OCCASIONAL PAPERS

ERIC-VOEGELIN-ARCHIV
LUDWIG-MAXIMILIANS-UNIVERSITÄT
MÜNCHEN

— XXVI —

Peter Machinist

Mesopotamia in Eric Voegelin's *Order and History*

OCCASIONAL PAPERS

ERIC-VOEGELIN-ARCHIV
LUDWIG-MAXIMILIANS-UNIVERSITÄT
MÜNCHEN

— XXVI —

Peter Machinist

Mesopotamia in Eric Voegelin's *Order and History*

PETER MACHINIST, geb. 1944. 1980-81 Visiting Lecturer and Lady Davis Fellow an der Hebrew University of Jerusalem (Israel); 1984-85 Fellow am Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin. Seit 1991 Lehrtätigkeit an der Harvard University, Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations und Mitglied der Fakultat der Harvard Divinity School. Seit 1992 Hancock Professor of Hebrew and Other Oriental Languages an der Harvard University. Arbeitsschwerpunkte: Vergleichende Geschichte des Alten Orients, insbesondere von Mesopotamien (Assyrien) und des Alten Israel. Jüngste Veroffentlichungen: "Outsiders and Insiders: The Biblical View of Emergent Israel," in R.L. Cohn and L. Silberstein (Hrsg.), *The Other in Jewish History and Thought* (New York, 1994); "The Fall of Assyria in Comparative Ancient Perspective," in S. Parpola and R.M. Whiting (Hrsg.), *Assyria 1995* (Helsinki, 1997); "Biblical Traditions: The Philistines and Israelite History," in E.D. Oren (Hrsg.), *The Sea Peoples and Their World: A Reassessment* (Philadelphia, 2000); "The *Rab Shaqeh* at the Wall of Jerusalem: Israelite Identity in the Face of the Assyrian 'Other'," *Hebrew Studies* 41 (2000).

OCCASIONAL PAPERS, XXVI, September 2001

Peter Machinist,
Mesopotamia in Eric Voegelin's *Order and History*

OCCASIONAL PAPERS
hrsg. von Peter J. Opitz und Dietmar Herz
in Verbindung mit dem Eric-Voegelin-Archiv an der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München und dem Eric-Voegelin-Archiv e.V. München
Redaktion: Anna E. Frazier

ISSN 1430-6786

INHALTSVERZEICHNIS

PETER MACHINIST

MESOPOTAMIA IN ERIC VOEGELIN'S *ORDER AND HISTORY*

I. Introduction: *Order and History*

Already on its publication in 1956 and in the years immediately thereafter, Eric Voegelin's *Israel and Revelation*, the first volume of his series on *Order and History*, received broad notice. The reviewers included those not just in his own field of political philosophy, but in the area the volume concerned, Biblical and other ancient Near Eastern civilizations.[1] Among this latter group, the positive impression that Voegelin created may be epitomized in the review-essay by one of the grand masters of ancient Near Eastern studies, William Foxwell Albright of the Johns Hopkins University in the United States.[2] Writing in 1961, and taking into account also the second volume of the series, which had by then appeared, Albright had, to be sure, some critical remarks about the traces of "Hegelianism" in Voegelin – or so Albright thought[3] – but he was quick to qualify this criticism by noting that Voegelin had not gone all the way (e.g., had seriously modified Hegel's dialectical understanding of history). Albright had some other concerns about Voegelin's work as well – among them, a certain lingering Pan-Babylonianism in it (on which more, below), and too great a reliance on the German *Alttestamentler*, Albrecht Alt and Martin Noth, and so

an unwillingness, in Albright's view, to allow monotheistic and other cultural phenomena early in ancient Israel's history rather than just later. Yet despite such criticisms, or maybe because of the weighty issues they provoked, Albright in his review was clear and resolute about his great respect for Voegelin's achievement. Here was a scholar who, although not a professional ancient Orientalist, could grapple with the Hebrew Bible in the original, and had thought deeply about the issues especially of philosophical worldview posed by these ancient cultures. In Albright's judgment, Voegelin was far superior to Arnold Toynbee, the other obvious rival of the time as a writer of world history, in philosophical understanding and sympathy for Judaeo-Christian tradition, even if less wide-ranging historically and less reliant on primary sources.

Indeed, for an outsider like Voegelin to take the ancient Near East seriously and extensively in composing a large-scale investigation into world history was highly unusual in Voegelin and Albright's day, the example of Toynbee and a few others, notwithstanding. For too often such world histories, especially of the West as Voegelin's was, started with the Greeks, and if they looked at all at the contemporary and earlier Near East, it was brief and perfunctory, and often invidious in its comparisons. Albright himself very much felt the need to redress this imbalance, and sixteen years before *Order and History* began to appear, offered his own contribution in his book, *From the Stone Age to Christianity. Monotheism and the Historical Process*.[4] As its title suggests, the book swept through ancient Near Eastern history, from the Palaeolithic period on, looking at religious and other cultural phenomena; within this sweep, it attempted to chart the course of monotheism as it made its way from earliest Israel through

the first Christians, and so gave the West one of its fundamental points of reference.

Voegelin's effort, in *Order and History*, was arguably broader in historical scope, and certainly philosophically much deeper: much more a study in the history of ideas than what Albright only partially realized. As Voegelin laid his goal out in the first volume, *Israel and Revelation*, it was to follow the development in Western history, from their roots in the pre-Hellenistic Near East to the present, of ways of conceiving the world and of expressing those conceptions in particular symbolizations. For Voegelin, the development moved from a view of reality as essentially a "compact" cosmic whole – an integration of the human, natural, and divine realms – through a progressively deeper, more radical, and more pervasive rationalization, wherein human consciousness of reality began to differentiate among its parts, on to the separation of the human from the heavenly realms**,** in which the heavenly came to serve as a critique of the human and eventually was put off the stage, so to speak, in a focus on the human realm. Now Voegelin was willing to argue, in *Israel and Revelation*, that these various conceptions/symbolizations could be connected with different cultures historically – so the integrated cosmic especially with the pre-Biblical Near East, followed by the rationalized/ differentiated with Biblical Israel and especially the Classical and Christian worlds. But he was also quick to emphasize that the development was not a smooth linear one, rather filled with breaks, diversions, recursive elements, and survivals. The sense of the difficulties here only grew as Voegelin pushed on with subsequent volumes of *Order and History*. He held on to the idea that there were given moments or stages in the course of history when "epochal, differentiating events…leaps of being"[5] occurred, marking

changes in conceptions and their symbolizations. Still, he became ever more convinced that one had to reckon with parallel and crosscutting occurrences of the same patterns, which rendered the task of constructing a clear developmental scheme of these conceptions and symbolizations impossible. The result was that the original design of *Order and History*, moving in sequence from antiquity to the present, was left incomplete.[6]

II. Mesopotamia in Voegelin: Scope and Sources

One small, but not insignificant window on Voegelin's achievement in his *Order and History* is his treatment of ancient Mesopotamia. The treatment is to be found primarily in two places. The more elaborate and basic is in *Israel and Revelation*, where after an introduction to the broader problem of the volume and the series, Mesopotamia and its view of reality are presented in chapter 1 (pp. 16-45) as the first of three cultures of the ancient Near East – the others being the Achaemenid Persian empire and Egypt – that furnish the backdrop and contrast, partial or full, to Biblical Israel and its Weltanschauung. Later, in his fourth volume of *Order and History* entitled *The Ecumenic Age*, Voegelin returned to Mesopotamia, albeit more modestly and less systematically, as he discussed it and Egypt, along with a few references to other pre-Biblical cultures of the Near East, in the context of modes of writing history (*passim* in pp. 59-102 of chapter 1: Historiogenesis).

Voegelin's discussion of Mesopotamia is thus rather brief, and, focused as it is on the issue of conception and

symbolizations of reality, it is in no way intended as a rounded appreciation of Mesopotamian history and culture. Moreover, the appeal to ancient Mesopotamian sources is limited to certain literary texts, well-known and often the first, and occasionally, the only ones appealed to, particularly in modern general surveys of ancient Near Eastern cultures, as offering the clearest evidence of the Mesopotamian Weltanschauung. These texts include the myths of Adapa and Enuma elish, tales of the hero Gilgamesh, especially the main epic about him, the Laws or Code of Hammurapi, the Sumerian King List and something of its legacy in the work of the Hellenistic Babylonian priest, Berossos, and assorted royal inscriptions. Voegelin does not use, or at least does not mention, a variety of other texts and text categories like scholastic and scientific lists and problem sets, descriptions of rituals, and divination texts; these are, in fact, quite substantially represented in the ancient record – the divination are particularly numerous[7] – and, as we will see, they could have supplemented, provided alternatives to, or otherwise made more complex the view of reality derived from the selected literary texts. There is also no reference to non-written remains, especially the art, which could have helped at certain points as well.[8]

One should also note that Voegelin had to use this limited collection of primary sources in translation, because unlike the Hebrew Bible and New Testament, he did not know the original languages, primarily Sumerian and Akkadian.[9] To his credit, however, he did go to various standard translations, done by responsible specialists: especially, James B. Pritchard, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*,[10] along with the older Daniel D. Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*,[11] nd Alexander Heidel, *The Babylonian Genesis.*[12]

Voegelin's limited collection of primary sources was matched by a limited citation of secondary scholarship. On specific issues, Voegelin could, to be sure, invoke a nice range of modern discussions.[13] But in particular, it appears, he referred to three volumes, all of which survey, in whole or in part, Mesopotamian culture: Bruno Meissner's *Babylonien und Assyrien*;[14] Alfred Jeremias, *Handbuch der altorientalischen Geisteskultur*;[15] and Henri Frankfort, H.A. Frankfort, John A. Wilson, Thorkild Jacobsen, and William A. Irwin, *The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man.*[16]

The first of the three mentioned, Meissner's two volumes, is the most comprehensive. It is not a political history of Mesopotamia, but a systematic treatment of its social, religious, and other cultural institutions and achievements by one of the foremost Assyriologists of the day, who at the time of publication was moving to a chair at the University of Berlin.[17] Although the treatment is not as historically differentiated as it might be, and, naturally, needs updating in the light of many texts and non-written sources published later – issues that affect the other two volumes as well – still Meissner's work retains great value even 75-80 years after its appearance, and that because it was by a master, who wrote it, as A.L. Oppenheim noted, largely out of, and with constant reference to, the ancient sources themselves and the realia they represent, not in the first instance out of secondary discussions.[18]

Alfred Jeremias' volume was by a scholar trained in Assyriology in roughly the same period as Meissner, but who came to an academic post only much later, after some years as a pastor.[19] His scholarly career was aimed not really at the publication and analysis of particular texts and artifacts, as

Meissner's was, but at interpreting Mesopotamian civilization as a whole and generalizing from Mesopotamia to the world of the Hebrew Bible and the rest of the ancient Near East, indeed, to other religious traditions as well. In making sense of these cultural connections, he brought the view of the Pan-Babylonian school, of which he was one of the founders.[20] This school argued two principal theses: (1) that Mesopotamia was the source – and, for some, even the acme[21] – of the intellectual and moral achievements in Biblical Israel, as in much else of the ancient Near East apart from Egypt; and (2) that Mesopotamian culture was, from earliest Sumerian times, suffused with and focused on the understanding of the heavenly bodies – the planets, stars, etc. – which its religious beliefs, myths, and practices were founded on and served to explicate. Both of these Pan-Babylonian theses are well reflected in Jeremias' *Handbuch*. For, despite the word *altorientalisch* in its title, the book is really a treatment of Mesopotamian culture, from which lines are then drawn to other ancient cultures;[22] and this cultural treatment, while reminding one of Meissner's *Babylonien and Assyrien* – also with reference to primary sources – is in fact much narrower, centering on the heavenly world and the gods, and the means devised by the Mesopotamians to approach these. One should add, because of its re-emergence in Voegelin's own treatment, that this heavenly world was, as Jeremias – and his fellow Pan-Babylonianists – understood the Mesopotamian view, not a closed, separate realm; it was, rather, the guiding element of an integrated cosmos, reaching down to the earthly realm of humans and nature, which formed the counterpart of the heavenly.[23]

