Further Apprenticeship: šamallû to mašmaššu ṣehru

This chapter discusses the limited material that exists from Kiṣir-Aššur's "apprentice" šamallû, "junior apprentice exorcist" šamallû mašmaššu ṣehru and "junior exorcist" mašmaššu ṣehru phases to provide an overview of what is currently known about these intermediate phases of his training. Furthermore, a text related to calming an infant or a child from Kiṣir-Aššur's šamallû mašmaššu ṣehru-phase is used to suggest that he acquired healing competences related to children. This chapter therefore discusses Kiṣir-Aššur's possible involvement in healing infants and considers the general theories on infant and child healing in relation to Kiṣir-Aššur's previous tablets. Texts from Kiṣir-Aššur's nephew, Kiṣir-Nabû, are used to contextualize and discuss Kiṣir-Aššur's manuscripts from his šamallû mašmaššu ṣehru- and mašmaššu ṣehru-phases. Furthermore, Kiṣir-Aššur's tablets labelled as uʾiltus are also discussed in general.

Additionally, this chapter examines Kiṣir-Aššur's use of the phrase "(he) whose trust is Nabû" (ša Nabû tuklasssu) in colophons from his šamallû ṣehru and šamallû mašmaššu ṣehru phases, as well as on tablets without titles. This facilitates the distribution of a few tablets without titles onto Kiṣir-Aššur's apprentice career phases.

5.1 The šamallû-phase

After Kiṣir-Aššur's relatively well-attested šamallû ṣehru-phase, Kiṣir-Aššur became a šamallû "apprentice" (Maul 2010: 208 and note 67). The phase is unfortunately only attested by two texts, of which one is unpublished. What follows presents the relevant tablets and their content in order to facilitate a cautious discussion of the manuscripts in relation to Kiṣir-Aššur's career. The texts are listed in the table below.

KAL 10 no. 4 is a large tablet with an introductory diagnostic statement as well as a multitude of incantations and brief instructions directed at releasing a "Curse" (rev. 46: [KA.INI]M.MA [NAM]É[RIM.BÚR]. [RU].DA.KÁM).
TABLE 6  Texts assigned to Kišir-Aššur’s šamallû-phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Format and designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KAL 10 no. 4</td>
<td>Obverse and reverse: a diagnostic statement and ritual instruction (obv. 1–11), nine incantations (obv. 12–13, 14–33, 36–49, 50–55, obv. 57–rev. 5, rev. 6–20, 22–30, 32–37, 39–44) and six brief instructions (obv. 34–35, 56, rev. 21, 31, 38, 45) all against a “Curse” (māmītu) (rev. 46)</td>
<td>Portrait; ūlłu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N4 no. 175</td>
<td>Obverse and reverse: instructions for performing sections of the bīt mēserī ritual (obv. 1–rev. 7, rev. 8–17) with at least 15 incantation incipits preserved and associated brief ritual instructions (obv. 15, 17, 19, 26, 37(?), 39, 41, 43, 45, 52, rev. 3, 9, 14, 15, 16)</td>
<td>Portrait; ūlłu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Kišir-Aššur’s title is preserved in rev. 19 as ḫšAB.T[UR]. Seeing as the line is not tightly written, there is no reason to assume further signs should be reconstructed, although the side of the tablet is broken and it could technically have held ḫšAB.T[UR TUR].

The colophon provides the writing ḫšam-lu-Tū for the title šamallû (rev. 48). The text ends with a curse: “[He who] carries off [is tablet], may the gods of heaven and earth take away his eye(sight)”.2

The unpublished text N4 no. 175 outlines parts of the ritual known as bīt mēserī “the house of confinement” (Borger 1974; see also ibid. 1994). As shown in the detailed discussion of this ritual in Section 6.3.2, bīt mēserī made use of a number of figurines and drawings alongside incantations and ritual actions, in order to rid a patient and his house of demons (Seidl and Sallaberger 2005–06: 67; Wiggermann 1992: 106–13; Meier 1941–44: 140). A line in N4 no. 175 indicates that the ritual was somehow connected to the ritual action of “rubbing” (muššuʾu, rev. 6; see also Böck 2007; ibid. 2003). In the colophon, an erased line

---

1 Such a spelling is not attested in Kišir-Aššur’s other tablets with titles composed of the word šamallû (šeḫru/mašmaššu šeḫru). However, the abbreviated form is attested elsewhere in Assur and Ḥuzirina (e.g., Fadhil 2012: 55; Hunger 1968: 10).

2 KAL 10 no. 4 rev. 51: [ša ūlłu šu]-a-šú TŪM DINGIR ša-me-e qa-a-ra IG1-šu lit-[ba-lu]. Note also the writing IG1.KĀR in rev. 48 for bari “checked”, which is otherwise only attested in Kišir-Aššur’s N4 no. 224 from an uncertain phase of his career.
between rev. 18 and 19 still has ŠID-nu legible, and the line may once have held additional instructions.

In N4 no. 175 Kiṣir-Aššur’s name is written pZÚ.KEŠDÀ-d aš-šur, which is otherwise only attested in BAM 121 from an uncertain phase (see Sections 5.4 and 7.2.1). Furthermore, he copied his father Nabû-bêssunu’s title mašmaš bīt Aššur with a Babylonian form of the sign Š, possibly indicating that Kiṣir-Aššur was trained in Babylonian sign forms.3 The tablet was also described as “quickly extracted for his (own) ‘reading’”.4 In this context, the word tāmartu can be translated “viewing, reading” (CAD T: 111–114; AHw: 1313), and it must be considered a technical term related to knowledge acquisition, although the exact nuances are not clear (see Robson 2019: 124 and note 117; ibid. 2014: 152; Geller 2010: 134, 136–138). However, N4 no. 175 is the only tablet among Kiṣir-Aššur’s manuscripts with this phrase (cf. ACh Supp. 2 24 in Section 7.6). By comparison, Kiṣir-Nabû copied at least three tablets “for his (own) ‘reading’”, and these are all commentaries.5 The colophon of N4 no. 175 ends with a warning to the reader: “He who carries (the tablet) off, wherever he lifts his hands to (praise) Nabû, let him (i.e. Nabû) not hear his prayer, [he who fea]rs Nabû and Marduk shall not erase my written name!”6

Both Kiṣir-Aššur’s šamallû-phase tablets contain portions of two types of rituals, which were integral to the ašipu’s profession according to the EM (Geller 2018b; ibid. 2000). The manuscripts indicate that Kiṣir-Aššur as a šamallû focused on acquiring further ritual means to treat a so-called “Curse”, possibly as a cause of illness, as well as gaining an insight into how the important demarcation ritual bīt mêseri was performed. The latter observation is supported by the addition of the phrase “for his ‘reading’” in the colophon. Overviews of rituals slightly similar in form to N4 no. 175, although with different aims, are otherwise found during Kiṣir-Aššur’s mašmašsu-phase (KAR 298) and on a tablet without a title (KAL 10 no. 1). Presumably, Kiṣir-Aššur’s two šamallû tablets enabled Kiṣir-Aššur to apply ritual treatments towards “Curse” as a cause of illness and aid in preparing or performing the bīt mêseri ritual.

3 The Š in Nabû-bêssunu’s title mašmaš bīt Aššur was also written with a Babylonian form of the sign in N4 no. 241, copied on behalf of Kiṣir-Aššur as a šamallû šeḥru (Section 3.7.3). Note also the Babylonian form of the sign LÚ in the colophon of BAM 28 (see Ch. 8 note 18).


5 AfO 12 pl. 13–14 (ana IGI.DU₈.A-šú), a commentary on Tummu bītu and Šurpu tablet 2 (CCP 2.1.C); N4 no. 163 (ana IGI.LA-šú), a commentary on Marduk’s Address to the Demons (CCP 2.2.1.Aa); N4 no. 220 (ana a-ma-ri-šú), a commentary on Tummu bītu and Maqlû tablets 1–2 (CCP 2.1.A). Kiṣir-Nabû also copied three texts with related terminology: BAM 52 (mašALTU), BAM 106 (mašALTU) and Iraq 62 no. 35 (mašALTU), see Frahm 2011a: 268–270; CCP 2.2.1.Ab).

