Notes on the Assur Medical Catalogue with Comparison to the Nineveh Medical Encyclopaedia
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1 Introduction

Mesopotamian catalogues are crucial for reconstructing textual corpora, since texts to which they refer are often fragmentary or entirely missing. This was also true in ancient times when catalogues included a comment on missing texts: “collated, those which were at hand, many were not seen (and) not included” (4R², 53 iv 30-31; see below).

The Assur Medical Catalogue (henceforth AMC²) is preserved on a portrait oriented tablet, made in Assur (ll. 126-128), and copied from an already broken manuscript (he-pí, l. 83).³ The appearance of the script suggests that it was inscribed during the 8th or 7th century BCE, but we cannot be sure about the exact date of the master tablet. The tradition recorded on the catalogue probably goes back to the late 2nd millennium BCE, when canonization of medical texts began (Goltz 1974: 4).⁴

AMC consists of two parts. Incipits (the first line or words on a tablet) of medical treatises comprise the first part. The second part includes incipits and rubrics of therapeutic, ritual, exorcistic and divinatory texts. Thus, AMC, beside KAR 44, is a catalogue listing multiple therapeutic, some magico-medical⁵ and occasionally divinatory compositions. It is thus essential for understanding the organization and serialization of Mesopotamian medical lore.

* For different article issues, I am thankful to BabMed members, to participants of the BabMed Workshop 1 (Berlin, 12-14 October 2014), and to colleagues’ comments during the conference Sources of Evil (Würzburg, 15-17 April 2015). Special thanks are due to Mark Geller and Eugene Trabich for proofreading and discussions, and to Robert Biggs and Marten Stol for suggestions and corrections.
1 The song catalogue KAR 158 lists many lost works, see Groneberg 2003: 70. For the importance of catalogues see Krecher 1976-80; Shehata 2009: 10; Koch 2015: 165.
2 Bold Roman capital numbers with labels (e.g. II EYES) or lines (e.g. l. 127) refer to the AMC edition.
3 The gloss, he-pí “broken”, indicates that the manuscript is a faithful copy from a master tablet, see Frahm 2011: 16, 33, 319.
4 Finkel (2004: 26) suggests that medical texts from the 1st millennium are “dinosaurs” of older times.
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We assume that AMC represents the works of the asû “medical practitioner”, since the catalogue was written by a young asû (A.ZU TUR, l. 127). It is a manual with medical treatises and thus a companion to the medical curriculum. AMC shares important similarities with the Exorcist’s Manual (KAR 44) and diagnostic Sakkkû catalogue (CTN 4, 71), representing an ideal collection recorded by scholars of that time. AMC is a scholarly manual (index) to actual texts which were incorporated in a newly edited therapeutic encyclopaedia at Nineveh (see paragraph 7).

AMC shall take a significant place not only in studies about Mesopotamian medicine but also in the general history of ancient medicine, since AMC lists healing corpora, predating by several centuries the so-called Hippocratic Corpus.

2 AMC with Respect to the Asû vs. Āšipu/Mašmašu Discussion

AMC contributes to the burdensome discussion about the role of the asû “medical practitioner” vs. āšipu/mašmašu “exorcist”. It demonstrates that a stringent division between asû and āšipu/mašmašu did not exist in the first millennium BCE, nor can both healing professions be viewed as complementary, nor is it always possible to distinguish between their specific texts. Yet, on an ideal, theoretical level there is evidence for medicine, magic and diagnostics since we have three distinctive catalogues (AMC – medicine, KAR 44 – magic and CTN 4, 71 – diagnostics).

Let us observe the types of texts preserved on AMC. The first part lists mainly the incipits of the therapeutic treatises as known from Nineveh (discussed in paragraph 7 below). The second part records medical treatises with ancient surgery (ll. 70-78), magic (ll. 79-88), divination (ll. 89-90), magic and psychiatry (ll. 91-98), gynaecology and obstetrics (109-120), and even veterinary medicine (ll. 121-125). These treatises illustrate the multiple aspects of the asû’s work, and demonstrate numerous incursions into magical lore, āšipitu. Incursions are represented not only at the catalogue level (see fig. 3), but are repeatedly seen in therapeutic manuscripts. Texts belonging to the asû were often copied by āšipus (Scurlock 2014: 389, 410, 430), and even designated as niṣirti mašmašī “the secret of the exorcistic lore”. On the other hand, the asû employed incantations and rituals in addition to therapeutic recipes,

6 In Nineveh medical treatises, corresponding to the first part of AMC, there are numerous references to the asû and his handiwork. The latter is his main feature, Ritner 1965: 321; Majno 1975. The following examples are enough to illustrate the asû’s work: IL EYES, BAB 510 iv 39: Gula belet asûti iddimmu anâku asû “Gula, mistress of the medical skill; she casts (the spell) and I (the asû) carry it out” (Lambert 2008: 93); BAB 515 ii 1: ina ubânika teqqi “you (asû) daub (his eyes) with your finger”; BAB 516 iv 13: itqûr abāri qāt asî “lead spoon (salve) of the hand of a medical practitioner” (see Attia 2015: 42, 78); VIII STOMACH, BAB 578 iv 66: ana masri šatu asû āssu lā ubbal “the medical practitioner shall not reach out his hand to this sick man” (Cadelli 2000: 57, 207, 279). Similar are the prohibitions for treating patients during specific days. On the 1st of Nisanu: asû ana masri āssu lā ubbal “the medical practitioner should not reach out his hand to the sick man”, Livingstone 2013: 107, for further instances Livingstone 2013: 14: 17; 104: 109; 62: 110 ii 3; 112: 35; 113: 38.

7 Geller 2000; Jean 2006: 62-72; Bâcskay and Simkó 2012; Clancier 2014. See also Geller in this volume.


10 See Attinger 2008: 2-6; CMAwR I: 9.

11 See also Biggs 1995: 1918 stating that “the distinction” between an asû vs. āšipu “is more theoretical than real”.

12 The therapeutic treatises (series) were already discussed in different ways by Köcher 1978; Farber 1982: 594 n. 5; Böck 2003: 166; Attinger 2008: 26-27; Geller 2010: 26; Heefel 2010a; Scurlock 2014: 295-306.

13 Finkel (2014: 44-46) refers to AMC. Treatments of wounds and incantations against scorpion stings and snake bites are represented in the early medical and magical texts, George 2016: 5f., 167L, and passim. An Old or Middle Babylonian catalogue (BM 103690) proves the high antiquity of medical treatises, which were compiled even now only from the 1st millennium BCE. The reconstructed incipit [DIS NA ina EDIN U/R], MAH DAB.DAB-[šu] (AMC 70) is also attested on BM 103690 i 17, see Finkel’s edition in this volume. Another earlier attestation of a series is Šammu Sîkinšu in BM 103690 i 11. Compare also the comment to BRONCHIA 5 and IM 202652 discussed below.

14 AMC illustrates per se that the asû may act as a diviner, see Zucconi 2007: esp. 31. The asû should be added to the other professions that perform divination in Koch 2015: 18-24.


16 In veterinary medicine both the asû and āšipu were actively collaborating, see Panayotov 2015: 486ff.

17 For the idea of incursions see Geller forthcoming.

18 Lambert 1962: 68, AMT 94/2 is now BAM 471. Add also the Middle Babylonian tablet BAB 385 i 11’ where the rubric ni-ṣir-ti [maš,maš] was deliberately inserted between prescriptions separated by rulings, and the 1st millennium Assur text BAB 199 rev. 4 (Scurlock 2006: no. 187b).
just like the āšipu did.¹⁹ Both āšipu and asû treated the same body parts and diseases. In addition, they treated animals, and were concerned with divination, as blindingly obvious from the works recorded in the catalogues, see fig. 3. Therefore, it does not come as a surprise that the asû and āšipu were mentioned side by side in magical and medical texts. Both were concerned with healing.²⁰

These incursions, in the catalogues and actual texts, have brought about confusion if a modern scholar asked: why one profession was dealing with the milieu of the other and vice versa?

First, it is a matter of taxonomy. Stringent professional division is true for a modern clinic, but no hospitals existed in Mesopotamia. This is a significant difference. Mesopotamian medicine and healing magic were mainly domestic. During their education, modern students of medicine cover a wide range of disciplines, and a modern general practitioner deals with all problems at a certain level. A similar reality is mirrored in ancient texts: in the curriculum, a wide range of subjects were studied by both asû and āšipu. Later in practice, asû and āšipu dealt with similar cases, but specific cases might have been treated only by an experienced healer, if available. Both healing professions studied and used the same and/or similar healing techniques and texts, as reflected in the catalogues, see fig 3. One good example for an identical healing composition is the Hulbazizi “Eradicate that Evil” incantations series. Its rubric is mentioned in the second part of AMC (l. 83), and also in the Exorcist’s Manual (KAR 44: 7). With its baroque magic, Hulbazizi was linked to the exorcistic series Udug-hul, and the zi-pà series.²¹ But such incantations were an important part of magical practicalities with amulets, protecting domestic space and persons, applied by the āšipu and asû whenever needed.

3 The Pre-publication History of AMC

The modern study of AMC began during 1978 in Chicago when Irving Finkel identified, transliterated, and copied a fragment written in cuneiform, A 7821 (see fig. 1).²²

Finkel and the Großermeister of Mesopotamian medicine Franz Köcher recognized that the Chicago fragment (A 7821) belonged thematically to fragments housed at Yale, which were not published then (Beckman and Foster 1988: 3-4, 11-14, fragments 9a-d). Köcher was particularly interested in these fragments and prepared a preliminary edition, which was never published, but taken into consideration by Beckman and Foster (1988: 3-4), and later by the BabMed work on the catalogue. Concerning the importance of AMC, he wrote a private letter to M. Geller:


In the following winter, he writes impatiently:


---

¹⁹ Many examples are found in Collins 1999; Cadelli 2000; overview in Geller 2007a.
²² Personal communication of Irving L. Finkel.
²³ For this tablet see now Stadhouders 2011: 5.
In his edition, Köcher considered the Chicago fragment (A 7821) to be a duplicate of the Yale fragments. In fact, the Chicago fragment appears to be an indirect join to the Yale fragments.

4 The Publication History of AMC

For the sake of convenience, I list chronologically the relevant publications and works on AMC that I am aware of.

- Pardee published for the first time the veterinary section of the Chicago fragment, A 7821 (1985: 75).
- Beckman and Foster published copies of the Yale fragments (YBC 7123, 7126, 7139, 7146), which were already joined and transliterated by Köcher, but not reflected in their copies (1988: no. 9).
- Finkel draws attention to the crucial phrase SUR.GIBIL in CTN 4, 71 and YBC 7123 (1988: 148 n. 38).
- Cadelli refers to the suālu section in AMC and connects it to the Nineveh manuscripts (2000: 56, 80, 140 n. 48, 326 n. 103, 341 n. 234, 362 n. 444).
- Böck refers to the unpublished edition by Köcher, but does not mention the Chicago fragment, A 7821 (2003: 166 n. 13).
- Worthington, following the advice of Finkel, cites the section from the second part of AMC dealing with wound treatments (2003: 7 n. 35).
- In 2006, Attia, Buisson, and Geller work together on all the fragments in Paris and place anew A 7821. Their fragment placement is followed in the BabMed publication.
In 2007, Kinnier Wilson and Reynolds discuss in depth the fifth tablet of the medical treatise IV NECK.

In the same year, Stol convincingly demonstrates that SUR.GIBIL means “new text” (Stol 2007: 242).

The Parisian co-working of Attia, Buisson, and Geller is reflected in Attinger (2008: 8, 26-27).

