

Catalogues, Texts and Specialists

Some Thoughts on the Assur Medical Catalogue, Mesopotamian Medical Texts and Healing Professions

Abstract: One of the peculiarities of Mesopotamian textual scholarship is the text type of the catalogue, which is attested in a variety of forms and found on cuneiform tablets from the late third to the first millennium BCE. Text catalogues, which basically consist of a list of texts or compositions cited by their title, offer precious insights into technical, practical and theoretical aspects of Mesopotamian scholarly texts. While some text catalogues may represent lists of the holdings of particular tablet collections (“libraries”), catalogues of technical compendia give a chart of the internal structure of long and complex compositions. Such catalogues are thus crucial documents for the reconstruction of the compendia in question and help to fill gaps in the preserved textual record. Moreover, catalogues of technical compendia present clues concerning the formation, development and transmission of compositions that belong to different technical disciplines. Being the only known example for a catalogue that lists serialised compositions of medical therapeutic texts, the Assur Medical Catalogue (AMC) forms a key source for investigating the serialisation of medical compendia in the first millennium BCE.¹ At the same time, AMC raises the simple question what exactly it represents as a catalogue, which inevitably raises the issue of the Mesopotamian healing disciplines and their text corpora, and whose professional expertise the AMC reflects.

This paper aims to tackle these questions, based on a survey of different types of ancient Mesopotamian text catalogues. A comparison of the AMC with two other closely related texts, the catalogue of the “twin” series of diagnostic and physiognomic omens (*Sakikkû* and *Alamdimmû*) and the so-called Exorcist’s Manual (KAR 44 and duplicates), leads to the conclusion that the AMC represents in its core the text corpus of the *asû* “physician”, which was shaped into serialised compendia in the first millennium BCE. On the other hand, the comparison of the three catalogues reveals links as well as differences in their structure and contents, providing an opportunity to reconsider the relationship between the professional domains of the healing specialists *āšipu* “conjurer, exorcist” and *asû* “physician”, and their contributions to the medical text corpora reflected in the AMC.

1 Introduction

In his survey of Mesopotamian text catalogues in the *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*, Krecher (1980: 478) defined “literary” catalogues as “selbständige Verzeichnisse von literarischen Einheiten [i.e., compositions or works] ... bzw. von Teilen einer literarischen Einheit”, applying a broad usage of the term “literature”, since the kinds of texts encountered in Mesopotamian catalogues belong to various genres including myths, hymns, songs, cult laments, lexical lists, omen collections, ritual texts and incantations.²

Within the category “catalogue”, we can generally differentiate a) catalogues listing various compositions belonging to different text types/genres and b) catalogues that register the sections of one specific composition, or a group of

¹ A preliminary version of this contribution is available in Steinert forthcoming.

² Shorter catalogues are sometimes embedded within a text or appended as a separate section to a text of related, but differing content. For example, the so-called Diviner’s Manual (Oppenheim 1974) consists of two catalogues listing the titles of altogether 24 omen tablets (terrestrial and celestial), paired with a set of instructions and explanations how to determine the validity of a given ominous sign, by confirming the exact time on which it occurred. A similar case is the Late Babylonian tablet VAT 7847 + AO 6448 (= TCL 6, 12), which appends a list of tablet incipits and citations (from rituals, omen texts, medical and lexical texts) to a tablet with astronomical-astrological material (including illustrations of constellations, see Weidner 1967: 15-34, esp. 28, Tafel 7-10 and Finkel’s contribution in this volume). Similarly, ritual texts can contain catalogue-like sections listing incantation incipits, sometimes combined with concise “liturgical” instructions (for their ritual performance), see, e.g., the Ritual Tablet of *Šurpu* I rev. (Reiner 1958: 12); Lamaštu III 76-109 (Farber 2014: 137-40); cf. also the ritual instructions to the incantation series *Muššu’u* (Böck 2003; cf. Böck 2007: 70-78).

compositions belonging to one particular text type or genre.³ In the first millennium BCE, concomitant with the development of serialised compendia within the scholarly disciplines of *āšipūtu*, *bārūtu*, *kalūtu* and *asūtu*, catalogues also appear in two specific forms.⁴ These are the **text series catalogues**, which register the “sections” or “tablets” making up one composition (“series”) in a fixed sequence (e.g., catalogues of omen series such as *Enūma Anu Enlil*, *Šumma ālu* or *Sakikkū*), and the **catalogues of a professional corpus**, which list the compositions/text groups used by a specific technical discipline (e.g., the catalogues of texts belonging to *āšipūtu* and *kalūtu*). It is these two types of catalogues that this article will focus on.

If we try to define the purposes or contexts for which text catalogues were drawn up, composed or copied, we can differentiate several, though probably often overlapping uses to be discussed in the following sections: a) catalogues as tablet inventories (drawn up for archival purposes), b) catalogues as technical tools for textual scholarship, c) catalogues as tools in scribal education and specialist training.

2 Tablet Inventories or Registers

In a recent study of the Old Babylonian catalogues of (mostly) Sumerian literary works,⁵ Delnero (2010) argues that these texts are inventories compiled for archival purposes rather than lists of school curricula, as has often been suggested.⁶ Thus, Tinney (1999) proposed on the basis of two Old Babylonian tablets with lists of Sumerian literary compositions, the “Nippur catalogue” and the “Louvre catalogue”, that the elementary scribal curriculum reconstructed by Veldhuis (1997) was followed by a more advanced phase constituted by two sets of literary compositions, which Tinney designated as the Tetrad and the Decad.⁷ One of the catalogues of literary texts, the so-called “Nippur Catalogue” (UM 29-15-155), lists 62 compositions, with the first ten entries corresponding to the compositions of the Decad.⁸

Arguments for the Nippur and Louvre catalogues as lists describing a scribal curriculum are based on the fact that they have a considerable number of entries in common, some of which occur in identical sequence. Moreover, several compositions found at the beginning of the two catalogues are also attested on Type II exercise tablets,⁹ and there are instances of tablets with compositions of the Decad bearing catchlines which reflect the sequence of compositions in the Nippur and Louvre catalogues (Delnero 2010: 34-35; cf. Civil 1976: 145 n. 36). The observation that these catalogues list nearly all of the Sumerian literary texts known today has led to the conclusion that the catalogues give complete lists of the entire corpus of Sumerian literature in the Old Babylonian period, or of compositions regarded by the ancients as “canonical”.¹⁰ However, Delnero’s re-examination of the Old Babylonian literary catalogues throws serious doubt on

3 See also Tinney (1996: 17), distinguishing between lists of “texts to which the ancient scribe attributed the same subscript” and lists embracing “a variety of texts grouped by the native subscript used to refer to them”.

4 For these disciplines embracing the fields of “exorcism”, “medicine”, divination (extispicy) and the profession of the lamentation priest or cult singer, see e.g. Jean 2006; Gabbay 2014: 63-79; Geller 2007a; 2010: 43-88; Lenzi 2015: 146-151; Koch 2015: 15-24 and *passim*.

5 For examples of Old Babylonian catalogues including or consisting of Akkadian texts, see, e.g., AUAM 73.2402 (Cohen 1976: 129-33; ETCSL text 0.2.11); BM 85563 (Shaffer 1993: 209-10; SEAL text 10.1.2); MS 3391 (George 2009: 71-75, pl. 33-6; SEAL text 10.1.1). Cf. BM 59484 (a list of incipits of songs, in Middle Babylonian script; Finkel 1988a; see also SEAL text 10.3.1).

6 Other scholars, such as Wilcke (1976: 41), argued against the designation “literary catalogues” for these documents and preferred to speak of inventories of specific tablet collections.

7 The Tetrad forms a grouping of four hymnic compositions (“Lipit-Eštar B”, “Iddin-Dagan B”, “Enlil-bani A”, “Nisaba hymn A”). The Decad consists of two royal hymns (“Šulgi A”, “Lipit-Ištar A”), followed by “The Song of the Hoe”, “The Exaltation of Inana”, “Enlil in the Ekur”, “The Keš Temple hymn”, “Enki’s Journey to Nibru”, “Inana and Ebih”, “A hymn to Nungal” (Nungal A), and “Gilgameš and Huwawa, Version A”. For a recent discussion of the Decad as a curricular grouping, see also Delnero 2006: 22-147.

8 The same ten entries probably also constitute the beginning of the “Louvre Catalogue” (AO 5393; TCL 15, 28; see Delnero 2010: 33). For a similar interpretation of the Old Babylonian literary compositions found in a Nippur archive in terms of a curricular order, see also Robson 2001: 55-57.

9 These are single-column exercise tablets, divided into sections by horizontal rulings. Type II tablets typically contain short extracts from literary, religious and lexical texts representing the second, advanced stage of the scribal training (see Gesche 2001: 49-52, 172-98; Veldhuis 2013: 169, 171).

10 See especially Vanstiphout (2003: 10-11), who regards the Nippur and Louvre catalogues as lists of an Old Babylonian canon of Sumerian literary texts. For a broader view of the corpus of Old Babylonian Sumerian literary texts transmitted from the Ur III period as a “literary canon”, defining how literature should be written, see Veldhuis 2003: 17-18. Hallo (1991) argues that those texts included in the scribal curriculum could be regarded as a kind of canon, although “classical” may be a better characterisation of the Old Babylonian literary corpus than

their suggested purpose as lists of school curricula. Most importantly, he points out that the text entries encountered in these catalogues are never identical. Each catalogue contains a number of entries not listed in the others; and the sequence of compositions also differs considerably in many instances.¹¹ It is further noteworthy that the Nippur and Louvre catalogues lack a number of compositions that were popular in Old Babylonian times and are known from multiple manuscripts, including the four texts of the Tetrad, which one would expect to be listed together with the Decad, if the catalogues reflected the order in which they were taught in the scribal curriculum.

Almost all of the entries in the Old Babylonian text catalogues pertain to two groups of texts. They either present the incipits of various literary texts (e.g., hymns to deities, rulers, temples, narrative texts, dialogues, debate poems – texts copied as part of the scribal curriculum), or they list incipits of liturgical texts recited in a cultic setting (Emesal compositions such as Balaḡs and Eršemmas, only rarely copied on exercise tablets). Occasionally, catalogues consist of texts from both groups.¹² In addition, there are instances of catalogues registering literary and lexical works, as well as two catalogues of incantations (Delnero 2010: “I1” = JRL, Box 24, E 5 and 25; Wilcke 1973: 14-15; ETCSL no. 0.2.11) and of letters purportedly written by local rulers (AUWE 23, 112; van Dijk 1989: 441-46; Cavigneaux 1996: 57-59; Delnero 2010: 42-43 “Uk1”).¹³

The text incipits in the Old Babylonian catalogues are grouped and listed according to recurring ordering principles (Delnero 2010: 44-49), which also feature in text catalogues from later periods. Some incipits can be preceded or followed by separate **rubrics** identifying internal groupings of texts (e.g., by naming the genre of the compositions listed, or by giving a **subtotal** of incipits/compositions registered in the previous lines). In other cases, text incipits are grouped together because they are associated through a common theme or subject, or because the compositions begin with the same sign or sign group. Furthermore, groups of incipits can also be set apart from each other by **horizontal rulings**.¹⁴

A few clues point to the function of the Old Babylonian literary catalogues as inventories of tablet collections. Thus, some of the documents contain explicit references to the location of groups of tablets indicated by listed incipits. For instance, in UET 5, 86 (ETCSL no. 0.2.03; Delnero 2010: 47 “U1”), we find the note “(located) in the lower/upper (reed) basket” (ša^{si} pisan murub₄ šaplûm/elûm) after the eleventh and twenty-third incipit, referring to different storage containers that contained the tablets with the listed compositions.

Sometimes, the incipits refer to multiple compositions on collective tablets, which are stored together. BM 23771 (Kramer 1975: 141-52; Delnero 2010: 47 “B2”, a catalogue of Eršemma laments) features subtotals of compositions followed by the rubric ša 1 dub “(so-and-so many compositions) on a single tablet”, which reoccurs throughout the list. BM 23771 is thus an inventory of tablets and their contents.¹⁵ Another hint to the inventory function of the Old Babylo-

“canonical”. For the notion of “canonisation” in connection with the development of technical compendia throughout the second and first millennium BCE, cf. below.

¹¹ Note also that in the catalogues containing them, the compositions of the Decad are listed in partially diverging order or in incomplete sequences, with the exception of the Nippur and Louvre catalogues (Delnero 2010: 51).

¹² Delnero 2010: 41-44 and Table 1. For catalogues of Emesal prayers, see also Gabbay 2007: esp. 87-88; Gadotti and Kleinerman 2011: 72-77; Peterson 2010: 169-76; Löhnert 2009: 13-17.

¹³ Cf. also an Ur-III period catalogue listing only royal hymns (en₈-du lugal “royal songs”, Hallo 1963: 168; 1975: 77; ETCSL no. 0.1.2; Tinney 1996: 18). This tablet closes with the subscript pàd-da Niġ-ú-rum “(tablets/texts) found/retrieved by Niġurum”, possibly designating the person responsible for drawing up the document. A second Ur-III text known in two sources (HS 1360 = TMH NF 3, 55; Ni 1905) has recently been interpreted as a “liturgical text outlining a ritual procedure” (Richardson 2006: 7) rather than a catalogue of literary works (cf. Kramer 1961; van Dijk and Geller 2003: 4; ETCSL no. 0.1.1; Wilcke 1976: 42; Delnero 2010: 40-41). The tablet contains four sections of incantation incipits, which together form one “collection/series” (gîr-ġen-na, see Michalowski 2006: 249 n. 7; differently Richardson 2006: 5-7, translating it as “ritual procedure”). In this text, the expression dub-saġ-ta “(from the tablet (of) incipits)” heading the first two sections indicates that the following entries are “incipits” of incantations, which may formerly have been inscribed on separate tablets. While the first two sections of HS 1360 are summed up as texts which are ša pú-dili-kam “in one source” (i.e., collected on one tablet?), line 19 states that the third section of the collection could not be found (gîr-ġen-na-bi lú nu-da-pà), which reminds us of similar statements in tablet inventories (cf. below). For gîr-ġen-na as a term for “list” or “catalogue” see also Klein and Sefati 2014: 89 n. 30.

¹⁴ Not all Old Babylonian catalogues make use of these features, however.

¹⁵ Cf. further BM 85563 (Shaffer 1993), which registers tablets (dub and im-ġid-da) with cult songs designated by their incipit, where one composition takes up between one and eight tablets. In comparison, CBS 8086 (Michalowski 1980) enumerates the opening lines of different sections of Balaḡ songs as well as incipits of whole compositions. The entries probably have to be understood as an inventory of tablets, although this is not specified explicitly through numbers or designations such as dub or im-ġid-da. Cf. Peterson 2010 for another similar Old Babylonian inventory.

nian catalogues can be gleaned from the size and shape of the tablets: they are small (not larger than 10 cm x 5 cm) and in some cases cylinder-shaped, which points to their use as tags for tablet containers.¹⁶ This interpretation is underscored by examples of similar tags from later periods, which were inscribed with titles of compositions and placed on the shelves that contained the tablets.¹⁷

Although Old Babylonian catalogues such as the Nippur and Louvre catalogues list compositions that were regularly copied as scribal exercises, they probably did not serve primarily as curricular lists outlining a sequence of texts to be studied by scribal apprentices, but as practical inventories registering tablets and their contents, as stored in tablet collections. This is reflected foremost of all by their non-uniform character. However, a Late Babylonian school tablet from Babylon illustrates that catalogues (incipit lists of compositions) could play a role in scribal education. The tablet CTMMA 2, 65 (Gesche 2005; Veldhuis 2013) contains on its obverse the opening lines of lexical works, listed in the order of the constituent series tablets as well as according to their sequence in the curriculum. The list presents “a complete overview of the lexical corpus of the time” (Veldhuis 2013: 169). The tablet’s reverse contains a colophon phrased as a dedicatory prayer to a manifestation of the scribal god Nabû (*Nabû ša nikkassi* “Nabû-of-accounting”). Such prayers are a typical feature of a group of students’ tablets from first millennium BCE Babylonia dedicated to temples as votives, written on so-called Type 1 exercise tablets, which usually contain excerpted lines from lexical lists and are associated with the first stage of scribal education.¹⁸

An elaborate catalogue of hymnic compositions and songs dating to the late second millennium BCE is KAR 158 from Assur, found with a group of tablets that formed part of an archive belonging to the Aššur temple.¹⁹ The text contained ca. 400 incipits of Sumerian and Akkadian songs (including much love poetry) from the Old Babylonian and post-Old Babylonian period, many of which were probably used in a cultic setting. The catalogue entries are grouped at regular intervals, through the insertion of summary lines in which sub-totals of incipits are counted and classified. The songs in KAR 158 are grouped primarily according to musical categories: the obverse contains sections with incipits of *zamāru* “songs”, divided into *iškārātu* “sections” (Limet 1996; Groneberg 2003: 60-71). Thus, a group of incipits is regularly summed up in a ruled-off rubric as “so-and-so-many *iškārātu* (consisting of) so-and-so-many songs”, and further classified by musical, technical, thematic, geographical or “ethnic” specifications. Sometimes, groups of songs are additionally designated as belonging to a “series” or “cycle” (GIŠ.GĀR) indicated by title.²⁰ A number of the summary sections contain the verbal phrase *amnu* “I have counted/enumerated”, followed by the formula “May Ea order life for you!” (*Ea balātka liqbi*), which forms a unique feature of this catalogue. The last column on the reverse, however, presents a table recapitulating all the preceding rubrics (i.e., sub-totals of compositions) registered in col. i–vii.²¹

16 For tags and library labels, see, e.g., van Dijk 1972: 339 n. 3; Delnero 2010: 48; Michalowski 1980: 268. From the Old Babylonian period, five catalogues listing tablets with Balaḡ compositions or similar cult songs have been identified as labels: BM 23612, BM 23249, BM 85564, Museum Haaretz 143860 (Shaffer 2000: no. 1-4 and fig. 6-7; previously Kramer 1982; Michalowski 1980: 268; cf. Delnero 2010: 42, 48 B5-B7) and BM 85563 (Shaffer 1993; Groneberg 2003: 56). Another Old Babylonian catalogue of Eršemmas (BM 23701) is shaped in the form of a small five-sided prism (Kramer 1975: 142, 152-157; Delnero 2010: 41 B3). Photos of these objects can also be found online, in the Research Database of the British Museum.

17 For shelf labels from Hattuša, see Karasu 1996: 55-59; Gordin 2008: 21. From the first millennium BCE stem examples of lozenge-shaped labels. K. 1400 is inscribed with DIŠ URU ina SUKUD GAR-in / liq-ta-a-te “If a City is set on a Height; excerpts” (Freedman 1998: 5 n. 6; CDLI: P393892). Similarly, K. 1539 (CDLI: P393909) bears the title of *Enūma Anu Enlil* followed by *liqtāte*. Note further BM 57373 (CT 55, 411), an inventory of writing boards, similar to a docket. Possibly BAM 310, a very small tablet from Assur, had a similar purpose. It registers a commentary on the diagnostic omen series (*maš’alāte ša SA.GIG*) and a *mukallimtu*-commentary on the mythological text Lugal-e, followed by an “egertu-tablet with 37 stones” and the incantation incipit *šūhī uqnū* “My laughter is lapis lazuli” (cf. Schuster-Brandis 2008: 344 Text 13 line 17; Stadholders 2013: 305 Text 4).

18 For Type I exercise tablets, see the detailed study of Gesche 2001: 44-49; 61-171; for students’ tablets with dedications, see also Cavigneaux 1999; George 2010; Veldhuis 2013: 173-174 with further literature.

19 For the archival context, see Pedersén 1985: 31-38; 1986: 12-19, with 21 N1 (26). The text was edited by Ebeling (1922) and is now accessible via the SEAL website, text 10.3.2. Hecker (2013) offers a German translation. For discussions, see Black 1983: 25-29; Limet 1996; Groneberg 2003; Nissinen 2001: 111-113; Klein and Sefati 2008: 619-622; for a detailed study of the song categories/genres in KAR 158 and their connection to performance practices, see Shehata 2009.

20 E.g. ii 46; cf. Worthington 2010: 395. In some cases, the summaries begin with ŠU.NĪGIN “a total (of n compositions/songs of a specific kind)”. In others, a group of compositions is summed up in both ways (by reference to a “series” and by a total (e.g., iii 28-30 and 31)). Occasionally, a sum total is provided for several groups of compositions (see, e.g., ii 48).

21 See also Limet 1996: 152 with n. 2; Pedersén 1985: 35; 1986: 21 N1 (26). Col. viii has both horizontal and vertical rulings.

Although we cannot be certain about its exact purpose (a colophon or opening line at the beginning of the tablet is unfortunately not preserved), the main interest of KAR 158 seems to lie in registering concrete numbers of compositions/songs in specific categories, some of which form “series”. In this respect, the tablet with four columns of text on each side evokes the impression of being the main register to a large text collection.²² Possibly, KAR 158 was drawn up on a specific occasion, with the purpose of presenting a contents list of all the song compositions assembled in a tablet collection, registered by type rather than by numbered tablets.

Likewise from the second half of the second millennium BCE stem a group of about 60 tablets and fragments containing catalogues or shelf lists, which mostly originate from buildings on the acropolis Büyükkale at the Hittite capital Hattuša. Most of the shelf lists date to the Late Empire Period and are of varying format (from small one-column tablets with just a few entries up to three-column tablets). They have been described as stocktaking lists or inventories of tablets in different archives. These lists record one or several of the following details for each entry in the catalogues: the title of the composition (usually by incipit), the author of the text (if applicable), the number of tablets in a given series; the physical disposition of the tablet (e.g., shape, state of preservation) and whether the composition available on the shelf is complete.²³ Judging from the contents of these shelf lists and the preserved textual material from Hattuša, it seems that these catalogues do not represent complete lists of the whole of a library or of several tablet collections, but partial inventories for specific sections of tablet collections (Dardano 2006: 7-8, 11-12). This is indicated by the fact that the majority of the catalogue entries record rituals and genres such as oracles, medical texts and some political documents, while other text genres are not included (e.g., lexical texts, laws, annals and instructions). In addition, the catalogues provide information on the availability and actual presence (complete or incomplete) of the tablets constituting the recorded compositions within the archive.²⁴ Furthermore, the compositions recorded in the shelf lists are types of texts of which multiple copies are preserved, i.e., texts that were re-copied or re-edited over time. Thus, Gordin (2015: 117) speculates that certain shelf lists could be “inventories of tablets removed from specific collections”, which were replaced by a new edition of the compositions in question or moved from one scribal supervisor to another.²⁵

The shelf lists from Hattuša throw interesting light on differences to the Mesopotamian tablet inventories, namely that the latter texts usually provide much sparser information on authorship and on the completeness of the recorded texts in the collection. Thus, only a few catalogues from first millennium BCE Mesopotamia attribute texts to individual authors (Lambert 1957; 1962; Lenzi 2008a: 100-101, 119-120; 2008b).

Comments referring to the availability of texts or remarks about lost or lacking tablets are likewise relatively rare in Mesopotamian catalogues, but not entirely a late phenomenon.²⁶ The occurrence of such comments in the form of marginal notations in first millennium BCE catalogues points to their continued practical use as inventories. Although most examples with such marginal notations are attested for catalogues of ritual or incantation compendia, there is also one fragmentary catalogue from Nineveh with the incipits of the omen series *Šumma ālu* (K. 9094b; Freedman 1998: 324-325), which marks some catalogue entries with numbers (either “one” or “two”).

Two Neo-Assyrian catalogues with marginal notations stem from the library N4 at Assur (so-called “Haus des Beschwörungspriesters”). One of them (VAT 13723+) contains a fragmentary catalogue, which lists tablet incipits of ritual/incantation series, such as *Šurpu*, *Maqlû*, *Muššu’u*, *Utukkû lemnûtu* (Udug-hul), *Asakkû maršûtu* (Asag-gig-ga), *Lamaštu*, *Mis pî* and Namburbi texts as well as a number of other incantation incipits and text rubrics, many of which are known from the Exorcist’s Manual and from ritual texts (Geller 2000: 226-234).²⁷ The catalogue could have been used as an inventory, because at the margin of several lines in columns ii and iv, short notations occur which probably indicate the number of copies of the same tablet available in a collection, one, two, three or none (NU). The interpre-

²² Groneberg (2003: 69) suggests that the person who drew up the catalogue was a musical performer and belonged either to a temple or the palace.

²³ See Hoffner 2002; van den Hout 2002: 860-862; Dardano 2006; Gordin 2008: 21; 2015: 115-120.

²⁴ There are, for instance, repeated references to missing tablets that could not be found, see Dardano 2006: 8 and *passim*.

²⁵ Further underlining their practical function, Christiansen (2008: 306-307) notes the possibility that the shelf lists were drawn up in connection with specific events and tasks, and represent texts that had to be relocated or rewritten, e.g., for the performance of cultic events.

²⁶ Such statements occur already in Ur-III period catalogues (see above n. 13). In a remarkable Old Babylonian document formulated as a message, the anonymous sender lists incipits of Balağ compositions, stating that these are the compositions in his collection and requests from the recipient to send him “those that I do not have” (Gadotti and Kleinerman 2011: 73: 8-9).

²⁷ See also Pedersén 1986: 66 (291); Böck 2007: 65-66.

tation of VAT 13723+ as an inventory could explain why the incipits or constituent tablets for some of the series are not registered in their entirety – the compiler may have listed textual material available in one or multiple archives.²⁸

In a second catalogue from the Assur library N4, which contains a list of incantations of the genre ŠĀ.ZI.GA (LKA 94), some entries are preceded by NU (Biggs 1967: 11-16 col. ii 9-12; Pedersén 1986: 65 (236)).²⁹ Although the rubric at the end of col. iii calls the listed incipits “incantations” (ÉN TU₆.MEŠ) for ŠĀ.ZI.GA (“sexual arousal”), the catalogue does not only contain incantations, but also a few incipits which indicate therapeutic instructions, beginning with DIŠ NA (“If a man (...)”), with a purpose statement, or with the names of *materia medica* (stones). This could imply that LKA 94 gives an overview of a collection of ŠĀ.ZI.GA material in the form of a contents list that enumerates the incipits of text sections on multiple tablets. Most of the tablets not marked by NU seem to have been available to the compiler.³⁰ Biggs (1967: 11) suggested that the two ruled-off sections making up the list could mark older compositions and younger material added by a second compiler.

Maul (1994: 191-195) compared the ŠĀ.ZI.GA catalogue with a catalogue of NAM.BŪR.BI rituals from Uruk (SpTU 1, 6), which likewise consists of two ruled-off parts and contains entries preceded by NU. Maul proposed that both catalogues reflect a compilation of two inventories of existing texts in multiple collections, which the compiler had drawn up and compared with the texts available or known to him.³¹ In his analysis of the NAM.BŪR.BI catalogues from Ashurbanipal’s library at Nineveh, Maul (1994: 196–203) identified two copies of a list of NAM.BŪR.BI rituals.³² The exact purpose of the catalogue remains elusive, although it is clear that it does not register the complete corpus of NAM.BŪR.BI rituals in Ashurbanipal’s library, since the ritual series compiled at Nineveh was considerably longer. In contrast to series or corpus catalogues discussed in the next sections, the Nineveh NAM.BŪR.BI catalogue lacks a heading, and a colophon is not preserved. Further, it is unlikely that the catalogue presents the contents of the NAM.BŪR.BI series created by Ashurbanipal’s scholars, since the order of NAM.BŪR.BI tablets known from incipits and catchlines does not seem to be identical with the order of entries in the catalogue. The Nineveh NAM.BŪR.BI catalogue also does not assign tablet numbers to individual entries as do other series catalogues. Maul speculates whether the Nineveh catalogue could present a combination of several partial lists registering *corpora* and tablets that were integrated into the royal library (e.g., from Babylonia), similar to the “library records” (cf. below). More likely in my view, however, is Maul’s suggestion that the Nineveh NAM.BŪR.BI catalogue represents a preliminary stage to a series of rituals created at Nineveh. The NAM.BŪR.BI catalogues also reflect the fact that NAM.BŪR.BI rituals never developed into a standard (“canonical”) sequence accepted and transmitted at different places.³³ Thus, the sequence of rituals known from tablets and catchlines from Assur (library N4) does not correspond with that of the tablets in Babylonian script from Nineveh or with that of the Nineveh NAM.BŪR.BI catalogue. Neither was the NAM.BŪR.BI series created by Ashurbanipal’s scholars transmitted into later periods.³⁴

²⁸ This also fits in well with the observation that “it is rare to find complete sets of longer works in any collection” (Robson 2011: 570). Note that one fragment probably belonging to the same tablet may contain a passage similar to the editorial note (“Esagil-kin-apli colophon”) in the catalogue of the series *Sakikkū* and *Alamdimmū* (Geller 2000: 232), but this reading is contested (see Frahm forthcoming). In his article, Geller edited and discussed a few similar first millennium catalogues from Nippur, Sippar and Nineveh (Geller 2000: 234-242 Texts B, C and D), of which B contains incipits of incantations from the series *Muššu’u* (corresponding to a serial order) as well as incipits of fire incantations (see also Böck 2007: 66-67), while C (from Sippar) represents a multi-column tablet similar to VAT 13723+ enumerating incantation incipits from multiple series in sequences most likely corresponding to actual tablets in a collection.

²⁹ It is interesting that all entries marked by the sign NU indicate therapeutic material, which is found at the end of the first part of the catalogue.

³⁰ Only a small part of the catalogue entries has been identified to date in preserved tablets. The catalogue fits in with the impression that ŠĀ.ZI.GA incantations and rituals were never brought into a standard sequence. Cf. below for two sections in the Assur Medical Catalogue, which register therapeutic material related to ŠĀ.ZI.GA.

³¹ This view is supported by the fact that NAM.BŪR.BI rituals concerned with a common topic (e.g., snakes) were not registered in one continuous sequence, but in two groups separated by entries concerned with a different topic (Maul 1994: 192, SpTU 1, 6: 1’-2’, 5’-6’).

³² Mss. A₁ (K. 2389 + 10664) (+) A₂ (Rm. 2, 178) and ms. B (K. 3277). The first manuscript (K. 2389+) contained about 80 entries corresponding to the incipits of separate tablets. Ms. B (K. 3277) forms a fragment duplicating part of ms. A.

³³ The Nineveh and Uruk catalogues only share a few entries, and present two completely different sequences. The Nineveh catalogue follows a certain thematic arrangement of contents, e.g., with a section grouping ominous occurrences involving animals (lines 7’-15’), a group involving ominous occurrences in the bedroom (lines 1-2) or a group concerned with occurrences in connection with the practice of extispicy (lines 17-18), although the thematic groupings of rituals are not entirely consistent (Maul 1994: 196).

³⁴ Evidence from the Late Babylonian period is sparse, but the existence of a *pīrsu*-series of NAM.BŪR.BI rituals at Uruk is indicated by the colophon of SpTU 2, 18, designated as the first *pīrsu* of a compilation whose title is identical with the incipit of this tablet (Maul 1994: 203).

