Eric Schmidtchen

Esagil-kīn-apli’s Catalogue of Sakikkû and Alamdimmû

1 Introduction

Without doubt, Esagil-kīn-apli’s text catalogue of the prognostic-diagnostic omen series Sakikkû and the physiognomic-morphoscopic omen series Alamdimmû, known from two 1st millennium manuscripts, is of considerable importance and merits to be treated here together with the catalogues KAR 44 (Exorcist’s Manual) and AMC. (a) It serves as an important point of comparison for the terminology and structure of the other catalogues. Since a number of otherwise unattested expressions in the Sakikkû catalogue pose some difficulties, a discussion of the major terms will be provided later on in this article. (b) Combining both witnesses the catalogue is, with the exception of some line beginnings and a few lines at the end of the tablet, nearly completely preserved and offers crucial information for the reconstruction of both series. (c) Another remarkable feature is the insertion of an editorial note or, as John Wee called it, a manifesto, between the catalogues of Sakikkû (SA.GIG) and Alamdimmû, in the middle of the text. This editorial note is not only noteworthy because it mentions the series’ compiler – which is unusual in itself – but also by stating the reasons and justification for the edition, which has led to a discussion about canonisation within Mesopotamian technical texts pertaining to different scholarly disciplines.

1.1 Text Manuscripts and Publication History

The main text from Nimrud (A = ND 4358 + 4366; ancient Kalhu) was first published by James Kinnier Wilson in 1956 (i.e. the fragment ND 4358) and was supplemented with the second fragment (ND 4366) in 1962 by the same author. A new copy of the text, now joined, has been published by Donald Wiseman and Jeremy Black in 1996 as CTN 4, 71.

In 1988 Irving Finkel edited the second witness (B = BM 41237 + BM 46607 + BM 47163), which most likely stems from Babylon, and presented it together with A in a synoptic transliteration. This witness added further important information for the dating of both catalogued series and their “canonisation”, since it had preserved within the editorial note the full name of the king (Adad-apla-iddina) under whom the scholar Esagil-kīn-apli (here written with the Sumerian spelling “ES.GU.ZI.GIN.A”) was active. The editorial work should thus have taken place at the end of the second millennium, in the middle of the 11th century.

The catalogue has received further attention in recent years. For the first section of the catalogue listing the incipits the so-called Diagnostic Handbook (Sakikkû), Nils Heeßel provided a new synoptic transliteration and translation, followed by a short discussion on the role of the catalogue for the reconstruction and analysis of the compilation’s structure. He also provided a transliteration of the editorial note and discussed the canonisation process of this series. Barbara Böck used the last section of the catalogue on the physiognomic omen series as a point of comparison with the

1 Wee 2015: 252-255. It is often designated as the “colophon” of Esagil-kīn-apli, following the assessment of Irving Finkel 1988: 145 who stated that since it is appended to the Sakikkû-catalogue, “the passage thus qualifies effectively as a colophon”. James Kinnier Wilson (1956: 136-140) called it a postscript.
2 Kinnier Wilson 1956: 130-148. Cf. further the short account in Lambert 1957: 6 on the authorship and mythical sages. Since the second witness (B) was not yet identified at this time, Wilfred Lambert identified the broken name of the king mistakenly as Nabû-apla-iddina, the Babylonian king of the ninth century B.C.E.
4 CTN 4, 71 pl. 44. See also supra Plate 14-15.
5 Finkel 1988: 143-159. See also supra Plate 16-17.
6 For a discussion of the name and other attestations see Finkel 1988: 144.
7 Adad-apla-iddina ruled from 1068 to 1047 BCE (middle chronology).
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colophons of Alamdimmû series tablets, and discussed the reconstruction of the series. The editorial note has been translated and discussed several times, which underlines the position of this remarkable text passage as an anchor point for different questions and studies engaged with Mesopotamian scholarly texts.

2 The Sections of the Sakikkû and Alamdimmû Catalogue

2.1 Structure and Content

As mentioned above, the catalogue contains two incipit catalogues, one for the prognostic-diagnostic series Sakikkû (ll. 1-50), and one for the physiognomic series Alamdimmû (ll. 72-91). Both catalogues are separated by an editorial note of Esagil-kin-apli, describing the reasons for the scholar’s work and the methods he employed in his “new edition” of both series (ll. 51-71). Thus one can speak of a bi- or tripartite structure, depending on the value one ascribes to the note between both catalogues.

Like other text catalogues, the Esagil-kin-apli catalogue is introduced by a topicalising line or heading stating that “these are [the incipits] and all of the entries of Sakikkû”, which clearly refers to the first part of the catalogue. Interestingly, this structural element is lacking for the second (or third) part, the Alamdimmû catalogue, which might indicate a slightly different status of this series in comparison with the very stable and quasi “canonised” version of the diagnostic series Sakikkû. Furthermore, the text ends with a summary line, which probably presented a total for all the tablets of both series, combined with the label “secret/treasure of the apkallu-sage” (l. 92, niṣirti apkalli). The reading, meaning and function of the last line (l. 93) remain unclear. Despite the terminological connections referring to medical or diagnostic contexts its fragmentary state prevents more than tentative interpretations.

2.1.1 The Sakikkû Catalogue

As most of the preserved colophons from this series suggest, the forty tablets of Sakikkû were divided into six sections – an arrangement also apparent through the layout of the catalogue. Each division, separated by rulings, lists the

12 See below 2.1.3.
13 For a similar catalogue structure, cf. the Exorcist’s Manual (KAR 44 and duplicates, see Geller infra), which consists of two main sections separated by a note connecting the listed text to Esagil-kin-apli. Since the first half of KAR 44 mentions serialised texts, the latter half may be part of an explanatory note, comparable to the editorial note in our catalogue.
14 See Schmidtchen infra l. 1.
15 See infra CTN 4, 71 // l. 92: [naphar ... sa]kikkû[?] ‘alamdimmû niṣirti’ ap[kalli]. Finkel (1988: 152) reads differently ī.[ZI.DA] for niṣirti Ezida at the end of the line, but at least the copy of witness A reads clearly NUN and not ī, allowing the possible restoration NUN.[ME]. The phrase “secret/treasure of the sage” is rarely attested (see Lenzi 2008a: 174-175 for another attestation in CT 25, 50+: 19), while labels such as “secret of the scholar (ummânu)” and “secret of the āšipu” are more common (Lenzi 2008a: 179-184). Cf. also Lenzi 2006: 70-71 for a semantic analysis of pirištu and niṣirtu.
16 The preserved signs read by Irving Finkel as AL.TU.RA ŠUM.MA.ME, followed by a small gloss consisting of the sign A(?) (see Finkel 1988: 152 L. 93), may refer to the šummu i.e. “the entrust (of) the sick man/getting sick(?).” The logographic reading AL.TU.RA is otherwise unattested, but AL at the beginning could indicate a verbal form, maybe a stative. ME-a could be also read as qiba “diagnosis; interpretation”, but this makes little sense without a convenient verb following it. Another possible reading proposed here could be “šumTU”.RA TAG- ‘ma ME-a’ referring to a sick man who is touched (TAG) and its subsequent interpretation or diagnosis (ME-a = qiba). If read correctly, this statement could refer either to the first part of the catalogue (Sakikkû) or to an entirely different composition, but not to the Alamdimmû catalogue.
17 Cf. for example the colophon of Sakikkû tablet 9, which is designated as DUB 7.KAM DÎŠ 4.GIG ina TE-ka DUB 9.KAM e-nu-ma ana ī 4.GIG KA.PIRIG “Tablet seven of ‘If you approach the patient’; tablet nine of ‘When the āšipu (goes) to the patient’s house’ (Sakikkû).”
incipits of all tablets within a respective section (or sub-series). Every tablet incipit is preceded by its number of entries. At the end of each section a resuming summary rubric lists the total number of entries of the respective section and gives additional editorial information, showing that in this particular case one should speak of “sections”, i.e. fixed sections of Sakikkû, and not of “sub-series” as in the case of Alamdimmû (cf. below).

Schematic overview of the Sakikkû catalogue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tablet</th>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Number of Entries</th>
<th>Incipit/Description</th>
<th>Additional Editorial Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>“[When] the āšipu (KA.PIRIG) goes [to the house of] a sick man”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>“[If a man] goes [to the house] of a sick man”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[..] new(?), not finished ([..] GIBIL NU TIL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>[Total ...]</td>
<td></td>
<td>“When the āšipu goes to the house of a sick man”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (1)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>“If you approach a patient”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (2)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>“If he feels pressure (in his) temple”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (3)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>“If his right eye hurts him”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (4)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>“If his nose is red”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (5)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>“If his tongue is red”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (6)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>“If his right ear is dark”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (7)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>“If the patient, his face is red”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (8)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>“If the patient, his neck [turns to the right]”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (9)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>“If his right wrist hurts [him]”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (10)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>“[If] his chest hurts [him]”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 (11)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>“[If] his epigastrium is red”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 (12)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>“[If] his right hip is red”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18-19 [Total ...] [...] “If you approach [a patient]” [...] sections(?) edited (SUR.GIBIL ṣabtū)

| 15 (1) | 20    | [...]             | “[If] he is sick for one day” (and) (entries/prognoses) which are ill-portending | |
| 16 (2) | 21    | [...]             | “[If] he is sick for one day and his head hurts him” | |
| 17 (3) | 22    | [...]             | “If on the beginning of his sickness he constantly has sweat and boils” | |
| 18 (4) | 23    | [...]             | “If the patient, (his) body (gets hot and cold)” | |
| 19 (5) | 24    | [...]             | “If he gets hot and cold” | |
| 20 (6) | 25    | [...]             | “If the patient presents sweat” | |
| 21 (7) | 26    | 100               | “If all of his sinews are healthy” | |
| 22 (8) | 27    | 88                | “If the patient has been spasmodic, one, two or three (times and if) the patient keeps on groaning in the morning” | |
| 23 (9) | 28    | 103               | “If he vomits bile” | |

20 The mentioning of the number of entries is similar to the Late Babylonian catalogue of Enûma Anu Enlil from Uruk (VAT 7814 (+) AO 6470, published in Weidner 1941-44: 186-187 and pl. l-I; see Rochberg infra). Also in this catalogue, the number of entries per tablet are given, and the summary rubrics of the catalogue likewise provide a total of entries for each section in the series. To my knowledge, accounts of the number of tablet entries are not attested in other catalogues.

