Markham J. Geller

A Babylonian Hippocrates

The BabMed Project has made important progress towards understanding of the nature and theoretical underpinnings of Babylonian medicine, as a result of intensive study of the text catalogues being presented within this volume.[1] The present author has argued elsewhere that magic and medicine, as well as prognosis / diagnosis, were all separate disciplines, which could *in theory* be studied and practiced by either physicians or exorcists or even midwives.[2] It is likely that the various catalogues published here will permanently alter perceptions of how Babylonian 'healing arts' were composed into three very distinctive literary genres, which we will label as *medical, magical, and diagnostic*, more as convenient categories rather than formal definitions. Briefly, *medical* texts contain prescriptions and recipes (mostly pharmacological with little surgery) for the treatment of symptoms, while *magical* texts (within the sub-category of healing magic) comprise poetic incantations with accompanying rituals often performed by costumed exorcists under dramatic ceremonial conditions, essentially to treat the psychological as well as physical dimensions of illness. The third genre of texts consists of casuistic omens drawn from general practices of divination, aimed at predicting the patient's future prospects, either by interpreting his disease symptoms (signs) or general physiognomic features. Each of these genres is distinctive, with a degree of overlap between all three, which does not, however, alter the clearly recognisable characteristics of each genre.[3] The three health-related catalogues in the present study, which we will label for convenience AMC (Assur Medical Catalogue), KAR 44 (the Exorcist's Manual), and CTN 4, 71 (*Sakikkû* catalogue), all represent lengthy lists of the opening lines (incipits) of compositions dealing with medicine and magic, or alternatively the first lines of collections of diagnostic and physiognomic omens. All three catalogues are relevant to medicine and healing arts, listing compositions by their opening lines or rubrics, with two of these catalogues clearly attributing the editing of these texts to one scholar, Esagil-kīn-apli.[4] Two of these catalogues specifically refer to the process of creating a new 'weaving' or text edition, and all three catalogues are bipartite, i.e. they have a clear division between a more elementary or straightforward first section and a more esoteric second section. The pertinent questions are why such catalogues were created in the first place and by whom, and whether these catalogues represent some kind of 'canonisation' of texts pertaining to *Heilkunde*.

1 Canonicity

The issue of 'canonicity' in Mesopotamia, usually in relation to the Bible, was raised by Lambert already in 1957, followed by Francesca Rochberg (see in her *opera minora*, Rochberg 2010: 65-83) and Alan Lenzi (2008: 147-148), among others, but the issue has never quite been resolved.[5] While biblical canonicity remains at the cornerstone of the debate about standardisation of ancient texts, biblical scholars themselves remain divided regarding the usefulness of this term (see Lim 2013). A somewhat useful approach to the question has been taken by Karel van der Toorn, who argues

1 The Assur Medical Catalogue was studied by the entire BabMed research group, although the initial editing was done by Strahil Panayotov and Ulrike Steinert, followed by Steinert's excellent copy of the tablet fragments in Yale and Chicago.

2 In an article to be published in the *Cambridge History of Science* (forthcoming 2018). This division of *Heilkunde* does not agree with the general overview of Attinger 2008: 6-9, which lists various categories of texts dealing with healing (recipes, incantations, diagnostic omens, explanatory texts, and anatomical lists) without recognising the distinctive disciplines behind these texts.

3 A fourth genre of text belonging to healing practices consists of lists of plants and mineral stones as *materia medica*, combined with explanatory lists of these subjects known as *Šammu šikinšu* and *Abnu šikinšu* respectively. Another explanatory text of this same type, *Simmu šikinšu*, elaborated types of skin lesions with names of various dermatological conditions. These explanatory lists existed apart from commentaries on medical texts, which were not normally part of the curriculum.

4 Editing in this context refers to serialising compositions into 'tablets' or chapters and creating a widely agreed standard text which can usually be found in multiple copies in libraries and archives without significant variation.

5 The term 'canon' has many meanings within ecclesiastical contexts (such as a 'canon' of sacred texts or a church 'canon' or 'canon' law) which do not apply here. 'Canon' in the present usage results from the process of editing explained in the previous footnote. Alternative terms could be used, such as 'serialisation', but this term is only useful in describing the compiling of cuneiform texts into a 'series' or fixed sequence of tablets but does not address the agreed stability of a text characterised as 'canonised', nor does it explain the nature of a 'non-canonised' text circulating independently or outside the standard version.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501504914-003

for 'curriculum' as one precursor to a canon (an approach taken by biblical scholarship as well, but without reference to Mesopotamia; see van der Toorn 2007: 244f., 359). There is, however, no reliable documentary evidence for a structured curriculum, although late Babylonian school tradition can be tracked to a limited extent from 'school extracts' of basic genres (e.g. lexical texts, literary texts, incantations, etc.), copied by pupils (Gesche 2001, see Veldhuis 2014: 406-424).[6]

The catalogues edited in the present volume potentially provide convincing evidence for a perceived 'canon' of scientific literature, since each catalogue represents a discrete collection or corpus of literature which was widely accepted and clearly defined. Although in broad terms such a comprehensive notion of canon might seem plausible, in reality such a definition cannot be applied with precision to most of cuneiform literary production with any confidence. As Lambert already pointed out in 1957, not all of Akkadian literature (or Sumerian, for that matter) was edited into a *textus receptus*, comparable to holy scriptures, but on the other hand Mesopotamian scholarship maintained a vague idea of antediluvian *apkallu*-sages who established the basis of formal knowledge (or 'classics') later to be studied in learned circles, and this fiction served as a useful model for curriculum and widely shared texts.[7] Lambert is essentially correct in arguing that while the ancients themselves may have held a general notion of a classical 'canon', this in no way compels us to adopt a similar approach to the reception of cuneiform literature in general. On the other hand, there is little doubt that each of the catalogues treated in the present volume is intended to define a discrete thematically organised *corpus* of ancient texts, which leaves the question open as to whether these should be regarded as a literary 'canon'. In other words, the status of 'canon' as applied to any individual text is decisive, i.e. whether a text has come down to us in a standard recension which was recognised in antiquity as authoritative; the question of whether an entire *corpus* comprises a canon is not nearly as pressing and can be set aside for the moment.

2 Text Corpus

It was common in the ancient world for an individual text or even a corpus of texts to be attributed to a famous religious, literary, or learned figure, whose authority would validate a work as genuine, credible, and original. Within Greek medicine, the name of Hippocrates served this purpose well, among many other well-known authorities on Greek medicine. Nevertheless, we know little about Hippocrates, apart from his famous Oath, his presence on the island of Cos, and his undeserved fame as the father of medicine. Although most of the writers in his Corpus are anonymous, the attribution of these works to Hippocrates is the modern equivalent of a brand name. In fact, bad luck to any medical treatises falling outside the *Corpus Hippocraticum* brand, since they faced a struggle to survive, and this even applies to the fundamentally important books of medical writers like Herophilus or Diocles, only known from fragments cited by Galen and others.[8] Already in third century BCE Alexandria, scholars acknowledged the existence of an Hippocratic Corpus consisting of some 40 works attributed to Hippocrates, and began composing glossaries of its technical language. The preface to the lexicon of one such scholar, Erotian,[9] is worth quoting in full:

6 Another precursor to canon, as argued by van der Toorn, is the library catalogue (van der Toorn 2007: 236ff.), which he posits (on theoretical grounds) must have existed in Jerusalem for biblical books, although based upon the slenderest of evidence. Van der Toorn's argument uses the analogy of Mesopotamian libraries and library catalogues (ibid. 240f.), but he rightly points out that cuneiform catalogues usually specify inventories of works in a specific geographical location (ibid. 243).

7 As Lambert notes, even Berossos subscribed to this image of the sources of wisdom from before the Flood, although not actually listing antediluvian texts known to him (Lambert 1957: 9). See also Rochberg 2010: 216-217 for a discussion of Adapa, *apkallu* par excellence, acting as editor and compiler of classical texts. A more detailed treatment is given in Lenzi 2008: 106-120 and most recently in Sanders 2017. It is intriguing that Sumerian ABGAL (for *apkallu*) literally means 'grandfather' and nothing more.

