

fels 1993, 319–321; id. 1994, 39 with nos. 180–188; G. Stiehler-Alegria Delgado, *MVS* 18 (1996) 126–128, pl. 14: 266a, 267; E. Ehrenberg, *CRRAL* 43 (1998) 134 fn. 44; ead., *AUWE* 18 (1999) 20f. with pl. 8f. nos. 67–72; Ornan 2005, 83 fn. 243, 128f. with 270 fig. 167f., 263 fig. 134, 264 fig. 137, 265 fig. 146, 280 fig. 204; Giovinno 2007, fig. 43; Ataç 2010, 153 fig. 114; Dalley 2011, 3 (type 2).

b) *The bird-apkallū* were adopted from Ass. iconography and associated with the Seven S.s in the ritual literature only secondarily. Their iconographic tradition converges with that of their antecessor, the Ass. protective genius of the *griffin-demon* (Greif*). The creature is depicted as a winged eagle-headed human-bodied figure.

Mischwesen* A. § 7; B. § 3.9; Neassyrische* Kunstperiode. IV. fig. 2; Quaste* B. fig. 1a; Wiggermann 1992, 75, 188; Wallenfels 1994, 41 with no. 190; Ornan 2005, 263 fig. 136; Giovinno 2007, 140f., fig. 2, 14, 18, 22, 26; Ataç 2010, 100 fig. 78, 111 fig. 91, 118 fig. 96, 142 fig. 111 = ibid. frontispiece; Dalley 2011, 3f. (type 3).

c) *The anthropomorphic (ūmu)-apkallū* are human-headed and often depicted with wings and a headband decorated with rosettes. The winged figures with horned tiara often represented on Neo-Ass. wall reliefs, whose accessory and postures are identical to those of the bird-*apkallū* figures, have been interpreted as *apkallū* figures as well (e.g., Parpola 1993, xx; Dalley 2011, 2 sub 1.1; Kvanvig 2011, 144; contra: Wiggermann 1992, 74).

Mischwesen* A. § 7; B. § 3.31; Wiggermann 1992, 73f., 188; Wallenfels 1993, pl. 120 no. 1, pl. 120f. nos. 4–10, pl. 122f. nos. 15, 17–20, pl. 124 nos. 24–26; id. 1994, nos. 115–125; Parpola 1993, xxiv fig. 6; Ornan 2005, 164 with 284 fig. 219, 278 fig. 190; Giovinno 2007, fig. 1, 13, 17, 19–22, 51–54, 99–102; Ataç 2010, 4 fig. 1f., 52 fig. 43, 97f. fig. 74f., 100 fig. 78, 109–111 fig. 88–91, 118f. fig. 96f.; Dalley 2011, 2f. (type 1).

Apart from the abundant representations of the *apkallū*-type figures in the Neo-Ass. and Neo-Bab. glyptic and monumental art, the archaeol. evidence confirms, as stated in the textual records (namely the *Šēp Lemutti* series), that apotropaic figurines of the S.s made of clay (fish- and bird-*apkallū*) and wood (anthropomorphic (*ūmu*)-*apkallū*, not preserved) were used in Ass. prophylactic rituals by placing apotro-

paic boxes of burnt brick with several (fish- or bird-)*apkallū*-figurines within (mostly seven; boxes with one, four or fourteen figurines are also attested) as well as terracotta plaques with reliefs of a single (fish- or bird-)*apkallū* figure underneath the pavement of a room.

C. L. Woolley, *JRAS* 4 (1926) 690–694 with pl. IX nos. 1a–b, 2; M. E. L. Mallowan, Nimrud and its remains 1 (1966) 226–229 with fig. 191; Rittig 1977, 70–77 with fig. 20–23, 80–93 with fig. 27–33b and fig. 34f.; Green 1983, 88–90 with pl. Xb–d; see also Parpola 1993, xxiii fig. 5a–d, 70 fig. 14. – For other (cultic) artefacts depicting *apkallū* figures see, e.g., E. Klengel-Brandt (ed.), *Mit Sieben Siegeln versehen* (Ausstellungskat. Vorderasiatisches Museum Berlin 1997) xi no. 15 = ibid. frontispiece, 130 fig. 137; and, perhaps, Parpola 1993, 70 fig. 14.

