Adad-apla-iddina, Esagil-kīn-apli, and the Series SA.GIG

IRVING L. FINKEL

In 1956 J.V. Kinnier-Wilson published a recently discovered piece of a Nimrud tablet that contained part of a catalogue to the medical omen series SA.GIG. A broken section of that tablet describes the role played by a significant redactor, Ešguzi-gin-a, but the name of the king under whom he worked is broken (dX-apla-iddina), and has proved a point of discussion. Subsequently, the same scholar identified, joined, and published (in transliteration only) the remainder of the Nimrud tablet. The new piece added almost all the remaining incipits to SA.GIG, and added similar information for the physiognomic omen series Alamdimmû, Kataduggû, and associated texts.

The identification of a duplicate to the Nimrud catalogue (ND 4358+4366) in BM 41237+ now establishes for certain that the name of the king was Adad-apla-iddina, gives fuller information about the editing of the series, and adds the few SA.GIG incipits that were previously either broken, or altogether missing.

THE NEW MANUSCRIPT

BM 41237 (81-4-28,785) + 46607 (81-8-30,73) + 47163 (81-8-30,685) represents slightly more than the lower half of a single-column tablet; it measures 7.4 × 11.0 (at maximum) × 1.8 cms., and there seems every likelihood that when complete it contained the same material as did the

1. See Iraq 18 (1956) 130-146.
4. BM 46607 and 47163 were joined by C. B. F. Walker in 1977; BM 41237 was joined and the text identified by the present writer.
Nimrud tablet ND 4358+4366. The 81-4-28 and 81-8-30 collections of the British Museum both consist of tablets brought to England by Hormuzd Rassam; the provenances are stated in the Department Registers to be Babylon for 41237 and 46607, while 47163 has no provenance quoted. The script is Babylonian, small and neat, and probably Neo-Babylonian rather than later; the sign forms are not dissimilar from those in many tablets in a Babylonian hand from the libraries at Nineveh. A copy of BM 41237+ is given below as Fig. I.

THE EDITORIAL WORK ON SA.GIG

The authorship of the medical and physiognomic omens was anciently attributed to Ea, but it is evident that by the turn of the second millennium BC a proliferation of tablets, recensions and variants required a firm human editorial hand; and in the remarkable passage studied below (already partly known from ND 4358+) we are informed that order was brought to bear on the problem by one Ešguzi-gin-a.

The name of this scholar-scribe is well-known. The Akkadian equivalent to his name (written 𒈗𒉗-𒆠-𒈠-𒈠) is given in VR 44 iii 447 as 𒉗-𒈗-𒉗-𒈠-ki-in-ap-li, and he is also listed as one of the famed official ummānu, "(chief) scholars," in W 20030,7, the Seleucid List of Sages and Scholars in the following context:

16 [ina tar-šu=x-x]-x LUGAL =é-sag-gil-ki-in-DUMU.NITA um-man-nu
17 [ina-tar-šu] = AG-NIG.DU-SES LUGAL =é-sag-gil-ki-i-ni-ub-ba-(sic!) um-man-nu
18 [ina tar-šu=x-x] = AG-NIG.DU-SES LUGAL =é-sag-gil-ki-in-ub-ba LU(sic!) um-man-nu

Esagil-kini-ubba (Saggil-kīnām-ubbib), probably the author of the Babylonian Theodicy, is shown to have served as ummānu both under Nebuchadnezzar I and Adad-apla-iddina; his career thus spanned at least thirty-five years, although the reigns are given in reverse order.

Saggil-kīnām-ubbib is independently known to have worked under Adad-apla-iddina, from K.10802 rev. 1-2. On the basis of the present evidence one might hazard that Esagil-kīn-apli was Adad-apla-iddina's first appointed ummānu, but that he died in office and was replaced by Saggil-kīn-ubbib, but van Dijk's remarks on W 20030, 7:1614 make the expected restoration of Adad-apla-iddina's name unlikely. A text that might have given evidence were it more complete, is the TDP tablet A 3442. Dated in its colophon to ITI APIN UD 17.KAM [MU n.KAM m4X.DUMU.NITA-SUM-na LUGAL KA.DINGIR.RA.KI, the tablet can now be reasonably dated to the reign of Adad-apla-iddina, and seen as an example of the Esagil-kīn-apli edition.

10. See J. A. Brinkman, AOr 43, p. 115 n. 841.
12. UVB 18, p. 51.
13. The transliteration suggests a surviving trace of the RN ("vielleicht Raum für drei Zeichen"), but this is not shown in the copy (pl. 27), nor in that later printed in {Bagh. Mitt. Beiheft 2} as no. 89.
Esagil-kin-apli’s “father” is shown by the new duplicate to be Asalluḫi-mansum (not *Ištar-anšes-mansum), who functioned as apkallu (NUN.ME), or Sage, in the reign of Hammurapi. Above evidently must mean “descendant.” In the Uruk list the term apkallu is chiefly used for those scholars dating to pre-Flood Days, although there was a NUN.ME under Enmerkar, and the scholar who lived under Gilgamesh was likewise a NUN.ME. No scholar from the reign of Hammurapi is given in the Uruk list.