8 As can be seen from the surviving fragments of Herophilus (von Staden 1989) and Diocles (van der Eijk 2000-01), despite their reputations as authoritative, the writings of both of these scholars were in large measure lost because of their status outside any established corpus, in contrast to inferior works preserved within the *Corpus Hippocraticum*.

9 See Jouanna 1999: 63-64 on Erotian, a first century CE lexicographer, 'to whom we owe the most ancient list that has come down to us of the works judged authentically Hippocratic'. Erotian listed the works in the Hippocratic Corpus (all attributed to Hippocrates) by titles (see also Jouanna 1999: 373-416). Von Staden, like Jouanna, affirms that Erotian's lexicon was based on an earlier list of Bacchius from the 3rd century BCE (see von Staden 1990 and Wittern 1971). This listing of Hippocratic works is comparable to the catalogues being studied in the present volume.

> Since, of the [Hippocratic] works that have authentically been preserved, some are semiotic (*sēmeiōtikά*), while some are physiological and aetiological (*physikà kaì aitiologikά*), and some pertain to an account of the Art (*téchnē*); and of the therapeutic works (*therapeutikά*) some are dietetic, others surgical, and [still others are?] entirely mixed. (translation von Staden 1990: 552)

While making allowances for basic differences between Greek and Babylonian medicine, nevertheless the categories of Hippocratic genres outlined by Erotian (semiotic, aetiological, therapeutic, and general healing arts) go a long way towards resembling the character of the works listed in the cuneiform catalogues being studied here.

The issue, however, is whether any single Mesopotamian scholar was famous enough to have an entire corpus of texts attributed to his name. Mesopotamian scribes recorded the names of scholars to whom important individual works were attributed (Lambert 1957), but one name amongst these lists attracts our attention, namely Esagil-kīn-apli, who at one point appears without any special distinction within a long list of other notable scholars (Lambert 1957: 13, see line 44). It is this man who will be central to our investigation as a putative Babylonian counterpart to Hippocrates. Esagil-kīn-apli was an *ummânu*-scholar (the highest academic title one could hold, equivalent to *Ordinarius*) who is said to have lived in 11th-century BCE Babylonia, but at the same time was the descendant of Asalluhi-mansum, an *apkallu* or 'sage' belonging to the circle of Hammurapi of the 18th century BCE; the title of 'sage' was probably fictitious, since famous *apkallu* personalities were either antediluvian or were awarded mythological status (Lenzi 2008: 107). Esagil-kīn-apli, on the other hand, was not known for his literary *oeuvres*[10] but was clearly a man of science rather than of letters, since his legacy associates him with healing arts of various kinds, including incantations as well as diagnostic and physiognomic omens.

Lambert took up the thread once again in a second article on lists of ancestors and scholars (Lambert 1962), in which he published more complete records which he had discovered in the interim, and these lists are revealing. One passage in particular troubled Lambert, namely a fragmentary text attributing a number of important texts to the god of wisdom, Ea (Lambert 1962: 64):

> [*a-ši-pu-t*]u_4 LÚ.GALA-*ú-tu*$_4$: UD AN ^{d}EN.LÍL[11]
> [*alam-dí*]*m-mu-ú* : SAG.ITI.˹NU.TIL˺.LA : SA.GIG.˹GA˺[12]
> [KA.TA.D]U$_{11}$.GA : LUGAL.E UD.ME.LÁM.BI NIR.GÁL : AN.GIM.DÍM.[MA]
>
> ---
>
> [*an-nu-tu*$_4$] *šá pi-i* ^{d}*é*-[*a*]
>
> Exorcism, liturgy, astrology,
> Physiognomic omens, anomalous births, diagnostic omens (symptoms),
> Cledomancy, Lugal-e, Angim.
>
> ---
>
> [These are] the authorship (lit. 'from the mouth') of Ea.

This is the only instance among such lists which attributes to a *god* the authorship of specific genres of texts and individual works, many of which are relevant to the present discussion, such as exorcism (*āšipūtu*), physiognomic omens (*Alamdimmû*) and diagnostic symptoms (*Sakikkû*), in addition to astrology, omens derived from speech, and abnor-

10 In contrast to scholars such as Sîn-lēqe-unnīnī, the reputed author of the canonical *Gilgamesh Epic*, or Kabti-ilāni-Marduk, who was credited with composing a later epic about the plague-god Erra.

11 The inclusion of *kalûtu* and *Enūma Anu Enlil* (EAE) is somewhat unexpected, since both genres are quite separate from exorcism and other omens within this section, except for the fact that in later Uruk archives scholars bearing the title *kalû* (liturgy specialist) could also serve as *ṭupšar Enūma Anu Enlil* (astrologer). It may not be coincidental that these scholars all belonged to the Sîn-lēqe-unnīnī family, the eponymous ancestor of which was credited with a copy of the *Gilgamesh Epic*. See Gabbay 2014: 267. On the other hand, Esagil-kīn-apli is described as a priest (*išippu, ramku*, see CTN 4, 71, Finkel 1988: 148, Schmidtchen's edition in the present volume) and would certainly have needed to be familiar with liturgy (*kalûtu*). As for his personal connections with the corpus of *Enūma Anu Enlil*-celestial omens, one of the Assur sources of EAE 20 has a colophon stating that the tablet is based on a writing board from the 11th year of Adad-apla-iddina (Rochberg-Halton 1988: 216), which would indicate that a recension of the text was in progress during Esagil-kīn-apli's tenure as royal *ummânu* under this king. See also Koch 2015: 163.

12 A late esoteric commentary from Cutha comments on three different texts, given in the opening line as BAD-*ma iz-bu* SA.GIG *alam-dím-mu-ú*, which are the same texts cited in this catalogue attributed most likely to Esagil-kīn-apli's editorial work; see Biggs 1968: 53.

mal births (Šu*mma izbu*). Two literary works mentioned in this list, Lugal-e and Angim, were known in late bilingual editions (van Dijk 1983 and Cooper 1978) and are unexpected.[13] The assumption of Ea's 'authorship' in this context is also problematic and unprecedented, although explained by Rochberg as referring to Ea's divine authority as being somehow responsible for these texts (see Rochberg 2010: 215-216), whatever that may mean.[14] There are no other examples of texts thought to have been inspired by a god or dictated to a human agent.[15]

There are several good reasons, based upon purely circumstantial evidence, for supposing that the reference to the god Ea in this particular passage is either erroneous or intentionally cryptic. 1) No other god is credited with authorship of any other texts, although all other attributions in the Lambert lists use the same wording, *ša pī* PN, lit. 'from the mouth of PN'; the only other comparable reference is to Adapa, who is not a god but an antediluvian sage. 2) Several of the texts ascribed to the god Ea in this passage are known elsewhere as being attributed to Esagil-kīn-apli (in the catalogues KAR 44 and CTN 4, 71). 3) Esagil-kīn-apli does not appear anywhere else in Lambert's list of authors, although we recognise him in another list of famous scholars compiled by later Seleucid scribes (Lenzi 2008: 107-108).[16] The absence of Esagil-kīn-apli's name in the Lambert lists is therefore remarkable. Based on this evidence, we are forced to infer that in the statement, 'from the mouth of Ea', the writing ^{d}*é*-[*a*] is cryptic orthography for the full name Esagil-kīn-apli, if not a simple scribal error.[17] There is a way to explain how this could work. The clue is that Marduk was known as the *āšib Esagil*, 'the resident of the Esagil-temple', and in fact no other temple is ever associated with Marduk[18], and the Esagil-temple was thought to be located immediately above Ea's abode in the Apsû (George 1992: 296-297). In this light, the name ^{m}ÈŠ.GÚ.ZI.GIN.A // ^{m}*é-sag-gíl-ki-in-apli* (Lambert 1957: 13, l. 44) could be interpreted as, 'one who established (my) son (in) the Esagil-temple', i.e. Ea (referring to Marduk). The name Ea thereby becomes a nickname for our scholar. However, the question then arises as to why these texts were never attributed to Esagil-kīn-apli in relevant tablet colophons, especially in the standardised lengthy compositions from Nineveh.