The most interesting and most significant of the three Mesopotamian volumes to Voegelin was the most recent, *The*

Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man. It originated as a series of public lectures by faculty members of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, designed to look not only at Mesopotamia, but at two other principal cultures of the ancient Near East, Egypt and Israel, all through some of their native sources; at the end the Classical world was added by way of comparison. The lectures, and volume, were edited, introduced, and concluded by Henri Frankfort, one of the most brilliant and important archaeologists and art and cultural historians of the ancient Near East in the history of these fields,[24] together with his then wife, H.A. Groenewegen-Frankfort, herself to become a noted contributor to the study of ancient Near Eastern art.[25] Their participating colleagues were also well-known, in some cases major, Near Eastern scholars: John A. Wilson for Egypt, Thorkild Jacobsen for Mesopotamia, and William A. Irwin for Israel. *Intellectual Adventure* offered a new and integrated synthesis of the cultural achievements of the ancient Near East – one that has remained unrivaled almost to the present day. As such, it became a powerfully influential book both for professionals and especially for the larger public: for the latter, particularly by way of its first paperback version, retitled *Before Philosophy*, which omitted the section on Israel (= "The Hebrews") by Irwin.[26]

Given its deliberate appeal to an educated public beyond immediate *Fachkollegen* and its deliberate engagement with issues of intellectual tradition, it is easy to see why Voegelin would have been drawn to *Intellectual Adventure*. The connection becomes only clearer if we consider the volume a little more closely. Like Voegelin, the book understands the investigation of the ancient cultures it treats as first and foremost the investigation of their Weltanschauungen – the

ways they see and organize the world in and around them. Similarly, *Intellectual Adventure* takes as the best witness for the Weltanschauung the major ancient "literary" texts – myths, stories, prayers, rituals, and royal inscriptions. That these texts originated from only one segment of the cultures, the scribes of the ruling elites, is no matter, because as Thorkild Jacobsen would write later, "as the historian of literature deals only, or primarily, with the high literary achievements of a period, so the task of the historian of religion must be to present evidence of the highest religious achievement…."[27] And it is through these literary texts that *Intellectual Adventure* explains what is basic to the Weltanschauung not only of Mesopotamia, but of the other ancient Near Eastern cultures as well, with the (partial) exception of Biblical Israel: a basis that the book characterizes as "mythopoeic." The understanding here, it should be said, was not unique to the authors of *Intellectual Adventure*; it could, and can, be found in a number of other writers, including Alfred Jeremias, as we have seen. Still, by comparison to Jeremias, the formulation in *Intellectual Adventure* is much more subtle and probing, and was, it appears, much more appealing to Voegelin. It embraces, first, a view of the cosmos as a network of personal relationships in which everything – humans, deities, other organisms, and even non-organic materials – is essentially alive: a relationship, in short, of "Thou's" more than "It's," using language that echoes Martin Buber and, more directly for the Frankforts, Ernst Cassirer.[28] Humans, thus, are part of an integrated cosmic world. Myths, in turn, with their counterparts in rituals, reflect this integration: this reaction of the ancients to the interconnectedness of the human, natural, and divine realms in which they find themselves. It is no surprise, therefore, that the myths show a propensity for maintaining simultaneously what we in the West would regard as logically contradictory views

of reality.[29] For the myths, and the cultures that produced and are reflected in them, this complementarity[30] is primarily a process of gathering and making coherent, of seeing the whole in, the multi-sided character of the cosmos; it is not essentially a process of separation and rational analysis – with coherence, if any, then coming afterward – which is to be associated especially with the classical Greek "revolution."

III. Voegelin and the Nature of Mesopotamian Culture

Having looked at the sources, primary and secondary, on which Voegelin draws, let us return, now in more detail, to his view of Mesopotamian culture. As already noted, Mesopotamia is one of several cultures that for Voegelin illustrate the earliest stage in civilized humanity's effort to define a view of reality and the symbolization for it. It is the stage in which the world, or cosmos, is "experienced" – the word is a favorite of Voegelin's – as a whole: humanity, nature, the heavenly phenomena including the gods all apprehended as first and foremost parts of and within the same world and stuff; none, not even the gods, are beyond, above, or controlling of it. The conception involved, in mode and content, Voegelin calls "the cosmological myth," and the way the several parts live in the whole he deems "a consubstantiality of being," yielding a "compact" view of reality in which each part is "attuned" to the whole.[31]

The cultures that for Voegelin exemplify this "cosmological myth" include those of the pre-Biblical Near East and also several elsewhere, like Chou-dynasty China. In Voegelin's

view, each has a different way or "style"[32] of exemplifying the myth and its symbolization; indeed, occasionally, as in the "aborted" case of Pharaonic Egypt[33] and the more thoroughgoing and successful case of Biblical Israel, the myth was actually broken through to a new level where, as noted above, the cosmos began to be understood not as compact, but as a differentiated series of realities. The importance of Mesopotamia, for Voegelin, is that it comes closest to the "ideal" representation of the myth, insofar as it is the "most rigid" in its view of the cosmos as an undifferentiated whole, the "most barren" in disallowing the possibility of any higher conceptual breakthrough.[34]

Where this cosmic compactness shows most clearly and fundamentally, in Voegelin's judgment, is in the conception of political order.[35] In Mesopotamia, as he describes it – and the influence of Thorkild Jacobsen and the Chicago *Intellectual Adventure*, but also, in its own way, that of Alfred Jeremias, can be easily detected here – the political order or government of earthly humans is the counterpart of order in the heavenly cosmos: the earthly order established as the result of a decree by the order of the gods in the cosmos.[36] The human political order is thus conceived of cosmologically, but the reverse is also the case: the cosmic order is conceived of politically. Accordingly, changes in the human political order go in tandem with changes in the cosmic order: a new empire from city x, for example, may be reflected in the emergence of the god of city x to prominence in the pantheon.

Now this dual or mutual conception, Voegelin argues, was not always and everywhere present in Mesopotamian thought; it took more than a millennium to develop. One key moment came after the middle of the third millennium B.C., when the

Sumerian ruler, Lugalzaggesi, proclaimed his newly established imperial state – a state expanded well beyond the more local domains of his rivals and predecessors – as the gift of Enlil, the principal Mesopotamian god, and so as the correspondence to what Enlil controlled as ruler of "all the lands." A second moment for Voegelin is to be placed a few centuries later, at the end of the third millennium. This is the composition of the Sumerian Kinglist, a text that quite explicitly connects the introduction of kingship in Mesopotamia, which it understands as the beginning of civilized history, with the gods who lowered it from heaven for (Mesopotamian) humanity's use. But the full flowering of the cosmological Weltanschauung in Mesopotamia, in Voegelin's view, had to wait for yet several more centuries, until Hammurapi acceded to the throne of the Old Babylonian dynasty in the eighteenth century B.C., and created a Babylonian empire, the major political entity in the region. The repercussions of this for Voegelin appear in two major documents of the period: Hammurapi's collection or code of laws, especially its preamble,[37] and the myth called *Enuma elish*, which Voegelin, in accordance with the conventional opinion among Assyriologists when he wrote *Israel and Revelation*, dates to Hammurapi's reign.[38] The two texts complement each other, and Voegelin describes how they assert the divine choice of Babylon, Hammurapi's capital city, as the center on earth and of Marduk, the god of Babylon, as the new leader of the pantheon – the preamble specifying the earthly pre-eminence of Hammurapi himself, as the third element of this triad. In so doing, the texts continue the line of thinking in Lugalzaggesi and the Kinglist, but now far more elaborately and explicitly toward a full-fledged cosmological system of symbols.[39]

It remains to be noted that the cosmological myth was not just expressed or asserted as a conception in Mesopotamian royal inscriptions, historiography, or myth. It was also, Voegelin wants to emphasize, "experienced" through its symbolization. The primary mode here, as Voegelin makes clear, referring at one point to the historian of religion, Mircea Eliade,[40] was in ritual – the public festal events like that for the New Year. Participation in these events brought the "consubstantiality of being" with the cosmos, for it allowed those present, especially in the ritual of the New Year, to understand themselves as joining in the act of creating anew political order, both cosmic and earthly.

IV. Voegelin and Mesopotamia: Toward An Evaluation

It should be apparent that even in the small number of pages which he devotes to Mesopotamia in *Order and Society*, Voegelin ranges over enough issues and texts that a really full response would require much more space than is available here. I should rather consider several particular aspects of his discussion, and then turn to the issue that appears to be central to it: compactness vs. differentiation in the Mesoptamian Weltanschauung.

Let me begin with what may be called the Pan-Babylonian legacy in Voegelin, evident in the first of his volumes, *Israel and Revelation*. Albright, as we have seen, already drew attention to this, and, quite properly, he reacted critically to its presence.[41] Voegelin does not treat or advocate the whole Pan-Babylonian approach; rather, he focuses on its view that the

heavenly bodies were fundamental to the Mesopotamian Weltanschauung. In particular, he takes up the argument for the importance and pervasiveness in Mesopotamia of the zodiac and the number twelve as a means of symbolically conceptualizing cosmic compactness, and of the prominence of the sun within this symbolic system.[42] Now the zodiac was indeed known and studied in Mesopotamia, and the sun was certainly prominent as a celestial body and in the form of one of the major gods, Shamash. But the zodiac as such is a late discovery in Mesopotamian history, as Albright notes – roughly the middle of the first millennium B.C.; and the study of the celestial bodies in general, while it is first clearly attested in the Old Babylonian period (first half of the second millennium B.C.), only became a subject of intensive, comprehensive, systematic scholarly concern, again, much later: toward the late second, and then especially the first millennium B.C.[43] In addition, while a good many of the pantheon could be conceived in celestial body form – Shamash as the sun being the most obvious – this was only part of the picture: animal, vegetal, human, and other forms comprised, it would appear, a far larger part of the symbolic repertoire.[44] Put another way, the astral or celestial was just one of the realms of reality, supernatural and otherwise, that Mesopotamia faced and charted; and it will not do to reduce this wide range simply or mainly to the astral. Voegelin, to be sure, can be cautious in his formulations, saying that the zodiac and twelve were among the "auxiliary symbols," not the "central set," in the Mesopotamian Weltanschauung,[45] and recognizing that the zodiac was attested only late.[46] Even so, the Pan-Babylonian fixation survives, in his convictions that the "central set" and the "auxiliary" symbols all have a "common origin in the Sumero-Babylonian astronomic system"[47] and that the zodiac, if attested late, was in concept rooted much earlier, certainly

by the first half of the second millennium B.C., in the period of Hammurapi of Babylon.[48]