5.2 The šamallû mašmaššu ṣeḫru-phase

After the “apprentice”-phase, Kiṣir-Aššur became a “junior apprentice exorcist”. Previous research has not been able to differentiate these phases beyond the change in titles.\(^7\) Due to the meagre šamallû evidence presented above, doing so remains difficult. Regardless, it is still possible to present some observations in relation to the available evidence. Kiṣir-Aššur only copied three preserved texts during his šamallû mašmaššu ṣeḫru-phase, and these are presented in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Format and designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LKA 89+LKA 90</strong></td>
<td>Obverse and reverse (col. i–iv): diagnostic statement(?) (col. i 1'), instruction with embedded incantation (col. i 2'–26'+ col. i 1&quot;–9&quot;), prayers and incantations (col. i 10&quot;27&quot;+col. ii 1–12, col. ii 14–22+col. ii 1'–30'+col. iii 1–9, col. iii 12–30, col. iii 32–47, col. iii 49–68+col. iv 1–4, col. iv 5–18+col. iv 1'–3'), and brief instructions (col. ii 13, col. iii 10–11, col. iii 31, col. iii 48) all directed against ghostly afflictions</td>
<td>Two-columned; ṭuppu(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LKA 141</strong></td>
<td>Obverse and reverse: prayers (obv. 1–3, 17–20+[…]), an incantation (rev. 1'), and ritual instructions (obv. 4–15, rev. 3'–8') for reconciling a man with his god.</td>
<td>Portrait(?); ṭuppu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N4 no. 24</strong>(^a)</td>
<td>Obverse and reverse: incantation revolving around Lamaštu (obv. 1–rev. 15) with a rubric stating it was designed to “calm a child” (rev. 16: LÚ.TUR.ḪUN.GÁ)</td>
<td>Landscape; IM.ĠÍ.D.A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^a\) According to the most recent copy by Farber (1989: pl. 13). Kiṣir-Aššur was mašmaššu ṣeḫru (MAŠ.MAŠ TUR) when he copied this text. However, recent collations by Daniel Schwemer (personal communication) revealed the writing ŠÁMAN.LÁ in a smaller script underneath his title. This addition indicates Kiṣir-Aššur was šamallû mašmaššu ṣeḫru when the tablet was copied.

---

\(^7\) E.g., Robson 2014, 2011a; Maul 2010a; Gesche 2001: 213; Pearce 1993; Hunger 1968: 9–10.
**Further Apprenticeship: šamallû to mašmaššu šēhru**

*LKA 89+* is a two-columned tablet with incantations and ritual instructions against ghostly afflictions. These instructions aimed to free the patient of a ghost and to banish it to the netherworld, taking the generic “Any Evil” (*mimma lemnu*) with it. Ghosts were regularly treated in Kišir-Aššur’s texts, and he had previously treated the effects of these to some degree in the šamallû šēhru manuscript N4 no. 237 and the presumed šamallû šēhru tablet *BAM* 9. Interestingly, *LKA 89+* is described as an extract, although it is a library copy (multi-columned). The reason for this discrepancy could stem from the text having been copied from a writing-board and originally having been part of an even bigger text. It is therefore possible that the *nisḫu* label could describe both multi-columned tablets as well as brief extracts in N4. As a result, it can be difficult to establish what purpose a text served after its immediate use in the N4 collection. The multi-columned format could perhaps indicate a wish to keep the text for reference in the library afterwards, although in the case

---

8 For the most recent edition and copy, see *CMAwR* 2: 189ff. text 8.25 ms B; see also Scurlock 1988a no. 85, 87; Ebeling 1931a: 122ff.; cf. Abusch 2002: 76–78; Bottéro 1983. The join between *LKA 89+* and *LKA 90* was previously noted by Pedersén 1986: 72 no. 523; see also Verderame 2008: 56.

9 Abusch 2002: 76–77. The removal of *mimma lemnu* is also frequently stressed in the Ištar-Dumuzi incantation rituals (Farber 1977: 9). Ghost rituals were also used in, e.g., *bīt rimki* and the New Year festival, and were therefore not exclusively related to healing, but also stately or royal rituals (see Ambos 2013a: 52, 57ff., 201ff.; Scurlock 1988a: 127). Large parts of the row of entries and content are duplicated in the multi-columned *KAR* 227 (= N4 no. 88) written without a colophon. However, the end of *LKA 89+* col. iv cannot be found on *KAR* 227. Although large parts of *LKA 89+* are broken and cannot be assessed, the differences observed are on the reverse in col. iii of both examples, where the incantation in *KAR* 227 col. iii 8’–24’ is duplicated in *LKA 89+* col. iii 2’–17’. The *LKA 89+* entry opens with ŠN, which is not written in *KAR* 227. Furthermore, *LKA 89+* col. iii 17’ and the small instruction in 18’ were divided onto two lines each in *KAR* 227 col. iii 13’–14’ and 15’–16’.

10 *LKA 89+* col. iv 9’: [(x) x x x x x x x x x]’ na-as-ḫa. Presumably, the line read *ḫanṭiš or zamar* before, but the line ends with *nasḫa* written very tightly, and likely more than three signs were originally on the line. It is therefore difficult to account for so many broken signs without considering that the line originally contained another statement, such as a purpose statement (*ana šabāt epēšī*; see *KAR* 374 rev. 21; *LKA* 157 col. iv 12’). Such statements are argued in Section 7.4 to occur around the *mašmašša*-phase. However, other texts only contain the *ḫanṭiš nasāḫu* statement on the last line, although the lines could easily hold more signs (*BAM* 81 rev. 18’; *BAM* 186 rev. 34; *BAM* 188 rev. 13; *BAM* 351 rev. 15; cf. *BAM* 333 rev. 4’). *LKA 89+* is said to be “written and checked according to its original”, *LKA 89+* col. iv 5’: *LIBIR.RA.BI.GIM AB.SAR.ÂM bâ-ri.*

11 It is unclear if *nasḫa* always designates extracts in N4, or if the verb could be used to designate a copy (cf. Black 1985).

12 This suggestion is built on the assumption that such formats normally served such purposes. However, this cannot be substantiated, although this was likely the case at Nineveh. Robson (2014: 146–47) has shown that this collection was in fact atypical in
of *LKA* 89+, the format may simply imply that Kišir-Aššur needed to copy out more text than what could be copied onto a single columned format tablet.

*LKA* 141 contains at least two prayers and accompanying ritual instructions (Pedersén 1986: 73 no. 543), which concern one(?) ritual for reconciling a man with the god (or goddess) of his house (Ebeling 1953a: XI11).  

*N4* no. 24 was designated as a “recitation to calm a child” (KA.INIM.MA LÚ.TUR ḪUN.GÁ.KE₄). The term translated as “child” here, šēhru or šerru, can also designate a baby or an infant (see Farber 1989: 132–36). The incantation revolves around the demoness Lamaštu and therefore does not contain typical lullaby-like child calming motifs (e.g., Farber 1990a). Instead, it describes how Lamaštu stalks around a house and among the domesticated animals, luring the children to her venomous teats (Farber 2014: 301; Wiggermann 2000: 231 and note 93). The unsettling fear established by the crying of an infant heralded the presence of Lamaštu (ibid.: 237; Cadelli 1997: 26), and the family’s ancestors and domestic cult could be severely disturbed by children crying (Stol 2000: 212–13; van der Toorn 1996: 18–19, 121, 125).

Lamaštu was the daughter of Anu, she killed babies by posing as a midwife and was formally installed by the gods to keep population growth in check (Wiggermann 2000: 224–25). She preferably attacked babies and pregnant women by causing a number of symptoms (e.g., fever, intestinal problems, red rash) related to other illnesses (e.g., jaundice, pašittu) potentially leading to death (Wiggermann 2000: 236–39; Stol 2000: 210). Problems during pregnancy and birth as well as protecting and curing ill babies were all part of ašipūtu, and these areas are therefore expected to appear during the training of exorcists.

The themes encountered during this particular level of education appear to revolve around the cult of the house, i.e., the family cult, the personal deities attached to a house as well as calming infants crying, and how to appease and

---

several ways. In general, good copies could have been kept as library copies to replace older tablets in worse condition, although this would not necessarily depend on format (Clancier 2014: 46).

13 *LKA* 141 rev. 2’: KA.INI[MM]A DINGIR LÚ KI LÚ ’x’[x x x (x)]. The first prayer mentions in obv. 1: ... lu-u DINGIR Šlu-u ʾt5 Šlu-u DING[IR LÚ’ ...]. Furthermore, this colophon is the only instance where Kišir-Aššur writes the divine element of his father, Nabû-bēssunu’s name phonetically: na-bi-um. However, the spelling is peculiar. The tablet remains unedited.

14 Farber 1989: 102–107 ms L, pl. 13; Farber specifies that such incantations could serve to calm a crying child, to heal an ill child or to protect a child from dangers prophylactically (ibid.: 3; George 1993b; cf. van der Toorn 1996: 120).