It is usual in Nineveh colophons for Ashurbanipal to adopt the role of editor of texts for himself rather than acknowledging the hand of a scholar in his employ or any previous scholar, which is why one never finds useful information in any standard Ashurbanipal colophon regarding the actual textual history of any library texts. Ashurbanipal's claim that he himself wrote, checked, and collated the Library tablets should not be taken literally, of course. Ashurbanipal

13 Although the association of these two bilingual texts with magic, liturgy, and omens remains difficult to explain, it might be not entirely coincidental that the CTN 4, 71 catalogue describes Esagil-kīn-apli as UM.ME.A KUR EME.GIR$_7$ *u* URI^{ki}, literally '*ummânu*-scholar of the land of Sumerian (language) and Akkad' (Finkel 1988: 148, and Schmidtchen's edition in the present volume), an expression which also appears in a standard Ashurbanipal colophon (type 'b', BAK No. 318: 5). It may be that these two bilingual texts (Lugal-e and Angim) were also thought to be essential for the training of exorcists and professional healers. The first of these, Lugal-e, might be relevant to magic or divination because of a long list of powerful stones used against a cosmic demon, reflecting the properties of *materia magica*; see Frahm 2011: 117, reinforcing this suggestion from references to Lugal-e in commentaries. The second text, Angim, is less clear, since it describes the heroic exploits of the god Ninurta and his many weapons, which could be metaphoric for the exorcist's instruments against demonic adversaries or disease, but no actual association with Esagil-kīn-apli is otherwise known.

14 The notion of the god Ea as 'author' of these works could also be suggested by one standard Ashurbanipal colophon (type 'o'), written as if spoken by the king himself:

> NAM.KÙ.ZU ^{d}*é-a* NAM.GALA *ni-ṣir-ti ap-kal-lu*$_4$ *šá ana nu-uh lìb-bi* DINGIR.MEŠ GAL.MEŠ *šu-lu-ku ki-i pi-i* DUB.MEŠ GABA.RI KUR *aš-šur*^{ki} *u* KUR.URI^{ki} *i-na* DUB.MEŠ *áš-ṭur as-niq ab-re-e-ma*
>
> I wrote, checked, and collated on tablets the 'wisdom of Ea' – liturgy (*kalûtu*), the secret of the sage (*apkallu*) which is fitting for 'calming the mind' of the greatest gods, according to tablet copies from Assur and Akkad. (Gabbay 2014: 277-278)

However supportive this might at first seem for Ea as an author, Ashurbanipal's description of liturgy as the "wisdom of Ea" is not the same as attributing to Ea the authorship of *kalûtu*-texts; in fact, Ashurbanipal admits that such texts are actually based on the esoteric knowledge (*niširtu*) of a proverbial sage, the hypothetical *apkallu*-precursor of every *ummânu*-scholar, but not Ea.

15 If that were the case, one might have expected *Enūma eliš* to be attributed to Ea, with its final admonition in Tablet VII for the text to be taught to the children of mankind (see Lambert 2013: 132-133 = En. el. VII), such as one finds at the end of Second Enoch (see Badalanova Geller 2010).

16 In fact, all of the other *ummânu*-scholars mentioned in the Seleucid Uruk list of kings and scholars (dating from 165 BCE) are also known from Lambert's list of sages (e.g. Sîn-lēqe-unnīnī, Kabti-ilāni-Marduk, Enlil-ibni, Gimil-Gula, Taqīš-Gula, and Esagil-kīnī-ubba). The *only* scholar missing from the Lambert-list (Lambert 1962) is Esagil-kīn-apli, unless he is accounted for under the name 'Ea'. Lambert (1957: 13) produces one Nineveh list of scribes in which Esagil-kīn-apli's name also appears (5R 44), but this scribal exercise was intended to identify the famous scribes by both their Sumerian names and Akkadian equivalents.

17 Perhaps based on a faulty *Vorlage* where the scribe only had the first character É of the name and concluded that the god Ea was meant.

18 See George 1992: 80, 11 and Lambert 2013: 294, rev. 10, *a-šib é-sa*[*g-g*]*íl* EN E^{ki} ^{d}*marduk* MAH, 'exalted Marduk, lord of Babylon, who resides in the Esagil'.

takes credit for the work of his army of very capable but anonymous scribes, who had the enormous task of producing numerous editions of Library tablets in such a standardised script that hardly any individual ductus can be detected. Within this context, lack of reference in colophons to Esagil-kīn-apli's contribution to incantations, omens, or medical texts is unsurprising.[19]

In essence, what we see in Ashurbanipal's Library and in the colophons of its texts is the equivalent of a King James Bible, which also managed to obscure the individual contributions among the 47 scholars who produced this masterful translation based on various ancient versions of the biblical text. We occasionally get a few scattered exceptional hints at Akkadian editorial work, such as the very unusual and even eccentric esoteric remarks found on a hemerology tablet from Assur, the so-called Nazimaruttaš Hemerology (Livingstone 2013: 179; cf. Heeßel 2011: 171-173):

> UD.MEŠ DU_{10}.GA.MEŠ KA 7 *ṭu*[*p-pa-a-n*]*i* GABA.RI UD.KIB.NUN^{ki} NIBRU^{ki} KÁ.DINGIR.RA^{ki} UD.UNUG^{ki} ŠEŠ.UNUG^{ki} UNUG^{ki} *u eri-du*$_{10}$^{ki}
>
> *um-ma-a-ni ú-na-as-si-hu-ma ú-na-as-si-qu-ma ana* ^{m}*na-zi-múru-taš*
>
> LUGAL ŠÚ SUM-*nu ana ṣu-bu bu-tú-qe-e za-re-e šèr-re-e*[20] *ša-ba-áš ka-re-e ù mim-ma ṣe-bu-tú* DU_{10}.GA
>
> Favourable days, according to seven tablets, (based on) copies from Sippar, Nippur, Babylon, Larsa, Ur, Uruk, and Eridu. The scholars extracted, chose, and gave to Nazimaruttaš, king of the universe (the information, being) good for looking out for deficiencies (*ana ṣu-bu bu-tú-qe-e*), 'weaving' rows (*za-re-e šèr-re-e*), collecting 'heaps' (*ša-ba-áš ka-re-e*) and whatever is planned.

This intriguing and almost incomprehensible note within a hemerology is not exactly a colophon since it occurs at the end of the obverse, not the reverse of the tablet. The point of this passage is to show how complex texts were being edited from various recensions or manuscripts from many different libraries and archives, in this case from seven tablets (*ṭuppānī*) from seven cities, all of which had libraries and archives. Although usually interpreted as referring to agricultural work (see most recently Koch 2015: 217), it is more than likely that the expressions, 'looking out for deficiencies', 'weaving rows', 'collecting heaps', etc. are all metaphors for scholarly activities. For instance, the puzzling expression 'collecting heaps' of barley would make good sense if *karû* ('heaps') is a pun on *iškāru*, 'series',[21] the standard technical word in colophons and catalogues for edited tablets appearing in a standard sequence.[22] 'Deficiencies' or 'losses' (*butuqqû*) on tablets could be gaps, and the 'weaving' (*zarû*) of lines (lit. rows) of a text is a metaphor referring to the work of establishing text editions. In fact, a text as a 'textile' (Latin *textus*) was how editorial work was characterised in one catalogue being edited in the present volume (CTN 4, 71) ascribed to Esagil-kīn-apli,[23] for which we offer the following interpretive translation of the relevant passage:

---

19 One further idea can be considered: it may be that Lambert's Nineveh list of scholars and sages was actually a rather subversive text, providing the names of scholars who were responsible for standard editions of texts and text genres, but whose names were intentionally omitted from Ashurbanipal Library colophons. Lambert's lists would then reflect the scholars getting their own back, reacting against the imposed anonymity of the royal colophons.

20 Livingstone translates as 'begetting children', which cannot be ruled out. Hunger (BAK No. 292) translates 'das Besäen der Saatfurchen', understanding *šèr-re-e* as *šer'u* 'row'. An alternative interpretation is to read the word as *sirrû* '(woven) row', which could be derived from Sumerian sir_5 'to weave' (see also n. 24 below).

21 Although the usual logogram for *iškāru* is ÉŠ.GÀR, there is evidence in colophons for the learned orthography ^{giš}GÀR (BAK No. 47: 2), which could reinforce the pun of *karû* for series.