21 For an explanation and interpretation of the catalogue’s editorial remarks see paragraph 3.

22 The incipits of the serial tablets are often marked in the catalogue by inserting (DIŠ) GIG “(If) the sick man/patient”, probably to clarify that the tablet belongs to the respective diagnostic-prognostic text group and not e.g. to the physiognomic text corpus. The position therefore has rarely a syntactic, but rather a topicalising value, i.e. “If (concerning) a sick person – (symptoms follow)”. A differing interpretation of the reading of GIG as “sick place” is given in Kinnier Wilson 1956: 142 (line 8) followed by Heeßel 2000: 240. However, the use of GIG in this function is rare. Cf. the construction in SA.GIG Tablet 9: 1, which reads “If the patient – his face holds sweat” (DIŠ GIG IGI.MEŠ-šú IR ū-kal, Labat 1951: 70; Scurlock 2014: 66). Since especially in the second sub-series of Sakikkû, GIG after the DIŠ usually has a topicalising function (“regarding a sick person”), I hesitate to translate it as “If the patient’s face holds sweat”. 

23 A differing interpretation of the reading of GIG as “sick place” is given in Kinnier Wilson 1956: 142 (line 8) followed by Heeßel 2000: 240. However, the use of GIG in this function is rare. Cf. the construction in SA.GIG Tablet 9: 1, which reads “If the patient – his face holds sweat” (DIŠ GIG IGI.MEŠ-šú IR ū-kal, Labat 1951: 70; Scurlock 2014: 66). Since especially in the second sub-series of Sakikkû, GIG after the DIŠ usually has a topicalising function (“regarding a sick person”), I hesitate to translate it as “If the patient’s face holds sweat”.

24 This construction is repeated in the second sub-series of Sakikkû (cf. infra).
Generally, the incipits of *Sakikkû* witnesses and the incipits given in the catalogue seem to agree for the most part. However, some deviations are noticeable, which may suggest that the series underwent further changes and revisions after its formation, and that the catalogue may also show an earlier stage of the series than most of the first millennium witnesses that have come down to us. The most obvious deviations are (a) differences in the naming of incipits. More subtle discrepancies between catalogue and *Sakikkû* witnesses are seen (b) in the assigned tablet number, and (c) in the number of entries in a given tablet.

a) Differences in the naming of incipits:

**Tablet 9:** The incipit of Tablet 9, preserved in Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian witnesses, begins most likely with a supplementary entry: “If the patient’s face contains sweat (lit. the patient ‘holds’ sweat on his face)” (*šumma maršu pānīšu zuʾta ukāl*). In contrast, the quoted entry of the catalogue is the second entry of the respective witnesses.

**Tablet 15:** Another discrepancy is encountered in the incipit of Tablet 15, known from the catchline of a manuscript of Tablet 14, which reads “If he is sick for one day and he is affected in his head” (*šumma ūm ištēn maruṣma ina qaqqad īšu mahīṣ*). However, the incipit given in the catalogue as well as in rubrics of other witnesses of *Sakikkû* (referring to the

---

**Table:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tablet</th>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Number of Entries</th>
<th>Incipit/Description</th>
<th>Additional Editorial Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 (10)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>“If the patient requests an apple”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 (11)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>“If the lamp which has been set up at the patient’s head”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 (1)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>“If collapse befalls him”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 (2)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>“If a man is stricken by stroke of the face”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 (3)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>60(?)</td>
<td>“If Šugidimmakku turns into Antašubbû”</td>
<td>Sections edited (sadirū SUR.GIBIL šabtû)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 (4)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>“If Lugalurra is born with him”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 (5)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>“If he is sick and he constantly opens his mouth”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 (1)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>81(?)</td>
<td>“If ṣētu-fever has made him feverish”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 (2)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>[... ]</td>
<td>“If wind has struck him”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 (3)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>[... ]</td>
<td>“If the condition of the sore (simmu) including (EN) “sāmānu (is) Hand of Gula”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 (4)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>[... ]</td>
<td>“If a man is aroused towards a (var. his) woman”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 (5)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>[... ]</td>
<td>“If a man, his face is constantly spinning”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 (1)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>147/149(?)</td>
<td>“If (regarding) a fertile woman – she is pregnant and the top of her forehead is green-yellow”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 (2)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>“If a pregnant woman is sick”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 (4)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>152/82</td>
<td>“If a woman in labour is bloated and belches”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 (5)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>“If the infant, the suckling”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>“If a [pregnant] women is sick(?)” propery arranged(?) (GiŠ.Giš.A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Total of 40 Tablets (and) 3000+ [...] entries</td>
<td>of (the series) <em>Sakikkû</em> completed (ZAG.TIL.LA.BI.ŠÈ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
name of section 3) is “If he is sick for one day (and) (entries/prognoses) which are ill-portending” (šumma ūm ištēn maruṣma ša laptūti). A new witness of the beginning of Tablet 15 which parallels Sakikkû 3: 77 (3: 89 in Heeßel 2000) seems to confirm the catchline given in Tablet 14. Thus, the deviating entry in the catalogue may have to be explained as an unintroduced collective entry citing two distinctive text sections of Tablet 15. In this case, the second entry is not marked by EN (adi), as would be expected from other such instances in the catalogue. The sign sequence GAR TAG ti has been formerly interpreted as šikin lipti “the nature of the affliction (lit. touch)” (see for example Heeßel 2000: 19). However, the rubric of Tablet 23 Ms. A (LKU 64: 20’) notes instead GAR TAG ti tī which, if not to be regarded as a scribal mistake, might hint at the suggested interpretation ša laptūti “(entries or prognoses) which are ill-portending/anomalous”. For the special meaning “ill-portending; anomalous”, used as an antonym to šalmut “favourable, propitious” cf. the distinct examples in CAD L 95f. sub 2 as well as CAD Ś/1 259 sub 1e. Thus, it seems likely that the phrase ša laptūti is meant as a remark commenting on the exclusively negative prognoses found within Tablet 15.

Tablet 22: A minor deviation is to be observed in the incipit of Tablet 22, which reads “If the patient keeps groaning in the morning”, skipping the catalogue’s introductory symptoms “If the patient has been spasmodic one, two or three (times)”.

Tablet 34: A last peculiarity is found in a Late Babylonian manuscript of Tablet 33, which gives as catchline for Tablet 34 the incipit “[If a man ...] does not feel sexual desire (lit. cannot erect his heart) [for another?] woman” against the catalogue’s wording “If a man feels sexual desire (for) his woman”. Since the only preserved serial witness A of Tablet 33 is broken until the middle of the respective catchline one should likewise assume that it represents the second half of the protasis. Accordingly, this would give the following complete protasis “If a man feels sexual desire for (his/a) woman, but he does not feel sexual desire for [another?] woman: this/his woman [has ...?] his heart/desire [...]”.

b) Differences in the assigned tablet number:

Tablet 19: A first discrepancy in the numbering of the tablets stems from what Heeßel calls an abridgement of Tablets 19 (“If he is getting hot and cold”) and 20 (“If the patient presents sweat”). In text witnesses from Neo-Assyrian times onward, the text of both tablets was integrated into one tablet and designated as Tablet 19, followed by the catchline of the catalogue’s Tablet 21.

Tablet 22: The catalogue incipit of Tablet 22 “If the patient has been spasmodic one, two and three (times) (and if) the patient keeps groaning in the morning” is designates as Tablet 23 in one of the witnesses. Since the manuscript of the preceding tablet with the incipit “If all of his sinews are well” is only preserved in fragmentary form, it is still unknown which number was assigned to it. Interestingly, a commentary on Tablet 21 continues with comments on a tablet with the incipit “If the patient, when he has been laid low” (DIŠ GIG GEN, SUB-ū), which is neither attested in the Sakikkû catalogue nor in any other textual witness and may have been introduced into the series after an abridgement such as Tablet 19/20.

26 Three witnesses preserve the catalogue’s title of the sub-series, of which at least one (witness 17 B) is a Neo-Assyrian copy. See Heeßel 2000: 206.
27 The new witness is K. 12639. Cf. Heeßel 2000: 161 n. 3 who also connects the catchline of Tablet 14 with the entry in Tablet 3: 77 (mentioned by Heeßel as 3: 89, counting the lines and not the entries).
28 See for collective entries in the catalogue, introduced with EN (adi), l. 40 (Sakikkû Tablet 33) as well as l. 86 (Šumma liptu Tablet 1). See also below paragraph 3.1.2.
29 This suggestion is underscored by the fact that Tablet 16 begins likewise with the formulation “If he is sick for one day and (...)”.
30 Heeßel 2000: 358 and 374 ([... ana MUNUS BAR]-i šā-ši NU IL-ši MUNUS BI ŠA-[šu ...]).
31 Sakikkû catalogue l. 41: [x (x)] DIŠ ‘NA’ ana ‘MUNUS’ (šiši) ŠA-ši IL-šu-ma). The commentary SpTU 2, 39 (W 22730/2) has been attributed to the unsteady corpus of ŠA.ZI.GA texts, but could in almost the same manner belong to Tablet 34. Interestingly, the rubric offers the same incipit as our catalogue (ibid. rev 8’; [... ša pi um-man]-nu ša DIŠ NA ana MUNUS-ši ŠA-ši IL-šu-ma). This wording is, to my knowledge, otherwise not attested in the known ŠA.ZI.GA texts.
32 This suggestion is underscored by the use of -ma after IL-ši which indicates that further symptoms or symptomatic phenomena followed before the apodosis.
33 Heeßel 2000: 240. Heeßel’s argument is based on the difference in the tablet number and on the contents of the alleged Tablet 19/20. Since later witnesses from Ashurbanipal’s library do not preserve tablet numbers, a better explanation for this phenomenon is not at hand. Similar discrepancies between series catalogue and text manuscripts stemming from an abridgement of two series tablets are attested for other standards series (cf. Šumma ilu, Enûma Anu Enlil).
Tablet 26: Another peculiarity that could support the idea of alternative recensions of Sakikkû is encountered in a manuscript of Tablet 26 (the first tablet of the section 4), which designates it as Tablet 27.36 This could give further support for the supposition that a tablet was added to the series after the redaction reflected in the catalogue, which was already proposed above in connection with Sakikkû Tablet 21 and its commentary (“If the sick man, when he has been laid low”).

Tablet 28: Furthermore, in at least three witnesses, the tablets registered as Sakikkû Tablets 27 and 28 in the catalogue are combined in one tablet designated as Tablet 26.37 So far, no satisfying explanation can be given for this phenomenon.

Up to the 6th section nothing further can be said about the assigned tablet numbers of the series tablets, since the available manuscripts do not preserve a colophon.