Heeßel refers to lines from the second part of AMC, dealing with lesions and skin problems (2008: 169-71).


Heeßel refers to AMC in connection with the organization of the medical series (2010a: 34).

Abusch and Schwemer publish a Nineveh text with a catchline to the kidney section and discuss its position in AMC, following suggestions of Heeßel (CMAwR 1: 126-28).

Frahm investigates who might be the author of AMC and draws close attention to the phrase SUR.GIBIL sabtu (2011: 328-29).

Loretz refers to the veterinary section of AMC (Chicago fragment, A 7821), and cites the aforementioned work of Pardee (Loretz 2011: 199).

The first modern edition of the first part of AMC was published by Scurlock (2014: 295-306, notes on pp. 333-35). Unluckily, she overlooked the Chicago fragment, A 7821, which was already mentioned in earlier literature: Pardee 1985: 75; Attinger 2008: 8, 26-27; Loretz 2011: 199. In addition, Scurlock did not edit the second part of the catalogue.

In the same year, Finkel refers to the second part of AMC, showing that much more is to be expected from Mesopotamian surgery (2014: 44-46).

Johnson discusses the treatise suālu (VIII STOMACH) in respect to AMC, and transliterates the section in AMC together with VII BRONCHIA (2014: 12-13).

I commented on the second part of AMC (Panayotov 2014: 43; Panayotov 2015: 486).

Parys mentions the veterinary section of A 7821 and its relation to YBC 7123 (2014: 5).

Attia mentions AMC in her work on the treatise of sick eyes (2015: 2-4).

Bácska refers to AMC concerning fevers (2015: 4 n. 15).

Wee summarizes what was already said many times about the phrase SUR.GIBIL la šab-tu₃ (2015: 253-54).


Geller forthcoming elaborates of the interactions between the professions asû and ašipu/mašmašu.

Bácska and Simkó 2017 refer to the AMC in respect of the placement of BAM 494 in the therapeutic corpus.

Bácska 2018: 90 refers to BAM 579 and to AMC in relation to fever.

The contributions of Heeßel, as well as Stadhouders and Johnson, and Steinert and Vacín (all in Panyotov and Vacín (forthcoming)) discuss additional texts in relation to AMC.

5 The Heading of AMC

AMC had a heading, from which only MU.NE “its name” survived. Theoretically, iškāru “series”, or asûtu “medical craft” might be reconstructed based on other catalogues headings, and especially on the Exorcist’s Manual (KAR 44). Let us observe some catalogues headings:

CTN 4, 71: 1 (Finkel 1988, and edition in this volume)
[SAG DUB.MEŠ u] ‘ŠU.NIGIN’ MU.MEŠ ‘ša SA’.GIG.MEŠ MU.N[E]
[These are the names of the tablet incipits and all the entries of Sakikkū.

4R², 53² iv 30-31 (Lambert 1962: 68; Gabbay 2015: 19; CDLI P357084)
[D]UB SAG.MEŠ ÉŠ.GÀR NAM.GALA IGI.LAL.MEŠ šá ina ŠU.MIN šu-šu-u /

24 The mentioned Assur incipit (BAM 156) might need revision since it is not known until now from Nineveh.
25 Not clear on the copy of Beckman and Foster 1988: 11, 9a obv. 1.
26 Discussion in Worthington 2010.
27 The initial title of the catalogue (4R², 53 i 1) is broken off, but MEŠ – presumably a rest from SAG.MEŠ – partly survived. There is a different restoration in Gabbay 2015: 15: [ER].MEŠ (u) ER.ŠEM.MA.MEŠ MU.NE. Compare also 4R²/53 iii 1: ER.ŠEM.MA.MEŠ KI.DU.DU.MEŠ MU.NE “These are the names (of) the Eršemma’s for the ritual performances (kidudû)”.

28 The initial title of the catalogue (4R², 53 i 1) is broken off, but MEŠ – presumably a rest from SAG.MEŠ – partly survived. There is a different restoration in Gabbay 2015: 15: [ER].MEŠ (u) ER.ŠEM.MA.MEŠ MU.NE. Compare also 4R²/53 iii 1: ER.ŠEM.MA.MEŠ KI.DU.DU.MEŠ MU.NE “These are the names (of) the Eršemma’s for the ritual performances (kidudû)”.
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5 The Heading of AMC
Tablet of the incipits of the lamentation priest series, collated, those which were at hand, many were not seen (and) not included.

KAR 44: 1 (see Geller 2000 and in this volume)
SAG.MEŠ ÉŠ.GÀR MAŠ.MAŠ-ŠÁ ñIŠ.IIG.ZU U IGL.DU₄-ЬМ KUN-NU PAP MU.NE
These are all names of the incipits of magical series, established for editing and reading (lit. “viewing”).

Thus, one might theoretically reconstruct the heading of AMC accordingly:

[SAG.MEŠ ÉŠ.GÀR MEŠ A.ZU-ŠÁ ñIŠ.IIG.ZU U IGL.DU₄-ЬМ KUN-NU PAP] MU.‘NE
These are [all] the names [of the incipits of medical treatises, established for learning and “reading” (lit. viewing)].

Such a heading would juxtapose AMC to its logical counterpart KAR 44.

6 Structure, Multi-layered Approach, and Logic

Both parts of AMC show the same strict organization: treatises (series) are labelled on the AMC tablet as sadīru “sections”. Each section or treatise is registered according to the incipits of its component chapters (tablets) in an established order. Then, a summarizing rubric follows introduced by napharu(NÍGIN) “total”, mentioning the sum of all tablets that belonged to each individual medical treatise. After that, additional material is introduced with adi(EN) “until, including”. This material is thematically related to each individual treatise, although listed separately after it. The additional materials on AMC might be what we otherwise know as ahû “non-canonical, extraneous” (arguments will be provided in paragraph 12, for a different point of view see elsewhere in this volume). In other words, AMC is a product of the so-called 1st millennium canonization.28

AMC has a multi-layered approach for listing body parts. In the first part of AMC there is a general vertical organization from head to foot,29 consisting of different layers. It starts with the I CRANIUM, proceeds to the II EYES, turns horizontally to the III EARS, goes to the IV NECK, then to the nose, V NOSEBLEED, proceeds to the VI TEETH, and enters the nose for bronchial problems, VII BRONCHIA. A similar case of vertical and horizontal mix can be seen in X KIDNEY, which is a combination of urinary and kidney complaints, suggesting a multi-layered approach to kidneys which includes the penis and testicles. So, there is a mix of vertical and horizontal organizational structures.30

The logic of the organization in the first part of AMC is from head to foot. The logic of the second part is topical. Four of the treatises portray in proper sequence the basic principles of human reproduction: XIX POTENCY; XX SEX; XXI PREGNANCY; XXII BIRTH.

7 A Therapeutic Encyclopaedia: Part One of AMC and the Nineveh Manuscripts

The first part of AMC lists the incipits of the medical treatises, which are the actual texts from Nineveh. It is important to stress that these texts are not known in such recensions from Assur – where AMC was actually copied! This raises an important methodological question: should we only use Nineveh material31 for the reconstruction of AMC, or can

28 The term canonization has been recently discussed in Koch 2015: 52-54.
29 An organization quite common in ancient medical systems such as the Mesopotamian (Köcher in BAM 5: vii), which is partly still in use today, see Asper 2015: 22.
30 A similar case can be observed in the organization of Ṣakkūkû (SA.GIG) Tablets 3-14, Scurlock 2014: 13-139.
31 Scurlock 2014 used mainly Nineveh material. However, Scurlock does not make a sound difference between serialized or excerpt tablets, neither between traditions belonging to different cities. Scurlock approaches the material as if all texts do belong to one particular tradition.
we also use texts from Assur? So, which medical tradition does PART 1 of AMC follow? In order to narrow down this question, we first need to look at the structure of the treatises in Nineveh, since they are the best-attested examples of these texts we have now:

- Each medical treatise in Nineveh consists of chapters ("tablets", *tuppu*), designated and numbered in a proper sequence. Each chapter was a standardized two-column tablet of ca. 250 lines (see paragraph 10), and had a name which was always its incipit. The chapters were organized sequentially into a treatise, and the incipit of the first chapter (tablet) was used as a designation for the whole medical treatise.
- An incipit could be used as a catchline. The latter is the incipit of the next sequential chapter (tablet) inscribed before the colophon.
- With the help of the preserved Nineveh incipits and catchlines, we are aware of the sequence not only between the chapters (tablets) within each individual treatise, but also partly of the sequence of medical treatises at Nineveh. This is how we know that these Nineveh treatises were compiled into a single large therapeutic encyclopaedia. Where catchlines and incipits are missing, we can use the AMC for reconstructions.

Thus, the Nineveh encyclopaedia mirrors to a large extent the first part of AMC, demonstrating that:

- The incipits in the first part of AMC are almost identical with the incipits of the medical treatises from Nineveh.
- Not only the sequence of chapters within a given treatise, but also the sequence of the entire medical treatises in AMC PART 1 mirror almost entirely the Nineveh medical corpus as a whole, judging by Nineveh incipits and catchlines.

**Fig. 2:** Tablet Structure of the Nineveh Treatises

It can hardly be a coincidence that the structure of the therapeutic texts from Nineveh is reflected in the first part of AMC, or vice versa. In order to prove this, we only need to compare AMC PART 1 with the serialized Nineveh manuscripts.

Importantly, the Nineveh Medical Encyclopaedia was a standardized edition preserved in several copies in Nineveh, as proven by the multiple duplicates.

---

For *tuppu* instead of *ṭuppu* see Streck 2009: 136ff.
I CRANIUM

**Title:** šumma amēlu muhhašu umma ukâl
“If a man’s skull/brain contains heat (fever)”

For the sequences of the tablets on AMC, Scurlock provides the following Nineveh texts (Scurlock 2014: 296-7: 2-5). It is important to stress that the first three tablets have real duplicates from Nineveh.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMC Tablets Incipits</th>
<th>Nineveh Serialized Manuscripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. reconstructed from BAM 480 (AMC 2)</td>
<td>1. BAM 4, BAM 480[1] [Tablet 1] has a catchline to no. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. partly reconstructed from BAM 482 (AMC 2)</td>
<td>2. AMT 19/1 (reverse), AMT 20/1[1] (obverse) BAM 482[1] [Tablet 2] has a catchline to no. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. partly reconstructed from AMT 102-105 (AMC 3)</td>
<td>3. AMT 102-105/1[1] (with many duplicates) [Tablet 3], which has a catchline presumably to no. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. partly reconstructed from AMT 102-105, CT 23, 50 (AMC 4)</td>
<td>4. CT 23, 50[1] [Tablet 4], which has a catchline to the fifth tablet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. reconstructed from CT 23, 50 (AMC 5)</td>
<td>5. probably BAM 494[1]; BAM 495[1]; BAM 500[1]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Altogether, there are five tablets in the first treatise (see already CT 23, p. 5), and the incipits of three of them [Tablets 2, 3, and 4] are partly preserved on AMC. Nevertheless, it seems that all five tablets could be placed into AMC and that the sequence of the medical treatise CRANIUM (UGU) from Nineveh corresponds exactly to the sequence of AMC. BAM 494 is uncertain, since its colophon and incipit are broken off. It might also have been a tablet from the treatise XII SKIN found in the second part of AMC. However, the context of BAM 494 fits CRANIUM 5 better. In addition, the format of BAM 494 implies that it certainly belonged to the Nineveh serialized manuscripts (see paragraph 9 below).