Out of these convictions come further questionable observations on Voegelin's part. One is his characterization of the god Marduk as the sun-god.[49] Though it is true that in Enuma elish Marduk is greeted at birth by the other younger gods with a play on his name involving the Sumerian word for the sun and the sun-god (Utu),[50] and that in the final part of that myth, he is connected to the proper sun-god Shamash/Utu,[51] still Marduk is never the sun-god: it is always Shamash/Utu in Mesopotamia. Indeed, in the final part of Enuma elish, it is not only Shamash with which Marduk is connected, but a number of other deities, though the mechanism of being given fifty divine names and so, in a sense, absorbing the divinity of all these deities as a mark of his cosmic supremacy.[52] A second questionable observation concerns the Gilgamesh Epic. Voegelin does note correctly that this story went through several stages of composition, and that the last and twelfth tablet – which narrates Gilgamesh' conversation with the dead Enkidu about the netherworld – is a late addition which "looks like an appendix after Tablet XI has brought a formal ending" to the plot.[53] But Voegelin's conclusion, that the addition of Tablet XII "probably reflects the influence of zodiacal symbolism,"[54] appears far-fetched even on the surface of it, and that sense is strengthened by the lack of any real celestial or astral meaning to the story as given in Tablet XII and by Voegelin's forced effort to find astral meaning in other episodes from other tablets of the Epic.[55] In short, we should look elsewhere to explain the addition of tablet XII, and the recent suggestion of Eckart Frahm, that it is part of an attempt by a scribe of the Neo-Assyrian king,

Sennacherib, to explain the violent death of the latter's father, Sargon II, on the battlefield, has much to commend it.[56]

We may turn, next, to Voegelin's sketch, in *Israel and Revelation*, of Mesopotamian political history. Here he writes about a general trajectory of development from independent city-states, at the beginning of the third millennium B.C., each composed of "agglomerations of temples with their large land holdings,"[57] to larger territorial states, by the latter third millennium, which incorporated several city-states and, eventually, also land outside. The focus in this discussion appears to be on the southern part of Mesopotamia, properly Babylonia (itself a combination of Akkad and Sumer), and on the chronological period down through Hammurapi of Babylonia in the first half of the second millennium B.C. But Voegelin does mention, though much more briefly and incidentally, Assyria, in northern Mesopotamia, and some of its post-Hammurapi history. What holds this expanse of history together for Voegelin is not only its political development, but its corresponding development of the cosmological myth, based on a divine pantheon that essentially transcended the individual cities and states and embraced the region as a whole in "a common religious culture."[58]

There is much that is correct here. The deities, though they had their particular urban or regional homes, were indeed worshipped in many parts of Mesopotamia, and were, or came to be, considered – and the indications of this lie already in the first half of the third millennium B.C. – a common pantheon and assembly. Further, the emergence of larger, more territorially based polities can be followed in the wake of more localized, often city-centered organizations. Yet within Voegelin's generalizations are many nuances, variants, and

breaks that need to be noted, some of them already evident when he was writing *Israel and Revelation*. One difficulty is that the path from localized city-state to territorial, even imperial, state was not smooth or linear, but pitted, full of reversals and simultaneous alternatives. Hammurapi, for example, may have held sway in much of the region of Mesopotamia for a time, but it was only for a time, and even then his rivals were not permanently subdued. Indeed, one can make a case that localism, especially in Babylonia through the Old Babylonian period, remained the norm, against which the larger and more multi-faceted polities were the aberration.[59] Secondly, the political and social experience everywhere in Babylonia, let alone in Mesopotamia altogether, was not the same, and this, it appears more and more clear, reaches back to earliest times. On the one hand, it was southern Babylonia – the area of Sumer – that was marked by city-states, in the third millennium B.C. and earlier; and the older view of them, from Anton Deimel and Anna Schneider in the 1920's, as constructed of temple estates has essentially been reaffirmed by some recent studies, though in the face of challenges by other scholars, who would find the presence of communal and royal land ownership and power as well.[60] In any case, the picture in northern Babylonia – the area of Akkad – in the same period looks increasingly different. Piotr Steinkeller has been the scholar to make the sharpest recent argument for these differences, among which, in his estimation, are the subordination of all local centers to a large territorial state under the control of the northern Babylonian city of Kish, an economy that lacked the southern-style temple estates, but appears, rather, to have been dominated by the royal palace, land that could be held not only by large groups, but also, in a more limited way, by individuals, etc.[61]

Connected with these limitations in Voegelin's portrayal of Mesopotamian historical development is yet another, which leads directly to the central issue in his discussion, on compactness vs. differentiation. This has to do with Voegelin's focus on Babylonia down to Hammurapi in the early second millennium B.C. It was within this expanse, as we have seen, that Voegelin places the emergence and development of the cosmological Weltanschauung; and once fully crystallized in the period of Hammurapi, Voegelin supposes, no essential further development occurred in Mesopotamia, particularly to a differentiated view of reality. Voegelin finds, thus, no need for any substantial discussion of Mesopotamian history post-Hammurapi, either in Babylonia or in Assyria, and the few notices he does offer, while they acknowledge some change in political organization, affirm continuity in Weltanschauung. To find really visible breaks in the Weltanschauung, Voegelin argues, one must wait until the Achaemenid Persian empire, of the latter sixth century B.C. and following, which conquered Mesopotamia and modified, but only in part, its cosmological heritage.[62]

How, then, to evaluate Voegelin's view of Mesopotamia as the pristine exemplar of cosmological compactness that remained fixed after Hammurapi? To begin with, we should recognize that Voegelin himself begins to offer some nuances here, especially in a later volume of his *Order and History*, *The Ecumenic Age*. In his discussion in that volume of what he calls historiogenesis[63] – historical writing that aims to link a sequence of events and/or persons in human history with their putative origin in divine actions – Voegelin seems to be moving in two different directions. On the one hand, he clearly affirms that in its Mesopotamian and other pre-Biblical forms, historiogenesis is a manifestation of cosmological thinking.

This is illustrated best for him by the Sumerian King List, which organizes what in reality were often contemporaneous royal dynasties of different city-states in early Mesopotamia into a single chronological sequence back to the very introduction of kingship in the land by the gods. Thus for Voegelin the aim of the List is to argue that Mesopotamian history was always unified under one dynasty at any one time – a view of the List, in fact, favored by the bulk of Assyriological specialists[64] – and, further, that that unity was intended by the gods to match the unity of the cosmos itself.

Yet as Voegelin lays out this view of the List, and of historiogenesis more generally, he qualifies it, it would appear, in various ways, and so shakes the notion of cosmological compactness that it is supposed to exemplify. Historiogenesis, he tells us at one point, marks an advance on an earlier stage of human cosmological culture, replacing a simpler and more congenial notion, that coherence and consubstantiality can be renewed continually in ritual, with a view of time dominated by linearity – a view that "implacably places events on the line of irreversible time where opportunities are lost forever and defeat is final."[65] Nonetheless, Voegelin remarks, this linear dimension has to exist, in historiogenetic writing, along with other notions of time: rhythmical, infinite, cyclical.[66] And the attempt to dominate and bend these other notions to the linear – an attempt instanced by the Sumerian King List's move to eliminate the reality of contemporaneous dynasties toward a sequential unity – bespeaks the sense of complexity, tension, and fragility in the cosmic order that the historiogenetic writer must be understood to recognize and to confront.[67] In short, Voegelin has, with historiogenesis, opened up the potential, if not the existence, of cracks in the way cosmological cultures perceived cosmic coherence. To be sure, he goes on to deny

that in the case of Mesopotamia such cracks really occurred,[68] but one may argue that he has, indeed, allowed at least one crack already, in the heightened self-consciousness of the historiogenetic author to which he points. For the very recognition of cosmic complexity and tension and the need to deal with them imply a certain distancing of the self from the reality around it in order to theorize about it, which Voegelin's original notion of cosmological coherence, as presented in his *Israel and Revelation*, had not quite prepared us for. Voegelin, in a way, now acknowledges this, or at least a bit of this, when he writes that historiogenesis "is a speculation on the origin and cause of social order,"[69] which together with other kinds of speculation practiced in cosmological cultures "holds an intermediate position between cosmological compactness and noetic differentiation."[70] And his point is confirmed – even if he might not understand it this way – when he emphasizes that historiogenesis, and the speculation it represents, has remained vital and relevant long after the demise of the cosmological cultures that gave it birth, namely in cultures that have broken with the cosmological myth toward more differentiated, abstract, and rationalizing conceptions of reality.[71]

Clearly, then, a most important way – arguably even the fundamental way – into the issue of compactness in Mesopotamia, as in other cultures, is through the issue of thinking, more specifically, critical and self-conscious thinking: the degree to which a culture is able to examine analytically, and thus to stand back and even apart from, the world to which it belongs; or, to put it differently, the degree to which it is able to think about and express itself on the nature of knowing and the knower, on the manner of conceptualizing problems. I want, accordingly, to revisit this question in the case of Mesopotamia, taking up the hints that

Voegelin offers, but is finally not willing or able to follow through.[72]

Since a comprehensive treatment would require a monograph, let me focus on two arenas that illustrate what is at stake in the Mesopotamian context. The first takes us back to a text on which Voegelin had dwelt a great deal, the mythic narrative known, in its ancient setting, as Enuma elish. In *Israel and Revelation*, Voegelin quite correctly sees, drawing as he acknowledges on the discussion of Thorkild Jacobsen in *The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man*, that this myth is essentially political, woven within a cosmogonic and theogonic setting.[73] That is, the text aims to legitimize the emergence of the god Marduk and his city, Babylon, to the central place of authority not simply in Babylonia, but in the cosmic order as a whole, offering, thus, a clear example of the umbilical link between heaven and earth – the compactness – that is Voegelin's fundamental emphasis. Yet at the same time in the text of the myth, there is a level of self-consciousness about this umbilical link, a sense of the differentiated realities that need to be "compacted," which deserves notice, and which represents, at least in the elaborate way the myth lays the matter out, arguably something new in the Mesopotamian intellectual landscape. This self-consciousness is, in the first instance, literary: a recognition, on the part of the myth, of the variety of different traditions that it is bringing together and now organizing around the person and achievements of Marduk. For example, at the beginning of tablet VI (lines 1-8), after Marduk has defeated Tiamat and created out of her dismembered body a new cosmos, he turns to the creation of humans. The account here, as generally recognized, draws on a pre-existing tradition best represented by the Old Babylonian myth of Atrahasis.[74] Yet in Enuma elish, unlike Atrahasis, the

reason for the creation of humans is given only cryptically. What seems to be at play, I would argue, is a kind of gapping technique, in which readers, or listeners, to Enuma elish are invited to go back to the pre-existing tradition for the full explanation, at the same time that in so doing they are made to realize that the tradition no longer centers on Enlil, Ea, and the birth-goddess, as in Atrahasis, but is now Marduk's, and so is to celebrate his new and supreme power in the pantheon.