15 Jean 2006: 66; Geller 2000: 245, 256–58; Stol 2000: 59ff.; KAR 44 obv. 15: MUNUS NU ’[el-hu] mPEŠ₄.KÉŠ.DA ml|LA.RA.AH *DIM₄.ME.KÁM u LÚ.TUR.HUN.GÁ, “(When) a woman is unclean Woman not able to give birth, travailing woman in difficulty because of Lamaštu, (incantations) to calm a child”.
Further Apprenticeship: šamallû to mašmaššu ṣeḫru

remove the evils induced by the divinities’ dissatisfaction with the inhabitants. Apart from the possible uses to treat the cause behind an illness, reconciling a man with his god and treating ghosts as causes of domestic troubles implies that something could upset a household’s various deities. In the first half of the second millennium, crying children were notorious for disturbing the peace of the family, as well as the domestic cult (van der Toorn 1996: 120–21, 125–28; cf. Farber 1989: 1–4; Farber 1990a), and sleeping or resting gods evidently considered noise a disturbance. With N4 no. 24, Kiṣir-Aššur became able to calm a child and prophylactically keep Lamaštu at bay while ensuring that domestic cultic aggravation, which he also learned to handle as šamallû mašmaššu ṣeḫru, was less prone to happen.

Although one can only consider this evidence tentative, Kiṣir-Aššur appears to have learned these genres in order to remove domestic misfortune and possible sources of illness. Exorcistic healing of illness appears to have involved a dual approach by ritually soothing the anger of the divine cause and providing a physical treatment (Heeßel 2000: 94–96; cf. Stol 1991–92: 44ff.; van der Toorn 1985: 67ff.). Kiṣir-Aššur may therefore have focused his attention on the latter during his šamallû ṣeḫru-phase in particular, whereas especially the šamallû mašmaššu ṣeḫru-phase could have focused on soothing (possible) causes of illness. As stated above, it is unknown if the rituals were learned in order to treat possible estranged divinities before illness, or as a dual approach while healing illness. Furthermore, as argued in the following sections, N4 no. 24 may indicate that Kiṣir-Aššur also had pediatric duties during his šamallû mašmaššu ṣeḫru-phase.

5.2.1 The Child Calming Incantation N4 no. 24 and Duplicates

Kiṣir-Aššur’s nephew, Kiṣir-Nabû, copied roughly the same Lamaštu incantation as Kiṣir-Aššur’s N4 no. 24, although Kiṣir-Nabû produced his copy as mašmaššu and included a ritual. N4 no. 24 contains no ritual instruction and deals explicitly with Lamaštu and is intended to calm a child, whereas the

---

17 Heffron 2014: 88–93; Stol 2000: 211–213; van der Toorn 1996: 18–19, 121, 125; Farber 1990a: 146–47. A frequently cited example is the motif of noise in Atra-ḫasīs causing Enlil to become so angry it results in the flood (Lambert and Millard 1969). Michalowski (1990: 385–89) argues that the metaphor of noise in mythological narratives “establishes a privileged position for the concept of creation, activity, independence”, which in Atram-ḫasīs asserts humanity as “an independent, creative being” (ibid.: 389). Therefore, he does not regard noise as a literal mark of overpopulation. See also Machinist 1983 for noise as a motif in the Erra Epic.
ritual instruction in Kišir-Nabû’s N4 no. 247 indicates that the purpose was to keep the child safe by applying ingredients to the child to keep Lamaštu, as well as “Any Evil” (mîmma lemnu), at bay.19

The colophon of Kišir-Aššur’s N4 no. 24 contains a tablet designation, his name, and a title. The tablet is labelled as an IM.GÍD.DA (lit.: “Long tablet”), a label interpreted in other studies as an exercise (see Ch. 6 notes 4–5). In comparison, Kišir-Nabû’s N4 no. 247 was categorized as an uʾiltu, perhaps indicating an obligation of some sort (see Section 5.3.2). N4 no. 247 was copied when Kišir-Nabû was mašmaššu, and it was copied according to a Nineveh(?) writing-board copied from Nippur.20 Kišir-Aššur provided no copying statement for his content in N4 no. 24. Kišir-Nabû’s N4 no. 247 contains several Assyrianisms not present in Kišir-Aššur’s duplicate, despite N4 no. 247 being copied from an alleged Babylonian original (Farber 1989: 103, 105; cf. Farber 2014: 210). Other minor differences in choice of spellings and line division are present in N4 no. 24 and N4 no. 247, although it is currently unclear if the alterations stem from differing recensions (Farber 1989: 103–7). One example of such differences between the texts is:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{N4 no. 247 obv. 2} & \quad \text{ap-re-e-šá} \quad \text{up-pu-rat} \quad \text{AGA-š[á ...]} \\
\text{N4 no. 24 obv. 2–3} & \quad \text{up-ru-šá} \quad \text{up-pu-rat}^3 \quad \text{a-ga-šá} \quad \text{ap-rat} \\
\text{LKU 32 obv. 12} & \quad \text{up-ri-šá} \quad \text{up-pu-ra[t ...]} \\
\end{align*}
\]

The later Babylonian duplicate LKU 32 also shares features with both N4 no. 24,21 as well as N4 no. 247.22 Thus, it is unclear how many recensions these three texts represent. Notably, the IM.GÍD.DA B̄AM 102 copied by Kišir-Aššur

---


21 Mainly choice of words and writings, for example: N4 no. 24 obv. 5 \textit{du-ra-niš} uš-ta-na-ār N4 no. 247 obv. 4 \textit{se-ra-niš} uš-ta-[na-šak(?)] LKU 32 obv. 13 \textit{du-ra-niš} uš-ta-na-ār...

Farber (2014: 35) noted that \textit{LKU 32} contains “several Assyrianisms not present in the Assur ‘version’”, which is presumably represented by Kišir-Aššur’s N4 no. 24. However, Kišir-Nabû’s N4 no. 247 also contains Assyrianisms (Farber 1989: 103).

22 Especially the ritual instruction. \textit{LKU 32} also contains at least three other associated incantations and ritual instructions.
as mašmaššu is largely similar in structure to N4 no. 24, i.e., only an incantation and an explicit statement about not having written a ritual, which could indicate that Kiṣir-Aššur was practicing certain shorter incantations for a specific purpose during these phases (see also the šamallû šehru manuscript N4 A 400). Comparably, his father Nabû-bēssunu copied KAL 4 no. 6 as mašmaššu šehru, and this tablet likely only contained a single prayer related to a namburbi-ritual.

5.2.2 Excursus: Paediatricians and Treatments

Unlike veterinarians, no titles are known for ancient paediatricians, but only for midwives. Nevertheless, the exorcist was involved in assessing the physiognomy of humans in general, as well as providing prophylactic or therapeutic treatment of children. The 40th tablet of Sa-gig attests to 112 diagnoses of child symptoms (Volk 1999: 13; Cadelli 1997: 12–13). The most dominant among the problems diagnosed are behavioural problems, such as the ones presumably treated by N4 no. 24, and digestive disorders such as colic (Cadelli 1997: 26, 29). Although age is rarely specified, the entries may often concern newborns as well as babies (Cadelli 1997: 13).

Already during pregnancy, Lamaštu and witchcraft could pose a threat to the unborn child (Cadelli 1997: 15). Some demonic beings could even be born with the child, such as Lugal-urra or Šulpaea (Cadelli 1997: 15; Stol 1993: 89). This portended a scattered house (Volk 1999: 18 note 108). Cramps associated with epilepsy were particularly ominous (ibid.: 16–17; Cadelli 1997: 23–24). These symptoms could foreshadow a fatal end for mother, father or the entire household (Volk 1999: 17 and note 102; Stol 1993: 89). Jaundice (aḫḫāzu in

---

23 OB Mari was probably famous as a centre for healing child illnesses (Volk 1999: 29–30 and notes 179–80 with references). For midwives, see Stol 2000: 171–76.
24 Steinert 2018c: 181; Böck 2000: 32, 313, 315; Stol 2000: 59–72. However, the exorcist is advised not to see the mother for a duration of one month after birth (Stol 2000: 206). Note that at least one incipit related to birth is only attested in the N4 text collection (Steinert 2018d: 272; N4 no. 167).
25 The general writing is LÚ .TUR for “baby, newborn, infant, child”, which can be read śerru, the more literary laʾû/lakû, or the common designation for a child šehru (Stol 2000: 176; cf. Volk 1999: 12 note 73 with references to discussion).
26 Infant colic can present itself as a regular occurring emotional response involving crying, screaming and occasional difficulty in breathing because of the “fussing”, combined with physical manifestations such as stomach pains, regurgitation and diarrhoea (Hyman et al. 2006: 1522–1523; Wessel et al. 1954).
27 See also Sa-gig tablet 29, in which various ominous portents are specified if a child is born with Antašubba or Šulpaea or if these demons fall on a child during various periods of the child’s life (Scurlock 2014: 219–220; Heeßel 2000: 318–338).
tablet 40), which could signal the presence of Lamaštu in children, was also considered ominous, and the birth of a yellow child heralded the death of the owner of the house.