22 A similar metaphor occurs in a hymn to Ninurta (Mayer 1992: 26 sub XIX), which reads:

> *um-man-nu mu-du-u* GIM *ša-a-ri a-na mi-hi-il-tu*$_4$ *i-ziq-qa*
> *u kul-lat tup-šar-ru-tu* GIM *gu-ru-un-né-e ina kar-ši-šú kam-su*
> The knowledgeable scholar blows like the wind onto his writing, and gathers all scribal craft in his heart (lit. belly) like a heap (of grain). [reference courtesy of Cale Johnson]

23 See Frahm 2011: 328, n. 1565. The text CTN 4, 71 is unique in containing two separate catalogues of different but related text genres (diagnostic omens and physiognomic omens), separated by an unusually candid observation regarding the editing of such texts, which was labelled by John Wee (2015: 274) as Esagil-kīn-apli's 'manifesto'. Although the passage (see Finkel 1988 and Schmidtchen's edition in this volume) reads like a colophon, it occurs within the middle of the text, similar to the remarks in the hemerology tablet cited above.

ša ultu ulla SUR.GIBIL *la ṣabtu ù* GIM GU.MEŠ GIL.MEŠ *ša* GABA.RI NU TUKU

That (for) which from earlier an edition (lit. SUR.GIBIL 'weaving')[24] has never been realised[25] and (which) was like twisted threads for which no copy (GABA.RI) existed.[26]

The significant point is that Esagil-kīn-apli describes his own redaction of texts as a previously unaccomplished 'weaving' or 'textile', and in fact the expression SUR.GIBIL *ṣab-tu*$_4$ is a signature phrase associated with Esagil-kīn-apli's own approach to the edition of texts, and this phrase is only found in specific and significant contexts, as we will see below. An Akkadian equivalent to SUR.GIBIL 'weaving' does occur rarely in colophons, such as in a colophon to the medical plant list (Uruanna) from Nineveh, which reads *ša ul-tu ul-la za-ra-a la ṣab-tu*, 'that (for) which from earlier a "weaving" (*zarû*) has never been realised' (Hunger 1968: 99 = BAK No. 321). Although Esagil-kīn-apli is not mentioned by name in this colophon, for reasons already explained,[27] this particular genre (lists of medical plants) would have been relevant to other texts attributed to Esagil-kīn-apli.[28]

A second Nineveh colophon with the expression *za-ra-a* occurs in an acrostic hymn to Marduk and his consort Zarpanitu. The colophon of K. 7592+ (= SAA 3 No. 2 rev. 24) is unusually instructive for explaining colophon terminology:

ŠU.NIGIN 30-TA.ÀM [MU].ŠID.IM *za-ra-a ta-nit-ti* ᵣdᵀ[AMAR.UTU ....] *nar-bi* ᵈ*zar-pa*-[*ni-tum b*]*e-el-tu*$_4$ GAL-*tu*$_4$ *na*-[*ram-ti* ᵈAMAR.UTU ...]

Total of thirty [lines] in 'rows', an edition (lit. 'weaving'), a hymn to Marduk ..., the feats of the great lady Zarpanitu, beloved of [Marduk ...]. (Livingstone 1989: 10)[29]

The logical inference is that *za-ra-a* corresponds to SUR.GIBIL, as in the colophon BAK No. 321 cited above (Hunger 1968: 98-99). However, the term MU.ŠID.IM in this tablet logically represents a logogram for Akk. *sadīru*,[30] 'ruled sections', based on the fact that there are actually 30 ruled off sections easily identifiable on this tablet.[31] The term *sadīru* also appears in the CTN 4, 71 catalogue, in which two broken entries (ll. 19 and 31) refer to a specific sub-series of diagnostic omens – the latter consisting of no less than 860 lines – as a *sa-di-ru* SUR.GIBIL *ṣab-tu*$_4$, a 'ruled section, an accomplished edition (lit. 'weaving')'.[32] But what is the reason for noting that the text is a *zarû* (= SUR.GIBIL)? The arrangement (or 'weaving', *zarû*) of the tablet is based upon the idea that the rows or sections are organized as an acrostic, which spells out the phrase, 'I Ashurbanipal, who has invoked you, heal me, O Marduk, that I may praise you!' (*a-na-ku aš-šur-ba-ni-ap-li ša il-su-ka bu-ul-li-ṭa-ni-ma ma-ru-du-uk da-li-li-ka lu-ud-lul*). The purpose of the colophon

24 The word SUR for weaving has been previously discussed by Stol 2007: 241-242, associating this logogram with Akk. *ṭamû*, 'spinning'. Stol cites bilingual evidence for SUR = *ṭamû* / *ṭemû* 'to spin', for which the usual Sum. equivalent is NU with the reading /sir$_3$/, which confirms Stol's idea that SUR is phonetic for SIR$_3$, to 'spin' or 'weave', thus supporting the textile metaphor. Frahm (2011: 328) suggests that this might also be a metaphor for 'winnowing' (*zarû*). However, what has not been taken into account is further lexical evidence, namely zara$_6$ (BAD. DILI^{túg}) for 'garment', as well as za-ra BAD = *ṭamû* (for zara$_3$), 'to spin'. It may be that the logogram SUR.GIBIL for *zarû* 'weaving' (and not *zarû eddešu* 'new weaving') uses GIBIL ('new') to distinguish itself from the lexical equation ZARA$_5$ (BAD), which could erroneously be read as SUMUN (BAD), 'old'. John Wee's suggestion of reading *ṣa-ra-a* for this term as derived from a root *ṣrr* is unconvincing; see Wee 2015: 254 n. 27.

25 Literally, 'grasped'.

26 See Finkel 1988: 148 and the new edition of this text in the present volume.

27 The presence of this phrase (*ša ultu ulla zarâ la ṣabtu*) in an Ashurbanipal colophon could represent a subtle allusion to Esagil-kīn-apli's reputed editorial work, without mentioning the scholar by name. See Frahm 2011: 332 n. 1588, in which he suggests that "the Assyrian king presents himself as an Esagil-kīn-apli redivivus".

28 The catalogue KAR 44: 26 does not refer specifically to Uruanna-plant lists but does list another explanatory plant list, *Šammu šikinšu*.

29 This is the only other known use of the term *za-ra-a* in a colophon, and although the rest of this colophon is uninscribed, this does not rule out the possibility that this tablet originated in an Ashurbanipal workshop.

30 Akk. *sadīru* can correspond to either logogram MU.ŠID or MU.MEŠ, depending upon scribe, e.g. Hunger 1968: 134 = BAK No. 487 [CT 40, 4, *Šumma ālu* omens] has 12 sections (MU.MEŠ) and 95 lines (MU.ŠID.BI). In Ashurbanipal's acrostic hymn cited above, the phrase [MU].ŠID.(BI).IM indicates a text that is organised in ruled sections. Cf. Steinert (*infra*) for further discussion.

31 See also Sokoloff 2002: 799-800, for the cognate Babylonian Aramaic term *sydr*' 'recitation of the Bible' indicating fixed sections of the Pentateuch recited regularly in sequence in synagogue liturgy, in addition to more general meanings of 'order, row, division'.

32 The expression *sa-di-ru* SUR.GIBIL *ṣab-tu*$_4$ also occurs several times in AMC. One revealing use of the term *sadīru* appears in a colophon of the plant list Uruanna, characterised by long lists of words arranged in boxes but not in rows; hence its colophon expressly states that *la i-šu-ú sa-di-i-ru*, (the text) 'has no rows' (BAK No. 321: 5 = Hunger 1968: 99). Cf. a similar discussion in Frahm 2011: 332 n. 1588.

of combining these two terms, *zarû* and *sadīru*, was to allude to the type of editorial work specifically associated with Esagil-kīn-apli, which may have also been reflected in the acrostic.

