Typesetter Query for the article IRQ2000010 AU Correction

As per edits corrections we updated the closing apostrophe for aleph in page 10, line no 495 to 498, please kindly check and advice.
A small tablet fragment acquired by the Iraq Museum raises interesting questions, although at first it appeared to be a simple duplicate manuscript from the large bilingual incantation series Udug-hul. Publishing this fragment has drawn attention to an interesting feature of Mesopotamian incantations, in which the āši-pu-exorcist protects himself first, before addressing the patient. Although this practice has been known from Tablet 3 of Udug-hul incantations, it turns out that Assur exorcists occasionally inserted their own names into otherwise anonymous incantations and prayers, in order to ensure their own protection, which is a practice not known from other sites.

Introduction
The text edited in this paper (IM 183624)1 was acquired by the Iraq Museum in 2002.2 This fragment, from the large incantation series Udug-hul = Utukkū Lemnūtu (meaning “Evil Demons”) measures (7.2 × 6–7.5 × 1 cm) and originally belonged to a much larger tablet. The fragment represents the end of the second column and a very small part from the third column.

This text is the only fragment from Udug-hul Tablet 3 to be found in the Iraq Museum until now.3 Duplicates in the British Museum (K 224+; K 4665+; BM 38594; BM 47852; BM 35611+) were previously published (CT 16, plates 1–8), with new copies and an edition and translation by M. J. Geller.4 The text is dated to the Late Babylonian period, judging from the sign forms, but there is no possibility of a join with published tablets.

Transliteration of IM 183624
Coll. ii (Udug-hul 3 ll. 60–69)

1' pi-[i-šu₂ el-lu ana pi-ia iš-ku-ni]
ʻuš₁₁₃ kuy₃-[ga]₁₃n[u₁₁₁₁-gu₁₀ ṣal₂-la-a]-ni
f₂₁₃-مات-su³ [el-le-tu₂ ana im-ti-ia iš]-³-kun³
f₂₁₃-[šu₁₂] kuy₃-[ga]-a-ni ṣu₂₁₀ [gu₁₀ ṣal₂-la-a]-ni
5' ik-rib-[šu₂ el-lu ana ik-ri]-³-[bi]-a iš-³-kun³
zag-meš ū₂₃-em-ma-an-³-hul⁴-a lu₂-[lu]-ja su-na / ṣal₂-la-a-na
mu-šal-pi-it eš-re-tu ša₂ ina SU mar-ši iš-šu₂-ua
t₆₅-dug₄-ga inim ṣen-ki-ga
ina MIN-e a-mat ᵣ-e₂-a
e-ne-ne-ne hul-meš ū₂₃-em-ma-an-zi-zi
10' šu-[nu lem-nu-tu₃ li-in-na-as-hu
[bi] ma-nu e₂₅-tukul-mah an-na-ke₄ šu mu-da-šgal₂
e-ra kak-ki ši-ru ša₂ d₄-a-nim ina qa-ti-ia na-ša₂-ki
₃ines-sag-unug⁵ (šu₂) nimgi₅ kul-ab₅₄₄-ke₄ nam-ti-la
silim-šal₂-gu₁₀ e₂₅-[erased] DUT-DU-de₃
15' ᵣMIN na-gi-ir kul-la-bi an₄ ba-la-ti-{erased}-ia

1 A preliminary version of this tablet appeared in Geller 2016: 102–105 (courtesy of Munther Ali) with some errors which are now corrected in the present article. Abbreviations in this text are those used in the Chicago Assyrian Dictionary.
2 This unprovenanced fragment came to the Iraq Museum via Mr. Riadh Huta Salih, sold to the Iraq Museum on 14/02/2002 and registered as document No. 219 / 2002.
3 This fragment is the only one known to Munther Ali in the Iraq Museum. Geller refers to another fragment (IM 21180, see Geller 2016: 174) belonging to the series, but when Ali examined this text number in the Iraq museum, he found some 28 fragments from different texts, most of them being economic with none from the UH series.
u ša₂-la-me-ia ar₂-ki-ia lit-tal-lak
udug sig₅-ga a₂-da-ğu₅ mu-un-da-an-ġen-na
še-ed dum-qi₂ ina im-ni-ia ina a-la-ku
lama sig₅-ga a₂-gub₃-bu-ğu₁₀ mu-un-da-an-ġe[n-na]
[the rest is missing, but traces are erased on bottom of tablet]