Some physical symptoms could therefore herald the destruction of a household. Treatments safeguarding the household and keeping it in balance were essential, and such purposes seem to correspond to Kišir-Aššur’s šamallû mašmaššu seḫru texts and large parts of his mašmaššu texts concerning, e.g., namburbi-rituals (see Sections 5.2 and 6.4).

Little is known about what therapeutic treatments for diseases were applied to babies. The best information stems from the NA royal correspondence, although we often find only brief remarks that a child is doing well. Nonetheless, some exorcists practicing at the contemporary NA royal court at Nineveh, may have been involved in observing and healing infants or children in addition to adults (e.g., Parpola 1993 nos. 213–215, 218, 302, 305). Volk (1999: 11) regarded it as a chance of discovery that child treatments are so poorly documented in medical literature. However, child healing is not listed as an identifiable category in the AMC.

Nonetheless, many illness diagnoses for children are attested in “adult” versions (Cadelli 1997: 32). It is therefore plausible, although impossible to prove, that at least older children received the same (modified) treatments as adults.

28 Lamaštu was known as “the goddess who (makes) his face yellow” ul-tú ša IGI-šú SIG7 (Volk 1999: 24 note 137 with reference).

29 De Zorzi 2014: 44; Cadelli 1997: 31; Leichty 1970: 66; tablet 4 line 5: [BE SAL Ù.TU]-ma MIN-ma (= ul-la-nu-um-ma) SIG7 ma-[li] EN É ÚŠ, “If a woman gives birth, and at the birth (the child) is already fully yellow (Leichty: flecked with green (spots)) – the owner of the house will die.”

30 For boy’s problems, see George 2016: 167–68. Note BAM 248 col. iv 39–43 with prophylactic treatments for keeping “hands” of various deities from approaching infants (Scurllock 2014: 626ff.). Scurllock (ibid.: 621) furthermore states: “Treatments specifically and exclusively designed for infants or toddlers are relatively rare and usually scattered among prescriptions for adults with similar problems.” For additional examples of treatments for adults or children, as well as cures exclusively for children, see Steinert 2018d: 228.


32 The evidence from the antechamber to the third NA tomb at Nimrud showed several individuals ranging 6–12 years of age, a fully grown foetus (8th–9th lunar month), and a baby (3–9 months) (Macgregor 2012: 81; Müller-Karpe et al. 2008: 144). Although these individuals must date to the 8th century, it is uncertain whether or not these were royal children.

33 Apart from pregnancy and birth which occur near the end of the AMC, the best candidate is an earlier entry in line 98: [...] ana dDIM₉.M[E] Z[1-hê x x x], “for era[dicating(?)] Lamaštu [...]”.
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Further Apprenticeship: šamallû to mašmaššu šeḫru (ibid.: 33 note 159).
A human adult treatment was perhaps also modified into at least one horse prescription in BAM 159 (Stol 2011: 395 and note 223; cf. Böck 2009a: 117–18). I would also like to emphasize the recent findings by Heeßel (2006: 19–20) concerning the possible lack of differences between the treatment of men and women in major parts of the first 35 tablets of Sa-gig. This could indicate that the diagnostic and therapeutic corpora may not always have been applied exclusively to the identified gender, even species, and perhaps also age group.

In relation to horses in particular, it is noteworthy that they and children are prone to nasal breathing and regurgitation (Section 4.4.2). Furthermore, gastro-intestinal disorders are regularly observed in both horses and infants (Hyman et al. 2006: 1519; Gonçalves et al. 2002: 643). This may indicate an overlap in physiological conception, and due to the possible physiological knowledge taught to Kiṣir-Aḫšur as šamallû šeḫru concerning horses, we can perhaps hypothesize an overlap between some child and horse illnesses, and maybe adult treatments for similar problems.

The AMC may indicate that conditions occurring in both children and adults were integrated into the adult sections of such medical texts, e.g., AMC line 23 adds šá LÚ.TUR and AMC line 28 adds ū LÚ.TUR su-alu GI (Steinert 2018d: 227–228, 230). However, such cures are not found in the majority of therapeutic manuscripts, and the phrases above could therefore indicate that the prescriptions for adults referenced in AMC line 23 and 28 could be modified and applied to children.

It is unclear if Sa-gig tablet 40 lists any cases of “regurgitation”, although it may be described by the verb šurrūtu (Cadelli 1997: 17, 20, 30; cf. Scurlock and Andersen 2005: 749 note 120). It therefore remains uncertain if “regurgitation” was differentiated from “vomiting” in terminology (cf. Volk 1999: 20–21; see translation by Scurlock 2014: 263–269).

This would require an understanding of how little medication a baby or an infant would need. Today, presumably as in ancient times, children are usually treated for issues connected to nutrition, common and infectious diseases, as well as injuries or trauma (see, e.g., Scurlock and Andersen 2005: 410ff.; Cadelli 1997: 20–21, 27–29). It is noteworthy that such issues are often treated similarly regardless of age. However, symptoms of diseases can be subtler in babies, and the physician must diagnose beyond specialization. Yet, there is generally little doubt when a child is in pain. Paediatricians today assess pain in infants and young children via a variety of pain scales in order to determine their levels of discomfort (e.g., Beltramini et al. 2017). Infants are prone to non-epileptic motor phenomena, such as tremors, jitters, forms of myoclonus, and brainstem release phenomena (Huntsman et al. 2008). The ancient medical texts seem to focus on such experiences in relation to the infant’s motor system because they could foreshadow severe afflictions, which in turn could affect the entire household (Volk 1999: 16–17; Cadelli 1997: 23–24). These problems would therefore have been a matter of concern for a healer regardless of the medical knowledge gained from treating children. Practicing on infants and children would have allowed a healer to study failures to thrive in a non-verbal environment, how the body communicates problems and levels of pain under such conditions, as well as sharpening their diagnostic abilities, regardless whether or not this could be transferred.
5.2.3 An Interpretation: Kiṣir-Aššur as Paediatrician?

In Section 4.2.2, I suggested that Kiṣir-Aššur might have worked (alongside his father) with animals, perhaps only horses, in addition to humans after having acquired veterinarian knowledge as šamallū šeḫru. Following this line of reasoning, the evidence presented here tentatively suggests that he may have moved on to (aid his father when) treating infants, babies or children at least as šamallū mašmaššu šeḫru. In addition to the obvious dangers of doing more harm than good when practicing medicine, there may have been an economic and ethical value system explaining why practicing on ill animals and babies provided more professional security than on human adults.37

In comparison, the OB laws of Ḥammurabi contain several clauses for both physician (asû) and veterinarian (asî alpim ulu imērim) accidents or malpractice, which are instructive for understanding what was at risk. Although law collections such as the laws of Ḥammurabi may not reflect actual practice, and instead relate to “cultural assumptions and values of their drafters and copyists” (Roth 1995: 4–7 with references),38 they certainly reflect a concern for justice when wronged, which can be used to emphasize tendencies towards punishment:

LḪ paragraph 218: “If a physician (asûm) performs major surgery with a bronze lancet upon an awilum-man and thus causes the awilum’s death, or opens an awilum’s temple with a bronze lancet and thus blinds the awilum’s eye, they shall cut off his hand” (Roth 1995: 123).39

These observations were formulated following a personal communication with Elisabeth Lund, chief paediatrician at Kolding Hospital, Denmark. However, it is also possible that Kiṣir-Aššur copied the incantation N4 no. 24 because he himself became a father around this time (JoAnn Scurlock, personal communication). It cannot be excluded that some texts were copied by Kiṣir-Aššur for reasons unrelated to his profession, similar to one of Nabû-zuquq-kênu’s manuscripts containing the 12th tablet of the Gilgameš Epic (Frahm 1999).