This weaving metaphor occurs elsewhere in relation to Esagil-kīn-apli's interests in editing texts, as in an Assur copy of physiognomic omens published by Nils Heeßel, which makes an oblique remark about Esagil-kīn-apli. The text reads, DIŠ ⌜*alan*⌝*-dím-mu-u* LIBIR.RA *šá é-sag-gíl*-GIN.A NU DU_8.MEŠ-*šú*, 'an older (recension) of *Alamdimmû*-(physiognomic omens) which Esagil-kīn-apli never "untied"' (Heeßel 2010: 145-150). What is meant by 'older' omens, which this famous scholar never 'untied' or 'resolved'? The likelihood is that to 'untie' a text would mean to take apart its individual variants in order to incorporate them into a standard edition, which in effect would mean that the individual tablet is no longer required. 'Untying' the tablet would refer to this editing process, and the opposite case, that the tablet is not 'untied', would mean that the tablet has not yet had its variants recorded and it remains as a separate composition, in a synoptic relationship to other texts of the same genre.[33] In other words, this is a text which was outside the confines of a standardised or canonised text with its widely agreed fixed form, and as such the Assur tablet discovered by Heeßel falls outside of the usual process of text editions attributed specifically to Esagil-kīn-apli.

3 Non-canonical Texts

If so much effort is expended by one scholar to create standard editions of texts, we would ideally like to know what is actually meant by non-standard or 'external' (*ahû*) texts in relation to closely edited or 'woven' ones. The reason why this is important is because canonicity is often defined by its exceptions, so while there is no clear vocabulary for standardisation of texts (beyond the metaphorical terms discussed above), texts which were not standardised in the same way were labelled as 'outsider' (*ahû*)-texts. Nevertheless, this is all part of the same process of establishing standard text editions.

A revealing clue to identifying non-canonical texts occurs in a letter to Ashurbanipal from his chief scribes Nabû-zeru-lešir and Issar-šumu-ereš (SAA 10 No. 8 rev. 1-2 = Parpola 1993: 9): *šu-mu an-ni-u la-a ša* ÉŠ.GÀR-*ma šu-u ša pi-i um-ma-ni šu-ú*, 'this omen is not from the Series (i.e. *Enūma Anu Enlil*), it is an oral communication of a scholar', and then reiterates the matter once again, *an-ni-ú la-a ša* ÉŠ.GÀR-*ma šu-u a-hi-u šu-u*, 'it is not from the series, it is "external" (non-standard)' (ibid. rev. 8, and see Elman 1975: 23). A somewhat surprising reference to non-canonical tablets occurs in another court letter from the exorcist Marduk-šakin-šumi to the king in the very same year (671 BCE), reporting on a list of various rituals being performed on the king's behalf on the day; the scholar promises to prepare a further number of rituals for the following day, about which he reports (SAA 10 No. 240: 23-27 = Parpola 1993: 191): *ú-ma-a re-eš ṭup-pa-a-ni ma-a'-du-ti lu* 20 *lu* 30 SIG_5.MEŠ *a-hi-ú-ti ú-ba-'a a-na-áš-ši-a a-šaṭ-ṭar* 'I will now search for, pick out, and write the incipits of many tablets,[34] some 20 or 30, either "good" (i.e. canonical) or "external" (non-canonical) ones.' The value judgment expressed in this letter is striking, with the contrast between 'good' and 'external' tablets being clearly expressed. That this distinction is not accidental can be seen in another letter from the same Marduk-šakin-šumi to Ashurbanipal a short time later, in which he describes his own actions to prepare anti-witchcraft rituals (SAA 10 No. 245 rev. 12-18 = Parpola 1993: 195): *a-na-ku an-nu-rig ṭup-pa-a-ni* 30 40 SIG_5.MEŠ *am-mar ina muh-hi qur-bu-u-ni ù a-hi-ú-ti i-ba-áš-ši i-se-niš im-ma-ti-me-ni* [*in-né-p*]*u-šú-u-*[*n*]*i re-e-šú* [*a-na-áš-ši a-m*]*a-ta-ha* ….. 'I am now picking out and using 30-40 tablets, as many "good" (standard) ones near to the subject and "external" (non-standard) ones as there are, in addition to what is usually performed ….' There appears to be no question that the standardised tablets were to be preferred to the non-standard ones, although the latter had their uses.[35] In any case, there is a clear contrast between

33 See Wee 2015: 254, in which he compares this phrase to the editorial process of 'unravelling textual threads from older compositions', which is a similar idea.

34 Parpola (1993: 191) translated this passage as, 'I shall now look up, collect, and copy numerous – 20 to 30 – canonical and non-canonical tablets', relying upon the idiom *rēša našû*, 'to pick out', which is technically correct. However, in most instances the term *rēšu* occurs either immediately before *našû* or in the vicinity, whereas in the present clause the term *rēšu* appears far in advance of *našû*, and together with two other verbs which do not share the same idiom with *rēšu*. For this reason, we have opted for a translation of *rēš ṭuppāni* as 'incipits', partly on contextual grounds, since it would have been difficult even for a trained scribe to produce 20 to 30 tablets on a single day, unless they were quite small. The recording of incipits would make good sense in this context, in effect producing a thematic catalogue of relevant omen texts, similar to the catalogues being studied in the present volume.

35 See also SAA 10 No. 182 rev. 24-28, in which the writer remarks that while his competitors only had access to all kinds of 'external' (non-standard) tablets, he himself was fortunate enough to learn from his own father (Parpola 1993: 146-147).

tablets which are SIG_5 'good' and others which are either *lā ša iškāri* 'not from a series' or *ahûti*, 'external, non-standard'. We are reminded once again of the Hippocratic Corpus, which managed to protect its own texts for posterity in preference to medical literature not included within the Corpus.

We have a number of examples of such *ahû*-texts, most often but not exclusively appearing in collections of omens. The question is what is meant by the term *ahû*, 'outside' in reference to editions of texts.[36] There are clear cases in which the term *ahû* refers to non-standard manuscripts of a known series, such as individual *Šumma izbu* extracts marked as *ahûti* (Leichty: 1970 198-199, de Zorzi 2014: I 336-237). On the other hand, a lengthy *ahû*-tablet of *Enūma Anu Enlil* published by Rochberg (2010: 85-111) parallels (with many variants) the standard edition of the same material, thus showing the contrast between standard and non-standard editions of the same text. An *ahû*-text might simply be a tablet with many orthographic peculiarities, and although not be specifically marked as *ahû*, it could be considered as a candidate for non-canonicity if its variant readings do not regularly conform to those of the standard series.[37]

In effect, Nineveh sources show a remarkable degree of conformity with Late Babylonian redactions of the same texts from Babylon, Sippar, and Uruk, among other sites. Although colophons never refer to such texts as 'standardised', it is usual to note that the tablets have been 'checked and collated', or even copied from a writing board or tablet from a library elsewhere, such as Babylon. However, on occasion one encounters exceptions. A few colophons include the term *ahû*, 'outside', to refer to texts which are 'non-canonical' or not part of the standard composition.[38] Several examples of such non-canonical tablets occur in collections of physiognomic omens,[39] but the more interesting example is one standard Nineveh colophon (Type q, see Hunger 1968: 103 = BAK No. 329) which labels the tablet as a *bul-ṭi* TA *muh-hi* EN UMBIN *liq-ti* BAR.MEŠ, or 'prescriptions from head to toenail, non-canonical collections'.[40] It is worth examining in this connection a fuller version of the colophon most commonly appearing on editions of medical recipes from Nineveh (BAK No. 329):

> *ni-siq ṭup-šar-ru-ti ša ina* LUGAL.MEŠ-*ni a-lik mah-ri-ia mam-ma šip-ru šu-a-tu la e-hu-uz-zu bul-ṭi* TA *muh-hi* EN UMBIN *liq-ti* BAR.MEŠ *ta-hi-zu nak-la a-zu-gal-lu-ut* ^{d}*nin-urta u* ^{d}*gu-la ma-la ba-aš-mu ina ṭup-pa-a-ni áš-ṭur as-niq* IGI.KÁR-*ma a-na ta-mar-ti ši-ta-si-ia qé-reb* É.GAL-*ia ú-kin*
>
> The apex of scribal arts – which among my royal predecessor no one could grasp this work – I (Ashurbanipal) wrote, checked, and collated the recipes 'from cranium to toe(nails)', the non-standardised selections (*liqtī ahûti*),[41] (and) clever analysis (*tāhīzu nakla*). I established (*ukīn*) within my palace (editions) of the highest medical arts of Ninurta and Gula, as much (as exists) taking the form of (cuneiform)-tablets, for my (own) reading and lecturing.