Another correspondence between the textual and the iconographic tradition of the Seven S.s can be found on Lamaštu amulets depicting fish- and (always wingless) anthropomorphic *ūmu-apkallū* figures in scenes corresponding exactly to the prescriptions of the rituals to be performed, which are given in the *Bit Mēseri* series.

See e.g. CUSAS 32, pl. 138, no 63; Heeßel, *AMD* 4 (2002) 199 fig. 20, 203, fig. 25, 206 fig. 27, 209 fig. 30; cf. Wiggermann 1992, 74 and 76 sub “*Lamaštu amulets*”. The bird-*apkallū* figure does not appear on Lamaštu amulets, cf. Wiggermann, o.c. 75f. Cf. also the cylinder seal with winged anthropomorphic *ūmu-apkallū* figures and a Lamaštu head in Heeßel, o.c. 244 fig. 164.

Ataç M.-E. 2010: The mythology of kingship in Neo-Assyrian art, esp. 145–201. – Borger R. 1974: Die Beschwörungsserie *bit mēseri* und die Himmelfahrt Henochs, *JNES* 33, 183–196 = id. 1994: The incantation series *Bit Mēseri* and Enoch’s ascension to heaven, in: R. S. Hess/D. T. Tsumura (ed.), *I studied inscriptions from before the Flood, 224–233* (abridged; translated by V. Philips Long). – Dalley S. 2011: *Apkallū*, *IDD* electronic pre-publication, 1–7. – Galter H. D. 2005: *Sa lām abūbi: die Zeit vor der großen Flut in der mesopotamischen Überlieferung*, Fs. M. Schretter 269–301. – Gammie J. G./Perdue L. G. (ed.) 1990: *The sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. – Giovinno M. 2007: *The Assyrian Sacred Tree: a history of interpretations* (= *OBO* 230). – Green A. 1983: Neo-Assyrian apotropaic figures: figurines, rituals and monumental art, ..., *Iraq* 45, 87–96 (with pl. IX–XV). – Kvanvig H. S. 2011: Mesopotamian primeval traditions, in: id., *Primeval history: Babylonian, biblical, and Enochic: an intertextual reading*, 12–181. – Lambert W. G. 1962: A cat-

alogue of texts and authors, *JCS* 16, 59–77. – Lenzi A. 2008a: *The Uruk List of Kings and Sages and late Mesopotamian scholarship*, *JANER* 8, 138–169; id. 2008b: *Secrecy and the gods: secret knowledge in ancient Mesopotamia and biblical Israel* (= *SAAS* 19). – Ornan T. 2005: *The triumph of the symbol: pictorial representation of deities in Mesopotamia and the biblical image ban* (= *OBO* 213). – Parpola S. 1993: *Letters from Assyrian and Babylonian scholars* (= *SAA* 10), esp. xvii–xxiv. – Perdue L. G. (ed.) 2008: *Scribes, sages, and seers: the sage in the eastern Mediterranean world*. – Reiner E. 1961: *The etiological myth of the “Seven Sages”*, *OrNS* 30, 1–11. – Rittig D. 1977: *Assyrisch-babylonische Kleinplastik magischer Bedeutung vom 13.–6. Jh. v. Chr.* (= *MVS* 1). – Wallenfels R. 1993: *Apkallū-sealings from Hellenistic Uruk*, *BagM* 24, 309–324 with pl. 120–124; id. 1994: *Uruk: Hellenistic seal impressions in the Yale Babylonian Collection* (= *AUWE* 19) 29–31 with nos. 115–125, 39–41 with nos. 180–188, 190. – Wiggermann F. A. M. 1992: *Mesopotamian protective spirits: the ritual texts* (= *CunMon.* 1). – Wilcke C. 1991: *Göttliche und menschliche Weisheit im Alten Orient: Magie und Wissenschaft, Mythos und Geschichte*, in: A. Assmann (ed.), *Weisheit*, 259–270.

J. Fechner

Weisheitsliteratur (wisdom literature). A. In Mesopotamien.