The marginal notations about the non-availability of textual sources encountered in catalogues of incantations and rituals can further be compared with the Nineveh catalogue of Emesal prayers (Balaḡs, Eršemmas and Šuilas to different deities), which according to its colophon forms “the tablet of checked incipits of the *corpus* of the lamentation priest’s craft (*kalûtu*), which were available” (K. 2529+ rev. iv 30: DUB SAG.MEŠ ÉŠ.GĀR NAM.GALA IGI.LĀ.MEŠ šá ina ŠU^{II} šu-šu-u). The colophon continues with the remark that “many (compositions/incipits) could not be traced and were therefore not added (to the list)” (rev. iv 31–32 [ma]-ṛ a’ ʾ-du-tum ul am-ru ina lib-bi la ru-ud-du-u).³⁵ Although the catalogue does not register the complete corpus of all Emesal compositions in existence at the time, it nonetheless reflects the attempt of a compiler, aware of an already established sequence of compositions, to record the compositions what were available to him based on this standard order.³⁶

Other catalogues of compositions reflect compilations of textual material drawn up for other purposes than to provide a tablet inventory. Thus, K. 2832 + 6680 forms a fragment of a two-column tablet listing the incipits of prayers that could be used in different ritual settings. The list is headed by the titles of the rituals *Bīt rimki*, *Bīt salā’ mē* and *im-babbar im-dadag-ga* (col. i 1–3), followed in col. i by a list of Marduk prayers, while the beginning of col. ii preserves incipits of prayers to Šamaš. The purpose of this list may have been to catalogue prayers (for use in different contexts) according to addressed deity, rather than providing an inventory of tablets in a collection or outlining the order of prayers in the ritual series enumerated at the beginning of the tablet.³⁷

One last text group to be mentioned in the present context are the so-called “library records” from Nineveh, which document Ashurbanipal’s efforts of collecting scholarly tablets for his royal library.³⁸ These tablets do not constitute library inventories, but administrative lists documenting the transfer of tablets especially from Babylonia to Nineveh during Ashurbanipal’s reign. The library records list tablets and writing-boards “in the process of accession into the royal collections” (Frame and George 2005: 278), and the largest numbers of tablets listed refer to scholarly texts pertaining to exorcist’s lore (*āšipūtu*), astrological omens (*Enūma Anu Enlil*), teratological and terrestrial omens (*Šumma izbu*, *Šumma ālu*), medical recipes (*bulṭū*), dream omens and extispicy (*bārūtu*).³⁹ The incoming tablets were recorded in groups specified as having been provided by named individuals, some of which come from Babylonian cities.⁴⁰

3 Text Series Catalogues

The second type of catalogue is attested only in the first millennium BCE, since it reflects the formation of “standard”, serialised compositions, which are witnessed in texts from the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian period onwards.⁴¹ These catalogues provide a fixed sequence of tablets forming one composition and are primarily known for long compendia associated with the disciplines of *āšipūtu* and *bārūtu*. They are attested for omen texts, in particular for those

The creation of a series entitled NAM.BŪR.BI.MEŠ at Nineveh is implied by a few tablet colophons (Maul 1994: 216–21), which assign a number to the respective tablet. The highest number known to date (the 135th Tablet) is found in the colophon of K. 3464 + 3554 (Maul 1994: 216 n. 433). So far, only tablets 9, 122, 123 and 135 of this series have been identified through a colophon on tablets from Nineveh (Maul 1994: 217–221).

³⁵ Black 1987: 33–35; Gabbay 2014: 233–234 with n. 46; 2015: 15–20 and pl. 29–30; note also the comment NU IGI “not seen” (i.e., could not be traced) in obv. ii 31.

³⁶ Cf. Black 1987: 35–36; Gabbay 2014: 234. See also Maul (1994: 191 n. 298), who argues that the *kalûtu* catalogue is not an *ad hoc* tablet inventory, because it reflects an already “canonised” corpus of texts. The sequence of compositions in this Nineveh catalogue for the most part corresponds to the sequence found in catchlines of tablets with Balaḡs and Eršemmas from Nineveh (also tablets from Sultantepe and Ur follow this order), see Gabbay 2007: 89; 2014: 201–202; 2015: 2 *passim*. For additional fragments of other Nineveh catalogues concerning tablets with Emesal prayers, see Maul 1988: Kat. n. 1–8 (Eršahungas); Gabbay 2015: 15 mss. B and C (Eršemmas).

³⁷ See Mayer 1976: 399 and 421; Oshima 2011: 12, 111, 115–116, 125, 328–329, 337, 345 (photo of the obv.), 383, 397; CDLI: P394707.

³⁸ Lambert 1976; 1989: 95–96, 98; 1992: 95–96; Parpola 1983a; SAA 7, 49–56; Frame and George 2005: 277–278.

³⁹ For an overview of the text types, see Parpola 1983a: 5.

⁴⁰ See, e.g., SAA 7, 49 ii 16’–17’, iii 4’ (tablets of Aplaya and Arrabu, exorcists from Nippur), 50 ii 7’–8’ (tablet of Mušēzib-Nabû, royal scribe from Babylon), 51 ii 3’ (tablets from Bīt Ibā).

⁴¹ For the history of divinatory texts, Koch (2015: 63–64) describes the 17th–13th century BCE as the period of serialisation (with the development of serialised texts similar in content to first millennium texts), while she designates the 13th–9th century BCE as the period of standardisation, during which the creation of standard series took place. However, for some texts, multiple variant recensions are attested throughout the first millennium BCE, despite the development of relatively stable compositions with only minor variants within the same recension (cf. below).

with the highest numbers of constituent tablets: the series of astrological omens (*Enūma Anu Enlil*, ca. 70 tablets), terrestrial omens (*Šumma ālu*, 120+ tablets), extispicy (*Bārūtu*, 100 tablets) and the series of diagnostic and physiognomic omens (*Sakikkū*, 40 tablets and *Alamdimmū*, ca. 25 tablets).

In the cuneiform sources, the “standard” compendia of the first millennium BCE are sometimes designated as *iškāru* (ĒŠ. GĀR) “assignment”, which Assyriologists often translate as “series”.⁴² The meanings of *iškāru* as a term to classify texts can be delimited as “composition” (“literary work”) or “collection” (of texts, compositions).⁴³ In letters of scholars to the Neo-Assyrian kings, as well as in catalogues and rubrics of scholarly tablets, texts belonging to an *iškāru* are distinguished from “outsider, additional” texts (*ahû*) and from texts marked as “oral” traditions (*ša pī ummāni* “from the mouth of a scholar”).⁴⁴ Occasionally, the ancient scholars attribute a special status to texts designated as *iškāru*, although *ahû*-material and oral traditions likewise constituted important sources for scholarly study.⁴⁵ *Ahû*-material (groups of entries, tablets or whole compendia) is predominantly attested or mentioned for divinatory texts (*Enūma Anu Enlil*,⁴⁶ *Šumma ālu*,⁴⁷ *Iqqur ipuš*,⁴⁸

⁴² The terms ĒŠ-gār (also GĪŠ-gār) and *iškāru* originally referred to an assigned task to be performed, as well as to materials supplied for craftsmen and to the finished products of their labour (CAD I/J, 244-249). Because the first millennium compendia and series are relatively consistent, they are often designated as “canonical” or “standard” compositions, even though such characterisations are partially problematic. For discussions of “canonicity”, see Lambert 1957; Rochberg-Halton 1984, 1987; Rochberg 2016; Lieberman 1990; Hallo 1991; Böck 2000: 20-23; Veldhuis 1998: 79-80, 2003; Frahm 2011: 317-328 and Frahm forthcoming; Robson 2011: 571-572; Worthington 2010; Koch 2015: 52-54 as well as Rochberg’s contribution in this volume. While textual criteria (such as form, content, degree of standardisation) are often used to define canonicity, the criterium of the authority inherent in the texts has steadily gained momentum. Thus, the continued use of texts and their valuation in the eyes of scribal and scholarly communities, as well as the importance of certain texts in constituting the identity of certain disciplines and groups of specialists, is emphasised over the criterium of textual stability, since the text corpora of the first millennium BCE were not entirely fixed and closed. For the historical context of the processes of serialisation and standardisation, especially with regard to the omen compendia, cf. Heeßel 2011; Koch 2015: 59-66.

⁴³ See CAD I/J 249 sub 6; Worthington 2010. The use of *iškāru* for a collection of compositions with a title as well as for units (sections) within such collections is already attested in the Old Babylonian period (Worthington 2010: 395) and in the Middle Assyrian catalogue of songs KAR 158 (see above). This usage is also found in the colophon of a Middle Assyrian medical fragment from Assur (BAM 36), which contained a “collection on the [sick] lungs” (rev. 5’: GĪŠ.GĀR MUR.MEŠ [GIG.MEŠ], Köcher 1963: xvii; Hunger 1968: no. 242). In the first millennium, the designation of literary compositions as “series” with genuine titles is attested for epics (e.g., *iškār Gilgameš* and *iškār Etana* in a Nineveh “library record”, in a list of texts and authors, and in colophons (Lambert 1962: 66 K. 9717+ rev. 10-11; 1976: 314 K. 13684+ 4-5; George 2003: 736-741)), wisdom literature (e.g., *iškār alpi u sīsē* “series of Ox and Horse”, *iškār šēlebi* “series of the Fox”, Lambert 1962: 66 K. 9717+, Sm. 669 rev. 12-14; Lambert 1960: 151, 164, 175, 186), lexical lists (SAA 7, 51 ii 7’; Lambert 1976: 314 K. 14067+ 18), omen compendia (e.g., *iškār Ziqīqu*, Lambert 1976: 314 K. 14067: 20), and rituals (e.g., SAA 10, 261: 3-4 ĒŠ.GĀR *šur[pu]*); cf. Krecher 1980: §4.

⁴⁴ Cf. Frahm 2011: 45 and *passim* for the close links of the first millennium commentary literature to oral tradition (textual material stemming, e.g., from scholarly discussions and explanations); cf. also Elman 1975. However, the label *ša pī ummāni* “from the mouth of a scholar” is occasionally also attached to text sections with medical recipes (Steinert 2015: 126-127). Moreover, the phrase *ša pī* is an expression to indicate the authorship of a text, see Lambert 1957; for the notion of “authorship” in Mesopotamia, cf. Lenzi 2015: 151-153 with further literature.

⁴⁵ See, e.g., Rochberg-Halton 1984; 1987; Koch 2015: 35, 53-54 *passim*. For the contrast between *iškāru* and *ahû* in letters, see, e.g., SAA 10, 8 rev. 8; SAA 10, 101 obv. 1-rev. 6; cf. also the contrast between “good” (SIG₇) tablets and *ahû*-tablets of rituals in SAA 10, 245 rev. 14 and 240: 25. Sometimes, the terms *iškāru* and *ahû* are not mutually exclusive, since a library record from Nineveh mentions an *iškār ahûti* “series of extraneous material” of astrological omens (*Enūma Anu Enlil*; Lambert 1976: 314 K. 14067: 11). The Assur catalogue of the series *Enūma Anu Enlil*, which includes a list of incipits for “29 tablets of *ahû*-material”, underscores this point (Weidner 1941-44: 185 col. ii 5; Rochberg-Halton 1987: 329-330; Fincke 2001: 24-25, 34-35 and Rochberg in this volume). Texts identified as *ahû* can also become organised in “series”. Basically, *ahû* implies textual material not included in the standard recensions of certain compositions, and there can be close links as well as differences between both types of material. Lieberman (1990: 308) thus suggested that *ahû* has the sense of “appendix” or “excursus” (to the standard text). Robson (2011: 572) suggests that the contrast between *iškāru* and *ahû* does not involve judgements concerning canonicity vs. non-canonicity, but that *iškāru* denoted material from a series that was known to a scholarly community, while *ahû* represents parallel textual traditions that were still new to them. See also Rochberg’s discussion in this volume.

⁴⁶ See the references in the previous footnote. An identification of extraneous material for astrological omens is also encountered in tablet colophons (e.g., SpTU 5, 261 rev. 25-26: [n M]U.DIDL BAR.MEŠ DIŠ UD AN “EN.LÍL.L[Ā] / [šā ŠĀ Ē]Š.GĀR NU *šaṭ-ru* “n extraneous entries of *Enūma Anu Enlil*, which are not written down in the (standard) series”.

⁴⁷ Only very few manuscripts of terrestrial omens contain explicit identifications of the material as extraneous, see K. 217+ (Boissier 1894-99: 105: 39; CDLI: P393792), a collection of omens on dogs and bitches, excerpted from various sources, with a section identified as “17 extraneous entries from If a city is set on a height” (17 MU.MEŠ BAR.MEŠ *šūt* DIŠ URU *ina* SUKUD GAR-in). See further SpTU 2, 32-34 and SpTU 3, 97; Koch 2015: 256.

⁴⁸ A library record from Nineveh registers the series, extraneous (tablets) and commentaries (Lambert 1976: 314 Rm. 150: 13-14: DIŠ *iqqur ipuš* *adi* BAR.MEŠ *šātu mukallimtu*).

Alamdimmû,⁴⁹ *Šumma izbu*⁵⁰) and to a lesser degree for other genres such as rituals⁵¹ or Emesal prayers⁵². The existence of medical texts technically defined as *ahû* “extraneous” has yet to be confirmed, and it is possible that the contrast between texts belonging to a fixed “standard” series (*iškāru*) and texts collected separately was not as important as in other text corpora.⁵³

On a technical level, *iškāru* entails the notion of a composition organised into a sequence of “sections” or “tablets”, connected to the original meaning of the term as (work) assignments (performed one after another). Especially the long technical compendia were often divided into sections or sub-series, as for instance *Sakikkû*, *Enūma Anu Enlil* and the *Bārûtu* series. This division can be witnessed in the respective series catalogues, which reflect such an arrangement. Furthermore, series catalogues and colophons often assign numbers to the tablets of a series, according to their position in the section rather than according to their position in the series as a whole. The organisation of serialised compendia into sub-series is linked to the term *sadīru* “section; chapter”.⁵⁴ In a few instances, the word seems to refer to the ruled-off sections on a tablet.⁵⁵ But in the *Sakikkû* Catalogue and in AMC, the word *sadīru* describes the arrangement of a series into sections made up of several tablets, which are organised in a fixed sequence. In this context, we find the expression *sadīrū ša zarâ*(SUR.GIBIL) *šabtû* “sections which have been edited”, referring to the creation of a serial arrangement (cf. discussion below).

49 A few *ahû* texts of *Alamdimmû* are known (Böck 2000: 21, 262-279). One Babylonian manuscript with the same incipit as Tablet 1 of the standard series, describes the contents as “[a total of n entries] from *Alamdimmû* (pertaining to the) right and left (side), extracted from extraneous collections” (TBP 64 rev. 6’ [ŠU.NIGIN x+]1 MU.MEŠ *alamdimmû* 15 u 150 TA ŠĀ *liqtī* BAR.MEŠ ZI-*ha*), Böck 2000: 262). There was also an excerpt series of *ahû* omens of *Alamdimmû* written on oblong tablets (Böck 2000: 280-291, see for the colophons *ibid.* 282: 21 (TBP 23); 286: 33 (TBP 24); cf. 290: 30 (TBP 25)). A library record mentions “37 tablets of the series *Alamdimmû* together with (*adi*) extraneous (tablets and the series) *Nigdimdimmû* and *Kataduggû*” (SAA 7, 52: 10-12). So far, no *ahû* texts have been identified for diagnostic omens (*Sakikkû*), although recensions differing from the standard series existed (Heeßel 2010a; George 1991).

50 For *Šumma izbu*, *ahû* material is attested from Nineveh and Babylonia, which was collected on IM.GÍD.DA type tablets (oblong one-column tablets), see de Zorzi 2014: 11-12, 236-237, 246-249. Two sequences of omens duplicated on multiple tablets from Nineveh and Assur, are summarised in rubrics of one manuscript as *ahû* omens (K. 3966 = CT 28, 3 obv. 17’, rev. 12). A duplicating manuscript (K. 6287: 12) attributes one sequence of these omens to a “first IM.GÍ[D.DA]-tablet”, indicating the existence of a series of *ahû*-omens (de Zorzi 2014: 236; Leichty 1970: 199-200). Another text, K. 3838+ (CT 28, 32), contains on its reverse a sequence of omens, which are summarised in a rubric as “26 *ahû*-omens on malformations from a text copy from Uruk” (26 MU.ŠID.BI.IM *iz-bi a-hu-ti* GA[BA.RI] UNUG^{ki}), while its obverse features omens from Tablet 18 of the standard series (de Zorzi 2014: 236; cf. Leichty 1970: 199). Furthermore, omens in K. 4031 (CT 27, 29) are said to have been “excerpted from extraneous *Šumma izbu*” (rev. 15: šā BE *iz-bu* BAR-i ZI-*ha*). The evidence from Late Babylonian sources also attests to serialised *ahû* material as well as to the existence of commentaries on these texts (Zorzi 2014: 246-249). At least some of the *ahû* material associated with *Šumma izbu* does not differ markedly from the standard series and seems to have been extracted and arranged in a different way, although the *ahû* texts also include additional material (de Zorzi 2014: 237).

51 Cf. KAR 44 rev. 8 and dupl. (Geller 2000: 251: 31; Jean 2006: 69), including a genre of “extraneous incantations” (TU₆.TU₆ BAR.RA) within the *āšipūtu*-corpus. This genre is otherwise mentioned in two almanacs listing favourable months and times for various rituals, in the Neo-Assyrian STT 300: 44 and the Late Babylonian BRM 4, 20: 77 (Geller 2014: 32, 50: 66, equated with *šipātu ahātu*).

52 Gabbay 2014: 198. A section of the *kalûtu* catalogue that lists Balaḡ songs to Enlil includes six incipits marked as *ahû* “extraneous” (K. 2529+ i-ii 33-38, Gabbay 2015: 16 and pl. 29). However, as Gabbay (2014: 198) discusses, it is hard to say “what the essential distinction between standard and extraneous compositions was”, since the designation *ahû* never occurs in cultic texts as a marker of specific Balaḡ compositions, which resembles the situation in the medical corpus (see below).

53 To my knowledge, the only reference to *ahû*-material for medical texts stems from Ashurbanipal colophon q, found on several tablets of therapeutic texts belonging to the *Nineveh Medical Compendium* that corresponds to AMC PART 1 (Hunger 1968: no. 329: 4-6). The colophon speaks of *liqtī ahûti* “extraneous collections” and “remedies from the top of the head to the (toe) nail(s)” (*bulḫi ištu muḫhi adi šupri*) as sources for the material written down on the tablets, which the king claims to have collected. I do not know of any other colophon in first millennium medical texts identifying the content as *ahû*. Cf. the discussion below.

54 Cf. CAD S 18. The basic meanings of *sadīru* are “line” (e.g., veins in a stone), “row” and “sequence; order”. The latter meanings are attested in a list of personal and royal names in non-Akkadian languages, which are rendered into Akkadian (Lambert 1957: 5-7, 12-13; Balkan 1978 [1954]: 1; K. 4426+ = 5R 44 i 14’; CDLI: P395542). Concerning one sequence of kings with Sumerian names, a rubric explains that “these are kings after the Flood, they are not written/listed together in a (chronological) order” (*ana sadīr ahāmeš lā šaṭrū/sadrū*). The verb *sadāru* can mean “to do regularly”; “to array; to set in a row” and “to do little by little, in installments” (CAD S 11-17).

55 Note the colophon of a Middle Assyrian manuscript of the series *Ana ittišu* Tablet 7 from Assur, which is preceded by the remark *sadīršu āmur*(IGI)-*ma lā urri*, “I have seen its (the tablet’s) sectional arrangement (on the original), but I have not applied it (in my copy)” (Landsberger 1937: 104 iv 23; Weidner 1952-53: 209 no. 59; Pedersén 1986: 24 (82)). As Landsberger (1937: ix) noted, this manuscript indeed does not use the sectional layout of ruled-off textual units, which is regularly found in other manuscripts of the series.

The word *sadīru* occurs in an unusual colophon found on tablets from Nineveh inscribed with a *nishu* (excerpt, extract)-edition of the compendium of *materia medica* Uruanna.⁵⁶ The passage describes in unusual detail the editorial work on the compilation, which is attributed to Ashurbanipal himself.⁵⁷

¹⁴⁶ First/tenth/twelfth *nishu* of (the compendium) Uruanna = *maštaka*. (On) plants that were (explained) in *šātu*-lists and *lišānu*-lists,⁵⁸ but which since old times had not received a (proper) edition (*ša ultu ulla zarâ lā šabtū*). Ashurbanipal, [king of the world, king] of Assyria, checked the plants (and) equivalents of (these) plants (which) had grown immensely (in number, *šamhūma*), but (which) did not have a (consistent) order (*lā išū sadīru*).

⁷⁴⁷ (Regarding) the plants and their equivalents, he took them together as a whole (*ana ahāmeš uqarreb*)⁵⁹ ... He did not change the title(s) of the old tablets (*rēš ṭuppāni labirūti ul ušanni*), [and he kept] their order as it was before (*kima mahrīmma sadīršunu* [...]). But as regards (the sections entitled) ⁶GAL = [...], ⁶Emubul = [...], ⁶Harambi = ⁶ham[baqu]qu, including (the section) “Lion’s blood = the fluid inside the tamarisk”, he (var. I) did not organise them (lit. “did not call their name”) as sections (*ina sadīri šumšunu ul imbi/ambi*), but entered (their text) on (individual?) tablets (*ina muhhi ṭuppāni ušēli*).⁶⁰

The colophon describes the editorial activities undertaken by Ashurbanipal’s scholars through a number of different expressions. The phrase *zarâ* (= SUR.(GIBIL)) *šabātu* is generally understood in Assyriology as the *terminus technicus* for the process of creating a text from a combination of different sources, expressed through a textile metaphor.⁶¹ The phrases involving *sadīru* in the singular seem to refer primarily to the existence or non-existence of a consistent organisation of the textual material in thematic sections. But especially in the last sentence, *sadīrū* (plural) seems to designate sections of the compendium or groups of entries set in a particular order.⁶² As the colophon claims, Uruanna was not organised and had not been properly “edited”, while new material was added over time, which resulted in a lack of consistency and order in the structure of the text. Lines 7-17 seem to speak of different parts of the compendium Uruanna designated by title/tablet incipits (*rēš ṭuppāni*). As I interpret the colophon, some of the sections were not re-organised drastically through the new edition: their title/incipit remained the same, and their sequence was not reshaped. However, some parts of the compendium indicated by title did not keep their status as “sections” (i.e. ruled-

⁵⁶ Hunger 1968: No. 321: 1-17. A translation of the passage based on additional sources can also be found in Böck (2011: 692-693 and 2015: 21) who is preparing an edition of Uruanna and other texts on drug lore. According to Böck’s survey there existed two other recensions of Uruanna in the first millennium beside the *nishu*-series on twelve tablets: one comprising four tablets, and a second one on only two tablets (cf. Stol 2005: 504-505; Böck 2015: 22-25). Böck further notes that the manuscripts for each recension are rarely exact duplicates and vary, e.g., in the number of lines. “Ashurbanipal’s” twelve-tablet edition also differs from the other recensions, presenting entries of the same passages in a different order.

⁵⁷ Cf. Frahm (forthcoming). He regards the use of the phrase *zarâ šabātu* in the Uruanna colophon as a conscious allusion to the *Sakikkū/Alamdimmū* catalogue and the Exorcist’s Manual where similar editorial achievements are intimately linked to the scholar Esagil-kin-apli.

⁵⁸ As has been elucidated by Frahm (2011: 48-49, 88-91), *šātu* is sometimes a term for a type of commentary (with word explanations), but *šātu* and *lišānu* also refer to lexical lists, the first being bilingual (e.g., HAR-ra = *hubullu*), the latter monolingual lists (Akkadian synonyms, such as *Maliku šarru*). Indeed, commentaries draw on such lists for their explanations. Thus, the Uruanna colophon could refer to commentaries on the series, but more likely to textual links between the compendium and lexical lists; cf. Böck 2010a: 163.

⁵⁹ For *qurrubu* “to take (pieces of information) as a whole”, CAD Q 239 sub 10f. Here, the expression probably means that the editor based his edition of “plants and their equivalents” on different available textual sources, which were compared or combined.

⁶⁰ The translation is my own. For the text, see K. 4345+ with additional joins; a photo is available via CDLI: P395492.

⁶¹ Cf. Stol 2007: 241-242; Heeßel 2000: 106; Lambert 2005: xvii and xix n. 10; Frahm 2011: 328 and Frahm forthcoming; Wee 2015: 253-254. The equation SUR.GIBIL = *zarû* is not attested in lexical lists, but suggested from the usage of either SUR.GIBIL or *zarû* with *šabātu* in identical contexts. The word *zarû* is probably derived from a Sumerian loanword /zara/, which is equated with *ṭamû* “to spin” (MSL 14, 250: 82; CAD Z 70; CAD T 45; cf. also Sum. sur meaning “to spin; to weave”). Alternatively, *zarû* may have to be connected with *zâru* “to twist” (to thread a rope); cf. Wee 2015: 254 for further analyses of the word. It is noteworthy that the word *zarâ* is sometimes used in a meaning similar to *sadīru*, to designate a text divided into ruled-off sections or verses, see the colophon of Ashurbanipal’s Acrostic Hymn to Marduk (SAA 3, 10 (No. 2) rev. 24), describing the text as consisting of a total of 30 verses (30-TA.ĀM [MU].ŠID.(BI).IM *za-ra-a*). The text indeed consists of 30 ruled-off stanzas, and it is possible that MU.ŠID.(BI).IM stands for *sadīru* in this instance. In contrast, two acrostic prayers of Nabû-ušēbši are described as consisting of a particular number of lines (11/10 MU.MEŠ) that are not set in such a verse arrangement (*za-ra-a* NU GAR), see Oshima 2011: 94-95, 312 obv. 12 and rev. 11. In another colophon, MU.MEŠ stands for ruled-off sections and MU.ŠID.BI for the lines contained on the tablet (Hunger 1968: No. 134). The textile metaphor associated with the expression *zarâ šabātu* is especially emphasized in the editorial note in the *Sakikkū* Catalogue, referring to Esagil-kin-apli’s editorial activities (Finkel 1988b: 148-49 B obv. 18’; Heeßel 2000: 104-107). In catalogue rubrics (*Sakikkū* Catalogue and AMC), the expression SUR.GIBIL *šabātu* is used also in reference to sections that have been edited (*sadīrū ša zarâ šabtū*), cf. below.

⁶² Note that Uruanna manuscripts are divided not only into columns, but also into ruled-off sections of entries belonging together.

off sections on a tablet?), but were split up and arranged on individual tablets.⁶³ It seems thus that the colophon speaks of two processes in connection with the edition of Uruanna material: changes in the division of the text into constituent tablets, and changes in the arrangement of text sections (*sadīru*) on these tablets.⁶⁴ In fact, these processes are evident in the variant recensions attested for other standard series, which show differences in the order or arrangement of textual sequences on individual tablets, as well as in the division of contents between tablets.

A catalogue of the lexical series *Nabnītu* from Sippar (BM 65529) offers a parallel expression with the cognate verb *sadāru*, to describe the sequence of tablets within a text series.⁶⁵ The colophon (rev. 27) explains that the contents of the catalogue are presented according to the order encountered in the “tablet of incipits” (KI DUB SAG *suddurū*), based on originals from Nippur and Babylon.

In other series catalogues, the terms *sadīru* “section” and *ṭuppu* “tablet” occur as terms specifying the organisational structure of a text series. In this context, however, *sadīru* refers to a sequence of multiple tablets forming a sub-series, not to ruled-off sections on individual tablets.

This usage of *sadīru* is attested in the catalogue of the “twin” series of diagnostic and physiognomic omens *Sakikkū* and *Alamdimmū*, preserved on two tablets in portrait format: one Neo-Assyrian manuscript from Nimrud (CTN 4, 71, ca. 9th century BCE), the other from Babylon (BM 41237+, ca. 7th or 6th century BCE).⁶⁶ In its first part, the catalogue lists the forty tablet incipits of *Sakikkū* (SA.GIG.MEŠ) ordered in six sections (or sub-series) named after the first tablet of each section. In addition, the number of entries (omens) in each tablet is given.⁶⁷ The last part of the catalogue lists the tablet incipits of the series *Alamdimmū* without providing the number of entries in each tablet, but presenting a similar division of the composition into five sections (or sub-series).⁶⁸ Both parts of the catalogue are joined by a lengthy editorial note, which claims that the renowned scholar Esagil-kin-apli from Borsippa, who is said to have lived during the reign of Adad-apla-iddina (11th century BCE), “produced an edition of the series *Sakikkū*, by arranging it from head to feet, and established it for learning”.⁶⁹ As has been pointed out by Heeßel (2000: 105-107), this “vertical” arrangement

⁶³ In fact, one Neo-Assyrian tablet from the “Haus des Beschwörungspriesters” at Assur (KADP 28, dupl. KADP 29) starts with the incipit “Lion’s [blood] = water inside the tama[risk]”, but does not preserve a colophon (Köcher 1955: 7, 64-67; Pedersén 1986: 71 (502)). One of the Nineveh fragments with a duplicating passage bears a differing Ashurbanipal colophon dedicating the tablet to the Nabû temple (Hunger 1968: no. 338 ms. B K. 4199), but does not preserve a rubric or catchline. However, according to Böck, the section “Lion’s blood” formed an independent composition that consists of re-arranged entries extracted from the series Uruanna (as reported in Frahm 2011: 254; cf. Köcher 1955: 7). Thus, it is also possible that the sentence “I/he did not organise them as sections” in the Uruanna colophon expresses that the named textual entities such as “Lion’s blood = water inside the tamarisk” were shaped into independent compositions instead of organising them into sections of the Uruanna compendium. Further conclusions on the formative processes and status of these texts in the light of the Uruanna colophon thus have to await the announced edition of all sources related to Uruanna by Böck.

⁶⁴ This interpretation remains provisional and has to await the publication of the Uruanna texts, which will throw more light on the arrangement of the *nishu*-series. The colophon also describes the deletion of entries from the text that appeared more than once (Böck 2011: 164; 2015: 21-22): *ù Ū.HI.A šā a-di 2-šū 3-šū šaṭ-ru / ul-tu lib-bi ū-še-li-ma* (K. 4345+: 8-9): “Plants that were registered (lit. written) twice or thrice, I removed from (the text)”.

⁶⁵ MSL 16, 10-17; cf. Lambert 2005: XVII–XVIII with additional readings from the duplicate BM 40855.

⁶⁶ See the editions by Finkel 1988b and in this volume; cf. Heeßel 2000: 13-17, 104-110; Livingstone 2013: 273; Frahm 2011: 324-332; Koch 2015: 278-279; Schmidtchen (in this volume).

⁶⁷ The catalogue uses the title SA.GIG.(MEŠ) for the diagnostic omen series, while tablet colophons mostly designate the series by the first tablet of the first section (sub-series), “When the *āšipu* goes to the patient’s house” (*Enūma ana bīt marši āšipu illaku*). Some diagnostic series tablets are not only numbered according to their place in the series as a whole, but also according to their position in the section to which they belong.