Translation
Coll. ii = lines 60–69
1’ [He (Ea) superimposed his pure] mouth [upon mine].
2’–3’ he superimposed [his pure] spittle [upon mine].
4’–5’ he superimposed his pure prayer upon mine.
6’–7’ Since a (demon) attacking limbs is (already) in the patient’s body,
8’– through an effective incantation – the word of Ea –
9’–10’ may those evil ones be uprooted.
11’–12’ I hold Anu’s exalted e ru-wood scepter in my hand.
13’–16’ May Mes-sanga-unug, Kullab’s herald, go behind me for my own health and well-being.  
17’–18’ In order for the good spirit to go on my right, 
19’–20’ and for the good genius to go on my left, 

Coll. iii = lines 94–98 

1’–2’ [(May the demons) be removed from the distraught] man’s body. 
3’–4’ [May they not approach] my body [(as well) but stand aside] 
5’–6’ [nor may they follow] behind me. 
7’–8’ [I adjure you by] the great gods [that you may go away]. 
9’ [May they not be detained but let their bond be broken!]. 

Commentary 
Col. ii 
4’. The signs are clearer on the copy than on the photograph, which shows considerable damage to the surface of this line. 
6’. Geller 2016: 103, l. 63, should read zag-meš (not zag.meš). 
9’–10’. This new manuscript deviates from other duplicates in the verbal form /zi-zi/ corresponding to Akk. nasāhu, in contrast to other variants with more a conventional verb /bu(r)/ in this position. One other manuscript (CBS 13905) has the variant /sīsī/, which is in a similar phonetic range to /zi/, but all three of these Sumerian forms can correlate with Akk. nasāhu. 
11’. Geller 2016: 103, l. 65, should read šu-nu (not ši2-šu-nu). 
12’. The reading šu mu-da-ĝal2 (corresponding to ina qa-ti-ia na-ša2-ku) is a variant from the more usual reading, šu-ĝū10 mu-un-da-an-ĝal2 (‘I hold in my hand’), but lacking the possessive suffix or dimensional infixes. 
14’. Variants to this line all read: egir-ĝū10 DU.DU-de3 // ĺarīya littallak, “may GN go behind me.” The scribe misunderstands the Sum. as a finite verbal form (mu-un-DU.DU-de3), although the Akk. translation conforms to other duplicates. 

Col. iii 
4’–5’. The sigla for these lines in Geller 2016: 103, l. 95–96 should read hh and not ii. 

General comments 
This manuscript fragment from Udug-hul, one of the longest and important bilingual incantation series from Mesopotamia, comes from Tablet 3, probably the first tablet of Udug-hul known from Old Babylonian libraries. Since this section may well have been the original beginning of the composition, it deals with the āšipu-incantation priest speaking on his own behalf, in the first person, asking the gods to protect him even before he tries to heal the patient. This may be because of the recognized dangers of visiting a sick person and coming into possible contact with demons, or simply because the exorcist had to first demonstrate that he himself was pure and free of disease or demonic attack, in order to be able to heal someone else. In order to do this, the exorcist had to claim that he was the representative of the gods of exorcism, Ea and Marduk, and that he was sent by them, so that whatever spells the exorcist recited were actually coming from the gods, rather than from himself.5 For this reason, according to our tablet, the healing god had placed his mouth, spittle and words into the exorcist’s mouth, so that whatever incantation the āšipu recited came directly from healing gods. The question is how unusual or exceptional this 

may be, since other incantations occasionally use a formulaic expression, *ktām iqabbi*, “he should say thus,” meaning that the client rather than the exorcist should recite the incantation. In this tablet of Udug-hul, however, it seems that the exorcist is speaking rather than the patient.

The question is whether one finds any parallels in other incantations, and the obvious place to look is *Maqlû*, the text of which has recently been published by Tzvi Abusch and Daniel Schwemer. *Maqlû* incantations are predominantly in the first person, but who is speaking, the exorcist or patient? According to Abusch, the speaker is not an *āšipu* but actually “a member of the laity, not a priest”, who acts as if he is a messenger of the gods and claims to be so. Here is a sample text of the speaker in *Maqlû* I 61:

Incantation. I have been sent and I will go; I have been commissioned and I will speak. Asalluhi, lord of exorcism, has sent me against my warlock and witch. (Translation T. Abusch).