Tablet 28: A Late Babylonian manuscript of Tablet 36 is correctly numbered in accordance with the catalogue, while a witness of Tablet 37 from Uruk is (maybe by mistake) numbered as Tablet 36 as well.38 A similar peculiarity can be observed in the slightly damaged summary rubric of section 6 in the catalogue, which notes a “total of 70239 (entries): ‘(If a [pregnant] woman is sick(?) (…)’”. The section title given here is the incipit of Tablet 37 and not the expected incipit of Tablet 36.

c) Differences in the number of entries in a given tablet:
The problems regarding the diverging numbers of entries assigned to each series tablet will be touched on cursorily, since the differences between the catalogue witnesses (A and B) and between Sakikkû manuscripts and catalogue are manifold. The catalogue witnesses A and B only preserve the number of entries per tablet for section 6.40 In this section, both witnesses sometimes offer slightly differing numbers (II. 44 and 46 = Tablet 36 and 38), while they diverge considerably from each other in II. 47 and 48 (= Tablet 37 and 39).41 The proportional differences between catalogue and the first millennium witnesses may again point to deviations between an original recension and the later “classical” series attested from Neo-Assyrian and later times, since nearly every number stated in the colophon of an actual Sakikkû witness, if preserved, shows lower numbers than the respective numbers in the catalogue.42

Apart from these differences, the catalogue provides us with the incipits of as yet unidentified tablets of the diagnostic series and facilitates a discussion about its overall organisation as well as its sectional structure and contents. For example, the catalogue incipit of Sakikkû Tablet 25 (“If the lamp which has been set up at the patient’s head”) is otherwise known as the incipit of Tablet 94 of the terrestrial omen series Šumma ālu.43 This could suggest that sections 1-3 of Sakikkû, which are said to have been “(newly) compiled”, were enclosed in a set of terrestrial omen tablets drawn from forerunners of the first millennium series Šumma ālu (cf. Sakikkû Tablets 2 and 25), or that they were composed in the fashion of the terrestrial omens (cf. Sakikkû Tablet 1).44

---

36 This tablet number is preserved in a Late Babylonian witness and may be a later development (Heeßel 2000: 286 Ms. B).
38 Cf. Labat 1951: 216.
39 If one adds up the (highest) entry numbers given for tablets 36-40 in the catalogue, one gets a total of only 692 entries. This discrepancy suggests textual corruption.
40 The entry numbers for sections 3 and 4 of Sakikkû are only fragmentarily preserved, and do not yield enough information for a comparison of both witnesses.
41 See Schmedtchen infra, commentary on ll. 44-49 of the catalogue.
42 E.g. Tablet 22 (designated as 23) has 71 entries according to its colophon, but the catalogue lists 88 entries. A similar case is found for Tablet 23, which books 33 entries in the colophon and 103 in the catalogue. Cf. further Tablet 26 (59 against 60 entries), Tablet 27 and 28 (54 against 60 entries for each tablet in the catalogue), Tablet 29 (35 or 38 against 144 entries), Tablet 36 (115/114 against 147/149 entries), Tablet 37 (64 against 118 entries), and Tablet 40 (112 against 126 entries).
43 An examination of the excerpts of this Šumma ālu tablet (CT 39, 35-36: 1’-17’) shows that the apodoses are concerned with prognoses and diagnoses for the sick man, which might substantiate the idea of a connection between both series (cf. also Heeßel 2001-02 for connections between Sakikkû Tablet 2 and Šumma ālu).
44 See George 1991. Another example of a tablet formerly only attested within the catalogue is Tablet 24 “If the patient requests an apple”, for which a first witness could now be identified (BM 38908), thanks to the recurring phrase “If (he) requests X (foodstuff): (then) Y”, which matches the tablet incipit in the catalogue and has no evident position in another divinatory series.
Although only two tablets of section 5 are preserved, some observations regarding the contents can be made from the catalogue incipits for 
Sakikkû Tablets 31-35. An identification of the witnesses of Tablet 31 (“If šētu-fever has made him feverish”) has been possible only through the incipit in the catalogue. The witnesses of Tablet 31 themselves, consisting of therapeutic prescriptions with a prefixed diagnosis (himīṯ šēti), have more affinities with second millennium therapeutic texts.\(^{45}\) The following Tablet 32 (“If wind has struck him” (šibīṯ šāri)) could not be identified yet, but the incipit shows a similar formulary as Tablet 31. Since both topics (šētu and wind) seem to be related in the therapeutic texts as well, it is quite possible that Sakikkû Tablet 32 had a similar format consisting of symptom descriptions and therapeutic treatments.\(^{46}\) The well-known Tablet 33 comprises at least two separate sections. The first section is concerned with disease diagnoses using the peculiar formulation “If the condition of the sore (simmu) is ..., its name is X”, otherwise known from the plant and stone description texts 
ŠÀ.ZI.GA and Šammu šikinšu. The second part of Sakikkû Tablet 33 gives correspondences between certain symptoms, some of the aforementioned diseases and their respective responsible divine originator. Another topic encountered in therapeutic texts and possibly in Sakikkû are prescriptions concerning niš libbi (potency problems, 
ŠÀ.ZI.GA). Therapeutic material for 
ŠÀ.ZI.GA remained largely unserialised throughout the history of Mesopotamian medical texts.\(^ {47}\) The possible inclusion in Sakikkû section 5 might be witnessed by the incipit of Tablet 34 (“If a man feels sexual desire for a (var. his) woman”).\(^ {48}\) These observations should underscore the status of Sakikkû Tablets 31-35 as a supplementary section, which consists of quite heterogeneous material.\(^ {49}\)

Similarly, witnesses of section 6 are preserved for only two tablets (36 and 40) and for a short passage of Tablet 37. While Tablets 36-39 are sometimes labelled as “gynaecological”\(^ {50}\), the catalogue suggests the more proper label “obstetrics” as well as “pregnancy and birth related omens”. The catalogue incipits of Tablets 38 (“If a woman’s ‘water’ flows (for three days)”) and 39 (“If a woman in childbed is bloated and belches”) hint at female health issues during pregnancy and birth as thematic contexts (see also Tablet 37 “If a pregnant woman is sick”), while Tablet 36 is concerned with predictions for the pregnant woman and her child based on features of the woman’s body.\(^ {51}\) Tablet 40 deals with “paediatrics” sensu stricto.

### 2.1.2 The Alamdimmû Catalogue

The second part of the catalogue, concerned with the physiognomic-morphoscopic omen series Alamdimmû, begins immediately (l. 72 ff.) after the editorial note of Esagil-kin-apli (ll. 51-71). In contrast to the Sakikkû catalogue, no heading referring to the tablets and entries of the series introduces this part of the catalogue. The tablet incipits are again grouped into sections followed by a summary rubric, this time listing only the total of tablets in each section, but not


\(^{46}\) Cf. the therapeutic text BAM 146 (VAT 13793), which is likewise concerned with himīṯ šēti. Despite differences in the treatments and format of the symptom descriptions on this tablet, the catchline for the following tablet is identical with the incipit of Sakikkû Tablet 32 given in the catalogue. Cf. further for a possible connection of babu tu “blisters” and šibīṯ šāri, BAM 112 ii 11'-12' (BAM 7, No. 4) as well as the simmu/marsu šikinšu-list in Sakikkû 33: 26.

\(^{47}\) With the exception of a rubric from Hattuša (KUB 4, 48 lower edge l. 5), which states that the respective text is the first(!) tablet of a series called DIŠ LŪ ŠÀ ZI.GA, cf. Biggs 1967: 56.

\(^{48}\) One single fragment of Sakikkû 34 (BM 33357) is known to me, which offers a few fragmentary lines (mentioning the use of substitute figures) and a colophon. The commentary SpTU 2, 39 (W 22730/2) may belong to this tablet and indicates the diagnosis of kišpu “sorcery”, which also occurs in 
ŠÀ.ZI.GA texts. More often however, the symptom of losing one’s “sexual desire” (ŠÀ.ZI.GA) is encountered in the separate genre of anti-witchcraft rituals. The overall topic of Sakikkû Tablet 34 is therefore not entirely certain and may have included omens and rituals/treatments for other phenomena than the loss of “potency” within the context of magically induced complaints.

\(^{49}\) The incipit of Tablet 35 (“If a man’s face is constantly spinning”: pānūšu iṣṣanundū) could indicate that the tablet was concerned with witchcraft-induced illnesses, since this symptom seems to be very prominent in the genre of Mesopotamian anti-witchcraft treatments. Cf. Abusch and Schwemer 2011.

\(^{50}\) This label fits only the second part of Tablet 37, which is unfortunately fragmentarily preserved.

\(^{51}\) As a possible candidate for Tablet 38, note LKU 126 (containing birth omens, mentioned in Stol 2000: 202), as well as SpTU 1, 82 and K. 6288 for Tablet 39 (with omens concerning body moles on children, cf. Böck 2000: 310-315). These texts could indicate a further connection between Sakikkû, teratological texts (such as Summa izbu) and physiognomic material that has not been ascribed to the standard series Alamdimmû. These texts may reflect the implementation of material taken from sources that differ from the usual associated material of Sakikkû. Cf. also my discussion of the catalogue’s term GIŠ.GIŠ.A in paragraph 3.2.2. which may underscore this idea.
the number of entries as in the Sakikkû catalogue. Likewise, no entry numbers are given in front of the tablet incipits of each section. The rubrics contain no editorial remarks except for the last summarising rubric, which notes the completion of Alamdimmû (l. 91).

According to the catalogue, the series has five sections or sub-series. The summary line (l. 91) may have provided the total number of tablets for the whole series, similar to the summary line (l. 50) giving the total number of tablets for Sakikkû. However, the catalogue does not state entry numbers for the tablets of Alamdimmû, and the sub-series Alamdimmû, Kataduggû and Nigdimdimmû are often enumerated in a sequence in other texts.52 This could support the assumption that not all parts of the series reached the status of an overall fixed “classical” compilation to the extent that its counterpart Sakikkû did (note that the names of individual sections of Sakikkû are never mentioned apart from the main series). One should also note that in contrast to the diagnostic series, additional material such as ahû-tablets, interlinear commentaries, and excerpts are attested for the physiognomic series in the first millennium,53 beside new compilations such as Šumma Ea liballiṭka, which unites materials from Almašdimmû, Kataduggû and Summa ālu.54 The editorial information given in this part of the catalogue is sparse (ll. 77, 83, 91), and in the section on women (l. 83) it appears in a rather peculiar position, between Tablet 1 and 2, differing from the first catalogue, which lists editorial information in the summary rubrics.