Another, and more complex, example of this intertextuality comes at the end of Enuma elish, in the latter part of tablet VI (lines 121-166) and then tablet VII (lines 1-144). In this, the climax of the story, Marduk's supremacy in the cosmos is confirmed by the awarding to him of fifty honorific names, each of which represents a name, or epithet, of another deity. Here again Enuma elish is drawing on earlier literary traditions, from the Old Babylonian myth of Anzu and from the god-lists, particularly from the three-column type of list in which one god is equated with a variety of others, especially in terms of particular attributes.[75] Further, the choice of fifty names is a deliberate reference to the sacred number of Enlil, the previous head of the pantheon. But clearly what is going on in Enuma elish is not simply a literary adaptation; it is a theological statement, or better, since the names are explained, played with, and punned on, a theological discussion about the nature of Marduk's divinity, as absorptive and in this way transcendent of the rest of the pantheon, going well beyond the kind of leadership role Enlil had exercised, just as the text of Enuma elish itself is absorptive and transcendent of the literary traditions it is using. Indeed, both in this name section and in Enuma elish as a whole, Marduk is presented not only within the cosmos, but to some extent apart from and above it, because he does not merely rule it, but creates it, as we have

seen, in a new way, from Tiamat's corpse.[76] All of this, to be sure, is not given to us as a systematic, explicit treatise on the nature of divinity in the manner of the Classical and later European tradition. Still, the sophistication of the text's consideration of what Marduk represents is unmistakable. And it is a sophistication that, while it builds on traditions of the Old Babylonian period of Hammurapi and his dynasty, eclipses those traditions: the three-column god-list on which it draws, for example, is not an Old Babylonian feature, but is attested only from the latter part of the second millennium B.C. on.[77] For this reason and others, Enuma elish is now generally dated much later than Old Babylonia, to the end of the second millennium B.C. or beginning of the first, and thus shows a development of cosmological thinking in Mesopotamia that Voegelin, following the earlier scholarly dating to Old Babylonia, was not able to recognize.[78]

A second arena in which critical, self-conscious thinking may be tracked in Mesopotamia is in its scholastic and scientific texts: those embracing such fields as mathematics, astronomy, grammar, and divination. As we have already observed, Voegelin does not really consider these, and it is a serious gap in his treatment. For they clearly reveal a capacity to dissect phenomena, normally of the celestial, natural, and/or human worlds, into their constituents, to analyze and categorize such constituents, and in certain, though modest, ways to generalize and so think abstractly about their properties and behaviors.[79] Thus, in the two major types of mathematical texts known, (sample) problems and tables of numbers – both attested already in the Old Babylonian period – we find an ability to calculate that rests on more than simply the manipulation of concrete objects. A much cited example is an Old Babylonian number table known by its modern label as Plimpton 322. A

broken tablet now extant in four columns, it exhibits fifteen cases, all of them, as the initial editors of the text saw,[80] representing right triangles. The number of each case is given in the farthest column to the right, Column IV. In turn, the numbers in Columns II and III indicate the shorter leg and the hypotenuse, respectively, and the numbers in Column I, finally, offer the square of the quotient achieved when the hypotenuse of each triangle is divided by its longer leg. Now, the basis of these columns, as the editors realized and as has generally been accepted since, is the quadratic equation known in Classical tradition as the Pythagorean theorem, a^2 (longer leg) + b^2 (shorter leg) = c^2 (hypotenuse). More specifically, the numbers given in the columns are a list of Pythagorean numbers or "triples," that is, integers or finite fractions designed to satisfy the requirements for right triangles. Although the way in which these numbers were arrived at is not stated in the text, and so has been debated among modern scholars, at the very least the sequential progression of the numbers by descending size, as one reads down through the fifteen preserved cases, and the large sizes the numbers represent – together suggest that the numbers were determined not by trial and error – or trial and error alone – but through use of certain equations, and thus on some level of number theory.[81]

Something similar, indeed even more elaborate, is evident in Babylonian astronomy, but unlike the instance of mathematics, the extant astronomical texts show an increasing sophistication and range as one moves into the first millennium B.C.[82] Already well before the middle of that millennium, celestial phenomena can be described not only from actual observation, but from the use of arithmetic procedures. For example, tablet 14 of the collection of celestial phenomena known as Enuma

Anu Enlil – a tablet that originates from probably late in the second millennium B.C., but derives, at least in part, from Old Babylonian traditions of the first half of the second[83] – is composed of several tables of numbers that represent the changes in the visibility of the moon through the course of a month in which the winter equinox occurs. The numbers are based on computations – the equations, however, not explicitly expressed – that combine the variability over the month in length of time of the moon's visibility or invisibility after sunset with the variability in length of the night. Later texts, going down past 500 B.C. well into the Hellenistic period, take account of a much wider range of factors governing lunar visibility, and apply a similarly new breadth to other celestial phenomena, like eclipses. The whole is then brought together using a much more complex and comprehensive set of mathematical systems, which allow the periodic occurrences of these celestial phenomena to be charted and predicted with an increasingly refined precision, reaching quite high levels of accuracy indeed. This later complexity – the emergence of a real mathematical astronomy – owes essentially nothing, it should be noted, to Greek influence. Indeed, since it clearly develops out of the earlier Babylonian astronomical tradition, where elements of it begin to appear in the Greek world, they must be explained as derivative of Babylonia.[84]

A third illustration of analytical, abstract thinking brings us to the study of grammar. In Babylonia, this is manifest mostly, as in so many other areas, in the shape of lists, here of grammatical forms. There are two groups of such lists, the earlier from the Old Babylonian period, the later, from the Neo-Babylonian period about a millennium after, in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C.. Behind both groups stands the long tradition of bilingualism in Babylonia, involving Sumerian and

Akkadian, and more particularly, the need to keep alive for religious and elite cultural purposes a knowledge of Sumerian, which by 2000 B.C. at the latest had moved from vernacular to learned language. This bilingualism is reflected in the aim of almost all the lists to compare in adjacent columns what are taken as equivalent Sumerian and Akkadian forms, arranged, then, in categories of pronouns, adverbs, prepositions and other particles, and especially verbs. But as we move from Old to Neo-Babylonian, we can detect a development, not unlike what the astronomical texts exhibit. For while the Old Babylonian texts offer mainly comparisons of full, independent forms, the Neo-Babylonian show a sharpening of the analytical perspective to a more subtle – and abstract – matching of segmented morphemes, particularly of the verb, with the morphemes now regularly identified by specific grammatical labels. The following is an example:

Old Babylonian	**Neo-Babylonian**
(Sumerian) [ba-an]-gar l (Akkadian) *is-ta-ka-an* „He has placed."	ba l *ga*$^{!}$*-mar-tum* AN$^{!}$.TA „ba (indicates) the perfect (?); (it is) a prefix."[85]

There is one more field of scholastic analysis we should look at, although it may appear bizarre to our Western rational sensibilities and so irrelevant here. The field is divination, the examination of phenomena in the human and natural worlds that were taken as signs or omens by which the gods communicated to humans their intentions.[86] The Mesopotamian practice of it is attested abundantly, diversely, and over a long span, from the end of the third to the end of the first millennium B.C., bespeaking, thus, its fundamental place in the native world view. But reading and interpreting

the divine language at issue, with its complex manifestation in many “dialects” as represented by the signs/omens to be found in the bodies of animals sacrificed to the gods, or the conjunctions of the heavenly bodies, or the freak births of humans and animals, etc. – this was not something just anyone could do. Rather, it was the work of experts, scholars, learned in the different groups of signs, which we may regard as vocabularies, and then in the syntax of these signs, that is, their putative connections to the events, in human and natural affairs, to which they were understood to point.[87]On the face of it, the whole enterprise seems to be a quintessential example of Voegelin’s cosmic compactness, since it is directed toward discovering fundamental correlations – bogus correlations to our Western scientific tradition – between what the gods want and do in heaven and what happens on earth. That is not untrue, but it does not obviate the fact that Mesopotamian divination was pursued in a highly rational, that is, analytical, systematic way. The very description of it above as the study and interpretation of divine language suggests what was involved. Signs or omens were categorized according to origin – sacrifical animals, celestial, freak births, etc. – and their correlations with events laid out in a systematic way according to criteria like right and left (e.g., “if the right side of the liver of a sacrificed sheep has such and such a feature, the king will be victorious in battle; if it is the left side, he will lose.”). The number of such criteria and the collection and systematization of the correlations become larger and more elaborate as one moves from the first half of the second through the first millennia B.C. Indeed, as M.T. Larsen has noted, one of the first millennium handbooks, a manual from the Neo-Assyrian empire dealing with extispicy, actually introduces a level of generalizing statement that is striking. For its tenth and last chapter, labelled in the native Akkadian terminology

multabiltu – which Larsen appropriately translates as "analysis" – lays out more explicitly than at any earlier point in the divinatory tradition the principles or criteria, like left and right, underlying the correlations. The description is framed, again, in the columnar format that we have encountered above in the god-lists, and in mathematics, astronomy, and grammar. Here is an example arranged in three columns, adapted from Larsen's rendering; the generalizing phrases are in the first two columns, with the actual omen sentence, which they serve to interpret, in the third column:

Length (of the part of the liver of the sacrificed animal understood as a sign)	Success	If the Station (a liver part) is long enough to reach the Path (a liver part), then the king will have success on his) campaign.[88]

V. Conclusion

The examples just discussed, from Enuma elish and the scholastic/scientific realm, testify, it is clear, to a capacity for detached observation and examination of phenomena, in which differentiation into parts, categorization, abstraction, and so self-reflective perspective, in one way or another, all have a role to play. One particular manifestation, as Enuma elish illustrates, is the exploration of the nature of divinity and its place in the cosmos that bespeaks a concern for the issue of transcendence. This is not to deny that there were other, co-existing points of view in Mesopotamia, which do exemplify the "mythopoeic" or, in other terms, the "cosmological." Rather, our examples undercut those modern interpreters who

feel the need to make a choice: so the Frankforts, in the *Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man*, who appear to argue that for Mesopotamians the world around was *only* mythopoeic – *only* an ever-present group of personalities, "Thou's," toward whom neutral detachment was not possible; or Voegelin, at least in the first *Order and History* volume, *Israel and Revelation*, for whom Mesopotamians saw and experienced the world *only* cosmologically – *only* as one undifferentiated, compact cosmos, integrating heaven and earth.

There is a second challenge here as well, and it has to do with historical perspective. Voegelin's perspective for Mesopotamia, one will recall, extended, essentially, not beyond the Old Babylonian period of the first half of the second millennium B.C. Most of our examples, on the other hand, show that the understanding of cosmic compactness and of analysis, abstraction, and self-reflection did not stop then, but continued to develop well thereafter, reaching in many arenas their highest, most elaborated levels in the first millennium B.C.

And yet in following this development, specifically of the analytical, abstracting, self-reflecting part of it, there are certain matters that give us pause. The first is that while there was a concern in Mesopotamia to find something of the principles that underlie the movements or character of the phenomena being analyzed, the expression of these principles, to judge by the written evidence, was limited and infrequent. To put the point more directly, we do not find in the Mesopotamian written record full-scale treatises, formal and explicit expositions of principles and their proofs, as we have come to expect from the Classical tradition, Greek and Roman

– though not everywhere there – and its Western legacy, as well as from certain other traditions, like the Indian Sanskrit. Thus, if Mesopotamia evidences a serious interest in the nature and transcendence of divinity, this is regularly communicated, as the Enuma elish example reveals, in mythic or hymnic narratives or the arrangement of lists of gods; we do not have a treatise like Cicero's *On the Nature of the Gods*. Or if we have a text like Plimpton 322, with its columnar list of Pythagorean "triples," neither in this text, admittedly broken as we have seen, nor in the various other Mesopotamian number lists is the Pythagorean theorem, or any other theorem, ever found stated as such. Something similar applies as well to the second category of mathematical texts, those treating sample problems, and even to the late first millennium B.C. astronomical texts, particularly to that group of them that describe procedures.[89] In both of these, the problem at issue and its solution, be it strictly mathematical or the movement of a celestial body like the visibility of the moon, are regularly presented in terms of a series of steps of calculation: first one adds this, then one multiplies that, etc.; and along the way a technical terminology is used to identify the steps and phenomena being calculated. But once more, the equations lying behind the calculations – and in the case of the late astronomical texts, the equations, as we have noted, can be in very complicated systems, indeed – do not seem to be given, even if modern scholarly treatments of the problems often "rewrite" them in terms of the equations. Indeed, the calculations themselves are directed to specific problems, whether in mathematics per se or in the movements of specific celestial bodies; there does not appear to be any larger, systematic discussion of classes of mathematical problems or of the nature of celestial bodies: why they move in the way they do, or how they may be understood together as

components of an overall physical universe. Perhaps we come closest to an abstract statement of principles in the first millennium Neo-Babylonian grammatical texts and the Neo-Assyrian divination manual on extispicy. Yet even here, it must be admitted, the statement is extremely schematic: only a columnar arrangement involving a very abbreviated set of generalizing labels – "perfect," "length," "success," etc.– thus, without a full explanation of what is at issue on the order of the linguistic and rhetorical discussions in Aristotle's *On Interpretation*, *Poetics*, and *Rhetoric*, or in the Indian Panini's *The Eight Books*.

