 200	157

Index of Names

- Aaboe, Asger 71
Adams, Samuel L. 256, 265
Ahn, Gregor 232
Aitken, K. T. 181
Allen, James P. 10, 15, 92, 111, 115
Alston, William P. 280
Altenmüller, Hartwig 80
Alter, Robert 261, 262, 263, 265, 266, 268
Ames, Roger T. 279
Amiet, Pierre 231
Anderson, Graham 46,
Andrianopoulos, Vasileios 233
Annus, Amar 142
Anthonioz, Stéphanie 41
Archi, Alfonso 60
Armstrong, Arthur H. 153
Armstrong, David 88
Artemov, Sergei 285
Assmann, Jan 7, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20,
81, 89, 94, 96, 97, 99, 111, 116, 139, 235,
256
Attinger, Pascal 36
Avrahami, Yael 16, 17, 18, 166, 196
- Bachmann, Manuel 236
Bailey, Cyril 207
Baines, John 77, 82
Balentine, Samuel E. 187
Baltzer, Klaus 195
Barr, James 278
Barta, Winfried 115
Barton, John 18, 19
Baßler, Moritz 88
Bauer, Thomas 93
Bawanypeck, Daliah 1
Beale, G. K. 177
Beattie, Geoffrey 244
Beaulieu, Paul-Alain 37
Beierwaltes, Werner 156, 159
Bell, Catherine 230, 244, 245, 246,
247 Bellah, Robert N. 21
Berg, Robert M. van den 163
Berges, Ulrich 181
Bergmann, Michael 284
Berlejung, Angelika 229, 255 Biagioli,
Mario 280
Bilstein, Johannes 229
Blair, Ann M. 93
Blumenthal, Elke 28, 77, 81, 116
- Bobzien, Susanne 260
Boman, Thorleif 16
Borger, Rykle 58,
Bottéro, Jean 42, 43
Botterweck, Gerhard Johannes 189
Box, George H. 107
Boyer, Pascal 230, 233
Brandt, Christina 2, 97
Braun, Rainer 207
Bredekamp, Horst 55
Brennan, Tad 272
Brisson, Luc 25
Brock, Richard 38
Bröcker, Walter 135
Brown, David 1
Brown, Jessica 294
Brunner-Traut, Emma 10, 90, 142
Brunner, Helmut 107, 120
Burkard, Günter 115, 120
Burkhardt, Adelheid 15
Burnett, John 15,
Bynum, Caroline 245
- Caminada, Martin 272
Caminos, Ricaordo Augusto 107, 113
Cancik-Krischbaum, Eva 1, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12,
13, 15, 22, 28, 55, 61, 257, 273
Carasik, Michael 17
Carroll, Robert P. 181
Cavigneaux, Antoine 45
Černý, Jaroslav 114
Chadwick, John 24
Chalmers, David 244
Charlesworth, Max 282
Chiaradonna, Ricardo 156
Chignell, Andrew 294
Childs, Brevard 248
Chisholm Robert B. 176
Christianson, James L. 216
Civil, Miguel 17
Clark, Andy 244
Clements, Ronald E. 181
Clines, David J. A. 259, 263
Collins, John J. 262
Cornford, Francis M. 24, 68, 69, 135
Crenshaw, James L. 217, 227, 255, 263, 266,
267, 268, 269, 271
Crisostomo, C. Jay 41, 43, 47, 64
Crocker, Jennifer 233

- Crome, Peter 159
 Cross, Charles 283
 Cryer, Frederick H. 38
 Cupitt, Don 278
 Currid, D. 179
- D'Ors, Eugenio 88
 Dafni, Evangelia G. 178
 Daly, Lloyd W. 46
 Deicher, Susanne 1, 136
 Deleuze, Gilles 88, 95, 97, 98
 Dell, Katherine J. 206, 209, 210, 215, 256, 261, 263
 Di Lella, Alexander A. 175
 Dietrich, Jan 2, 13, 17, 18, 20, 24, 105, 112, 113, 130, 140, 141, 218, 252, 258, 259, 270, 271, 272, 273, 279
 Dietrich, Walter 176, 177
 Dodds, Eric R. 154
 Donald, Merlin 4, 20
 Donner, Herbert 79
 Döring, Klaus 135
 Doury, Marianne 284, 285