37 One example is the area of surgery, although it is unclear who practiced this in most periods outside of the OB period where the asû is mentioned in this role in the laws of Ḥammurabi (Böck 2014a: 19–20; Geller 2010: 53, 56, 58, 60–61). Even today, there are potential problems related to infections during surgery, and the occasional threat in incantations concerned with “the obsidian blades of Gula” (ṣurrū naglabû Gula) emphasizes that this was likely considered an equal threat to illness and patient alike as a last resort (Böck 2014a: 19; Geller 2010: 3, 54; Collins 1999: 94, 217–18, 233).


39 However, other rules applied if the man was a slave of a commoner (muškênum), see paragraph 219–20.
LḪ paragraph 225: “If he (i.e., a veterinarian, asī alpim ulu imērim) performs major surgery upon an ox or a donkey and thus causes its death, he shall give one quarter(?) of its value to the owner of the ox or donkey” (ibid.: 124).40

Causing the death of an ox or donkey while performing surgery on it resulted in a fine of one-fourth(?) of the animal’s value. However, if a physician caused a man’s (awīlum) death or blinded his eye during surgery, he would have his hand cut off, effectively ending his practice. Therefore, less may have been at stake when treating an animal compared to an adult. Although the laws of Ḫammurabi stem from the OB period, they were actually copied, probably for their historic value, in the N4 collection.41 Still, we do not know if regulations for malpractice stipulated in the laws of Ḫammurabi are applicable to the āšipu’s trade.

Children are not mentioned in the extant law collections in relation to healing, but it must be considered certain that infants were vulnerable during pregnancy and in the time following birth, and that they were occasionally in need of medical assistance (Stol 2000: 27–48, 129–34, 209–14).42 It is therefore plausible that the failed healing (or assisted delivery?) of a prominent family member’s baby could damage your reputation, although you may have been allowed to continue your practice elsewhere.43 If this analysis is correct, it is possible to identify three hypothetical and generalized steps with increased professional consequences as a result of a failed healing:

1) Animals → Economic penalty
2) Infants, babies → Damaged social reputation/social exclusion
3) Adults → Physical penalty/termination of practice

This could imply that some apprentice healers, if trained in all such treatments, may have had greater autonomy when healing animals and babies, as the cost of failure would have been more manageable in terms of continuing

40 One fourth or one fifth of the price is unclear (Roth 1995: 142 note 41).
41 Ismail 1982: 199. It is currently unknown if the content related to the laws or the prologue.
42 For birth at the NA court, see Melville 2004: 37 note 1, 42–43, 47. For birth incantations, see Couto-Ferreira 2017: 58, 63, 64; Böck 2009c: 272–74; Stol 2000: 59–71. Concerning birth, see Steinert 2018d: 272–76 with further references. It seems the death of a child could be associated with misfortune (ibid.: 269–270 with further references).
43 This appears to have been the case for Urad-Gula, the son of Esarhaddon’s chief exorcist Adad-šumu-uṣur. One tenuous suggestion is he was dismissed from the royal court in disgrace because he had failed to oversee the successful delivery of a child, perhaps Assurbanipal’s (SAA 10 no. 293; see Parpola 1983a: 354–56). Perhaps this was the reason for his petition to Assurbanipal in the famed “Forlorn Scholar” letter (SAA 10 no. 294; cf. Geller 2010: 77–79; Parpola 1987: 268–69)?
his career. In these cases, it is likely that the apprentice gained autonomy in treating animals such as horses before babies, which in turn were treated with greater autonomy by the apprentice before adults. However, this remains hypothetical. It should be kept in mind that medical healing often had a religious aspect. In relation to rituals, the success of such performances may have depended on the gods (see Ambos 2010: 17–18). Although healers were likely to be held responsible to some extent for failed healings, it is possible that failure could be interpreted as the will of the gods. Yet, no available sources describe the consequences of an unsuccessful treatment by an āšipu.

The hypothesis above may, however, be tentatively substantiated in relation to Kiṣir-Aššur’s career. As shown in Section 3.5, Kiṣir-Aššur’s šamallū šeẖru tablet RA 15 pl. 76 relates to venomous stings and bites as well as horse treatments (colic?). This tablet may therefore relate to knowledge acquisition or perhaps even practice in these areas of treatment. Kiṣir-Aššur’s šamallū mašmaššu šeẖru tablet N4 no. 24, discussed above, relates to prophylactically treating a child. The evidence is therefore vague and limited. A number of texts copied by Kiṣir-Nabû and related to children and pregnancy are copied during his mašmaššu šeẖru- and mašmaššu-phases, thus indicating such material belonged to later phases.

The surviving evidence indicates that Kiṣir-Aššur may have worked with treatments related to horses before children, although he also copied adult treatments as šamallū šeẖru. Though it is possible that Kiṣir-Aššur aided in practicing on adults alongside animals and children throughout his apprenticeship, I draw on the value system outlined above to suggest that he may have experienced greater autonomy when treating on animals and children before becoming an autonomous healer of adults as well. I therefore hypothesize that Kiṣir-Aššur, in addition to periodically aiding his father with a range of healing activities, may have had greater autonomy when treating horses (and other animals?) and babies before moving on to practice healing on human adults without supervision as mašmaššu.

---

44 Adults were probably also the most valuable members of a household to keep healthy. Furthermore, adults would also have been able to complain verbally, whereas animals and babies can mainly communicate their distress non-verbally if crying and screams are disregarded.

45 For a survey of ritual failures and mistakes, see Ambos 2007. Some texts stress illnesses that the healer should not attempt to heal (Schwemer 2011: 434).
5.3 The mašmaššu šeḫru-phase

Kiṣir-Aššur’s “junior exorcist” mašmaššu šeḫru-phase is poorly attested, with only one text preserved. Sadly, the manuscript is unpublished and little is known about the content. Nonetheless, a few observations can still be made.

Although the exact content of N4 A 2727 is currently unknown, the text contains two incantations with instructions for application, of which the first incantation duplicates BAM 105 obv. 1–6 and presumably also STT 97 col. iv 25–29 (Daniel Schwemer, personal communication). This brief incantation mentions various (gynaecological?) problems concerning a young woman, although the brief ritual instruction in BAM 105 obv. 7 explains that the incantation was widely used, as it could be recited over any suppository, ointment and enema against “Anus illness” (DÜR.GIG) (Section 8.4.1; see also Kiṣir-Aššur’s BAM 102 in Section 6.1). Therefore, it is unclear against what problem N4 A 2727 was directed. However, considering the widely applicable use of the incantation and instruction in BAM 105, it does not seem accidental that N4 A 2727 contains the label “tested prescriptions, which are suitable for use(?)” (bulṭī latkūti ša ina qāti šūṣû). These are presumably the earliest prescriptions labelled as “tested” (latku) copied by Kiṣir-Aššur (see Section 8.3). The phrase ša ina qāti šūṣû seems to indicate the treatment in question was considered especially useful, although the exact nuances are uncertain (see Ch. 6 note 25).

Table 8: Texts assigned to Kiṣir-Aššur’s mašmaššu šeḫru-phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Format and designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N4 A 2727</td>
<td>Obverse and reverse: two incantations with instructions, of which one may have been against “Anus illness”</td>
<td>Landscape; u’iltu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46 BAM 105 obv. 2–3: nab-ni-sa da-mu u šar-i ku iš-bat KAL ina MURUB₄-iššū; iš-bat KI.SIKIL ina pag-ri-šā. Perhaps the incantation concerned menstruation or a severe gynaecological problem. It was certainly employed for “Anus illness” on account of the associated bleeding. The association between menstruation and bleeding from male pelvic orifices were also used in diagnoses concerning "if a man passes blood from his anus" or "if a man's penis drips blood", see Stol 2016: 438; Geller 2005: 40–41, 68–69, 94–95, 104–105, 140–141, 188–189, 212–215, 218–219.
Noticeably, only around five tablets represent the various Bāba-šuma-ibni family members’ mašmaššu šeḫru-phases. This observation could tentatively indicate that this family did not keep tablets, did not inscribe their names or titles, or kept their tablets elsewhere during the mašmaššu šeḫru-phase. Kiṣir-Nabû probably copied three tablets related to pregnancy and babies during his mašmaššu šeḫru- and mašmaššu-phases. In combination with Kiṣir-Aššur’s child-calming incantation N4 no. 24, the evidence indicates that such material belonged to the šamallû mašmaššu šeḫru, mašmaššu šeḫru and mašmaššu phases. However, he also copied a tablet with prescriptions for skin illnesses of the head (BAM 33) and a commentary to the incantation tummu bītu and Šurpu tablet 2 (AfO 12 pl. 13–14) as mašmaššu šeḫru. At least the first incantation in Kiṣir-Aššur’s N4 A 2727 was a tested remedy used elsewhere against “Anus illness”.