One other major, and related, feature of Mesopotamian expressions of analysis and abstraction must also be emphasized. It is that in co-existing with expressions of cosmic compactness, they occur not only as discrete parallels to them, but often as interwoven with them. So, it will be recalled, what is arguably the major exploration of Marduk's divinity in Mesopotamia – its composite, differentiated, yet transcendent character – is carried out in the form of a myth that describes the creation, and recreation, of the cosmos, in which the earthly is intimately bound with the heavenly. As for divination, whatever its analytical methods and perspective, they are for an enterprise whose raison d'être, to repeat, is the clarification and implementation of communication between heaven and earth, and so of cosmic harmony. Finally, the astronomical computations of the movements of celestial phenomena begin, and largely continue, in connection with divination based on these movements;[90] only occasionally, and then especially in the late first millennium B.C., do we find a mathematical astronomy that appears to work on its own, and with its own, intrinsic interest in the phenomena it is examining.

The foregoing observations, it is important to underscore yet once more, are based on the written evidence from Mesopotamia. Obviously, this evidence cannot have reflected all the intellectual and other activity that went on, and one proof is the fact that we can often reconstruct, even if without certainty in every instance, the unstated equations that underlie the mathematical and astronomical tablets we have. It is thus quite possible that in oral behavior and tradition – of which we have only occasional hints in the written sources[91] – the Mesopotamians could have been more forthcoming about the principles and arguments of their work. For example, the mathematics teacher, as in other cultures, might have explained the equation to his pupils after they had struggled with written problems based on it that he had earlier assigned to them.

We cannot know this, of course, with any assurance. In any case, we cannot trivialize the patterns and limitations in the written record that we do have. For that record is a large, long-lasting, and varied one in Mesopotamia, and the literacy it reflects had undeniable power and status there, being so difficult and restricted a skill and yet so vital for managing the complex polities that emerged. The patterns and limitations, therefore, must say something significant about Mesopotamian civilization as a whole, at least as far as what its elites, who commanded the literacy, understood and valued.

On this basis, then, we may come back to Eric Voegelin and his view of Mesopotamia as a cosmological culture, indeed, the paradigmatic cosmological culture. Clearly, that view needs some serious nuancing to allow for the presence of procedures and perspectives of an analytical, differentiating, abstracting, self-reflecting kind, and for a much longer time

frame of historical development. Yet it is equally clear that these procedures and perspectives had their limitations and were often embedded in cosmological world-views. We have, in sum, something of a mixed situation: a cosmological culture with a move toward differentiation and self-reflection that was still far from maturity and autonomy. It is a measure of Voegelin's insight that he began to see this and to talk, however tentatively and incompletely, about some of its properties by the fourth volume of his *Order and History* on *The Ecumenic Age*.

Abstract

The focus of this paper is Eric Voegelin's understanding of ancient Mesopotamia, as he worked it out first and more elaborately in the initial volume of his *Order and History* series, *Israel and Revelation*, and as he revisited it, more briefly, in a later volume of the series, *The Ecumenic Age*. Mesopotamia was of no little importance to Voegelin's project in *Order and History*, since it represented for him arguably the paradigmatic instance of a cosmological culture. This paper, thus, begins by describing Voegelin's understanding of Mesopotamia, in the course of which it looks also at the sources he drew on, both the ancient texts and the modern scholarship. It then offers an evaluation of what he produced in the light of contemporary Mesopotamian studies. Voegelin, it appears, was right to affirm that a cosmological world-view had a place, even a substantial place, in Mesopotamia. Where he erred, especially in *Israel and Revelation*, was in not giving real attention to the presence *also* of rational, abstract, self-reflective thinking, the evidence for which may be found, inter alia, in the myth of Enuma elish – a text otherwise, as Voegelin correctly observed, so cosmological in its orientation – and in the texts from such scholastic fields as mathematics, astronomy, grammar, and divination. To his credit, however, Voegelin began to grasp that matters were more complex than he had presented in *Israel and Revelation*, for in the later *The Ecumenic Age* there is a recognition, implicit, tentative, and incomplete as it may be, that rationalizing, self-reflective thinking did have a place in the Mesopotamian cultural universe.

Zusammenfassung

Gegenstand des vorliegenden Essays ist das Verständnis Eric Voegelins vom Alten Mesopotamien, wie er es erstmals und sehr detailliert im ersten Band von *Order and History: Israel and Revelation* darstellte und wie er es dann noch einmal kürzer in einem späteren Band dieses Werkes – in *The Ecumenic Age* – thematisierte. Mesopotamien war für das *Order and History* zugrundeliegende Konzept von nicht geringer Bedeutung, da es für Voegelin den paradigmatischen Fall einer kosmologischen Kultur bildete. Der Essay beginnt deshalb mit einer Beschreibung seiner Auffassung von Mesopotamien und wirft auch einen Blick auf die Quellen, auf die er sich bezog – und zwar sowohl auf die alten Texte, wie auch auf die moderne Sekundärliteratur. Er versucht sodann eine Bewertung von Voegelins Auffassung im Lichte des gegenwärtigen Forschungsstandes. Sie bestätigt Voegelins Ansicht, dass in Mesopotamien eine kosmologische Weltsicht bestand, dass sie sogar einen wichtigen Platz innehatte. Die Schwäche seines Ansatzes liegt dagegen darin – und zwar insbesondere in *Israel and Revelation* –, dass er die Existenz rationalen, abstrakten und selbst-reflexiven Denkens, das es ebenfalls gab – u.a. im Enuma elish-Mythos, ein Text, der ansonsten, wie Voegelin richtig beobachtete, eine kosmologische Orientierung aufweist, sowie in Texten über Mathematik, Astronomie, Grammatik und Weissagung – nicht die volle Aufmerksamkeit widmete. Allerdings ist Voegelin zugute zu halten, dass er selbst zu spüren begann, dass die Materie komplexer war als er sie in *Israel und Revelation* dargestellt hatte, denn im späteren *The Ecumenic Age* findet sich – wenngleich nur implizit, versuchsweise und unvollständig – die Anerkennung, dass rationalisierendes,

selbst-reflexives Denken seinen Platz im kulturellen Universum Mesopotamiens hatte.

NOTES

1. Eric Voegelin, *Israel and Revelation* (*Order and History* vol. 1; Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1956). See the list of reviews in Stephen A. McKnight, ed., *Eric Voegelin's Search for Order in History* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1978), 203-206.
2. William F. Albright, "Eric Voegelin: Order and History," *Theological Studies* 22 (1961), 270-279. Albright thought this review-essay important enough to reprint in his only published collection of his articles, *History, Archaeology, and Christian Humanism* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964), 259-271; this is the version used here.
3. Watching for signs of "Hegelianism" became a kind of obsession of Albright's, since he regarded it as a bête noire of scholarship, especially of European scholarship. See, e.g., his Histo*ry, Archaeology, and Christian Humanism* (above n. 2), index *sub* Hegel, Hegelian(ism).
4. Published originally in Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1940, and reprinted, revised, and translated afterward a number of times. The last American edition is Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1957. On this book, and its importance for Albright, see my article, "William Foxwell Albright: The Man and His Work," in Jerrold S. Cooper and Glenn M. Schwartz, eds., *The Study of the Ancient Near East in the Twenty-First Century. The William Foxwel Albright Centennial Conference* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1996), 399-401.
5. Eric Voegelin, *The Ecumenic Age* (*Order and History* vol. 4; Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1974), 2.
6. See his general statement in *ibid*., 2-4; further, the remarks by Jürgen Gebhardt, in his "Epilogue" to the fifth and last published volume of *Order and History*, Eric Voegelin, *In Search of Order* (*Order and History* vol. 5; Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press, 1987), 109, quoting Voegelin.in the same volume, 13.

7. See A.L. Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia. Portrait of a Dead Civilization* (revised ed. completed by Erica Reiner) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977), 16.
8. E.g., in extending and filling out the understanding of kingship in Mesopotamia. An instructive instance in this regard, focusing on the Akkadian ruler of the latter third millennium B.C., Naram-Sin, is the study of Irene J. Winter, "Sex, Rhetoric, and the Public Monument: The Alluring Body of Naram-Sin of Agade," in Natalie Boymel Kampen, ed., *Sexuality in Ancient Art* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 11-26.
9. It is significant, for the ultimate interest and goal of Voegelin's *Israel and Revelation* (above n. 1), that even in the Mesopotamian chapter, some pages are devoted to commenting on the Mesopotamian world view through Biblical sources, pp. 31, 35-37.
10. Voegelin used the 2nd edition, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955.
11. 2 vols., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1926-1927.
12. Voegelin used the 2nd edition, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.
13. See, e.g., Voegelin, *Israel and Revelation* (above n. 1), 22: n. 3 for the date of King Hammurapi and the First Dynasty of Babylon to which he belonged.
14. 2 vols., Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1920-1925.
15. Voegelin used the 2nd edition, Berlin/Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1929.
16. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946.
17. See the brief biography with references by R. Borger, in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 8 (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1993-1997), 33.
18. Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia* (above n. 7), 388, who adds that although "well-balanced," it was "somewhat pedantic."
19. A brief biography with references to more elaborate discussions is by D.O. Edzard, in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und*

Vorderasiatischen Archäologie 5 (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1976-1980), 276.

20. On this so-called school, see J.W. Rogerson, *Myth in Old Testament Interpretation* (Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 134; Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1974), 45-51; and W.C. Gwaltney, Jr., "Pan-Babylonianism," in John H. Hayes, Jr., ed., *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* vol. K-Z (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1999), 233-234. The most famous debate over the ideas of this school was the Babel-Bibel Streit, initiated by the German Assyriologist, Friedrich Delitzsch, in 1902. The debate is exhaustively chronicled in two recent works: Klaus Johanning, *Der Bibel-Babel-Streit. Eine forschungsgeschichtliche Studie* (Europäische Hochschulschriften XXIII/343; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1988); and Reinhard G. Lehmann, *Friedrich Delitzsch und der Babel-Bibel-Streit* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 133; Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994).
21. Mesopotamia as the acme does not appear to have been the emphasis of Jeremias at least in the 2nd edition of his Handbuch. See his preface to this edition, where he speaks of ancient Israel, whose culture "mit Babylon wurzelhaft und untrennbar verbunden ist, dass die echte Religion Israels nur aus einer Neuschöpfung zu erklären ist" (p. XI). Such a statement may be understood as part of Jeremias' more conservative views of the Bible, views that opposed the stance of one of the reigning Biblical critics, Julius Wellhausen; see Johanning, Der Bibel-Babel-Streit (above n. 20), 269-271.
22. Jeremias, *Handbuch* (above n. 15), especially Kapitel XII.
23. See his summary in *ibid*., 25-26. There, and echoed elsewhere in the book, Jeremias speaks specifically of man as "'Bild der Gottheit'. Er ist also ein Mikrokosmos, wie der Kosmos ein Makroanthropos, ein 'Himmelsmann', ist" (25). The scholar who emphasized this point perhaps most forcefully was Jeremias' mentor and fellow Pan-Babylonianist, Hugo Winckler.
24. See the brief biography by E. Ebeling, in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 3 (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1957-71, 99-100; also the recent work

of Maurits van Loon, trans. and ed., *"Hans' Frankfort's Earlier Years. Based on His Letters to "Bram" van Regteren Altena* (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 1995), together with the substantial review of this book by Alexander Joffe, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 57 (1998), 232-234.