 Dowd, Ryan 216, 217
 Downs, Roger M. 234
 Dubach, Manuel 186
 Durham, John I. 248
 Dürr, Lorenz 122
 Dux, Günter 235
 Dziobek, Eberhard 14
- Ebeling, Jarle 37
 Eco, Umberto 82, 87
 Ehrhard, Anne-Françoise 143
 Eisenberg, Peter 143
 Elkana, Yehuda 2, 21, 97
 Emilsson, E. Kjalar 153
 Englund, Robert K. 41, 42
 Enmarch, Roland 77, 79, 89, 106, 117, 119, 124, 125,
 Erman, Adolf 83, 125, 141, 142,
 Escolano-Poveda, Marina 115
 Evans, Craig A. 181, 182,
 Evans, John F. 171
 Everson, Stephen 151
- Fadhil, Anmar Abdulillah 10
 Fantham, Elaine 46
 Farmer, Kathleen A. 256
 Faulkner, Raymond O. 11, 107, 126
 Fechner, Josephine 232
 Fecht, Gerhard 119, 124
 Ferber, Rafael 135, 145
 Fichtner, Johannes 122
 Finkel, Irving 9
- Finsterbusch, Karin 18
 Fischer-Elfert, Hans Werner 82, 107
 Fiske, Susan T. 235
 Fitzenreiter, Martin 95
 Fleck, Ludwig 1
 Fohrer, Georg 270
 Fontenelle, Thierry 42
 Foster, Benjamin R. 36
 Foucault, Michel 1, 7, 26, 40, 88, 95, 145
 Fox, Michael V. 18, 115, 116, 128, 131, 207, 208, 217, 227, 259, 292
 Frahm, Eckart 1, 4, 9, 55, 62
 Frame, Grant 36
 Franke, Detlef 32
 Frankfort, Henri 3, 4, 11, 243, 244
 Frankfort, Henriette A. 3, 4, 11
 Frankfort, John A. Wilson 243, 244
 Frede, Dorothea 25
 Freuling, Georg 255, 256, 260, 261, 263, 270, 271
 Frey-Anthes, Henrike 232
 Fullerton, Kemper 270
- Gabbay, Uri 1, 4, 57
 Gammie, John G. 207
 Gardiner, Alan H. 14, 96, 114, 120, 139
 Gauss, Hermann 135
 Geertz, Clifford 230
 Geller, Markham J. 64
 Geller, Stephan A. 18
 Genette, Gerard 78
 Gennep, Arnold van 235
 George, Andrew R. 53, 70
 Gericke, Jaco 18, 187, 218, 256, 257, 273, 277, 282, 287, 291, 298
 Gerson, Lloyd P. 151
 Gertz, Jan Christian 177
 Gettier, Edmund 47
 Gibbs, Raymond W. Jr. 244
 Gibson, Arthur 296
 Ginsberg, H. Louis 128
 Girard, René 256
 Gittel, B. 165
 Glasser, Étienne 220
 Glassner, Jean-Jacques 43
 Gloeckl, Rainer 233
 Gloy, Karen 1, 6, 25, 136, 144, 146
 Gnirs, Andrea M. 85, 120
 Goedicke, Hans 116
 Goering, Greg Schmidt 168
 Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von 138
 Goff, Matthew J. 168
 Goldman, Alvin 281
 Goldstein, Bernhard R. 68
 Gomes, Gilberto 272

- Gong, Yushu 59, 60, 61
 Goody, Jack 6
 Gradl, Felix 263
 Graness, Anke 105
 Grapow, Hermann 125
 Greenstein, Edward L. 111, 257, 264, 272
 Grenfell, Bernard P. 15
 Gressmann, Hugo 122
 Grimal, Nicolas-Christophe 81
 Grimes, Roland L. 229, 230
 Groarke, Leo 285
 Grossman, Jonathan 177
 Guglielmi, Waltraud 81, 83
 Gunn, David M. 177
 Gurney, Oliver R. 9, 38
- Haarmann, Volker 198
 Habachi, Labib 14
 Hacker, Edward A. 272
 Hagen, Fredrik 14, 111, 114
 Hallo, William W. 106
 Handelman, Don 236
 Hansen, Hans 47, 296, 297
 Hansson, Sven Ole 278
 Harris, William V. 38
 Harrison, Peter 67, 222
 Hart Weed, Jennifer 278
 Hartenstein, Friedrich 236
 Hawary, Amr El 13, 15, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 100
 Hazony, Yoram 18, 19, 279