Excursus:

Concerning the first Nineveh treatise, I CRANIUM, it is worth noting the Assur text BAM 3 with the following incipit

DIŠ NA UGU-šú KÚM DAB-al (BAM 3 i 11)
If a man’s skull/brain contains heat (fever).

BAM 3 duplicates the incipit of BAM 480 [Tablet 1]:

DIŠ NA UGU-šú KÚM ú-kal (BAM 480 i 1)
If a man’s skull/brain contains heat (fever).

---

34 See also Scurlock 2014: 729.
35 Edition in Attia and Buisson 2003. See also Heeßel in TUAT NF 5: 50ff., 158.
36 This is an eclectic copy based on several duplicates from Nineveh: K. 2566+ (AMT 102-105), K. 2974 (AMT 13/5, 14/5), K. 4023 (AMT 102-105), K. 7642 (AMT 102-105), K. 7834 (AMT 102-105), K. 8090 (AMT 102-105), K. 16698 (CDLI P400934, Panayotov 2016a: 60 n. 4), see Thompson 1937a: 26ff., and add BAM 483-486, BAM 488-489 (Farber 1982: 594 n. 5; Bácskay and Simkó 2017), BAM 493 and possibly BAM 492. See also Scurlock 2006: nos. 58, 65, 66, 71, 113, 114a. K. Simkó is working on UGU 3.
37 See Thompson 1937a: 36ff.
39 Köcher 1978: 19 considered that the medical treatise I CRANIUM consisted of five tablets, but later in BAM 6: ix n. 10, he suggested that I CRANIUM consisted of six tablets. It remains unclear what is the exact reason behind this statement. Scurlock (2014: 297) also counts five tablets and not six.
Observe the slightly different spelling DAB-{al (BAM 3) vs. ú-{kal (BAM 480). BAM 3 (Assur), although thematically very close to BAM 480 (Nineveh), is certainly not to be considered a real duplicate to BAM 480, but a close parallel belonging to a different tradition. Another fact that supports this observation is that the catchline on BAM 3 is different from the catchline on BAM 480:

\[
\text{DIŠ NA 'IGI.MIN-šú' GISSU ár-ma EGIR-šú (BAM 3 iv 46)}
\]

(Incipient): If a man’s eyes are covered with a film, (is written) thereafter

\[
[\text{DIŠ NA SAG.K}][\text{.DAB.BA ’TUUK.TUK-ši (BAM 480 iv 50')}]
\]

[If a man] repeatedly has a sagkidabbu-headache.

Two significant points are to be made: first, the texts BAM 3 (Assur) and BAM 480 (Nineveh) are similar but not exactly the same; second, the catchlines of the following tablets are different. This demonstrates per se that we have two similar but still different medical treatises, belonging to different cities: one from Assur (BAM 3) and the other from Nineveh (BAM 480), both reflecting local traditions. We will observe such differences further below. On top of that, BAM 3, produced in Assur, was “excerpted/copied” (nasāhu) from a writing board with an origin in Akkad (Babylonia):

\[
\text{ina pu-ut} \text{\cdot ZU URI} \text{\cdot ZI-ha (BAM 3 iv 47)}
\]

Excerpted/copied from a wax writing board from Akkad.

In addition, there is a Late Babylonian version of this text (courtesy of G. Buisson and H. Stadthouders), written also on a two-column tablet.

### II EYES

**Title**: šumma amēlu īnāšu maršā “If a man’s eyes are sick”

AMC lists four tablets (Attinger 2008: 26; Attia 2015: 3). From Nineveh only three tablets were known (Fincke 2000: 6-7). The sequence in AMC again corresponds to the sequence of the Ninevehs manuscripts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMC Tablets Incipits</th>
<th>Nineveh Serialized Manuscripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. preserved (AMC 8)</td>
<td>1. BAM 510, 513, 514(^{44}) [Tablet 1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. partly reconstructed from BAM 515 (AMC 8)</td>
<td>2. BAM 515 [Tablet 2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. preserved (AMC 9)</td>
<td>3. BAM 516 [Tablet 3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. partly preserved (AMC 9)</td>
<td>4. probably BAM 520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{40}\) For the texts see Worthington 2003; 2005; 2006: esp. p. 18.

\(^{41}\) Panayotov 2016b: 66.

\(^{42}\) Pace Worthington 2006: 26, nothing is to be seen or expected after the last sign. See for instance CT 39, 38: 16; KAR 71 rev. 27 where EGIR-šú comes alone after the incipit. EGIR-šú is combined with iš-šaṭ-ṭar on AO 11447 (Geller 2007b), see below. In other words, EGIR-šú is a shorthand for EGIR-šú iš-šaṭ-ṭar ‘is written thereafter’.

\(^{43}\) On the meaning of nishu see Black 1987: 35-36.

The fourth tablet from Nineveh is unknown until now, since catchlines and incipits of relevant tablets are broken off. I would suggest that a good candidate for the fourth tablet from Nineveh is BAM 520 (Attiya 2015: 4). Thus, the sequence of the three tablets from Nineveh might correspond exactly to the sequence of AMC.

Excursus:

The incipits for I CRANIUM and II EYES are the same in AMC and the Nineveh manuscripts, but different in the Assur manuscript BAM 3. The Assur text, BAM 3 resembling closely BAM 480, was followed by a tablet – known only from a catchline – with recipes for sick eyes, see excursus to I CRANIUM. However, the overall thematic sequence on BAM 3, BAM 480 and AMC is the same: I CRANIUM – II EYES.

There is another manuscript that partly fits this sequence: AO 11447 (Geller 2007b) – a portrait oriented, single-column tablet from Assur which contains various prescriptions for head diseases, as well as skin and ear complaints (Geller 2007b and Fincke 2011). This tablet was the “first excerpt” nishu mahrû(IGI-û) of a larger collection with prescriptions. It was followed by a tablet on eye diseases, since the catchline of AO 11447 refers to eye problems:

Diš Na ‘IGI.MIN’-šú MÚD DIRI LAL-MA₄⁸ u I-bar-ru-ra ... EGIR-šú iš-šaṭ-tar
(The tablet with the incipit) ‘If a man’s eyes are full of blood, (his eyesight) is diminished and (his eyes) flicker ... ’ is written thereafter.

Therefore, the known medical treatises from Assur demonstrate a similar but still different organization in comparison with PART 1 of AMC, and respectively with the Nineveh manuscripts.

III EARS

Title: šumma ami₄lu uzun imittušu [(…)] iltanassi “If a man’s right ear [(…)] constantly rings (lit. screams)”

This medical treatise consisted of one tablet in AMC, and not two as proposed in Scurlock (2014: 296). The difference between Scurlock’s reconstruction and the BabMed one is due to the overlooking of the Chicago fragment by Scurlock (see paragraph 4 above).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMC Tablets Incipits</th>
<th>Nineveh Serialized Manuscript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. (partly) preserved (AMC 11)</td>
<td>1. presumably BAM 503⁴⁹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We cannot find a corresponding catchline from Nineveh, but BAM 503 is a good candidate for the one-tablet-treatise, see also Köcher in BAM 5: xxxiii. Importantly, it is a two-column tablet (see paragraph 10 below), and contains prescriptions for sick ears.

---

⁴⁵ The assumptions that BAM 520 might be a part of EYES 4 lies in the fact that some prescriptions from BAM 520 are known in similar form from BAM 516 (EYES 3) (this is a common feature of therapeutic manuscripts within a single treatise), and in the fact that BAM 520 is a two-column tablet, see paragraph 10 below.

⁴⁶ There is a forthcoming edition of the treatise by Geller and Panayotov.

⁴⁷ Geller 2007b: 14 reads nis-hu IGI(ISÁ) TIL-û and translates “Extrait premier, terminé”. Collations show no space for two signs between nis-hu and –û, but only for one, thus read as in BAK No. 244. The sign IGI was intentionally erased by scratching the clay surface after it dried out. A similar case can be observed on BAM 480, as noted by Finkel in Worthington 2005: 6.

⁴⁸ See Geller 2007b: 14 n. 77. For diminished eyesight see also BAM 516 ii 8’ Diš Na’ di-gi-il IGLMIN-Sû ma-a-ﬁ; or BAM 159 iv 16f.’ na-ṭa-la / mu-ut-ṭu (Parys 2014: 20).

**IV NECK**

*Title:* šumma amēlu labānšu ikkalšu šugidimmakku “If a man’s neck tendons hurt him due to ghost affliction”

The existence of this Nineveh treatise in the AMC is not recorded by Scurlock (2014: 296), although Kinnier Wilson and Reynolds (2007: 68 n. 6) and Attinger (2008: 27) showed that this treatise is cited in the AMC. The difference in the reconstructions is caused by the omission of the Chicago Fragment (see paragraph 4 above).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMC Tablets Incipits</th>
<th>Nineveh Serialized Manuscripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. partly preserved (AMC 13)</td>
<td>1. lost&lt;sup&gt;51&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. partly preserved (AMC 14)</td>
<td>2. AMT 97/6 [Tablet 2]&lt;sup&gt;52&lt;/sup&gt; has a catchline to no. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. partly preserved (AMC 15)</td>
<td>3. BAM 473&lt;sup&gt;53&lt;/sup&gt;, 474 [Tablet 3] has a catchline to no. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. reconstructed from BAM 475 (AMC 15)</td>
<td>4. BAM 475 [Tablet 4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. partly preserved (AMC 16)</td>
<td>5. AMT 24/1+…, CDLI P394418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. reconstructed from AMT 24/1+ (AMC 16)</td>
<td>6. lost&lt;sup&gt;54&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fifth tablet can be assembled from different texts, as AMT 24/1+BAM 523 etc. (joined on CDLI P394418, Kinnier Wilson and Reynolds 2007). Its incipit matches the fifth tablet in AMC, and has a catchline to Tablet 6, which might be reconstructed on AMC as well.

The total number of six tablets seems to match the space on AMC. Four out of six tablet incipits are partly preserved on AMC. Thus, the Nineveh manuscripts correspond to the sequence of incipits on AMC.<sup>55</sup>

**Excursus:**

As in the case of the medical treatises I CRANIUM and II EYES, there is an Assur counterpart to AMC and the Nineveh manuscripts. BAM 209 is designated as the third tablet of the treatise:

DUB.3.KÁM DIŠ NA SA.GŪ-šú [GU₇-šú ŠU.GIDIM.MA] (BAM 209 rev. 18’)

Third tablet (of the treatise) ‘If a man’s neck tendons [hurt him: ‘Hand-of-Ghost’].

The name of the treatise is the same as on AMC and the Nineveh manuscripts, but the text is not a real duplicate, see Scurlock 2006: 707 and 719. Again the Assur tradition differs from Nineveh.

NECK Tablet 3 also has a Middle Assyrian forerunner from Tell Taban (courtesy of D. Shibata who is currently working on it).

---

<sup>50</sup> Four tablets of the Nineveh treatise were also listed by Köcher in BAM 3: xii n. 10. Note that AMT 46/1, 47/3 might also be part of IV NECK, or of a collection with relevant incantations and rituals.

<sup>51</sup> BAM 471 might be Tablet 1 or 6.

<sup>52</sup> See also Labat 1957: 109; Scurlock 2006: nos. 137c, 304a, 307, 308a, 329.

<sup>53</sup> Parts of the text are edited in Scurlock 2006: nos. 65, 169, 288, 336, 337; and in CAMwR 2: text. 10.6.

<sup>54</sup> BAM 471 might be Tablet 6 or 1.