25. Her important book on the subject is *Arrest and Movement. An Essay on Space and Time in the Representational Art of the Ancient Near East* (London: Faber & Faber Ltd., 1951, and later reprinted).
26. The paperback, without Irwin and retitled *Before Philosophy. The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man*, appeared first in 1949 and was subsequently reprinted several times by Harmondsworth/Baltimore: Penguin Books. Later, the original volume, with Irwin, was brought back as a paperback by the initial publisher, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977; it included some updating of bibliography. Why Irwin was dropped from the *Before Philosophy* version is not finally clear to me; in various ways, it appears, his topic, ancient Israel/Hebrews, and his treatment of it were judged not to fit tightly with the sections on other ancient Near Eastern cultures and on the "mythopoeic" world view.
27. Thorkild Jacobsen, *The Treasures of Darkness: A History of Mesopotamian Religion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976), 4. Voegelin's closeness to Jacobsen and the other authors of *Intellectual Adventure* in regard to the value set on the Mesopotamian literary texts is confirmed by the fact that Voegelin did not seek to use all the resources available to him in the other books on which he relied for Mesopotamia, those by Bruno Meissner and Alfred Jeremias. For their handbooks dealt with many more texts than the literary ones.
28. See the references to Cassirer in the introduction and conclusion of the Frankforts to *Intellectual Adventure* (above n. 16), 27, 388.
29. See Henri Frankfort, *Ancient Egyptian Religion. An Interpretation* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1961 [reprint; original, 1948]), 1-2 and *passim*.

30. This term, so far as I can tell, is my own; Frankfort, in *Ancient Egyptian Religion* (above n. 29), uses "multiplicity of approaches" (4).
31. See Voegelin, *Israel and Revelation* (above n. 1), *passim*; *idem*, *Ecumenic Age* (above n. 5), 68 and *passim*. To be sure, Voegelin does recognize a realm of history that precedes the stage in which the cosmological myth "generally" appears. He labels this "the level of tribal organization" (*Israel and Revelation*, 14). But he does not really discuss it or whatever views of reality it might have had. The impression given is that if there were such views, they were inchoate: not at the level of articulation that the cosmological myth represents, and against which the emergence of later stages can be understood.
32. Voegelin, *Israel and Revelation* (above n. 1), 14.
33. Voegelin is referring here pre-eminently to the reign of Amenophis IV = Akhenaton and his intellectual and cultural revolution.
34. Voegelin, *Israel and Revelation* (above n. 1), 14-15. "Ideal" is my term for what I understand Voegelin to be saying; "most rigid" and "most barren" are his in characterizing Mesopotamia.
35. I suppose this is not surprising for Voegelin, who was at his core a political philosopher.
36. Sometimes, it appears, Voegelin uses in *Israel and Revelation* (above n. 1) cosmos to represent the reality of everything in existence: earthly, heavenly, and in the underworld; sometimes, cosmos is used more narrowly for the heavenly world of the gods, who control, or set the agenda for, the earthly. The matter is given more extended discussion in a later volume of *Order and History*, *The Ecumenic Age* (above n. 5), chapter 1, where it appears to apply to things of heaven and earth.
37. Note this use of "preamble" (Voegelin, *Israel and Revelation* [above n. 1], 24) for what is generally described by Mesopotamian scholars as the prologue to the Laws. "Preamble," of course, carries the sense, as in American historical tradition, of an introduction to a document making a political statement and serving a political purpose; it thus fits well with Voegelin's understanding of the Laws.

38. See, e.g., in the book used by Voegelin for its translation and commentary on Enuma elish, Heidel, *Babylonian Genesis* (above n. 12), 13-14.
39. Voegelin, *Israel and Revelation* (above n. 1), 25.
40. Voegelin, *Ecumenic Age* (above n. 5), 73; also *idem*, *Israel and Revelation* (above n. 1), 34.
41. Albright, "Eric Voegelin" (above n. 2), 264-265.
42. Voegelin, *Israel and Revelation* (above n. 1), 29-34.
43. On the zodiac and the date and use of it in Mesopotamia, see Francesca Rochberg, *Babylonian Horoscopes* (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 88/1; Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1998), 28-30, who remarks that the earliest attestation is from the fifth century B.C. On Mesopotamian astronomy in general, the main development of which occurred in the Babylonian part of the region, the most recent comprehensive review, with bibliography, is Hermann Hunger and David Pingree, *Astral Sciences in Mesopotamia* (Handbuch der Orientalistik 1/ 44; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1999); this covers both the strictly scientific activities and those connected with omens or divination, on which more below. Another recent study, focusing on the first millennium B.C., is David Brown, *Mesopotamian Planetary Astronomy-Astrology* (Cuneiform Monographs 18; Groningen: Styx Publications, 2000). For a shorter and less technical survey, see Francesca Rochberg, "Astronomy and Calendars in Ancient Mesopotamia," in Jack M. Sasson, ed., *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East* vol. III (New York: Scribner's, 1995), 1925-1940. An important collection of papers is Hannes D. Galter, ed., *Die Rolle der Astronomie in den Kulturen Mesopotamiens*. (Grazer Morgenländische Studien 3; Graz, 1993).
44. See, e.g., Jacobsen, *Treasures of Darkness* (above n. 27), especially chapters 1-5; for individual deities and divine phenomena, there are the recent handbook of Jeremy Black and Anthony Green, *Gods, Demons and Symbols of Ancient Mesopotamia. An Illustrated Dictionary* (London: British Museum Press, 1992); and the earlier collection of D.O. Edzard, "Mesopotamien," in H.W. Haussig, ed., *Wörterbuch der*

Mythologie I: Götter und Mythen im Vorderen Orient (Stuttgart: Ernst Klett Verlag, 1965), 19-139 + Tafeln I-IV.

45. Voegelin, *Israel and Revelation* (above n. 1), 29.
46. *Ibid*., 29-30, 31.
47. *Ibid*., 29.
48. *Ibid*., 30.
49. *Ibid*., 33.
50. This comes in Tablet I: 101-102. We still lack an up-to-date edition of Enuma elish, though one has been promised by W.G. Lambert. The most recent and careful translations of the myth are W.G. Lambert, "Enuma Elisch," in *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments* Band III/4*: Weisheitstexte, Mythen und Epen. Mythen und Epen II* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1994), 565-602; and Benjamin R. Foster, "Epic of Creation," in his *Before the Muses* vol. I (Bethesda, Maryland: CDL Press, 1996), 350-409.
51. Tablet VI: 127-128.
52. See discussion below.
53. Voegelin, *Israel and Revelation* (above n. 1), 30. It should be added that tablet XII is a translation into Akkadian of a portion of an earlier Sumerian text about Gilgamesh and the netherworld. See the recent translation of this text, in all its known recensions, and of tablet XII by Andrew George, *The Epic of Gilgamesh. A New Translation* (New York: Barnes and Noble Books, 1999). 175-195 (where the Sumerian text is called "Bilgames and the Netherworld").
54. *Ibid*.
55. *Ibid*., 31.
56. See E. Frahm, "Nabu-zuqup-kenu, das Gilgames^{v}–Epos und der Tod Sargons II," *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 51 (1999), 73-90. I thank Natan Wasserman for this reference; see his approving discussion of the thesis *apud* his review of a new Hebrew retelling of the Gilgamesh Epic by Sh. Shifrah, *Ha-Aretz* 8 December 2000, B-15 (in Hebrew).
57. Voegelin, *Israel and Revelation* (above n. 1), 22.
58. *Ibid*., 23.

59. For this position, see the succinct discussion of Piotr Michalowski, "Charisma and Control: On Continuity and Change in Early Mesopotamia Bureaucratic Systems," in Mc.Guire Gibson and Robert D. Biggs, eds., *The Organization of Power. Aspects of Bureaucracy in the Ancient Near East* (Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 46; Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1987), 56-58, with references, in 56: n. 4, to the work of W.W. Hallo and the latter's reaction to D.O. Edzard's study, *Die "zweite Zwischenzeit" Babyloniens* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1957). See also the discussion of this issue from the angle of political and civilizational collapse by Norman Yoffee, "The Collapse of Ancient Mesopotamian States and Civilization," in Norman Yoffee and George L. Cowgill, eds., *The Collapse of Ancient States and Civilizations* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1988), 44-68. The broader course of Mesopotamian, especially Babylonian, history through the Old Babylonian period may be followed in such recent surveys as Paul Garelli, *et al*., *Le Proche-Orient asiatique*. tome 1. *Des Origines aux invasions des peuples de la mer* (3rd edition) (Nouvelle Clio; Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1997), chap. II-VI; Mario Liverani, *Antico Oriente. Storia, Societa, Economia* (Roma-Bari: Editori Laterza, 1988), chap. IV-XIV; and Amelie Kuhrt, *The Ancient Near East c. 3000-330 B.C.* vol. I (London/New York: Routledge, 1995), chaps. 1-2.

60. See, *inter alios*, the contrasting positions, with summaries of other work, of Benjamin Foster, "A New Look at the Sumerian Temple State," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 24 (1981), 225-241; and Piotr Steinkeller, "Land-Tenure Conditions in Third-Millennium Babylonia: The Problem of Regional Variation" – the latter together with the Discussion and then the Appendix of Glenn R. Magid, "Temple Households and Land in Pre-Sargonic Girsu," in Michael Hudson and Baruch A. Levine, eds., *Urbanization and Land Ownership in the Ancient Near East* (Peabody Museum Bulletin 7; Cambridge, MA: Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, 1999), 289-329, especially 290-298.

61. See Steinkeller, "Land-Tenure" (above n. 60), especially 299-309, and 316: n. 31 referring to others of his publications. Voegelin, to be sure, does mention the difference between Babylonia and the later, post-Hammurapi Assyrian empire in terms of political centralization: the city-states remaining fundamental to Babylonian political and socio-economic life, while the Assyrian "came nearer to the type of an organized national state" (*Israel and Revelation* [above n. 1], 38). But Voegelin says nothing about the different situations within Babylonia itself already before Hammurapi.
62. Voegelin, *Israel and Revelation* (above n. 1), 38 (on political difference), 26-27, 41 (on continuity), 46-51 (on the Achaemenid Persians).
63. This forms chapter 1 of the volume.
64. See, for example, Thorkild Jacobsen, who provided the major edition of the List, in his *The Sumerian King List* (Assyriological Studies 11; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939), 164 and *passim*. At the same time, of course, Jacobsen and other Assyriologists recognize, along with Voegelin, that behind the view of unity lay the reality of multiple, competing dynastic centers in Mesopotamia.
65. Voegelin, *Ecumenic Age* (above n. 5), 65, also 64.
66. *Ibid*., 76.
67. *Ibid*., 65 and *passim*.
68. *Ibid*., 96; there he does allow that the Egypt of the Pharaoh Akhenaton did experience, perhaps, a "loosening of imperial compactness."
69. *Ibid*., 60.
70. *Ibid*., 64. The other kinds of speculation Voegelin labels theogony, anthropogony, and cosmogony, *ibid*., 61-64.
71. *Ibid*., 66-67.
72. For an earlier attempt of mine at this question, see Peter Machinist, "On Self-Consciousness in Mesopotamia," in S.N. Eisenstadt, ed., *The Origins and Diversity of Axial Age Civilizations* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1986), 183-202, 511-518 (German edition as "Über die Selbstbewusstheit in Mesopotamien," in S.N. Eisenstadt, eds.,

Kulturen der Achsenzeit. Ihre Ursprünge und ihre Vielfalt.Teil 1 [Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1987], 258-291). Among other essays on the same or related questions, there is M.T. Larsen, "The Mesopotamian Lukewarm Mind. Reflections on Science, Divination and Literacy," in Francesca Rochberg-Halton, ed., *Language, Literature, and History: Philological and Historical Studies Presented to Erica Reiner* (American Oriental Series 67; New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1987), 203-225.