⁶⁸ For this part of the catalogue, see also Böck 2000: 15-18; Koch 2015: 285-288. Note that although the physiognomic series as a whole is called *Alamdimmū* in lines 91 and 92 of the catalogue, the same title was also used as the name of the first sub-series, which is summed up in line 77 as “12 tablets of *Alamdimmū*, (arranged) from head to foot” (12 DUB.MEŠ *alam-dīm-mu-ū* TA UGU-*hi* EN “GİR”). This title stems from the incipit of the last tablet of the sub-series (*Šumma alamdimmū*). This naming pattern is exceptional, since sub-series are usually designated by the title of their first tablet. The other sub-series of *Alamdimmū* were designated *Nigdimdimmū* “Shape”, *Kataduggū* “Utterance”, *Šumma simništu qaqqada rabāt* “If a woman’s head is big” and *Šumma liptu* “If a liptu-mark”, comprising all together about 23 (or more) tablets.

⁶⁹ Lines 61-62: SA.GIG TA UGU-*hi* EN GİR.MEŠ SUR.GIBIL DAB.MEŠ-*ma* ana NĪG.ZU GUB-*in*. It is important to note that the catalogue does not explicitly attribute to Esagil-kin-apli a new edition of the series *Alamdimmū* as a whole. Some have argued that the remark later on in the editorial note, “concerning both series (i.e., *Sakikkū* and *Alamdimmū*), their arrangement (*riksu*) is one” (*šā ĒŠ.GĀR ki-lal-la-an “KĒŠ”-su-nu DIŠ-ma*), could hint at their joint redaction by Esagil-kin-apli, but this statement may also refer to similar organisational principles that were applied in both series and to a general perception that both series belong together because of their subject matter. Although *Sakikkū* and *Alamdimmū* are mentioned beside each other, e.g., in the Exorcist’s Manual, they were never assembled together in one consecutive series. That Esagil-kin-apli indeed contributed to the redaction of the standard series *Alamdimmū*, is indicated by an early Neo-Assyrian manuscript

of the omens was probably the main innovation introduced by Esagil-kīn-apli in his redaction of *Sakikkū*, since older diagnostic texts from the second millennium BCE are usually not ordered in this fashion.⁷⁰ The catalogue further indicates that Esagil-kīn-apli's editorial efforts were largely concentrated on sections 2 and 3 of *Sakikkū*, because only these sections are marked in the respective summary rubrics by the comment *sadīrū* (*ša*) SUR.GIBIL *šabtū* "sections that have received an edition".⁷¹ It is noteworthy that although the majority of the manuscripts of *Sakikkū* agree with the tablet incipits given in the catalogue, there are also some discrepancies, which suggest that the series may have undergone some changes after its redaction by Esagil-kīn-apli. The catalogue thus may preserve an earlier stage of development than most of the text witnesses extant from the first millennium BCE.⁷² Deviations between catalogue and manuscripts can be detected in the designation of tablet incipits, in the numbering of tablets, and in the numbers of entries pertaining to individual tablets of *Sakikkū*.⁷³

Apart from the *Sakikkū* Catalogue, the expression *sadīrū* (*ša*) SUR.GIBIL *šabtū* does not occur in other catalogues for standard omen series, i.e., *Šumma ālu*, *Enūma Anu Enlil* and *Bārūtu*. In contrast to the latter two series, *Šumma ālu* was not divided into sections or sub-series, although it was longer than any other omen compendium (comprising 120 tablets). Nonetheless, the series can be divided into three or four thematic sections, which are further arranged in sub-topics, revealing systematic principles of organisation that betray redactional processes.⁷⁴ For instance, omens on terrestrial animals observed in the city are grouped together in Tablets 22-49, and the tablets are arranged according to the animal that was observed.⁷⁵ Three tablets with a catalogue for *Šumma ālu* are known to date. The manuscript from Assur (VAT 9438+ and KAR 394, Weidner 1941-44 pl. III; Freedman 1998: 322-323; Rochberg (in this volume)) is the best

of diagnostic omens containing a recension of Tablet 2 differing from the standard series (Heeßel 2007: 9-10 and no. 51; 2010a), which is designated in a rubric as "the old (version of) *Alamdimmū* which Esagil-kīn-apli has not resolved" (NU DU_g.MEŠ). This could hint at the scholar's involvement in an edition of the 12 tablets of the section *Alamdimmū*, which is explicitly referred to as arranged "from head to foot".

70 See especially the Old Babylonian texts edited in Heeßel 2000: 97-99; George 2013: no. 15; cf. Middle Babylonian texts in Heeßel 2000: 99-103; Heeßel 2010d: 11-12; Rutz 2011. One Middle Babylonian text from Nippur (IM 57947, Labat 1956; Heeßel 2010d: 12-14) is designated in the colophon as Tablet 2 of a series called "When you approach the patient", which is identical with the title of the second section of the standard series *Sakikkū*, but the text is not a duplicate of the first millennium recension. This implies that the serialisation of the diagnostic texts already started in the second half of the second millennium BCE, and that Esagil-kīn-apli drew on this older series.

71 See also Heeßel 2000: 106-107, noting that especially sections 1, 4 and 5 have several close links to older diagnostic material. This would imply that Esagil-kīn-apli did not reshape all sections of *Sakikkū* in a fundamental way. The fragmentary rubric for the first section contains the phrase GIBIL NU TIL "new, not finished", possibly indicating that this section was a relatively new addition to the series. This section has many parallels to passages in *Šumma ālu* (cf. Heeßel 2001-02a: 26). It is also noteworthy that some tablets of section 4 contain therapeutic instructions, and that some tablets of section 5 have similarities in contents and formulations with medical texts, pointing to the inclusion of heterogeneous material. *Sakikkū* section 6 with observations concerning women and infants contains material that bears similarities with birth omens and with material in *Šumma izbu*. For a discussion of the editorial remarks SUKUD.GIM and GIŠ.GIŠ.A in the catalogue's summary rubrics to sections 4-6, see Heeßel 2000: 107 and Schmidtchen's contribution in this volume.

72 See Schmidtchen's contribution in this volume. A comparison of the catalogue with the sources for the series *Alamdimmū* also points to changes or to the addition of new material to the series in the Neo-Assyrian period, after Esagil-kīn-apli's edition (cf. the editorial remark GIBIL NU TIL "new, not finished" qualifying the first(?) tablet in the fourth section or subseries (concerned with women, Finkel 1988b: 152 A 83 and the edition in this volume). In general, the *Sakikkū* manuscripts from Nineveh, Nimrud and Babylonia follow Esagil-kīn-apli's recension outlined in the catalogue, but a variant edition is attested from Sultantepe. Moreover, Esagil-kīn-apli's recension of *Sakikkū* is not attested at Assur, which fits in with evidence suggesting that the scholars at Assur followed older versions and variant traditions rather than the newly standardised series, as is witnessed for instance in an older recension of *Alamdimmū* still in use in Neo-Assyrian Assur (Böck 2000: 290-295; Heeßel 2007: 9-10 and no. 51; 2010a; cf. Koch 2015: 65, 94 *passim*). A varying version of *Sakikkū* Tablet 1 is also known from Uruk (George 1991).

73 For instance, the incipit of *Sakikkū* Tablet 9 in the catalogue probably corresponds to the second omen in some Neo-Babylonian and Neo-Assyrian exemplars of Tablet 9 (Scurlock 2014: 66, 707). The incipit for Tablet 22 in the catalogue contains an additional statement that is not found in the manuscripts of Tablet 22 (Finkel 1988b: 147 A 27 with n. 27; Heeßel 2000: 250). Moreover, two Babylonian manuscripts corresponding to Tablet 22 are designated as Tablet 23 in their colophon, which may indicate the existence of an additional tablet in some editions of the series (for a discussion, cf. Heeßel 2000: 136, 257 colophon of mss. A and D). A manuscript from Nineveh designated in its colophon as Tablet 19 contains a catchline that corresponds to Tablet 21 in the catalogue, which implies that the text which is distributed over Tablets 19 and 20 in the catalogue, was collected in only one tablet in the edition used at Nineveh. The same phenomenon is found in a Babylonian manuscript of Tablet 26 (BM 47753), which is designated as Tablet "27" in its colophon. Three Late Babylonian witnesses combine the text of Tablets 27/28 on one tablet, which in one of the manuscripts is designated as Tablet 26 (cf. Stol 1993: 56, 74, 88; Heeßel 2000: 136). For a detailed discussion, see Schmidtchen (in this volume).

74 Freedman (1998: vii) suggests three segments (terrestrial omens (1-21), animal omens (22-79), human omens (80-120+)); while Koch (2015: 241) divides the series into four segments.

75 See Freedman 1998: 6 and Koch 2015: 241-256 for an overview of the organisation of the series and the various ordering principles applied.

preserved one; it also contained a catalogue of the series *Enūma Anu Enlil*, followed by the incipits of an extraneous astrological series. The other two catalogue fragments (K. 9094b and BM 68437) are probably restricted to *Šumma ālu* alone, but only preserve about 15 tablet incipits.⁷⁶ The Assur catalogue is introduced by an opening line (obv. col. ii 7) and preserves the incipits of Tablets 1-26 (obv. ii 7-33) and 33-62 (rev. iii 1-30).⁷⁷ In contrast to the *Enūma Anu Enlil* tablets listed in col. i of the Assur catalogue, no tablet numbers are attached to the incipits of *Šumma ālu* (neither do the other two catalogue fragments from Nineveh and Sippar contain tablet numbers). A comparison between the catalogue and manuscripts of *Šumma ālu* shows a situation resembling that described above for *Sakikkû*. While there are only slight discrepancies in the order and name of the tablets in the three catalogue fragments (Freedman 1998: 324 ad lines 4-5), there are considerable discrepancies between the catalogues and the preserved *Šumma ālu* texts, reflecting different recensions and alternative arrangements of the series.⁷⁸

A similar picture is presented by the catalogues of *Enūma Anu Enlil* and the first millennium BCE manuscripts of the series. Modern reconstructions of the tablet sequence are based on two catalogues, one being the compound catalogue from Assur, which also listed the tablet sequence of *Šumma ālu*, and a second catalogue from Late Babylonian Uruk (Weidner 1941-44; Fincke 2001; Rochberg (in this volume)). Both catalogues are incomplete, and their text does not overlap (the Uruk catalogue preserves the first 29 tablets, while the Assur catalogue covers Tablets 39-59). The extant textual material from the first millennium shows that different recensions of *Enūma Anu Enlil* existed and kept evolving during that period.⁷⁹ Fincke (2001) concludes for the tablets listed in the Assur catalogue that there were four different recensions of the series: one attested at Assur (comprising ca. 63 tablets), one at Nineveh (also followed in Uruk in Late Babylonian times, with 69 tablets), a Neo-Babylonian recension at Babylon and Kiš (comprising 68 tablets), and a diverging Neo-Babylonian recension with 70 tablets, so far only attested at Nineveh, but the situation may be more complex (cf. al-Rawi and George 2006; Gehlken 2005: 252-254). Although the manuscripts of different recensions are far from uniform, the contents and layout of the series are quite stable between the recensions,⁸⁰ and diverging tablet numbers reflect primarily differing tablet formats and varying ways of dividing the text between tablets (Koch 2015: 165-166).⁸¹

The last omen compendium, for which we have a catalogue, is the extispicy series, which gained the title *Bārûtu* “the Art of the Seer” in the first millennium BCE.⁸² The series, which was standardised to a higher degree than the other omen series in this period, was composed of ten sections of varying length (between four and seventeen tablets) each

⁷⁶ Freedman 1998: 324-325; Heeßel 2001-02b: 235. K. 9094b contains numerical notations (“one/two” preceding several incipits, indicating its use as an inventory or check list (cf. above). Another fragmentary catalogue from Late Babylonian Uruk contains incipits of a *nishu*-series of *Šumma ālu* (SpTU 3, 95).

⁷⁷ The heading reads DUB SAG.MEŠ ša DIŠ URU ina SUKUD-e GAR ÉŠ.GÀR ‘MU’.NE [(x)]; cf. Freedman 1998: 324. For parallel headings in series catalogues, see also Exorcist’s Manual, *Sakikkû* Catalogue and AMC.

⁷⁸ For a discussion and reconstruction of the series, see Freedman 1998: 6-8, 17-23, 329-343; Koch 2015: 239-241. For instance, two copies of the same tablet can have differing tablet numbers and catchlines, and the position of tablets within the series varied. Especially tablets from Babylon often preserve numbers that do not agree with the tablet sequence of Nineveh manuscripts or with that of the catalogue. Other variations in tablet numbering can be explained through variations in tablet formats. That is, in some editions, the text of one tablet was written on a single tablet, whereas in others the text was split up into two tablets. Sometimes, the colophons of commentaries on the series likewise indicate conflicting sequences of tablets. Cf. for these problems of variation the discussion of the Neo-Assyrian *Šumma ālu* manuscripts from Assur, Heeßel 2007: 7-8, e.g., no. 37; Freedman 2006: 6.

⁷⁹ See, e.g., Rochberg-Halton 1988; al-Rawi and George 2006 for discussions of different first millennium recensions of Tablet 20 of *Enūma Anu Enlil* and their development from earlier Middle Babylonian and Middle Assyrian precursors.

⁸⁰ The series can be divided into four sections: lunar omens, solar omens, meteorological omens and omens on planetary and stellar phenomena. There is evidence from rubrics of first millennium texts and from the Uruk catalogue that the first three sections were referred to by the deity represented in them: lunar omens were referred to as Sîn (omens), solar and meteorological omens as Šamaš and Adad (van Soldt 1995: 103; Weidner 1941-44: 187: 23-24).

⁸¹ For the reconstruction of the series, see also Koch 2015: 163-179; Gehlken 2005; Fincke 2001. One example for discrepancies between recensions is a varying tablet number for the lunar section, which in the Uruk catalogue consists of 22 tablets, but in one recension from Uruk of 23 tablets (Rochberg-Halton 1988: 270).

⁸² For an overview of the series, see Koch 2015: 94-115. The earliest evidence for the use of the term *Bārûtu* as the name of the series stems from Late Babylonian colophons (Koch-Westenholz 2000: 25-27). In the Neo-Assyrian letters and “library records”, the term *Bārûtu* is used to classify the contents of incoming tablets and seems to refer to the discipline of the diviner or to the genre of extispicy omens in general rather than to the standard series (see, e.g., Parpola 1983a: 20-21 No. 3 = SAA 7, 51 i 9’, 15’, ii 2’, never preceded by ÉŠ.GÀR). This usage resembles the term *āšipūtu* “exorcist’s lore” as a label for tablets in the “library records”.

concerned with one or several features of the exta, totalling about 100 tablets.⁸³ A catalogue has come down to us in two manuscripts, one of which is a tablet fragment that could have contained the incipits for the whole series.⁸⁴ According to its colophon, it belonged to the scholar Nabû-zuqup-kēnu from Kalhu and was a copy of an original from Babylon (Koch 2005: 8, 89; ms. B = K. 3041). Ms. A (K. 1352 = CT 20, 1) presents a tablet in landscape format almost completely preserved lacking a colophon or heading. This manuscript contains the tablet incipits of only the two last sections of the *Bārûtu* series (*Šumma hašû* and *Šumma multābiltu*). It assigns a tablet number for each section and adds the number of entries (“lines”) for the section *Šumma hašû* (but not for the section *Šumma multābiltu*). The catalogue is summed up as GÚ SAG DUB KI.HAL NIGIN.NA.E.NE.KE₄ MU.MU.ŠID.MA.BI.KE₄ “the total of tablet incipits of KI.HAL together with line-count” (rev. 13).⁸⁵ The unique phrase KI.HAL remains unclear, but HAL usually stands for *bārû* “seer” or *bārûtu* “extispicy”.⁸⁶

Some of the series catalogues display recurring structural features reflecting the developed organisation of the source text, e.g., a division into sections and a numbering of tablets within the series/sections. However, not all series catalogues have a uniform layout, and a comparison between catalogues and source texts often reveals discrepancies and textual variation, in the form of diverging (local) recensions of the series.

4 Catalogues of a Professional Corpus

The third category in our survey is the professional corpus catalogues from the first millennium BCE, which list multiple works and text groups belonging to a technical discipline. These catalogues are considered to comprise ideally the entire corpus of a scholarly profession (Gabbay 2014: 233). The example *par excellence* is the Exorcist’s Manual (KAR 44 and duplicates) which defines the corpus of *āšipûtu* (to be discussed in comparison with AMC). A second catalogue that can be assigned to this category is the *kalûtu* catalogue from Nineveh (K. 2529+).

Linked to the characterisation of these exemplary catalogues is the use of the word *iškāru* in their headings (KAR 44: 1 and duplicates) or summary rubrics (K. 2529+ rev. iv 30), coupled with the professional titles *āšipûtu* and *kalûtu*, which should in this context better be understood as “corpus” rather than “series”. Thus, Gabbay (2014: 195 n. 14) prefers the notion of “corpus” rejecting the translation of *iškāru* as “series” in this specific context, because in the corpus catalogues “the term ... does not refer to the fixed sequence of the compositions but only to their collection in a group”.⁸⁷

⁸³ Koch 2015: 94-95. All Neo-Assyrian manuscripts number the tablets according to their place within the section, while Late Babylonian texts number the tablets according to their place within the *Bārûtu* series as a whole. In some colophons of series tablets from Nineveh, the section title is preceded by ÉŠ.GĀR (Koch 2005: 137 A iv 44: DUB 3.KAM ÉŠ.GĀR BE *multābiltu*, see also 169 r14, 209 Cr15’). The Neo-Assyrian, Neo- and Late Babylonian manuscripts of the standard series are congruent to a remarkable degree, although there may have been differences in length between series tablets from Nineveh and Babylonia. Thus, although it may have a Babylonian origin and composition date prior to the library of Ashurbanipal, the text of the canonical series was fixed already in the Neo-Assyrian period, even if the series’ name *Bārûtu* only came into use later. For an overview of the history of extispicy texts, see Koch 2015: 67-94; cf. Heeßel 2012: 7-15; for further text types associated with the extispicy corpus including commentaries (*mukallimtu*) and other explanatory texts (e.g., *niširti bārûti*) as well as excerpt series (*nishu*, *rikis gerri* “guide”), rituals, prayers, oracle questions and procedure texts, see Koch 2005; 2015: 115-127.

⁸⁴ Koch 2005: 7-8, 85-89; Koch 2015: 115. This tablet may have been part of a series of catalogues, possibly preserving a fragmentary catchline before its colophon.

⁸⁵ At first glance, SAG DUB (= *rēš tuppi*) “tablet incipit” seems to be a variant of DUB SAG. However, the Akkadian reading of the latter is clarified in a Middle Babylonian text catalogue (BM 103690), which offers the partially syllabic rendering DUB *re-še-e-tim* in its opening line, which seems to replace DUB SAG.MEŠ and can be interpreted as “tablet of incipits”, the native expression for “catalogue; inventory” (see Finkel in this volume). See further the *kalûtu* catalogue (K. 2529 (4R², 53)+ rev. iv 30; Gabbay 2015: 19), summed up as DUB SAG.MEŠ ÉŠ.GĀR NAM.GALA “tablet of the titles of the lamentation priest’s (text) corpus”. The opening line of the Exorcist’s Manual presents another variant expression. KAR 44: 1 has SAG.MEŠ ÉŠ.GĀR MAŠ.MAŠ-*ti*, lit. “titles of the corpus of exorcism”, while the duplicate Rm. 717 + BM 34188 from Babylon (Geller 2000: 249) reads “KA DUB” SAG.MEŠ ÉŠ.GĀR LÚ.MAŠ.MAŠ-*ú-ti* “wording of the tablet of incipits of the corpus of exorcism”; cf. CAD R 288 sub 4c; CAD P 467 sub 7c. GÚ is to be read *napharu* “total”.

⁸⁶ Markham Geller (oral communication) suggests to read ABSIN (KI.AŠ.AŠ), for *absinnu/šer’u* “furrow/row”, which he interprets as a metaphoric expression for a serialised text edition (“rows”). Cf. also Geller *infra*.

⁸⁷ Note in this regard SpTU 3, 74, a Late Babylonian manuscript of *Maqlû* Tablet 3, which is designated as IM 3.KAM MU *maqlû* [É]Š.GĀR *āšipûtu* “third tablet of *Maqlû*, (belonging to) the corpus of the exorcist’s craft” (line 185). The expressions *iškār kalûti/āšipûti* are also used in a letter of the scholar Marduk-šāpik-zēri to the Assyrian king (SAA 10, 160), where he describes the areas of expertise of scholars whom

If we compare the Exorcist's Manual with the *kalûtu* catalogue, it has to be noted that whereas the former provides an overview of very much the entire corpus of the profession, the *kalûtu* catalogue is rather a catalogue of compositions based on the tablets actually found in the library, as is indicated by the remarks in the catalogue and colophon (noting that many tablets were not available). Furthermore, variations in the spelling of identical incipits within the catalogue indicate that the compiler examined and copied the incipits of actual tablets in the library (Gabbay 2014: 234). However, despite some omissions the Nineveh catalogue probably includes most compositions belonging to the corpus of the lamentation priest. These are listed in a standard sequence that was in use in Nineveh, Sultantepe and Ur, as is confirmed by catchlines of tablets. Another difference between both catalogues is that for the Exorcist's Manual duplicating copies are attested from several places and periods (Neo-Assyrian, Neo- and Late Babylonian), whereas the *kalûtu* catalogue is so far only known from Nineveh.⁸⁸

On a formal and structural level, there are other marked differences. The *kalûtu* catalogue does not contain a reference to a compiler or editor of the corpus, as does the Exorcist's Manual with its reference to Esagil-kîn-apli. The *kalûtu* catalogue presents itself as a list of compositions divided into sections grouped by type (BALAG, ÉR.ŠĒM.MA and ŠU.ÎL. LĀ). Each section is introduced and concluded by separate rubrics and summary lines (stating the total number of compositions in the respective section). This sectional structure with subtotals and rubrics resembles the series catalogues discussed above. One common feature of the Exorcist's Manual and *kalûtu* catalogue (which they share with some series catalogues) is the occurrence of an opening line and a summary line at the end of the catalogue.⁸⁹

5 The Assur Medical Catalogue: Series or Corpus Catalogue?

The Assur Medical Catalogue (AMC) edited in this volume presents a one-column tablet in portrait format. Five fragments have been identified, none of which join directly. Four fragments were copied by Beckman and Foster (1988 no. 9a-d) and partially edited by Scurlock (2014: 295-306). The fifth fragment, A 7821 from Chicago, was recognised by Irving Finkel in 1978 and mentioned by Attinger (2008: 8), but has never been edited.⁹⁰ The findspot of the fragments is unknown. The tablet's fragmentary colophon reveals that the text was copied by a young physician (*asû šehru*) whose father bears the title "*šangû* of the goddess Baba who is in the midst of Baltil", referring to the Gula temple at Assur.⁹¹ Since neither the scribe nor his father can be identified, also the exact date of the copy remains debatable – according to the sign forms, the tablet could date to the 8th or 7th century BCE. Consequently, it is not entirely certain whether the catalogue stems from the reign of Ashurbanipal and reflects the recension of a series of the medical therapeutic texts created at Nineveh during Ashurbanipal's reign, as Köcher (1978: 18-20) has argued on the basis of text incipits and catchlines from Nineveh.

Since the question of dating and of the "stage of textual development" reflected in the AMC is crucial for the reconstruction of a history of medical texts in Mesopotamia in the first millennium BCE, the arguments and counterarguments for attributing the catalogue to Ashurbanipal's reign and his collection of medical texts at Nineveh have to be

he recommends for service (rev. 6, 30). Elsewhere in the letter, Marduk-šāpik-zēri only uses professional titles to designate the scholars' specialisation, indicating that *iškār kalûti*, etc. are quasi synonymous (e.g., obv. 37, rev. 7-8, 9 *kalûtu ugdammir*; rev. 14 *āšipûtu ṭupšarr[ûtu iltasî]*; rev. 31 *bārûti ile''e*; cf. rev. 33 *asû mādiš ile''e*). For *kalûtu* as a designation for the corpus of Emesal prayers, see also Gabbay 2014: 195 n. 15.

⁸⁸ From Nineveh, there is one tablet fragment, which could present a duplicate to K. 2529+, while a third tablet in landscape format (K. 2) contains only one section (Eršemmas) of the *kalûtu* catalogue (see Gabbay 2015: 15-20, pl. 28). Only one small Neo-Babylonian fragment of a catalogue of Emesal prayers is known so far (A 3515), which however seems to present a list of incipits of individual tablets making up different Balaḡs or sections of Balaḡs, which differs from the sequence of compositions in the Nineveh catalogue (Gabbay 2007).

⁸⁹ The opening line of K. 2529+ is only fragmentarily preserved and restored by Gabbay (2015: 15 A 1, pl. 29) as [ÉR].MEŠ [û ÉR.ŠĒM.MA.MEŠ MJU.NE, while the summary identifies the preceding catalogue as the tablet of incipits (DUB SAG.MEŠ) of the corpus of *kalûtu* (ibid. 29 A rev. iv 30). Cf. Panayotov (in this volume) for an alternative restoration of the opening line of K. 2529+.

⁹⁰ The text has been discussed in various places, see, e.g., Geller 2005: 247; Heeßel 2008a: 169-171; 2010b: 34; Böck 2008: 296-299; Johnson 2014: 44-46 and Panayotov (in this volume) with further references.

⁹¹ For the title *asû šehru* "young/junior physician", compare parallel expressions attested in the colophons of the Assur exorcists from the library N4, which allows one to reconstruct the stages in the professional training and career, from apprentice to fully competent exorcist (see Maul 2010a). For the scribe of AMC, see also Frahm (forthcoming). Unfortunately, the name of the scribe is not well enough preserved for a safe reading, and the father's name is lost in the lacuna.

discussed. Notably, Heeßel (2010b: 31-35) raises doubts about Köcher's claim, arguing that even though the medical texts from Nineveh currently provide the best evidence for a serialisation of therapeutic material, there are indications that this process started before Ashurbanipal, and possibly received input from Babylonia.⁹²

Another hint that speaks against regarding the AMC as the catalogue of a medical series assembled at Nineveh is presented by Ashurbanipal colophon q (Hunger 1968 no. 329: 2-8), which is attached to the tablet manuscripts belonging to the *Nineveh Medical Compendium* corresponding more or less to the series listed in the first part of the AMC. In contrast to the Uruanna colophon discussed above, which contains detailed and concrete information about editorial work on the series (including the technical expression *zarâ šabātu*), Ashurbanipal colophon q does not make such a claim, but merely refers to copying and assembling of textual material, which is designated as follows:

nisiq ūpšarrūti ša ina šarrāni ālik mahriya mamma šipru šuātu lā ihuzu bulṭi ištu muhhi adi šupri liqti ahūti tāhizu nakla azugallūti Ninurta u Gula mala bašmu ina ūppāni aštur asniq abrēma ana tāmarti šitassiya qereb ekalliya ukīn

The precious works of scribal lore, which nobody among the kings before me has learned to master, **remedies from the top of the head to the (toe)nail(s) (and) collections of extraneous material, elaborate lore, the great healing arts of Ninurta and Gula, as much as has been invented**, I wrote on tablets, checked, collated and set (them) up in my palace, to read (them) and have them read out to me.

It is noteworthy that the colophon identifies the texts as the professional lore of the *asû*, by invoking the divine patrons of the discipline, namely as the “great physicianship” (*azugallūtu*) of Ninurta and Gula. The colophon describes the corpus of medical texts, which Ashurbanipal collected for his personal study, through two descriptive titles. The first one occurs also in the AMC, where it is found in a rubric summarising the first of two parts, of which the catalogue consists. This line reads as follows:

58) (YBC 7139 obv. 17') [NĪGIN X DUB.MEŠ (...) *bul-ṭi² T*]A UGU EN *šu-up-ri sa-di-ru šā* SUR.GIBIL *šab-tu*
[A total of n tablets (...) with treatments]⁹³ from the top of the head to the (toe)nail(s). Sections that have received an edition.

The restoration at the beginning of line 58 is based on the Ashurbanipal colophon, and the expression *bulṭi ištu muhhi adi šupri* “remedies from the top of the head to the (toe)nail(s)” in the colophon appears to be a direct reference to the serialised text corpus in AMC PART 1. Notably, notwithstanding a few discrepancies, most Nineveh tablets bearing this colophon can be correlated through incipits, catchlines or tablet numbers with sections of therapeutic tablets serialised and named in PART 1 of the AMC (lines 2-57).⁹⁴ Indeed, PART 1 of the AMC presents a sequence of 12 sections (*sadīrū*) dealing with illnesses ordered by body part or region *a capite ad calcem* (see Fig. 1). Each section of AMC PART 1 consists of a section listing tablet incipits, followed in most cases by a summary rubric giving a subtotal of tablets. Thus, AMC PART 1 formed a series designated as “remedies (ordered) from top of the head to (toe)nail(s)”, which was also known and collected at Nineveh (designated here as the *Nineveh Medical Compendium*).

The second designation *liqti ahūti* “extraneous collections” in Ashurbanipal colophon q seems to diverge from the AMC. One could interpret it as an apposition to the preceding title *bulṭi ištu muhhi adi šupri*, which would mean that this therapeutic series was considered as “extraneous”. However, since *ahū* texts are generally found in conjunction with an existing “series” (*iškāru*), we would need to ask what the corresponding corpus of “standard texts” to such “non-standard collections” of therapeutic remedies would be. Since we do not know of such a “series”, this interpretation seems unlikely, and it could be suggested that *liqti ahūti* is a collective expression for existing textual material

⁹² Similarly, the *Sakikkū* catalogue points to an initial edition of the diagnostic series through a Babylonian scholar of the 11th century BCE, even though the best textual evidence comes from Ashurbanipal's library.

⁹³ It is theoretically possible to restore the title *šumma amēlu muhhašu ukāl* in the gap before *bulṭi ištu muhhi adi šupri*, according to the name of the first tablet of the first section in AMC PART 1 (= CRANIUM 1). This naming pattern is also found for AMC PART 2. It is not certain however whether there is enough space for this restoration in the gap at the beginning of line 58. Cf. also the discussion below and the commentary to the AMC edition in this volume.

⁹⁴ For identifications of Nineveh tablets corresponding to AMC PART 1, see Scurlock 2014: 296-306 and the commentary to the AMC edition in this volume. See, e.g., BAM 515 iv 50' (EYES Tablet 2); BAM 530 (NOSEBLEED); BAM 538 (TEETH 1); BAM 543 (TEETH 2); BAM 547 (BRONCHIA 1); BAM 574 (STOMACH 1); BAM 575 (STOMACH 2); BAM 578 (STOMACH 3); BAM 579 (STOMACH 5). BAM 548 (BRONCHIA 5) bears Ashurbanipal colophon b instead (Hunger 1968: no. 318), which does not contain the reference to *bulṭi ištu muhhi adi šupri*, but refers to tablets and wooden writing boards from Assyria, Sumer and Akkad (= Babylonia), which Ashurbanipal copied in “the assembly of the scholars”.

outside the serialised collection called *bulṭi ištu muhhi adi šupri*. In fact, could *liqtī ahūti* refer to textual material listed in PART 2 of the AMC?