 Heidegger, Martin 91, 143, 147
 Helck, Wolfgang 120
 Hengel, Martin 211
 Herrmann, Siegfried 21
 Herter, Hans 144
 Herzberg, Stephan 23
 Hesse, Franz 176, 182, 263
 Hilgert, Markus 4, 8, 30, 55, 97, 99, 101, 136
 Hoffman, Yair 121
 Hoffmann, Friedhelm 96, 261, 262
 Holbraad, Martin 39
 Holland, John H. 243, 252
 Horn, Christoph 22, 156
 Hornung, Erik 90, 98, 99, 118
 Houlihan, Patrick 116
 Howald, Ernst 144
 Hudson, Michael 6
 Hume, David 217, 218
 Hunger, Herrmann 37
 Hunt, Arthur S. 15
 Hutter, Manfred 232
- Ichikawa, Jonathan Jenkins 38
- Imhausen, Annette 1, 4, 64, 87, 90, 91
 Irwin, William A. 252
- Jacobsen, Thorkild 252
 Jaeger, Werner 24
 Jamrozik, Anja 244
 Janowski, Bernd 17, 235, 236, 255
 Jasnow, Richard Lewis 107, 109
 Jay, Jacqueline E. 3, 41, 43, 47
 Jennings, Theodore W. Jr. 229, 232
 Jiménez, Enrique 10
 Johnson, Dru 17, 18, 227, 245, 247, 249, 260, 271, 279, 280, 286, 296
 Johnson, J. Cale 1, 4, 74
 Johnson, Mark 244, 245
 Johnston, Andrew J. 57
 Joll, Nicholas 279
 Jones, Alexander 68, 69
 Jonte-Pace, Diane 245
 Jurmann, Claus 80
- Kadish, Gerald E. 111
 Kahl, Jochem 1, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 55
 Kaiser, Gerhard 256, 259, 263, 271, 272
 Kamlah, Jens 229
 Kaplony, Peter 124
 Kaufmann, Yehezkel 121
 Keel, Othmar 99, 229, 231
 Kelemen, Pal 55
 Kellenberger, Edgar 177
 Kenn, Klaus 233, 238
 Koch-Westenholz, Ulla 9, 62, 65
 Koch, Klaus 255
 Kock, Theodor 144
 Köhler, Wolfgang 181
 Köhlmoos, Melanie 261, 270
 Köpp-Junk, Heidi 83
 Kornblith, Hilary 243
 Kosman, Aryeh 23
 Krämer, Benedikt 155
 Krämer, Sybille 55
 Kratz, Reinhard G. 200
 Kraus, Hans-Joachim 17
 Kraus, Rolf 92
 Krauss, Samuel 46
 Krebernik, Manfred
 Krispijn, Theo J.H. 42
 Krüger, Thomas 175, 191, 218, 220, 221, 255, 271
 Kubisch, Sabine 77, 78
 Kucharek, Andrea 83
 Kuhn, Thomas S. 1
 Kühn, Wilfred 152
 Kühschelm, Roman 176, 181, 182
 Küster, Marc Wilhelm 55

- Kutsch, Ernst 261, 262
 Kwon, JiSeong James 220
 Kynes, Will 221, 265
 Kyriacou, Christos 279
- Lakoff, George 244, 245
 Lambert, Wilfred 3, 40, 60
 Lämmerhirt, Kai 39
 Lacombe-Unal, F. 113
 Landsberger, Benno 5, 51, 91
 Lang, Ewald 143
 Lapp, Günther 89
 Lapsley, Jacqueline E. 172
 Larkin, Brian 63
 Larsen, Mogens T. 3, 5, 11
 Latour, Bruno 94, 95
 Lawson, E. Thomas 230, 233
 Lee, Eunny P. 212
 Leisegang, Hans 6, 145
 Leitz, Christian 13
 Lenzi, Alan 11
 Leslie, Alan M. 230
 Leuenberger, Martin 229
 Lévi-Strauss, Claude 20
 Lichtheim, Miriam 10, 78, 80, 81, 106, 107,
 119, 120, 124
 Lieberman, Saul 46
 Lieberman, Stephen J. 45
 Liénard, Pierre 230, 233
 Liess, Kathrin 186
 Lieven, Alexandra von 13, 14
 Lindpointer, Rudolf 91, 92
 Linné, Carl von 145
 Linville, Patricia 235
 Liverani, Mario 39
 Livingstone, Alasdair 13
 Lloyd, Antony C. 152
 Lloyd, Geoffrey E.R. 2, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25
 Lohfink, Norbert 206, 207
 Lohmann, Katharina 115
 Loprieno, Antonio 83