The catalogue opens with the forty incipits to the series SA.GIG, and divides the tablets into sub-series as is also found in the colophons known from the sources in Labat TDP. Each entry is ruled, and each incipit is prefaced with the number of lines in the tablet. Both manuscripts share the same format, although where the line totals are preserved in both, there is no agreement. After the incipits for SA.GIG comes the unusual passage that describes Esagil-kin-apli’s work. Appended to the catalogue as it is, the passage thus qualifies effectively as a colophon. The style of the SA.GIG catalogue differs in both manuscripts for the succeeding entries in that line totals for the individual tablets are omitted. It might well be that originally the catalogue to SA.GIG and the catalogue to Alamdimma and related texts were separate, and were subsequently amalgamated. This is in some measure borne out by the placing of what we have termed the colophon to SA.GIG.

The end of the Nimrud tablet ND 4358+ is badly broken, but the phrase niširi e[zida], “secret of Ezida” (A 92) fits well with its discovery in Nabu’s temple Ezida at Nimrud, and it seems probable that BM 41237+, if not itself from Borsippa, originated textually in a manuscript from Ezida in Borsippa. Thus we are dealing with the Borsippa edition of SA.GIG from the Sage of Borsippa; see B 21 below.

The pieces ND 4358 and 4366 have now been joined and further cleaned, and J. A. Black has recently prepared a complete new copy for inclusion in the forthcoming volume of Late Assyrian texts from the Nabu temple library at Nimrud. His very considerable kindness in making this copy available prior to publication and collating several passages has meant that a transliteration of the tablet, revised in the light of the Babylonian duplicate, can be given here. The incipits are thus given in full for the convenience of future workers with the series. One or two difficulties still remain, but the forty incipits in this edition of SA.GIG are now complete.

The following transliteration is based on A = ND 4358+4366, restored where necessary after B = BM 41237+; where B has preferable reading, however, it is adopted in the transliteration. Variations and sundry observations on new readings are given in the footnotes. Where the line totals are preserved in A and B they are quoted in that order.

15. Correct therefore Iraq 18 (1956) 136; UVB 18, p. 51, etc.
17. See also E. Reiner, OrBS 30 (1961) 7; J. J. A. van Dijk, UVB 18, pp. 40-47.
18. If correctly understood; see UVB 18, pp. 50-51.
20. J. V. Kinnier Wilson has commented on these incipits in the above-mentioned articles, so translations are not given here.
21. Labat has rather simplified the manuscript difficulties in Traité akkadien de diagnostics et prognostics médicaux (Leiden, 1951); the problem will need investigation if a new edition is undertaken incorporating the many new sources and commentaries, published and unpublished. Compare, for example, E. Leichty, AFO 24 (1975) 82-88.
### Transliteration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv. A 1</th>
<th>[SAC DUB.MEŠ u $]U.$NIGIN,1 MU.MEŠ ša SA.GIG.MEŠ MU.X22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 2</td>
<td>I [.. e-nu-ma ana E] 'LÜ.GIG KA.PIRIG DU-ku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 3</td>
<td>II [.. DIŠ LÜ ana E] 'LÜ.GIG DU-ku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 4</td>
<td>[..........................] * x23 GIBIL NU TIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 5</td>
<td>[NIGIN ............... e-nu]-ma ana E 'LÜ.GIG KA.PIRIG DU-ku]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 6</td>
<td>III [..] ana GIG ina TE-ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 7</td>
<td>IV [..] DIŠ SAC.KI he-si-ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 8</td>
<td>V [..] DIŠ GIG 15-shu KUšu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 9</td>
<td>VI [..] DIŠ KIR-šu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 10</td>
<td>VII [..] DIŠ EME-šu SAš šu1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 11</td>
<td>VIII [..] DIŠ ČESTUG 15-shu 'tar-kâr1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 12</td>
<td>IX [..] DIŠ GIC pa-nu-šu * SAš24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 13</td>
<td>X [..] DIŠ GIC 'GÜ-sù125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 14</td>
<td>XI [..] DIŠ rit-ta-šu ša 15 KUšu1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 15</td>
<td>XII [..] DIŠ GABA-su KUšu-šu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 16</td>
<td>XIII [..] DIŠ SAš GŠ-šu * [SAš]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 17</td>
<td>XIV [..] DIŠ giš-šiš 15-shu * [SAš-dt]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 18</td>
<td>[NIGIN ............... ana G]i[G] ina TE-ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 19</td>
<td>[..........................] * x26 SUR.GIBIL šab-[tuš]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 20</td>
<td>XV [..] DIŠ U]D L.KAM GIC-ma GAR TAG-[f]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 21</td>
<td>XVI [..] DIŠ U]D L.KAM GIC-ma SAC,-šu KUšu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 22</td>
<td>XVII [..] DIŠ ina SAC GIG-šu IR bu-bu-ša ir-ta-[šu]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 23</td>
<td>XVIII [..] DIŠ GIC SU-šu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 24</td>
<td>XIX [..] DIŠ i-mim u ŠED,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 25</td>
<td>XX [..] DIŠ GIC IR ū-ka[l]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 26</td>
<td>XXI 100 DIŠ NIGIN SA.MEŠ-šu SILIM.MEŠ-ma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