The incantation goes on to explain that the witches have “seized my mouth, made my neck tremble, pressed against my chest, bent my spine, weakened my heart, taken away my sexual drive, made me

---

6 See Maul 1994: 67. A parallel expression *ktām taqabbi*, “you should say thus” appears more frequently in Namburbi incantations, and this refers presumably to the exorcist.

7 Abusch 2015; id. 2016.

8 Schwemer 2017. This volume contains autograph copies of *Maqlû* tablets.

turn anger against myself, sapped my strength” (Maqlû I 97–100, translation Abusch). Abusch argues that it is the client or victim who makes these statements, and just as he claims to be suffering from witches, the patient also claims to be sent by Marduk (like an āšîpu). Evidence supporting this point of view comes from Old Babylonian Sumerian incantations, known by the rubric ka-inim-ma e-sîr-dib-bê-da-kam, “incantations for passing along the street”, and these incantations were collected and copied by scribes together with Old Babylonian Udag-hul incantations, although not incorporated into the late bilingual Udag-hul Series. The passage cited by Abusch follows the well-known ‘Enki-Asalluhi dialogue’, and reads as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
nig_2\text{-}\bar{g}a_2\text{-}e & \space i\text{-}zu\text{-}mu \space u_3 \space za\text{-}e \space in\text{-}ga\text{-}e\text{-}zu \\
\bar{g}en\text{-}na \space dumu\text{-}mu & \space d\text{a}sal\text{-}lu\text{-}hi \\
lu_2\text{-}ulu_1 \space lu_2\text{-}didli & \space lu_2\text{-}gc_6\text{-}sa_2\text{-}a \space sila\text{-}a \space \bar{g}en\text{-}a\text{-}n[a] \\
\bar{g}a_2\text{-}e & \space lu_2\text{-}ki\text{-}n\text{-}gi_4\text{-}a \space d\text{e}n\text{-}ki\text{-}ga \space me\text{-}en \space he_2\text{-}eb\text{-}[be_2] \\
\bar{g}a_2\text{-}e & \space lu_2\text{-}ki\text{-}n\text{-}gi_4\text{-}a \space d\text{am}\text{-}gal\text{-}nun\text{-}na \space me\text{-[en]} \\
\bar{g}a_2\text{-}e & \space lu_2\text{-}ki\text{-}n\text{-}gi_4\text{-}a \space d\text{asal}\text{-}[u_2\text{-}hi \space me\text{-}en] \\
\bar{g}a_2\text{-}e & \space lu_2 \space eridu\text{'-}ga \space me\text{-}en \space he_2\text{-}[eb\text{-}be_2]
\end{align*}
\]
What I (Enki) know, you also know.
Go my son Asalluhi.
If a man, a lonely man, is one who walks at night in the street,
then let him [say], 'I am Enki’s messenger,
I am Damgalunna’s messenger,
I am [am] the messenger, Asalluhi.’
Let [him say], 'I am the man of Eridu.’

It would be correct to surmise that this passage is not unusual, in that the victim who walks along the street at night (always a dangerous thing to do because of demons) has to recite a special incantation, in order to keep the demons away (and probably keep his spirits up). However, it seems that this Esir dibbeda incantation advises the victim to mimic a standard type of incantation, in which he declares that he – the patient – is Enki’s emissary, in effect pretending to be an ǎšipu. This reflects Udug-hul Tablet 3, in which the ǎšipu speaks directly to the demons and declares, “I hold Anu’s exalted ści-wood scepter in my hand;” in other words, claiming that he (the speaker) is a personal representative of the gods. Nevertheless, the logic behind the Esir dibbeda magic is that in order to frighten off the demons at night, the victim should recite this type of incantation as if he were an incantation priest and had the power to chase away demons. This deviates from Udug-hul incantations normally meant to be recited by the ǎšipu in order to protect himself, when he goes to see the patient or victim; healing can be dangerous, just as was walking in the streets at night.