 Luhmann, Niklas 9, 21
- Maffie, James 281, 282
 Malaise, Michel 78
 Mancini, Marco 46
 Mann, William N. 24
 Maroko, Erik 1, 136
 Marten, Rainer 144
 Martinich, A. P. 35
 Masson-Oursel, Paul 278
 Mathys, Hans-Peter 256, 259, 263, 271, 272
 Matlock, Teenie 244
 Maul, Stefan M. 1, 4, 8, 19, 63
 McAfee, Matthew 177
- McGinnis, C. M. 177
 McKane, William 115
 McLaughlin, John L. 179, 181, 182, 183
 Mehrabian, Albert 244
 Merleau-Ponty, Maurice 251
 Meyer, Insa 187
 Millar, Suzanna R. 272
 Miller, Geoffrey 178, 272
 Mitchell, Basil 282
 Mittermayer, Catherine 61
 Moberly, R. W. L. 155
 Moers, Gerald 81, 98, 111
 Morenz, Ludwig D. 13, 14, 77, 79, 80, 81,
 82, 124, 126
 Mortley, Raoul 155
 Most, Glenn W. 9
 Müller, Katrin 16
 Müller, Reinhard 181
 Mutius, Hans-Georg von 95
- Nagel, Jennifer 35, 38
 Natorp, Paul 135
 Nelson, H. H. 11
 Neugebauer, Otto 69, 70, 71, 72
 Nietzsche, Friedrich 147, 251
 Nims, Charles F. 122
 Nissinen, Martti 38
- O'Meara, Dominic J. 155
 Ockinga, Boyo G. 111
 Oehler, Klaus 135
 Oelsner, Joachim 7, 140
 Oeming, Manfred 255, 262
 Olyan, Saul 176, 189, 229
 Oorschot, Jürgen van 262
 Otto, Adelheid 231
 Otto, Eberhard 81, 82
 Otto, Eckart 17, 21, 140, 283, 289
- Pailin, David 278
 Parkinson, Richard B. 15, 89, 99, 111, 115,
 120, 124
 Parpola, Simo 9, 37, 38, 39, 40
 Parry, William Thomas 272
 Pavese, Carlotta 35
 Pedersen, Johannes 16
 Perlitt, Lothar 187
 Petterson, Jeremiah 56
 Peuckert, Sylvia 142
 Pham, Xuan Huong Thi 229
 Plantinga, Alvin 294
 Podella, Thomas 228, 229
 Polanyi, Michael 251
 Pommerening, Tanja 1, 12, 13, 64, 87
 Pongratz-Leisten, Beate 39

- Popko, Lutz 89
 Porada, Edith 231
 Porten, Bezalel 107
 Porter, Anne 246
- Quack, Joachim Friedrich 10, 13, 20, 92, 96,
 98, 106, 107, 109, 114, 120, 124, 139,
 142, 160, 163
 Quine, Willard V. O. 243
 Quirke, Stephan 98, 120
- Rad, Gerhard von 3
 Radestock, Susanne 10, 12, 141
 Ranston, Harry 207
 Rappe, Sarah 163
 Renaud, Odette 115
 Renn, Jürgen 1, 4, 94
 Rescher, Nicholas 87, 88
 Rheinberger, Hans-Jörg 2, 52, 58, 59, 64, 95
 Richardson, Richard 140
 Ricœur, Paul 236
 Robson, Eleanor 1, 4
 Rochberg, Francesca 1, 4, 19, 35, 43, 44, 67,
 68
 Röd, Wolfgang 97
 Roelofsen, Floris 283
 Röhser, Günter 176, 181, 182
 Rorty, Richard 147
 Rosán, Laurence J. 154
 Rositani, Annunziata 37
 Roth, Martha T. 42
 Rudman, Dominic 207
 Ryle, Gilbert 88
- Saffrey, Henri D. 160
 Sallaberger, Walther 51
 Salo, Reettakaisa Sofia 171
 Sauneron, Serge 7
 Schäfer, Christian 25
 Schäfer, Heinrich 10, 83, 90
 Schellenberg-Lagler, Annette 20, 127, 128,
 168, 169, 173, 174, 217, 218, 219, 222,
 227, 228, 256, 259, 268, 271, 280
 Schiefsky, Mark 21
 Schmid, Konrad 4, 182, 261, 272
 Schneider, Thomas 139
 Schoors, Anton 112, 128
 Schöpflin, Karin 171, 172
 Schrakamp, Ingo 55, 60
 Schroer, Silvia 99, 229, 231
 Schubert, Gerhard 143
 Schwitzgebel, Eric 38, 294
 Scurlock, Jo Ann 1, 4