Schematic overview of the Alamdimmû catalogue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Tablet Information</th>
<th>Incipit/Description</th>
<th>Additional Editorial Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72a55</td>
<td>“If the head appears to resemble the gods”</td>
<td>from the top (of the head) to the foot […] (TA UGU-hi EN GIR [sections edited?])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72b</td>
<td>“If the curls on a man’s head turn (to) the right”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73a</td>
<td>“If a man has no forehead”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73b</td>
<td>“If his right eyebrow is thick”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74a</td>
<td>“If his nose is long”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74b</td>
<td>“If his tongue is shiny”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74c</td>
<td>“If his cheek bone is pronounced”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75a</td>
<td>“If his face is long”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75b</td>
<td>“If his neck is long”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75c</td>
<td>“If his chest [is long]”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76a</td>
<td>“If he has the hump of an ox”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76b</td>
<td>“If the form (alamdimmû) […]”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>[Total of 12 tablets]</td>
<td>Alamdimmû (“shape; form”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78a</td>
<td>[“If …] regularly (gives) a free-will offering(?) to his god”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78b</td>
<td>(A) “If [ditto(?) = while speaking] his head […]” / (B) “[If a man] while speaking […]”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 48’</td>
<td>[Total of 2(?) tablets]</td>
<td>[Nigdimdimmû (?) (“deeds/habitus”) …]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-80</td>
<td>[“When] the great gods [established] the spirit of mankind for rulership, and established its (i.e. mankind’s) utterance for its constant guidance”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>[…] 1 tablet</td>
<td>Kataduggû (“utterance”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

52 Cf. KAR 44 (Geller infra) l. 6. See further the catalogue of texts and authors in Lambert 1962: 64, where Almašdimmû and Kataduggû are both attributed to Ea and are mentioned apart from one another. Cf. Geller infra for the possible identification of Ea in this list as a pun on or even a mistake for the name Esagil-kin-apli. See furthermore the inventory fragment K. 13818: 10-12 (TBP 51), which registers 37+ tablets of Almašdimmû […] (together with/including) ahû-tablets, Nigdimdimmû, […] (and) Kataduggû (cf. Parpola 1983: 24-25 and Böck 2000: 18 with additional bibliographical information).


54 See Reiner 1982 for the first tablet and von Soden 1981 for the second tablet of this series, which is only attested in texts from the Neo-Assyrian period. However, one witness of Tablet 2 is written in the Babylonian ductus.

55 Since the line distribution between A and B differs, I follow witness A, whose pattern is followed in the overall numbering of lines within the transliteration.
Lines | Tablet Information | Incipit/Description | Additional Editorial Information
--- | --- | --- | ---
82 | [...] | "[If a woman’s] head is big" | new, not finished (GIBIL NU TIL)
83 | [...] | "[If a woman’s head?] is big" |
84 | [...] | "[If (regarding) a woman, the curls] of her (lit. his) head turn to the right" |
85 | [Total of 2(? tablets)] | "If a woman’s head is big" |
86 | [...] | "[If a liptu-mark] on a man’s head is scattered and [present] including (EN) “(If) the liptu-mark is light red” |
87a | [...] | "[If an umšatu-mark?] is present on the right side of a man’s head" |
87b | [...] | "[If an umšatu-mark?] is present on the right side of a man’s head" |
88a | [...] | "[If a pindû-mark?] is present on] a man’s head” |
88b | [...] | "[If an umšatu-mark?] is present on the right side of a man’s head”; ditto on his [forehead?] ...
89 | [...] and an ibāru-mark(?) [x] is present(?) |
90 | [Total of ... tablets] | "[If a] liptu-mark(?)" |
91 | [Total of ... tablets] | [of] Alamdimmû |

In view of the fragmentary state of the physiognomic series, the catalogue offers some additional information for the reconstruction of the contents of tablets that have not been identified yet. Moreover, the rubric following the first 12 tablet incipits shows that Alamdimmû was not only the name of the whole series, but also the title of the first sub-series in particular (l. 77), named after the last tablet of the sub-series. The same rubric states further that this section was arranged “from the top of the head to the foot (or feet)”, which may point out that the same editorial principles introduced by Esagil-kīn-apli for the first sections of Sakikkû were also employed in the edition of Alamdimmû, as a revision of older originals whose arrangement may have been slightly different. In a similar vein some differences between catalogue and the first millennium witnesses suggest variations between the series at the time of its re-edition and the time of Ashurbanipal, from which our main sources stem. One should also consider that in contrast to the series tablets of Sakikkû, none of the manuscripts of the sub-series Nigdimmû, Kataduggû, Šumma sinništu qaqqada rabât or Šumma liptu offer a secondary tablet numbering, which assigns a number according to the tablet’s position within the section or sub-series as well as a second number according to the tablet’s position within the series as a whole.

The main differences or discrepancies between catalogue and manuscripts of Alamdimmû series tablets seem to concern especially the sections following the main part of Alamdimmû (Tablets 1-12, l. 72a-76b). One of the most striking deviations is the order of the section on women (Šumma sinništu qaqqada rabât, l. 82-84). The first incipit (l. 82) indicates a tablet focussing on the form and peculiar features of the head, followed by omens concerning the lower body parts, as is shown in the series witnesses edited by Böck. It is conspicuous that in l. 83, this incipit seems to have been repeated, while the remark “new, not finished” was added. This doubling could be regarded as editorial inconsistency, since the summary rubric (l. 85) mentions the first tablet again, this time as the name of the sub-series together with the total of constituent tablets. The second tablet of the sub-series, “(If the curls of a woman’s head turn to the right)” (l. 84) reminds us of the contents of Alamdimmû Tablet 2, which likewise lists mainly omens dealing with a man’s hair. In contrast to the women’s tablets, the sub-series Alamdimmû concerned with the male body starts with the properties of the hair, followed by omens on features of the head.

---

56 This is surprising since usually the incipit of the first tablet provides the name for longer compositions.
57 This may be indicated in the rubric of a physiognomic text found at Assur (VAT 10493 + 10543 rev. iii 6-7) that assigns the text to an “older (version) of Alamdimmû, which Esagil-kīn-apli has not ‘solved’ (i.e. replaced, DU,MEŠ-šú); first tablet of Alamdimmû”, see Heeßel 2010: 145, 154-157. A differing interpretation of the meaning of paṭāru “to loosen” in this rubric is given by Frahm 2011: 330.
58 See e.g. the tablet numbering in manuscripts of the first tablet of Kataduggû and Šumma liptu, which show that the tablet numbers of the respective sections refer only to the place within the sub-series (Böck 2000: 144 and 178). On the other hand, the rubrics refer to the following tablets in the order given by the catalogue.
A similar pattern can be observed in the main witness A of the women’s sub-series, an eight-column tablet of which almost the whole obverse is lost. The reverse starts with omens referring to the ears and proceeds down to the toes. Since witness B from Uruk (SpTU 4, 149) seems to spread the text on the reverse of A over its obverse and reverse, one could argue that manuscript A contained the whole sub-series on women (i.e. both series tablets). The obverse of A may potentially be identified with the second tablet listed in the catalogue (i.e. l. 84). The unpublished Neo-Assyrian fragments K. 6551+ (+) K. 8625 very likely belong to the same tablet as witness A and with some certainty give an idea about the content of the left column of the obverse, namely properties of women’s hair. It thus seems that witness A started with the text of the second tablet of the sub-series, before presenting the first tablet (compared with the tablet order of the catalogue), thereby following the order of the men’s section (in the sub-series Alamdimmû). The divergence between the catalogue and the Neo-Assyrian text from Nineveh indicates textual revisions after an initial edition documented in the catalogue. The catalogue’s remark GIBIL NU TIL after the first women’s tablet (l. 83), which would have been expected to appear within the summary rubric, underscores that the edition of the women’s sub-series was not yet finalised when the catalogue was drawn up.

The most fragmentary section in the catalogue is the section on skin moles (ll. 86-88b). With the help of some terminological peculiarities of the tablet incipits, at least three incipits in the catalogue can be restored and identified with their counterparts in texts from the Neo-Assyrian and Late Babylonian period. For example, the phrase BAR-ma in l. 86 is likewise attested in the incipit of Šumma liptu. Similarly, the phrase ZAG GAR-‘atî in l. 87b corresponds with the incipit of the tablet Šumma umṣatu, which also begins with a mole located on the right side. In l. 88b, the fragmentary incipit [...] IB? MES ŠUB.MES can be connected with the incipit of Šumma urāšu, the only incipit in the mole section using the phrase ŠUB.MES. The fragmentary incipits listed in l. 87a and 88a may belong to the tablets Šumma kurāru and Šumma pindû. If this restoration is correct, the incipits must have been listed in an abbreviated form. Other tablets associated with this sub-series in Neo-Assyrian manuscripts, such as the tablet on kittabru-moles for women and the tablet on the movement of the veins (or muscles), do not seem to have been mentioned in the catalogue at all; they could be additions to the series from the later Neo-Assyrian period.

With regard to the reconstruction of the series Alamdimmû it is noteworthy that the first tablet incipit of the sub-series (l. 72a) is so far solely attested in the catalogue and in a fragmentary extra-serial (ahû) tablet (BM 1993:11-8, 1 = TBP 64), which could only be restored with the help of the catalogue. The following catalogue incipits of Alamdimmû Tablets 2-9 seem to conform to the first millennium standard series. Since Tablet 10 is badly preserved, the reading of its first structuring item (“chest”, GABA) is only confirmed by witness B of the catalogue. For the incipits of the following Tablets 11-12 (l. 76), of which no text witnesses are currently known, the catalogue again forms the only piece of evidence. The twelfth and last tablet was probably concerned with the overall shape or form of a person’s body (alam-dimmû), while Tablets 11-12 refer to the structure “from head to foot” (cf. l. 77).

The first tablet of the second sub-series Nigdimmû has not yet been identified. Its incipit according to the catalogue, “(If ...) regularly gives a free-will offering to his god” is otherwise only attested with the king as subject of the protasis (lit. BĀRA “throne”), in Tablet 11 of the omen series Šumma ālu. Unfortunately, the beginning of the catalogue entry is damaged, which precludes a definitive decision whether this tablet of Nigdimmû was also concerned with

60 See Böck 2000: 154ff. 4 A (K. 6190+). The last three preserved omens on this tablet each combine several features observed on various parts of the body (but also arranged in “vertical” order). Cf. Böck 2000: 169-170, ll. 250-269.
61 Cf. CDLI, P397707.
62 During a stay at the British Museum in April 2016, the respective fragment of the upper part of K. 6808+ could not be located for confirming the join, but the fragment K. 8625 seems to belong on its reverse to column viii 8’ of witness A. Its obverse should be positioned about 7 lines before the end of column 1.
63 See also Schmidtchen infra with a more comprehensive commentary on these lines.
66 See Böck 2000: 262f. The only known fragment of Alamdimmû Tablet 1 (K. 12484) preserves merely the last few lines and the incipit of the following tablet (Böck 2000: 71). The extra-serial fragment (BM 1993:11-8, 1 = TBP 64) provides only few hints about the contents of the tablet. It preserves part of the incipit and the end of twelve more lines consisting of different divine names plus a few apodoses on the reverse. For the list of deities compare the god-list AN = Anum (CT 24, 45-46 vii 50-69).
the piety of the king or with the piety of a private person. The second tablet of Nīgdīmdimmū is likewise preserved only fragmentarily, but a new reading of catalogue witness B “(If ...) while speaking (his head ...)” corresponds quite well with the topic of the final section of Tablet 2. This reading would furthermore draw a connection to another known text, edited by Kraus in 1936-37, which could also belong to the second tablet of Nīgdīmdimmū or to a tablet with similar content. However, the term Nīgdīmdimmū seems to imply a broader meaning than English “appearance” and may be compared to German “Auftreten” or Latin habitus, which usually includes both a person’s appearance and behaviour.