36 The term *ahû* (Sum. bar) 'outside', has a close equivalent in the Jewish Aramaic term *beraitha*, 'outside', which also refers to extra traditions cited in the Talmud which were not originally codified in the Mishnah, which was the main sourcebook of rabbinic academies, apart from the Bible itself (see Stemberger 1982: 191-192). A *beraitha* can be characterised as 1) free standing and independent, 2) anonymous, and 3) representing an older stratum of authoritative knowledge.

37 A good example of a possible *ahû*-tablet is K. 111+, which duplicates Udug-hul Tablet 13-15; this large two-column tablet lacks a colophon and shows signs of being burned. Although found in Nineveh, the tablet was written in a very distinctive Babylonian script and has many orthographic peculiarities and variants which differ from other Udug-hul duplicates from other sites (Babylon, Sippar, Uruk, etc.); see Geller 2016: 17-18.

38 Rochberg (2010: 76) refers to *ahû*-collections among celestial omens (*Enūma Anu Enlil*), *Šumma ālu* and *Šumma izbu*-omens, the menology *Iqqur īpuš* and medical prescriptions, and identifies *ahû*-texts as a 'classification primarily applicable to casuistic literature, and more specifically to the so-called scientific texts, that is, divination and medicine'; see generally Rochberg 2010: 65ff. and 85ff. Koch defines omen texts characterised as *ahû* as being 'older omen material that was left out of the standard series … extraneous but not unauthoritative' (Koch (2015: 65).

39 See Böck 2000: 19, 262ff. for *ahû*-tablets of physiognomic omens. The first is a small excerpt tablet from the series *Alamdimmû*, with the colophon which states, [ŠU.NIGIN X]+1 MU.MEŠ *alam-dím-mu-ú* 15 *u* 150 TA ŠÀ *liq-ti* BAR.MEŠ ZI-*ha* [GABA.R]I KÁ.DINGIR.RA^{ki} SUMUN-*šú* SAR-*ma ba-ri-im* '[Total of] x lines of *Alamdimmû*, right and left, extracted from among *ahû*-selections, a copy from Babylon, its *Vorlage* being copied and checked.' Other tablets of these omens are known to be 'extraneous' by comparison with the standard editions of these omens.

40 The same colophon (Hunger 1968 = BAK No. 329) occurs on almost all Nineveh medical compositions which have Ashurbanipal colophons preserved, e.g. BAM 538.

41 The translation 'selections' is taken from Koch 2015: 184. See Heeßel 2012: No. 1 (KAR 483) for *liqte ahûti* in explanatory omens and Koch 2005: 296 (KAR 151) showing these omens being collected as a *nishu*-extract.

This colophon tells us a certain amount about the editing of medical recipes in the Ashurbanipal Library, and specifically that medical recipes (*bulṭī*) were edited and compiled which were *a capite ad calcem*, an almost universal 'from head-to-foot' organisation of medical data known from Babylonian diagnostic omens as well as from Greek and Egyptian and even Chinese medical literature.[42] In addition, the colophon explains that medical texts also came in the form of selections (*liqtī* lit. 'gleanings') of non-standard (*ahû*) texts, as well as being quoted within ingenious explanatory hermeneutics (*tāhīzu nakla*) on medical literature.

The impression given is that the *bulṭī* or medical recipes, drawn from non-standard editions, were constantly being edited by Ashurbanipal's scholars into *azugallūtu*, the highest niveau of medical learning, represented by the large Nineveh tablets of collected medical prescriptions and incantations found in his Library. No other libraries or centres of learning at that time produced the quality and variety of medical texts which could rival those from Nineveh. Nevertheless, the thrust of this colophon raises serious doubts as to whether medical recipes (*bulṭī*) were ever actually standardised or belonged to a fixed canon *prior to* the editing processes carried out by Ashurbanipal's scholars, since medical texts from Assur and other cities do not normally appear in duplicate copies (see Geller 2010: 97-108). What is more typical of medical recipes are collections of individual and largely unique manuscripts, in which various prescriptions may be duplicated elsewhere but the composition as a whole is not. It may be that the colophon cited above (BAK No. 329) expressed an ambitious goal of Ashurbanipal rather than what had actually been achieved. In any case, the combined phrases 'head to toenail recipes' and 'outside collections' occur *only* with medical texts among Ashurbanipal colophons and clearly typify the discipline of *asûtu*.

4 Corpus Again

The question is whether we can identify an Akkadian term to describe the abstract concept of a 'corpus' of texts. Technical terminology was available for more concrete descriptions of how compositions were organised, such as *iškāru* (lit. 'work assignment') used to describe a collection of 'tablets' (*ṭuppū*) which would be the modern equivalent of chapters of a book; these 'tablets' were organised into numbered sequences (hence 'series'). Apart from complete compositions, scholars could also construct a *nishu* or 'extract' from a longer composition, which could be conveniently used for study or teaching purposes;[43] the term *pirsu* had a similar meaning (Hunger 1968: 171).

However, there appears to be a more general term for 'corpus' within the diagnostic / physiognomic omen catalogue CTN 4, 71. One of the noteworthy characteristics of this particular catalogue is that the obverse of the tablet records the total number of lines in the diagnostic series *Sakikkû*, but at the same time the *Sakikkû* catalogue is divided into six sections, each listing the number of 'tablets' in each sub-section, and only at the very end does the text mention that *Sakikkû* is composed of 40 tablets (DUB.MEŠ); see Schmidtchen's edition in this volume. The *Sakikkû* catalogue (CTN 4, 71) incorporates a unique note attributed to Esagil-kīn-apli discussed above (see n. 23), which adds the following remarks:[44]

> He (Esagil-kīn-apli) contemplated in his mind and undertaking an edition (SUR.GIBIL, lit. 'weaving') of *Sakikkû* (diagnostic omens) 'from cranium to feet' (i.e. *a capite ad calcem*), he established (the text) into a recension (NÍG. ZU = *ihzu*).[45] Take care and pay attention! Do not neglect your recension (*ihzu*), he who does not establish a recension (NÍG.ZU NU GUB.BÉ = *ihza lā ukīn*) cannot explain symptoms (*sakikkû*), nor can he reveal (anything about) physiognomic omens (*Alamdimmû*). *Sakikkû* (diagnostic omens) is a 'corpus' (*riksu*) of disease and a 'corpus' (*riksu*)

42 A variant colophon occasionally appears (BAK No. 319) which includes the usual statement that none of Ashurbanipal's predecessor kings were capable of working at the highest level of scribal arts (*nisiq ṭupšarrūti*), and then reads: *né-me-eq* ^{d}*nabû ti-kip sa-ana-tak-ki ma-la ba-áš-mu ina ṭup-pa-a-ni áš-ṭur as-niq ab-re-e-ma* 'I wrote, checked, and collated Nabû's wisdom, as much as is formed in cuneiform wedges on tablets.' This type of colophon is typical for the non-medical anti-witchcraft corpus (see for example Abusch and Schwemer 2011: 327), and it is also the colophon which appears on the Lambert list of sages and scholars (Lambert 1962: 63). It is likely that Ashurbanipal was unaware of the contents of the latter text, but that this colophon was a *pro forma* addendum required by palace protocols.

43 See Koch 2015: 184 for a discussion of *nishu*-excerpts from celestial omens of *Enūma Anu Enlil*.

44 My own interpretive translation differs from that given elsewhere in this volume (cf. Schmidtchen *supra*).

45 The idea of *ihzu* as 'recension' rather than a more general term for 'knowledge' is based on the context of this passage, which refers specifically to editing texts; in fact, the term *ihzu* can refer to a 'mounting' for precious stones or metals, which is a suitable metaphor in this context for the frame or fixed setting of an edited text.

of mental illness, (while) *Alamdimmû*-omens concern physiognomy and (physical) form and human fate, which Ea and his son (i.e. Marduk) have determined; as to the textual series (*iškāru*) of both (i.e. *Sakikkû* and *Alamdimmû*), their 'corpus' (*riksu*) is as one.