5.3.1 Discussion of the mašmaššu šeḫru-phase

Little is known about the concrete competences demanded during the “junior” (šeḫru) phases of various professions. For the MA period, Wagensonner has elucidated various aspects concerning the training of three ṭupšarru šeḫrus who were sons of the MA royal scribe Ninurta-uballissu (Wagensonner 2014a; Wagensonner 2014b; Wagensonner 2011: 647–49). At least two of the brothers wrote tablets or controlled each other’s work. Although we cannot determine if they were still engaged in a learning process at this stage, Wagensonner (2011: 649) considered it likely they were already at the peak of their education (cf. ibid. 2014b: 459).

---

47 See Kiṣir-Nabû’s mašmaššu šeḫru tablets AfO 12 pl. 13–14, BAM 33 and perhaps KAR 114(?), as well as Nabû-bēssunu’s KAL 4 no. 6; cf. Maul 2010a: 208–10. KAR 114 contains another child calming incantation and ritual (Farber 1989: 98–101 no. 32 ms h).

48 Kiṣir-Nabû copied KAR 114 as mašmaššu (šeḫru’), rev. ii: ... MAŠ.[MAŠ (TUR’)], (almost no space), and LKA 143 and N4 no. 247 as mašmaššu (cf. Fadhil 2012: 37 note 2). See also KAR 223 for postponing a birth from happening in the first month of the year, which was copied by Kiṣir-Nabû without a title, but including the ša Nabû tuklassu-phrase (Stol 2000: 93 and note 19 with references). Furthermore, knowledge related to children is also found in Late Babylonian scholarly texts from Uruk. Stevens suggested a correlation existed within this material between knowledge related to the professional specialization of a tablet owner and the occurrence of so-called protective formulae in the colophons (Stevens 2013: 211–12; see the discussion of such phrases in Section 6.2.3). If we accept this division, it would seem that diagnoses, treatments, and omens for women, birth, and babies were part of their specialization and this knowledge likely belonged to the mašmaššu šeḫru- and mašmaššu-phases of the Urukean scholars examined by Stevens (e.g., SpTU I no. 38, no. 48, no. 59, SpTU III no. 90, SpTU V no. 248; Stevens 2013: 234–36).

In the LB scribal education, incantations against Lamaštu, as well as incantations from, e.g., Maqlû and Šurpu, were copied in the second phase (Gesche 2001: 176). A brief catalogue of five related incantation incipits from the Lamaštu series, as well as a number of prescriptions for treating “Anus illness”, are also among the medical school tablets published by Finkel (2000: 144, 195–96). Stevens (2013) also found some shared features in the LB Uruk Šangû-Ninurta family’s tablet collection, which might mark certain tablets as part of specialist training or as advanced pedagogical texts. These features included the tablets written by šeḫrus, designated as commentaries, being malsûtu or IM.GÍD.DAs (i.e., exercises; cf. Gesche 2001: 50), and containing errors, notes, or brief colophons without ownership or copying statements. Stevens suggests the “junior” status may have lasted “many months or even years” (Stevens 2013: 220–21).

Interestingly, in SAA 10 no. 290 Urad-Gula writes to the king concerning the exorcist Nabû-leʾutu and his son who was performing rituals with him: “Even I have noticed that this son of his is (still) in the unsteadiness of youth (ṣaḫḫurānūtu)” (Parpola 1993: 277). Therefore, the participating son in this case was clearly considered immature. The question is if he was a (mašmaššu) šeḫru at this time.

Considering that Kiṣir-Aššur also wrote at least two IM.GÍD.DAs as šamallû mašmaššu šeḫru and mašmaššu, we might consider it likely he was still in training as a mašmaššu šeḫru. In terms of content, Kiṣir-Aššur and his nephew tentatively appears to have been closer to the educational principles of the LB healers than the MA tupšarrus during his mašmaššu šeḫru-phase.

5.3.2 **Excursus: Kiṣir-Aššur’s uʾiltu-tablets**

Kiṣir-Aššur copied numerous tablets labelled as uʾiltus throughout his career. Seeing as the label may in some contexts have had a pedagogical nuance (see below), I have included an excursus on the term in this chapter before examining Kiṣir-Aššur’s mašmaššu- and mašmaš bit Aššur-phase in the following chapters. However, the exact nuances of the term uʾiltu in the N4 text collection are poorly understood. Kiṣir-Aššur likely copied four such texts as šamallû šeḫru, one as šamallû, one as mašmaššu šeḫru, possibly four as mašmaššu,

50 Stevens 2013: 219–20 and notes 49–54 and 56; Frahm 2011a: 313 note 1492, 314 note 1495. Kiṣir-Nabû’s commentary AfO 12 pl. 13–14 was written as mašmaššu šeḫru. See also Pearce and Doty 2000: 337–41.

51 SAA 10 no. 290 rev. 15-s. 1: ... u a-na-ku 16 a-ta-mar DUMU-šú an-ni-i k1 [ina] ŠÀ ba-ra-ar ṣa-hu-ra-nu-tú ši-u.

52 For NA apprentices, see Robson 2014: 152–53; Robson 2013: 50; Robson 2011a: 564–65.
five as **mašmaš bīt Aššur**, and at least three during an uncertain phase. The **uʾiltu** label was written systematically with the signs **ú-ît-ti/ti** by Kiṣir-Aššur and Kiṣir-Nabû.

In the **CAD** (U-W: 51), the word is translated as “a type of tablet about twice as wide as long, inscribed parallel to the longer axis containing a scholar's report, obligation, debt, promissory note, debt note” (see also **AHw**: 1405; Gesche 2001: 147), and it is further specified at Nineveh as containing astrological reports and generally having a ratio between its sides of 1:2 with a landscape format (Radner 1995: 72; Radner 1997: 60–61; Parpola 1983a: 65; Parpola 1983b: 2 note 5; Hunger 1992: xv). The word originates etymologically from “to bind (by an agreement)” **eʾēlu** (**CAD** E: 40; **AHw**: 189), and it is therefore related to something owed to someone. As mentioned in the **CAD**, **uʾiltu**-reports were often written to the NA kings concerning celestial omens (Hunger 1992: xv). Scholars “kept the king's watch” (**maṣṣartu ša šarri naṣāru**), which involved watching, guarding and protecting the king by ensuring he knew what course the gods had decreed for him (Parpola 1993: XXI–XXII). The inherent responsibility between observation and report may have been reflected in the label **uʾiltu**. As discussed in Section 5.3.2, the **uʾiltu** label in N4 may tentatively designate the content as an exercise, obligation or commitment on behalf of the copyist. The word **uʾiltu** can therefore cautiously be proposed in some instances to indicate a duty or exercise administered by, or made in relation to, a senior teacher, practitioner or colleague. There is currently no evidence to suggest that the label could also designate a healer's obligation in relation to a patient. None of Kiṣir-Aššur's **mašmaš bīt Aššur**-phase **uʾiltus** are copied on his behalf, which suggests that Kiṣir-Aššur copied them himself. However, it cannot be excluded that the anonymous “written and checked” statement, spelled **SAR-ma Ė**, could hide a Š-stem of **šaṭāru** in some cases (see Section 7.4.2 as well as Ch. 3 note 134). This remains uncertain.

Noticably, Kiṣir-Aššur's **uʾiltus** all seem to be one-columned tablets in portrait format, which is unexpected (see also Maul 2019: 312). The only

---

53 Šamallû ṣeḫru: **BAM** 201; N4 A 400; N4 no. 237; N4 no. 241(?); šamallû: N4 no. 175; mašmaššu ṣeḫru: N4 A 2727; mašmaššu: **BAM** 88; **BAM** 122; **KAL** 4 no. 7(?); **KAR** 230; mašmaš bīt Aššur: **BAM** 300; **KAR** 62; **KAR** 63; **LKA** 83; N4 no. 110; broken title: **KAL** 7 no. 24(?); **KAL** 10 no. 13; **LKA** 137. Kiṣir-Aššur or Kiṣir-Nabû: **BAM** 260; **LKA** 146.