AMC PART 2 (lines 59-122) also consists of multiple sections of tablet incipits, which are not ordered anatomically, but grouped according to different topics (including sections on skin ailments, the treatment of wounds and injuries, therapies for illnesses attributed to divine anger, witchcraft, demons, treatments for “mental” illnesses, for problems associated with sexuality and reproduction, for women’s illnesses, and veterinary prescriptions). PART 2 is designated by the incipit of its first tablet (i.e., Tablet 1 of the section SKIN), which is repeated in the summary rubric of PART 2 as follows:

123) (A. 7821 rev. 13’ (+) YBC 7123 rev. 4’) ʾNĪGIN X+30’+8’ DUB.MEŠ DĪŠ GIG [...] -ta-šú um-mu-r[a-(at)]

124) (A. 7821 rev. 14’ (+) YBC 7123 rev. 5’) [sa-di-ru] ʾšá’ [SUR.GIBIL] šab-tu

ʾA total of n+38’ tablets (belonging to) ʾIf a lesion [...] his [... i]s swollen’.⁹⁵ [Sections] that have received an [edition.]

The whole corpus of texts listed in the AMC is then summed up in line 125 as:

125) (A 7821 rev. 15’ (+) YBC 7123 rev. 6’) [NĪGIN X X D]UB.MEŠ [sa-di-ru šá S]UR.GIBIL šab-tu

[A total of n tab]lets. [Sections that] have received an edition.

This line shows that the text corpus listed AMC did not have an overarching title. Since the sections of AMC PART 2 consist of quite heterogeneous topics and material, it is possible that the Ashurbanipal colophon referred to texts corresponding to these sections as “extraneous collections”.⁹⁶ However, if this is the case, the colophon diverges from the AMC, since the series title of AMC PART 2 would have been unknown at Nineveh. Could AMC PART 2 reflect a compendium only known at Assur?

The usage of *ahū* in Ashurbanipal colophon q to designate medical texts is absolutely unique, since there is not the slightest evidence from other colophons of medical texts that there was medical material technically designated as *ahū*. Moreover, while textual parallels for the material listed in AMC PART 2 can be identified in the medical texts from Nineveh, so far no Nineveh (serial) text has been found that offers an incipit or catchline matching AMC PART 2, in contrast to AMC PART 1, which finds numerous attestations in corresponding Nineveh serial tablets with an identical incipit or catchline. On the other hand, relatively more textual parallels (occasionally with an identical incipit) seem to have survived from Babylonia and Assur for PART 2 of the AMC. This could be an accident of discovery, but it could also indicate that the editions of medical texts in the AMC and those collected or compiled at Nineveh were not entirely identical. Thus, it may be concluded that *liqtī ahūti* in the Ashurbanipal colophon probably refers to medical texts integrated into the royal library, which did not belong to the “head to (toe)nail(s)”-series (i.e. the *Nineveh Medical Compendium* corresponding to AMC PART 1) and which were not organised in a series corresponding to AMC PART 2 (although we may be dealing with overlapping or parallel material).

A number of tablets from Nineveh apparently belong to a series designated by the same title as AMC PART 1. This *Nineveh Medical Compendium* with remedies from head to feet was divided into sections of multiple tablets, many of which find an exact counterpart in the AMC. But there are at the same time a few discrepancies between the catalogue’s

⁹⁵ The series title/incipit cannot be restored yet, as we presently have no textual evidence for a series with this title or for a tablet with this incipit. The tablet incipit within the section SKIN (line 59) is likewise fragmentary.

⁹⁶ Note that the term *liqtī bulṭi* “collection of remedies” is found in colophons of two tablets from Assur written by Kišir-Nabû, a member of the family of exorcists associated with the library N4 who was active in the last third of the 7th century BCE (Maul 2010a). However, the colophons of BAM 52: 102 and BAM 106 rev. 7’ refer to a *nishu*-series of a “collection of remedies”, copied according to originals from Babylonia (Hunger 1968 no. 211–12; Maul 2010a: 213). BAM 52 presents the 6th *nishu*, and BAM 106 the [7th] *nishu*. Especially BAM 52 shares a number of passages with texts from Nineveh belonging to the sub-series “Suālu” on digestive disorders, which corresponds to the section STOMACH in AMC, but the text reflects a differing recension of the material (cf. Cadelli 2000). BAM 147, another tablet written by Kišir-Nabû, with treatments for fever, is designated in rev. 27 as the “2nd *nishu* copied according to a writing board from Babylonia”, but here the phrase *liqtī bulṭi* is omitted. Cf. above for *liqtu* collections in connection with omen series such as *Šumma ālu* and *Alamdimmū*, referring sometimes to extracts or to *ahū* texts. In the letter SAA 16, 65, the *liqtū* of *Enūma Anu Enlil*, which a goldsmith’s son is said to have studied illegitimately, could refer to extracts (lit. “gleanings”) from the series.

sequence and the texts of the *Nineveh Medical Compendium*, which further supports the view that the AMC is not a catalogue of the Nineveh recension of the same series.⁹⁷

Whether the AMC reflects an edition and serialisation of medical texts that took place at Assur, cannot be decisively answered either at the moment, but the series title “remedies from the top of the head to the toe(nails)” is only attested in AMC and in Ashurbanipal colophon q, and the series title of AMC PART 2 has not been identified in any other source.⁹⁸ The issue is complicated by the circumstance that most Neo-Assyrian medical texts known from Assur stem from the library N4. Although a few tablets from this archive offer parallels to Nineveh texts corresponding to AMC PART 1, these texts often differ considerably from the Nineveh recension.⁹⁹ Some of the Assur manuscripts in question consist of excerpts or one-column tablets offering only an extract from the series tablets identified from Nineveh, where two-column tablets of standard size form the format of the texts belonging to the *Nineveh Medical Compendium* (i.e. the “head to toenails” series reflected in AMC PART 1).¹⁰⁰

Let us reconsider the question what the AMC represents by asking to which type of catalogue it belongs. It can be excluded that the catalogue was an *ad hoc* library inventory – that the AMC was the copy of an older original is hinted at by the remark *hepi* “broken” in line 83 (YBC 7126 rev. 6’ (+) YBC 7139 rev. 17’) of the text. The colophon is fragmentary, but most probably referred to an original that was copied.¹⁰¹ Several features of the AMC seem to point to a series catalogue, but I would like to approach the issue through a comparison between the characteristic features of the *Sakikkû* Catalogue, the Exorcist’s Manual and AMC.¹⁰²

As discussed above, the series catalogues are linked to redaction processes described as serialisation. They list an order of tablets of a particular series known by a title, such as the *Sakikkû* Catalogue. As in the latter catalogue, the phrase SUR.GIBIL(*zarâ*) *šabātu* “to produce an edition” is used in the AMC, but here the editorial work is claimed explicitly for all “sections” (*sadīrū*) of texts listed in the catalogue. Since both AMC and the *Sakikkû* catalogue present

⁹⁷ For a discussion of these discrepancies, see the commentary to the AMC edition.

⁹⁸ However, the incipit of Tablet 1 of the AMC section SKIN is possibly cited in the colophon of CTN 4, 116, a therapeutic text on skin ailments from Nimrud very likely related to the AMC corpus. For discussion see the commentary to the AMC edition in this volume.

⁹⁹ The lack of manuscripts from Assur following the serial order of the AMC may be accidental. There are nonetheless tablets from Assur whose incipits can be linked to incipits in AMC. Thus, the one-column tablet BAM 209 represents Tablet 3 of the section NECK according to its colophon, and its incipit corresponds with the respective incipit in AMC. However, although a partial duplicate, BAM 209 contains only part of the text of the series tablet attested from Nineveh (BAM 473), see Köcher 1964: xii with n. 10; Abusch et al. 2016: text 10.6 mss. A and B. Similar differences between Nineveh and Assur manuscripts can be pointed out for other tablets of the therapeutic series in AMC PART 1. Sometimes, an Assur text forms the only source for a certain incipit in the AMC. For instance, BAM 156 has the same incipit as Tablet 4 of the section EPIGASTRIUM ([DIŠ N]A NAM.ÉRIM *šah*-[hi]-hu GIG “If a person suffers from a wasting curse”), but also contains extracts from other sections of the series (see Scurlock 2014: 329-333).

¹⁰⁰ A few texts found in the library N4 belong to one (or different) *nishu*-series of therapeutic material related to the AMC series (see above n. 96). Among the *nishu*-tablets written by Kišir-Aššur, BAM 9 is called the “first *nishu*” copied from a writing board and containing duplicating sections to Tablets 1-3 of the first section CRANIUM on illnesses of the head (*šumma amēlu muhhašu umma ukāl* “If the patient’s skull is feverish”), found in AMC and in Nineveh texts (Hunger 1968: no. 200; Köcher 1963: xiii-xiv). Another “first *nishu*” is encountered in AO 11447 stemming from a different workshop at Assur (Geller 2007b: 4-18), which preserves therapies for (skin lesions on) the head and the ears, with no textual overlaps to BAM 9, but fitting topics included in the sections CRANIUM and EARS. BAM 99 is the 7th *nishu* copied from an original in the Gula temple (Esabad) of Assur; it concerns treatments for rectal illnesses, some of which are duplicated in Nineveh manuscripts of the section ANUS (Maul 2010a: 213-214; Hunger 1968: no. 202; Geller 2005: no. 22, 35 with parallels in other texts from Assur). The colophons of other *nishu*-tablets found in the library N4 point to textual traditions (copied originals) coming from Babylonia, see e.g. BAM 3 (a two-column excerpt tablet closely related to CRANIUM, “extracted from a wooden writing board from Akkad (Babylonia)” (Worthington 2006: 26, 32).

¹⁰¹ Line 126 (YBC 7123 rev. 7’) probably has to be restored [*kīma labīrīšu šatīrma*] BA.AN.Ē “[written according to an older original and] checked”.

¹⁰² The tablet formats used for the catalogues cannot be clearly linked to different catalogue types, but seem to depend primarily on the length and format of the text and on scribal habits. Thus, some series catalogues are written on one-column tablets (in portrait or landscape format, see e.g. *Sakikkû* catalogue vs. Ms. A of the *Bārūtu* catalogue), but the same applies to corpus catalogues (e.g. *Kalūtu* catalogue vs. Exorcist’s Manual). Thus, the tablet format of the catalogues does not seem to correlate with different professions, as Irving Finkel (2000: 146) has suggested for a Late Babylonian collection of texts with medical and magical material (i.e. texts in portrait format contain *asūtu*; tablets in landscape format contain *āšipūtu*). If one compares catalogue tablets, landscape format is often used for excerpts (see e.g. Ms. A with an extract of the *Bārūtu* catalogue) or for catalogues that present a continuous list of titles or keywords (e.g. Exorcist’s Manual), while catalogues that consist of lengthy sequences of tablet incipits with a sectional arrangement are predominantly on tablets in the portrait format (e.g. AMC, *Sakikkû* and *Kalūtu* catalogue).

a sequence of tablets and sections designated as *sadīrū*, the AMC could be regarded as the counterpart to the *Sakikkū* catalogue, the former presenting a series of therapeutic texts, the latter covering diagnostic texts.

There are, however, slight differences between both catalogues. The AMC does not use an overarching series title under which all texts in the AMC are numbered and serialised (as is the case in the *Sakikkū* catalogue). Also in the Nineveh colophons, individual tablets from the *Nineveh Medical Compendium* (reflected in AMC PART 1) are numbered and specified according to their place in the respective section, but never according to their position in the “series” as a whole. This differs from the *Sakikkū* series tablets, but also from Late Babylonian texts from Uruk, where a series of therapeutic texts is attested whose title is identical with that of the first tablet in the first section of AMC PART 1, *šumma amēlu muhhašu umma ukāl* (“If the patient’s skull is feverish”). This series is known in two recensions, designated as *ṭuppu*- and *pīrsu*-recension, according to the manuscript colophons, which divide the series text either into “tablets” (*ṭuppu*) or “divisions” (*pīrsu*).¹⁰³ The *ṭuppu*-recension consisted of 45 “tablets”, which were counted in a continuous sequence, i.e., it was not organised in sections as the AMC/*Nineveh Medical Compendium*.¹⁰⁴ Since the 41st Tablet of the Uruk series deals with women’s ailments, the *ṭuppu*-series seems to have included material that would correspond to PART 2 of AMC.¹⁰⁵ Thus, it can be concluded that, whereas by the Late Babylonian period the therapeutic texts seem to have been organised as one continuous series, in the Neo-Assyrian period these texts may also be considered as a corpus divided into two parts, each of which is arranged in a sectional order. The AMC could thus lie somewhat between a series and corpus catalogue.

Although AMC reflects the serialisation of a text corpus, the sequence of consecutive sections is so far only confirmed by colophons/catchlines of the *Nineveh Medical Compendium* corresponding to several sections of AMC PART 1. However, the arrangement of the AMC in sections (*sadīrū*) forming two parts with independent titles resembles the dual structure of the twin series *Sakikkū* and *Alamdimmū* in their joint catalogue.

The AMC and the *Sakikkū* Catalogue are very similar in their structural layout: each section of the series is described by a list of tablet incipits usually followed by a ruled-off summary rubric giving a sub-total of tablets for the section. This can be exemplified with the sixth section of the AMC (TEETH) concerned with treatments for illnesses of the mouth and teeth. Line 20 lists the incipits of the two component tablets of the section. After a ruling follows a three-line summary rubric, which states the total of tablets followed by the section title and a number of phrases, which seem to indicate some of the topics of therapies included in the section. These phrases are introduced by the preposition *adi*(EN):

¹⁰³ For *pīrsu*-recensions of text series, see CAD P 411 sub c; Hunger 1968: 171; Farber 2014: 17-22.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. above. A similar change is encountered in the *Bārūtu* series: only Late Babylonian texts count the tablets in a continuous sequence and refer to an overarching series title, whereas Neo-Assyrian manuscripts use only section titles and number tablets accordingly (cf. Koch-Westenholz 2000: 26-27, 79, 184, 267-268).

¹⁰⁵ The catchline of Tablet 41 of the Uruk *ṭuppu*-series (SpTU 1, 59) is not known from the AMC or from any other medical text. SpTU 1, 48 preserves the colophon of a text designated as the 45th(?) and final Tablet of *šumma amēlu muhhašu umma ukāl* and text sections dealing with calming down a frightened infant (Farber 1989a: 21f. and §13) and with epilepsy-related conditions. The number of constituent tablets in the Late Babylonian therapeutic series is quite low compared with AMC PART 1 and 2, which register more than 90 tablets altogether. The Uruk series of *šumma amēlu muhhašu umma ukāl* may thus have differed considerably from the Neo-Assyrian recension(s) of the therapeutic text series. For the Uruk *pīrsu*-series, the attested 9th and 10th Tablet have been identified in SpTU 1, 44 and 46 (Heeßel 2010c: 55-57, 59-60). The 9th *pīrsu* shares its incipit with Tablet 1 of the section BRONCHIA in AMC and with Nineveh texts, but also contains passages from Tablet 2 of section TEETH, duplicated in the Nineveh manuscript BAM 543 (Köcher 1980b: xx-xxi; Heeßel 2010c: 55-57; Scurlock 2014: text 2.5.6). SpTU 1, 46 is concerned with paralysis of the mouth and contains sections corresponding to material in Tablet 5 of the AMC section NECK (cf. Kinnier Wilson and Reynolds 2007). It is noteworthy that the sequence of the textual material in *pīrsu* 9 and 10 from Late Babylonian Uruk is reversed in comparison with the AMC and the Nineveh texts, where the section NECK precedes the sections TEETH and BRONCHIA (cf. Fig. 1 AMC Structure Chart). A Late Babylonian manuscript of the 30th *pīrsu* of *šumma amēlu muhhašu umma ukāl* is further attested in BM 42272 from Babylon (Scurlock 2014: texts 2.6.2 and 2.14.1; Abusch and Schwemer 2011: text 7.10 ms. j; Abusch et al. 2016: text 7.11 ms. n; Bácskay 2015). This tablet deals with treatments for witchcraft-induced conditions and for fever, but it is still unclear to which section of the AMC corpus the treatments in BM 42272 may be related. Note further BM 35512 (mentioned in Bácskay 2015: 2 n. 13, 4-5 *passim*), a Late Babylonian tablet from Babylon with treatments for fever containing several parallel passages to BM 42272, which is however designated as the “34th *nishu* of *šumma amēlu muhhašu umma ukāl*, with remedies (*bulṭū*) according to an original from the house of Dābibi” (cf. also Bácskay 2018). The catchline of BM 35512 indicates that the following *nishu*-tablet dealt with skin diseases. The 19th *nishu* of *šumma amēlu muhhašu umma ukāl*, according to remedies from “the house of Dābibi” is fragmentarily preserved in BAM 403 from Uruk (see rev. 7’-8’). The text deals with internal ailments (possibly related to STOMACH). These text examples demonstrate that several differing serialised therapeutic compendia were compiled and circulated in 1st millennium BCE Babylonia.

VI TEETH

20) A. 7821: 15' (+) YBC 7146: 4'
[DIŠ NA ZÚ.MEŠ-šú 'GIG' [: DIŠ NA] *gi-er me-er* ZÚ.ME-šú [*i-na-áš*]

- 21) YBC 7146: 5' [NÍGIN 2 DUB.MEŠ DIŠ NA ZÚ.MEŠ-šú GIG E]N KA-šú GIG-uš¹ ZÚ-šú *na'-di'-a[t']*
22) YBC 7146: 6' [...] x ' : ' *ta-a-bi-i-lu* DAB-su *bu-šá-nu* 'DAB'-s[u]
23) YBC 7146: 7' šá LÚ.TUR

²⁰[If a man's teeth] are sore. [If] all of a [man's] teeth [become loose].

²¹[A total of two tablets (of the section) 'If a man's teeth are sore'.] Including (prescriptions for the case that) his mouth is sore (and) his tooth *falls out*, ²²[...] (if) 'dryness' seizes him, *bu'šānu*-disease seizes him, ²³(including *bu'šānu*) in an infant.

If we compare this passage with Nineveh colophons of corresponding therapeutic tablets, the manuscript of TEETH Tablet 1 preserved on BAM 538 offers the catchline of Tablet 2, followed by the section title:

BAM 538 iv 50': DIŠ NA *gi-mer* ZÚ.MEŠ-šú 'i'-na-áš [DUB] 1.KAM DIŠ NA ZÚ.MEŠ-šú GIG
'If all of a man's teeth become loose'. First [tablet] of 'If a man's teeth are sore'.

The section title of TEETH is also cited in the colophon of BAM 543 iv 60', which contains TEETH Tablet 2:

[DUB 2.K]AM DIŠ NA ZÚ.MEŠ-šú GIG 'AL'.TIL
[Second tablet] of 'If a man's teeth are sore'. Finished.

The catchline of this tablet (iv 59) cites the incipit of the first tablet of the following section on respiratory ailments (BRONCHIA), *šumma amēlu (napīš) appišu kabit* "If a patient has difficulties breathing through the nose".

In some cases such as the section TEETH, it can be shown that the phrases following *adi* in the summary rubrics of the AMC represent key phrases extracted from sections contained in the tablets enumerated before. For instance, the Nineveh text BAM 543 (corresponding to TEETH Tablet 2) contains a prescription for *tābīlu* "dryness" (iv 22: [DIŠ NA (KA-šú) *t[a-bi-i-lu ša-ab-tū]*), but also recipes for treating *bu'šānu*, corresponding to key phrases in the AMC summary rubric for the section (lines 21-23).¹⁰⁶

The answer to the question what AMC represents could have been found in its opening line (unfortunately fragmentary), a feature encountered in series and corpus catalogues.¹⁰⁷ The opening lines of the Exorcist's Manual (KAR 44) and the *Sakikkû* Catalogue illustrate the differences between both catalogue types:

KAR 44: 1 (and duplicates):
(KA DUB) SAG.MEŠ ÉŠ.GÀR MAŠ.MAŠ-ti šá a-na NÍG.ZU u IGI.DU_g.ÀM *kun-nu* PAP MU.NE
(Wording of the tablet of) titles ("incipits") of the **corpus** of exorcism, established for learning and reading (lit. viewing), the sum total of their names.

Sakikkû Catalogue opening line:
[SAG DUB.MEŠ u Š]U.NÍGIN MU.MEŠ ša SA.GIG.MEŠ MU.N[E]
[The titles ("incipits") of the tablets and?] sum total of **lines** (entries) of (the series) *Sakikkû* ("sick cords"), their names.

¹⁰⁶ See, e.g., BAM 543 ii 11, 19, note ii 24: [...]x-šú KÚM *il-la-tu-šú* DU-ku *bu-u'-šá-na* DAB-su; further ii 46', 50', 59', iii 53', iv 3. The first phrases after *adi* in AMC line 23 have not yet been identified in serial tablets of the section. They could indicate sections in TEETH Tablet 1 – the manuscript BAM 538 from Nineveh is badly preserved. Similarly, no therapeutic texts are currently known which contain recipes for treating *bu'šānu* in infants (all known recipes start with *šumma amēlu*).

¹⁰⁷ The AMC only preserves the last two signs of the opening line, 'MU.NE'.

The Exorcist's Manual is defined as a list of several text series (or "genres")¹⁰⁸ forming a professional corpus, the *Sakikkû* Catalogue presents itself as a chart with totals of "lines" (i.e., omen entries) and tablet incipits of one text series, identified by name. In terms of text "genres" contained in AMC, it resembles in some ways the Exorcist's Manual, because it lists not only incipits of tablets with medical therapies, but also rubrics of incantation genres and omen collections, i.e., it is of mixed content. In contrast, *Sakikkû* is a specialised composition, restricted almost entirely to diagnosis and prognosis.

On the other hand, the AMC and *Sakikkû/Alamdimmû* catalogue share the division of textual material into a sequence of *sadīrū* "sections" reflecting a thematic arrangement of contents. Both catalogues associate this sectional arrangement with the creation of an "edition". Moreover, both compendia make use of the "head to foot" order in some of their sections, an innovation that in the *Sakikkû* catalogue is attributed to the editor Esagil-kīn-apli.¹⁰⁹ Similarly, the Exorcist's Manual (line 27) connects the texts listed in the first part of the catalogue with this scholar.¹¹⁰ It is more striking that there is no mention of Esagil-kīn-apli in AMC, which does not claim any authority or personal agency behind the editorial work at all. This subtle difference may indicate that the AMC (and the corresponding edition of therapeutic texts) was created in a different professional milieu, but that the compilers were aware of and influenced by Esagil-kīn-apli's innovations in his edition of *Sakikkû*. In this line of thought, it can be concluded that the edition of therapeutic texts described in the AMC was most likely produced later than Esagil-kīn-apli's edition of the diagnostic series.

6 Exorcist's Manual and AMC: Reconsidering the Tale of Two Healing Professions

The analysis in the preceding paragraph has revealed structural similarities between AMC and the *Sakikkû* Catalogue, but also pointed out affinities with the Exorcist's Manual (in terms of contents and text genres), and I have suggested that AMC could be regarded as an intermediate between a corpus and a series catalogue. This ultimately leads to the question whose corpus AMC represents. In my view, there are good reasons to suggest that AMC represents the corpus of *asûtu* "medicine", forming the counterpart to the Exorcist's Manual, which outlines the corpus of *āšipûtu* "exorcism lore". In this section, I will test this hypothesis by a close comparison of both catalogues and their contents. The question whether we can identify and differentiate the professional text corpora of *āšipûtu* and *asûtu*, is tied up with the old and thorny problem regarding the definition of both disciplines.¹¹¹ My approach is to take the AMC and Exorcist's

¹⁰⁸ Contrary to the catalogue opening line speaking of "incipits" (SAG.MEŠ), the titles listed in the Exorcist's Manual correspond to rubrics of incantation genres or rituals, often encountered in the texts (KA.INIM.MA ...), rather than to incipits. Occasionally in ms. A (KAR 44), small explanatory glosses are attached to a genre designation, forming the actual incipit of the compendium in question. See Geller's edition of the Exorcist's Manual in this volume.

¹⁰⁹ It should be noted that there are a few instances of similar tablet incipits in *Sakikkû* (sections 4 and 5) and AMC. For instance, *Sakikkû* Tablet 27 starts with the same entry as Tablet 5 of the section NECK (DIŠ NA *mi-šit-ti pa-ni ma-šid-ma ta-lam-ma-šû i-šam-ma-am-šû* KIN *mi-šit-ti* GIG), which is attested in AMT 77/1 i 1; and these two tablets share further diagnostic entries (Stol 1991-92: 51-52; 1993: 74-75; Heeßel 2000: 303-304, AMT 77/1 i 2-10 = *Sakikkû* 27: 5-13). BAM 66, a Middle Assyrian tablet from the so-called "library of Tiglath-pileser I" contains similar recipes to STOMACH Tablet 4 (*himīṭ šēti*), but also shares some parallel entries with *Sakikkû* Tablet 31, which itself consists of complete recipes (cf. Finkel 1994: 87-88; Heeßel 2000: 348-349). The incipit of *Sakikkû* Tablet 32, *šumma (amēlu) šāru išbišsuma magal ēm*, is also found in BAM 146: 56', a therapeutic text related to the section STOMACH (Heeßel 2000: 352; cf. AMC lines 30, 31, 35). Likewise, *Sakikkû* Tablet 33 has many parallels and correspondences in therapeutic texts and AMC sections HAMSTRING and SKIN (lines 53-58, 59-69; cf. Heeßel 2000: 365-370; Stol 1991-92: 49-52 for citations from *Sakikkû* in therapeutic texts). Stol (1991-92: 49) argued concerning the citations from *Sakikkû* in the therapeutic texts that the compilers of the therapeutic texts knew and drew on the diagnostic series.

¹¹⁰ It is unclear whether the attribution *ša Esagil-kīn-apli* "according to Esagil-kīn-apli" means that he was believed to have contributed to editions of the text corpus (or to have created this part of the catalogue?). Notably, the Exorcist's Manual does not explicitly claim that the scholar produced an edition (*zarā šabātu*) of the listed texts. Cf. Frahm (forthcoming), suggesting that the expression "established for learning and reading" found in both catalogues, and linked in the *Sakikkû* Catalogue to Esagil-kīn-apli's accomplishments, could imply notions of "canonicity", in the sense that Esagil-kīn-apli could have actually contributed to creating revised editions for other texts in the *āšipu*'s corpus.

¹¹¹ For discussions of the relationship between *āšipu* and *asû* see, e.g., Ritter 1965; Stol 1991-92: 58-62; van Binsbergen and Wiggermann 1999: 25-32; Scurlock 1999; 2014: 2-4; Heeßel 2009: 13-15; Geller 2007a; 2010: 43-55; Attinger 2008: 71-77; Schwemer 2011: 421-423; 2015a: 26-27; Böck 2014: 185-92; 2015: 31-33; Steinert 2016a: 214-219, 223-225.

Manual as a point of departure to reformulate the current perspectives concerning the relationship between the two fields of healing traditions in Mesopotamia.

To start with, a few general arguments speak for the attribution of AMC and Exorcist's Manual to *asûtu* and *āšipûtu*. As a first argument, from very early on in the textual sources, *āšipu* and *asû* are considered as distinguishable healing specialists, and in the Neo-Assyrian period, *asûs* belonged to the circle of scholars and specialists employed to serve the king's needs. Thus, we can expect that like all the other technical disciplines (*tušarrûtu*, *āšipûtu*, *bārûtu*, and *kalûtu*), *asûtu* also developed a definable text corpus. Whereas the corpus of the *āšipu* is well defined by the Exorcist's Manual, we still lack a corresponding corpus catalogue for *asûtu*, and AMC looks like a good candidate.

Second, there is a strong likelihood that the AMC is linked to *asûtu*, since it was copied by a young *asû* and invokes Gula, the patron goddess of *asûtu*, in the colophon. Moreover, the Ashurbanipal colophon q designates the contents of the tablets of the *Nineveh Medical Compendium* corresponding to AMC PART 1 as *azugallût Ninurta u Gula*.

Thirdly, the title of the therapeutic series in AMC PART 1 designates its contents as *bulû* "remedies", a term very much associated with the *asû*.¹¹² For instance, in the Neo-Assyrian letters of *asûs*, the senders often emphasise their medical expertise by recommending *bulû* and giving practical instructions about their application, sometimes citing directly from the therapeutic series included in AMC PART 1.¹¹³ The focus on *bulû* in the letters of *asûs* points in my view to their connection with the therapeutic corpus in the AMC. In contrast, letters of *āšipus* predominantly refer to texts that are included in the Exorcist's Manual, and often discuss matters connected to rituals and divination (SAA 10, 185-315; Jean 2006). Although the court *āšipus* regularly correspond with the king concerning the diagnosis and treatment of illnesses (including the application of remedies), occasionally cooperating with an *asû* (SAA 10, 297; Jean 2006: 101-102, 125; Villard 2006: 148), they also advised the king in many other matters (ritual, religious, internal and political).¹¹⁴

The interpretation of the AMC texts as reflecting *asûtu* would at last provide this healing profession with a text corpus, which could serve as the basis for defining the discipline of *asûtu* in relation to *āšipûtu*. Although it has previously been argued that the therapeutic texts in the AMC originate with the *āšipu* and form the counterpart to the diagnostic series *Sakikkû*,¹¹⁵ the Exorcist's Manual provides indirect evidence against this thesis, since the *āšipûtu* catalogue does not mention the therapeutic corpus as such with a recognisable title such as "remedies from the top of the head to the (toe)nail(s)".

A closer look at the Exorcist's Manual will help to clarify the matter, since it forms a list of compositions, genres and competences, which the *āšipu* should master, providing a comprehensive overview of his areas of expertise and practice.¹¹⁶

¹¹² The word refers predominantly to medical prescriptions, but occasionally includes ritual procedures involving offerings and prayers performed in combination with the application of drugs (Steinert 2015: 118).

¹¹³ See especially the letters of the chief physician Urad-Nanaya (SAA 10, 314–326; cf. Parpola 1983b: Nos. 153, 246-257; Jean 2006: 121–22; Villard 2006: 139–40, 143–53; Geller 2010: 79–86). In SAA 10, 315, he writes that he was previously unable to give a diagnosis for Esarhaddon's illness and offer effective treatment (lines 9-10, citing the king's speech: *atâ šikin muršiya anniu lā tammar bulûšu lā teppaš* "Why do you not see the nature of this illness of mine (and) apply remedies for it?", line 12: *sakikkêšu lā ušahkime* "(formerly) I could not clarify his symptoms"). Then he adds instructions for remedies (lotion, medicine bags, salve), which he is sending to the king. The other letters of Urad-Nanaya have similar topics. SAA 10, 316 mentions two plants and explains their effect. SAA 10, 318 concerns the treatment of a skin rash. SAA 10, 319 discusses the treatment of an abscess, and includes a positive prognosis for the infant patient. SAA 10, 320 rev. 1-5 speaks about remedies for the teeth (*bulû ša šinni*) and makes a prognosis. In SAA 10, 321-322, the *asû* encloses detailed instructions (*malûru*) for applying remedies against nosebleed. SAA 10, 323 concerns drugs for fumigating the ears, which Urad-Nanaya sends. In SAA 10, 324: 8-10, he notifies the king that the remedy for the ears (*bulû ša uzni*) is ready. Last but not least, SAA 10, 326 informs the addressee that in all the recipe texts (*ina bulû gabbu*), the symptoms he experiences (simultaneous purging above and below) are regarded as favourable to a cure (rev. 1-3). In fact, this statement is based on the therapeutic texts and can be found in Tablet 1 of the section STOMACH (BAM 574 i 31: *ina pišu u šuburrišu ušeššerma ... uballu*). It is striking that the Assyrian library records do not refer to the term *asûtu* as they do to *bārûtu* or *āšipûtu* to classify textual material, but that the category *bulû* "(medical) remedies" is used instead (cf. Parpola 1983a).