<sup>55</sup> Note that lines 1’-2’ on fragment 9b in Scurlock 2014: 298 do not deal with nosebleed but represent the additional materials to the medical treatise IV NECK.
V NOSEBLEED

Title: šūmma amēlu dāmu ina appišu illak “If blood flows from a man’s nose”

This medical treatise seems to consist of only one tablet on AMC, and not of two as suggested by Scurlock 2014: 298: 3’. Again, the difference is caused by Scurlock’s exclusion of the Chicago Fragment (see paragraph 4 above). There seems to be no additional material noted by the term adi (EN). The AMC incipit matches the fragmentary line on the Nineveh manuscript, BAM 530 iv 2’: MŪD ina KI[R₄ ...]. Thus, it should be part of a rubric with the name/designation of this medical treatise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMC Tablets Incipits</th>
<th>Nineveh Serialized Manuscript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. (partly) preserved (AMC 19)</td>
<td>1. BAM 530⁵⁴</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are good reasons to restore [...] šá ED[IN...] in BAM 530 iv 1’ according to BAM 538 i 1 (VI TEETH, CDLI P396377) and position it after MUŠ.DĪM.GURUN. EDIN often qualifies MUŠ.DĪM.GURUN, see CAD P 452a, and note especially the expression on K. 4023 (AMT 105/1 iv 15), which will, furthermore, fit the spacing on BAM 530 iv 1’ and BAM 538 i 1. Thus, I would tentatively reconstruct the fragmentary incipit as follows:

[DĪŠ NA ZŪ.MEŠ-šú GIG MUŠ.DĪM.GURUN.NA] šá ED[IN.NA U₅.MEŠ ...] (BAM 530 iv 1')

If man’s teeth are sick you ... copulating geckos] of the steppe [...]  

DĪŠ NA ZŪ.MEŠ-šú GIG MUŠ.DĪM.GURUN.N[A šá EDIN.NA U₅.MEŠ ...] (BAM 538 i 1)  

If man’s teeth are sick [you ... copulating] geckos [of the steppe ...]

Then the sequence between V NOSEBLEED and VI TEETH would be the same on AMC and the Nineveh manuscripts.

VI TEETH

Title: šūmma amēlu šinnāšu marṣā “If man’s teeth are sick”

This medical treatise is registered in the fragmentary line of AMC 20, which can accommodate two incipits, also in Scurlock 2014: 298: 4’. Two manuscripts are also known from Nineveh (Stol 2017, and Stol, in Panayotov and Vacín (forthcoming)):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMC Tablets Incipits</th>
<th>Nineveh Serialized Manuscripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. (partly) preserved (AMC 20)</td>
<td>1. BAM 538¹⁷ [Tablet 1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>has a catchline to no. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (partly) preserved (AMC 20)</td>
<td>2. BAM 543¹⁸ [Tablet 2]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BAM 543 [TEETH Tablet 2] directs us to the first tablet (BAM 547) of the next treatise, VII BRONCHIA, as Köcher already pointed out (1978: 20⁵⁹). Not only the internal tablet sequence of AMC mirrors the evidence from Nineveh, but also the sequence between the two individual medical treatises VI TEETH to VII BRONCHIA is the same for the Nineveh material and AMC, as with the previous treatise V NOSEBLEED and VI TEETH.
VII BRONCHIA

Title: šumma amēlu appašu kabit “If a man’s nose (breathing) is difficult”

This medical treatise has four tablets preserved on AMC, but six Nineveh tablets all together have to be reconstructed (Scurlock 2014: 298-299: 8’-12’). Again, the tablet sequence in AMC seems to correspond exactly to the Nineveh manuscripts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMC Tablets Incipits</th>
<th>Nineveh Serialized Manuscripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. reconstructed from BAM 547 (AMC 24)</td>
<td>1. BAM 547(^{60}) [Tablet 1] has a catchline to an as yet unidentified incipit, which must belong to Tablet 2, since it matches the AMC incipit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. preserved (AMC 24)</td>
<td>2. AMT 48/4(^{61}) [Tablet 2] has a catchline to no. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. partly reconstructed from AMT 49/4 (AMC 25)</td>
<td>3. AMT 49/4(^{61}) [Tablet 3] has a catchline to no. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. reconstructed from AMT 49/4 (AMC 26)</td>
<td>4. AMT 49/1(+)51/5(^{64}); AMT 48/5(^{64})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. preserved (AMC 26)</td>
<td>5. AMT 80/1; BAM 548(^{65})-552(^{64}) [Tablet 5] has a catchline to no. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. partly reconstructed from BAM 548 (AMC 27)</td>
<td>6. BAM 554-556(^{67})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerning AMT 48/4 and AMT 49/4, note that the spellings of the incipit for Tablet 3 are insignificantly different, presumably suggesting different scribal workshops in Nineveh, or different master texts:

[DĪŠ NA GABA-s]u SAG ŠÀ-šū u MAŠ.SÌL... \(\text{AMT 48/4 iv 13’}\) [If a man’s chest, epigastrium (lit. “top of his stomach”) and shoulders hurt him.]

[DĪŠ NA GABA-su SAG ŠÀ-šū MAŠ.SÌL... \(\text{AMT 49/4 i 1}\) If a man’s chest, epigastrium (lit. “top of his stomach”) (and) both shoulders hurt him.]

A further difference between the Nineveh and AMC incipits is the designation of Tablet 6:

[DĪŠ NA su-a-lam ha-ha u ki-ṣir-te MU[R.MEŠ\(^{63}\) GIG\(^{66}\)] (BAM 548 iv 14’)]

If a man [is sick] with suālu-cough, hahhu-wet cough and constriction of the lungs.

The reference to the partly reconstructed MU[R.MEŠ\(^{63}\)] is missing in AMC:

[DĪŠ NA su-a-lam ha-ha] u ki-ṣir-te GIG (AMC 27)

[If a man] is sick [with suālu-cough, hahhu-wet cough] and constriction.

Additionally, Scurlock lists more evidence from Nineveh (Scurlock 2014: 298: 10). BAM 548 [Tablet 5] has a catchline to what should be Tablet 6, unknown until now (Johnson 2014: 12). Here, it is obvious that the tablet sequence of the treatise in AMC corresponds exactly to Nineveh, but we have some minor difference in the incipits, which can be also seen in the later Uruk texts, see the excursus below.

---

60 See Thompson 1934: 1f.
61 See Thompson 1934: 2f; CMAwR 1: 243f.
62 See Thompson 1934: 3f.
63 See Thompson 1934: 4f.
64 BAM 527 might also belong here.
65 BAM 548 is edited in Scurlock 2014: 465ff.
66 See BAM 549 in Collins 1999: 260ff. See also Heeßel in TUAT NF 5: 60f.
67 See discussion in Scurlock 2014: 301. BAM 558, 564, 566-567, 571-572 might also belong to VII BRONCHIA, or are related. BAM 566-567 might also belong to the 5th chapter of VIII STOMACH, see below.
Excursus:
For the medical treatise VII BRONCHIA local traditions can also be demonstrated this time from the south. The Late Babylonian Uruk text, SpTU 1, 44 has the incipit:

\[
\text{DIŠ NA } na-piš \text{ KIR₄-šu DUGUD (SpTU 1, 44: 1)}
\]
If man’s nose-breathing is difficult.

This incipit is very similar to the first tablet from Nineveh, BAM 547 [VII BRONCHIA Tablet 1]:

\[
\text{DIŠ NA KIR₄-šu DUGUD (BAM 547)}^{68}
\]
If man’s nose (breathing) is difficult.

Importantly \text{na-piš} is missing on BAM 547! Yet, SpTU 1, 44 is the 9th \text{pirsu} “division” of the therapeutic encyclopaedia in Late Babylonian Uruk, entitled \text{šumma amēlu muḫašu umma ukāl} (Köcher 1978: 18).

Moreover, BRONCHIA Tablet 5 has a recently discovered Middle Babylonian forerunner, IM 202652 (Baghdad Museum), with the incipit [\text{DIŠ NA su-a-l}am ’\text{GIG ana ša-ha-ṭi}’] (courtesy of A. Fadhil who is co-working on this text with the author). The incipit is also known from BM 103690 i 36 (Middle Babylonian, see Finkel’s article in this volume).

VIII STOMACH
Title: \text{šumma amēlu suālu maruṣ ana kīs libbi itār} “If a man is sick with \text{suālu-cough (which) turns (for him) into intestinal disease (lit. binding of the belly)}”
The \text{suālu} section on AMC lists texts exclusively from Nineveh (Cadelli 2000: 56 and \text{passim}; Scurlock 2014: 299 13’-14’; Johnson 2014).^{69} However, Köcher (1978: 19-20) and Scurlock (2014: 299) count six tablets in this treatise and not five tablets as Johnson (2014). The difference is based on the incipit of AMT 43/6, which was left unrecorded by Johnson (see the comments to the next treatise). Note that the AMC restoration of the first tablet has \text{GUR-š₂}, but the \text{š₂} is actually missing on BAM 574, which casts doubt on the reconstruction. The Nineveh tablets juxtaposed to AMC incipits are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMC Tablets Incipits</th>
<th>Nineveh Serialized Manuscripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. reconstructed from BAM 574 (AMC 29)</td>
<td>1. BAM 574\textsuperscript{70} [Tablet 1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. preserved (AMC 29)</td>
<td>2. BAM 575\textsuperscript{71} [Tablet 2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. reconstructed from BAM 575 (AMC 30)</td>
<td>3. BAM 578\textsuperscript{72} [Tablet 3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. reconstructed from BAM 578 (AMC 30)</td>
<td>4. probably K. 2386\textsuperscript{73}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. preserved (AMC 30)</td>
<td>5. BAM 579\textsuperscript{74}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the orthography of the incipit of BAM 579 differs insignificantly from the incipit on AMC 30:

\textsuperscript{68} See also Farber 1982: 595.
\textsuperscript{69} For an edition of the whole Nineveh treatise see Cadelli 2000.
\textsuperscript{71} See Cadelli 2000: 124ff. See also Böck in TUAT NF 5: 73f., and Bácskay 2018: 76ff. \text{passim}.
\textsuperscript{73} See Johnson 2014 (CDLI P394390), and also Böck in TUAT NF 5: 82f.
\textsuperscript{74} See Cadelli 2000: 252ff. Consider also BAM 566-567, which might have also belonged to VII BRONCHIA, if not belonging to VIII STOMACH. BAM 573 fits thematically as well. See also Böck in TUAT NF 5: 80L, and Bácskay 2018: 82ff. \text{passim}. 
DIŠ NA ŠÂ-šú KÛM DAB-it (AMC 30)
If heat (fever) afflicts a man’s belly.

compared to:

DIŠ NA ŠÂ-šú KÛM DAB (BAM 579 i 1)
If heat (fever) afflicts a man’s belly.

Furthermore, BAM 579 has a catchline, which presumably refers to the next medical treatise based on AMT 43/6, see below.

IXa EPIGASTRIUM
Title: šumma amēlu rēš libbišu naši “If a man’s epigastrium is swollen (lit. risen)”
The sequence of the reconstructed medical treatise, IXa EPIGASTRIUM, and the next two treatises are based mainly on the evidence from Nineveh. AMC is too fragmentary here, and new information must be discovered before one tries to reconstruct this problematic section.