 Seow, Choon-Leong 175, 176, 180, 206, 215
 Sepp, Hans Rainer 236, 237
- Sève, Bernard 42
 Sherbiny, Wael 107, 126
 Shupak, Nili 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110,
 111, 112, 115, 116, 118, 121, 129, 177
 Simpson, William Kelly 14, 81
 Sitzler, Dorothea 124, 126
 Sjöberg, Åke W. 8, 56, 57
 Skehan, Patrick W. 175
 Skladny, Udo 256
 Sneed, Mark 216, 218, 221, 222, 223, 292
 Snell, Bruno 16, 21
 Snoeck, Jan A. M. 230
 Soden, Wolfram von 5, 35, 91, 99, 138, 232
 Sorabji, Richard 152
 Sparkes, Alonzo William 284, 285
 Staal, Frits 233
 Stadler, Martin A. 90
 Stauder, Andréas 20, 77, 79
 Stea, David 234
 Steele, John M. 4
 Steiner, Richard C. 122
 Steinert, Ulrike 55
 Steinkeller, Piotr 41
 Steup, Matthias 38
 Stewart, H. M. 95
 Stier, Fridolin 272
 Stolz, Fritz 20
 Streck, Michael 36
 Strobach, Niko 25
 Stroll, Avrum 35, 88
 Swindal, James 277
 Szabó, Ernő Kulcsár 65
 Szaif, Jan 25
- Tacke, Nikolaus 11
 Talon, Philippe 41
 Talstra, Eep 178
 Taylor, Charles 23
 Taylor, Jon 36
 Taylor, Shalley E. 233
 Taylor, Thomas 159
 Thissen, Heinz J. 115
 Thomé, Horst 235
 Tigay, Jeffrey H. 45
 Tobin, Vincent A. 115
 Tribble, Phyllis 245
 Tsevat, Mattitiah 257, 271
 Turner, Victor 232, 235
- Uehlinger, Christoph 4, 229
 Uhlig, Torsten 181, 182, 183, 189
 Uhlmann, Gyburg 57
- Vall, Gregory 19

- Van De Mieroop, Marc 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 44,
45, 51, 97, 136, 137
Van de Walle, B. 78
Velde, Te 96, 100
Veldhuis, Niek 1, 4, 42, 55, 60, 136
Vernant, Jean-Pierre 24
Vernus, Pascal 14, 117
Veyne, Paul 39
Viano, Marizio 40, 41, 43, 44, 47
Vogiatzis, Ioannis 233
Völkel, Markus 88
Volokhine, Youri 78
Volten, Aksel 120
- Wagner, Andreas 2, 16
Wagner, Thomas 228, 229, 232, 262, 268
Walsem, René van 13, 14
Waltke, Bruce K. 256
Wang, Xinli 280
Wasserman, Nathan 36
Watson, Jamie Carlin 4, 285
Weinfeld, Moshe 119, 122
- Weinrich, Harald 143
Weizsäcker, Carl Friedrich von 138
Welton, Rebekkah 186
Westendorf, Wolfhart 1
White, Claire 230, 232, 237
Whitley, Charles F. 206, 207
Wiener, Morton 244
Wilcke, Claus 55
Williams, Roland J. 115
Wintzer, Abraham 43
Winter, Urs 231
Witte, Markus 261, 262, 263, 266
Wolff, Hans Walter 2, 16, 17
Wong, David 280
Wulf, Christoph 229
- Yamazaki, Naoko 141
Yardeni, Ada 107
- Zauzich, Karl-Theodor 107, 109
Zimmerli, Walter 171, 172

Index of Subjects

- Abstraction 3, 8, 20, 21, 90–92, 155, 208, 284, 285, 295
Aesop Romance 46
Alexander Romance 46
Allusions 183, 198, 220, 221
Alphabet 37, 45, 46, 47, 54, 162
Angelus interpres 171
Anthropology 215–224
Argument transition markers 284, 285
Aspective 10, 22, 23, 27, 90
Axial Age 27, 92
- Belief 37, 38, 39, 40, 108, 129, 161, 162, 208, 211, 212, 246–248, 277, 298
- Calvinism 222
Carpe diem 116, 218–224
Causality 67, 68, 74, 158, 256, 260, 290
Children 23, 39, 108, 114, 158, 177, 178, 191, 198, 250, 251
Cognitive impairments 175, 176, 200
Cognitive organs 166, 176, 177, 181–183, 189