¹¹⁴ See also Jean 2006: 112-128, 168-170, 197-208 and Villard 2006; Geller 2010: 86-88.

¹¹⁵ This idea has been suggested by Scurlock (2014: 295, cf. *ibid.* 2-4). However, Stol (1991-92) has previously pointed out marked differences between diagnostic and therapeutic texts, which could suggest a disciplinary divide.

¹¹⁶ For the text see Geller's edition in this volume. The manual has also been edited in Geller 2000: 242-258 and Jean 2006: 62-82; see also Hecker 2008: 76-79 for a German translation. For discussions, see further Bottéro 1985: 65-110; Clancier 2009b; 2014 and Frahm (forthcoming). At present, seven copies of the text have been identified. The earliest manuscripts from Assyria (Assur and Nineveh) date to the 7th century BCE, while the Babylonian manuscripts from Uruk and Babylon (SpTU 5, 231, Rm. 717+ and BM 36678) date to the Late Babylonian period (ca. 5th and 4th century BCE). One manuscript from Sippar (BM 55148+) could have been written between the 7th and 5th century BCE.

The catalogue can be divided into two main sections and a short coda.¹¹⁷ The first section (lines 1-26/27) starts with an opening line identifying the following list as the compositions of the exorcist's craft. Lines 2-26 consist predominantly of rituals and incantations, presented in a hierarchical fashion. The first titles and topics (lines 2-4) pertain to the domain of the temple/gods (temple building rituals, rituals for the induction of divine cult images, rituals for the investiture of the En-priest and other cult-related rituals), followed by prayers to be used in various ritual settings (e.g., prayers to the sun god, Šuila prayers, prayers to soothe the anger of a deity), rituals for specific months and rituals relating to the king (line 5).

The manual then turns to texts and genres concerned with normal human clients and their concerns. These compositions are predominantly related to healing and constitute the greater part of the section (lines 6-20). First, the diagnostic series *Sakikkû* is listed together with the physiognomic and behavioural omen texts *Alamdimmû*, *Nigdimdimmû* and *Kataduggû* (line 6). In lines 7-20, various series of rituals and incantations concerned with treating all kinds of illnesses and evils are enumerated (many of which are known from first millennium BCE sources), including purification rituals (e.g., *Bit rimki*, *Bit mēseri*), rituals against a host of evil demons (e.g., UDUG.HUL.A.MEŠ, Á.SÂG.GIG.GA.MEŠ, *lilû* and *ardat lilû* demons), witchcraft, incantations against "the curse" resulting from a broken oath (lines 12, 14) and incantations for various health problems (lines 14-20). Then, the manual continues with other rituals related to aspects of daily life (lines 21-24), ranging from agriculture (field pests, floods), animal husbandry (epidemics) to travel and warfare, followed by texts concerned with divination (line 25). The last items in line 26 are plant and stone description texts (*Abnu šikinšu*, *Šammu šikinšu*), drug compendia and manuals on stones and amulets, which show that the *āšipu*'s corpus included so-called "pharmacological" texts.¹¹⁸ All the works listed up to line 26 can be designated as the core of the *āšipu*'s corpus and are explicitly connected to Esagil-kīn-apli, in the ruled-off line 27 (he "established" (*ukīn*) them "for learning and reading").¹¹⁹

The following second part of the catalogue (lines 28-40) forms in a way an appendix to the first section (cf. Jean 2006: 73-74; Clancier 2009b; 2014; Frahm forthcoming). It contains additional text genres and compositions, which represent more advanced and sophisticated "realms of knowledge" to be mastered by the exorcist, such as Namburbi rituals for all ominous events (line 31), "foreign/extraneous(?)" incantations (TU₆.TU₆.BAR.RA), medical remedies, commentaries/word lists and omens series such as *Šumma ālu* and *Enūma Anu Enlil*. In this section (lines 36-40), the reader and adept is repeatedly addressed directly and instructed about the progressive stages of his training toward mastery of all areas of scholarly learning, "as much as the god Ea invented" (line 28).¹²⁰

In view of the catalogue's instructive passages, Clancier (2009b; 2014), Geller (2012) and Frahm (forthcoming) have pointed out that the Exorcist's Manual served as a didactic tool for the training of apprentices. Although the AMC does not contain a comparable section of explicitly instructive nature, it could nonetheless have served similar functions as the Exorcist's Manual.¹²¹ It may not be a coincidence that the AMC was copied by a young *asû*, which may imply that this

¹¹⁷ Following Frahm (forthcoming), the last two lines 41-42 of the catalogue form a coda-like third part, since they are ruled off in two of the manuscripts and do not list compositions, but formulate a blessing for the scholar who has mastered the whole corpus outlined before.

¹¹⁸ For DUB NA₄.MEŠ DUB Ū.HI.A *taṣīri u malālī* "the tablet of stones, the tablet of plants, (amulet) strings and pendants" in line 26, cf. Köcher 1971: vii; 1980a: xi ad BAM 430 and 431; Schuster-Brandis 2008: 21, 60; Böck 2015: 26. These designations could refer cursorily to practical handbooks on drugs of herbal and mineral origin (sometimes called *Herbals*), and the latter two terms could refer to collections on amulet bracelets and medicine bags. The occurrence of handbooks on drug lore and botany in the Exorcist's Manual shows that, contrary to Scurlock (2014: 2-3), not all "pharmacological" texts pertain solely to the *asû*. It can be shown however that some practical drug handbooks were copied by *asûs*, see, e.g., BAM 1 (Hunger 1968: no. 234), while manuscripts of Uruanna were copied and owned both by exorcists and physicians (Böck 2015: 29-30; note KADP 22, compiled by "ten expert physicians" (col. iv 13), but found in the Assur library N4). It is noteworthy that the compendium Uruanna is not mentioned in the Exorcist's Manual.

¹¹⁹ See Frahm (forthcoming) for a discussion of the debated question whether this rubric forms a subscript or a heading for the second part of the catalogue. I agree with Frahm's argumentation that the attribution to Esagil-kīn-apli (in lines 1 and 27) concerns the compositions in the first part of the catalogue.

¹²⁰ See Frahm forthcoming. As noted before, this section refers to esoteric realms and corpora of knowledge associated with the *Apsû* and referred to with the rare terms *kakugallûtu* and *išippûtu*. Clancier (2009b; 2014) similarly argues that the two parts of the Manual reflect two stages of learning, that of the *āšipu* "ritual specialist" and that of the *ummānu* "scholar" versed in all fields of knowledge. The Exorcist's Manual lists most, but not all texts that can be linked to the discipline or were used by *āšipus*, e.g., É.GAL.KU₄.RA incantations and the *Bit salā' mē* ritual are not included (Jean 2006: 106-109), neither are the specialised compendia *Muššu'u* "Embrocation; Massage" and *Qutāru* "Fumigation" (cf. above; Finkel 1991; Böck 2007: 25-29, 31-43).

¹²¹ Notably, the *Sakikkû* Catalogue also contains a concluding narrative section, which describes Esagil-kīn-apli's editorial work (Finkel 1988b; Heeßel 2000: 104-105), followed by secrecy formulae and a definition of the scholar's/*āšipu*'s task vis-à-vis his clients, especially the king. The Exorcist's Manual likewise refers to realms of its corpus as "secret" (*niširtu*). In contrast, we do not find such formulae in the AMC.

catalogue was intended for both practitioner and adept, as a contents list to the discipline's serialised text corpus (e.g., to familiarise the adept with the contents and organisation of the text corpus). In addition, the catalogue could also have served practical purposes. For instance, the summary rubrics of AMC with their key phrases could have helped to identify or retrieve relevant tablets and sections of recipes.

If we suppose that the Exorcist's Manual and the AMC represent the corpora of the two healing disciplines *āšipūtu* and *asūtu* and compare the types of texts they contain, it is possible to delimit for each profession a core corpus of texts reflecting the focus of their traditional expertise and healing practices. This allows the following distinction:

The primary focus of *asūtu* texts and professional lore was on **medical prescriptions (*bulṭū*) ordered by topic (illness types)**, but it also included **incantations/ritual instructions** and a few divinatory texts. *Asūtu* can thus primarily be connected with the therapeutic corpus, which includes diagnostic sections.

The primary focus of the *āšipūtu* texts and professional lore was on **incantations/rituals for various purposes**, including a separate diagnostic series for healing practice. It also included drug compendia, some medical recipes (*bulṭū*) and a number of divinatory texts.

Both catalogues cover many of the same topics related to healing (e.g., illness types defined according to affected body part, women's and children's illnesses, veterinary medicine), which means that *āšipūtu* and *asūtu* treated basically the same range of illnesses.¹²²

The therapeutic techniques employed by the two professions are at the same time complementary and overlapping, but each discipline has its own core corpus of texts and genres. While the Exorcist's Manual lists mainly incantation genres and ritual compendia, the AMC lists mainly sections of recipe collections. Yet, the Exorcist's Manual refers to collections of remedies (*bulṭū*) in the second section (appendix), while the AMC mentions a number of incantation genres that occur among the core texts in the first section of the Exorcist's Manual. This partial overlap between text types could point to mutual borrowing and exchange between *āšipūtu* and *asūtu*, i.e., both disciplines adopted and integrated some core texts or practices from the corpus of the other profession. Such intersections between both corpora are not surprising, since there is evidence for the interdisciplinarity of specialists' interests and education and for the cooperation between *āšipūtu* and *asūtu*, especially in the first millennium BCE (cf. below).¹²³

Looking at the areas of overlap between both catalogues, one notices an interesting pattern in terms of the positions of such texts and genres in the catalogues. In the AMC, incantations and genres that are found among the core texts of *āšipūtu* in the Exorcist's Manual are always mentioned in the *adi*-sections (summaries) for several sections of the therapeutic corpus. Most instances occur in AMC PART 2, which seems to include much more material reflecting healing practices typically associated with *āšipūtu*.¹²⁴ Thus, in some cases the keywords and text genres cited in AMC's *adi*-sections could represent "additional" or peripheral material that was incorporated in a particular section of the text

¹²² The structural principle in AMC PART 1, grouping texts according to specific body parts or regions *a capite ad calcem* is applied at times, but less consequently in the Exorcist's Manual. For instance, line 9 contains a sequence referring to incantations for diseased head (SAG.GIG.GA.MEŠ) – neck (GÚ.GIG.GA.MEŠ) – all ailments (TU.RA.KĪLIB.BA). Lines 16-17 list spells for diseased eyes (IGI.GIG.GA.KE₄) – teeth (ZÚ.GIG.GA.KE₄) – *bu'sānu*-disease (KA.HAB.DIB.BA) – belly (ŠĀ.GIG.GA.KE₄) – lungs (MUR.GIG.GA.KE₄) – incantations for all ailments (TU₆.TU₆.GIG.DŪ.A.BI). Second, the sequence of a few topics is the same in both catalogues, e.g., the grouping of texts related to sexuality and reproduction (pregnancy, birth). Other overlapping topics in both catalogues are nosebleed (KAR 44: 18 and AMC line 19), snake bite/scorpion stings (KAR 44: 19 and AMC section HAZARDS, lines 70-78), or purification rituals for the animal stalls (KAR 44: 24 and the VETERINARY section in AMC lines 119-120).

¹²³ Such interdisciplinary interests were not restricted to *āšipūtu* and *asūtu*. Although specialised in a particular field, divination and healing experts also studied texts of others disciplines (see Koch 2015: 18-24; Lenzi 2015: 147-150). Scribal and specialist training included various strands of cuneiform literature. For instance, the libraries of exorcists also contained some texts of disciplines such as *bārūtu* and *kalūtu* (Assur), astronomy and mathematics (Uruk), see Jean 2006: 149-153, 161-164; Clancier 2009a: 81-103, 400-406; 2009b: 112-113; 2014: 8-10. For collaboration between specialists of different professions (e.g., *kalū* and *āšipūtu/mašmaššu* or between *asūtu* and *bārūtu*, see also Lenzi 2015: 177-178; for similar glimpses from the Old Babylonian period (Mari letters), see also Durand 1988: no. 263: 17-23 and no. 125 (M. 7989).

¹²⁴ The only example for a "genre" designation from the Exorcist's Manual in AMC PART 1 is UŠ₁₁.BŪR.RU.DA.KĀM, mentioned in the *adi*-section of ABDOMEN (line 43). However, since the label UŠ₁₁.BŪR.RU.DA is also encountered in therapeutic medical texts as a thematic marker, it remains to be investigated whether the keyword is used in the AMC merely as a rubric indicating that the section in question included medical remedies for witchcraft, or whether the keyword indeed signifies textual material more closely allied to the *āšipūtu*'s corpus (e.g. UŠ₁₁.BŪR.RU.DA-rituals also embedded in *Bit rimki*). For an overview of this heterogeneous material of UŠ₁₁.BŪR.RU.DA-rituals and therapies, see Abusch and Schwemer 2011: texts 7.1-10; Abusch et al. 2016: texts 7.11-26.

corpus, but was highlighted as special.¹²⁵ Unfortunately, it is not always possible to determine, whether the genres from the Exorcist's Manual in the AMC refer to specific incantations (with or without rituals) on tablets that contain mainly medical recipes, or whether the rubrics indicate smaller compilations from the *āšipūtu* incantation series/collections on separate tablets, to be added on top of the tablets in a respective section.¹²⁶ Nonetheless, in some cases it is likely that the genres from the Exorcist's Manual in the AMC signify textual material such as incantations, rituals and specific therapies from *āšipūtu*, which have been integrated into sections of the therapeutic corpus of *asūtu*.¹²⁷

The following genres/rubrics from the Exorcist's Manual occur also in AMC PART 2:¹²⁸

- 1) The series/compilation of incantations known as (KA.INIM.MA) HUL.BA.ZI.ZI.(KE₄) is listed in line 7 of the Exorcist's Manual among the core texts of *āšipūtu*, but also appears in the summary rubric for the section dubbed provisionally EVIL POWERS in AMC PART 2 (lines 79-83), listed there as additional or inclusive material (line 83: EN HUL.BA.ZI.ZI *he-pi*).¹²⁹ The summary rubric (lines 80-82) mentions several key phrases, which form citations from the diagnostic section of recipes as well as incantation genres. The rubric KA.DAB.BÉ.DA.KÁM (line 82) indicates that text sections belonging to EVIL POWERS were concerned with sorcery and other evil agents as causes of illness.¹³⁰
- 2) The incantation genre [NAM.ÉRIM.B]ÚR.RU.DA.KÁM against the "curse" probably has to be restored in AMC line 86 among material included in the section dubbed DIVINE ANGER (lines 84-88). This section consists of four tablets, whose incipits are partially known from textual sources.¹³¹ The label [NAM.ÉRIM.B]ÚR.RU.DA is listed in the *adi*-section beside entries relating to anti-witchcraft treatments and rituals, as is also the case in the Exorcist's Manual line 12, where NAM.ÉRIM.BÚR.RU.DA is enumerated with UŠ₁₁.HUL.GÁL.MEŠ, ÁŠ.HUL.GÁL.MEŠ and UŠ₁₁.BÚR.RU.DA.¹³² But the section DIVINE ANGER as a whole seems to feature textual material closely associated with *āšipūtu* techniques (e.g., amulets, rituals).

¹²⁵ As pointed out above, in some cases in AMC PART 1, it can be shown that the phrases in the *adi*-sections are citations from the respective series tablets. The technique of citing a text section on a tablet with *adi*(EN) + incipit is also found in the *Sakikkû* Catalogue, for Tablet 33 of the series, which indeed consists of two ruled-off sections with a differing formula. The catalogue cites the incipits of both texts sections (lines 1 and 103) as: [x+] DÍŠ 'GIG' GAR-šú EN 'sa'-ma-nu ŠU 'ME.ME "[x (entries)]: 'If the characteristic(s) of the lesion', including 'šāmānu (is caused by) Hand of Gula'" (Finkel 1988b: 147 A 40; Heeßel 2000: 16, 366). According to Heeßel, the two sections of *Sakikkû* Tablet 33 did not originally belong together, which probably was one reason why both of them are cited in the series catalogue.

¹²⁶ The number '38' (+) for the tablet sub-total of AMC PART 2 (line 123) seems to be considerably higher than the number of preserved tablet incipits, which may be a clue that some material enumerated in the summary sections in PART 2 was found on separate tablets that were added to the tally.

¹²⁷ A similar differentiation between core texts of a scholarly profession and peripheral texts from other professions' corpora is elucidated in Stevens' (2013) study of protective formulae found in texts from Late Babylonian tablet collections from Uruk. While texts belonging to the tablet owner's discipline bear protective formulae, texts from other disciplines in his collection do not feature such formulae. Cf. Lenzi 2013: 36-39.

¹²⁸ For the occurrence of these genres in medical contexts see the commentary to the AMC edition in this volume.

¹²⁹ For compilations of apotropaic HUL.BA.ZI.ZI incantations and their use on protective amulets, see Finkel 1976: 72-73, 74-77, 245-283; Heeßel 2002. Incantations from HUL.BA.ZI.ZI were integrated into medical therapeutic texts in several different contexts. They can be found interspersed, e.g., in tablets belonging to the AMC section EARS, but more often in treatments for ghost-induced illnesses and pain (e.g., headache). Only in two texts, HUL.BA.ZI.ZI spells are used against witchcraft: in STT 275 i 19'-27' (Finkel 1976: 251 spell no. 20; Abusch et al. 2016: text 3.4 ms. B; Schuster-Brandis 2008: Kette 51), and in BAM 326 ii 2'-6' (Ebeling 1949: 202-203; Finkel 1976: 259-263 spell no. 57; cf. Abusch et al. 2016: text 3.7 ms. C, spell šu-zi hul-ġál). In the medical texts, HUL.BA.ZI.ZI incantations are almost always combined with treatments typical for *āšipūtu* texts, namely with amulet bracelets, leather pouches and salves. Thus, these treatment types feature prominently in *Sakikkû* tablets that contain therapeutic sections.

¹³⁰ For KA.DAB.BÉ.DA "Seizing of the mouth", a type of sorcery performed by one's legal opponent, see Schwemer 2007a: 14-16, 63 n. 136, 95-97. Only few medical prescriptions against KA.DAB.BÉ.DA are known to date, which are mostly found in compilations concerned with witchcraft-induced illnesses (which may be related to the AMC section EVIL POWERS), but also on collective tablets with recipes for diverse ailments (see Abusch et al. 2016: texts 10.14-18).

¹³¹ The incipits are: 1) *ana kimilti Anim paš[āri]* "To loosen the wrath of Anu", 2) *šumma amēlu ginā šūdūr* "If a man is constantly frightened", 3) *ÉN ili ul idi* "Incantation: My god, I do not know" (cf. Lambert 1974), and 4) *ana amēli ilšu u ištaršu ina rēšišu uzuzzi* "For a man's god and goddess to stand by him".

¹³² For NAM.ÉRIM as the curse activated by a broken oath, cf. Schramm 2001: 4-8. Schwemer has noted that there is a close relation and overlap between rituals/incantations and treatments for witchcraft (UŠ₁₁.BÚR.RU.DA) and NAM.ÉRIM.BÚR.RU.DA in the textual sources, which is reflected in the mixture of both topics in the *adi*-section of the AMC section under discussion (Abusch et al. 2016: text group 7.11; Schwemer 2007a: 66, n. 151). There are examples of tablets with medical recipes (e.g., potions, but also amulets) for both purposes, which may have

- 3) The entry ŠĀ.ZI.GA “arousal”, relating to incantations and rituals to stimulate sexual desire, occurs in the Exorcist’s Manual line 14, whereas in AMC line 106 we probably find [KA.INIM.MA ŠĀ.ZI.G]A among material in the *adi*-section for the section dubbed SEX, mentioned beside the genres MUNUS.GIN.NA.KĀM (“to make a woman come (to you)”) and ŠĀ.ZI.GA.MUNUS.A.KĀM, concerned with arousing female sexual desire.¹³³ In the corpus of ŠĀ.ZI.GA texts published by Biggs (1967), one can identify different components and therapeutic strategies, including incantations, rituals and treatments such as ointments, amulets, or potions. Both in second and first millennium texts and compendia, such medical and “magical” procedures appear regularly on the same tablet or are applied in combined use (e.g., potions with herbs, ointments and amulets). It is thus very difficult to identify components or texts that pertain exclusively to *asûtu* or *āšipûtu*. It may thus be that both disciplines employed similar texts and methods for treating problems involving sexuality and libido, although it is conspicuous that Gula does not feature in this text group at all. This points to strong *āšipûtu* components in the AMC section SEX.
- 4) The rubric following ŠĀ.ZI.GA in the Exorcist’s Manual line 15 is MUNUS.PEŠ₄.KĒŠ.DA, a genre of incantations concerned with protecting pregnant women from miscarriage (lit. “to bind a pregnant woman”).¹³⁴ The genre MUNUS.PEŠ₄.KĒ[Š.DA.KĀM] is mentioned in the AMC as the last entry in the *adi*-section of PREGNANCY (line 112) among a number of key phrases which all start with DIŠ MUNUS “if a woman ...”, indicating the incipits of text sections, probably included on the section tablets. It is odd that the rubric ka-inim-ma munus-kēš-d[a]-kam marking Sumerian incantations is so far only attested on tablets from the Old Babylonian period (CBS 1509 i 20, iii 25; Finkel 1980: 38-39, 42-43 text C). In the first millennium BCE texts, we find occasional Sumerian spells concerned with “binding the mouth”, combined with instructions for protective amulet bracelets against bleeding and miscarriage. Such texts focussing on amulets for pregnant women, designated *takšîrû/kušârû ša erîti* “amulet strings/knots for a pregnant woman”, are well attested in different contexts, and some of the sources can be connected with the section PREGNANCY.¹³⁵

The section PREGNANCY is remarkable because it contains a reference to the healing goddess Ninkarrak (one of Gula’s manifestations) in its title: DIŠ NA *ana* ⁴NI]N.KAR.RA.AK ⁷pa⁷-qid “If a man is entrusted to Ninkarrak”. This incipit as well as the incipits of the other two section tablets can be matched with textual sources at our disposal.¹³⁶

The section includes heterogeneous material, some components of which can be identified as incantation genres mentioned side by side in the Exorcist’s Manual line 15 (MUNUS.PEŠ₄.KĒŠ.DA, ⁴DÎM.ME.KĀM and LÚ.TUR.HUN.GĀ) or as practices at home in *āšipûtu* (especially the amulets, figurine rituals), while a few components in this section could have had ties with *asûtu* as well, e.g., in view of the association with the goddess Gula/Ninkarrak. However, typical *asûtu* practices are harder to isolate within this material, and the textual contents of the section PREGNANCY point primarily to a major contribution or influx of *āšipûtu* material into the medical corpus in AMC

a connection to the AMC section DIVINE ANGER (see, e.g., BAM 190-193 = Abusch and Schwemer 2011: text group 7.10 F, Q, R, O; BAM 197 = Abusch and Schwemer 2011: text 1.7 A). See the commentary to the AMC edition for discussion.

133 This AMC section probably consisted of one tablet, whose fragmentary incipit is an incantation reminiscent of spells connected to ŠĀ.ZI.GA texts. For the genre MUNUS.GIN.NA.KAM/KĀM, cf. Biggs 1967: 70-71 KAR 61: 1-25; 74-78 KAR 69 obv. 19, rev. 1, 9, 21; Geller 2014: 27-68 BRM 4, 20 and STT 300). For ŠĀ.ZI.GA.MUNUS.A.KAM/KĀM, cf. Biggs 1967: 9-10, 65 K. 2499 rev. 10: *ana* MUNUS ⁷ZI-tú⁷ [*šur-ši-i*] “to [let] a woman [get] aroused”.

134 Notably, in AMC, the section PREGNANCY (lines 107-112) also follows two sections, which have been dubbed POTENCY and SEX, because they both deal with matters of heterosexual relations. The section PREGNANCY is concerned with protecting pregnant women and families from losing their offspring, be it through miscarriage or illness. The death of the offspring is attributed especially to the child-snatching demon Lamaštu, to witchcraft, to the healing goddess Gula (who has an affinity to children’s illnesses, Böck 2014: 62-68), but also to the “curse”.

135 For amulet compendia, see Schuster-Brandis 2008: 146-150, 192-197. Note the short Sumerian spell munus igi ka-kēš in VAT 13629+13866 (Schwemer 2007b: no. 41): i 14-16; TCL 6, 49: 15 (Thureau-Dangin 1921; Abusch and Schwemer 2011: text 7.8.1 and *ibid.* Summary 12), see also *ibid.* rev. 12 *takšîru ša erîti*. For texts with ties to PREGNANCY, cf. Abusch and Schwemer 2011: 13; cf. Farber 2014: 35-36, especially TCL 6, 49 (from Seleucid Uruk), LKA 9 rev. i’ 1’-21’ (from the Assur library N4); VAT 13629+13866 (Schwemer 2007b: no. 41, from library N4); SpTU 3, 84; BM 42327+ // BM 51246+ (see also Farber 1989: 110-115 §§ 39-40; Farber 2014: texts “RA” and “SpTU”). These texts combine spells (e.g., Lamaštu and anti-witchcraft spells) with rituals and therapeutic measures such as amulets.

136 For a discussion, see Steinert 2016b: 244-246 and the commentary to the AMC edition in this volume. Some of the citations in the *adi*-section occur in a number of Neo-Assyrian and Neo- or Late Babylonian texts on women’s healthcare, either as thematic sections of collective tablets or as the sole topic of smaller therapeutic collections (one-column tablets).

PART 2. It may thus be that *asû* and *āšipu* applied the same types of therapies to treat women with pregnancy- and birth-related problems.¹³⁷

- 5) Line 25 of the Exorcist's Manual lists material related to divinatory texts referred to as "all oracular decisions (obtained from) stars, birds, oxen, and flocks, (from) ominous utterances (*egerrû*), stones, flour, incense (*qutrênu*) (and from) a god".¹³⁸ Interestingly, there is a two-tablet section in AMC (lines 89-90) concerned with *egerrûs*, which has the fragmentary incipit *e-nu-ma a-na I₅.GAR [...]* "When [you ...] for an oracle".¹³⁹ Its summary section includes material designated as EŠ.BAR GU₄.MEŠ EŠ.BAR MUL.MEŠ "oracle decisions from cattle and stars" clearly reminiscent of the Exorcist's Manual. The expressions refer to a group of texts concerned with everyday oracle techniques, which are only sparsely attested in the textual record. The divination techniques listed in the Exorcist's Manual involve signs drawn from the behaviour of domestic animals in one's surroundings,¹⁴⁰ from the flight of birds,¹⁴¹ from meteors or shooting stars,¹⁴² from throwing stone dice onto a board,¹⁴³ and from flour and incense. The latter two divination techniques involving flour and the smoke produced by burning incense are better known to have been used by the "seer" (*bārû*), who also practiced extispicy and lecanomancy.¹⁴⁴

Since we have no textual sources matching the incipit in AMC line 89, we can only speculate whether the two tablets contained omens or rituals (or a combination of both). It is quite striking however to find such material in a medical catalogue copied by an *asû*. Notably, all of the forms of oracular inquiry enumerated in AMC 89-90 and in the Exorcist's Manual line 25 also occur in the omen series *Šumma ālu*, assigned to the *āšipûtu* corpus.¹⁴⁵ Their occurrence in AMC may thus attest to the interest of both healing specialists in divinatory practices that were probably very widespread and popular. Both healing practitioners could have had similar texts at their disposal to provide an interpretation for ominous signs encountered by their clients, or to perform oracular inquiries in connection with illness events. Apotropaic rituals to avert such negative signs are found in the Namburbi rituals, which are listed in the second section of the Exorcist's Manual, but they were not known so far to have formed part of the *asûtu* corpus.

137 Some problems included in AMC section PREGNANCY, such as loss of blood or amniotic fluid, were also treated with other medical therapies (e.g., potions, tampons). Prescriptions of these types are encountered in Neo-Assyrian, Neo- and Late Babylonian gynaecological recipe collections, some of which do not include incantations. But the same types of therapies are in other manuscripts mixed with spells and "magical" rituals, and tablets including medical recipes for these purposes formed part of *āšipus'* text collections.

138 EŠ.BAR MUL.MEŠ MUŠEN.MEŠ u GU₄.MEŠ u MÁŠ.ANŠE.MEŠ I₅.GAR NA₄ ZĪ NA.RI DINGIR DÜ.A.BI. Cf. the edition of the Exorcist's Manual in this volume.

139 Incipits starting with *enûma* are typical for tablets with ritual instructions, which complement incantation series and compendia. The term *egerrû* stands for oracles and signs connected to various auditory experiences, including human utterances overheard in one's surroundings, the messages of prophets or ecstasies, animal cries and other noises (Oppenheim 1954-56; Butler 1998: 151-158). For *egerrûs* in *Šumma ālu*, see Tablet 95 lines 1-33 (CT 39, 41), where the *egerrûs* are produced by various domestic animals or by birds (Butler 1998: 152-153; Koch 2015: 254). In prayers and literary texts (e.g., *Ludlul bēl nēmeqi*), *egerrûs* are the utterings of other people, which are interpreted as ominous signs reflecting the personal crisis of the sufferer.

140 See STT 73; Reiner 1960; 1995: 71-74.

141 For texts on augury and ornithomancy including the extispicy of birds, cf. Maul 2013: 131-153; Koch 2015: 140-142. Omens from the flight of birds were included in *Šumma ālu* tablets 64-79; see further K. 6278+CT 40, 48 and BM 108874 (de Zorzi 2009).

142 See Koch 2015: 212.

143 See LKA 137, discussed by Finkel 1995.

144 For oracles using flour or barley ears, see Maul 2010b: 119-126; 2013: 156-162. References in *Šumma ālu* to a divinatory method of pouring flour onto water indicate that such methods were also employed by the *āšipu* (Maul 2010b: 126-127; 2013: 160-161) as is also confirmed by a Late Babylonian text (BM 36330) that contains beside prescriptions for different health matters (necklaces) a set of instructions for performing aleuromancy (Abusch et al. 2016: 704 rev. 7-u.e. 2). Two Old Babylonian tablets connected with the practice of the *bārû* describe the divinatory procedure of libanomancy, in which the smoke of flour poured onto an incense burner is observed (Maul 2013: 162-167; Koch 2015: 138; see also *ibid.*: 249 for smoke omens in *Šumma ālu* Tablet 52). A late Old Babylonian text from the palace library of Tigunānum (George 2013: appendix No. II) describes a procedure for "asking something from a god" (*awātam itti ilim ērīš*), which reminds us of the mention of oracle decisions from a god at the end of the enumeration in line 25 of the Exorcist's Manual. The reference in the Exorcist's Manual to "decisions from a god" also brings to mind omens in *Šumma ālu* tablets 94 and 96, where occurrences during prayer or on one's way to/from a temple serve to indicate whether the deity has heard the prayer (Koch 2015: 254-255).

145 They are clustered especially in Tablets 89-96, with omens involving smoke, lights and lamps standing near the sickbed, *egerrûs*, etc. (Koch 2015: 253-255). The fact that the oracle practices are mentioned in the first section of the Exorcist's Manual, whereas *Šumma ālu* is found in the second section, seems to indicate two differing though overlapping text groups.

7 *Asûtu* Texts in the Exorcist's Manual?