73. Voegelin, *Israel and Revelation* (above n. 1), 41-45; the reference to Jacobsen is in 41: n. 21.

74. In this myth, the creation of humans is prepared for and then occurs in Tablet I: 1-305+. See the recent translations of W. von Soden, "Der altbabylonische Atramchasis-Mythos," in *Texte aus der Umwelt.*..III/4 (above n. 50), 618-626, and Benjamin R. Foster, "Atrahasis," in his *Before the Muses* I (above n. 50), 161-170.

75. On the background in Anzu, see W.G. Lambert, "Ninurta Mythology in the Babylonian Epic of Creation," in Karl Hecker and Walter Sommerfeld, eds., *Keilschriftliche Literaturen. Ausgewählte Vorträge der XXXII. Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale* (Berliner Beiträge zum Vorderen Orient 6; Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 1986), 55-60. On the three-column god-list behind the fifty names, see, *inter alios*, W.G. Lambert, "The Reign of Nebuchadnezzar I: A Turning Point in the History of Ancient Mesopotamian Religion," in W.S. McCullough, ed., *The Seed of Wisdom. Essays in Honor of Theophile J. Meek* ((Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964), 4-5, 12-13, who also notes similar expressions in prayers. A concise, but comprehensive appreciation of Enuma elish is furnished also by W.G. Lambert, "Enuma Elish," in D.N. Freedman, ed., *Anchor Bible Dictionary* vol. 2 (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 526-528.

76. It is significant, moreover, that Tiamat is not finally killed; the possibility of her returning, or of the story beginning all over again – in good mythic fashion – is indicated at the end, when Marduk is implored, "möge er Tiamat binden und ihr Leben in tödliche Gefahr bringen" (Lambert, "Enuma Elisch" [above n. 50], 601, VII: 132).

77. See Lambert, "The Reign of Nebuchadnezzar I" (above n. 73), 4-5; also *idem*, "Götterlisten," in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 3 (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1957-1971), 473-479, especially 476-477.

78. The major redirection of the discussion here was the article of W.G. Lambert, The Reign of Nebuchadnezzar I" (above n. 73), 3-13. Among subsequent studies, see Walter Sommerfeld, *Der Aufstieg Marduks* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 213; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982), especially 174-181; and T. Abusch, "Marduk," in Karel van der Toorn, *et al*., eds., *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* (2nd edition) (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1999), 547-548. These studies offer some variant positions to that of Lambert (see Lambert's review of Sommerfeld, as "Studies in Marduk," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 47 (1984), especially 4-6). But they all agree that Enuma elish is post-Hammurapi and has nothing directly to do with his achievements.

79. In what follows, I use, but revise and supplement, my article, "On Self-Consciousness" (above n. 71), 195-202 (German translation: 274-283).

80. See O. Neugebauer and A. Sachs, *Mathematical Cuneiform Texts* (American Oriental Series 29; New Haven: American Oriental Society/American Schools of Oriental Research, 1945), 38-41 + Plate 25, especially p. 38.

81. In addition to the references in Machinist, "On Self-Consciousness" (above n. 71), 517-518: n. 59-60, 69 (German translation: 290-291: n. 59-60, 69), compare the solutions to this Plimpton text offered, e.g., by A. Aaboe, *Episodes from the Early History of Mathematics* (New York: Random House/L.W. Singer Co., 1964), 30-31; and J. Friberg, "Mathematik, in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 7 (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1987-1990), 560, also 551-552. The whole of Friberg's article, it should be noted (531-585), represents arguably the most up-to-date and comprehensive treatment available of Babylonian mathematics. A shorter, more accessible survey is Marvin A. Powell, "Metrology and Mathematics in Ancient Mesopotamia," in Jack M. Sasson, ed., *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East* vol. III (New York: Scribner's, 1995), 1941-

1957. See also Alasdair Livingstone, "Babylonian Mathematics in the Context of Babylonian Thought," in J. Prosecky, ed., *Intellectual Life of the Ancient Near East. Papers Presented at the 43rd Rencontre assyriologique internationale Prague, July 1-5, 1996* (Prague: Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic: Oriental Institute, 1998), 215-219.

82. See the references in n. 43.

83. The most recent study and (partial) edition of tablet 14, with related texts, is F.N.H. Al-Rawi and A.R. George, "Enuma Anu Enlil XIV and Other Early Astronomical Tables," *Archiv für Orientforschung* 38-39 (1991/1992), 52-73. On the date of tablet 14, see Brown, *Mesopotamian Planetary* (above n. 43), 114.

84. On the connections between Babylonian and Greek astronomy, see O. Neugebauer, "The Survival of Babylonian Methods in the Exact Sciences of Antiquity and Middle Ages," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 107 (1963), 528-535 = O. Neugebauer, *Astronomy and History. Selected Essays* (New York/ Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1983), 157-164; George Huxley, *The Interaction of Greek and Babylonian Astronomy* (Belfast: The Library of the Queen's University, 1964);B. L. van der Waerden, *Erwachende Wissenschaft. Band 2: Die Anfänge der Astronomie* (Basel/Stuttgart: Birkhäuser Verlag, 1968), 253-267.

85. For the example cited, see the reference in Machinist, "On Self-Consciousness" (above n. 71), 517-518: n. 66 (German translation: 290-291: n. 66). For general discussion, see D.O. Edzard, "Grammatik," in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 3 (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1957-1971), 610-616; Thorkild Jacobsen, "Very Ancient Texts: Babylonian Grammatical Texts," in Dell Hymes, ed., *Studies in the History of Linguistics. Traditions and Paradigms* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1974), 41-62; Piotr Michalowski, "Babylonian Grammatical Tradition," in William Bright, ed., *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics* vol. 1 (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 151-153; and W.G. Lambert, "Babylonian Linguistics," in K. Van Lerberghe and G. Voet, eds., *Languages and Cultures in Contact. At the Crossroads of Civilizations in the Syro-*

Mesopotamian Realm. Proceedings of the 42th (sic!) *RAI* (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 96; Leuven: Peeters, no date [ca. 2000]), 217-231.

86. Out of the very large modern bibliography on Mesopotamian divination, one may begin with the concise and lucid orientation of Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia* (above n. 7), 206-227; and then the searching analysis of. Jean Bottero, "Symptômes, signes, ecritures en Mesopotamie ancienne," in J.P. Vernant, *et al*., *Divination et Rationalite* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1974), 70-197. Among the studies of particular "dialects" of divination may be mentioned Ivan Starr, *The Rituals of the Diviner* (Bibliotheca Mesopotamica 12; Malibu: Undena Publications, 1983); Ulla Jeyes, *Old Babylonian Extispicy. Omen Texts in the British Museum* (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut vor het Nabije Oosten, 1989); and Ulla Koch-Westenholz, *Mesopotamian Astrology. An Introduction to Babylonian and Assyrian Celestial Divination* (Carsten Niebuhr Institute Publications 19; Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 1995).

87. It should be emphasized that in Mesopotamian thinking, the signs or omens did not "cause" the events, but served to communicate to humans the divine intent to cause or affect them. See on this point, e.g., Jerrold Cooper, "Apodictic Death and the Historicity of 'Historical' Omens," in Bendt Alster, ed., *Death in Mesopotamia. XXVI*^{e} *Rencontre assyriologique internationale* (Mesopotamia 8; Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1980), 99-105, especially 101.

88. Larsen, "Mesopotamian Lukewarm Mind" (above n. 71), 214-216.

89. The main collection of procedure texts was published by Otto Neugebauer, *Astronomical Cuneiform Texts* (London: Lund Humphries, 1955), vols. I, chap. III; II, chap. VI; III, 136-138 (Nos. 207cd-h), 210b-212 (Nos. 800a-e, 803, 804, 819c). For an early, less developed example, see Otto Neugebauer and A. Sachs, "Some Atypical Astronomical Cuneiform Texts, II," *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 22 (1968-1969), 96-111. A discussion of the latter text and the category as a whole may be found in Hunger and Pingree, *Astral Sciences* (above n. 43), 210-270.

90. See especially Koch-Westenholz, *Mesopotamian Astrology* (above n. 82). Note as well that the mythic text, Enuma elish, contains in tablet V a description of celestial phenomena, which are understood to have been created by Marduk out of the body of Tiamat after he had defeated her – all as part of his comprehensive effort to create and establish the cosmos; for brief discussion, see A.L. Oppenheim, "Man and Nature in Mesopotamian Civilization," in C.C. Gillispie, ed., *Dictionary of Scientific Biography* vol. XV (New York: Scribner's, 1978), 638-639.

91. See, e.g., J. Laesso/e, "Literary and Oral Tradition in Ancient Mesopotamia," in F. Hvidberg, ed., *Studi Orientalia Ioanni Pedersen* (Copenhagen: Einar Munksgaard, 1953), 205-218; and, building on and reacting to this article, Yaakov Elman, "Authoritative Oral Tradition in Neo-Assyrian Scribal Circles," *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University* 7 (1975), 19-32.

Wilhelm Fink Verlag

PERIAGOGE-TEXTE

Herausgegeben von Peter J. Opitz
in Verbindung mit dem Eric-Voegelin-Archiv an der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München und dem Eric-Voegelin-Archiv e.V. München

Eric Voegelin: Autobiographische Reflexionen
Herausgegeben, eingeleitet und mit einer Bibliographie der Schriften Eric Voegelins von Peter J. Opitz. München, 1994

Eric Voegelin: Die politischen Religionen
Herausgegeben und mit einem Nachwort von Peter J. Opitz. München, 1993; ^{2}1996

Eric Voegelin: Das Volk Gottes.
Sektenbewegungen und der Geist der Moderne
Herausgegeben, eingeleitet und mit einem Essay von Peter J. Opitz. Aus dem Englischen von Heike Kaltschmidt. München, 1994

Eric Voegelin: „Die spielerische Grausamkeit der Humanisten".
Studien zu Niccolò Machiavelli und Thomas Morus
Aus dem Englischen und mit einem Vorwort von Dietmar Herz. Nachwort von Peter J. Opitz. München, 1995

Eric Voegelin: Die Größe Max Webers
Herausgegeben und mit einem Nachwort von Peter J. Opitz. München, 1995

Eric Voegelin: Evangelium und Kultur.
Das Evangelium als Antwort
Mit einem Vorwort von Wolfhart Pannenberg. Aus dem Englischen und mit einem Nachwort von Helmut Winterholler. München, 1997

Eric Voegelin: Der Gottesmord.
Zur Geschichte und Gestalt der modernen politischen Gnosis
Herausgegeben und eingeleitet von Peter J. Opitz. Mit einem Nachwort von Thomas Hollweck. München, 1999

PERIAGOGE- STUDIEN

Herausgegeben von Peter J. Opitz und Dietmar Herz
in Verbindung mit dem Eric-Voegelin-Archiv an der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München und dem Eric-Voegelin-Archiv e.V. München

Gilbert Weiss: Theorie, Relevanz und Wahrheit.
Eine Rekonstruktion des Briefwechsels zwischen Eric Voegelin und Alfred Schütz (1938-1959)
München, 2000

Geoffrey Price: Eric Voegelin: International Bibliography, 1921-2000
München, 2001

Thies Marsen: Zwischen "reeducation" und politischer Philosophie. Der Aufbau der politischen Wissenschaft in München nach 1945
München, 2001

Christian Schwaabe: Freiheit und Vernunft in der unversöhnten Moderne. Max Webers kritischer Dezisionismus als Herausforderung des politischen Liberalismus
München: Fink Verlag , 2001 (i.V.)