This brings us back to the question of Maqlû incantations and who was reciting them. Who is “I” in these incantations? This question is similar to the problem of identifying the “you” addressed in medical recipes, when the text says, “you take, you grind up, you crush”, etc. We assume this “you” to refer to the professional healer, the ǎšī, and not the patient himself, and by analogy the “I” in Maqlû incantations could potentially refer to the professional healer, in this case the ǎšipu.

There is some evidence in Maqlû incantations to support the idea that it is the ǎšipu himself who is to be identified with the speaker. In Maqlû Table 2, 170–171 we find an interesting variant. The text reads:

\[\text{anāku ina qibṭa} \text{marduk bel nubattī u asalluhi bel āšipāti}^{13}\]
I (am) under the command of Marduk, lord of the evening offering, and Asalluhi lord of exorcism.

One significant variant manuscript from Aššur (VAT 10009 = KAL 4 No. 26) inserts a proper name, reading:

\[\text{anāku} \text{m} \text{aš-šur-ša-liṭ ina qī-bit \text{d} AMAR.UTU} \ldots\]
I, Mr. Assur-ša-liṭ, am under the command of Marduk ....

This is surprising, since Maqlû incantations do not normally refer to specific individuals by name, and this personal reference contrasts with the standard pattern of three other manuscripts from Nineveh and Sultantepe (K 24555+, K 2947+, SU 52/38). Two other intriguing references to this same Aššur-ša-liṭ appear in the same Maqlû Tablet 2 manuscript (VAT 10009). The first mention occurs in an incantation to Girra, god of the torch, which has the incipit, \[\text{EN} \text{girra āri ku bukur} \text{d anim}. \text{Spell. Blazing Girra, first born of Anu}.\]
After praising this god as capable of countering the effects of witchcraft, incantation soon introduces the intended object of the witchcraft:

\[\text{anāku} \text{[amanna mār amann]a ša išu} \text{amanna} \text{dištaršu amannu}^{16}\]
I am [N.N. son of] N.N., whose personal god is N.N., whose personal goddess is N.N.

\[\text{Geller} \text{1985:} \text{30. This passage was cited in Abusch} \text{2002:} \text{275, l. dūru-ku} \text{ina qī-bit} \text{d AMAR.UTU} \text{en na-hat-ti ii} \text{d asal-hu-hi} \text{EN ašip-ti}; \text{see Abusch} \text{2016:} \text{72}.\]
\[\text{Maqlû II} \text{77 (see Abusch} \text{2016:} \text{58). The Girra incantation covers ll. 77–104.}\]
\[\text{Maqlû II} \text{86 (see Abusch} \text{2016:} \text{62}).\]
\[\text{anāku} \text{[nenni a nenni]} \text{ša₂₃} \text{nenni-šu₂} \text{nenni d₁₅} \text{šu₂ nenni-tu₄}. \text{One Ms. has another variant reading: anā-ku}\]
At first glance, this looks like the standard designation of a victim or patient, since it follows the pattern found in U dug-hul incantations, which refer to the patient as lu₂-ulu₂ dumu dingir-ra-na / amēlu mār ilīsu, “a man son of his god”. However, the same Aššur manuscript of Maqlû (VAT 10009) varies the text of the entire line as follows:

anāku Aššuršāliš mār ilīsu Nabū ša ištaršu Tašmētu\(^\text{18}\)

I am Aššuršāliš, whose personal god is Nabū, whose personal goddess is Tašmētu.

The same manuscript again takes the opportunity to identify the first-person protagonist as Mr. Aššuršāliš, further giving the names of his personal or favoured god and goddess, rather than the general designation of being “man son of his god”.

An intrusion occurs once more in Maqlû Tablet 2, 98–100, in a passage which reads:

dîrîqrâ šarû šu ša lî\(^\text{21}\) kāšād lemmû a ayyâbi kušussûakitina anâku (var. māšûš-sāliš) la aḥłyabbil \(\text{19}\)

Resplendent Girra, august among the gods, vanquisher of evil and enemies, vanquish them that I (var. Aššuršāliš) not come to harm that I, your servant, should live and be safe and stand before you.