There are hints that the second section of the Exorcist's Manual (lines 28-42) contains some texts that were not regarded as part of the core *āšipūtu* corpus. Frahm (forthcoming) and others have argued that the second section of this catalogue refers to an advanced level of the *āšipūtu*'s training, and included textual material that was studied or collected also in other scholarly disciplines, such as commentaries/word lists and the omen series *Šumma ālu* or *Enūma Anu Enlil*. In fact, the instructions given in this passage encourage the adept to investigate links and relations between different compendia he has studied.

This section of the Exorcist's Manual also features an enumeration of medical materials that could refer to texts which had some overlap with traditions of *asûtu*. Thus, lines 32-36 list treatments (*šipru*) and remedies (*bulṭū*) for a number of illnesses that are grouped according to different categories which are to be studied as part of the corpus of the purification priest (*išippūtu*):

- 32) *ši-pir šim-mat ri-mu-ti u* SA.GAL SA.GIG(-ki) (GIG) *ki-sat ši-pir* TI¹⁴⁶ MA.LÁH
 33) *bul-ṭi* AN.TA.ŠUB.BA ¹⁴⁷LUGAL.ÛR.RA ŠU.DINGIR.RA ŠU ¹⁴⁸INANNA ŠU.GIDIM.MA
 34) A.LÁ HUL LÍL.LÁ.EN.NA SAG.HUL.HA.ZA ŠU NAM.ÉRIM.MA ŠU NAM.LÚ.U₁₈.LU
 35) *u bul-ṭi kal gim-ri ri-kis lip-it* (LÚ).GIG KÚM DAB-su *u ši-pir* MUNUS
 36) EN *ri-kis i-šip-pu-ti ta-kaš-šá-du tam-ma-ru* NÍG.ŠEŠ

¹⁴⁶ The treatment(s) for paralysis, palsy and *sagallu*-disease, (suffering from) *sakikkū* ('sore tendon'), *kissatu* ('gnawing'), the treatment(s) for (the illness) 'sailor's rib', ¹⁴⁷remedies for Fallen from heaven-disease (epilepsy), Lord of the roof (epilepsy), Hand of the god, Hand of the goddess, Hand of a ghost, ¹⁴⁸against the evil *alû*-demon, *lilû*-spirit, Supporter of evil-demon, Hand of a curse, Hand of mankind, ¹⁴⁹and remedies for every (illness), the compilation (concerning) the affliction(s) of the patient, being seized by fever and treatment(s) for a woman,

¹⁵⁰ (all this you study) until you master the (whole) corpus of the craft of the purification priest (and) discover the secret(s).¹⁴⁶

The enumeration falls into groups, which seem to be thematic and reflect illnesses that the *āšipūtu* was particularly interested in, and most of which had not been mentioned before in the first section of the catalogue. Many of the topics in the list recur in one way or another in AMC. Thus, the illnesses *šimmatu*, *rimûtu*, *sagallu*, and *kissatu* in line 32 are prime examples for conditions of the tendons, joints, muscles and extremities. These illnesses are also dealt with as a group in the AMC, in the section HAMSTRING (lines 53-57).¹⁴⁷ One of the topics of this section is the illness *sagallu*, as indicated by the probable title of Tablet 1 of HAMSTRING (DIŠ NA S[A.GAL GIG] "If a man [suffers from] *sa[gallu]*").¹⁴⁸ The summary rubric of this AMC section also mentions *sagallu* and *kissatu* as topics included in HAMSTRING,¹⁴⁹ and manuscripts with treatments for *šimmatu* and *rimûtu* (paralysis, palsy) can be linked with this AMC section.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁶ See also Frahm (forthcoming) for a syntactical analysis of this passage. In earlier periods, *išippu* (IŠIB) was a priest and cult functionary, but in the first millennium BCE texts, it appears to be an archaic term synonymous to *āšipūtu*. The latter seems to have taken over the functions of the *išippu*.

¹⁴⁷ For this group of conditions, cf. Böck 2010b; 2014: 26-30. These illnesses are also dealt with in the diagnostic series, especially in Tablets 14: 170'-72' and 33: 94-102, and a number of diagnostic entries on these illnesses also occur in therapeutic texts (Heeßel 2000: 371-373; Scurlock 2014: 243). The meaning of the illness "sailor's rib(s)" in line 32 remains obscure, but the name could indicate that these treatments had to do with the bones in particular. An alternative reading *ši-bir-ti*¹⁴⁸ MÁ.LAH "sailor's fracture" is suggested by Geller (in this volume); cf. there for manuscript variants.

¹⁴⁸ For *sagallu* (one of the main topics of HAMSTRING Tablets 1 and 2), see, e.g., BAM 130, AMT 42/6, CT 23, 1-2 and CT 23, 3-4; CT 23, 5-14 (cf. Thompson 1908: 63-69, 145-152, 245-251; Ebeling 1921: 138-144; Böck 2010b: 104-106).

¹⁴⁹ *Kissatu*/*kiššatu* is a skin ailment that occurs on the feet, but also on the head (Fincke 2011: 176-181; cf. *Sakikkū* Tablet 14: 30-31 and Tablet 33: 101-102; Heeßel 2000: 373), which is only rarely found in therapeutic texts, see AMT 69/5: 1 (If a man's feet are full of *kissatu*). *Kissatu* is often mentioned in incantations, cf. CAD K 429 sub a; MSL 9, 105 sub E; Böck 2007: 155-156 *Muššu'u* incantation IV/a lines 28-29; cf. *ibid.* 224-245 *Muššu'u* Tablet VI lines 12-16; inc. VIII/k lines 137-138, 147-148.

¹⁵⁰ The ailments *šimmatu* and *rimûtu* often occur together, cf. Böck 2010b: 98 sub 2.10.12-13). Spells used to treat ailments of the extremities and paralysis, which are encountered in therapeutic texts, were also included in the compendium *Muššu'u*, cf. Böck 2003: 2, 15-16; 2007: 23-24 (*Sagallu*), 49-64 for a discussion of the therapeutic passages. The reading of the logogram SA.GIG in line 32 of the Exorcist's Manual is somewhat ambiguous, since it would be expected to stand for *maškadu*, an illness dealt with in the section HAMSTRING. However, one manuscript

The remedies in lines 33-34 of the Exorcist's Manual concern a group of illnesses named after the "supernatural" entity causing them (gods, demons, ghosts or witchcraft), as well as seizures/epilepsy. These categories occur regularly in the diagnostic texts, but also in second and first millennium medical texts as well as in enumerations of illnesses in incantations.¹⁵¹ The illnesses listed in the two lines share certain features: they are regularly associated not only with physical, but also with mental/psychiatric and psychological symptoms, and they are often grouped together in therapeutic and other medical texts.¹⁵²

References to the illness categories listed in lines 33-34 of the Exorcist's Manual can be found in various places in the AMC corpus, both in PART 1 and 2. One reason for this is that the texts of AMC PART 1 are grouped according to affected body part, and not according to the disease agent causing the symptoms. Thus, references to "Hand of a ghost" can be found in numerous sections of the therapeutic corpus, since various ailments and symptoms were attributed to attacks of ghosts (see Scurlock 2006).¹⁵³ A similar pattern can be grasped for witchcraft-induced illnesses ("Hand of mankind") or "curse" (NAM.ÉRIM), which likewise feature in multiple AMC sections. However, there appears to be a thematic clustering of these illness entities in sections of AMC PART 2, which have been dubbed DIVINE ANGER (lines 84-88) and MENTAL ILLNESS (lines 91-98, cf. also the section EVIL POWERS, lines 79-83). One of the tablets of MENTAL ILLNESS has the incipit with *a-na AN.TA.ŠU[B.BA (...)] ZI-hi* "[To remove 'Fal]len from heaven'-disease (epilepsy), [(...)]" (AMC line 92), possibly forming part of an enumeration of similar related illnesses in the gap. The citations in the *adi*-section also mention the evil *alû*-demon. It is thus possible that the remedies for illnesses grouped in lines 33-34 of the Exorcist's Manual refer to collections of therapies, which are clustered in AMC sections such as MENTAL ILLNESS. One has the impression that the illnesses enumerated in lines 33-34 focus on categories in which the exorcist was particularly interested, and on treatments in which he specialised.¹⁵⁴ Given the predominantly ritual and magical character of most therapies for illnesses such as epilepsy in the textual record, it remains to be investigated whether the texts used by the *asû* and *āšipu* to treat such problems differed at all or whether the Exorcist's Manual and specific sections in the AMC could refer essentially to the same corpus of texts.¹⁵⁵

Line 35 of the Exorcist's Manual continues with an inclusive statement ("remedies for everything"), which could be a cursory reference to the entire corpus of therapeutic texts, as outlined in AMC, which is organised by types of illnesses and includes all areas of medical care. It is not clear whether the next phrase *rikis lipit marši*, "the compilation (of texts) on the affliction(s) of the sick man",¹⁵⁶ is independent from the following KÚM DAB-su "fever seized him" or whether it

spells SA.GIG-*ki* signalling that the logogram was to be read *sakikkû* "sick tendons", referring to an illness rather than to the general meaning "symptoms" better attested for SA.GIG.(MEŠ)/*sakikkû* (on which the name of the diagnostic series *Sakikkû* is based). SA.GIG/*sakikkû* as an illness is a learned expression rarely attested (cf. Böck 2014: 16 n. 100). The emphasis on illnesses of the "tendons; cords" (Sum. sa) in this enumeration and the unusual appearance of SA.GIG could well have been motivated by the link to the name of the diagnostic series.

151 For a study of this group of illnesses, see Stol 1993: 7-9, 16-19, 33-38, 41-42, 46-49. For epilepsy and "Hand of mankind", cf. also the diagnostic text STT 89 (Stol 1993: 91-98; Abusch and Schwemer 2011: text 12.1 A). For SAG.HUL.HA.ZA (*mukil rēš lemutti*) and "Hand of a curse" (ŠU NAM.ÉRIM.MA) in this context, cf. also *Sakikkû* Tablets 27: 4 and 28: 4, 7, 21 (Heeßel 2000: 297, 308-310).

152 See, e.g., the first section in SpTU 1, 43: 1-5, which groups AN.TA.ŠUB.BA, ŠU.DINGIR.RA, ŠU ⁴INNIN.NA, *bennu* and "Lord of the roof" (⁴LUGAL.ÛR.RA) beside depression as conditions coming from the heart (*libbu*), cf. Köcher 1978: 24-25; Geller 2014: 3-7; Steinert 2016a: 231-242. Section 4 (Tablets 26-30) of the diagnostic series focuses on this group of illnesses (Stol 1993: 55-90; Heeßel 2000: 278-340). Stol (1993: 99-113) discusses therapeutic texts and practices applied against these illnesses, consisting mainly of rituals, amulets and leather bags, ointments and fumigations, but rarely of potions. Plants against epilepsy are also registered in drug compendia (Uruanna and *Vademecums*), and there is considerable evidence for compendia on stones and amulets with sections for epilepsy and related conditions (see Stol 1993: 103, 107-111; Schuster-Brandis 2008). See further the Late Babylonian therapeutic compendium *Qutāru* (TCL 6, 34 i 1-2; Stol 1993: 25, 106-107) with commentary (BRM 4, 32: 1-4).

153 References to ghost-induced complaints are prominent, e.g. in the sections CRANIUM, EYES, EARS and NECK; cf. further section ABDOMEN, discussed in the commentary to the AMC edition. See also Johnson's contribution in this volume for a discussion of illness attributions to "Hand of a ghost" in the therapeutic corpus.

154 For Esarhaddon's chief court exorcist performing such rituals, see, e.g., SAA 10, 238.

155 For a detailed discussion of possible sources for this section, see the commentary to the AMC edition in this volume.

156 In some tablets of *Sakikkû*, (LÚ).GIG "sick man" is used rather than NA, the latter of which is typical for first millennium therapeutic texts. The word *lipitu* "touch" often assumes the meaning "affliction, illness", and is contrasted with *balātu* "life; good health, wellbeing" (see CAD L 401-402 sub 2). For *riksu* as "collection; compilation" (of tablets), see CAD R 351 sub 4e. One can compare the present expression with the *Sakikkû* Catalogue (Finkel 1988b: A 65-66 and the edition in this volume), which describes the series *Sakikkû* as *rikis murši u rikis kūrī* "the compilation on illness and the compilation on depression".

has to be read as one long phrase.¹⁵⁷ *Rikis lipit marši* (*ummu iṣbassu*) seems to be a descriptive formulation rather than the actual title or name of a compendium. It is remarkable that texts on fever are singled out as a specific component of the therapeutic corpus, since the AMC does not contain a section that solely deals with fever.¹⁵⁸

The last entry in line 35 of the Exorcist's Manual, *šipir sinniṣti* "treatment(s) for a woman", is likewise remarkable. Could it refer to medical therapies for women, which are differentiated from the incantation genres for pregnant women and women in childbirth enumerated in the first section of the manual (i.e., MUNUS.PEŠ₄.KĒŠ.DA, MUNUS LA.RA.AH)? One may speculate whether *šipir sinniṣti* refers to textual material that is clustered in sections PREGNANCY and BIRTH of the AMC.

To summarise, lines 32-36 of the Exorcist's Manual list therapeutic material consisting of treatments (*šiprū*) and remedies (*bulṭū*), which was regarded as a compendium or text corpus (*riksu*). It is possible that the manual refers to the therapeutic corpus witnessed in the AMC. The enumeration picks out certain illnesses, which seem to have been of special interest to the *āšipū*. Since the second part of the Exorcist's Manual includes texts not exclusively used by the discipline, it can be asked whether lines 32-36 may allude to medical practices and texts adopted from *asūtu*. However, in line with the discussion in the previous paragraph, one can also speculate whether the enumerated remedies may refer to domains and textual traditions of *āšipūtu* that were incorporated into the AMC/therapeutic corpus. In many instances, the texts identified as examples of remedies (*bulṭū*) which are enumerated in the second section of the Exorcist's Manual and have parallels in the AMC, contain many elements that appear to be typical for *āšipūtu*. Nonetheless, with regard to the textual sources concerned, the therapeutic practices and their users/copyists, it is still hard to disambiguate entirely which components come from which discipline.

8 Conclusions

The comparison between the Exorcist's Manual and AMC has brought to light a partial overlap between the corpora in both catalogues, which at the same time accentuates the basic orientation and disciplinary identity of *āšipūtu* and *asūtu*, but also blur the boundaries between them, which is underlined by the textual sources and their users. The analysis in the preceding sections has concluded that the two catalogues represent in their core the text corpora of the two disciplines respectively, showing that both disciplines had their own traditional focus on particular genres and texts. I have suggested that *asūtu* can be connected primarily with the genre of *bulṭū* "remedies" (i.e., "medical" recipes), correlating with the evidence for *asūs* specialising in medical treatments, while *āšipūtu* focused on incantations and therapeutic rituals (especially those found in the first part of the Exorcist's Manual). But at the same time, it seems that both specialists were free to apply a combination of therapeutic techniques, which we would classify as "magical" and "medical": *asūs* also used and transmitted incantations with their remedies (some of which are recognisable e.g. through references to the *asū*'s patron deities), while the therapeutic rituals of the *āšipū* often had clear medical components (e.g., in the use of pharmaceutic substances and medical techniques, beside more "magic" performances such as substitution rituals).¹⁵⁹

Especially the textual evidence from the first millennium suggests that the boundary between both disciplines was fluid in practice. The therapeutic compilations often contain a combination of genres and elements from both disciplines. The analysis of the two catalogues and the textual sources connected to them suggests that both professional

¹⁵⁷ Opinions on this point are divided, cf. Geller 2000: 258; Jean 2006: 70; Hecker 2008: 78; Clancier 2009b: 109-110 line 14; 2014: 26. If KÚM DAB-su has to be read as a separate phrase, it may be a short citation reminiscent of recipes starting with DIŠ NA KÚM DAB-su.

¹⁵⁸ AMC sections that include treatments for different types of fevers are e.g. CRANIUM and STOMACH. For texts on fever see further Bácskay 2018.

¹⁵⁹ The profile and therapeutic techniques of *asūtu* are well reflected in hymns to the healing goddess and incantations referring to her (see Böck 2014: 15-44, 78-115 with further literature). They include a range of medical treatments, surgery, midwifery and incantations. The profile of *āšipūtu* with its primary focus on exorcistic, apotropaic, purificatory techniques and on the normalisation of the patient's relationship with the divine realm is likewise reflected in descriptions of the patron deities Ea/Enki and Marduk/Asalluhi at work, e.g., in incantations from the *āšipū*'s core text corpus such as Udug-hul (see Geller 2016). However, Enki/Ea's wisdom includes "practical" medical knowledge, when he advises his son Asalluhi about treatments in medical incantations featuring the traditional formulary of the so-called "Marduk-Ea dialogue". For a contrastive juxtaposition of traits that are "typical" for incantations in the corpus of *āšipūtu* and *asūtu*, including diverging illness etiologies, see also Johnson's contribution in this volume; cf. also Steinert 2016a.

corpora contain core components of the discipline, but also additional or peripheral textual material with cross-disciplinary character.¹⁶⁰ In the Exorcist's Manual, groups of remedies/treatments which could allude to the therapeutic corpus of the AMC are listed in the second part of the catalogue, which features several texts that were also used by other scholarly disciplines. Vice versa, textual genres associated with *āšipūtu* are not evenly spread over the AMC. Thus, AMC PART 1 contains mainly remedies and mentions fewer incantation genres found in the Exorcist's Manual, while several sections of AMC PART 2 contain genres and contents encountered in the Exorcist's Manual; AMC PART 2 also seems to integrate more rituals beside medical recipes. A closer analysis of the contents of tablets belonging to AMC PART 1 may show, however, that also this part of the therapeutic corpus integrates some incantations that pertain to genres encountered among the core texts of *āšipūtu* in the first section of the Exorcist's Manual.¹⁶¹ It is striking that several tablets of the *Nineveh Medical Compendium* corresponding to AMC PART 1 display a recurring structural layout, featuring prescriptions in the first columns of the tablet, whereas the later columns of the tablet often contain incantations combined with therapeutic rituals (marked by KĪD.KĪD.BI or DÛ.DÛ.BI) or with remedies, which could indicate text sections that were assembled and combined from formerly independent text sources.¹⁶² Furthermore, the incantations in the tablets of the *Nineveh Medical Compendium* (= AMC PART 1) invoke the authority of the patron deities of both disciplines, often in combined fashion. Thus, while some spells refer to Ea and Asalluhi, others invoke Damu and Gula, and numerous spells refer to both pairs of deities, including further deities of healing and exorcism, such as Ningirima (see e.g., Collins 1999; Böck 2014: 78-115). The occurrence of the patron deities of *āšipūtu* or particular formulae (e.g. the Marduk-Ea formula) in "medical" incantations does not mean however that such spells were necessarily always taken over from the corpus of the *āšipu*. Some of the compositions invoking Asalluhi/Ea beside other healing deities could also have been composed by physicians who emulated popular elements and formulae typical for *āšipūtu* spells, e.g. to boost the authority and prestige of a spell.¹⁶³

The patchwork structure of the AMC therapeutic corpus and its cross-disciplinary elements may indicate that it ultimately forms a composite corpus integrating a core of *asûtu* lore and some adopted *āšipūtu* healing traditions that are recognised as additional elements in the AMC. With regard to the incantation genres mentioned in both catalogues,

160 Occasionally, the origin of a therapy or a group of treatments in a discipline is marked in text rubrics. For instance, BAM 516 iv 4 (Tablet 3 of the AMC section EYES) refers to eye balm "from the hand of an *asû*", Attia 2015: 77. A number of therapeutic texts attribute remedies to the *āšipu*. BAM 471 = AMT 94/2 ii 18 contains the label "salves against Hand of a ghost ... a secret of the exorcist's craft"; see also the Middle Babylonian duplicate BAM 385 i 11' ("drugs for a salve against Hand of a ghost, a secret of the exorcist"). AMT 40/2: 8-9 // STT 95(+) i 11-12 preserves remedies to calm divine anger, with a section designated "a tried leather bag (*mêlu latku*), a secret of the exorcist's craft". See further BAM 199: 14 (a salve for Hand of a ghost or "curse" designated as "secret of the exorcist", in a tablet written by Kišir-Aššur); see Lenzi 2008a: 179-181 for a discussion. A few references to the lore of the *asû* are found outside the medical texts themselves. The court physician Urad-Nanaya and the exorcist Nabû-nāšir mention "potions of *asûtu*" in a joint letter to Esarhaddon (SAA 10, 297 rev. 1). The Tukulti-Ninurta Epic speaks of the tablets taken by the king from Babylonia to Assyria as spoil, enumerating texts from various disciplines (*āšipūtu*, *bārūtu*, *kalūtu*) including "texts of the *asû*'s craft (with) instructions for bandages" (*maštarāt asûti nēpeš našmadāte*, Lambert 1957-58: 44 BM 98730 rev. 8; Foster 2005: 315). The application of potions and bandages is also discussed in Middle Babylonian letters of physicians (Sibbing Plantholt 2014). Especially expertise in drugs and the application of bandages (e.g., for skin diseases) as well as the treatment of injuries and veterinary care belong to the competence of *asûs* in Old Babylonian letters from Mari, while *āšipu*/*mašmaššu* are engaged in performing purificatory rituals (Finet 1957; Durand 1988).

161 Examples can be found in incantations with the rubrics KA.INIM.MA IGI.GIG.GA.KAM in the section EYES (Tablet 1) (cf. IGI.GIG.GA.KE₄ in the Exorcist's Manual) and KA.INIM.MA ZÚ.GIG.GA.KAM in the section TEETH (Tablets 1 and 2) (cf. ZÚ.GIG.GA.KE₄ in the manual). See for the section EYES: BAM 510 // 513 // 514 (Collins 1999: Eyes 1-5, 7, 9, 11, 13; Attia 2015); for the section TEETH: Collins 1999: Teeth 1-2 (BAM 538 //). A similar situation can be pointed out in the first millennium sources for the section STOMACH vis-à-vis the rubric ŠĀ.GIG.GA.KE₄ in the Exorcist's Manual. In the first millennium medical texts, the rubric KA.INIM.MA ŠĀ.GIG.GA.KAM occurs only sporadically, but one finds varying rubrics relating to the belly (ŠĀ) attached to incantations that in Old Babylonian precursors regularly bear the rubric KA.INIM.MA ŠĀ.GIG.GA.KAM (cf. Cadelli 2000: 313 with n. 5, ibid. 77, 88 (BAM 574 // = STOMACH 1 ii 28, iv 41); George 2016: 127-138, especially sub II.E.6-9; Collins 1999: Belly 9 (AMT 45/5 obv. 10' // BAM 508 ii 11') and Belly 27 (AMT 52/1: 15 with duplicates); Steinert and Vacín forthcoming). Compare further the rubric KA.HAB.DIB.BA in the Exorcist's Manual, which is not used as an incantation rubric in the section TEETH (Tablet 2), where one finds descriptive rubrics instead (cf. Collins 1999: spells *bu'šānu* 1-3, namely KA.INIM.MA (DIŠ NA) *bu'šānu* DAB-su).

162 Cf. also Johnson's contribution in this volume, adopting an "architectonic" approach in the analysis of tablets of the *Nineveh Medical Compendium* (= AMC PART 1), which aims at identifying textual building blocks or clusters of material (clusters of diagnostic entries/prescriptions vs. clusters of incantations) that may formerly have been contained on separate tablets. This interpretation is in line with the observation that at least in the Old Babylonian period, medical prescriptions were usually not collected together with incantations.

163 Cf. Johnson's contribution in this volume for a differing view that emphasises contrastive features of the incantations in the corpus of *āšipu* and *asû*, which he connects with different professional identities and competition between the two disciplines.

the question remains whether these keywords in the AMC refer to texts that were taken over directly from the *āšipūtu* corpus or whether they refer to independent compositions that adapt a genre of spells originating in or popular in the field of exorcism.

However, other issues have to be addressed. How does the evidence from the catalogues correspond with the actual expertise and practices of *asûs* and *āšipus* at the time? Which conclusions can be drawn concerning the formation process of the medical corpora (especially who was responsible for the compilation and serialisation of the AMC corpus)? On the level of healing practices, it seems that although *asûtu* and *āšipūtu* differed in their disciplinary profile, healers of each discipline often applied a similar range of therapeutic techniques and could potentially draw on the lore of both disciplines.¹⁶⁴ The documentation regarding this cross-disciplinarity is lopsided, since it can be observed that *āšipus* included *asûtu* (e.g., medical prescriptions) in their therapeutic repertoire and text collections, in addition to their traditional lore, while we have much less information for the opposite case.¹⁶⁵ However, especially first millennium texts indicate that both specialists sometimes worked together or offered alternative treatments.¹⁶⁶

Since the AMC seems to reflect a hybrid of *asûtu* combined with some *āšipūtu* healing traditions, it could be argued that the compilation process of the text corpus presented in the AMC is the result of a “joint venture”, i.e., that it was assembled by an interdisciplinary team of specialists. It is appealing to conclude that the royal court at Nineveh offered the best conditions for such a joint project and that the AMC corpus is for this reason likely to have been created there during Ashurbanipal’s reign. But this interpretation is not fully convincing. Although it is not certain who compiled the AMC text corpus, several hints point to its fundamental links with the discipline of *asûtu*, as discussed above. It is also clear, however, that texts from the AMC corpus were studied and used by both professions, and that each discipline contributed to it.

As to the question where and when the AMC corpus was compiled, it has to be emphasised that the manuscripts of the *Nineveh Medical Compendium* corresponding to AMC PART 1 diverge slightly from the tablet sequence and sectional structure outlined in AMC, and that the edition of therapeutic material outlined in AMC PART 2 is so far unattested at Nineveh (e.g., through matching catchlines or section titles). Yet, the close similarities between AMC PART 1 and the Nineveh texts corresponding to it suggest that the *Nineveh Medical Compendium* was closely related to AMC, but reflects some redactional differences and further developments of the series.

Although the redaction of therapeutic series in the AMC probably took place in the first centuries of the first millennium BCE, it also has to be remembered that attempts to compile collections of medical recipes in Babylonia and Assyria began already in the second half of the second millennium BCE, and that some texts from this period offer prescriptions that were integrated into the first millennium therapeutic series.¹⁶⁷ The existence of variant first millennium redactions

¹⁶⁴ The healing specialists at the Neo-Assyrian court usually bear only one professional title and are identified either as *āšipu* or *asû*, and the exceptional Urad-Gula who bears the title *āšipu*, but who is once designated as deputy of the chief physician and as *asû*, may in fact be two different individuals with the same name (Parpola 1983b: II 470 Appendix O; Baker 2011: 1402 no. 5-6). Some court scholars bearing the title *ummānu* “master scholar” were recognised as versed in the lore of more than one discipline (see e.g. SAA 10, 160).

¹⁶⁵ Cf. Villard 2006: 143-145, 148-150. Note the Nineveh library record SAA 7, 50 iii 7’-14’, registering tablets contributed by an *asû*, which include one tablet each of textual material classified as *āšipūtu* (rituals?), *Šumma izbu* omens, hemerologies and the series *Zaqīqu* (dream omens/rituals). Some *āšipūtu* texts of the first millennium (e.g., the Lamaštu series, therapies in tablets of the diagnostic series) show a predilection for certain therapeutic techniques, sometimes used together: amulet bracelets, ointments and fumigations. Nonetheless, these techniques could also be applied by the *asû*, as the medical recipe corpus of AMC Part 1 and letters show (see, e.g., SAA 10, 323 letter of court physician Urad-Nanaya on fumigants and oils for salves, cf. Parpola 1983b: No. 253 for discussion). Note in this connection also first millennium BCE compendia such as *Muššu’u* and *Qutāru*, which are compilations created by exorcists, drawing on older incantations and therapeutic traditions from the corpora of *āšipūtu* and *asûtu* (cf. Finkel 1991; Böck 2007: 79-89 *passim*).

¹⁶⁶ Cf. Stol 1991-92: 58-62, Jean 2006: 101-102 (for medical matters discussed in letters of court *āšipus*), 121-122, 125; Villard 2006. Neo-Assyrian letters occasionally throw light on the cooperation between both specialists (Villard 2006: 148). For instance, SAA 10, 297 is a joint letter by the chief court physician Urad-Nanaya and the *āšipu* Nabû-nāšir concerning their successful treatment of the queen mother Naqia. Two letters, SAA 10, 315 written by Urad-Nanaya and SAA 10, 241 written by the chief exorcist Marduk-šākin-šumi to Esarhaddon discuss the same medication applied to treat their royal patient. Note also entries in *Sakikkū* Tablet 33: 53-54 recommending that the *asû* should look at a particular diagnosed complaint. Occasional statements that an illness could not successfully be treated by either *āšipu* or *asû* indicate that patients had the choice between the services of these specialists or would try different options for treatment. Cf. further the letter SAA 13, 66 rev. 11’-13’, in which the sender asks the king for an *asû* and an *āšipu* so that they attend to his illness together. Competition between specialists of both disciplines seems to have been limited.

¹⁶⁷ The fragment BAM 36, copied from an original from the Baba temple at Assur, attests to a series/compilation (*iškāru*) on lung diseases in the Middle Assyrian period (Köcher 1963: xvii). A number of Middle Assyrian tablets from Assur with collections of medical prescriptions offer parallels to first millennium texts. For instance, BAM 12 belonged to the so-called “library of Tiglath-pileser I” and contains recipes for

of medical series in Babylonia, Assur and Nineveh shows in my view that the AMC reflects a stage in a longer and rather complex development, characterised by multiple interrelated formations of serialised therapeutic compendia in Babylonia and Assyria, which started already in the second half of the second millennium BCE and did not end at Nineveh.

With regard to the documentation on *asûs* and *āšīpu* for the first millennium BCE it has to be added that during this period, a change took place as far as institutional support, integration and the respective status of the *asû* and *āšīpu* are concerned. While still in the Neo-Assyrian period, both *āšīpu* and *asûs* were employed by the rulers, the *asûs* seem to have lost their institutional support base after the breakdown of local rulership beginning with the Achaemenid period, while the *āšīpu* were able to keep up their long-established links to the temples.¹⁶⁸ Moreover, the *āšīpu* steadily gained in importance over time, by employing strategies to broaden their corpus, expertise and social prestige, by absorbing strands of knowledge from other disciplines, and by building up the professional image and identity of the *āšīpu* as that of a scholar who shares in the divine and secret lore originating with Ea and Asalluhi, which was transmitted by the mythological sages (*apkallus*) and scholars (*ummânus*) of earlier periods who are claimed as ancestors.¹⁶⁹ The formative period for this “ideology of scribal succession” may reach back into the Middle Babylonian/Assyrian period.¹⁷⁰

Although first millennium BCE therapeutic texts also contain references claiming that the origin of medical recipes goes back to *ummânus* of older periods, it seems that *asûs* were not engaged in cultivating their status as *ummânus* to

bandages applied to the head, some of which have close counterparts in the AMC section CRANIUM (Scurlock 2014: no. 1.3.2). Fever recipes in BAM 66, found in the same library, provide parallels to the AMC section STOMACH (cf. Köcher 1963: xx). The Middle Assyrian tablet fragment BAM 16 with eye recipes likewise belonged to the “library of Tiglath-pileser I” (Köcher 1963: xv). Another important piece of evidence is the Middle Babylonian tablet BAM 11, which was brought to Assur probably in connection with Tukulti-Ninurta’s I invasion of Babylonia in ca. 1207 and kept in the library of the Aššur temple (Pedersén 1986: 24 (80); Heeßel 2009). It was written by the Babylonian physician Rabâ-ša-Marduk and contains remedies for migraine partially duplicating recipes in manuscripts of the first millennium section CRANIUM (Heeßel 2009: 21-22; Scurlock 2014: no. 2.11.1). For Middle Babylonian recipe collections from Nippur with duplicating passages in first millennium texts, see, e.g., BAM 394 (salves and poultices copied from a tablet owned by the physician Ahu-bāni), BAM 396 (a collection on urinary tract conditions, see Geller 2005: no. 1; Scurlock 2014: no. 2.10.1), BAM 398 (remedies for stroke and muscular illnesses, Köcher 1971: xxix-xxx). Note also BAM 416 (provenience unknown, recipes for skin conditions, see Scurlock 2014: no. 2.11.3).