Verlag Karl Alber

Eric Voegelin, Die Neue Wissenschaft der Politik. Eine Einführung
Herausgegeben von Peter J. Opitz. Mit einem Nachwort des Herausgebers und einer Bibliographie. Freiburg (Breisgau) / München, 1991

Eric Voegelin, Alfred Schütz, Leo Strauss und Aron Gurwitsch: Briefwechsel über „Die Neue Wissenschaft der Politik"
Herausgegeben von Peter J. Opitz. Freiburg (Breisgau) / München, 1993

Verlag Klett-Cotta

Eric Voegelin: Ordnung, Bewußtsein, Geschichte
Späte Schriften - eine Auswahl
Herausgegeben von Peter J. Opitz. Mit einem Vorwort und einem Nachwort des Herausgebers sowie einer Bibliographie. Stuttgart, 1988

The Philosophy of Order: Essays on History, Consciousness and Politics for Eric Voegelin on his 80th birthday, January 3, 1981
ed. by Peter J. Opitz and Gregor Sebba. Stuttgart, 1981

IN VORBEREITUNG:

Eric Voegelin: Ordnung und Geschichte

Herausgegeben von Peter J. Opitz und Dietmar Herz

Bd. 1: Die kosmologische Ordnung des alten Nahen Orients
Herausgegeben von Prof. Jan Assmann, Universität Heidelberg
Übersetzt von Reinhard Sonnenschmidt

Bd. 2: Israel und die Offenbarung: Die Geburt der Geschichte
Herausgegeben von Prof. Jörg Jeremias und PD Dr. Friedhelm Hartenstein, Universität Marburg
Übersetzt von Uta Uchegbu und Nils Winkler

Bd. 3: Israel und die Offenbarung
Moses und die Propheten
Herausgegeben von Prof. Jörg Jeremias und PD Dr. Friedhelm Hartenstein, Universität Marburg
Übersetzt von Nils Winkler

Bd. 4: Die Welt der Polis: Vom Mythos zur Philosophie
Herausgegeben von Prof. Jürgen Gebhardt, Universität Erlangen
Übersetzt von Lars Hochreuther

Bd. 5: Die Welt der Polis: Das Jahrhundert Athens
Herausgegeben von Prof. Jürgen Gebhardt, Universität Erlangen
Übersetzt von Lars Hochreuther

Bd. 6: Platon
Herausgegeben von Prof. Dietmar Herz, Universität Erfurt
Übersetzt von Veronika Weinberger

Bd. 7: Aristoteles
Herausgeben von Prof. Peter J. Opitz, Universität München
Übersetzt von Helmut Winterholler

Bd. 8: Das Ökumenische Zeitalter: Die Legitimität der Antike
Herausgegeben von Prof. Thomas Hollweck, Universität Boulder, Colorado
Übersetzt von Jörg Fündling

Bd. 9: Das Ökumenische Zeitalter: Weltherrschaft und Philosophie
Herausgegeben von Prof. Manfred Henningsen, Universität Hawai'i
Übersetzt von Wibke Reger

Bd. 10: Auf der Suche nach Ordnung
Herausgegeben von Paul Carringella, Hoover Institution, California
und Dr. Gilbert Weiss, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien
Übersetzt von Helmut Winterholler

OCCASIONAL PAPERS

Herausgegeben von Peter J. Opitz und Dietmar Herz
in Verbindung mit dem Eric-Voegelin-Archiv an der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München und dem Eric-Voegelin-Archiv e.V. München
(ISSN 1430-6786)

- I -
Eric Voegelin: Die geistige und politische Zukunft der westlichen Welt
Mit einem Vorwort von Peter J. Opitz
45 Seiten. München, April 1996; 2. Aufl. Juni 2000

- II A -
Thomas Hollweck: Der Dichter als Führer?
Dichtung und Repräsentanz in Voegelins frühen Arbeiten
51 Seiten. 1. Auflage, München, April 1996; 2. Aufl. Juni 1999

- II B -
Eric Voegelin: Wedekind.
Ein Beitrag zur Soziologie der Gegenwart
64 Seiten. München, April 1996; 2. Aufl. Oktober 1999

- III -
Dietmar Herz: Das Ideal einer objektiven Wissenschaft von Recht und Staat.
Zu Eric Voegelins Kritik an Hans Kelsen
72 Seiten. München, Mai 1996

- IV -
William Petropulos: The Person as Imago Dei.
Augustine and Max Scheler in Voegelin's „Herrschaftslehre" and „The Political Religions"
56 Seiten. München, Juni 1997; 2. überarbeitete Aufl. Juni 2000

- V -
Christian Schwaabe: Seinsvergessenheit und Umkehr.
Über das „richtige Denken" bei Eric Voegelin und Martin Heidegger
60 Seiten. München, Juni 1997

- VI -
Gilbert Weiss: Theorie, Relevanz und Wahrheit.
Zum Briefwechsel zwischen Eric Voegelin und Alfred Schütz
76 Seiten. München, Dezember 1997

- VII -
Dante Germino: Eric Voegelin on the gnostic roots of violence
60 Seiten. München, Februar 1998

- VIII -
Thomas Hollweck: The Romance of the Soul.
The Gnostic Myth in Modern Literature
56 Seiten. München, Juli 1998

- IX -
Eric Voegelin: Hegel - Eine Studie über Zauberei
Aus dem Englischen übersetzt von Nils Winkler und
mit einem Nachwort von Peter J. Opitz
97 Seiten. München, April 1999; 2. überarbeitete Aufl. Januar 2001

- X -
Sandro Chignola: „Fetishism" with the Norm and Symbols of Politics.
Eric Voegelin between Sociology and „Rechtswissenschaft", 1924-1938
71 Seiten. München, Juli 1999

- XI -
Peter J. Opitz (Hrsg.): Zwischen Evokation und Kontemplation.
Eric Voegelins „Introduction" zur „History of Political Ideas"
(englisch / deutsch).
Aus dem Englischen übersetzt und mit einem Nachwort von Peter J. Opitz
94 Seiten. München, Juli 1999

- XII -
Peter J. Opitz: Stationen einer Rückkehr.
Voegelins Weg nach München
58 Seiten. München, Juli 1999

- XIII -
Gregor Sebba: Jean-Jacques Rousseau:
Autobiography and Political Thought
Herausgegeben und mit einem Vorwort von Peter J. Opitz
40 Seiten. München, Januar 2000

- XIV -
Hans Maier / Peter J. Opitz: Eric Voegelin - Wanderer zwischen den Kontinenten
81 Seiten. München, Januar 2000; 2. Aufl. Juli 2000

- XV -
Thomas Heilke: The Philosophical Anthropology of Race:
A Voegelinian Encounter
52 Seiten. München. März 2000

- XVI -
Helmut Winterholler: Moses und das Volk Gottes.
Zum Offenbarungsverständnis von Eric Voegelin
48 Seiten. München, April 2000

- XVII -
Eric Voegelin: Die Entstehung der Revolutionsidee von Marx
Aus dem Englischen übersetzt von Nils Winkler und mit einem editorischen Nachwort von Peter J. Opitz
67 Seiten. München, April 2000

- XVIII -
Michael Franz: Voegelin's Analysis of Marx
56 Seiten. München, August 2000

- XIX -
Thomas Hollweck: Mythos und Geschichte:
Zur Genesis von *Order and History*
61 Seiten. München, August 2000

- XX -
Eric Voegelin: Plato's Myth of the Soul.
Materialien zu Eric Voegelins „History of Political Ideas" (II)
Herausgegeben von Elisabeth von Lochner
62 Seiten. München, Januar 2001

- XXI -
Norbert Blößner: The „Encomium of a Noble Man".
Anmerkungen zu Eric Voegelins *Politeia*-Interpretation
55 Seiten. München, März 2001

- XXII -
Hellmut Flashar: Dekomposition einer mythischen Philosophie –
Eric Voegelin über Aristoteles
27 Seiten. München, April 2001

- XXIII -
Christoph Horn: Kontinuität, Revision oder Entwicklung?
Das Verhältnis von *Politikos, Politeia* und *Nomoi* bei Eric Voegelin und aus der Sicht aktueller Forschungen
31 Seiten. München, Mai 2001

- XXIV -
Eckart Schütrumpf: **Eric Voegelins Deutung der aristotelischen *Politik* in *Order and History***
89 Seiten, München, Juni 2001

- XXV -
Arpad Szakolczai: **Stages of a Quest:** Reconstructing the Outline Structure of Eric Voegelin's *History of Political Ideas*
63 Seiten. München, Juli 2001

- XXVI -
Peter Machinist: **Mesopotamia in Eric Voegelin's *Order and History***
54 Seiten. München, September 2001

- XXVII -
William M. Thompson: Voegelin's *Israel and Revelation*:
The Reception and Challenge in America
77 Seiten. München, Oktober 2001

IN VORBEREITUNG:

Giuliana Parotto:**Zum Einfluß von Balthasar auf Eric Voegelin**

Preise: 10,- DM pro Heft (IX, XI, XXIV: 12,- DM) + Versandkosten. Änderungen vorbehalten.Abonnementbestellungen richten Sie bitte an: Peter.Opitz@lrz.uni-muenchen.de

Guidelines for Contributors

Occasional Papers invites the submission of original manuscripts on all aspects of the work and thought of Eric Voegelin. Authors should respect the following guidelines:

Scope
The *Occasional Papers* seek to publish innovative scholarly manuscripts available on the works of Eric Voegelin. The papers especially feature articles that contribute to the improvement of general knowledge or detailed research on his works. Besides, it is interested in publishing shorter pieces by Voegelin in order to make them available to a wider public.

Originality
Occasional Papers does not evaluate works already published elsewhere or under current review by another publisher. Our policy is that a new paper is not original enough if as many as half of the ideas will have appeared in a book or elsewhere first. Whenever a question about overlap might arise, at the time of submission please send a copy of the earlier work and ask the editor for a judgement. As a partial exception, a study that is promised to a future edited book can normally be published if the book will appear at least six months after the *Occasional Papers* article and if the author has arranged for the *Occasional Papers'* editor's agreement at the time of submission.

Length
Occasional Papers will not review a manuscript longer than 16.000 words including notes. Please provide a word count, which most word processors will compute, unless the manuscript totals fewer than forty pages when double-spaced. Number the pages consecutively and allow margins on all sides. We prefer a font no smaller than 12 points.

Procedure
Please submit a copy, printed on only one side of the page, addressed to the Editor Peter J. Opitz (address as printed below).

References

The *Occasional Papers* use, as a rule, footnotes to cite sources of evidence and references only, and not to present supplementary evidence and reasoning. If such additional material is needed, the reader should find it with the rest of the text, in general. An exception could be made for an addition that would disturb the flow of the text.

The reference list should contain the complete facts of publication or availability for each source cited. Provide author first names when available and include relevant information in a footnote. A note may include a brief annotation that helps the reader understand the sources value and viewpoint.

Anfragen, Heftbestellungen und Manuskripte bitte an:
Submission of orders and manuscripts to:

Eric-Voegelin-Archiv
Geschwister-Scholl-Institut
für Politische Wissenschaft
an der Universität München
Oettingenstrasse 67
D– 80538 München

Telefon (089) 2178–3090
Telefax (089) 2178–3092
Internet: http://www.lrz-muenchen.de/~voegelin-archiv/
E-Mail: Peter.Opitz@lrz.uni-muenchen.de oder
voegelin-archiv@lrz.uni-muenchen.de