It is possible that the two catalogues (i.e. of the series Sakikkū and Alamdimmū) were originally separate text entities. As mentioned above, the Sakikkū catalogue counts the entries of each tablet and enumerates them in the section rubrics. The total number of tablets (and entries) for the whole series is given in the final summary rubric. In contrast, the Alamdimmū catalogue only gives totals for the tablets of each sub-series. Whether the total of the series’ tablets was registered in the final summary rubric is not known, but likely. Moreover, the Alamdimmū catalogue has no introducing heading, and its position after the editorial note suggests a later addition, maybe to depict more accurately the content of the editorial note which mentions both series. Additionally, it should be mentioned that the Alamdimmū catalogue makes only sparse and eclectic use of editorial remarks.

The scope of variants and deviations is slightly higher in the case of Sakikkū, which must have undergone further revisions after the compilation by Esagil-kin-apli, e.g. the addition of at least one tablet. The 1st millennium BCE manuscripts attest to different recensions of the series, in which the text was distributed in varying ways over tablets. On the other hand, despite some uncertainties, the Alamdimmū catalogue also indicates some later additions of tablets.

### 2.1.3 The Editorial Note of Esagil-kin-apli

The so-called “Esagil-kin-apli colophon” or “editorial note” is remarkable in several ways. Heeßel boiled it down when stating: “Die Bedeutung dieses Kolophons ist natürlich kaum zu überschätzen, er ist der erste und bisher einzige Text seiner Art.” The catalogue’s editorial note provides us with information on topics, which Mesopotamian scientific as well as literary texts often lack – an author or compiler, a reason, a purpose, and to some degree the method employed, i.e. the “who”, the “why”, and the “how” as well as the “when” of the series’ compilation.

The term “editorial note” chosen here tries to avoid certain problems connected with the designation “Esagil-kin-apli colophon” usually used. According to Finkel, especially its position after the Sakikkū catalogue qualifies it “effec-

---

68 It would not be unexpected to find material from Šumma ālu implemented within Alamdimmū, and one could speculate whether corresponding entries about the free-will offering of a man could have existed in Šumma ālu, which could have been found in the later tablets of the series concerned with human behaviour, maybe somewhere in Tablets 97-102, cf. Freedman 1998: 342-343. Note also the connections between Šumma ālu Tablet 94 and Sakikkū Tablet 25 (see the discussion of the Sakikkū catalogue in the previous paragraph).

69 See the fragment K. 9779+ (Böck 2000: 128-129). The last passage of this tablet observes different ways of speaking (speaking loudly, low, little etc.) as well as the visibility or invisibility of the tongue. The catalogue incipit was possibly concerned with the movement of the head while speaking (“If a man while speaking his head […],” l. 78b).

70 Kraus 1936-37: 222, K. 12695+ together with the Middle Babylonian text PUM 4501 which could likewise represent an earlier version or at least a comparable tradition of this type of behavioural omens. The Kuyunjik text observes movements of the tongue, lips, mouth and teeth while speaking (see the formulation DIŠ NA ina da-ba-bi-[ṣū] on the reverse, taken up in the continuing text as KI.MIN). The only certain fragment of Nīgdīmdimmū shows a considerable portion of blank space at the beginning of each entry except for the first entry of the section, which begins with [DIŠ NA] “(x) da·ba-ba (ma·-\[da\/]diš? ...)” (K. 9779+: 3’), a phrase that covers more or less the same meaning as the one given in K. 12695+. The blank space after DIŠ in the following entries is an example for a non-written but graphically marked placeholder instead of the introductory phrase “(while) speaking” (adverbial accusative). For other examples cf. Sakikkū Tablet 3: 25-28 witness A (Babylon) and D (Uruk), which use a blank space instead of repeating the name of the respective body part (SAG.DU), but resume with the following pronoun -ṣū referring back to the patient.

71 Cf. likewise the lexical equation with epšētu “acts” in Igituh I 389ff. (see also CAD N/2 212), which would suggest the translation “deeds, accomplishments”.

72 Finkel 1988: 145.

73 Cf. l. 83 where “new, not finished” appears outside the rubric. The unclear term GIŠ.GIŠ.A is mentioned in the final summary rubric (l. 91). The short remark “from the top of the head to the foot” (l. 77) is only mentioned in the Alamdimmū catalogue.
tively as a colophon”. In the broadest sense this might fit, but the passage differs markedly from the usual colophons that appear at the very end of a text, since a second catalogue on Alamdimmû follows. Moreover, the editorial note differs from ordinary colophons through its instructive passages. These instructional passages or remarks addressed to any future investigator are comparable to the second part of the Exorcist’s Manual (KAR 44 ll. 28-42, the colophon is l. 43), and should be regarded as a crucial part of the document in its own right and not as a colophon in the strict sense.

Concerning its terminology and the use of unusual cryptographic spellings, KAR 44 – Esagil-kin-apli’s catalogue of the lore of āšipūtu – seems to be in direct relationship with the editorial note and remarks in our text catalogue. Another remarkable text, the colophon BAK No. 321 inscribed on a Neo-Assyrian recension of the drug compendium Uruanna from Nineveh and presumably connected with the direct editorial activity of Ashurbanipal himself, shares some terminological peculiarities with the editorial note of Esagil-kin-apli. Thus, the editorial note of the Sakikkû catalogue could have been used as a source for the Uruanna colophon.

Thematic overview of Esagil-kin-apli’s editorial note:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51-52</td>
<td>Reasons</td>
<td>That which since old times had never received an edition, and (which was) like twisted threads for which there was no copy:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Acknowledgement of the king (dating)</td>
<td>During the reign of Adad-apla-iddina, King of Babylon,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Purpose (pursued)</td>
<td>to work it anew,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54-61</td>
<td>Authority (descent from a famous scholar of Hammurapi, titles, and divine patronage)</td>
<td>Esagil-kin-apli, son of Asalluhi-mansum, the sage of king Hammurapi, the ummat of Sîn, Lisi and Nanaya, the noble Borsipaean, chamberlain of the Ezida, anointed one of Nabû, who holds the tablet of destinies of the gods, who checks the conflicting (versions), the šippi purifying and ramku ablution-priest of Ninzilzil, the lady of careful preparation, close sister of his beloved one, scholar of the land of Sumer and Akkad, with the skillful wisdom with which Ea and Marduk/Gula(?) gifted him –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-62</td>
<td>Purpose or objective (achieved): method</td>
<td>in a methodical manner, he undertook an edition of Sakikkû “from the top of the head to the feet”, and established it for instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-65</td>
<td>Instructions (for care and competence)</td>
<td>Pay attention! Take care! Do not neglect your knowledge! The one who has not obtained knowledge shall not speak (about) Sakikkû, and tell (about) Alamdimmû.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-68</td>
<td>Circumscription of the series’ thematic scope; structure or connection of both series</td>
<td>Sakikkû is the compilation concerning disease, depression (and distress), Alamdimmû is about the features and the (human) shape, the fate of mankind, which Ea and Marduk/Gula(?) established. Regarding both series, their arrangement (lit. bundling) is one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69-71</td>
<td>Instructions (for care and competence); dedication to the king</td>
<td>[The exorcist], who makes the decision, who watches over people’s lives, who knows Sakikkû and Alamdimmû in its entirety, shall inspect, check, [ponder], and (then) give an interpretation to the king.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thematically the editorial note can be divided into two parts. The first part (ll. 51-62) speaks about the reasons and purpose of the compilation and edition of Sakikkû and proclaims Esagil-kin-apli’s authority (by giving the scholar’s full
titles and by drawing his lineage back to a scholar of the famous king Hammurapi). The second part (ll. 62-71) is introduced by a didactic passage, reminding later scholars not to neglect their knowledge and carefulness. Furthermore, it connects the compilation with a second series, the series on physiognomic omens (Alamdimmû), whose catalogue immediately follows the editorial note, and which has not been mentioned before in this note. The concluding dedication of the series’ use in service of the king should be understood as a political comment rather than as a statement about the exclusive use of both series for the king. In any case, it is not unusual that a highly learned scholar such as Esagil-kin-apli with access to the relevant texts stood in the service of the king and palace.

The introductory passage (l. 51-52) hints at the circumstances and need for a new edition of an existing text corpus collected in multiple series, which as Esagil-kin-apli puts it, was “like twisted threads without a copy” (l. 52). One witness of such an older diagnostic series is known from Middle Babylonian Nippur (2 N-T 336), and a number of excerpt tablets from this period have also been identified. These manuscripts feature several entries that can also be found in Sakikkû sections 2-3 of the 1st millennium series, although they appear in a different order. Since the name of the older diagnostic series is identical with the name of the second section of Sakikkû, it seems certain that this material formed part of Esagil-kin-apli’s revision. The existence of different and contradicting textual traditions, which are attested since the Old Babylonian period, thus formed the main reason for re-working the older material into a “new edition” (l. 54).

The legitimation of Esagil-kin-apli’s compulsory work is laid out in the following catalogue passage, which focuses on the competence and experience of the compiler (ll. 54-61) and of the later user (ll. 62-65, 69-71) – at first with regard to Sakikkû (ll. 61-62, 64-65, 70-71), and later also with regard to the series Alamdimmû (ll. 65-66, 70-71). Esagil-kin-apli’s competence is underlined by the extensive enumeration of his titles, divine patrons and his connections to institutions and offices (ll. 55-61), as well as through his prominent lineage, going back to the scholar of Hammurapi, Asalluhi-mansum. The āšipu’s competence as a user is repeatedly referred to through instructions such as “Pay attention! Take care! Do not neglect your knowledge!” (ll. 62-63), and through the recommendation to follow the logical order of patient examination, (counter-)checking, and “interpreting” (lit. to carry (in) one’s heart; to ponder) the observed and described phenomena in order to find the right diagnosis (l. 71). These phrases underline the ongoing process of attributing hidden or secret knowledge to the lore of the āšipu, an idea that was further developed in a “mythology of scribal succession” claiming the transmission of secret knowledge via the sages (apkallû) before the flood and other prominent scholars of later periods, which was inherited by the ummânu-scholars (Lenzi 2008a). Cryptographic spellings, secrecy of knowledge and attributions of scholarly works to famous scholars helped to underscore the role of the āšipûtu discipline and its practitioners, and to protect their text corpus from the uninformed and ignorant.