Already in the early years of Assyriology the designation “Weisheitsliteratur” was used in the field (e.g. Ungnad 1920). Since then, this term has been widely used in Assyriology (van Dijk, SSA; Lambert, BWL; Cohen 2013), similarly to the way it is employed in Biblical studies, where this term originates (BWL 1). W. l. is a terminological umbrella which covers a variety of texts: proverbials (Sprichwort*), fables (Fabel*), riddles (Rätsel*, s. Streck/Wasserman 2011), disputative dialogues (Streitgespräch*), didactic instructions, and long and theological deliberations in the form of monologues and dialogues (*The Poem of the Righteous Sufferer*, *Ludlul* bēl nēmeqi* and *The Babylonian Theodicy*; Theodizee* A, s. Oshima 2014). What welds this textual diversity into one single if loose, lit. category – and note that from a formal point of view, no generic, emic definition of w. l. is found in cun. texts – is the vague, but

unmistakable, interest in all aspects of the human condition. Thematically, w. l. texts, both Sum. and Akk., strive to present a virtuous and blameless way of conducting oneself in the world, esp. in relation to the gods (s. Streck/Wasserman 2014). It further presents the principles which lead to a prosperous and respectful life, and advises how to avoid conflicts with family members, peers and superiors. Another central theme in Mesopot. w. l. is the finality of life and the necessity to come to terms with unavoidable death. Side by side with the emphasis on moral and ethic matters (Fechner 2015), one also finds wisdom texts which focus on daily-life practicalities, such as *The Farmer’s Instructions* (Civil 1994).

From a discourse point of view, Mesopot. w. l. is marked by its distinct conversational mode. In ancient Mesopotamia one struggled with the complexities of human condition verbally, even vocally. The notion of what is right to do was perceived not through silent musing, but by divulging one’s troubles to others and hearing what others advise. Moral conduct was not achieved introspectively but orally and aurally. Shared experiences, not sudden insights or deductive reflections, were the sources of Mesopot. wisdom. Against this background it is evident that wisdom in ancient Mesopotamia was considered the mental product of sages, not of prophets or philosophers (Gammie/Perdue 1990; Clifford 2007; Weiser* § 2.2).

Texts belonging to w. l. are found at the very beginning of Mesopot. civilization. Collections of proverbs and exemplars of the didactic composition *The Instructions of Šuruppak* are known from different ED sites (Alster, SumProv.; id. 2005, 31–220, esp. 176–194). The social setting of these w. l. texts was identified as the secondary stages of scribal education (s. a. Schule*; Beaulieu 2007; Kleinerman 2011). The educational setting of these w. l. texts, mainly of proverbs, may explain their long lit. preservation. But scribal interest in w. l. was not restricted to these early stages of schooling, as proven by the 1st mill. commentaries on *Ludlul bēl nēmeqi* and the *Theodicy* (Frahm

2011, 119–121). The interrelations of some w. l. texts with elaborate lex. knowledge is another indication of their inception and circulation in the scribal milieu (Wasserman 2013).

Beyond serving as a lit. means of expression of ethical, moral and existential questions (a fine example of which is Siduri's speech to Gilgameš in the Old Bab. Sippar tablet, George, GE 278f.), Mesopot. w. l. offered a productive channel for political and social criticism, which was at times ironic and even biting sarcasm. Examples of this aspect of w. l. are the Old Bab. composition *At the Cleaners* (Wasserman 2013), and the two 1st mill. compositions *Dialogue of Pessimism* (BWL 139–149) and *The Poor Man of Nippur* (Gurney 1956; Worthington 2010). Each of these texts presents a different representative of governing strata of Mesopot. society in a mocking way, exposing his pompous attitude and subsequently pointing at his inherent weakness. It must be emphasized that none of the above texts raises a radical claim to break the existing power paradigm and replace it with another. Clearly, scribal circles were careful to maintain their delicate and dialectical relationship with high echelons of power, and humor was used prudently, in a non-explosive way (Foster 1974; Alster 1975; Greenstein 2007).

Other w. l. texts, however, were supportive of the existing political system, encouraging their readers, or listeners, to see the benefits embedded in it. For instance, the 1st mill. composition called *Advice to a Prince* (BWL 110–115; Reiner 1982) and the 2nd mill. fragments concerning wolves and kings (Streck/Wasserman 2016), both make a clear propagandistic effort in favor of the power of the king.