168 For connections of the *āšīpu* with temples in the Neo-Assyrian and Late Babylonian period, see Jean 2006: 139-143 (for his roles in the temple cult); Sallaberger and Vulliet 2005: 632; Geller 2010: 183 n. 58 (*āšīpu* receiving income from temples, e.g., as prebend holders in the Late Babylonian period). For the *asû*, firm evidence for links with temples is still lacking, although connections with the Gula temples have been suggested, since *asûs* traditionally refer to Gula as their main patron deity and link their medical expertise to her (cf. Avalos 1995: 212-216, 218-231). However, *asûs* are often characterised as free-lance craftsmen (cf. Geller 2010: 50-52). But there is also continuous evidence from the second and first millennium BCE for the patronage of both professions by local rulers (cf. Avalos 1995: 170-172, 220-222; Geller 2010: 62-88).

169 For ideological constructions revolving around the title “scholar” (*ummānu*), the sages (*apkallū*) and the professions of *āšīpu*, *kalū*, *ṭupšarru*, *bārū* and *asû*, see Lenzi 2008a: 67-128; 2008b; 2015: 172, 178-180; cf. Böck 2015: 31-33. One example for the use of this “ideology of scribal succession” is found in the *Sakikkū* Catalogue, which refers to the editor of the diagnostic series Esagil-kīn-apli as “scholar (*ummānu*) of Sumer and Akkad”, whose ancestor was Asalluhi-mansum, “sage (*apkallu*) of king Hammurapi” (Finkel 1988b: 148 A 55, 60 // B 18’ and 22’). The tendency to claim medical lore as part of the domain of *āšīpūtu* can be seen for instance in the “Gula Hymn of Bulluṣa-rabi” composed by an *āšīpu*, in which Gula receives the art of *asūtu* from Ea (Lambert 1967; Lenzi 2008a: 97-100). See further LKA 146//, a text with recipes for leather bags (*mēlu*) paired with an incantation, which attributes these remedies to Ea and an *apkallu*, brought up from the Apsū by Nabū (Lambert 1980; Lenzi 2008a: 122-125). Cf. Maul 2013: 277-291; Steinert 2016a: 225-230 concerning the development of astro-medicine and astro-magic within *āšīpūtu*, as a strategy to boost their clientele and influence in the light of the rising popularity of astrology (cf. further Reiner 1995; Heeßel 2008b; Schwemer 2015b). For the *āšīpu* vis-à-vis other professions concerned with divination, cf. also Koch 2015: 18-24. The high rank of *āšīpu* in Neo-Assyrian times is reflected in a list of court scholars (SAA 7, 1) that records *ṭupšarrus* (“scribes; astrologers”) and *āšīpus* at the top of the hierarchy, followed by *bārūs*, *asûs*, *kalūs* and augurs.

170 In the Neo-Assyrian period, the title *ummānu* was applied to scholars and experts of various professions (*āšīpu*, *kalū*, *ṭupšarru*, *bārū* and *asû*) in the service of the king (see, e.g., SAA 10, 160), and the title “royal *ummānu*” is first attested in the early Neo-Assyrian period, referring to the chief scholarly advisor of the king, and replacing the older title “royal scribe” which was in use in the Middle Assyrian period (Wiggermann 2008: 208-210). One of the “royal scribes” attested in the Middle Assyrian period is Ribātu (time of Tukulti-Ninurta I, 1233–1197 BCE) whose father Rišēya was “royal exorcist” (*āšip šarri*) under Shalmaneser I (1263–1234 BCE). Sources from the first millennium such as the Synchronistic King List and the Uruk List of Kings and Sages project the connection between individual scholars and kings back to the second millennium (e.g., by identifying scholars of the Kassite and Isin-II periods as *ummânus* of kings and by listing as their predecessors *apkallus* associated with kings before and after the Flood (cf. Lenzi 2008a: 75, 106-120; 2008b with further literature; compare also the role of some of these scholars in the “Catalogue of Texts and Authors”, Lambert 1962). The iconography of the *apkallus* as mythological figures (especially the fish-*apkallus*) also originates in the Kassite period (Wiggermann 1994: 224; Green 1994: 252, 262 §§ 3.8-9, 3.31), while before that time *abgal/apkallu* is used as the title of a human functionary associated with Enki/Ea (cf. Lenzi 2008a: 127-128).

the extent that the *āšipus* did.¹⁷¹ The *āšipu* mastered a far greater corpus of texts than the *asû*, and his knowledge and activities were of a wider range and higher order. He focused not only on applying medical treatments and healthcare services for individuals and households, but also attended to the concerns of the king and society at large by mediating (through rituals) between the human and divine world and preserving wellbeing and divine order (cf. the *āšipu*'s role in rituals for the induction of divine cult statues or in purificatory rituals for the king). Through their vast knowledge and their employment of strategies to boost their social prestige, the *āšipus* were in a better position to preserve institutional ties and support from local temples throughout the Late Babylonian period, while the *asûs* seem to have lost these strategic ties (e.g., with the shrines of healing deities), becoming largely invisible in the written records (Robson 2011: 558). By the Late Babylonian period, the field of *asûtu* healing techniques seems largely to have been taken over and carried out by the *āšipu* as well, although the profession of the *asû* may have survived for some time, as a craft practiced outside the large institutions (cf. Finkel 2000).

In conclusion, seen from a diachronic perspective, the medical recipes (*bulṭū*) forming the heart of the AMC corpus reflect the traditional focus and core of *asûtu*, which was combined with incantations and developed in exchange with the neighbouring field of *āšipūtu*.¹⁷² The sources from the first millennium BCE show that *asûtu* lore was applied by *āšipus* in their professional practice and integrated into their text collections. This means that while *asûtu* and *āšipūtu* were regarded as distinguishable disciplines, the expertise and practical profile of specialists was not necessarily restricted to one field of knowledge. Despite these developments constantly blurring the distinction between both disciplines and their corpora, the professional core of *asûtu* within the AMC should not be overlooked.

9 Epilogue: The Functions of Catalogues

Catalogues can be connected to practical concerns of Mesopotamian scribes and “librarians”, namely organising and keeping track of tablets in a collection. They often functioned as inventories listing contents of an archive/library or of a section of a library (shelf lists, including tags and labels for retrieving tablets from shelves or baskets). The concrete occasions and reasons motivating the documentation of tablets in inventories often remain unknown, but it is likely that some catalogues document events of stocktaking in tablet collections (*Inventuren*), while others were made in connection with the movement of tablets between different archives, or in connection with tasks such as (re)editing and copying of tablets and compositions.

It has often been suspected that catalogues were used in scribal training. Although the function of Old Babylonian “literary catalogues” as lists of school curricula is debated, examples of students’ tablets from later times show that catalogues of compositions sometimes played a role in a school context. Explicit statements in catalogues such as the Exorcist’s Manual likewise underline their role in specialist training, as “outlines of study programs” (Freedman 1998: 5) or as overviews of a professional corpus to be mastered by the adept at the end of his training.

Especially the series catalogues and professional corpus catalogues have been characterised as serving “theoretical” purposes rather than a function as shelf lists or tablets inventories (Geller 2000: 227). Some of the catalogues for

¹⁷¹ See Lenzi 2008a: 179-184 for medical texts designated as secret lore of the *ummānu/āšipu*. Note that a corresponding label “secret of the *asû*” is not attested to my knowledge, compare however a number of medical prescriptions with the label “secret of kingship” (or “drugs for the king”), possibly alluding to patronage relations between the king and *asûs* (see Lenzi 2008a: 185-186, e.g., BAM 579 (STOMACH 5) iv 32). Note AMT 105/1 iv 21-25, a manuscript of Tablet 3 of the section CRANIUM (*šumma amēlu muhhašu umma ukāl*), which claims that recipes for salves and bandages contained in the text go back to the antediluvian *apkallus* and were transmitted by a sage from Nippur who is associated with Enlil-bāni, a 19th century BCE king of Isin (cf. Lenzi 2008a: 117, 200-201; Steinert 2015: 129-131, 139). Such an elaborate attribution of origins is so far not attested in any other manuscript of the therapeutic corpus, and was very likely a late addition to the text, to enhance the authority of the remedies.

¹⁷² In the Old Babylonian period, the genres of medical recipes and incantations were mostly collected on separate tablets, although some of the medical spells were very likely applied together with remedies (cf. Wasserman 1996-97: 2 n. 4; 2007: 52-55 for thematic correspondences between recipes and incantations; cf. George 2016: 5-6 Table 1 for Old Babylonian incantations with appended ritual (*kīd-kīd-bi/kikkittu*). Some of the Old Babylonian spells invoking Gula link them with the *asû* (see Cunningham 1997 for references). The combination of medical recipes and spells in the textual sources increases in the Middle Babylonian period and can probably be linked to the formation of longer compendia and compilations. However, throughout the second and first millennium BCE, one can still encounter tablets of medical recipes lacking incantations. A number of such tablets were written by *asûs*, see, e.g., BAM 11 (Heeßel 2009).

a particular series are attested in varying versions, reflecting different recensions of the text in different places and periods. Two catalogues, the *Sakikkû* Catalogue and the Exorcist's Manual, are known from multiple first millennium copies with only minor textual variants, showing that they were copied as scholarly reference works. Both catalogues contain explicit statements alluding to the purpose of the texts. The *Sakikkû* Catalogue claims to record the efforts of a famous scholar, Esagil-kin-apli, to have produced an authoritative edition of the omen series, which the catalogue is supposed to reflect, while the Exorcist's Manual associates the core text corpus of the exorcist with this scholar. Through instructive passages, both catalogues underline their function as tools for studying the text corpora they describe. They include admonitions to the reader concerning the texts' status (i.e., as exclusive knowledge). These statements suggest that the catalogues were tools for scholarly learning and for the instruction of the adept. But through their reference to a named scholar as authority behind the catalogues and text corpora, they could also have played a role in the construction of professional identities and histories.

The series catalogues probably served as important cornerstones for different disciplines, but they had additional technical functions, by recording text redactions and serialisation processes. Individual catalogues such as the AMC document an intermediate stage in a longer process, in the course of which a text corpus eventually becomes a text series. Last but not least, since the series catalogues are in a way comparable to the table of contents in our books, giving an overview of an oeuvre, they could also have served practical purposes, for instance as an aid-memoire, or as a blueprint for accumulating specialist tablet collections.

References

- Abusch and Schwemer 2011 = T. Abusch and D. Schwemer, *Corpus of Mesopotamian Anti-Witchcraft Rituals*, vol. 1, Ancient Magic and Divination 8/1 (Leiden / Boston)
- Abusch et al. 2016 = T. Abusch, D. Schwemer, M. Luukko and G. van Buylaere, *Corpus of Mesopotamian Anti-Witchcraft Rituals*, vol. 2, Ancient Magic and Divination 8/2 (Leiden / Boston)
- Al-Rawi and George 2006 = F. N. H. Al-Rawi and A. R. George, 'Tablets from the Sippar Library XIII. *Enūma Anu Enlil* XX', *Iraq* 68, 23-57
- Attia 2015 = A. Attia, 'Traduction et commentaires des trois premières tablettes de la série IGI', *Le Journal des Médecines Cunéiformes* 25, 1-120
- Attinger 2008 = P. Attinger, 'La médecine mésopotamienne', *Le Journal des Médecines Cunéiformes* 11-12, 1-96
- Avalos 1995 = H. Avalos, *Illness and Health Care in the Ancient Near East. The Role of the Temple in Greece, Mesopotamia, and Israel*, Harvard Semitic Monographs 54 (Atlanta)
- Bácskay 2015 = A. Bácskay, 'Magical-medical prescriptions against fever: an edition of BM 42272', *Le Journal des Médecines Cunéiformes* 26, 1-32
- Bácskay 2018 = A. Bácskay, *Therapeutic Prescriptions against Fever in Ancient Mesopotamia*, AOAT 447 (Münster)
- Baker 2011 = H. Baker (ed.), *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, Vol. 3/II (Helsinki)
- Balkan 1978 [1954] = K. Balkan, *Kassitenstudien. 1. Die Sprache der Kassiten*, American Oriental Series 37 (New Haven, CT/Millwood, NY)
- Beckman and Foster 1988 = G. Beckman and B. R. Foster, 'Assyrian Scholarly Texts in the Yale Babylonian Collection', in: *A Scientific Humanist. Studies in Memory of Abraham Sachs*, ed. E. Leichty, M. de Jong Ellis and P. Gerardi, Occasional Publications of the Samuel Noah Kramer Fund 9 (Philadelphia), 1-26
- Biggs 1967 = R. D. Biggs, ŠÀ.ZI.GA. *Ancient Mesopotamian Potency Incantations*, Texts from Cuneiform Sources 2 (Locust Valley, NY)
- Black 1983 = J. A. Black, 'Babylonian Ballads. A New Genre', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 103, 25-34
- Black 1987 = J. A. Black, 'Sumerian Balag Compositions', *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 44, 32-79
- Böck 2000 = B. Böck, *Die babylonisch-assyrische Morphoskopie*, Archiv für Orientforschung Beiheft 27 (Horn)
- Böck 2003 = B. Böck, '"When You Perform the Ritual of 'Rubbing"'. On Medicine and Magic in Ancient Mesopotamia', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 62, 1-16
- Böck 2007 = B. Böck, *Das Handbuch Muššu'u "Einreibung". Eine Serie sumerischer und akkadischer Beschwörungen aus dem 1. Jt. vor Chr.* (Madrid)
- Böck 2008 = B. Böck, 'Babylonisch-assyrische Medizin in Texten und Untersuchungen. Erkrankungen des uro-genitalen Traktes, des Enddarmes und des Anus', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 98, 295-346
- Böck 2010a = B. Böck, 'Pharmakologische Texte', in: *Texte zur Heilkunde, Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments, Neue Folge* 5, ed. B. Janowski and D. Schwemer (Gütersloh), 163-168
- Böck 2010b = B. Böck, 'Krankheiten der Extremitäten und unteren Körperhälfte', in: *Texte zur Heilkunde, Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments, Neue Folge* 5, ed. B. Janowski and D. Schwemer (Gütersloh), 99-106
- Böck 2011 = B. Böck, 'Sourcing, Organizing, and Administering Medicinal Ingredients', in: *The Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture*, ed. K. Radner and E. Robson (Oxford), 690-705

- Böck 2014 = B. Böck, *The Healing Goddess Gula. Towards an Understanding of Ancient Babylonian Medicine*, Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 67 (Leiden/Boston)
- Böck 2015 = B. Böck, 'Shaping Texts and Text Genres. On the Drug Lore of Babylonian Practitioners of Medicine', *Aula Orientalis* 33, 21-37
- Boissier 1894-99 = A. Boissier, *Documents assyriens relatifs aux présages* (Paris)
- Bottéro 1985 = J. Bottéro, *Mythes et rites de Babylone* (Genève)
- Butler 1998 = S. A. L. Butler, *Mesopotamian Conceptions of Dreams and Dream Rituals*, *Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 258 (Münster)
- Cadelli 2000 = D. S. Cadelli, *Recherche sur la médecine mésopotamienne. La série šumma amêlu suâlam maruș*, Doctorat de l'Université de Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne (Paris)
- Cagni 1969 = L. Cagni, *L'Epopée di Erra* (Rome)
- Cavigneaux 1996 = A. Cavigneaux, *Uruk. Altbabylonische Texte aus dem Planquadrat Pe XVI-4/5*, *Ausgrabungen in Uruk-Warka. Endberichte* 23 (Mainz)
- Cavigneaux 1999 = A. Cavigneaux, 'Nabû ša harê und die Kinder von Babylon', in: *Babylon. Focus mesopotamischer Geschichte, Wiege früher Gelehrsamkeit, Mythos in der Moderne. 2. Internationales Colloquium der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* 24.-26. März 1998 in Berlin, ed. J. Renger (Saarbrücken), 385-391
- Christiansen 2008 = B. Christiansen, 'Review of P. Dardano, Die hethitischen Tontafelkataloge aus Hattuša (CTH 276-282)', *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 98, 302-308
- Civil 1976 = M. Civil, 'Lexicography', in: *Sumerological Studies in Honor of Thorkild Jacobsen on His 70th Birthday June 7, 1974*, ed. S. J. Lieberman, *Assyriological Studies* 20 (Chicago), 123-157
- Clancier 2009a = P. Clancier, *Les bibliothèques en Babylonie dans la deuxième moitié du 1er millénaire av. J.-C.*, *Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 363 (Münster)
- Clancier 2009b = P. Clancier, 'Le manuel de l'exorciste d'Uruk', in: *Et il y eut un esprit dans l'Homme. Jean Bottéro et la Mésopotamie*, ed. X. Faivre, B. Lion and C. Michel (Paris), 105-117
- Clancier 2014 = P. Clancier, 'Teaching and Learning Medicine and Exorcism at Uruk in the Hellenistic Period', in: *Scientific Sources and Teaching Contexts throughout History. Problems and Perspectives*, ed. A. Bernard and C. Proust (Dordrecht), 41-68
- Cohen 1976 = M. E. Cohen, 'Literary Texts from the Andrews University Archaeological Museum', *Revue d'Assyriologie* 70, 129-144
- Collins 1999 = T. J. Collins, *Natural Illness in Babylonian Medical Incantations* (PhD diss., University of Chicago)
- Cunningham 1997 = G. Cunningham, 'Deliver Me from Evil'. *Mesopotamian Incantations 2500-1500 B.C.*, *Studia Pohl, Series Maior* 17 (Rome)
- Dardano 2006 = P. Dardano, *Die hethitischen Tontafelkataloge aus Hattuša (CTH 276-282)*, *Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 46 (Wiesbaden)
- Delnero 2006 = P. Delnero, *Variation in Sumerian Literary Compositions. A Case Study Based on the Decad* (PhD Dissertation, Philadelphia)
- Delnero 2010 = P. Delnero, 'Sumerian Literary Catalogue and the Scribal Curriculum', *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 100, 32-55
- De Zorzi 2009 = N. de Zorzi, 'Bird Divination in Mesopotamia. New Evidence from BM 108874', *KASKAL* 8, 43-75
- De Zorzi 2014 = N. de Zorzi, *La serie teratomantica šumma izbu. 2 vols.*, *History of the Ancient Near East, Monographs* 15 (Padua)
- Durand 1988 = J.-M. Durand, 'Maladies et médecines', *Archives Epistolaires de Mari* 1/1, *Archives Royales de Mari* 26/1 (Paris), 543-584
- Ebeling 1921 = E. Ebeling, 'Keilschrifttafeln medicinischen Inhalts I', *Archiv für die Geschichte der Medizin* 13, 138-144
- Ebeling 1922 = E. Ebeling, 'Ein Hymnenkatalog aus Assur', *Berliner Beiträge zur Keilschriftforschung* 1/3, 1-32
- Ebeling 1949 = E. Ebeling, 'Beschwörungen gegen den Feind und den bösen Blick aus dem Zweistromlande', *Archiv Orientalní* 17, 172-211
- Elman 1975 = Y. Elman, 'Authoritative Oral Tradition in Neo-Assyrian Scribal Circles', *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Society* 7, 19-32
- Farber 1989 = W. Farber, *Schlaf, Kindchen, Schlaf! Mesopotamische Baby-Beschwörungen und -Rituale*, *Mesopotamian Civilizations* 2 (Winona Lake, IN)
- Farber 2014 = W. Farber, *Lamaštu. An Edition of the Canonical Series of Lamaštu Incantations and Rituals and Related Texts from the Second and First Millennia B.C.*, *Mesopotamian Civilizations* 17 (Winona Lake, IN)
- Fincke 2001 = J. C. Fincke, 'Der Assur-Katalog der Serie enūma anu enlil (EAE)', *Orientalia Nova Series* 70, 19-39
- Fincke 2011 = J. C. Fincke, 'Spezialisierung und Differenzierung im Bereich der altorientalischen Medizin. Die Dermatologie am Beispiel der Symptome simmū matqūtu, kalmātu (matuqtu), kibšu, kiššatu und gurištu', in: *The Empirical Dimension of Ancient Near Eastern Studies*, ed. G. J. Selz and K. Wagensohn, *Wiener Offene Altorientalistik* 6 (Vienna), 159-208
- Finet 1957 = A. Finet, 'Les médecins au Royaume de Mari', *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves* 14, 123-144
- Finkel 1976 = I. L. Finkel, *HUL.BA.ZI.ZI. Ancient Mesopotamian Exorcistic Incantations* (PhD Dissertation, Birmingham)
- Finkel 1980 = I. L. Finkel, 'The Crescent Fertile', *Archiv für Orientforschung* 27, 32-52
- Finkel 1988a = I. L. Finkel, 'A Fragmentary Catalogue of Lovesongs', *Acta Sumerologica* 10, 17-18
- Finkel 1988b = I. L. Finkel, 'Adad-apla-iddina, Esagil-kin-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, *Occasional Publications of the Samuel Noah Kramer Fund* 9 (Philadelphia), 143-159
- Finkel 1991 = I. L. Finkel, 'Muššu'u, Qutāru and the Scribe Tanittu-Bēl', in: *Velles Paraules. Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Miguel Civil on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. P. Michalowski, P. Steinkeller, E. C. Stone and R. L. Zettler, *Aula Orientalis* 9 (Barcelona), 91-104
- Finkel 1994 = I. L. Finkel, 'On TDP Tablets XXIX and XXXI, and the Nature of SA.GIG', *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 46, 87-88
- Finkel 1995 = I. L. Finkel, 'In Black and White. Remarks on the Assur Psephomancy Ritual', *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 85, 271-276
- 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, IN), 137-223

- Foster 2005 = B. R. Foster, *Before the Muses. An Anthology of Akkadian Literature* (Bethesda, MD)
- Frahm 2011 = E. Frahm, *Babylonian and Assyrian Commentaries. Origins of Interpretation*, Guides to the Mesopotamian Textual Record 5 (Münster)
- Frahm forthcoming = E. Frahm, 'The "Exorcist's Manual": Structure, Language, "Sitz im Leben"', in: *The Sources of Evil: Complexity and Systematization, Differentiation and Interdependency in Mesopotamian Exorcistic Lore*, ed. D. Schwemer et al. (Leiden/Boston)
- Frame and George 2005 = G. Frame and A. R. George, 'The Royal Libraries of Nineveh. New Evidence for King Ashurbanipal's Tablet Collecting', *Iraq* 67, 265-284
- Freedman 1998 = S. M. Freedman, *If a City Is Set on a Height. The Akkadian Omen Series Šumma ālu ina mēlê šakin*, vol. 1, Tablets 1-21, Occasional Publications of the Samuel Noah Kramer Fund 17 (Philadelphia)
- Freedman 2006 = S. M. Freedman, *If a City Is Set on a Height. The Akkadian Omen Series Šumma ālu ina mēlê šakin*, vol. 2, Tablets 22-40, Occasional Publications of the Samuel Noah Kramer Fund 19 (Philadelphia)
- Gabbay 2007 = U. Gabbay, 'A Neo-Babylonian Catalogue of Balaḡ Tablets in the Oriental Institute of Chicago', *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 97, 86-97
- Gabbay 2014 = U. Gabbay, *Pacifying the Heart of the Gods. Sumerian Emesal Prayers of the First Millennium BC*, Heidelberger Emesal-Studien 1 (Wiesbaden)
- Gabbay 2015 = U. Gabbay, *The Eršema Prayers of the First Millennium BC*, Heidelberger Emesal-Studien 2 (Wiesbaden)
- Gadotti and Kleinerman 2011 = A. Gadotti and A. Kleinerman, '"Here is What I Have. Send Me What I am Missing". Exchange of Syllabi in Ancient Mesopotamia', *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 101, 72-77
- Gehlken 2005 = E. Gehlken, 'Die Adad-Tafeln der Omenserie *Enūma Anu Enlil*. Teil 1: Einführung', *Baghdader Mitteilungen* 36, 235-273
- Geller 2000 = M. J. Geller, 'Incipits and Rubrics', in: *Wisdom, Gods and Literature. Studies in Assyriology in Honour of W. G. Lambert*, ed. I. L. Finkel and A. R. George (Winona Lake, IN), 225-258
- Geller 2005 = M. J. Geller, *Renal and Rectal Disease Texts. Babylonisch-assyrische Medizin in Texten und Untersuchungen VII* (Berlin)
- Geller 2007a = M. J. Geller, 'Médecine et magie: l'*asū*, l'*āšipu* et le *mašmāšu*', *Le Journal des Médecines Cunéiformes* 9, 1-15
- Geller 2007b = M. J. Geller, 'Textes médicaux du Louvre, nouvelle édition. AO 11447, AO 7760 et AO 6774. Première partie', *Le Journal des Médecines Cunéiformes* 10, 4-18
- Geller 2010 = M. J. Geller, *Ancient Babylonian Medicine. Theory and Practice* (Malden, MA)
- Geller 2012 = M. J. Geller, 'Y a-t-il une magie sans médecine en Mésopotamie?', *Le Journal des Médecines Cunéiformes* 20, 43-52
- Geller 2014 = M. J. Geller, *Melothesia in Babylonia. Medicine, Magic, and Astrology in the Ancient Near East*, Science, Technology and Medicine in Ancient Cultures 2 (Boston / Berlin)
- Geller 2016 = M. J. Geller in collaboration with L. Vacín, *Healing Magic and Evil Demons: Canonical Udug-hul Incantations*, Die babylonisch-assyrische Medizin in Texten und Untersuchungen 8 (Berlin)
- George 1991 = A. R. George, 'Babylonian Texts from the Folios of Sidney Smith, Part Two: Prognostic and Diagnostic Omens, Tablet I', *Revue d'Assyriologie* 85, 137-165
- George 2003 = A. R. George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic. Introduction, Critical Edition and Cuneiform Texts* (Oxford)
- George 2009 = A. R. George, *Babylonian Literary Texts in the Schøyen Collection*, Cornell University Studies in Assyriology and Sumerology 10 (Bethesda, MD)
- George 2010 = A. R. George, 'The Colophon of MS 5007', in: M. Civil, *The Lexical Lists in the Schøyen Collection*, Cornell University Studies in Assyriology and Sumerology 12 (Bethesda, MD), 274-279
- George 2013 = A. R. George, *Babylonian Divinatory Texts Chiefly in the Schøyen Collection*, Cornell University Studies in Assyriology and Sumerology 18 (Bethesda, MD)
- George 2016 = A. R. George, *Mesopotamian Incantations and Related Texts in the Schøyen Collection*, Cornell University Studies in Assyriology and Sumerology 32 (Bethesda, MD)
- Gesche 2001 = P. D. Gesche, *Schulunterricht in Babylonien im ersten Jahrtausend v. Chr.*, Alter Orient und Altes Testament 275 (Münster)
- Gesche 2005 = P. D. Gesche, 'Late Babylonian School Exercise Tablets', in: *Literary and Scholastic Texts of the First Millennium B.C.*, ed. I. Spar and W. G. Lambert, CTMMA 2 (New York), 257-265
- Gordin 2008 = S. Gordin, *Scribal Families of Hattuša in the 13th Century BCE. A Prosopographical Study* (M.A. thesis; Tel Aviv University)
- Gordin 2015 = S. Gordin, *Hittite Scribal Circles. Scholarly Tradition and Writing Habits*, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 59 (Wiesbaden)
- Green 1994 = A. Green, 'Mischwesen. B. Archäologisch. Mesopotamien', *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 8, 246-264
- Groneberg 2003 = B. Groneberg, 'Searching for Akkadian Lyrics. From Old Babylonian to the "Liederkatalog" KAR 158', *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 55, 55-74
- Hallo 1963 = W. Hallo, 'On the Antiquity of Sumerian Literature', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 83, 167-176
- Hallo 1975 = W. Hallo, 'Another Sumerian Literary Catalogue?', *Studia Orientalia* 46 (Helsinki), 77-80
- Hallo 1991 = W. Hallo, 'The Concept of Canonicity in Cuneiform and Biblical Literature. A Comparative Appraisal', in: *The Biblical Canon in Comparative Perspective*, ed. K. L. Younger, W. W. Hallo and B. F. Batto, Scripture in Context 4, Ancient Near Eastern Texts and Studies 11 (Lewiston, NY), 1-19
- Hecker 2008 = K. Hecker, 'Der "Leitfaden der Beschwörungskunst"', in: *Omina, Orakel, Rituale und Beschwörungen*, ed. B. Janowski and G. Wilhelm, *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments, Neue Folge* 4, ed. B. Janowski and G. Wilhelm (Gütersloh), 76-79
- Hecker 2013 = K. Hecker, 'Ich zählte die Lieder', in: *Hymnen, Klagelieder und Gebete. Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments, Neue Folge* 7, ed. B. Janowski and D. Schwemer (Gütersloh), 54-63
- Heeßel 2000 = N. P. Heeßel, *Babylonisch-assyrische Diagnostik*, Alter Orient und Altes Testament 43 (Münster)