54 By comparison, the OB **galamāḫu** Ur-Utu from Sippar owned 46 letters referring to an etymologically similar “binding” (**eʾiltu**) that was to be released (**paṭāru**) by the gods, probably through a ritual (Tanret 2011: 283–284). The word is translated “obligation, liability, sin” in **CAD** (E: 51–52), and in the case of Ur-Utu, it could lead to illness and the eventual loss of life (Tanret 2011: 283–284).
exceptions appear to be Kiṣir-Aššur’s three *uʾiltus* *LKA* 83, N4 A 400 and N4 A 2727 in single-column, landscape format. Peculiarly, the majority of Kiṣir-Nabû’s *uʾiltus* seem to be in the landscape format. Why Kiṣir-Aššur’s *uʾiltus* largely differ from the expected landscape format is unclear. Perhaps it was no different from choosing paper with lines over paper with squares (Ulla Koch, personal communication). There does not seem to be any distribution of such texts according to specific career phases or content (cf. Finkel 2000: 146). The meaning of the term and the shape of *uʾiltus* in general require further investigation.

5.4 **Excursus: The ša Nabû tuklassu-phrase**

At least five of Kiṣir-Aššur’s texts contain the phrase “whose trust is Nabû” (*ša* Nabû *tuklassu*) or a variant thereof, usually written *ša*/*šá* 𒆠AG/PA NIR-su/*GISKIM-su/tuk-lat-su. Of these texts, three can be attributed to the šamallû ṣeḫru-phase (*RA* 15 pl. 76) and šamallû mašmaššu ṣeḫru-phase (*LKA* 89+, *LKA* 141). This leaves two texts, *BAM* 9 and *BAM* 121, which do not contain a title related to a career phase. Although Section 7.1 argues that Kiṣir-Aššur’s tablets without titles belong to later career phases, the presence of this phrase in earlier phases could indicate that *BAM* 9 and *BAM* 121 belong somewhere before the mašmaššu-phase (see below). These two colophons read:

55 *BAM* 9 rev. 72: [... dAG tuk-lat-su [d]aš-me-tu₄ [x' [...]]; *BAM* 121 rev. 25: ... *ša* 𒆠PA NIR-su; *LKA* 89+ col. iv 6': ... *ša* 𒆠AG GISKIM-su; *LKA* 141 rev. 10': ... *šá* [...]; *RA* 15 pl. 76 rev. 11': ... *ša* 𒆠PA tuk-lat-su; cf. *KAL* 4 no. 37 rev. 8': [... NI]R-su. The last text was likely copied by Kiṣir-Aššur or Kiṣir-Nabû (see Section 7.3). Kiṣir-Nabû has at least nine tablets with this or similar phrases: CMAwR 1 pl. 25–26 rev. 27: *ša* a-na 𒆠AG U 𒆠KURNUN [t]a-ak-lum; *BAM* 52 rev. 103: ... *ša* 𒆠PA NIR-su; *BAM* 121 rev. 25: ... *ša* 𒆠AG tuk-[lat-su]; *BAM* 147 rev. 28': ... *šá* PA NIR-su; *KAR* 223 rev. 14: ... *šá* DAG NIR-su; *LKA* 100 rev. 8: ... *ša* 𒆠PA tuk-[at]-s[u]; *LKA* 118 rev. 4': [... x'] u 𒆠Taš-me-tu₄ ta-a[k-šu]; N4 no. 163 (= Geller 2016: 394–96; Geller 2014: 64ff.) rev. 25: ... *ša* NĀ1 NIR-su; N4 no. 247 rev. 25: ... *ša* [...]; cf. *CT* 15 pl. 43f. rev. 11': ... *ša* 𒆠AG tuk-lat-[su]; *KAL* 4 no. 37 (see above); *KAV* 182 col. iv 9': [... 𒆠AG tuk-lat-su. Notably, Kiṣir-Nabû regularly seems to choose the same Sumerogram for Nabû (PA/AG) as the theophoric element of his name.

56 Generally, the phrase *ša* Nabû *tuklassu* is included directly after the personal name of the copyist or owner of the tablet. However, Kiṣir-Aššur’s *BAM* 9 and Kiṣir-Nabû’s *LKA* 118 differ, and in *BAM* 9, Kiṣir-Aššur writes an altered version of the phrase after his father Nabû-bēssunu’s name (see below). Kiṣir-Nabû’s texts published in CMAwR 1 pl. 25–26 and *LKA* 118 also show alternative formulations over this thematic sentence.
BAM 9 rev. 69: [DIŠ NA] UD.DA TAB BA-ma SÍG SA[G.DU]-IŠU²
GUB.MEŠ EG[IR²-šú iš-saṭ-ṭar]

BAM 9 rev. 70: [(nis-ḫu)] IG1-ū GABA.RI (GL)ZU [xxxxxxx x(?)]

BAM 9 rev. 71: [D]U[B (blank)] KI-šir-AN.ŠÁR DUMU p.[d]1 AG-bé-[sun
l]uMAŠ.MAŠ BAL.TIL[ki/E] AN.ŠÁR(?)

BAM 9 rev. 72: [(x x?) šá dA]G tuK-lat-su [T]aš-me-tu4 [x³[(x x x x?)]]

BAM 9 rev. 73: [DUMU p.dB]a-ba₆-MU-DÙ luZABAR.DAB.BA Ė-[šár-ra]

BAM 9 rev. 74: [(niš dPA u?) dAM]AR.UTU šu-mì šaṭ-rù la t[a-pa-šî]

BAM 9 rev. 75: [(x x x?) d]AG 1[d]A[MAR.UTU]

BAM 9 rev. 76: [(x x x?)] f[x x x x-šú 1-m[a (x x x?)]]

(Catch-line); 70 First [extract], a copy of a writing-board [from² ...],
71 [ta]b[et] (of) Kiṣir-Aššur, son of Nabû-bē[ssunu the Assur exorcist/
exorcist of the Aššur temple], 72 [...] whose trust is [Na]bû, [T]ašmētu
[...], 73 [son of B]aba-šuma-ibni, the zabardabbû-priest of Eṣarra; 74 [on
oath of Nabû and Ma]rd, do not [erase] my written name! 75 [...] Nabû
and M[arduk ... (curse?)], 76 ...] him, and [...].

BAM 121 rev. 24: a-na ša-bat e-pe-še ZI-[h]a¹

BAM 121 rev. 25: DUB-pi vZU.KEŠDA-AN.ŠÁR ša dPA NIR-su

BAM 121 rev. 26: DUMU p[d] AG-be-sun luMAŠ.MAŠ Ė AN.ŠÁR

Extracted for undertaking a (ritual) procedure, 25 tablet of Kiṣir-Aššur,
whose trust is Nabû, 26 the son of Nabû-bēssunu, the exorcist of the Aššur
temple.

BAM 9 is a “first [extract], a copy of a writing-board [from² ...]” and is
designated as a tupp[a] of Kiṣir-Aššur. We should note that Kiṣir-Aššur’s RA 15
pl. 76 and RA 40 pl. 116, both copied as šamallû šeḥru and the former with the
ša Nabû tuklassu addendum and described as “the 32nd² extract” copying a
writing-board, were also designated as tupp[a]. This is not the case for Kiṣir-
Aššur’s later numbered extracts.57

57 The catch-line of BAM 9 is repeated as the opening of the single prescription found on
BAM 145. This tablet’s colophon is unfortunately too broken to determine who wrote it
and for what purpose, although Scurlock remarks that “it is of the ‘excerpted for specific
performance’ type” (Scurlock 2014: 423). Therefore, it is uncertain if we can regard this
However, the ša Nabû tuklassu-phase in BAM 9 does not resemble the way Kišir-Aššur ordinarily writes this phrase, as it also includes an uncertain passage concerning Tašmētu. Although this may be a variation, it is also noteworthy that the phrase occurs after Kišir-Aššur’s father’s name and in the middle of his geneology. No comparable examples can be identified among Kišir-Aššur’s colophons. As such, it may be an elaborate praise of his father’s devotion to the god of writing and his consort. Furthermore, the text contains a protective statement, and such statements only appear in the surviving evidence on tablets from Kišir-Aššur’s šamallû ṣeḫru-, šamallû- and mašmaš bit Aššur-phases, as well as an uncertain phase (Section 6.2.3).

BAM 121 consists of one-line “ditto” (KI.MIN) prescriptions, it may have covered several physiological areas with changes marked with a double horizontal ruling, and it ends with a longer prescription on the reverse. Due to the ana šabāt epešī-phase, however, the tablet was likely copied for the specific treatment of an afflicted patient, perhaps overseen by Kišir-Aššur himself (see Section 7.4). Furthermore, Kišir-Aššur used a logographic writing of his name in the colophon (Arbøll 2018b). This is one of only two surviving tablets from Kišir-Aššur in which this writing occurs (see also N4 no. 175). As such, it is unusual, although the content is not particularly unique.