Alster B. 1975: Paradoxical proverbs and satire in Sumerian literature, JCS 27, 201–230; id. 2005: Wisdom of ancient Sumer. – Beaulieu P.-A. 2007: The social and intellectual setting of Babylonian wisdom literature, in: Clifford 2007, 3–20. – Civil M. 1994: The Farmer's Instructions: a Sumerian agricultural manual (= AulaOr. Suppl. 5). – Clifford R. J. (ed.) 2007: Wisdom literature in Mesopotamia and Israel (= SBL Sym. Ser. 36). – Cohen Y. 2013: Wisdom from the late Bronze Age (= SBL WAW 29). – Fechner J. 2015: Moral concepts within the Sumerian-Akka-

dian proverbial literature: origins, developments and tendencies, in: M.-S. Ortola/G. Achard-Bayle (ed.), Concepts éthiques et moraux: approches multiculturelles et interdisciplinaires (= Aliento 6), 17–60. – Foster B. R. 1974: Humor and cuneiform literature, JNES 6, 69–85. – Frahm E. 2011: Babylonian and Assyrian text commentaries: origins of interpretation (= GMTR 5). – Gammie J. G./Perdue L. G. 1990: The sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East. – Greenstein E. L. 2007: Sages with a sense of humor: the Babylonian dialogue between the master and his servant and the book of Qohelet, in: Clifford 2007, 55–66. – Gurney O. R. 1956: The Sultantepe tablets: V. The tale of the poor man of Nippur, AnSt. 6, 145–164. – Kleiner A. 2011: Education in early 2nd millennium BC Babylonia: the Sumerian epistolary miscellany (= CunMon. 42). – Oshima T. 2014: Babylonian poems of pious sufferers: *lud-lul bēl nemeqi* and the Babylonian theodicy (= Orientalische Religionen in der Antike 14). – Reiner E. 1982: The Babylonian Fürstenspiegel in practice, Fs. I. M. Diakonoff 320–326. – Streck M. P./Wasserman N. 2011: Dialogues and riddles: three Old Babylonian wisdom texts, Iraq 73, 117–125; idd. 2014: Mankind's bitter fate: the wisdom dialogue BM 79111+, JCS 66, 39–47; idd. 2016: On wolves and kings: two tablets with Akkadian wisdom texts from the second millennium BC, Iraq (in press). – Ungnad A. 1920: Zur akkadischen Weisheitsliteratur, OLZ 23, 249f. – Wasserman N. 2013: Treating garments in the Old Babylonian period: "At the Cleaners" in a comparative view, Iraq 75, 255–277. – Worthington M. 2010: Medicine, comedy, power and their interconnections in Babylonia and Assyria, JMC 15, 25–39.

N. Wasserman

Weisheitsliteratur. B. Bei den Hethitern.

Sum.-akk. Kompositionen, die sich thematisch mit den der „Weisheit“ zugerechneten bibl. Schriften (insbes. Sprüche, Hiob und Kohelet) berühren und deshalb unter derselben Bezeichnung zusammengefasst werden, sind in heth. Tafelsammlungen bisher nur in geringer Zahl bezeugt. In den syr. Städten Ugarit und Emar, die seit dem späten 14. Jh. unter heth. Oberherrschaft standen, haben sich mehr zu diesem Genre gehörige Texte gefunden als in Ḫattuša, so dass die spärliche Bezeugung am letzteren Ort vielleicht nur auf ungünstige Fundumstände zurückzuführen ist. Wie breit das Corpus der zugehörigen Texte zu definieren ist, ist Gegenstand der Diskussion; s. dazu insbes. Alster 2005, 18–30 und Cohen

2013, 7–12, jeweils mit älterer Lit. Weisheitstexte im engeren Sinne sind geprägt von Reflexionen über die *conditio humana*; das „richtige Verhalten“ wird in Sprichwörtern oder didaktischen Ermahnungen, z. B. des Vaters an den Sohn, dargestellt. Andere Texte kreisen um das Thema der Beschränkung des menschlichen Lebens durch Krankheit und Tod oder des Zweifels an seiner Sinnhaftigkeit *sub specie aeternitatis* (*vanitas*-Thema).