The most intriguing feature of this description of diagnostic and physiognomic omens is the appearance of the term *riksu*, which literally refers to a 'set table' used for offerings or a 'binding' of various items together, but used in this highly unusual text as a metaphor for 'corpus'.[46] The point of the remark is that diagnostic and physiognomic omens, while already organised sequentially into compositions (i.e. 'tablets'), should be taken together to form a single canon of texts on the topic of signs or omens derived from physical traits.[47] The interesting feature of this passage is the number of metaphors being employed for the job of editing texts (*zarâ ṣabātu, ihzu, kânu, riksu*), since no technical vocabulary existed to explain such editorial work, and that these neologisms are associated in this text with Esagil-kīn-apli.

5 Conclusion – a Babylonian Hippocrates

The question which has been lurking in the background of this entire discussion is whether Esagil-kīn-apli was thought to be responsible for the three catalogues in the present volume (AMC, KAR 44, CTN 4, 71) which list all works dealing with healing arts. The two relevant questions concern the processes of standardising text editions into canonical versions and the attribution of texts to an author. All three catalogues dating from the Neo-Assyrian period list compositions of texts in relevant genres, but only two of the catalogues formally attributed this activity to the earlier scholar Esagil-kīn-apli.

The data surveyed in the present discussion has been based upon certain assumptions. First, the process of editing standardised texts within Mesopotamian school tradition was already well established by the time these catalogues were created, since already in the Old Babylonian period anonymous Nippur scholars were composing Sumerian literary texts with remarkably few variants, indicating a process of canonicity long before Esagil-kīn-apli's time. Nevertheless, earlier scholars invented no specific terminology to describe this activity, and most of the works listed in our three catalogues did not yet exist in the form we know them in the Old Babylonian period. It is therefore defensible to argue that the serialisation and standardisation of most of the texts mentioned in these lists belonged to a later period – an editorial activity specifically dated in one catalogue to the reign of Adad-apla-iddina in the 11th century BCE and attributed to a single scholar, Esagil-kīn-apli (see Finkel 1988). However, the jarring statement in KAR 44 that Esagil-kīn-apli's pedigree reaches back to the time of Hammurapi may intentionally allude to the fact that such editing processes had already been put into place in older periods by predecessors in the academy. Nevertheless, this leaves us

46 One reference to *riksu* as corpus is not quite certain but could possibly be an important witness to this term. The usage in question occurs at the end of a lengthy tablet which compiles several incantations from the incantation Compendium (see Schramm 2008), copied by R. C. Thompson in CT 17, 15-18 (BM 34223). This Seleucid period tablet (see BAK No. 421) contains a catchline followed by a unique rubric (CT 17, 18):

én sag-gig an-edin-na ì-du$_7$-du$_7$ im-gin$_7$ mu-un-ri-ri
im-dub 24 kešda nam-nar éš-gàr udug-hul-meš nu al-til
'Incantation: "the headache demon circles around in the steppe and blows like the wind."
24th tablet, *riksu* of chanting, Series of Udug-hul-a-meš, not complete.'

The usual interpretation of this line is šìr-nam-nar, 'musical song', but this term is rare and does not apply to any known corpus of texts, and bears no special relationship to Udug-hul incantations. The likelihood is that the term nam-nar is not technical but rather a general description of a category of incantations, for which Udug-hul comprises one component. A similar term is *šerkugû* for ritual songs in incantations, also mentioned in KAR 44 but rarely employed. The meaning of the colophon would be that the incantation in question represents the 24th tablet of a corpus of liturgy (lit. 'song'), incorporating the Udug-hul series, but not complete.

47 It is hardly coincidental that the CTN 4, 71 passage (attributed to Esagil-kīn-apli) describes diagnostic omens (SA.GIG) *twice* as a *riksu* of both physical and mental disease, while avoiding this term in describing physiognomic omens (*Alamdimmû*). This reflects the actual status of such omens when these observations were made, since *Sakikkû* was a single composition composed of six sub-series (*sadīru*) combined into a unified work (*riksu*), while physiognomic omens consisted of several independent compositions (*Alamdimmû, Nigdimdimmû, Kataduggû, Šumma sinništu qaqqaqda rabiat, Šumma liptu*), which never appeared under a single title and hence were not designated as a 'corpus' (*riksu*). The passage concludes, however, that the serialised compositions (*iškārū*) of diagnostic and physiognomic omens should be considered together as a combined 'corpus' (*riksu*) or canon.

with the problem of explaining why only two of the catalogues, KAR 44 and CTN 4, 71 attribute their lists to Esagil-kīn-apli, while the third catalogue, AMC, is silent on this point.

Before addressing this question, it would be useful to review the striking similarities of all three catalogues. All are single-column tablets, with one (KAR 44) being landscape (horizontal) in layout, while the other two have a portrait (vertical) layout; this conforms with Irving Finkel's observations regarding different layouts for Late Babylonian school texts dealing with magic and medicine.[48] Second, all three catalogues are divided into two main sections, indicating a natural division of the sources listed. In CTN 4, 71 the first section lists diagnostic omens while the second section lists physiognomic omens (see the edition of Schmidtchen below). In KAR 44, the first section lists works forming the standard curriculum of exorcists,[49] while the second list comprises more esoteric works at an advanced level of training and education. In both these catalogues, the two sections are divided by a comment attributing these compositions to a single scholar, Esagil-kīn-apli.[50] In AMC, the first section lists diseases associated with parts of the body, while the second section enumerates more general pathologies unrelated to any specific area of human anatomy. Although no attribution is given to any scholar in AMC, nevertheless the list includes frequent repetitions of key phrases – e.g. *zarâ* (SUR.GIBIL) *ṣabātu* – which are closely associated with Esagil-kīn-apli's editorial work in CTN 4, 71, so that the attribution is hinted at if not specifically stated.[51]

There are several possible reasons why Esagil-kīn-apli was not mentioned in AMC. First, the format and content of AMC is so similar to that of the other catalogues, with some overlap between genres and general similarity of subject matter, that it may not have been considered necessary to mention Esagil-kīn-apli by name. Second, no other authority among scholars and sages was credited with producing standard editions of medical texts, so again mentioning him by name may have been redundant. Moreover, in Lambert's lists of scholars and ancestors discussed above, the section we ascribed to Esagil-kīn-apli (i.e. 'from the mouth of Ea') identifies texts dealing with magic, liturgy, diagnostics, and physiognomic omens, which are the very texts listed in KAR 44 and CTN 4, 71; no mention is made of *asûtu* or medicine in the Lambert list in connection with Esagil-kīn-apli or any other scholar. The reason for this may be (as noted above) that the standard editions of medical texts came relatively late, probably from anonymous scholars in the employ of Ashurbanipal's Library, and given that the Lambert lists themselves date from roughly this same period and scholarly atelier, it would have been obvious that medical texts had not been edited in duplicate copies in the earlier era of Adad-apla-iddina or Esagil-kīn-apli. However, the actual editorial processes of creating a SUR.GIBIL *ṣabtu*, a 'text edition formally accomplished', followed the methods and procedures already established by Esagil-kīn-apli for genres thematically similar and related to medicine. So while Esagil-kīn-apli was not mentioned by name in AMC, his scholarly presence was certainly felt.

Is there any justification for assuming Esagil-kīn-apli to have been a Babylonian Hippocrates? The answer must be affirmative, since Esagil-kīn-apli is the only ancient authority whose name was associated with editorial work on Babylonian magic, diagnostics, and medicine, and the only name which merits comparison with Hippocrates within Greek medicine. Esagil-kīn-apli was someone to whom magical and medical works could be attributed in order to lend authority to standardised texts, with the usual implications for assumed canonicity and preservation of texts within identifiable corpora.

48 Finkel provides a simple scheme based on a Late Babylonian archive of tablets dealing with both magic and medicine; portrait or vertical orientation was used for *asûtu* and landscape or horizontal orientation was used for *āšipūtu* (Finkel 2000: 146), which conforms to the patterns of the three catalogues AMC, KAR 44, and CTN 4, 71. One grey area is the last of these catalogues (CTN 4, 71) dealing with diagnostic and physiognomic omens, usually associated with the exorcist, but in the catalogue scheme, these omens were considered to be closer to therapeutic prescriptions than incantations, judging by the portrait rather than landscape orientation (following AMC rather than KAR 44). It seems plausible, however, that distinctive disciplines are not to be confused with the professionals who employed them.