- Heeßel 2001-02a = N. P. Heeßel, “‘Wenn ein Mann zum Haus des Kranken geht ...’”. Intertextuelle Bezüge zwischen der Series *Šumma ālu* und der zweiten Tafel der Serie SA.GIG’, *Archiv für Orientforschung* 48-49, 24-49
- Heeßel 2001-02b = N. P. Heeßel, Review of S. M. Freedman, *If a City Is Set on a Height. The Akkadian Omen Series Šumma ālu ina mēlē šakin*, vol. 1, *Archiv für Orientforschung* 48-49, 232-241
- Heeßel 2002 = N. P. Heeßel, *Pazuzu. Archäologische und philologische Studien zu einem altorientalischen Dämon*, Ancient Magic and Divination 4 (Leiden / Boston)
- Heeßel 2007 = N. P. Heeßel, *Divinatorische Texte I: Terrestrische, teratologische, physiognomische und oneiromantische Omina*, Keilschrifttexte aus Assur literarischen Inhalts 1, Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 116 (Wiesbaden)
- Heeßel 2008a = N. P. Heeßel, ‘Warzen, Beulen und Narben. Eine Sammlung medizinischer Rezepte und physiognomischer Beobachtungen aus Assur gegen Gesichtsmale’, in: *Studies in Ancient Near Eastern World View and Society Presented to Marten Stol on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday, 10 November 2005, and His Retirement from the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam*, ed. R. van der Spek (Bethesda, MD), 161-171
- Heeßel 2008b = N. P. Heeßel, ‘Astrological Medicine in Babylonia’, in: *Astro-Medicine. Astrology and Medicine*, ed. A. Aksoy, C. Burnett and R. Yoeli-Tlalim (Florence), 1-16
- Heeßel 2009 = N. P. Heeßel, ‘The Babylonian Physician Rabā-Ša-Marduk. Another Look at Physicians and Exorcists in the Ancient Near East’, in: *Advances in Mesopotamian Medicine from Hammurabi to Hippocrates. Proceedings of the International Conference “Oeil Malade et Mauvais Oeil”*, Collège de France, Paris, 23rd June 2006, ed. M. J. Geller and I. L. Finkel (Leiden), 13-28
- Heeßel 2010a = 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 2010b = N. P. Heeßel, ‘Einleitung zur Struktur und Entwicklung des Corpus der therapeutischen Texte’, in: *Texte zur Heilkunde, Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments, Neue Folge* 5, ed. B. Janowski and D. Schwemer (Gütersloh), 31-35
- Heeßel 2010c = N. P. Heeßel, ‘Erkrankungen der Ohren, der Nase und Atemwege, des Mundes, der Zunge und der Zähne’, in: *Texte zur Heilkunde, Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments, Neue Folge* 5, ed. B. Janowski and D. Schwemer (Gütersloh), 52-61
- Heeßel 2010d = N. P. Heeßel, ‘Diagnostische Texte’, in: *Texte zur Heilkunde, Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments, Neue Folge* 5, ed. B. Janowski and D. Schwemer (Gütersloh), 8-31
- 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. P. Heeßel, *Divinatorische Texte II. Opferschau-Omina*, Keilschrifttexte aus Assur literarischen Inhalts 5, Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 139 (Wiesbaden)
- Hoffner 2002 = H. A. Hoffner, ‘Archive Shelf Lists’, in: *The Context of Scripture, Vol. 3. Archival Documents from the Biblical World*, ed. W. W. Hallo and K. L. Younger (Leiden), 67-69
- Hunger 1968 = H. Hunger, *Babylonische und assyrische Kolophone*, Alter Orient und Altes Testament 2 (Kevelaer / Neukirchen-Vluyn)
- Jean 2006 = C. Jean, *La magie néo-assyrienne en contexte. Recherches sur le métier d’exorciste et le concept d’āšipūtu*, State Archives of Assyria Studies 17 (Helsinki)
- Johnson 2014 = J. C. Johnson, ‘Towards a Reconstruction of SUALU IV. Can We Localize K 2386+ in the Therapeutic Corpus?’, in: *Le Journal des Médecines Cunéiformes* 24, 11-38
- Karasu 1996 = C. Karasu, ‘Some Remarks on Archive-Library Systems of Hattuša-Boğazköy’, *Archivum Anatolicum* 2, 39-59
- Kinnier Wilson and Reynolds 2007 = J. V. Kinnier Wilson and E. H. Reynolds, ‘On Stroke and Facial Palsy in Babylonian Texts’, in: *Disease in Babylonia*, ed. I. L. Finkel and M. J. Geller, Cuneiform Monographs 36 (Leiden), 67-99
- Klein and Sefati 2008 = J. Klein and Y. Sefati, “‘Secular’ Love Songs in Mesopotamian Literature”, in: *Birkat Shalom. Studies in the Bible, Ancient Near Eastern Literature, and Postbiblical Judaism Presented to Shalom M. Paul*, 2 vols., ed. C. Cohen (Winona Lake, IN), 613-626
- Klein and Sefati 2014 = J. Klein and Y. Sefati, ‘The „Stars (of) Heaven“ and Cuneiform Writing’, in: *He Has Opened Nisaba’s House of Learning: Studies in Honor of Åke Waldemar Sjöberg on the Occasion of His 89th Birthday on August 1st 2013*, ed. L. Sassmannshausen, in collaboration with G. Neumann (Leiden/Boston), 85-102
- Koch 2005 = U. S. Koch, *Secrets of Extispicy. The Chapter Multābiltu of the Babylonian Extispicy Series and Niširti bārūti Texts Mainly from Aššurbanipal’s Library*, Alter Orient und Altes Testament 326 (Münster)
- Koch 2015 = U. S. Koch, *Mesopotamian Divination Texts. Conversing with the Gods. Sources from the First Millennium BCE*, Guides to the Mesopotamian Textual Record 7 (Münster)
- Koch-Westenholz 2000 = U. S. Koch-Westenholz, *Babylonian Liver Omens. The Chapters Manzāzu, Padānu and Pān tākalti of the Babylonian Extispicy Series Mainly from Aššurbanipal’s Library*, Carsten Niebuhr Institute Publications 25 (Copenhagen)
- Köcher 1955 = F. Köcher, *Keilschrifttexte zur assyrisch-babylonischen Drogen- und Pflanzenkunde* (Berlin)
- Köcher 1963 = F. Köcher, *Die babylonisch-assyrische Medizin in Texten und Untersuchungen I. Keilschrifttexte aus Assur* 1 (Berlin)
- Köcher 1964 = F. Köcher, *Die babylonisch-assyrische Medizin in Texten und Untersuchungen III. Keilschrifttexte aus Assur* 3 (Berlin)
- Köcher 1971 = F. Köcher, *Die babylonisch-assyrische Medizin in Texten und Untersuchungen IV. Keilschrifttexte aus Assur* 4, *Babylon, Nippur, Sippar, Uruk und unbekannter Herkunft* (Berlin)

- Köcher 1978 = F. Köcher, 'Spätbabylonische medizinische Texte aus Uruk', in: *Medizinische Diagnostik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ed. C. Habrich, F. Marguth and J. H. Wolf (München), 17-39
- Köcher 1980a = F. Köcher, *Die babylonisch-assyrische Medizin in Texten und Untersuchungen V. Keilschrifttexte aus Ninive 1* (Berlin)
- Köcher 1980b = F. Köcher, *Die babylonisch-assyrische Medizin in Texten und Untersuchungen VI. Keilschrifttexte aus Ninive 2* (Berlin)
- Kramer 1961 = S. N. Kramer, 'Kataloge', in: I. Bernhardt, *Sumerische literarische Texte aus Nippur, Band 1. Mythen, Epen, Weisheitsliteratur und andere Literaturgattungen*, Texte und Materialien der Frau Professor Hilprecht-Sammlung Vorderasiatischer Altertümer im Eigentum der Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena, Neue Folge 3 (Berlin), 19-20
- Kramer 1975 = S. N. Kramer, 'Two British Museum 'iršemma' Catalogues', *Studia Orientalia* 46 (Helsinki), 141-166
- Kramer 1982 = S. N. Kramer, 'Three Old Babylonian balag-Catalogues from the British Museum', in: *Societies and Languages of the Ancient Near East. Studies in Honor of I. M. Diakonoff* (Warminster), 206-213
- Krecher 1980 = J. Krecher, 'Kataloge, literarische', *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 5, 478-485
- Labat 1956 = R. Labat, 'Une nouvelle tablette de pronostics médicaux', *Syria* 33, 119-130
- Lambert 1957 = W. G. Lambert, 'Ancestors, Authors, and Canonicity', *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 11, 1-14
- Lambert 1957-58 = W. G. Lambert, 'Three Unpublished Fragments of the Tukulti-Ninurta Epic', *Archiv für Orientforschung* 18, 38-51
- Lambert 1960 = W. G. Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature* (Winona Lake, IN)
- Lambert 1962 = W. G. Lambert, 'A Catalogue of Texts and Authors', *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 16, 59-77
- Lambert 1967 = W. G. Lambert, 'The Gula Hymn of Bulluša-rabi', *Orientalia Nova Series* 36, 105-132
- Lambert 1974 = W. G. Lambert, 'DINGIR.ŠÀ.DIB.BA Incantations', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 33, 274-322
- Lambert 1976 = W. G. Lambert, 'A Late Assyrian Catalogue of Literary and Scholarly Texts', in: *Kramer Anniversary Volume. Cuneiform Studies in Honor of Samuel Noah Kramer*, ed. B. L. Eichler, J. W. Heimerdinger and Å. W. Sjöberg, *Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 25 (Kevelaer / Neukirchen-Vluyn), 313-318
- Lambert 1980 = W. G. Lambert, 'The Twenty-one 'Poultices'', *Anatolian Studies* 30, 77-83
- Lambert 1989 = W. G. Lambert, 'The Laws of Hammurabi in the First Millennium', in: *Reflets des deux fleuves. Volume des mélanges offerts à André Finet*, ed. M. Lebeau and P. Talon, *Akkadica Supplementum* 6 (Leuven), 95-98
- Lambert 1992 = W. G. Lambert, 'Addenda et Corrigenda to W. G. Lambert, *Catalogue of the Cuneiform Tablets of the Kouyunjik Collection of the British Museum, Third Supplement (1992)*', *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 1992/129
- Lambert 2005 = W. G. Lambert, 'Introduction. The Transmission of the Literary and Scholastic Tradition', in: *Literary and Scholastic Texts of the First Millennium B.C.*, ed. I. Spar and W. G. Lambert, *Cuneiform Texts in the Metropolitan Museum of Art 2* (New York), ix-xix
- Landsberger 1937 = B. Landsberger, *Die Serie ana ittišu*, Materialien zum Sumerischen Lexikon 1 (Rome)
- Leichty 1970 = E. Leichty *The Omen Series Šumma Izbū*, Texts from Cuneiform Sources 4 (Locust Valley, NY)
- Lenzi 2008a = A. Lenzi, *Secrecy and the Gods. Secret Knowledge in Ancient Mesopotamia and Biblical Israel*, *State Archives of Assyria Studies* 19 (Helsinki)
- Lenzi 2008b = A. Lenzi, 'The Uruk List of Kings and Sages and Late Mesopotamian Scholarship', *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religion* 8, 137-169
- Lenzi 2013 = A. Lenzi, 'Advertising Secrecy, Creating Power in Ancient Mesopotamia. How Scholars Used Secrecy in Scribal Education to Bolster and Perpetuate Their Social Prestige and Power', *Antiquo Oriente* 11, 13-42
- Lenzi 2015 = A. Lenzi, 'Mesopotamian Scholarship. Kassite to Late Babylonian Periods', *Journal of Near Eastern History* 2, 145-201
- Lieberman 1990 = S. J. Lieberman, 'Canonical and Official Cuneiform Texts. Towards an Understanding of Aššurbanipal's Personal Tablet Collection', in: *Lingering over Words. Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Literature in Honor of William L. Moran*, ed. T. Abusch, J. Huehnergard and P. Steinkeller (Atlanta), 305-336
- Limet 1996 = H. Limet, 'Le texte KAR 158', in: *Collectanea Orientalia. Histoire, art de l'espace et industrie de la terre. Études offertes en hommage à Agnes Spycket*, ed. H. Gasche and B. Hrouda (Neuchâtel/Paris), 151-158
- Livingstone 2013 = A. Livingstone, *Hemerologies of Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars*, *Cornell University Studies in Assyriology and Sumerology* 25 (Bethesda, MD)
- Löhnert 2009 = A. Löhnert, 'Wie die Sonne tritt heraus!' Eine Klage zum Auszug Enlils mit einer Untersuchung zu Komposition und Tradition sumerischer Klagelieder in altbabylonischer Zeit, *Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 365 (Münster)
- Maul 1988 = S. M. Maul, 'Herzberuhigungsklagen'. Die sumerisch-akkadischen Eršahunga-Gebete (Wiesbaden)
- Maul 1994 = S. M. Maul, *Zukunftsbewältigung. Eine Untersuchung altorientalischen Denkens anhand der babylonisch-assyrischen Löserituale (Namburbi)*, *Baghdader Forschungen* 18 (Mainz am Rhein)
- Maul 2010a = S. M. Maul, 'Die Tontafelbibliothek aus dem sogenannten "Haus des Beschwörungspriesters"', 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), 189-228
- Maul 2010b = S. M. Maul, 'Aleuromantie. Von der altorientalischen Kunst, mit Hilfe von Opfermehl das Maß göttlichen Wohlwollens zu ermitteln', in: *Von Göttern und Menschen. Beiträge zu Literatur und Geschichte des Alten Orients. Festschrift für Brigitte Groneberg*, ed. D. Shehata, F. Weiershäuser and K. V. Zand, *Cuneiform Monographs* 41 (Leiden/Boston), 115-130
- Maul 2013 = S. M. Maul, *Die Wahrsagekunst im Alten Orient. Zeichen des Himmels und der Erde* (München)
- Mayer 1976 = W. Mayer, *Untersuchungen zur Formensprache der babylonischen "Gebetsbeschwörungen"*, *Studia Pohl, Series Maior* 5 (Rome)
- Michalowski 1980 = P. Michalowski, 'A New Sumerian "Catalogue" from Nippur', *Oriens Antiquus* 19, 265-268

- Michalowski 2006 = P. Michalowski, 'How to Read the Liver—in Sumerian', in: *If a Man Builds a Joyful House: Assyriological Studies in Honor of Erle Verdun Leichty*, ed. A. K. Guinan et al. (Leiden/Boston), 247-257
- Nissinen 2001 = M. Nissinen, 'Akkadian Rituals and Poetry of Divine Love', in: *Mythology and Mythologies*, ed. R. M. Whiting, Melammu Symposia 2 (Helsinki), 93-136
- Oppenheim 1954-56 = A. L. Oppenheim, 'Sumerian: INIM.GAR, Akkadian: *egirrû* = Greek: *kledon*', *Archiv für Orientforschung* 17, 49-55
- Oppenheim 1974 = A. L. Oppenheim, 'A Babylonian Diviner's Manual', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 33, 197-220
- Oshima 2011 = T. Oshima, *Babylonian Prayers to Marduk*, Orientalische Religionen in der Antike 7 (Tübingen)
- Parpola 1983a = S. Parpola, 'Assyrian Library Records', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 42, 1-29
- Parpola 1983b = S. Parpola, *Letters from Assyrian Scholars to the Kings Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal*, Alter Orient und Altes Testament 5/1-2 (Neukirchen-Vluyn)
- Pedersén 1985 = O. Pedersén, *Archives and Libraries in the City of Assur. A Survey of the Material from the German Excavations. Part I* (Uppsala)
- Pedersén 1986 = O. Pedersén, *Archives and Libraries in the City of Assur. A Survey of the Material from the German Excavations. Part II* (Uppsala)
- Peterson 2010 = J. Peterson, 'A New Old Babylonian Sumerian Literary "Catalog"?', *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 100, 169-176
- Reiner 1958 = E. Reiner, *Šurpu. A Collection of Sumerian and Akkadian Incantations*, Archiv für Orientforschung Beiheft 11 (Graz)
- Reiner 1960 = E. Reiner (and M. Civil), 'Another Volume of Sultantepe Tablets', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 26, 177-211
- Reiner 1995 = E. Reiner, *Astral Magic in Babylonia* (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, New Series 85/4) (Philadelphia)
- Richardson 2006 = S. Richardson, 'gir₃-gen-na and Šulgi's 'Library'. Liver Omen Texts in the Third Millennium BC (I)', *Cuneiform Digital Library Journal* 2006/3, 1-9
- Ritter 1965 = E. Ritter, 'Magical-Expert (= *āšipu*) and Physician (= *asû*). Notes on Two Complementary Professions in Babylonian Medicine', in: *Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger on His Seventy-Fifth Birthday April 21, 1965*, ed. H. G. Güterbock and T. Jacobsen, Assyriological Studies 16 (Chicago), 299-321
- Robson 2001 = E. Robson, 'The Tablet House. A Scribal School in Old Babylonian Nippur', *Revue d'Assyriologie* 95, 39-66
- Robson 2011 = E. Robson, 'The Production and Dissemination of Scholarly Knowledge', in: *The Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture*, ed. K. Radner and E. Robson (Oxford), 557-576
- Rochberg 2016 = F. Rochberg, 'Canonicity and Power in Cuneiform Scribal Scholarship', in: *Problems of Canonicity and Identity Formation in Ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia*, ed. K. Ryholt and G. Barjamovic, Carsten Niebuhr Institute Publications 43 (Copenhagen) 217-229
- Rochberg-Halton 1984 = F. Rochberg-Halton, 'Canonicity in Cuneiform Texts', *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 36, 127-144
- Rochberg-Halton 1987 = F. Rochberg-Halton, 'The Assumed 29th *Ahû* Tablet of *Enûma Anu Enlil*', in: *Language, Literature, and History. Philological and Historical Studies Presented to Erica Reiner*, ed. F. Rochberg-Halton, American Oriental Series 67 (New Haven, CT), 327-350
- Rochberg-Halton 1988 = F. Rochberg-Halton, *Aspects of Celestial Divination. The Lunar Eclipse Tablets of Enûma Anu Enlil*, Archiv für Orientforschung Beiheft 22 (Horn)
- Rutz 2011 = M. T. Rutz, 'Threads for Esagil-kin-apli. The Medical Diagnostic-Prognostic Series in Middle Babylonian Nippur', *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 101, 294-308
- Sallaberger and Vulliet 2005 = W. Sallaberger and F. H. Vulliet, 'Priester. A. I.', *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 10, 617-640
- Schramm 2001 = W. Schramm, *Bann, Bann! Eine sumerisch-akkadische Beschwörungsserie*, Göttinger Arbeitshefte zur Altorientalischen Literatur (GAAL) 2 (Göttingen)
- Schuster-Brandis 2008 = A. Schuster-Brandis, *Steine als Schutz- und Heilmittel. Untersuchung zu ihrer Verwendung in der Beschwörungskunst Mesopotamiens im 1. Jt. v. Chr.*, Alter Orient und Altes Testament 46 (Münster)
- Schwemer 2007a = D. Schwemer, *Abwehrzauber und Behexung. Studien zum Schadenzauberglauben im alten Mesopotamien* (Wiesbaden)
- Schwemer 2007b = D. Schwemer, *Rituale und Beschwörungen gegen Schadenzauber*, Keilschrifttexte aus Assur literarischen Inhalts 2, Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 117 (Wiesbaden)
- Schwemer 2011 = D. Schwemer, 'Magic Rituals. Conceptualizations and Performance', in: *The Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture*, ed. K. Radner and E. Robson (Oxford), 418-442
- Schwemer 2015a = D. Schwemer, 'The Ancient Near East', in: *The Cambridge History of Magic and Witchcraft in the West from Antiquity to the Present*, ed. D. J. Collins (Cambridge), 17-51
- Schwemer 2015b = D. Schwemer, 'Secret Knowledge of Lu-Nanna, the Sage of Ur: Six Astral Rituals for Gaining Power and Success (BM 38599)', in: *Saeculum. Gedenkschrift für Heinrich Otten anlässlich seines 100. Geburtstags*, ed. A. Müller-Karpe, E. Rieken and W. Sommerfeld (Wiesbaden), 211-228
- Scurlock 1999 = J. Scurlock, 'Physician, Exorcist, Conjurer, Magician. A Tale of Two Healing Professionals', in: *Mesopotamian Magic. Textual, Historical, and Interpretative Perspectives*, ed. T. Abusch and K. van der Toorn, Ancient Magic and Divination 1 (Groningen), 69-79
- Scurlock 2006 = J. Scurlock, *Magico-medical Means of Treating Ghost-induced Illnesses in Ancient Mesopotamia*, Ancient Magic and Divination 3 (Leiden / Boston)
- Scurlock 2014 = J. Scurlock, *Sourcebook for Ancient Mesopotamian Medicine*, Writings from the Ancient World 36 (Atlanta)
- Shaffer 1993 = A. Shaffer, 'From the Bookshelf of a Professional Wailer', in: *The Tablet and the Scroll. Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William W. Hallo*, ed. M. E. Cohen, D. C. Snell and D. B. Weisberg (Bethesda, MD), 209-210
- Shaffer 2000 = A. Shaffer, 'A New Look at Some Old Catalogues', in: *Wisdom, Gods and Literature. Studies in Assyriology in Honour of W. G. Lambert*, ed. I. L. Finkel and A. R. George (Winona Lake, IN), 429-436

- Shehata 2009 = D. Shehata, *Musiker und ihr vokales Repertoire. Untersuchungen zu Inhalt und Organisation von Musikerberufen und Liedergattungen in altbabylonischer Zeit*, Göttinger Beiträge zum Alten Orient 3 (Göttingen)
- Sibbing Plantholt 2014 = I. Sibbing Plantholt, 'A New Look at the Kassite Medical Letters and an Edition of Šumu-libši Letter N 696', *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 104, 171-181
- Stadhouders 2013 = H. Stadhouders, 'A Time to Rejoice. The Egalkura Rituals and the Mirth of Iyyar', in: *Time and History in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 56th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Barcelona 26–30 July 2010*, ed. L. Feliu, J. Llop, A. Millet Albà and J. Sanmartín (Winona Lake, IN), 301-323
- Steinert 2015 = U. Steinert, 'Tested Remedies in Mesopotamian Medical Texts. A Label for Efficacy Based on Empirical Observation?', in: *In the Wake of the Compendia. Infrastructural Contexts and the Licensing of Empiricism in Ancient and Medieval Mesopotamia*, ed. J. C. Johnson (Boston/Berlin), 103-145
- Steinert 2016a = U. Steinert, 'Körperwissen, Tradition und Innovation in der babylonischen Medizin', in: *Körperwissen. Transfer und Innovation*, ed. A.-B. Renger and C. Wulf (*Paragrana. Internationale Zeitschrift für Historische Anthropologie* 25/1; Berlin), 195-254
- Steinert 2016b = U. Steinert, Review of W. Farber 2014, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 106, 240-251
- Steinert forthcoming = U. Steinert, 'Catalogues, Texts and Specialists: Some Thoughts on the Assur Medical Catalogue and Mesopotamian Healing Professions', in: *The Sources of Evil: Complexity and Systematization, Differentiation and Interdependency in Mesopotamian Exorcistic Lore*, ed. D. Schwemer et al. (Leiden/Boston)
- Steinert and Vacín forthcoming = U. Steinert and L. Vacín, 'BM 92518 and Old Babylonian Incantations for the "Belly"', in: *Magic and Medicine in Mesopotamia*, ed. S. V. Panayotov and L. Vacín, *AMD* 14 (Leiden/Boston)
- Stevens 2013 = K. Stevens, 'Secrets in the Library. Protected Knowledge and Professional Identity in Late Babylonian Uruk', *Iraq* 75, 211-253
- Stol 1991-92 = M. Stol, 'Diagnosis and Therapy in Babylonian Medicine', *Jaarbericht Ex Oriente Lux* 32, 42-65
- Stol 1993 = M. Stol, *Epilepsy in Babylonia*, Cuneiform Monographs 2 (Groningen)
- Stol 2005 = M. Stol, 'Pflanzenkunde. A. Nach schriftlichen Quellen', *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 10, 503-506
- Stol 2007 = M. Stol, 'Remarks on Some Sumerograms and Akkadian Words', in: *Studies Presented to Robert D. Biggs, June 4, 2004*, ed. M. T. Roth, W. Farber, M. W. Stolper and B. von Bechtolsheim, *Assyriological Studies* 27 (Chicago), 233-242
- Thompson 1908 = R. C. Thompson, 'An Assyrian Incantation against Rheumatism', *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* 30, 63-69, 145-152, 245-251
- Thureau-Dangin 1921 = F. Thureau-Dangin, 'Rituel et amulettes contre Labartu', *Revue d'Assyriologie* 18, 161-198
- Tinney 1996 = S. Tinney, *The Nippur Lament. Royal Rhetoric and Divine Legitimation in the Reign of Išme-Dagan of Isin (1953–1935 B.C.)*, Occasional Publications of the Samuel Noah Kramer Fund 16 (Philadelphia)
- Tinney 1999 = S. Tinney, 'On the Curricular Setting of Sumerian Literature', *Iraq* 61, 159-172
- Van Binsbergen and Wiggermann 1999 = W. van Binsbergen and F. A. M. Wiggermann, 'Magic in History. A Theoretical Perspective, and its Application to Mesopotamia', in: *Mesopotamian Magic. Textual, Historical, and Interpretative Perspectives*, ed. T. Abusch and K. van der Toorn, *Ancient Magic and Divination* (Groningen) 3-34
- Van den Hout 2002 = T. P. van den Hout, 'Another View of Hittite Literature', in: *Anatolia antica. Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati*, ed. S. de Martino and F. Pecchioli Daddi (Florence), 857-878
- Van Dijk 1972 = J. van Dijk, 'Une variante du theme de l'Esclave de la Lune', *Orientalia Nova Series* 41, 339-348
- Van Dijk 1989 = J. van Dijk, 'Ein spätaltbabylonischer Katalog einer Sammlung sumerischer Briefe', *Orientalia Nova Series* 58, 441-452
- Van Dijk and Geller 2003 = J. van Dijk and M. J. Geller, *Ur III Incantations from the Frau Professor Hilprecht-Collection, Jena*, Texte und Materialien der Frau Professor Hilprecht Collection of Babylonian Antiquities im Eigentum der Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena 6 (Wiesbaden)
- Van Soldt 1995 = W. H. van Soldt, *Solar Omens of Enūma Anu Enlil. Tablets 23 (24) – 29 (30)*, Publication de l'Institut historique-archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul 73 (Leiden)
- Vanstiphout 2003 = H. L. J. Vanstiphout, 'The Old Babylonian Literary Canon. Structure, Function, and Intention', in: *Cultural Repertoires. Structure, Function, and Dynamics*, ed. G. J. Dorleijn, *Groningen Studies in Cultural Change* 3 (Leuven), 1-28
- Veldhuis 1997 = N. Veldhuis, *Elementary Education at Nippur. The Lists of Trees and Wooden Objects* (PhD diss.; Groningen)
- Veldhuis 1998 = N. Veldhuis, 'TIN.TIR = Babylon, the Question of Canonization and the Production of Meaning', *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 50, 77-85
- Veldhuis 2003 = N. Veldhuis, 'Mesopotamian Canons', in: *Homer, the Bible, and Beyond. Literary and Religious Canons in the Ancient World*, ed. M. Finkelberg and G. G. Stroumsa, *Jerusalem Studies in Religion and Culture* 2 (Leiden/Boston), 9-28
- Veldhuis 2013 = N. Veldhuis, 'Purity and Access. A Catalog of Lexical Texts Dedicated to Nabû', *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 65, 169-180
- Villard 2006 = P. Villard, 'Les guérisseurs à la cour néo-assyrienne', in: *Médecine et médecins au Proche-Orient ancien*, ed. L. Battini and P. Villard, *BAR International Series* 1528 (Oxford), 139-160
- Wasserman 1996-97 = N. Wasserman, 'An Old-Babylonian Medical Text against the *kurārum* Disease', *Revue d'Assyriologie* 90, 1-5 and 91, 31-32
- Wasserman 2007 = N. Wasserman, 'Between Magic and Medicine – Apropos of an Old Babylonian Therapeutic Text against *Kurārum* Disease', in: *Disease in Babylonia*, ed. I. L. Finkel and M. J. Geller, *Cuneiform Monographs* 36 (Leiden), 40-61
- Wee 2015 = J. Z. 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. C. Johnson (Boston/Berlin), 247-287
- Weidner 1941-44 = E. F. Weidner, 'Die astrologische Serie Enūma Anu Enlil', *Archiv für Orientforschung* 14, 172-195, 308-317

- Weidner 1952-53 = E. F. Weidner, 'Die Bibliothek Tiglatpileser I', *Archiv für Orientforschung* 16, 197-215
- Weidner 1967 = E. F. Weidner, *Gestirn-Darstellungen auf babylonischen Tontafeln*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 254. Band, 2. Abhandlung (Vienna)
- Wiggermann 1994 = F. A. M. Wiggermann, 'Mischwesen. A. Philologisch. Mesopotamien', *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 8, 222-246
- Wiggermann 2008 = F. A. M. Wiggermann, 'A Babylonian Scholar in Assur', in: *Studies in Ancient Near Eastern World View and Society Presented to Marten Stol on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday, 10 November 2005, and His Retirement from the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam*, ed. R. van der Spek (Bethesda, MD), 203-234
- Wilcke 1973 = C. Wilcke, 'Sumerische literarische Texte in Manchester und Liverpool', *Archiv für Orientforschung* 24, 1-18
- Wilcke 1976 = C. Wilcke, *Kollationen zu den sumerischen literarischen Texten aus Nippur in der Hilprecht-Sammlung Jena*, Abhandlungen der sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-historische Klasse 65,4 (Berlin)
- Worthington 2006 = M. Worthington, 'Edition of BAM 3', *Le Journal des Médecines Cunéiformes* 7, 18-48
- Worthington 2010 = M. Worthington, 'Serie (series)', *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 12, 395-398

1	HEADING	
PART I Title: (...) "remedies from the top of the head to the (toe)nail(s)"		
I	2-5	CRANIUM
		Incipits
	6-7	Summary + <i>adi</i> -section 5 Tablets
II	8-9	EYES
		Incipits
	10	Summary + <i>adi</i> -section 4
III	11	EARS
		Incipits
	12	Summary + <i>adi</i> -section 1
IV	13-16	NECK
		Incipits
	17-18	Summary + <i>adi</i> -section 6
V	19	NOSEBLEED
		Incipit 1(?)
VI	20	TEETH
		Incipits
	21-23	Summary + <i>adi</i> -section 2
VII	24-27	BRONCHIA
		Incipits
	28	Summary + <i>adi</i> -section 6
VIII	29-30	STOMACH
		Incipits
	31-35	Summary + <i>adi</i> -section 5
IXa	36-37	EPIGASTRIUM
		Incipits
	38-39	Summary + <i>adi</i> -section "4"
IXb	40-42	ABDOMEN
		Incipits
	43-44	<i>adi</i> -section 8+x(?)
X	45-46	KIDNEY
		Incipits
	47	Summary + <i>adi</i> -section 3
XI	48-50	ANUS
		Incipits
	51-52	Summary + <i>adi</i> -section 5

XII	53–54	HAMSTRING	
		Incipits	
	55–57	Summary + <i>adi</i> -section	「4」
	58	SUB-TOTAL	[54+]
PART II Title: “If a lesion [...] and] his [...] is <i>swollen</i> ”			
XIII	59–61	SKIN	
		Incipits	
	62–69	Summary + <i>adi</i> -section	「？」
XIV	70	HAZARDS	
		Incipits	
	71–78	Summary + <i>adi</i> -section (?)	「1？」
XV	79	EVIL POWERS	
		Incipit	
	80–83	Summary + <i>adi</i> -section	1
XVI	84–85	DIVINE ANGER	
		Incipits	
	86–88	Summary + <i>adi</i> -section	4
XVII	89	ORACLES	
		Incipits	
	90	Summary + <i>adi</i> -section	2
XVIII	91–92	MENTAL ILLNESS	
		Incipits	
	93–98	Summary + <i>adi</i> -section	3
XIX	99–100	POTENCY	
		Incipits	
	101–2	Summary + <i>adi</i> -section	「3+」
XX	103	SEX	
		Incipits	
	104–8	Summary + <i>adi</i> -section	「1+？」
XXI	109–10	PREGNANCY	
		Incipits	
	111–14	Summary (+ <i>adi</i> -section)	「3+？」
XXII	115–19	BIRTH	
		Incipits	
	120	Summary (no <i>adi</i> -section)	8
XXIII	121	VETERINARY	
		Incipits	
	122	Summary (no <i>adi</i> -section)	1
	123–24	SUB-TOTAL	「38」(+)
	125	TOTAL	「92+」
	126–29	COLOPHON	

FIGURE 1: *Assur Medical Catalogue Structure Chart.*