Cognitive processes 52, 95, 165–167, 170–172, 199–201, 227, 230–233, 281
Contradictions 9, 21, 97, 216
Contraositions 258, 260–274
Cult 11, 12, 27, 80, 81, 116–123, 129, 161, 217, 231–233, 235, 236, 250
Culture 3, 18–20, 26, 37, 42, 45, 51, 52, 63, 69, 73, 87, 91, 94, 99, 130, 136, 137, 147, 165, 233, 235, 273, 280
Cuneiform 27, 39, 41–47, 54, 58–64, 67–74, 136, 139
- Death 47, 96, 98, 112, 115–117, 120, 121, 129–150, 207, 210, 212, 218, 227–229, 238
Deed-Consequence-Relation 219, 255–261, 265
Definition 25, 27, 99, 135, 136, 143, 144–147, 281
Denotation 72
Determinative 68, 79, 80, 84, 92, 120, 138
Dialogue 8, 21–25, 27, 53, 56, 111, 116, 127, 135, 147, 151, 157, 158, 163, 261
Diatribe 207
Differentiation 9, 20, 21, 27, 144, 145, 144
- Doubt 39, 43, 115, 116, 118, 129, 209, 212, 213, 248, 265, 269, 272, 273
- Ecclesiastes, see Qoheleth
Education 43, 44, 59, 60, 83, 105, 108–115, 128–130, 139, 168, 248, 251
Eigenbegrifflichkeit 51, 91
Enabling / disabling of human cognition 165–189
Encyclopaedia(s) 93
Epicureanism 206, 207
Epistemology
– Epistemic things 52–64, 95
– Epistemological incommensurability 277, 280, 282, 285, 286, 288, 293, 294, 296–298
– Epistemology of religion 280
– Ethnoepistemology 277, 281, 282
Eschatological new beginning 165, 189–199, 222, 223
Eternity 15, 69, 89, 94, 215, 223, 227–229
Ethics 18, 19, 27, 87, 117, 120–122, 129, 130, 269, 272, 294
Explanation 8, 68, 69, 93, 222, 251, 266, 272, 273, 281, 288, 292, 293, 295
- Friends of Job 116, 174, 259, 261–274
- Generations 17, 129, 244, 248–251
Graphemes 58–63
Greek philosophy 9, 206, 207, 208, 213
- Hiding of God 127, 174, 187–189, 193, 197
Hierarchy 140
Hypotaxis 136, 143, 144–147
- Image of God 123, 124, 129
Incomprehensibility of God 156, 174, 186, 187
Informal fallacies 277, 283, 294, 296, 297
Intellectual intuition 151, 152
Involvement of God 126, 165, 167, 199–201, 269
Isotope 87
- Job (person) 19, 105, 111, 117, 127, 130, 176, 180, 209, 259, 262–269, 287, 288

- Justification 40, 87, 93, 195, 249, 260, 271, 277, 280–298
- Knowledge, see also thinking
 – inclusive knowledge 93
 – knowledge transfer 12, 18, 44, 45, 52, 54, 60, 108
 – secret knowledge 11, 27, 36
- Laws 7, 42, 43, 139, 140, 220, 263
- Liminal 232–235, 238
- Limitations of human cognition 20, 90, 111, 172–175, 181, 184, 186, 189, 206, 211, 213, 215, 218, 227, 228
- List science
 – lexical lists 41–45, 55, 70
- Logic 7–9, 12, 13, 16, 25, 42, 44, 91, 94, 97–99, 136, 142–144, 147, 218, 247, 248, 255–274, 277, 278, 282–297
- Mantic science 19, 27
- Mesopotamia 1, 3–9, 13, 26, 27, 35–39, 51–64, 136
- Messiah, messianic figure 191, 193, 195–198
- Metaepistemology 279
- Methodology 5, 53, 223
- Model-making 68, 69, 73
- Monotheism 15, 20, 23, 24, 27
- Mythological knowledge 151
- Nature 6, 7, 57, 67–70, 73, 74, 94, 97, 135, 137, 144, 145, 159
- Negative henology 151, 155