22. Sign perhaps B[1] or N[E]. To mark the heading, the whole line is in larger script than the remainder.
23. Signs like 'TU BP'.
26. x = lower half of broken vertical.
ADAD-APLA-IDDINA, ESAGIL-KIN-APLI, AND THE SERIES SA.GIG

A 27 XXII 88 DIS GIG ʾis-bûr‘ 1 2 u 3rd GIG ina ʾše1-re-e-ši ʾil-te-ʾnê-eb-bu
A 28 XXIII 103 DIS ʾZE1 ep-ru
A 29 XXIV 137 DIS ʾGIG GIL-HASHUR APIN-šš
A 30 XXV 85 DIS IZI.GAR ša ina SAG LÜ.GIG kun-nu

A 31 SU.NIGIN 14 US 20 DIS UD 1.KAM GIG-ma SA x28 ʾSA11 SUR.GIBIL šab-tuš

A 32 XXVI 60 DIS SUB-tu SUB-su-ma
A 33 XXVII 60 DIS NA mi-šit-ti pa-ni ma-šid-ma
A 34 B 1′ XXVIII ʾ6011 šum4-ma SU.GIDIM.MA ana AN.TA.SUB.BA GUR-šu
A 35 XXIX 144 DIS ʾGIG-ŁUGAL.ŪR.RA ʾDU120 BI Ū.TU
A 36 XXX 84 DIS GIG-ma KA-šš BAD.BAD-še1

A 37 B 4′ NIGIN 4+2 US 20+[... DIS $][B-š][š] SUB-su-ma SA.GIG AN.TA.SUB.BA =ŠUKUD.GIM

A 38 B 5′ XXXI 81 DIS UD.DA TAB-su-ma
A 39 B 6′ XXXII [...]. DIS IM ʾis-bit-su-ma
A 40 B 7′ XXXIII [...]. DIS ʾGIG GAR-šu EN ʾsa11-ma-nu10 SU ‘ME.ME
A 41 B 8′ XXXIV [...]. DIS ʾNA1 ana MUNUS-šu ŠA-šš ʾIL-šu-ma
A 42 B 9′ XXXV [...]. DIS ʾNA1 IGLMES-šš NIGIN.MES-du31

A 43 B 10′ [NIGIN] 3+[...]. US $25 DIS UD.DA TAB-su-ma SUKUD.GIM

Rev. A 44 B 11′ XXXVI 147 šum4-ma TU PEŠ-ma UGU SAG [AG].KI1-šu [SIG,]
A 45 B 12′ XXXVII 118/94 DIS MUNUS PEŠ GIG-ma
A 46 B 13′ XXXVIII 141/143 DIS MUNUS A-šš UD 3.KAM X-šu133
A 47 B 14′ XXXIX 152/82 DIS MUNUS ba-tiš-ti i-di-ip ʾf1-[g]š-šu24
A 48 B 15′ XL 62+24/144 DIS LÜ.TUR la2-šš

27. Numeral possibly 148 (collation by Black). Reading ʾis-bûr‘(? after Iraq 18 (1956) copy; 1 2 3 after new copy, quite provisional; the equivalent incipit in TDP 176:1 reads simply [DIŠ GIG ina ʾše1-re-eši ʾil-te-ʾnê-eb-bu... (Tablet "23")], which might suggest that this line in fact contains what should be two incipits.
28. x: broken Winkelhaken followed by vertical visible as ʾIG1 (collation by Black).
29. This tablet has remained unknown, but now the following Late Babylonian unpublished pieces have been identified by the writer: (i) BM 42310+; (ii) BM 46563; (iii) BM 56805; and (iv) an unnumbered fragment. BM 38375 is a fragment of a commentary on this tablet. The sources suggest that DU₂.BI rather than KLI₂.BI is to be read. The format of this tablet differs noticeably from TDP generally. The medical problems are linked in the obverse to the age of the patient (DIŠ ina MU n.KAM SUB-su...), and in the reverse to the spot where the patient is at the time of attack (for example, DIŠ AN.TA.SUB.BA ina a-lak gir ri ŠUB-su...). Each "omen" or diagnosis has a magical/medical "23”), which might suggest that this text contains prescriptions appended, in some cases even including the incipits of the incantations to be used. One would scarcely identify the text as SA.GIG were the first line not preserved.
30. EN clear; ʾza1- short, but probable (collation by Black).
31. A: NIGIN.MES-du; B: NIGIN1-[...].
33. x like B[1 or TA[B.
34. Confirmed by H. Hunger, Spät Babylonische Texte aus Uruk 1 (Berlin, 1976), no. 40.
ESAGIL-KIN-APLIS EDITORIAL WORK

A 51-2  B obv. 18' ša ul-tu ul-la SUR.GIBIL [1] šab-tu₄, u TIM GUM.MES ₄ GIL.MES₄ ša₄ GABA.RI₄ NU TUKU