Esagil-kin-apli (spelled *ÈŠ.GÚ.ZI.GI/GIN.A in the catalogue), is said to have been active under the Babylonian king Adad-apla-iddina (l. 53-54). The Exorcist’s Manual (KAR 44: 27) uses the variant spellings [...] *ÈŠ.GÚ.ZI.GI.IN.A, *ÈŠ.GÚ.ZI.DA.IBILA, and *ÈŠ.GÚ.ZI.GI.LA, but likewise refers to Asalluhi-mansum as his ancestor and assigns to him the title

---

81 Compare the Exorcist’s Manual KAR 44: 1 and 27 (see Geller infra), which bear more or less equal information. The continuing lines of the editorial note remind us of the second part of KAR 44 lines 28-42 (esp. 41-42), which is partly instructive and points out the necessity of extending one’s expertise beyond the previously listed series of āšipûtu. One could speculate whether the second part of the Exorcist’s Manual was modelled after the binary structure of the Sakikkû and Alamdimmû catalogue (the latter of which was a later addition) or whether these similarities have to do with the general structure of both catalogues.

82 The introductory phrase “regarding that which since old times had never received an edition” (ša ulta ulla zarâ lā šabtû) appears also in the Uruanna colophon BAK No. 321: 3, cf. 3.1.1.

83 Heefel 2010: 142.

84 See Labat 1956. It is uncertain whether the Neo-Assyrian diagnostic text STT 89 from Huzirina (Sultantepe) also belongs to this older version of the diagnostic series. Both this text as well as the Middle Babylonian witness 2 N-T 336 from Nippur state that they belong to the series ana marsî ina tehîka, STT 89 is designated as the 33rd(?) and 2 NB 336 as the 2nd tablet of this series, cf. Stol 1993: 91-98 and Abusch and Schwemer 2011: 434-443. For the excerpt tablets cf. Kraus 1987: 196-202, no. 2 (Ni. 670); Heefel 2000: 99-100 (PBS 2/2, 104 = CBS 3424A); Rutz 2011: 301-307 (CBS 12580 and CBS 3831).

85 The principle according to which the entries of the serial witness 2 NB 336 are ordered is uncertain, but the excerpts seem to be arranged according to their apodoses. Cf. further the similar Middle Babylonian excerpt tablets from Assur (Heefel 2010: 161-187) as well as the fragmentary excerpts from Boghazköy (Wilhelm 1994) and Emar (Arnaud 1987: nos. 694, 695 and maybe 697).

86 See TLB II, 21; Geller 2001-02: 73-74 (LB 2126) and George 2013: no. 15 (MS 2670). Cf. further George 2013: no. 16 (MS 3104) for another text with partially diagnostic content.

87 Cf. Frahm 2011: 326 (on similarities with KAR 44) and especially Lenzi 2008.
purification-priest of the Ezida. A Neo-Assyrian catalogue that correlates famous scholars and other scribal ancestors with prominent kings provides the Akkadian spelling "È-saq-gil-ki-in-ap-li". This spelling appears in slightly varying form in the “Seleucid list of kings and sages” as “È-saq-gil-ki-i-ni-IBILA. In this list, Esagil-kin-apli is followed by another famous scholar, Esagil-kinam-ubbib, who worked under Nebukadnezzar I (ca. 1125–1104 BCE) and Adad-apla-iddina (ca. 1068–1047 BCE), and who was most likely Esagil-kin-apli’s predecessor in the office of chief scholar (ummanu).

Esagil-kin-apli’s revision of the diagnostic and physiognomic material was achieved by the introduction of the ingenious ordering principle “from the top of the head to the feet” (ll. 61-62), which strictly speaking applies, within the scope of the two discussed series, only to Sakikkû section 2, to the first sub-series of Alamdimmû, to part of the sub-series Šumma simištu qaqqada rabât and to the sub-series on body marks and moles. One could argue that the introduction of this ordering principle constituted a major change in the structure of the older text series, which resulted in the catalogue’s lauding statement praising the new structure as an improvement compared with the “entangled threads” of the older series. This claim for practicability is underlined through the statement that Esagil-kin-apli established the new series for “instruction” or “learning” (ana ihzi ukîn, l. 62). The phrase mirrors the statement in the Exorcist’s Manual that Esagil-kin-apli implemented the “conjuror’s canon” for “learning and reading” (ana ihzu u tâmartu kunnû).

An explanatory passage in the editorial note (ll. 65-68) emphasises with regard to the diagnostic and physiognomic series that “their arrangement (lit. bundling) is one” (rikissunu ištēnma), which could be interpreted as a reference to their internal structure, especially to the ordering principle “from head to feet”. Another interpretation of this statement could be to understand the term riksu in its meaning “compilation”, i.e. that both series were regarded as one logical unit. Thus, the passage also explains that “Sakikkû is the compilation (riksu) concerning disease, depression (and distress), Alamdimmû (is about) the features and the (human) habitus” (ll. 65-66). Since both series are exclusively concerned with the interpretation of signs of the human body, with regard to the sick or healthy individual respectively, the term riksu may likewise indicate a connection between the two series.

3 The Terminology of the Catalogue’s Editorial Remarks

The catalogue of the series Sakikkû and Alamdimmû makes use of several rare or otherwise unattested technical terms. Apart from the well-known expressions ZAG.TIL.LA.BI.ŠÈ “finished” (lit. “(brought) to its end”), NU TIL “not finished”, and EN “including; together with”, the phrase SUR.GIBIL(ṣ/zarâ) šabātu has been explained more or less satisfactorily (see ll. 19, 31, 51, 62 of the catalogue). The terms SUKUD.GIM (ll. 37, 43) and GIŠ.GIŠ.A (ll. 49, 91) still remain unclear. Some possible explanations for their reading will be proposed below (3.2.1. and 3.2.2.)

3.1 Terms with Identified Meaning

3.1.1 (sadīrū) SUR.GIBIL(ṣ/zarâ) šabātu

This editorial remark has been discussed several times and seems to circumscribe, according to some scholars, a process closely connected with “canonisation”. The process is accordingly described by a metaphor of “weaving”.

88 Lambert 1957: 12 iii 44.
89 Cf. Finkel 1988: 164 and 150; Lenzi 2008b; Geller infra. The lost royal name in front of Esagil-kin-apli’s name in the Seleucid list most likely has to be restored as Adad-apla-iddina.
90 The Old Babylonian texts on moles are likewise partially ordered from head to toe, which may indicate that this principle was used in physiognomic and divinatory texts concerning the human body even before the Middle Babylonian period. Cf. YOS 10, 54 (YBC 4646) and TBP 62 (Si 22).
91 KAR 44: 1 (and dupl., see Geller infra). Cf. also Frahm 2011: 326-327.
92 Thus Heeßel 2010: 141: “Was die beiden Serien betrifft, ihre Anordnung ist dieselbe (d.h. vom Kopf zu den Füßen)”.
94 Especially Finkel 1988: 150.
related with the meanings of the sign SUR for ṭamû “to spin” and ebēhu “to gird; to twist”. The following sign GIBIL “new” leads Stol to the very literal interpretation “new textus”, referring to the similar double meaning of Latin textus “woven” and its transferred meaning “text”. The proposed equation of SUR.GIBIL with ₃ zarû/₃ is not attested in lexical texts, but the latter appears in a congruent construction with şabātu, in the Ashurbanipal colophon to a nishu-recension of the plant compendium Uruanna, which begins:96

\[
\text{ša ul-tu ul-la za-ra-a la šab-tu}
\]

That which since old times was not held (lit. grasped) together by š/za-ra-a (…)

refraining the beginning of Esagil-kin-apli’s editorial note (l. 51):97

\[
\text{ša ul-tu ul-la ’SUR’,[GIBIL] ’la’ šab-tu}
\]

That which since the old times was not held (lit. grasped) together by ’SUR’,[GIBIL] (…)

The word zarû/ṣarû used in the Uruanna colophon may, according to R. Campbell Thompson, be connected with Hebrew *ṣwr “to bind”.98 Following this approach, Stephen Lieberman connected the verb with Akkadian šarâru “to tie together”.99 Both readings correspond more or less with the semantics of the alleged Sumerian equivalent SUR(.GIBIL). Eckart Frahm further notes that zarû can mean “to winnow”, which could describe the process of selecting authoritative texts in a metaphorical way as “sifting the chaff from the wheat”.100 One should note in addition that if zarû/ṣ is the Akkadian equivalent of the logogram SUR.GIBIL, it seems to disregard the element GIBIL, which would have corresponded to eššu “new” in Akkadian.

The frequent use of the expression SUR.GIBIL şabātu with the noun sadīru “line, row; ruled-off section” poses another question regarding the casus of zarû, which is written in a formal accusative, but considered to be the subject of the plural verb šabtū.101 The ending -a might be explained by the fact that zarû is often deemed to be a loanword.102 However, the Sakikkû catalogue (l. 31) and the AMC (Assur Medical Catalogue) use the expression together with the plural sadīrū,103 formally in nominative and therefore in the right case and numerus for the stative šabtū. I would therefore propose a translation with zarâ as an infinitive noun in an adverbial accusative and sadīrū as the subject of šabtū: “sections (which) are held (together) by a (new) weave”. Of course, this does not change fundamentally the idiomatic translation “edited”, which has been more or less accepted.104 In any case, the use of the expression together with sadîru as subject (“sections (which) have been edited”) helps to explain the otherwise conspicuous grammatical construction zarâ šabâtu.