Abusch and Schwemer record the Nineveh evidence, following Heeßel (CMAwR 1: 126-28), noting that in this section AMC shows some differences from the Nineveh material. Nevertheless, Scurlock contests the placement of Abusch and Schwemer of the treatise DIŠ NA SAG ŠÂ-šú na-ši on AMC (Scurlock 2014: 229, 301, 334 n. 50). She assumes, as did Köcher (1978: 19), that AMT 43/6 is the sixth tablet of VIII STOMACH (suālu). However, no clear arguments can be presented against the reconstruction of Abusch and Schwemer. Also, the fragmentary lines on AMC will not accommodate more than five incipits for VIII STOMACH (suālu). Thus, for now it seems that suālu consisted of only five tablets in Nineveh. Thus, the number of incipits for VIII STOMACH (suālu) in Nineveh and on AMC seems to be the same.

The Nineveh sequence of the medical treatises presumably differs compared to AMC:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMC</th>
<th>Nineveh Serialized Manuscripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIII STOMACH</td>
<td>5. BAM 579 has a catchline to AMT 43/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IXa EPIGASTRIUM</td>
<td>IX EPIGASTRIUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IXb ABDOMEN(?)75</td>
<td>1. AMT 43/676 (Tablet 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-7. not yet known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. AMT 44/7 (CMAwR 1: text 7.5) has a catchline to X KIDNEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X KIDNEY</td>
<td>X KIDNEY see below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

75 The designation IXb ABDOMEN is a temporary solution.
76 See Thompson 1929: 58.
X KIDNEY

Title: šumma amēlu kalissu ikkalāšu “If man’s kidney hurts him”

Regarding the first two tablets of this medical treatise we have no information from Nineveh:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMC Tablets Incipits</th>
<th>Nineveh Serialized Manuscripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. partly preserved (AMC 45)</td>
<td>1. lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. partly preserved (AMC 45)</td>
<td>2. lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. partly preserved (AMC 46)</td>
<td>3. BAM 7 (Geller 2005), No. 9b, Ms. J, pl. 6-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third Nineveh tablet BAM 7, No. 9b, Ms. J, pl. 6-8, is accordingly designated as DUB.3.KĀM, and has a fragmentary catchline:

DIŠ NA ina la si-ma-ni-šú .... (BAM 7, No. 9b, Ms. J, pl. 8)

This catchline matches the incipit on AMC for the next treatise, XI ANUS. Therefore, the sequence between the treatise in AMC and in Nineveh manuscripts corresponds exactly.

XI ANUS

Title: šumma amēlu ina lā simānīšu qablāšu ikkalāšu “If a man has pain in his hips prematurely”

According to AMC, the first tablet of this medical treatise should be BAM 7, No. 22, Ms. W (pl. 15-18):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMC Tablets Incipits</th>
<th>Nineveh Serialized Manuscripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. partly preserved (AMC 48)</td>
<td>1. BAM 7, No. 22, Ms. W, pl. 15-18 [Tablet 1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. partly preserved (AMC 48)</td>
<td>2. K. 7925+ (AMT 43/2) [Tablet 2] (part of BAM 7, No. 22, Ms. W, pl. 18) has a catchline to no. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. partly preserved (AMC 49)</td>
<td>3. BAM 7, No. 23, Ms. X pl. 19-20 [Tablet 3], has no incipit, but a catchline to Tablet 4, thus it is Tablet 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. partly preserved (AMC 49)</td>
<td>4. BAM 7, No. 24, Ms. Y pl. 21-23 [Tablet 4] has a catchline to no. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. partly preserved (AMC 50)</td>
<td>5. BAM 7, No. 25, Ms. Z (CDLI P395402)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Geller has suggested indirect joins between several Nineveh fragments: Sm. 36+... (+) Sm. 969 (+) K. 7925 to (+) K. 5955+14453 (BAM 7, pl. 18). As Nils Heeßel has pointed out,77 if we disregard the suggested indirect joins, the tablets from Nineveh and AMC will have the same sequence. The fragments in the British Museum look quite similar, but they are not glued, since the contact is not good. Thus, if we follow the sequence from AMC we have to regard the fragment K. 7925+ (AMT 43/2, part of BAM 7, No. 22, Ms. W, pl. 18) as part of Tablet 2, since it has the catchline to Tablet 3 matching AMC. Therefore, the sequence of AMC and the Nineveh material was most probably the same.

Excursus:

Again, an Assur tablet is a counterpart to the Nineveh texts and AMC: BM 103386 also deals with rectal diseases and bears a catchline:

DIŠ NA li-kis DŪR.GIG GIG ŠÀ.MEŠ-šû ... (BM 103386 rev. 44)78

---

77 During the BabMed workshop 2014.
It closely resembles the catchline in the Nineveh manuscript (K. 7925\(^{5}\), part of BAM 7, No. 22, Ms. W, pl. 18), and the incipit of ANUS Tablet 3 in AMC:

\[\text{[DIŠ NA īr-kiš DÜR GIG ŠÀ.MEŠ [...] (K. 7925\(^{5}\), part of BAM 7, No. 22, Ms. W, pl. 18)}\]

The one-column tablet from Assur is designated as the x+9\(^{th}\) tablet of the treatise DIŠ NA UD.DA SÁ.SÁ (BM 103386 rev. 45). Interestingly, this incipit reminds us of the fourth tablet of the \textit{suālu} treatise: DIŠ NA UD.DA KUR-id (see above). This illustrates again different local traditions, as already observed (see above to treatise I, II, IV and VII). However, there is a difference between UD.DA SÁ.SÁ and UD.DA KUR-id, elucidated by Johnson 2014: 23-26.

\textbf{XII HAMSTRING}

\textbf{Title: \textit{šumma amēlu sagalla maruš} “If a man suffers from \textit{sagallu}-hamstring problems”}

This medical treatise is the last treatise of the first (anatomical) part of AMC. Scurlock also suggests (2014: 303: 14) that it consisted of four tablets on AMC:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMC Tablets Incipits</th>
<th>Nineveh Serialized Manuscripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. partly preserved (AMC 53)</td>
<td>1. lost(^{79})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. partly preserved (AMC 53)</td>
<td>2. AMT 32/5+ [Tablet 2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. partly preserved (AMC 53)</td>
<td>3. lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. partly preserved (AMC 54)</td>
<td>4. lost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pace Scurlock (2014: 303: 16-17), CT 23, 1+\(^{80}\) (CDLI P365732, colophon BAK No. 319) cannot be Tablet 2 of \textit{XII HAMSTRING} because: CT 23, 1+ is a one-column tablet and not a two-column tablet, which is a crucial sign for identifying a text belonging to a serialized therapeutic Nineveh manuscript (see the discussion in paragraph 9 and 10 below). Furthermore, the incipit of CT 23, 1+ does not quite match the one in AMC:

\[\text{[..] ÚR.MEŠ-šū 1-niš GU_ MEŠ-šū (AMC 53)}\]

\[\text{[..]’s thighs repeatedly hurt him all at once.} \]

\[\text{DIŠ SA.MEŠ₃ ûûÓR-šū 1-niš GU,M_EŠ-šū … (CT 23, 1+: 1, CDLI P365732)}\]

If the muscles (lit. strings) of his upper thigh repeatedly hurt him all at once.

In addition, CT 23, 1+ is a compilation of incantations (ÉN) and rituals (DÙ.DÙ.BI) against SA.GAL “hamstring-disease” (see CT 23/1+: 8: KA.INIMA.MA SA.GAL.LA.KAM\(^{81}\), followed by two rituals (DÙ.DÙ.BI) and again an incantation (ÉNI)). In contrast, the Nineveh tablet AMT 32/5+ (joined on CDLI P394437) is a two-column tablet. It has a catchline “\textit{ênumà} DIŠ’ NA \textit{bur-ka-šû}, which matches the third tablet of the treatise, \textit{XII HAMSTRING} in AMC. On top of that, AMT 32/5+ is designated as DUB.2.KAM ...! Thus, AMT 32/5+ and not CT 23, 1+ is the second tablet of \textit{XII HAMSTRING}.

Note that the incipit of AMT 42/6 (CDLI P421951) might match the incipit of Tablet 2 on AMC (l. 53):

\[\text{DIŠ SA ûûÓR-šū 1-niš GU, ... (AMT 42/6: 1)}\]

If the muscle (lit. string) of his upper thigh [repeatedly] hurts [him] all at once.

\(^{79}\) AMT 69/2 and AMT 70/7 possibly also belong to \textit{XII HAMSTRING}. See Böck in TUAT NF 5: 100ff.

\(^{80}\) Note that AMT 4/5 (K. 11397) is a fragment of a two-column tablet which duplicates exactly parts of CT 23, 13 iv 11-23 suggesting that it is another Nineveh duplicate of collections with incantations and rituals having the rubric KA.INIMA.MA SA.GAL.LA.KÁM, see further the Assur manuscript BAM 131: 1ff. See Scurlock 2014: 243 n. 78, and the \textit{Diagnostic Handbook} 10: 11 and 33: 96.

\(^{81}\) For this incantation against SA.GAL “hamstring-disease” see already Thompson 1908: 63ff. For CT 23, 5-14 see also Böck in TUAT NF 5: 104ff.
It is unclear, however, whether AMT 42/6 is part of a two-column tablet, or whether it could join the serialized Nineveh two-column tablet AMT 32/5+. It might be that AMT 42/6 belongs to the incantation collection KA.INIMA.MA SA.GAL. LA.KAM as CT 23, 1+.

Another candidate to be positioned into AMC is the two-column Nineveh tablet AMT 15/3+ (joined on CDLI P393740, edited by Eypper 201682). Unfortunately, its incipit and colophon are too fragmentary, and cannot be matched to what is preserved on AMC. However, both the content and the physical format hint that it might belong to XII HAMSTRING tablets. AMT 15/3+ might be Tablet 1, 3 or 4.

Excursus:
The treatise XII HAMSTRING also has Assur versions, likewise containing the rubric KA.INIMA.MA SA.GAL.LA.KAM, as BAM 12483, a two-column tablet. Unfortunately, no incipit is preserved and the colophon is fragmentary, but it is obvious that this was a serialized tablet since the sign DUB might be seen at the end of BAM 124. In addition, BAM 129 also contains KA.INIMA.MA SA.GAL.LA.KAM rubrics, and is likewise a two-column tablet. The single column BAM 130 shows the incipit known from AMC:

\[\text{DIŠ NA SA.GAL GIG (BAM 130: 1)}\]
\[\text{If a man suffers from sagallu- hamstring problems,}\]

which might be expected as the first incipit on AMC, XII HAMSTRING:

\[\text{‘DIŠ NA’ S[A.GAL GIG ...] (AMC 53)}\]
\[\text{‘If a man’ [suffers from] salgallu- hamstring problems ...].}\]

7.1 Contradictions between AMC Part One and the Nineveh Manuscripts

Certainly, the Nineveh manuscripts have similarities and differences with AMC, see above sub 7 (IXa EPIGASTRIUM).

In AMC 43-4484, the sign EN introduces two consecutive lines. This is not found in other parts of AMC, and does not make sense here. Scurlock emends the first EN to NÍGIN, avoiding the problem (Scurlock 2014: 302, fragment 9c+d: 6+2’).85 If we accept Scurlock’s emendation of EN to NÍGIN, then IXa EPIGASTRIUM might precede X KIDNEY in AMC, as noted in CMAwR 1: 128. On the other hand, we could have only one major treatise between VIII STOMACH and X KIDNEY. This is also suggested elsewhere in the correspondence of the Nineveh manuscripts and AMC PART 1, see above. However, this cannot be proven at the present state of preservation of AMC, and the dividing line after AMC 37 contradicts such an assumption.