A 53-4  B rev. 19' ina BAL-e ìDIM-DUMU.NITA-MU₄ LUGAL TIM.TIR.KI₄ GIBIL.BIŠE [x], AM₄

A 54-5  B 20' =eš-zi-gin-a³ DUMU₄₄ asal-lu-ḥi-ma-an-sum₄₄ NUN.M[E]₄ 'mīš-[a][m]-mu-ra-pī LUGAL

A 55-6  B 21' um-mat ₄₃ 43 si₄₄ na-na-a BARA₄ SIPA.KU reš-ti-l

A 57-8  B 22' ZABAR.DAB.BA é-zi-da pa-šiš ₃₂.ZU.ZU₄ na-daš DUB ši-mat DIN.GIR.MES sa-niq mit-ḫur-[u][l]₄₇

A 59-60  B 23' iš-pu pam-ku ša Ânim-zîl-îl be-let tak-nê-e ta-li-mat nar-mi-šû

A 60-1  B 24' UM.ME.A KUR EME.KU u URI.KI ina GESTUG₂₁ ni-kîl-ti ša ₄₀ U PAP.PAP₄₈ šî-ru-ku-šû


A 65-6  B 28' [al]am-dim-ma-â ul i-nam-bi sa-kîk-ka ri-kis GIC u ri-kis k[u-r₃]

A 66-7  B 29' alam-dim-ma-û bu-un-na-an-nê-e la-a-nu šî-mat NAM.LU₃₅ L[U]₄

A 67-8  B 30' ša ₄₀ U PAP.PAP₄₃ iš-šu šâ ES.GAR ki-lal-la-an K[E]₅₄₅-su₄₅ 1-ma

A 69  B 31' [a-ši-pu(?)] TAR-k₃₅ ES.BAR ba-₄-šî ZI-ti UN.MES


A 71  B 33' [liš-ta-bil]-ma ana LUGAL ME-a liš-kun

35. A: 4+6; B: 5+6.
37. A: SU.NIGIN 40 DUB.MES 3000+ ₆ + ₄ = [ . . . ]; B: SU.NIGIN 40 1800[ . . . ].
39. LÚ before GABA.RI see Iraq 18 [1956] 138-39 is not visible in the new copy; ša remains uncertain.
40. A: ina, ìDIM-DUMU.NITA-SUM.NA; B: ina, ìDIM-DUMU.NITA-MU.
41. A: 'KAR₁·DINGIR.RA. 'KI'.
42. A. AAN now seems clear contra 'šd-on; the restoration proposed in JCS 11 [1957] 13 is thus ruled out. An adverb is probably to be restored.
43. A: ìDIM-gu₃-gi₄ A; B: ìDIM-gu₃₄-gi₄ A.
44. A: A.
Concerning that which from old time had not received an [authorised] edition, and according to ‘twisted threads’ for which no duplicates were available,\(^58\)

In the reign of Adad-apla-iddina, King of Babylon, to work it anew . . .

Esagil-kin-apli, son of Assallubi-mansum, the Sage of King Hammurabi, the ummatu\(^27\) of Sin, Lisi and Nanai, a prominent citizen of Borsippa, the zabardabba\(^28\) of Ezida,\(^58\) the pašti\(^59\) of Nabu\(^59\) who holds the gods’ Tablet of Fate, and can reconcile conflicting things, the ʾišippu and ramku priest of Ninzilzil,\(^60\) lady of loving trust, ‘sister’\(^61\) of his loved one, the (chief) scholar of Sumer and Akkad, through the incisive intelligence that Ea and Assallubi/Marduk(?\(^62\) had bestowed on him, deliberated with himself, and produced the authorised editions for SA.CIG, from head to foot,\(^63\)

and established them for knowledge. Take care! Pay [attention!]

Do not neglect your knowledge! He who does not attain(?) knowledge must not speak aloud the SA.CIG omens,

nor must he pronounce out loud Alamdimmūl SA.CIG (concerns) all diseases and all (forms of) distress;

Alamdimmū (concerns) external form and appearance (and how they imply) the fate of man

which Ea and Assallubi/Marduk(?) ordained in Heaven. (Regarding) the twin series, their arrangement is one.\(^64\)

\(^56\). The Uruk commentaries to TDP available in SpBTU vol. I are consistently described where preserved as being ša pi ʾummānī/ʾummānī, “according to the Sage(s).” Admittedly this attribution occurs in commentaries to other texts, but does it here perhaps mean that Esagil-kin-apli also wrote explanations of the difficult passages?

\(^57\). The term um-mat occurs also in CRRAI 19, p. 436 12, but its meaning remains uncertain. The present passage shows that the citation in AHw, p. 1415 sub ʾummātu 3) c) as subordinate to mūkin . . . must be corrected. A meaning “descendant” in the Nebuchadnezzar 1 text seems probable, and support for this might be provided by the passage quoted from Rm 17+ and BM 55148+ below, where ʾašir-ul ʾamū-si, a a corresponds to um-mat ʾ30ʾ4š, uʾna-no-a. Compare also K 2596 rev. iii 18ʾ20ʾ (drawn to my attention by W. G. Lambert), a colophon describing the textual history of the incantations against agricultural pests:

\[\text{AS(for )} \ast(<\text{PAP}) \text{SU.K.KAL.DUG}, \text{NU.} \]

\[\text{BAL.BAL u} \text{m-mat . . .]} \]

\[\text{SU.AN.NA.KI ZABAR.DAB.BA} \text{ʾna-bi-um . . .]} \]

\[\text{GUDU} \text{ʾaš-gul u} \text{e-zi-da ki-[i, . . .]} \]

For the name of this scholar-scribe see JCS 11 (1957) 13:51.