The Aššur scribe of VAT 10009 has again inserted the name Aššuršāliš into the text of l. 99, after anāku, “I”, in the standard edition.

The pressing question, then, is who this Mr. Assuršāliš is likely to be. One possibility is that he would be a client or patient, since we know that such persons can be referred to in other witchcraft incantations by a general designation of “N.N. son of N.N.” (annamma mār annamma). The second question is why this particular scribe would insert a proper name into the text. Was this manuscript again taking the opportunity to identify the first-person protagonist as Mr. Assuršāliš for some reason, in contrast to all other manuscripts of Maqlû which are known to us? An alternative possibility is that whoever wrote this Aššur tablet (probably an ašîpu) took the initiative to insert his own name, to afford himself the protection offered by the relevant incantations.

If this were the only case of a personal name being inserted in place of the usual anonymous reference to ‘N.N. son of N.N.’, there would be little grounds for choosing between the two options, i.e. the proper name designating either the patient or the scribe. Fortunately, there are several other cases, exclusively from Aššur, of personal names being inserted into a similar genre of incantation-prayers, and these offer precise comparisons with the inserted name Aššuršāliš in Maqlû Tablet 2. The first of these insertions in another Aššur manuscript is found in a Šuilla prayer to Nabû (CMAWr 2 No. 9.7: 14),\(^\text{20}\) which has the same structure as many other Šuilla texts.\(^\text{21}\) The prayer offers praise to Nabû, ending with the pious wish, liktarrâbâka gimûr tenêşêti, ‘may all the population keep praying to you’ (l. 13). The following line (14), based on a Nineveh manuscript from Assurbanipal’s Library (K 6644), reads:

\[
[\text{anāku annamma mār} \text{annamma ša ilīsu annamma ištaršu annammttu}]
\]

I am N.N. son of N.N., whose personal god is N.N. and personal goddess is N.N.

\(\text{\textsuperscript{18}}\) a-na-ku Aššuršāliš-liš dumû Dingir-šū₃ ša₂ Dingir-šu₂
\(\text{\textsuperscript{19}}\) dAG aG₃-tar-šu₂ dAPENU₃ (see Abusch 2016: 62).
\(\text{\textsuperscript{20}}\) Abusch and Schwemer 2016: 343, 347. See online at https://www.phil.uni-wuerzburg.de/cmawro/cmawro-online/ (last accessed 19.08.2020).
\(\text{\textsuperscript{21}}\) For the general structure of Šuilla prayers, see Lenzi 2011: 27–28.
Crucially, one Assur duplicate (A 138 = LKA 40a) has a variant reading for this entire line, which corresponds verbatim (except for the proper name) to Maqlû II 86 cited above:

\[
\text{ana-ku} \text{ba-la-si} \text{dumu dingir-šu₂ ša₄₂ dingir-šu₂ d} \text{pa} \text{d} \text{15-šu₂ d} \text{papnun} \]

I am Balassi son of his god, whose god is Nabû, whose goddess is Tašmētu.

The correspondence between this phrase and Maqlû II 86 can hardly be coincidental, especially since the proper name is again associated with the god Nabû and his spouse Tašmētu. The fact that Nabû was a patron god of scribal arts lends credence to the suggestion that the proper name inserted here, Balassi, refers to an Assur aššipu or scribe who actually wrote this tablet (A 138). Abusch and Schwemer comment on Balassi, that since several Aššur individuals are known by this name, we cannot be certain of the identity of this person.\(^\text{23}\) It is true that Balassi was popular at Aššur. Nevertheless, among the references to the name Balassi at Aššur associated with various professions (see PNA I / II 254–256), there are also clear references to a court ummanu and astrologer by this name, which raises the possibility that the name could refer to the scribe who copied this Maqlû tablet. Furthermore, it is worth noting that the Aššur tablet containing Balassi’s name (A 138) was found in Aššur’s Haus des Beschwörungs priesterst,\(^\text{24}\) which might be relevant information, as we will see shortly.