5.4.1 Kišir-Aššur’s Use of the ša Nabû tuklassu-phase

In general, the ša Nabû tuklassu-phase in this form seems to occur mainly in connection with individuals connected to the N4 collection, such as the Bāba-šuma-ibni and Bēl-kundi-ilāya families (Borger 1970b: 167; cf. Hunger 1968: 12–15). A somewhat comparable phrase occurs in several of the colophons
from Assurbanipal’s libraries. Maul interprets the ša Nabû tuklassu-phrase mainly as a pious and praising supplement, signalling that the copyist was a faithful trainee of Nabû, but without an exact function in N4 (Maul 2010a: 215 and note 96). Although he did not pursue his analysis further, the subordinate relationship to Nabû seems to occur most frequently diachronically within texts related to training (Gesche 2001: 159–61; Maul 1998: XII–XIV, XVI; Cavigneaux 1996: 24–27; Cavigneaux 1981: 37–38).

As shown by the šamallû šeḫru and šamallû mašmaššu šeḫru tablets on which this phrase occurs, it seems to be connected to a number of Kišir-Aššur’s student tablets. This is corroborated comparatively by at least one commentary from Kišir-Nabû with this phrase (N4 no. 163 = Geller 2014: 64ff.), albeit this text is from an unknown phase. A number of Kišir-Nabû’s numbered extracts (BAM 52, BAM 106, BAM 147), of which two are instructional (BAM 52, BAM 106), also contain this phrase without a title. However, Kišir-Nabû’s mašmaššu-phase tablet N4 no. 247 likely also included the phrase, which argues against the above observations. The phrase may in Kišir-Aššur’s case have been used primarily on apprentice phase tablets, although the evidence is far from conclusive.

Where does this place BAM 9 and BAM 121? As argued in Section 7.1, titles were probably not omitted on tablets with names before Kišir-Aššur’s later phases. The use of the ša Nabû tuklassu-phrase on these two tablets indicates they may have been part of Kišir-Aššur’s apprentice phases. However, the phrase in BAM 9 may relate to Kišir-Aššur’s father, Nabû-bêssunu, which would make this text the only example of such a use of the expression by Kišir-Aššur. This could indicate the text was earlier than other preserved texts with the ša Nabû tuklassu-phrase. This observation, together with the fact that BAM 9 was a first extract related to the head, could support the text being from around Kišir-Aššur’s šamallû šeḫru-phase. BAM 9 was also labelled a tuppu, much like the other numbered extract from his šamallû šeḫru-phase, RA 15 pl. 76. Kišir-Aššur’s later extracts were not labelled as tuppus. However, the evidence is
tenuous at best. Perhaps the lack of a title should be explained with this text being from before Kišir-Aššur officially became šamallû šeḫru.

*BAM* 9 contains a catch-line that opens the fragmentary tablet *BAM* 145 with a broken colophon (see Ch. 3 note 38). This text appears to be an exercise of some sort (Köcher 1963a: XII). If *BAM* 145 was copied by Kišir-Aššur after *BAM* 9, this would further support *BAM* 9 as an earlier phase tablet. Considering the indications, although none are conclusive, I regard *BAM* 9 as a šamallû šeḫru tablet in this study.

*BAM* 121 contains a purpose statement, which indicates that this text is from a later phase of Kišir-Aššur’s career (see Section 7.4). The combined use of the ša Nabû tuklassu-phrase together with a purpose statement may very tentatively indicate this was one of the first tablets Kišir-Aššur copied for a healing treatment. I suggest that the text may have been written slightly before or during the mašmaššu šeḫru-phase, in order to account for the ša Nabû tuklassu-phrase combined with a purpose statement.

5.5 Summary

The evidence for Kišir-Aššur’s šamallû-, šamallû mašmaššu šeḫru- and mašmaššu šeḫru-phases is problematic as there are few texts, and the manuscripts in general probably cover several years of Kišir-Aššur’s career. During his šamallû-phase, Kišir-Aššur copied incantations and brief ritual instructions for treating a “Curse” (māmītu), as well as guidelines for performing sections of the ritual *bīt mēseri*. The latter text was copied “for his (own) ‘reading’”, which suggests an instructive purpose. As a šamallû mašmaššu šeḫru, Kišir-Aššur copied texts connected to the domestic cult and infants. One ritual was aimed at reconciling a man with his god and another at treating ghosts, possibly related to the ancestral cult. Albeit very uncertain, Kišir-Aššur may have focused on such rituals to be able to treat possible causes of illness. Another of his šamallû mašmaššu šeḫru texts, an IM.GÍD.DA, attests to him copying a peculiar tradition of an incantation to calm an infant, baby or child. This focus on infants could be seen in relation to his other texts from this phase, as crying infants were known causes of disturbance for the family cult.

The incantation to calm an infant focused on Lamaštu, a known killer of infants and children. If Kišir-Aššur treated infants or children medically is uncertain. In general, such treatments are difficult to identify, and it is possible that adult treatments could be administered in revised versions to infants, babies or children. If so, Kišir-Aššur could have treated children, but this remains hypothetical. Nevertheless, there existed an overlap in physiological
conceptualisation between infants and horses, which Kişir-Aššur had previously encountered as šamallû šeḫru. As a result, it is possible that he used this overlap to gain deeper insight into human physiology in order to provide better treatments. Due to the increasing economic and cultural worth of horses, children and adults, this chapter hypothesized that Kişir-Aššur may have experienced greater autonomy when aiding his father, first when treating horses, thereafter infants or children, and finally adults. If so, Kişir-Aššur would have been able to build upon previous insights into animal-human physiology. The argumentation follows the microhistoric approach seeking to illuminate the subject’s world via comparative evidence to fill gaps in the documentation.

Kişir-Aššur was probably still training to become an exorcist during his mašmaššu šeḫru-phase, although the evidence is unclear (see Sections 5.3.1 and 6). His sole text from this phase consists of an uʾiltu with two incantations and instructions. At least one of the incantations duplicates a relative simple spell used elsewhere for treating “Anus illness” (DÚR.GIG), which is ordinarily considered a relatively simple ailment (see Sections 3.1 and 3.1.1). The content of Kişir-Aššur’s manuscript was described as “tested prescriptions, which are suitable for use(?).” In the surviving material, such statements were mainly employed after Kişir-Aššur became mašmaššu (see Sections 6.2.2 and 8.3; cf. Section 5.3). The text suggests that Kişir-Aššur acquired certain treatments considered useful for practice during his mašmaššu šeḫru-phase. Comparative material from Kişir-Ašşur’s nephew, Kişir-Nabû, indicates that initiation into advanced knowledge may have begun during the mašmaššu šeḫru. The fact that the material copied in Kişir-Aššur’s sole text from this phase may have been used for treating “Anus illness”, implies it may not have been considered advanced knowledge. Furthermore, his šamallû manuscript N4 no. 175 suggests that he began copying texts for gaining a deeper understanding of the content earlier during his training.

Concerning the differences in skill and responsibility that may be implied in the sequence of titles borne by Kişir-Ašşur before he became mašmaššu, a number of relevant observations have been presented throughout Chapters 3–5. However, the publication of further texts assigned to Kişir-Ašşur may alter individual observations as well as the importance of identified focuses. We may therefore not yet be in a position to fully understand all aspects of Kişir-Aššur’s training. Nonetheless, I have argued extensively for my ideas, which are supported by comparative evidence. Thus, I consider the hypothesised progression in patient groups, defined by a social hierarchy and autonomous practice, a likely scenario. Although he copied numerous medical texts with treatments for adults, I have on the basis of thorough discussions proposed that some material could perhaps be modified and applied to animals and
children as well (Section 5.2.2). Furthermore, I have argued that he likely aided his father simultaneously in treating adults and preparing healing ceremonies during his training.

Alternative hypotheses may be suggested, although a progression from simple to complex material is not reflected in the material. Almost all of Kiṣir-Aššur’s šammallû šeḥru manuscripts concern healing or rituals instructions for a single individual. During his šammallû-phase, he copied two rituals related to the individual and his house. As a šammallû mašmaššu šeḥru, Kiṣir-Aššur copied texts connected to the domestic cult and infants. When he became mašmaššu šeḥru, he learned tested healing procedures. As a mašmaššu, he copied an increasing number of different text types relevant to practice (Chapter 6), and a wide variety of rituals were copied during this and his mašmaš bit Aššur-phase (Chapter 8). Thus, a tentative progress from individual to household in terms of illness, and finally a change in focus towards social problems, evil omens and official cult can be proposed.