\(^58\). Compare the scribal ancestor Baba-tum-ibni, in colophons from Assur, who is described as zabardabbū of Etarra; see now O. Pedersen, Archives and Libraries in the City of Assur part 2, Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Studia Semitica Upsaliensia 8, p. 45 n. 22.

\(^59\). For ʾzi-zi-u as a name of Nabû see F. Pomponio, Studi Semitici 51 (1978) 158-159.

\(^60\). ʾnin-zu-zu is given as Emešal for Nanai in MSL 4 9:90 (compare W. G. Lambert, MIO 12/2 [1966] 45); she is described as ʾna-na-a DUMU.MUNUS [. . .] ša man-zu-as-su ša-qa-u be-lak-nē-e [. . .] in CT 23 49 7-8, and the syncretistic hymn KAR 109 22 states that in BARA.SIPA.KI ʾnin-zu-zu le be-lak-nē-e zi-kir-šā.

\(^61\). It is assumed that narmā stands for narāmu (compare CAD N/1 381 sub narmā), and refers to Nabû, and that šū refers to Esagil-kin-apli; talimtu must therefore mean “lover” here.

\(^62\). In line 30ʾ, A offers 40 u [. . .] and B [. . .] PAP.PAP where gods must be meant, and since the ordaining of human fate must be largely Ea’s responsibility (compare K 2448 2-3 referred to above), 40 may be trusted; in the parallel phrase in line 23ʾ A has ʾ30ʾ and B ʾ50ʾ which must be emended. PAP.PAP seems likely to stand for Assalubi/Marduk, although no support can be offered; \[\text{PAP.PAP = DUMU.MUNUS ʾnin-šibur (Kleisschrifttexte aus Assur verschiedener Inhalts 50 i 7-8), explained as LU KA na-qid, is no doubt irrelevant.} \]

\(^63\). a capite ad calcem (MSL 16, p. 23 and refs.) expressed in Akkadian! Compare also line A 77 below, TDP 28 86-96, and B . D. Biggs, RA 62 (1968) 58 17ʾ.

\(^64\). That is, both organized by this tablet.
Let the šīpu who makes the decisions, and who watches over people’s lives, who comprehensively knows SAG.GIC and Alamdimū, inspect (the patient) and check (the appropriate series), [let him ponder], and let him put his diagnosis at the disposal of the king.\(^{65}\)

In many ways this passage is a remarkable one. According to this text, SUR.GIBIL (= za-ra-a) šobatu effectively represents the process of “canonisation” so often discussed by Assyriologists; a text is established from disparate sources to represent the standard version of the composition. The expression is also applied to the individual sub-series in A 19 and A 31; compare also A 49 (not apparently SUR.GIBIL), and also A 4: GIBIL NU TIL. Other technical terms here, still quite obscure, are \(^{66}\)SUKUD.GIM in A 37 and A 43, and GIS.GIS. A in A 49 and A 91. The passage is direct supportive evidence for the conventional placing of “canonisation” in the second half of the second millennium, and provides a unique glimpse of a major scholarly effort from a master scribe.

In the Exorcist’s Manual KAR 44, the opening section (obv. 2 - rev. 3) lists the “incipits of the series of šīpu which have been established for knowledge and study” (SAG.MEŠ ES.GAR MAŠ.MAŠ-ti ša ana NIG.ZU u IG.DU, A kun-nu). The following section (rev. 5-20) is, in contrast, described as the “incipits of the series of šīpu according to Esgal-kin-aplu (SAG.MEŠ ES.GAR MAŠ.MAŠ-ti ša =e-sag-š-DU-A). Two new Late Babylonian duplicates to KAR 44 to be published by M. J. Geller (Rm 717+ and BM 55148+) offer fuller information at this point, and are particularly relevant to the passage under study: Rm 717+ (with variants from BM 55148+) reads as follows:

Rev. 3. SU.NIGIN ≡ES.GAR a-ši-pu-tu (var. MAŠ.MAŠ-x[...]) ša =eš-gū-zi-gin-DUMU×US (var. ≡š-gū-zi-gr-in-a) DUMU ≡asal-lú-ši-[ma-an-su]m

Rev. 4. NUN.ME ≡h-a-am-mu-ra-pṭ LUGAL ŠE (var. x[...]) SA BAL BAL ści-si4 A (var. A A) i-šip-pu (var. GUDU,) é-zi-da (var. adds [...])