7.2 The numbers 12 and 50 in the Nineveh Medical Encyclopaedia

By juxtaposing the first part of the AMC with the Nineveh manuscripts we can establish the sequence of the Nineveh Medical Encyclopaedia, which seems to have consisted of 12 treatises86 (series) divided into chapters (tablets), comprising a total of 50 standardized manuscripts (two-column tablets).87 The 12 treatises were created especially for the Ashurbanipal library and their chapters were designated by the same colophon (see paragraphs 9 and 10 below). This

---

82 See also Thompson 1937b: 265-286.
83 See also Thompson 1937b: 413-432.
84 YBC 7126: 6’: Scurlock 2014: 302, fragment 9c+d: 6+2; Beckman and Foster 1988: 13, 9c obv. 6-7’.
85 See also the transliteration by Köcher and Geller in BAM 7: 247 (add a dividing ruling after line 7’), where the EN is not corrected.
86 Also, the second part of the AMC might have had exactly 12 treatises, see fig. 3.
87
shows a sophisticated level of intention and standardization. The Nineveh Medical Encyclopaedia had a fixed form and we see that the chapters (tablets) had multiple copies in Nineveh corroborated by the real duplicates, all having the same uniformity of two-column tablets (see in detail paragraph 7, 9 and 10).

What is surprising is that the numbers, 12 (treatises) and 50 (chapters), are rather precise and do not seem coincidental, but intentionally chosen and constructed by the royal editors working under Ashurbanipal. The idea that the Nineveh Medical Encyclopaedia is an esoteric scholarly construction is not far-fetched, since we have the example of the Diagnostic Handbook structured in exactly 40 tablets in the recension of Esagil-kīn-apli (see also the edition of CTN 4, 71 in this volume). The number 40 represents the god Ea,\(^{88}\) to whom the authorship of the medical omens of the Diagnostic Handbook has been attributed in an ancient “Catalogue of Texts and Authors”.\(^{89}\) The intentional arrangement of the Diagnostic Handbook’s tablets “can thus be seen as a homage to the god who allegedly first revealed this knowledge” (Heeßel 2004: 103\(^{90}\)). Having the example of the related Diagnostic Handbook, it is worth speculating what the numbers 12 and 50 might have meant from a Mesopotamian ‘numerological’ perspective.

It is challenging to comprehend what the numbers 12 and 50 might have meant, since we do not have an ancient text explaining the authorship of the Nineveh Medical Encyclopaedia. There are several different layers of interpretation:

12: The number twelve is thought-provoking in the healing context of the Nineveh Encyclopaedia, if we accept the fact that it symbolized the twelve months. This will directly connect body parts/sections to months especially in the light of different melothesia schemas. The idea that months were important for healing practices was already present at the time of the Nineveh library. Contemporary sources to the Nineveh Medical Encyclopaedia like STT 300\(^{91}\) teach us that the 12 months were important for the successful performance of apotropaic and healing rituals. This idea developed in the following centuries and the 12 months were correlated to planets and to body parts:

From the two British Museum tablets (i.e. BM 47755 and BM 56605) we now learn that the months can be converted into planetary influences affecting a specific part of a patient’s body, which is a classic example of melothesia, in fact the clearest example we have from Mesopotamia. (Geller 2014: 88)

This idea is clearly expressed in BM 56605 where the body parts are connected to the 12 zodiacal signs (Wee 2016). This schema is worth comparing with the 12 names of the treatises comprising the Nineveh Encyclopaedia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nineveh Medical Encyclopaedia</th>
<th>Body parts of BM 56605</th>
<th>Zodiacal name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Names of the 12 Treatises</td>
<td>after Wee 2016: 217</td>
<td>BM 56605 after Wee 2016: 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly reconstructed</td>
<td>BM 56605</td>
<td>BM 56605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIŠ NA UGU-šú KÚM ú-kal</td>
<td>&quot;SAG&quot; &quot;Head&quot;</td>
<td>Aries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I CRANIUM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIŠ NA IGIII-šú GIG</td>
<td>&quot;x' GŪ&quot; &quot;... Neck&quot;</td>
<td>Taurus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II EYES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIŠ NA GEŠTU 15-šú ([..]) GŪ.GŪ-si</td>
<td>Ê  'MAŠ.SIL &quot;Arm, Shoulder&quot;</td>
<td>Gemini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III EARS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIŠ NA SA.GŪ-šú GŪ,.šū</td>
<td>&quot;GABA&quot; &quot;Chest&quot;</td>
<td>Cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV NECK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ 4 chapters (II EYES) + 1 chapter (V NOSEBLEED) + 5 chapters (VIII STOMACH) + 5 chapters (XI ANUS)
+ 1 chapter (III EARS) + 2 chapters (VI TEETH) + 8 chapters (IX EPIGASTRIUM) + 4 chapters (XII HAMSTRING)

\(^{88}\) The divine name of Ea can be written ₅ dryer. See also Livingstone 1986: 30.
\(^{90}\) Reference to Heeßel 2004 is a courtesy of Eric Schmidtchen.
\(^{91}\) See Geller 2014.
\(^{92}\) One wonders if SA.GŪ should be read here.
This chart illustrates that the Nineveh Medical Encyclopaedia pays much more attention to the head as a whole, whereas the later Babylonian tradition focus more on the middle body. It is obvious that the systems are different but the general organization from head to foot and the division into 12 is the same.

50: The number 50 alone has deep theological connotations representing Enlil in early periods, and later on especially Marduk generated by the so-called fifty names of Marduk. There is an understandable connection between Marduk and the Nineveh Encyclopaedia since in the first millennium BCE, Marduk was turned into one of the central gods in healing magic. In other words, the number 50 (manuscripts) can be a homage to the god Marduk and his healing powers, similar to the pun of 40 (manuscripts) of the Diagnostic Handbook and the authorship of the god Ea.

12×50: The structural order of the Nineveh Medical Encyclopaedia might be based upon Mesopotamian “numeology”, in which case multiplication of numbers was a main technique called nēmēq arē “the wisdom of the multiplication” in the esoteric work i-na, GIŞ.HUR AN.KI. If we multiply 12×50 we would get 600, a number which signifies both divine groups, Anunnakû and Igīgû. Thus, through 600 one might hint at the whole divine pantheon and express a concept of totality. In addition, the number 50 might have also represented the idea of a totality of medical prescriptions. Thus, 50 and 600 might have connoted the special healing power of the Nineveh Medical Encyclopaedia through the totality of medical knowledge, collected and organized by the seasoned scholars in Nineveh.

This totality of healing arts in the Nineveh Medical Encyclopaedia is not a modern fiction but was the way the ancient Nineveh scholars understood the Encyclopaedia. The idea was directly expressed in the colophon labelling the Nineveh manuscripts, BAK No. 329: 5 azugallût Ninurta u Gula mala bašmu “the advanced healing art(s) of Ninurta and Gula, as much as was created” (see paragraph 9). Also, the expression ina ba-ul-ti gab-bu “in the whole medical literature (lit. prescriptions)” (SAA 10: no 326: 3), seems to refer to the Nineveh Medical Encyclopaedia in its entirety in the Assyrian Capital, used as a reference work by the Royal physicians.

---

93 Wee 2016: 217 proposes HAR(?) “Insides(?)”.
94 Enlil can be written 50, see also Livingstone 1986: 30.
95 Lambert 2013: 160ff.
96 Geller 2016: 5.
97 Livingstone 1986: 19ff., esp. 22 (for the reading i-na, see Geller’s commentary to line 31 in the Exorcist’s Manual (KAR 44) in this volume).
8 The Summary Sections of AMC

The reconstruction of the summary of the first part, in the BabMed edition of this volume, is based on the colophon of Nineveh manuscripts, BAK No. 329: 4 (see paragraph 9 below). Since this is the notation from the Nineveh manuscripts, prepared especially for the Ashurbanipal library, it might not apply to AMC. In addition, the phrase is too short for the spacing on the AMC.

Scurlock reconstructs [NÌGIN 48 DUB.MEŠ DÌŠ NA UGU-šú KÛM ú-kal T]A UGU EN šu-up-ri sa-di-ru šá SUR.GIBIL ša-b-tu (Scurlock 2014: 303). With the help of the Chicago fragment, we know that in the first part of AMC, we have at least 50 tablets. Scurlock’s reconstruction, however, is logical for the organization of the Mesopotamian material, since it is the incipit of the first tablet of the first medical treatise in Nineveh, which served as the title of the encyclopaedia. This situation is also directly suggested by the summary after the second part of AMC:

[...]-ta-šú um-mu-‘ra-[at] (AMC 123)¹⁰¹

The summary shows the fragmentary incipit of the first treatise of the second part of AMC:

[...]-x-ta-šú um-mu-rat (AMC 59)

This situation can be also observed with the titles of the other catalogues, see below sub 11 fig. 3. Thus, AMC l. 58 might be reconstructed in a similar way to Scurlock, but with a higher number of tablets:

[NÌGIN 50+ DUB.MEŠ DÌŠ NA UGU-šú KÛM ú-kal (bulţī) T]A UGU EN šu-up-ri sa-di-ru šá SUR.GIBIL ša-b-tu

9 The Colophon (BAK No. 329) on the Nineveh Manuscripts

AMC l. 58 has the expression [... T]A UGU EN šu-up-ri ... This is reminiscent of colophons from the Ashurbanipal library (BAK No. 329: 4), see also above paragraph 8. Tablets with the designation bulţī ištu muhhi adi šupri “prescriptions from the top of the head until the toe-nail” belong almost exclusively to the Nineveh manuscripts, discussed above in paragraph 7. Therefore, it is safe to assume that the colophon (BAK No. 329) was especially composed for the therapeutic encyclopaedia and illustrates that the Nineveh manuscripts were edited for reference purposes in the library of Ashurbanipal (BAK No. 329: 6). There are more fragments with the same colophon, some of them may have belonged to Nineveh therapeutic manuscripts and/or might be joined to Nineveh manuscripts.¹⁰³

BAK No. 329

¹čal Aššur-báni-apli šar kiššati šar māt Aššur ša Nabû u Tašmētu uznu rapaštu isrukūšu ¹ehuzzu inu nanittu nisig tumšarrūti ²ša ina šarrāni ālik mahriya mamma šipru šuatu lā āhuzzu “bulţī ištu muhhi adi šupri liqtī ahūti tāhīzu nakla”¹’azugallīt Ninurta u Gula mala bašmu ina tuppāni ašṭur asnīq abrēma “ana tâmarti šitassīya qereb ēkallīya uki

¹Palace of Ashurbanipal king of the world, king of the land Assyria, to whom Nabû and Tašmētu granted understanding, (who) acquired insight (and) a high level of scribal proficiency, (that skill which among the kings, my predecessor(s) no one acquired. (I) wrote, checked, and collated tablets with “medical prescriptions from head to

¹⁰¹ See the spacing on Beckman and Foster 1988: 11, 9a rev. 4’.
¹⁰² For the discovery of the correct reading, see von Soden 1959.
the (toe)-nail, non-canonical materials, elaborate teaching(s), (and) the advanced healing art(s) of Ninurta and Gula, as much as was created, (and) ‘I placed (them) within my palace for consultation (and) my reading.’

Only a few serialized therapeutic tablets from Nineveh have a different colophon, BAK No. 318, see the attestations for the chapters VII BRONCHIA and XI ANUS below. These are the most important witnesses of BAK No. 329 from the Nineveh therapeutic encyclopaedia for now:

I CRANIUM (UGU): BAM 480; BAM 482 (possibly also AMT 19/1, AMT 20/1); AMT 102/1+ (K. 2566+, CDLI P365746) and AMT 104/1+ (CDLI P395359), both of which belong to the same tablet), duplicated by K. 7642; (possibly also BAM 494; CT 23, 50 (CDLI P365747).