Aus dem Bereich des „Hauses am Hang“ in Ḫattuša stammt ein im 13. Jh. geschriebenes zweisprachiges (akk.-heth.) Exemplar (KBo. 12, 70+ KUB 4, 3; CTH 316) der „Lehre des Šūpê-amēli“ oder nach den Anfangsworten *Šimā milka* („hört den Rat (des Šūpê-amēli)!“) genannten Komposition, von der auch Exemplare aus Ugarit und Emar vorliegen. In mehreren Abschnitten fehlt die heth. Übersetzung. Der Text besteht aus sentenzenhaften Verhaltensregeln für den Sohn sowie dessen Antwortrede, die weithin vom *vanitas*-Thema geprägt ist.

E. Laroche, Ugaritica 5 (1968) 779–784; M. Dietrich, Der Dialog zwischen Šūpê-amēli und seinem „Vater“, UF 23 (1991) 33–68; G. Keydana, Der Dialog zwischen Šūpê-amēli und seinem „Vater“: die hethitische Version, ibid. 69–74; Cohen 2013, 81–128.

Das wohl im 16. oder in der ersten Hälfte des 15. Jhs. niedergeschriebene akk.-sprachige Fragment KUB 4, 40 (CTH 814) enthält Sprichwörter; Cohen 2013, 199–201. Zu einer weiteren Sprichwortsammlung gehört das in der 2. Hälfte des 13. Jhs. niedergeschriebene Fragment KBo. 12, 128 (CTH 316), das im Bereich des „Hauses am Hang“ gefunden wurde. Es bietet neben dem nur in wenigen Zeichen erhaltenen akk. Text eine heth. Übersetzung, wobei aber auch hier mehrere Zeilen ohne Übersetzung bleiben.

Beckman 1986, 29 mit Fn. 64; Cohen 2013, 201–206.

Über die Funktion und Rezeption der W. in Ḫatti ist angesichts der spärlichen Bezeugung nur zu vermuten, dass sie keinen festen Platz in der Ausbildung von Schreibern* (D) hatte, wohl aber auf das Inte-

resse heth. Schreiber an Bildungsgut mesopot.-syr. Herkunft zurückgeht. In dieser Hinsicht ist die Trennung zwischen W. und anderen lit. Texten mesopot. Herkunft wie z. B. der „Botschaft des Lū-dingir-ra an seine Mutter“ (früher auch „signalement lyrique“ genannt, CTH 315), ein Text, der in Ḫattuša und in Ugarit als Trilingue (sum., akk., heth.) vorliegt, wenig begründet.

J. Nougayrol, Ugaritica 5, 310–319, 444f.; Laroche, ibid. 773–779; J. Klinger, AOF 37 (2010) 324–328. – M. Civil 1964: The „Message of Lū-dingir-ra to his mother“ and a group of Akkado-Hittite „proverbs“, JNES 23, 1–11.

Zu einer W. anderer Provenienz dürfen die hurr. Parabelsammlungen mit heth. Übersetzung gezählt werden, die in Niederschriften der Zeit um 1400 größtenteils im Tempel 16 in der Oberstadt von Ḫattuša gefunden wurden (KBo. 32, 12, 14, 36, 44, 47–51); E. Neu, StBoT 32 (1996) 56–218. Alle Parabeln weisen eine Bildhälfte (die mehrfach Züge der Tierfabel zeigt) und eine Sachhälfte auf. Das *tertium comparationis* ist jeweils ein Fehlverhalten, das (in der Sachhälfte) durch die Götter oder durch einen Würdenträger bestraft wird. Nach jeder Parabel folgt eine Überleitungsformel des Erzählers, der eine Pluralität von Hörern anspricht und seine Erzählung als hurr. *amōmi* / heth. *ḫatreššar* „Botschaft“ und hurr. *madi* / heth. *ḫattātār* „Weisheit“ bezeichnet.

Alster B. 2005: Wisdom of ancient Sumer. – Beckman G. 1986: Proverbs and proverbial allusions in Hittite, JNES 45, 19–30. – Cohen Y. 2013: Wisdom from the Late Bronze Age (= SBL WAW 29).

G. Wilhelm

Weissagung s. Omina (und Orakel); Orakel; Prophetie.

Weissbach (auch Weißbach, älter Weissbach), Franz Heinrich. *25.11.1865 in Chemnitz, †20.2.1944 in Markkleeberg bei Leipzig. Studierte klass. und oriental. Philologie in Leipzig. 1888–1929 „Hilfsarbeiter“, Bibliothekar und Oberbibliothekar an