The anonymity of cuneiform literature has been stressed by W. C. Lambert,\(^{66}\) who emphasized the importance of the Catalogue of Texts and Authors\(^{67}\) as being exceptional in approach. The present text, now more or less complete, shows both one individual at work, and the care with which those who were to use that work were to proceed. In its rather cryptic use of a colophon-style mixture of Sumerian and Akkadian and its choice of unusual words and gods the passage embodies the protective attitude of the šīpu to his inherited lore. The closing lines likewise are suggestive. It is interesting that while the šīpu is seen as responsible for health at large, it is primarily the king for whom the practical value of his knowledge is to be put to use, unless this is mere diplomatic hyperbole. Furthermore, would it be wholly inappropriate to see in the injunction to safeguard the corpus, study the symptoms, and produce the correct diagnosis on request a faint anticipation of the admonitions of Hippocrates?

---

\(^{65}\) ME-a is taken to stand for gibu; for passages in which this means a medical diagnosis, construed with šakûnu, see CAD Q, p. 249 sub voce.

\(^{66}\) See JCS 11 (1957) 1.

\(^{67}\) See JCS 16 (1962) 77.
ALAMDIMMU

A 72 B 34'
A 72 B 35'
A 73 B 36'
A 73 B 37'
A 74 B 38'
A 74 B 39'
A 75 B 40'
A 75 B 41'
A 75 B 42'
A 76 B 43'
A 76 B 44'

DIS SAG.DU IGI BAR-at DINGIR.MES
DIS ʼŠA.NIGIN1 [ina S]A.G.DU LŪ saḫ-ru
DIS SAC.KI NU TUKU
DIS SIG, IGI 15 ka-bar
DIS ʼKIR1-ŠU a-ri-ik
DIS EME-ŠU nam-ʼrat
DIS ʼTE.MURUB, MES-ŠU x-2-x
DIS pa-nu-šu CID.DA
DIS ʼSU1 CID.DA
DIS SABA-ʼSU1 CID.DA
DIS ʼUMBIN1 GIM GU, GAR-in
DIS alam-ŭl-ma-[a . . . . .]

A 77 B 45'
NIGIN 12 DUB.MEŠ alam-ŭl-mu-ŭ TA muḫ-hi EN
[RII ZAG.TIL.LA.BL.] 6

NIGDIMDIMMU

A 78 B 46'
A 78 B 47'

DIS pa1 m[u1 x (x)]-šu ša gi ʼgan1 sa SA
DIS [x] IGP SAG.DU-su x [x]

B 48'
[NIGIN 2] DUB.MEŠ [nig-ŭl-mu-ŭ . . . . .] 6

KATADUGGU

A 79 B 49' [DIS x (x)] X DINGIR.MEŠ GAL.MEŠ šd NAM.LŪ/[U, LŪ] [z]a-qi-iq-ša ana
[CAR-nu] ū ka-ta-dug-4-ga ša ana re-te-et ʼGIR1-ša ū-ku-nu

A 80 B 50'
A 81 B 51'
1 DUB DIS ka-1-ta-dug-4-ga1-ŭ7

68. A: DIS SAG.DU IGI BAR-at DINGIR.MEŠ[ME.U] 
(after new copy, contra Iraq 24 [1962] 55 29a); B: x KID
B[AR]-at DINGIR.MEŠ. This tablet is unidentified. Note
that unusually this series is named after Tablet XII rather
than Tablet I.


70. A: nam-ʼrat1; B: nam-ʼrat1 clear.

71. A: DIS TE1 [ . . . ].

72. In this and preceding entry B apparently omits -su.

73. A: DIS ʼUMBIN1 GIM GU, GAR-in; B: DIS GIS.X
GIM GU, [ . . . ].

74. Reading from A; B: DIS ana DINGIR-dū ŠA G1 x x
[ . . . ] (AŠ before ŠA probably erasure).

75. Reading from A; B: DIS LĀ KA X-dū [ . . . ]; SAC.DU
unlikely.

76. This rubric omitted in A. For the restoration compare
K.13280+13818 obv. 10-12: [ . . . ] 37 ʾES.GAR alam-ŭl-
mu-ŭ [ . . . ]-a-ši BAR.MEŠ nig-ŭl-mu-ŭ [ . . . ] k-a-
ta-dug,ga-ū (see S. Parpola, INES 42 [1983] 24-25; F. R.
Kraus, Texte zur babylonischen Physiognomatik, AIO
Beiheft 3 (Berlin, 1935), no. 51; Iraq 24 [1962] 53). See also
CT 54 106 15 and F. Rochberg-Halton, ed., Language,
Literature and History: Philological and Historical Studies
163.