II EYES (IGI): BAM 515 (possibly the other manuscripts as well).

IV NECK: AMT 94/4 (only a tiny fragment (CDLI P400270), presumably AMT 97/6 has the same colophon); BAM 473; BAM 475; AMT 24/1+ (CDLI P394418) see Kinnier Wilson and Reynolds 2007: passim, photo p. 98 (no tablet number and chapter title are given on this tablet before the colophon).

V NOSEBLEED: BAM 530.

VI TEETH: BAM 538 (the tablet is not numbered before the colophon); BAM 543.

VII BRONCHIA: BAM 547; AMT 48/4; AMT 49/4; BAM 548 has a different colophon, a variation of BAK No. 318.

VIII STOMACH: BAM 574; BAM 575; BAM 578; AMT 14, 7; BAM 579.

IXa EPIGASTRIUM: CMAwR 1: text 75.

X KIDNEY: BAM 7, No. 9b, Ms. J, pl. 6-8.

XI ANUS: BAM 7, No. 22 Ms. W pl. 18 (= ANUS Tablet 1). BAM 7, No. 23 Ms. X pl. 20 (= ANUS tablet 3) has a different colophon (BAK No. 318); BAM 7, No. 24 Ms. Y pl. 23.

XII HAMSTRING: AMT 32/5 (CDLI P394437). Note that AMT 4/5 might have had the same colophon as well.

10 The Format of the Nineveh Manuscripts

Judging from the list of the serialized tablets presented in the previous paragraph 9, the format of the Nineveh manuscripts always consisted of two-column tablets, with ca. 250 lines, depending on the scribe who wrote them. This is a sign of the standardization of the therapeutic encyclopaedia in Nineveh. More than 30 two-column tablets from Nineveh match PART 1 of AMC.

11 The Overall Structure of Magico-Medical and Diagnostic Catalogues

KAR 44 is the Mesopotamian superior catalogue for magic and medicine, including multiple references to complex rituals and incantatory series, but also including titles which overlap or refer to CTN 4, 71 and AMC. The three catalogues illustrate incursions into each other, see fig. 3. All share a common organization, see below paragraph 14. An important similarity between AMC and CTN 4, 71 is that the incipit of the first series in each part is used as a designation of the whole handbook, see also above paragraph 8. This fact causes potential confusion and should be taken into account whenever one refers to the first series of a handbook/encyclopaedia, or to the whole handbook/encyclopaedia. In addition, the Diagnostic Handbook and Therapeutic Encyclopaedia 1 might have had two alternative titles depending on manuscripts and tradition.
### Overall Structure of Magico-Medical and Diagnostic Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exorcist’s Handbook 1</th>
<th>Exorcist’s Handbook 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KAR 44</strong></td>
<td>Redaction of Esagil-šin-apli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ominous signs occurring on heaven and earth, l. 29; ‘if a city is set on height’-terrestrial omens, l. 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-canonical (ahū) incantations, l. 31; The treatment of šinnatu-paralysis, rimšitu-palsy, hamstring complaint, sore tendon illness, gna-wing sickness (and) treatment for the ‘ribs of the sailor’, l. 32; Cures (bulū) for ‘Falling Sickness’ (epilepsy), ‘Lord of the Roof’ (epilepsy), Hand of God, Hand of Goddess, Hand of Ghost-afflictions, l. 33; the evil alā-demon, the līlī-spirit, ‘Supporter of Evil’-demon, Hand of the (Broken-) Oath (affliction), Hand of Mankind (sorcery), l. 34; and any kind of recipes of a treatise of afflictions, concerning a sick man seized by fever and treatment(s) for a woman, l. 35; šarrūpī-shivering, lu’tu-decay, l. 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Therapeutic Encyclopaedia 1

- **Redaction of...**
- **Designation** -šamma anēlu muhhaṣu umma ašīl (bušt)? išu muhha ašīl (AMC) -šammu šišu muhha ašīl (on Nineveh manuscripts)

#### Therapeutic Encyclopaedia 2

- **Redaction of...**
- **Designation** -xu-ta-šu um-mu-rat

#### Diagnostic Handbook

- **Sub-Series:**
  - First tablet’s incipit, and Name of the first Treatise
  - Sub-Series:
    - 2. XII HAZARD
    - 3. XV EVIL POWERS
    - 4. XVI DIVINE ANGER
    - 5. XVII ORACLES
    - 6. XVIII MENTAL ILLNESS (unless if only one Treatise, AMC too fragmentary)
    - 7. XIX POTENCY
    - 8. XX SEX
    - 9. XXI PREGNANCY
    - 10. XII BIRTH
    - 11. XXIV VETERINARY

#### Physiognomic Handbook

- **Sub-Series:**
  - 1. Alamaṭ̌nu
  - 2. Nigal.mulānna
  - 3. Katašqagā
  - 4. Šumma sinšitu qaqqada rabīṭ
  - 5. Šumma šintu

---

**Fig. 3:** The overall structure of magico-medical and diagnostic handbooks.
12 The Additional Materials after EN in AMC as Ahû “Non-canonical”

Scurlock interprets the additional material after EN as “inventory of the contents” (2014: 296), also elsewhere in this volume. BAK No. 329: 4 shows that bulîṭi isṭū muḫḫi ʿadī ṣupri designates the serialized manuscripts of the encyclopaedia in Nineveh, as reflected in the first part of AMC (see above paragraphs 7 and 9). Could we then assume that liqtī ahûti “non-canonical materials” (BAK No. 329: 4) might refer to the materials introduced with EN after each of the medical treatises on AMC? For that, we will look into royal letters and other catalogues both from Assur and Nineveh.

Updating editions of canonical (ʾiškāru) and non-canonical material (ahû) was the daily work of the scribes under Ashurbanipal (SAA 10: nos. 101-103). The opposition between series (ʾiškāru) and different ahû-collections is expressed in the Nineveh letters:

SAA 10: no. 8 rev. 8, CDLI P334356:

\[\text{an-ni-ú la-a ša ĖŠ.GÂR-ма su-u a-hi-u šu-u} \]

This is not from the series; it is non-canonical.\(^{107}\)

The following example demonstrates that both serialized compositions (ʾiškāru) and non-canonical compositions (ahû) were brought together in front of king Ashurbanipal, in order to be edited for his royal library.

SAA 10: no. 101: 2-5, CDLI P313602:

\[\begin{align*}
\end{align*}\]

[Concerning] the tablets of [the series ... and] the non-canonical tablets [...] of which I s[poke] to the king, my lord, they have now been brought. [If] it pleases [the king], my lord, let them b[ring them in, and let the king, my lord, have a look.\(^{108}\)

The letters seem to convey the idea that the ahû-material was subordinated to a series, ʾiškāru.\(^{109}\) This is, furthermore, illustrated by the organization of entries in other catalogues. The Enûma Anu Enlil catalogue from Assur cites the incipits of the canonical series (ʾiškāru), and announces 29 tablets of ahû material at the end:

Fincke 2001: 24 (with modification):\(^{110}\)

\[\begin{align*}
\text{ii 3'} & \text{DiŠ 30 ina “BÂR UD.12.KÂM ih-mu-ṭam-ma} \\
\text{ii 4'} & \text{ba-ra-ri it-ta-a-ʾdir na-an-mur-Šu GIM IZI [PI]}Š_i “[1D” [(...)] \\
\text{ii 5'} & \text{PAP 29 DUB.MEŠ inGID.DA.MEŠ BAR.MEŠ} \\
\end{align*}\]

\(^{107}\) The integrity of a series (ʾiškāru) was recognized and differentiated not only from the (ahû) material but also from oral lore of the ʾummnânu “scholar”, see Geller 2010: 121. SAA 10: no. 8 r. 1.2: šu-mu an-ni-u la-a ša ĖŠ.GÂR-ма šu-u / ša pi-i um-ma-ni šu-ú “This omen is not from the series; it is from the oral tradition of the scholars.” For the technical professions (tupšarūtu, bārūtu, asûtu, āšipūtu, kalûtu) comprising the superordinate concept ʾummnânu see Verderame 2004.

\(^{108}\) Further relevant examples are cited in Frame and George 2005: 278ff.

\(^{109}\) Frahm also argues that the ahû material is secondary, less important than the canonical series (2011: 31749).

\(^{110}\) See also Rochberg 2010: 95, 308; Koch 2015: 165.

\(^{111}\) Gabbay 2014: 198; Gabbay 2015: 16; CDLI P357084.

A similar situation can be seen in the Nineveh kalûtu catalogue, 4R\(^{2}\), 53+ i 34-39,\(^{111}\) where the (ahû) material seems subordinated to the series (ʾiškāru). In addition, the library records from Nineveh portray the same situation and crucially employ ʾaṭī(E)N, in a similar way to AMC.
Parpola 1983: 25: 9-12\(^{112}\)
\[x \ast \{37 \text{ÈŠ.GÀR alan-dîm-mu-ú} [\ldots] a-di BAR.MEŠ nig-dîm-dîm-mu-ú [\ldots] K\}A.TA.DUG,GA-u\]

\(x \ast \{37\) (tablets) of the Series Alamdimmû [\ldots] \(^{111}\)including the non-canonicals (as well as) Nîgdimdimmû [\ldots], Kata-
duggû.\(^{113}\)

Crucial to mention is another instance of \textit{adi}(EN) introducing \textit{ahû} (BAR) in a literary catalogue:

\begin{quote}
Lambert 1976: 314: 14 (with modification):
13 DIŠ ašu ina SUKUD-e GAR: DIŠ iqqrur DÛ-uš
14 a-di BAR.MEŠ
\end{quote}

\(^{15}\) ‘If a city is set on a hill’. ‘If he destroys and rebuilds’, \(^{16}\)including the non-canonicals.

These examples imply that the additional material in AMC, introduced by \textit{adi}(EN), might be in fact what we otherwise know as \textit{ahû} material.

\section{13 The Unedited and Edited Nineveh Medical Treatises}

Therapeutic medical texts designated as \textit{bulṭu} “cure, prescription, medical recipe”, were brought to Nineveh in great quantities, not only on cuneiform tablets but also on \textit{lēʾu} “wax writing boards” (SAA 7: chapter 7). How does this fit in with the Ninevah manuscripts designated \textit{bulṭī ištu mubhī adī ṣupri} on BAK No. 329: 4? Could it be that the Nineveh library records and the Nineveh colophon BAK No. 329 describe the same material as \textit{bulṭu} but in different stages? The library records mention miscellaneous material that was not yet critically edited and brought into a canonical form. On the other hand, the Nineveh colophon BAK No. 329 refers with \textit{bulṭī ištu mubhī adī ṣupri} to an already edited and canon-
ized therapeutic encyclopedia, where the non-canonical material was sifted and organized separately in Nineveh, and noted with \textit{adi} on AMC. Similar editorial work on texts in Nineveh is known from the royal letters:

\begin{quote}
SAA 10: no. 177: 15-rev. 6 (with modification):
\end{quote}

\(^{19}\) The series should be revised. Let the king command: two “long” tablets containing explanations should be removed, and two tablets of the haruspices’ corpus should be put in (instead).

This scenario suggests that the therapeutic encyclopedia, designated \textit{bulṭī ištu mubhī adī ṣupri} on Nineveh manuscripts and mirrored in PART 1 of AMC, was edited anew under Ashurbanipal, as Köcher already suggested (BAM 6, p. ix n. 10). This idea seems expressed in AMC with SUR.GIBIL ṣab-tu “new edition”.\(^{114}\) This will then mean that AMC reflects the Nineveh Editions.