3.1.2 adî (EN)

The preposition adî “together with; including” is used in the Sakikkû/Alamdimmû catalogue and in the AMC as a marker for different text sections on a given tablet. This can be illustrated for line 40 of the Sakikkû catalogue, which describes

96 BAK No. 321: 3 (CT 14, pl. 9 and 22).
97 Cf. Frahm 2011: 332 n. 1588. He translates the passage Aššur-bâni-apli šar kiššati šar mât Aššur isniq as “Ashurbanipal, king of the world, king of Assyria, (newly) arranged them”, but the verb sanāqu should rather be interpreted as “checked”. See also the following line of the editorial note (l. 52) mentioning “twisted threads” (GU.MEŠ GIL.MEŠ) which underscores Stol’s interpretation. See also the discussion in Geller infra.
98 See Wee 2015: 254; Thompson 1949: ix n. 4 and Thompson 1924: 5 n. 3. Consider that the correct Hebrew etymology for “to bind” should be *ṣr (or *ṣrî) and not *ṣwr.
99 Lieberman 1990: 333 n. 182; cf. also the short discussion in Wee 2015: 254 n. 27.
100 Frahm 2011: 328 and n. 1567. In n. 1566, Frahm also notes the equation of SUR with šahâtu “to press out”, which may refer to the process of extracting (valuable) information from older sources. Cf. also the proposition of Lambert (2005: xix) suggesting a Sumerian loanword zarâ/û derived from Sumerian /zara/, on the basis of MSL 14, 250: 82 (za-ra BE(zara, ta-mu-û).
101 Cf. CAD Z 70 s.v. zarû B.
102 See Kinnier Wilson 1956: 138 who considers ZA-ra-a to be an Aramaic loanword.
103 See AMC ll. 58, 122, and 123 for the attestations of sadîru ša SUR.GIBIL şabtū (see Steinert infra).
104 Wee 2015: 253 and n. 24 with additional bibliographical notes.
the contents of Sakikkû Tablet 33 as: DIŠ šikin simmišu/muršišu adi(EN) sāmānu qāt Gula “If the condition of his wound/disease” including “sāmānu (is) Hand of Gula”). A second instance of this formulation is found in the Alamdimmû catalogue line 86, which registers the contents of Tablet 1 of the sub-series Šumma liptu as: [DIŠ liptu ina qaqlqad amēli zizma(?) adi(EN) lipte pelī “[If a liptu-mark on the head] of a man is scattered and (present)” including “light red liptu-mark”. It is unclear whether the word adi is facultative, since line 20 probably lists two separate content items of Sakikkû Tablet 15, without using adi: [... DIŠ ūm ištēn maruṣma ša laptūti “[If he sick for one day and’ (entries/prognoses) which are ill-portending”.

3.1.3  NU TIL (ul qati) and ZAG.TIL.LA.BI.ŠÈ (ana (pāṭ) gimrīšu?)

The expression NU TIL, well known from the contexts of colophons, also often written NU AL.TIL, should be equated with Akkadian ul qati “not finished” and is used to indicate that a fixed text has not yet reached its end. The phrase can refer to a tablet or a whole text series. It is used twice in our text, once in the Sakikkû catalogue (l. 4) and once in the Alamdimmû catalogue (l. 83). One has to note that in both cases, the expression does not appear in the summary rubrics (for a given sub-series or section), but is attached to tablet incipits. This may indicate a difference to the other editorial remarks that appear in the summary rubrics ((sadārša) SUR.GIBIL šabtū, SUKUD.GIM, GIŠ.GIŠ.A and ZAG.TIL.LA.BI.ŠÈ). It is unclear whether the different position of these technical remarks in or outside the summary rubrics is coincidental or follows a general rule. The Akkadian spelling of ZAG.TIL.LA.BI.ŠÈ has still not been clarified, but may be read, according to Borger, as ana pāṭ gimrīšu (lit. “to the border of its entirety”), which means “completed”. In the case of the Sakikkû and Alamdimmû catalogue, the expression appears at the end of both catalogues (ll. 50 and 91), and is preceded by the total of the series tablets (and entries in the case of Sakikkû).

3.2  Uncertain Terms

Two more expressions are left for which no translation can be given with absolute certainty. Similar to SUR.GIBIL, no one-to-one equation within the lexical texts seems to be attested which could explain the unusual Sumerograms and their meaning as editorial remarks.

3.2.1  SUKUD.GIM

Since this expression appears almost exclusively in the summary rubrics for sections 4 and 5 of Sakikkû (ll. 37 and 43), it seems to be crucial for the understanding of the approach that was pursued in connection with the two sections. The entries read as follows:

\[\text{‘NIGIN’ 4 2 UŠ ‘20’ [(x x)] ‘x’ ŠUB-su-ma SA.GIG ‘AN’.TA.’ŠUB’.BA “SUKUD.GIM (A l. 37)\]

Total of 408(?)(entries): “[If collapse] befalls him” (including?) the symptoms of Antašubbû; SUKUD.GIM.

[\text{Total of x}]+185? (entries): “If šētu-fever has made him feverish”; SUKUD.GIM.

---

105 See 2.1.1. section 1 concerning the differences between catalogue and serial tablets. The catchline to Sakikkû Tablet 15 (in a manuscript of Tablet 16) and the catalogue incipit of Tablet 15 differ from each other, a contradiction that could be explained by the proposition that the catalogue entry lists only part of the incipit of Tablet 15, followed by a second citation indicating another section on the same series tablet. This hypothesis has to await new textual evidence for confirmation.

106 Cf. CAD Q 179 sv. qatû 3b.

107 Borger 2010: 359.

108 SUKUD.GIM occurs once in an astrological context. According to CAD 8/3 394 s.v. Šutablakkatu sub 2, it indicates that something has been mentioned before, i.e. it means literally “as above”, but this meaning is hardly applicable to the usage of SUKUD.GIM in the rubrics of the Sakikkû catalogue.
Both sections 4 and 5 seem to contain text sections or tablets (short compilations) that may have existed in this form before the edition of *Sakikkû* in the 11th century BCE. This leads to the assumption that SUKUD. GIM must in some way mirror this circumstance of fixed sections or tablets that have been incorporated into the new edition of the series in a certain manner.

Most of the references for the sign SUKUD given by the AHw and CAD refer to Akkadian words with the meanings “elevation, height”, “to be/make (something) elevated, high” or “to raise”, as well as “exalted” and “sublime” (i.e. šaqû, elû, melû, šāhu, šihu, zagûru, but also arku “long”). Rather marginal uses of the sign are attested in the Akkadian equations upqu “a tree trunk or block”, kapâru “to strip, clip; trim down”, and kapâšû “to perform in various disguises”. The most promising verb seems to be elû, which comprises several transferred meanings, which are often connected with documents and tablets, writing, adding as well as excluding information from texts.

The alternative reading (SUKUD) + DİM for bani or epêšu “to make SUKUD” instead of GIM (or GEN) is possible but would determine the meaning of SUKUD as “made/fashioned high/upraised”. But this rendering would be too general in comparison with the specific proposition of *sadîru* SUR.GIBIL šâbû. It should be noted that the Sumerian orthography SUKUD.GEN, with the comparative particle following the verb, is also unusual, if it is to be read word by word in Akkadian.

A hint might be provided again by the colophon of the first *nishu*-tablet of Uruanna (BAK No. 321), referring to a text legend allegedly carried out by Ashurbanipal himself. The colophon adopts the phraseology of the beginning of Esagil-kin-apli’s editorial note as shown above. The passage of interest reads as follows:

\[
\text{ina sa-di-di MU-šû-nu ul am/im-bi-ma}
\]
\[
\text{ina UGU DUB.MEŠ-ni ú-še-li}
\]
I/he did not organise them (lit. call their name) in sections, but entered them (lit. I/he let their name go up) on (separate) tablets.

It may not be coincidental that the Ashurbanipal colophon uses terms and phrases similar to the editorial remarks in our catalogue, since it is likewise concerned with explaining editing processes. The use of such terminology might thus seek to draw on a certain authority for the respective editorial programme of Ashurbanipal.

In the citation, the verb šûlû (“to enter upon (or at the top of) a tablet (as incipit)”) seems to refer to the creation of a serial order by dividing the text into tablets (tuppu), in contrast to a division of the text into “sections” (*sadîru*). This use of šûlû may be compared with the term SUKUD.GIM in the summary rubrics of *Sakikkû* sections 4 and 5 (Tablets 109)

109 See Heefel 2000: 103 and 107; Finkel 1996: 88. It is interesting that the topics of the sub-series 4-6 correspond more or less with the topics indicated in the second part of KAR 44, which stipulates additional knowledge besides the “canonical” series of the ăššu’u’s lore. Thus, lines 33-35 of the Exorcist’s Manual enumerate recipes and treatments against AN.TA.ŠUB.BA, bēl āri, šadingirakkû, šûmînakku, qâṭ ētemmi, the evil alû, liû, mukîl-rēš-lemtû, qâṭ mâmîti, qâṭ amêlûti, as well as “collections” (?) concerning the affliction of a sick man by fever and treatments for women (see Geller *infra*).

110 See Heefel 2000: 107. Nils Heefel tentatively renders the term according to the context as “wie vorgefunden”.

111 For the latter transferred meanings see especially šaqû. This meaning might likewise be taken up in the other reading of the sign SUKUD as GALAM (= nakhu). The reading GALAM can be excluded due to the phonetical gloss SU (see above).

112 This may be connected with the Late Babylonian use of elû (Ṡ) as “to subtract” in mathematical contexts, see CAD E 133 sub 11a.

113 Cf. especially the meanings listed for elû in the G and Š-stem, CAD E 122, sub 2c 6 “to turn up, to be found (in the course of an accounting)”; CAD E 131/133, sub 10b-c, 10e “to produce a document; to enter on a document; to let appear; to debit, book, record”. Cf. also CAD E 127 f., sub 8c “to summon (as witness)”.

114 See also 3.1.1. above.

115 BAK No. 321: 16-17. The preceding lines explain that formerly the series whose subject are “plants which are alike” (šammû gabarê šammê) had never received a proper edition and did not have a sectional order (II. 4-5), while the text had grown over time. The colophon then describes the editorial activities carried out by Ashurbanipal: the existing textual material was assembled, and identical entries that appeared twice or thrice were removed from the text. The titles/incipits of some of the older existing tablets were not changed and their order (*sadîru*) was followed in the new edition (II. 10-15).

116 The colophon refers to specific sections of the series designated by name/incipit.

117 The word *sadîru* in the Uruanna colophon is used with two different meanings, which should be considered here. In the first instance (II. 5, 16) the term refers to “(reasonably arranged, ruled-off) sections” (pl.), and in the second instance (I. 11) it refers to the overall “order, sequence” (sg.) of certain tablets or sections (II. 12-15).
26-35) in the series catalogue. Notably, these two sections show a remarkably homogeneous structure, reflected in a content-based division of their text into tablets with a specific topic, already transparent by its incipits.\(^{119}\) This organisation differs from the more deductive structure “from head to toe” applied in Sakikkû section 2, but also from the structure of section 3 dealing with dynamic and temporal aspects of disease. Both sections 2 and 3 are characterised by an overarching topic, which continues for several tablets.\(^{120}\) In contrast, the term SUKUD.GIM could refer to the structure of sections 4 and 5 as divided into tablets with specific topics. The expression may have to be read kīma šulē (“structured according to (topics) recorded (on individual tablets)”), and may be closely related to the meaning of šulē in the Uruanna colophon. Although this interpretation is not entirely certain, it provides a possible explanation for the position of SUKUD.GIM in the catalogue, as a marker for the content and structure of the tablets of Sakikkû sections 4 and 5.