This is not the only case in which the proper name Balassi is inserted into a Šuilla prayer, but this second case is more difficult to track down, since key information has been omitted from the edition of the text. The prayer is addressed to Marduk’s spouse Zarpanitu, first edited in 1896 (BMS 9 rev.),\(^\text{25}\) with a partial duplicate published later from Aššur (VAT 13487 = LKA 48).\(^\text{26}\) The Assur manuscript includes lines of text not found in BMS 9, which contain the following reference on the reverse of the tablet (cf. Ebeling 1953: 72a: line 11) now possible to reconstructed fully, based on parallels:

\[
[\text{ana-ku} \text{ba-la-si} \text{a dingir-šu₂ ša₄₂ dingir-šu₂ d} \text{pa} \text{d} \text{15-šu₂ d} \text{papnun}]
\]

[I am] Balasi son of his god, [whose personal god is Nabû, whose personal goddess is Tašmētu].

Confirmation of this restoration can be found on the obverse of this same tablet, which duplicates the Nineveh manuscripts edited in BMS 9, although two relevant lines were omitted in Ebeling’s edition of the tablet (1953: 68), which can be seen clearly on LKA 48 obv. 8–9.\(^\text{27}\) The lines read:

\[
[\text{ana-ku} \text{ba-la-si} \text{dumu dingir-šu₂ ša₄₂ dingir-šu₂ d} \text{pa} \text{d} \text{15-šu₂ d} \text{papnun}]
\]

[I am] Balassi son of his personal god, [whose personal god is Nabû, whose personal goddess is Tašmētu].

Once again, it appears that a Šuilla prayer has inserted a proper name into the text which cannot be found in the Nineveh duplicate. Moreover, this Aššur manuscript (like others cited above) was found in the Haus des Beschwerungs priests in Aššur.\(^\text{28}\) A similar case of intrusion of a personal name in an Aššur manuscript occurs in a Šuilla prayer to Nuska,\(^\text{29}\) the god who lights up the night with his lamp, thematically resembling the God Girra and his torch in Maqlû Tablet 2. The same pattern appears among the four known manuscripts of this prayer, two from Nineveh and two from Aššur, namely that a proper name appears in an Aššur duplicate in place of the usual reference to “Somebody son of Somebody” at Nineveh. The relevant lines occur in a prayer with the incipit, EN ʾnuska šurbû ilitti Duranki, “Sublime Nuska,

\[\text{also appears to make mention to Tašmētu (if the reading is correct), since it ends with [} ʾ\text{[15-šu₂ [papnun]};} see the copy in Abusch and Schwemer. 2016: pl. 73. One possibility is that the line actually ends with [} ʾ\text{[pa-mi-[i]u₄]}; although the orthography for the term ummanu (somebody) is consistently written with the logogram NENNI throughout the anti-witchcraft corpus (see van Baylaere and Luukko 2020: 15–16). The other possibility is that this Assur tablet also cited a private name.

\[\text{23 Abusch and Schwemer 2016: 348.}

\[\text{24 Pedersén 1986: 50, 65.}

\[\text{25 King 1896: 44–47, plates 19–20.}

\[\text{26 For an edition of the relevant passages, cf. Ebeling 1953: 68–70, 72a.}

\[\text{27 VAT 13487. Lines 8–9 on the tablet are actually a single line of text widely spaced and written over two lines.}

\[\text{28 Pedersén 1986: 50.}

\[\text{29 The comparison with Maqlû was noted by Fadhl 2012: 15 n. 1, and for the edition of the text, see Panayotov 2009: 24–35.}
Somebody prospective client as Nabû-mu begins with the standard formulation, attested in two manuscripts from Nineveh and one from Maqlû containing insert their own names into a text where one usually finds reference to Cuneiform Commentaries Project, CCP 3.1.u83 (see https://ccp.yale.edu/P393842). commentary (K 872), probably written in Assur but found in Nineveh, now edited by the Yale A members of his family.37 His son Nabû-etlulanni was mentioned as being an apprentice exorcist,38 and it is likely that Aššur-mudammiq was himself an ašipu, which was why he wrote the tablet incorporating his name.39 Moreover, as in the other examples cited above, the Aššur tablet with Aššur-mudammiq’s name (VAT 13632) was also found in the Haus des Beschwörungspriesters.40 Finally, Mr. Aššur-mudammiq’s name appears in the colophon of a mukallimtu astrological commentary (K 872), probably written in Assur but found in Nineveh, now edited by the Yale Cuneiform Commentaries Project, CCP 3.1.u83 (see https://ccp.yale.edu/P393842).