49 Including his training as a priest. This information contrasts with the resumé of the exorcist provided in Koch 2015: 20-21, in which she maintains that the '*āšipu* was almost never directly affiliated with a temple, in contrast to the various other officials and "priests", who were responsible for cultic cleansing rituals and the daily cult' (ibid. 20). The fact that the activities of the *āšipu / mašmaššu* are best known in relation to exorcism and magical rituals does not rule out regular activities within the temple, which are clearly enumerated within KAR 44.

50 It is worth noting this same layout in a hemerology dating to the Neo-Assyrian period (Livingstone 2013: 179), with an explanatory statement coming at the end of the obverse attributing the hemerology to the time of Nazimaruttaš, about two centuries earlier than Adad-apla-iddina. See the discussion above.

51 This connection between AMC and CTN 4, 71 was already noted by Frahm (2011: 329 n. 1571).

References

Abusch and Schwemer 2011 = T. Abusch and D. Schwemer, *Corpus of Mesopotamian Anti-Witchcraft Rituals,* Volume One (Leiden/Boston)

Attinger 2008 = P. Attinger, 'La médecine mésopotamienne', *Le Journal des Médecines Cunéiformes* 11/12, 1-96

Badalanova Geller 2010 = F. Badalanova Geller, *2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch. Text and Context* (Max Planck Preprint 410, Berlin)

Biggs 1968 = R. D. Biggs, 'An Esoteric Babylonian Commentary', RA 62, 51-58

Böck 2000 = B. Böck, *Die babylonisch-assyrische Morphoskopie* (Vienna)

Cooper 1978 = J. S. Cooper, *The Return of Ninurta to Nippur* (Rome)

De Zorzi 2014 = N. de Zorzi, *La série teratomantica Šumma izbu* (Padova)

Elman 1975 = Y. Elman, 'Authoritative Oral Tradition in Neo-Assyrian Scribal Circles', JANES 7, 19-32

Finkel 1988 = I. L. Finkel, 'Adad-apla-iddina, Esagil-kīn-apli, and the Series SA.GIG', in: *A Scientific Humanist, Studies in Memory of Abraham Sachs*, ed. E. Leichty, M. de Jong Ellis and P. Gerardi (Philadelphia), 143-159

Finkel 2000 = I. L. Finkel, 'On Late Babylonian Medical Training', in: *Wisdom, Gods, and Literature. Studies in Assyriology in Honour of W. G. Lambert*, ed. A. R. George and I. L. Finkel (Winona Lake), 137-223

Frahm 2011 = E. Frahm, *Babylonian and Assyrian Text Commentaries* (Münster)

Gabbay 2014 = U. Gabbay, *Pacifying the Hearts of the Gods* (Wiesbaden)

Geller 2010 = M. J. Geller, *Ancient Babylonian Medicine, Theory and Practice* (Chichester)

Geller 2016 = M. J. Geller, *Healing Magic and Evil Demons* (Berlin)

George 1992 = A. R. George, *Babylonian Topographical Texts* (Louvain)

Gesche 2001 = P. Gesche, *Schulunterricht in Babylon im ersten Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (Münster)

Heeßel 2010 = N. P. Heeßel, 'Neues von Esagil-kīn-apli: Die ältere Version der physiognomischen Omenserie *alamdimmû*', in: *Assur-Forschungen. Arbeiten aus der Forschungsstelle "Edition literarischer Keilschrifttexte aus Assur" der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften*, ed. S. M. Maul and N. P. Heeßel (Wiesbaden), 139-187

Heeßel 2011 = N. P. Heeßel, '"Sieben Tafeln aus sieben Städten". Überlegungen zum Prozess der Serialisierung von Texten in Babylonien in der zweiten Hälfte des zweiten Jahrtausends v. Chr.', in: *Babylon. Wissenskultur in Orient und Okzident*, ed. E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, M. van Ess and J. Marzahn, Topoi, Berlin Studies of the Ancient World 1 (Berlin/Boston), 171-195

Heeßel 2012 = N. Heeßel, *Divinatorische Texte* II (KAL 5) (Wiesbaden)

Hunger 1968 = H. Hunger, *Babylonische und assyrische Kolophone* (Vienna)

Jouanna 1999 = J. Jouanna, *Hippocrates* (Baltimore)

Koch 2005 = U. Koch, *Secrets of Extispicy.* Alter Orient und Altes Testament 326 (Münster)

Koch 2015 = U. Koch, *Mesopotamian Divination Texts: Conversing with the Gods* (Münster)

Lambert 1957 = W. G. Lambert, 'Ancestors, Authors, and Canonicity', JCS 11, 1-14

Lambert 1962 = W. G. Lambert, 'A Catalogue of Texts and Authors', JCS 16, 59-77

Lambert 2013 = W. G. Lambert, *Babylonian Creation Myths* (Winona Lake)

Leichty 1970 = E. Leichty, *The Omen Series Šumma Izbu* (Locust Valley)

Lenzi 2008 = A. Lenzi, *Secrecy and the Gods* (Helsinki)

Lim 2013 = T. Lim, *The Formation of the Jewish Canon* (New Haven)

Livingstone 1989 = A. Livingstone, *Court Poetry and Literary Miscellanea* (Helsinki)

Livingstone 2013 = A. Livingstone, *Hemerologies of Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars* (Bethesda)

Mayer 1992 = W. Mayer, 'Ein Hymnus auf Ninurta als Helfer in der Not', OrNS 61, 17-57

Parpola 1993 = S. Parpola, *Letters from Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars* (Helsinki)

Rochberg 2010 = F. Rochberg, *In the Path of the Moon* (Leiden/Boston)

Rochberg-Halton 1988 = F. Rochberg-Halton, *Aspects of Bablonian Celestial Divination: The Lunar Eclipse Tablets of Enūma Anu Enlil* (Vienna)

Sanders 2017 = S. Sanders, *From Adapa to Enoch* (Tübingen)

Schramm 2008 = W. Schramm, *Ein Compendium sumerisch-akkadischer Beschwörungen* (Göttingen)

Sokoloff 2002 = M. Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic of the Talmudic and Geonic Periods* (Ramat-Gan/Baltimore)

Stemberger 1982 = H. L. Strack and G. Stemberger, *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrash* (7. Auflage, München)

Stol 2007 = M. Stol, 'Remarks on Some Sumerograms and Akkadian Words', in: *Studies Presented to Robert D. Biggs, June 4, 2004*, ed. M. Roth (Chicago), 233-242

Van der Eijk 2000-01 = P. van der Eijk, *Diocles of Carystus, a Collection of Fragments with Translations and Commentary* (Leiden/Boston/Köln)

Van der Toorn 2007 = K. van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge, MA)

Van Dijk 1983 = J. J. van Dijk, Lugal ud me-lám-bi nir-gál: *le récit épique et didactique des travaux de Ninurta, du deluge et de la nouvelle création* (Leiden)

Veldhuis 2014 = N. Veldhuis, *History of the Cuneiform Lexical Tradition* (Münster)

Von Staden 1989 = H. von Staden, *Herophilus: The Art of Medicine in Early Alexandria* (Cambridge)

Von Staden 1990 = H. von Staden, 'Lexicography in the Third Century B.C.: Bacchius of Tanagra, Erotian, and Hippocrates', in: *Tratados hipocráticos: Estudios acerca de su contenido, forma e influencia. Actas del VII^e Colloque International Hippocratique (Madrid, 24-29 de septiembre de 1990*, ed. J. A. López-Férez (Madrid), 549-569

Wee 2015 = J. Wee, 'Phenomena in Writing. Creating and Interpreting Variants of the Diagnostic Series Sa-gig', in: *In the Wake of the Compendia. Infrastructural Contexts and Licensing of Empiricism in Ancient and Medieval Mesopotamia*, ed. J. Cale Johnson (Berlin/Boston), 247-287

Wittern 1971 = R. Wittern, 'Zum Hippokratesglossar des Erotian καταπηροι im Corpus Hippocraticum', *Sudhoffs Archiv* 55, 76-79