### 3.2.2 GIŠ.GIŠ.A

This term is used twice in the catalogue, in the rubric of Sakikkû section 6 (l. 49) and in the summary rubric of Alamdimmû (l. 91):

\[
\text{‘NÍGIN’ 4/5’ 6 ’UŠ 40’} 2\text{ mūmûr}’\text{ PEŠ ‘[GIG-} \text{ma] GIŠ.GIŠ.A (A l. 49)}
\]
Total of 642/702(?) (entries): “(If) a pregnant woman(?) is sick and (...); GIŠ.GIŠ.A.

\[
\text{[ŠU.NIGIN ... šá] ‘alam-dim-mu’-ú ‘ZAG.TIL’.’LA.BL.’ŠÈ’ GIŠ.GIŠ.A (A l. 91)}
\]
Total of ... tablets of Alamdimmû. Completed (and) GIŠ.GIŠ.A.

Thus, GIŠ.GIŠ.A marks either the last section or the text series as a whole. The term is not attested anywhere else outside the catalogue, and no lexical equivalent is known. The closest equation for GIŠ in connection with colophons or writing in general would of course be šatāru “to write, copy, put down in writing” or “to list, register, record”.\(^{121}\) But many of the given translations seem to be too general as a meaningful editorial remark in the context of compilation practices. The only suitable specific notion of šatāru would be “to copy” (G or D-stem) or “to be copied” (N-stem).

Sometimes GIŠ is equated with našû (GUR 17) “to raise, lift up; to carry, bring (along)”. One should consider the contextually relevant meanings “to bring a word or report”,\(^{122}\) “to take, accept, get hold (of a document)”,\(^{123}\) “to collect (assets etc.)”.\(^{124}\) The spelling GIŠ for našû “to draw (a payment, sanction)” seems to be attested especially in economic texts from the Neo-Babylonian period.\(^{125}\) However, in this case one would expect that našû should be written with the usual sign IL or even syllabically.

These two equations render meanings within the semantic range of “to write – list – record – assign – collect – get hold of”, which could be applicable to our context, but still seem too unspecific. The other two editorial remarks discussed in the previous paragraphs express concrete aspects of the compilation process. One of them refers to newly edited sections (sadīru (ša) zarā šabtū), the other to the use of tablets (ina muhhi tuppāni šulū) in the new edition of a text series. Thus, one would expect a similar specific notion for GIŠ.GIŠ.A.

---

\(^{119}\) Cf. also 3.2.1. See for example the incipits like “If ṣētu-fever has made him feverish” (Sakikkû Tablet 31) or “If Šugidimmakku turns into Antašubba” (Sakikkû Tablet 28) which define more or less exactly the treated topics. In contrast, the incipits of Sakikkû section 2 as well as section 3 refer only to the anatomical features with which the respective sadīru-sections begin.

\(^{120}\) Exactly these series are marked by the editorial remark (sadīru ša) SUR.GIBIL šabtū in the Sakikkû catalogue.

\(^{121}\) Cf. CAD §2 227f. sub 1b; 3a-b and especially sub 3c “to list omens”; sub 4 “to assign” (often said of persons); sub 5 (D-stem) “to write, to copy, to list, record”; sub 6a (Št) “to have a tablet written, copied” and 6e “to have registered, recorded”. Cf. likewise the N-stem (passive) variants under 7.

\(^{122}\) CAD N/2 87 sub 2b.

\(^{123}\) CAD N/2 96 sub 3a. Cf. CT 22, 1: 38 referring to taking hold of scholarly tablets with našû. Cf. also BAK p. 13 and BAK No. 124: 6, 125: 4, 127: 3, 128: 4, 131: 3, 423: 3, and similarly 146: 6, regarding the prohibition to carry the tablet away (NU GIŠ). The phrase is otherwise attested in colophons with tabālu. However, it makes little sense as an editorial remark in the catalogue.

\(^{124}\) CAD N/2 98 sub 3b 1’.

\(^{125}\) CAD N/2 99f. sub 3c–2’b.
A third equation for GIŠ is ešēru, which is usually written with the logogram Si.SÁ.126 Especially the meanings of Š and Št-stem are of interest with regard to the catalogue, e.g. “to put in correct order, to keep in correct order” (Št₁ and Št₂).127 “to finish the work”128 and “to insure correct performance of a ritual”,129 but also the N-stem “to be put in correct order, to be fitted out correctly”.130 In connection with texts and their interpretation, one should further note the meaning “to clear up, set aright”.131 Taking into account that GIŠ.GIŠ.A seems to appear only at the end of the respective catalogues, I tentatively propose to read it as the Št₂ stem of ešēru, possibly to be interpreted as static or verbal noun (sutešur)132 with the meaning “put in correct form/order; properly arranged”. The phrase may overlap with the notion “finished”. It is unclear however, whether the term at the end of the last section in the Sakikkû catalogue (l. 49) refers to the whole series or only to section 6, although the latter seems more likely. Yet, the meaning “finished” for GIŠ.GIŠ.A is unlikely because this notion is already expressed by ZAG.TIL.LA.BL.ŠÊ (“completed”) in the following line 50, in the summary rubric for the Sakikkû catalogue. In the summary rubric of the Alamdimmû catalogue (l. 91), ZAG.TIL.LA.BL.ŠÊ even appears immediately before GIŠ.GIŠ.A. This would suggest that the term is valid for the whole series. At least for the use in Sakikkû section 6 one could argue that the term stands for the implementation of material stemming from texts outside the diagnostic-prognostic omen corpus, and that it expresses the fact that the constituent tablets have been arranged according to a logical or stringent order.133 Since none of the equations for GIŠ.GIŠ.A discussed here are attested in comparable contexts, e.g. in colophon rubrics, the proposed Akkadian reading šutešur remains of course tentative.

4 The Esagil-kīn-apli Catalogue as a Corpus Building Catalogue

Like the Exorcist’s Manual (KAR 44, see Geller infra), the Esagil-kīn-apli catalogue was faithfully copied over centuries, as is underlined by the two witnesses from the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-/Late Babylonian period and from different places (Babylon and Kalhu). As pointed out above (see 2.1.1.), the catalogue does not entirely mirror the recension(s) of the Diagnostic Handbook (Sakikkû) and the physiognomic standard series (Alamdimmû) attested in the first millennium, but seems to reflect the stage of an earlier recension of both series, especially in the case of Sakikkû. Since KAR 44 functions as a catalogue imaging the ideal corpus and curriculum of the āšipu or mašmašu-incantation expert, the Sakikkû and Alamdimmû-catalogue could be regarded as a catalogue representing a sub-corpus and specific branch of āšipûtu laid out in KAR 44. Thus, the crucial rank of Sakikkû and Alamdimmû in this branch of āšipûtu is shown by their prominent position in the first part of the Exorcist’s Manual. Both series are listed immediately after the prestigious priestly functions of the āšipu (KAR 44 ll. 2-5), and are followed by incantation series or rubrics dealing with demonic attacks and diseases (6-19), prophylactic, exorcistic, and purifying rituals (ll. 20-24), oracular techniques (l. 25) and lists of magico-medical paraphernalia (l. 26). Thus, the sequence of KAR 44 gives an overview of practices and texts concerned

126 See e.g. BAM 1 rev. 20 and BAM 575 iv 44.
127 CAD E 359-360 sub 12a. Cf. also CAD E 357 sub 6a and 6e (Š); AHw 255, sub Št₁, 1) “gebrauchsfertig machen”.
128 AHw 256, sub 3f, again in Št₁-stem.
129 CAD E 363, sub 12f.
130 CAD E 363, sub 15.
131 CAD E 361, sub 12b; AHw 256, sub 3d “(Weisungen etc.) recht gestalten”. See also AHw 256 sub 3a-b for ešēru Št in connection with the elucidation of obscure words and contradictory statements.
132 The verbal noun might be indicated by the suffixed -A.
133 For possible sources related to Sakikkû section 6 see also the last passage in paragraph 2.1.1. A similar case may be encountered in the physiognomic omen series and its sub-series. A hint that some sections of Alamdimmû may have been regarded as separate series in themselves is presented by the separate listing of the sub-series Kataduggû and Nigdimdimmû in library records and other texts (cf. the introductory passage in 2.1.2.). Another indication may be found in the sub-series on moles. In the Old Babylonian period, texts on skin moles seem to be regarded as a separate group, represented by three more or less uniformly styled texts (YBC 4646 (YOS 10, 54) on umṣatu; YBC 5074 (YOS 10, 55) on halû and umṣatu, and Si. 33 (Kraus 1939: pl. 63-64; YOS 10, 4; Böck 2000: 302-305) on umṣatu). Apart from the description of moles, VAT 7525 (Köcher, Oppenheim and Güterbock 1957:58; 66) presents the only Old Babylonian physiognomic texts that refers to human features. However, this text mixes physiognomic, behavioural and dream omens with omens on body moles. Note further that the section on moles within the standard series shows some terminological differences and deviations from the apodeses within the main series Alamdimmû. This may likewise underscore the independent status or differing tradition behind the sub-series on moles.
with healing a sick or troubled person, and is headed by the specialised series concerned with reading and interpreting signs drawn from the human body.

In this vein, the editorial work of Esagil-kin-apli may be considered as an approach to unify divinatory branches which are especially human-centred. Both series, the Diagnostic Handbook as well as the physiognomic series, focus on signs drawn from the human body and a person's behaviour, be it abnormal, pathological or unconscious. These signs are interpreted within the contextual or situational mode of the sign's occurrence. This means that the meaning of a sign depends on whether the examined person was sick and troubled, or whether the person was about to change his or her social position or status. The observing and supervising role of the ritual expert with regard to human affairs is also expressed in l. 69 of Esagil-kin-apli's editorial note, where the [exorcist] is said to be responsible for formulating a verdict (concerning a person's fate) and for watching over people's lives. In accordance with the scope of the text corpus outlined in KAR 44, the āšipu appears to have been the ultimate observer, mediator and practitioner regarding a broad range of circumstances and events in human life, especially those that were regarded as influenced by the divine realm. Not only the outstanding range of the exorcist's curriculum, but also his fundamental position as "speaker on behalf of other human beings" and his insight into divine knowledge that was passed down by the sages from before the flood and by later scholars like Esagil-kin-apli, helped to increase the āšipu's prestige and to sustain the longevity of the profession until the last wedges of cuneiform writing.
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