\(^{113}\) This entry in the library records reflects the organization of the catalogue CTN 4, 71, where \textit{Alamdimmû} is followed by \textit{Nîgdimdimmû} and Kata-
duggû, which are individual treatises, included in one handbook with the title of its first treatise being \textit{Alamdimmû}, see above paragraph 11. The handbook \textit{Alamdimmû} includes not only the first treatise \textit{Alamdimmû}, but also \textit{Nîgdimdimmû} (“appearance” – physiognomic omens), \textit{Kata-
duggû} (“utterance” – behavioral omens), the related treatise \textit{Šumma sinništu qaqqada rabāt} “If a woman has a big head” and \textit{Šumma liptu} “If a mole”, see paragraph 11 above and the edition of CTN 4, 71 in this volume. Literature on \textit{Alamdimmû} can be found in Popović 2007: 72ff.; Böck 2010: 200; Koch 2015: 285ff.
\(^{114}\) The editorial work in the library of Ashurbanipal was carried out on a colossal scale, since all of the works were assembled together and brought into the library in order to be edited into standardized and systematized editions (Parpola 1983: 5).
14 AMC in Comparison with KAR 44 and CTN 4, 71

Editorial work, as on AMC, was attributed to the famous Babylonian scholar Esagil-kīn-apli (Frahm 2011: 328-329; Scurlock 2014: 295), as suggested by the catalogues KAR 44 and CTN 4, 71. There are several similarities between the three catalogues:

- CTN 4, 71 starts with a heading. It is divided into two major parts. It employs the phrase SUR.GIBIL šab-tu. The first part of CTN 4, 71 obv. 1-rev. 7, before the famous passage of Esagil-kīn-apli (Frahm 2011: 326), refers to the Diagnostic Handbook (Sakikkû). The second part, CTN 4, 71 rev. 29-50, refers to the physiognomic handbook Alamdimmû, see fig. 3.
- KAR 44 starts with a heading. It is connected with Esagil-kīn-apli and divided into two parts: part one in KAR 44: obv. 1-rev. 3, and part two in KAR 44 rev. 4-22. SUR.GIBIL šab-tu is not mentioned. The name of Esagil-kīn-apli appears on KAR 44: rev. 4 (see Geller in this volume).
- AMC starts with a heading. It is also divided in two major parts. It employs the phrase SUR.GIBIL šab-tu for both parts. It does not refer to Esagil-kīn-apli, due to the breaks or the name of the Babylonian scholar was not at all preserved on the catalogue.

We have the following similarities: AMC and the CTN 4, 71 show the phrase SUR.GIBIL šab-tu (AMC ll. 58, 124, 125 vs. CTN 4, 71 obv. 19, 31, rev. 8). Esagil-kīn-apli was responsible for the editions of CTN 4, 71 and for KAR 44. Notably, all three catalogues are divided into two major parts. The copies of all three catalogues come from the Neo-Assyrian period.115

The physical format of the catalogues needs also to be taken into consideration. Finkel (2000: 146) pointed out that sometimes there is a clear physical difference between magical and medical texts (cf. Geller 2010: 111):

(a) tablets of “portrait” or vertical orientation = asûtu
(b) tablets of “landscape” or horizontal orientation = āšipûtu

This can furthermore be observed with the Late Babylonian magico-medical texts associated with the archive of Ninurta-ahhê-bullît (Joannès 1992; Jursa 2005). This whole archive, often missed in the literature, is a counterpart to the archive published by Finkel (2000).116 The difference in formats is not always significant (Attinger 2008: 5, and Fincke 2009: 98). But in the case of KAR 44 (b) vs. AMC (a) and the CTN 4, 71 (a), one may ask if it is not partly relevant. We can present the similarities between the catalogues in the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue</th>
<th>AMC</th>
<th>CTN 4, 71</th>
<th>KAR 44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heading</td>
<td>1st line MU.NE</td>
<td>1st line MU.NE</td>
<td>1st line MU.NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>two parts</td>
<td>two parts</td>
<td>two parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Edition</td>
<td>SUR.GIBIL šab-tu</td>
<td>SUR.GIBIL šab-tu</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
<td>Esagil-kīn-apli</td>
<td>Esagil-kīn-apli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>8th-7th century</td>
<td>9th-7th or 6th century</td>
<td>7th-5th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format</td>
<td>“portrait”, asûtu</td>
<td>“portrait”, asûtu</td>
<td>“landscape”, āšipûtu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

115 The earliest of the three catalogues is CTN 4, 71 from the Nabû temple in Kalhu (9th century BCE), having also one Neo-Babylonian copy (whose “sign forms are not dissimilar from those in many tablets in a Babylonian hand from the libraries at Nineveh”, see Finkel 1988: 144). Also, the Neo-Babylonian copy of CTN 4, 71 (published by Finkel 1988) might be contemporary with the Nineveh texts. KAR 44 was transmitted at least until Rimût-Anu, who lived in Uruk during the time of Darius II, at the end of the 5th century (Clancier 2014).
116 The publication of Joannès 1992 has to be added to Finkel 2000.
117 Concerning the bipartite structure of AMC, Johnson (2015a: 21) suggested that this structure might follow the model of the Old Babylonian lexical series Ugû-mu: “where “the head to toe” arrangement comes to an end”, and the text continues with short general descriptions of the body and the human being as stature, ages, shadow etc. (Veldhuis 2014: 159). Nevertheless, the division into two parts might be a general organizational approach.
118 At least of the second Handbook, see fig. 3.
15 Different Recensions of the Therapeutic Encyclopaedia

Different synchronic and diachronic versions of the medical treatises are similar to the Nineveh Therapeutic Encyclopaedia (paragraph 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Format of Manuscript</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Late Babylonian</td>
<td>unclear (two-column tablet)</td>
<td>Courtesy of G. Buisson and H. Stadhouders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assur</td>
<td>Neo Assyrian</td>
<td>nishu</td>
<td>BAM 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nineveh</td>
<td>Neo Assyrian</td>
<td>ṭuppu</td>
<td>BAM 480, and presumably the Nineveh encyclopaedia as reflected in AMC PART 1, see above paragraph 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruk</td>
<td>Late Babylonian</td>
<td>pîrsu</td>
<td>SpTU 1, 44 (9th pîrsu), SpTU 1, 46 (10th pîrsu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nishu</td>
<td>BAM 403 (bit Dābibī)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td>Late Babylonian</td>
<td>pîrsu</td>
<td>BM 42272 (30th pîrsu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nishu</td>
<td>BM 35512 (34th nishu from bit Dābibī)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Late Babylonian therapeutic material was organized differently from Assur and Nineveh medical treatises. Medical treatises of _pîrsus_ do not seem to be attested in Assur or Nineveh for now, although an organization into _pîrsus_ is attested in Nineveh for the Lamaštu series. The differences in the manuscript formats (_ṭuppu_, _nîshu_ and _pîrsu_) are not exactly transparent. The vehicle for the transformations of medical treatises might lie in different scholarly circles. This variety compels the modern scholar to specify which medical treatise he means. Is it a version of _šumma amēlu muḥhašu umma ukāl_ from Assur, Babylon, Uruk or the first treatise of the Medical Encyclopaedia from Nineveh?

16 Babylonian Influence?

AMC might go back to the tradition of the Babylonian scholar Esagil-kin-apli (see paragraph 14 and Geller in this volume). But then the Nineveh manuscripts also might have followed the same tradition, since they are mostly reflected in the PART 1 of AMC. Nils Heeßel has pointed out that the Assur scholarship seems to reject Esagil-kin-apli’s editions (Heeßel 2010b). This might be a clue why recensions of the Nineveh Medical Encyclopaedia, as recorded in AMC PART 1 and represented by the Nineveh manuscripts, are missing in Assur.

---

119 See also Heeßel 2010a: 34.
120 For organized medical compositions from Assur, among them also serialized _nîshus_, compare BAM 9 (_nîshu_), BAM 36, BAM 52 (_nîshu_), BAM 99 (_nîshu_), BAM 124, BAM 147 (_nîshu_), BAM 209, AO 11447, BM 103386.
121 See Frahm 2011: 232, § 74.2.2.
124 Mentioned in Bácskay 2015: 2 n. 13, and Bácskay, in Panayotov and Vacín (forthcoming). The Late Babylonian designation _bit Dābibī_ might suggest an earlier Middle Babylonian tradition of naming medical compositions after a family of healers, as shown by the Middle Babylonian (13th century BC) tablet BAM 11 (CDLI P281806) rev. 36-38: 18 _bu-ul-tā_ ša SAG.KL.DAB.BA / "ša GÎ.DA I.KAM.MA / ša bit(E=) Ra-bi-a-ša-4-AMAR.UTU "18 prescriptions for _sagkidabbî_-head illness; first oblong tablet of the house of Rabâ-ša-Marduk". Pace Heeßel (2009: 25), do not emend ŠE Ra-bi-a-ša-4-AMAR.UTU, the sign is certainly E.
125 See Farber 2014: 17-25, and passim.
126 As suggested by Weidner for the omen series _Enûma Anu Entil_, see Koch 2015: 164f.
On the other hand, Babylonian tradition was taken into consideration in Assur through the importing of tablets and scribes (Wiggermann 2008: 215; Heeßel 2009). BAM 3 from Assur contains an excerpt of the treatise CRANIUM (beginning with the incipit of CRANIUM Tablet 1, šumma amēlu muhašu umma ukāl “If a man’s cranium/brain contains fever”) which also came from Babylonia, as mentioned in the colophon of BAM 3 iv 47: ina pu-ūt éZU URI Zi-ha “excerpted/copied from a wax writing-board from Akkad (= Babylonia)”. Babylonian traditions were also introduced into Nineveh through imports of texts and scribes (Frame and George 2005; Frahm 2012). Some of them are still preserved on manuscripts in Babylonian ductus (Fincke 2003-04). On the other hand, Nineveh received many texts from Kalhu (Frahm 2011: 265), and some therapeutic fragments from Kalhu remind us strongly of the Nineveh Medical treatise I CRANIUM. Kalhu also incorporated Babylonian traditions, such as the one of Esagil-kin-apli in the diagnostic catalogue CTN 4, 71.

This all suggests that the Nineveh Medical Encyclopaedia, as reflected in AMC PART 1, might have originated from an older Babylonian encyclopaedia called šumma amēlu muhašu umma ukāl “If a man’s cranium/brain contains fever”. This is, furthermore, directly suggested by the fact that after the political demise of Assyria medical works with this name were still in use in the Late Babylonian world (see paragraph 15).

17 Further Perspectives in the Studies of Medical Texts

In reconstructing Mesopotamian medicine, it is important to edit and study the whole Nineveh therapeutic encyclopaedia, as reflected in AMC PART 1. The Nineveh encyclopaedia is the best example for systematized healing corpora from the Ancient Near East for now. There is unedited material in the British Museum and tiny fragments of Nineveh manuscripts suggest joining to bigger pieces.

References in catalogues show how much there is still to discover, see Finkel in this volume. The second part of AMC is full of texts that we still do not really know. Also, both parts of KAR 44 include references to medical treatises which have yet to be pieced together.

Certainly, there are more texts to be excavated in Nineveh, which will fill the therapeutic encyclopaedia. In addition, the temple of Gula in Assur has not been excavated at all. It also contained a collection of medical manuscripts and some texts were copied from there (e.g. BAM 99). Also, new texts from Kalhu will throw light on the situation of medical texts before Nineveh.

Furthermore, the fragmentary Late Babylonian material (ca. 800 pieces) in the British Museum is barely edited.
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