77. Compare Iraq 24 (1962) 53 and 57. In A line 81 is
written over the ruling between 80 and 82 as if added later
(J. A. Black).
SUMMA SINNIŠTU QAQQADA RABIAT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tablet</th>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 82 B 52'</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>[Diš Munus] SAG.DU GAL-AT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 83 B 53'</td>
<td>[Diš Munus] x x39 GAL-AT GIBIL NU TIL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 84</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>[Diš . . . . ] x SAG.DU-šú 15 GUR-ru78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 85</td>
<td>[NIGIN 2 DUB].MES Diš Munus SAG.DU [GAL-AT]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMA LIPTU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tablet</th>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 86</td>
<td>[Diš TAG-tu, ina SAG].DU NA BAR-[ma] [x]en' ū-is-ip-š-te' pi tu šú i-&lt; . . &gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 87</td>
<td>[Diš . . . . . . . . . ] x bi ku [x x x]80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 87</td>
<td>'Diš SAG1.DU NA zaq-pat [S]Á um ud' en [(x)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 88</td>
<td>[Diš . . . ina SAG].DU NA [ . . . . . . . . ] A.MES SUB.MES MIN ina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 89</td>
<td>[u-U[B-X]]</td>
<td>u i-x-(x)-[gi1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 90</td>
<td>[NIGIN81 . . . DUB].MES1 [Diš] 'li-[ip]-[te']</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tablet</th>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 91</td>
<td>[SUNIGIN . . . . DUB.MES ES.GAR ala]m-dim-mu-ú ZAG.TIL.LA.BISEGIS.GIS.A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 92</td>
<td>[SUNIGIN . . . . DUB.MES SAG.]IC.MES alam-dim-mu-ú 'SAL.ŠES' él-[zi-da]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 93</td>
<td>[ . . . . . . ] AL.TU.RA SUM.MA. 'ME782</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evident from the summary that Nigdimdimmû, Kataduggû, Šumma Sinništu, and Šumma Liptu were considered the sub-series to Alamdimmû. The uncertainty concerning the number of tablets to Šumma Liptu means that the missing final totals cannot be filled in for certain. J. V. Kinnier Wilson suggested six tablets for the latter case, so the resulting total would be 40+12+2+1+2+6 = 63 tablets for the twin series SAG.GIG and Alamdimmû, representing the editorial achievement of the Sage of Borsippa.

While on the subject of the SAG.GIG medical omens we may conclude with a text of a very different stamp. This is BM 47687+48517(81-11-3,392+1228), joined by the writer, and given in

---

78. A: [. . . ] GAL-et; B: [. . . ] x x [. . . ]; the GIBIL NU TIL here, in view of A obv. 4 above, shows that this entry is not to be taken as a third series tablet incipit.
80. Rm 268+ (TBP no. 50) gives the incipit for Tablet II as Diš GIG.PES ina SAG.DU LU CA'R-in NA BI [. . . ]; should one read then . . . N]A BI ku- [. . . ]?
82. SUM.MA.ME is taken to stand for SUMMA, “the ifs,” that is, the medical omens themselves. ME' is followed by a small low subscript sign like ZA.
ADAD-APLA-IDDINA, ESAGIL-KIN-APLI AND THE SERIES SA.GIG

This single-column tablet is likewise registered as being from Babylon, and is a record of miscellaneous material copied from a wooden tablet. The obverse contains what might be styled a "Poor Man's TDP," since the author has with great despatch reduced the complexity of the forty tablets of SA.GIG to a single statement for each part of the body, arranged approximately (pace line 20) ištu qaqqadi adi šepē, of which the following diagnoses survive:

**BM 47687+**

**Transliteration**

| Obv. 1 | [. . . ša-ta-na]-as-st SU ša-nim : 4[. . .] |
| Obv. 2 | [. . . šu K][²][šu] SU 4[. . .] |
| Obv. 3 | [. . . šu K][³][šu] SU 4t[. . .] |
| Obv. 4 | [. . . šu K][⁴][šu] SU 4[. . .] |
| Obv. 5 | [. . . šu K][⁵][šu] SU 4t[. . .] |
| Obv. 6 | [. . . šu K][⁶][šu] SU 4[. . .] |
| Obv. 7 | [. . . šu K][⁷][šu] SU 4[. . .] |
| Obv. 8 | [. . . . . . . . . .] U 4[. . .] |
| Obv. 9 | [. . . šu] SU ša-nim |
| Obv. 10 | [. . . šu] SU 4tM |
| Obv. 11 | EMES-šu <<u>> mut-ta-bil-t[a-šu K][²][šu] SU 4tU₇-sti₇ |
| Obv. 12 | GABA-su K[³][šu] SU 4š-tar |
| Obv. 13 | BAR.SIL MIN-šu K[³][šu] SU 4P A u 4LU GAL |
| Obv. 14 | K[³][šu] SU 4š-tar |
| Obv. 15 | K[³][šu] SU 4[. . .] |
| Obv. 16 | SVA.MES-šu SAR.EMES-šu SU 4[. . .] |
| Obv. 17 | MUR.BEB-SAR[šu] K[³][šu] SU 4[. . .] |
| Obv. 18 | GIR 15-šu K[³][šu] SU 4[. . .] |
| Obv. 19 | GIR 150-šu K[³][šu] SU 4[. . .] |
| Obv. 20 | UGU₄ ma-bi-tu [. . .] SU 4za-[ba₄-ba₄] |
| Obv. 21 | [. . . ša-ta-na]-as-st SU 4[. . .] |
| Obv. 22 | [. . . šu K][⁴][šu] SU 4[. . .] |

The reverse of BM 47687+, missing perhaps a single line at the top, lists and equates the watches of the night (1'-3'), and gives prescriptions for salves (and in one case a fumigant) against fever (4'-6'), the evil alā (7'-9'), and madness (10'-11'). The scribe's name survives, and the colophon may be restored with some confidence as follows:

[IC]ILKAR IClTAB SU še-ma²-ia

This tablet belongs with a group of scholarly texts in a similar hand and style, all found in the 81-11-3 collection, whose scribal names from the colophons invite comparison:
(a) BM 47463 (81-11-3,168), explanatory text:\textsuperscript{83}
DUB AŠ še-ma-\textsuperscript{-}i-dá A =A-DI-ru
(b) BM 47451 (81-11-3,156), bil. usburrua inc.:  
ŠUL mše-ma-\textsuperscript{-}i-dá A ŠÚ šá m\^\textsuperscript{d}a-ba,<ba<\textsuperscript{4}pir-\textsuperscript{2}u-ŠES A =A-DI-ru
(c) BM 47459 (81-11-3,164), ritual:  
IM.GID.DA = [. . . . . . ] m\^\textsuperscript{d}a-ba,<ba<\textsuperscript{4}NUNUZ-Š[ES] DUMU =e-ti-ru
(d) BM 47491 (81-11-3,196), Frauenkrankheit:  
IM AŠ še-ma-\textsuperscript{-}ia DUMU šá *za-ba,<ba<\textsuperscript{4}NUNUZ-ŠES A =e-ti-ru
A further text must also be compared:
(e) BM 47506 (81-11-3,211), medical:  
[. . . . . . ]x-\textsuperscript{u}š-ru A ŠÚ šá m\^\textsuperscript{d}a-ba,<ba<\textsuperscript{4}pir-\textsuperscript{2}u-ŠES A =e-ti-ru

Since A may be read e (\textsuperscript{4}še-ru\textsubscript{e} etc.), taken together these colophons provide the following branch of a scholarly family tree for Babylon in the Persian period:

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Ētiru} \\
| \text{Zababa-pir\textsuperscript{2}u-ṣru} \\
| \text{Šema\textsuperscript{a}} \\
| [. . . ]x-\textsuperscript{u}š-ru
\end{array} \]

It is likely that Zababa here is to be understood and read as Marduk, in which case two further spellings may be compared:

- (f) BM 47529+47685 (81-11-3,234+390), Comm. on Marduk’s Address:  
[. . . . . . ]\textsuperscript{4}ša.ZU-pi\textsuperscript{2}r-u-ṣ-ru A =e-f[i-ru]
- (g) BM 47462 (81-11-3,167), ābütu Alu omens:  
AŠ SIR\textsuperscript{4}.NUNUZ-ŠES A =e-f[i-ru]

A third, in which \textsuperscript{4}AMAR.UTU is written, adds another generation:

- (h) BM 47456 (81-11-3,161), Iqqur-Ipuš:  
ŠUL =\textsuperscript{4}AMAR.UTU-NUNUZ-ŠES DUMU šá =IR-ŠKÁ A =A-DI-ru

Provisionally, then, one may suggest the following:

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Ētiru} \\
| \text{Urad-Baba} \\
| \text{Marduk-pir\textsuperscript{2}u-ṣru} \quad \text{(floruit: [an] Artaxerxes year 9)} \\
| \text{Šema\textsuperscript{a}} \\
| [. . . ]x-\textsuperscript{u}š-ru
\end{array} \]

\textsuperscript{83}. Published in A. Livingstone, Mystical and Mythological Explanatory Works of Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars (Oxford, 1986), pls. iii-v; see pp. 259-260. There seems to be no sure reason to assume that mše-ma-\textsuperscript{-}a is a Hebrew scribe, since -ma would be expected. The use of AŠ for DIŠ before the name also in BM 47491 and BM 47462 below shows that this is not a mistake in BM 47483; compare K.2596 rev. iii 18’ at footnote St and, e.g., K.8173 11’-12’: AŠ 4.ZU-ZU-DU.DU A AŠ 4.KU.KU.x [. . . ]  ta-na\textsuperscript{a} ta-mar-ti-šá št-ṣur (colophon).

\textsuperscript{84}. For Sirsir = Marduk see B. Landsberger, WO 1 (1947) 362-366.
Note finally one further text from this group:

(i) BM 47447 (81-11-3, 152), Comm. on EAE:

\[ IM \approx \text{še-ma-ia} \ A \approx \text{IR-ba-ú} \ A \approx \text{e-ši-ru}, \]

dated ITU.ÁS UD 23.KAM MU 19.KAM \( ^m \text{ar-tak-Šat-su} \) LUGAL.

It is curious that Šema’a has omitted his father’s name. Comparison of these colophons highlights the uncertainties involved in reconstructing scribal families.

The preceding remarks\(^5\) are respectfully dedicated to the memory of Abraham J. Sachs, who was a bit of an apkallu himself. Would but that the present publication were his Festschrift and not his Memorial Volume.

\(^5\) It is a pleasure to acknowledge the helpful discussion of several points in this paper with J. A. Black, M. J. Geller, J. V. Kinnier Wilson, and W. G. Lambert. I am particularly grateful to Prof. Franz Köcher for his careful reading of the manuscript. Such errors as may have escaped remain the writer’s responsibility.
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