- Negative theology 146, 151, 155–158
- Neoplatonism 22, 151–155, 160–163
- Omens / Omina 7–9, 19, 27, 43, 44, 62, 67, 70, 137, 179
- Onto-Epistemology 87, 92, 93
- Order and disorder 13, 14, 27, 110
- Originality 200
- Osiris Mysteries 83
- Parataxis 136–143
- Paratext 78, 79, 81–83
- Pesach 250, 251
- Pessimism 216
- Philology 6, 9, 13, 27, 55
- Philosophy
 – Comparative philosophy 277, 278, 280
 – Philosophy of religion 157, 277–280, 282, 296, 297
- Planetary phenomena 40, 68–74, 98
- Plotinus 151–163
- Polytheism 27, 142
- Post-Structuralism 87, 88
- Pythagoreanism 159, 160
- Qoheleth 111, 112, 116, 121, 127–129, 173, 206–213, 215–224, 227–229, 237, 238
- Reader / reader-response 14, 77–84, 91, 93, 97, 182, 221, 247, 288
- Reading 9, 35, 41, 44, 45, 57–60, 77–84, 96–98
- Reason 4–7, 15, 20–24, 40–47, 68, 69, 99, 100, 138, 146, 147, 163, 208, 216, 222, 243–245, 269–273, 277, 280, 282–298
- Recognition formula 169, 171, 172, 177, 193–198
- Recording 4, 37, 52–54, 58, 121, 137
- Reflection 9, 14, 22, 25, 36, 52, 57, 63, 91, 152, 161, 186, 218, 219, 282, 297
- Religion
 – Religious language 15, 20, 24, 277, 287, 288
 – Religious symbol system 230, 234
- Representation 7, 8, 41, 45, 54, 57, 58, 69–74, 89, 90, 94, 95, 99, 156, 158, 161, 233, 272
- Revelation 166–171, 186–189, 198, 209, 217–224
- Rhizome 6, 8, 10, 27, 98, 136
- Rites de passage* 229, 233–238
- Ritual
 – testing 249
- Sabbath, see shabbat
- Scepticism 38, 88, 208–210
- Scribes 5, 17, 43, 56, 60, 61, 68, 70, 73, 89, 168, 221, 224, 293
- Semiotics 55, 56, 63, 87
- Shabbat / Sabbath 199, 248
- Speculative wisdom 105, 106, 111, 115, 118, 123, 128, 130
- Stoicism 206, 207, 211
- Sukkot 244, 248, 250
- Theory
 – theoretic attitude 4, 5, 9, 20, 24
- Thinking, see also knowledge
 – abstract thinking 9, 88
 – analogical 12, 22, 25, 27, 41, 42, 64, 138, 146, 244, 245
 – aspective 10, 22, 23, 26, 27, 90
 – associative 2, 10, 22, 26
 – binary 16, 24, 26, 147, 250
 – constellative thinking 27
 – hypotactic 8, 12, 18, 26, 27, 136, 143, 144

- inspired thinking 19, 27, 163
- listening thinking 16–8, 22, 25–27
- mnemonic thinking 18, 19, 27
- second-order thinking 2, 8, 9, 13, 14, 19, 21–27, 37, 98, 105, 277, 279, 290, 295
- seeing thinking 22, 25, 26
- synthetic thinking 2, 3, 16, 22, 26
- taxonomic thinking 2, 3, 26, 234
- theoretic thinking 6, 20, 27, 163
- thinking-acting dichotomy 245–247
- Tradition vs. Criticism 105–130
- Transrational cognition 151, 158, 162
- Tun-Ergehen-Zusammenhang*, see
Deed-Consequence Relation
- Typology of epistemological approaches 27
- Uta-napišti* 53
- Verstockung 176–190, 198
- Why- and how-questions 283, 293, 297
- Wisdom, Wisdom tradition 18, 19, 21, 36,
105–130, 139, 140, 160, 167–180, 187,
196, 201, 205–214, 217–219, 255, 257,
258, 266, 268, 270–722, 278
- Worldview 91–94, 122, 194, 199, 207, 215,
235–237
- Writing 5–7, 13, 15, 42–47, 51, 52, 54–64,
94–96, 108, 109, 111, 162