The obvious inference to be drawn from this evidence is that all these manuscripts from Aššur, containing Maqlû or Šuilla incantation-prayers, reflect the exclusive practice of Aššur scribes to insert their own names into a text where one usually finds reference to “Somebody son of Somebody”. The personal names inserted follow the same pattern in all cases: proper names have no patronymic but take the traditional form known from Udag-hul incantations, designating the prospective client as “man son of his god” (lu₂-ulu₃ dumu dingir-ra-na). Furthermore, all cases from Aššur associate the proper names with the god and goddess Nabû and Tašmētu, suitable patron gods for scribes. The likelihood, therefore, is that in all cases cited above, the names inserted into the text also identify the scribe who copied the tablet.41

What justification would there be for a scribe or an ašipu to do this? The unique character of Maqlû is that this was actually a ceremony to be performed on a certain night of the year, according to Abusch.42 If this is the case, who would be performing this ceremony? Would it be the patient, as

anāku annammaā mār annamma ša ilšu annamma4 ištaršu annamantu5
I am N.N. son of N.N., whose personal god is N.N., whose personal goddess is N.N.

However, a second Aššur manuscript (VAT 13632) inserts several new lines into this section, beginning with a variant for the above passage reading:

anāku Aššur-mudammiq mār ilšu [ša] ilšu Nabû ištaršu Tašmētu6
I am Aššur-mudammiq son of his god, whose personal god is Nabû, whose personal goddess is Tašmētu

Again, the personal name – this time Mr. Aššur-mudammiq – replaces the usual formulaic expression, but with a difference. The colophon of this Aššur tablet adds the important detail that the tablet was written on the 19th day of Ayyār, done at night-time, by Mr. Aššur-mudammiq himself.35 This is the first known case that the name inserted into the text matches the name of the tablet’s scribe, reinforcing the idea that the scribe sought the protection of the incantation-prayer for himself, and that he was identical with the suffering client or patient referred to in the text. Moreover, we are relatively well informed about Mr. Aššur-mudammiq’s career. His father, Mr. Nabû-mušēši, was known as a scribe of the Aššur Temple,6 as was his grandfather and other members of his family.37 His son Nabû-etlanni was mentioned as being an apprentice exorcist,38 and it is likely that Aššur-mudammiq was himself an ašipu, which was why he wrote the tablet incorporating his name.39 Moreover, as in the other examples cited above, the Aššur tablet with Aššur-mudammiq’s name (VAT 13632) was also found in the Haus des Beschwörungspriesters.40 Finally, Mr. Aššur-mudammiq’s name appears in the colophon of a mukallimtu astrological commentary (K 872), probably written in Assur but found in Nineveh, now edited by the Yale Cuneiform Commentaries Project, CCP 3.1.u83 (see https://ccp.yale.edu/P393842).

The obvious inference to be drawn from this evidence is that all these manuscripts from Aššur, containing Maqlû or Šuilla incantation-prayers, reflect the exclusive practice of Aššur scribes to insert their own names into a text where one usually finds reference to “Somebody son of Somebody”. The personal names inserted follow the same pattern in all cases: proper names have no patronymic but take the traditional form known from Udag-hul incantations, designating the prospective client as “man son of his god” (lu₂-ulu₃ dumu dingir-ra-na). Furthermore, all cases from Aššur associate the proper names with the god and goddess Nabû and Tašmētu, suitable patron gods for scribes. The likelihood, therefore, is that in all cases cited above, the names inserted into the text also identify the scribe who copied the tablet.41

What justification would there be for a scribe or an ašipu to do this? The unique character of Maqlû is that this was actually a ceremony to be performed on a certain night of the year, according to Abusch.42 If this is the case, who would be performing this ceremony? Would it be the patient, as

30 Panayotov 2009: 25, giving the manuscripts as K 2106+, K 3285, and VAT 9030.
31 This conforms to the general structure of Šuilla prayers, see Lenzi 2011: 27–28.
32 Panayotov 2009: 27.
34 Ms. VAT 13632 (LK A 51: 10–11) reads: [a-na-ku] 2aššur-sut₃-iq Dumu DINGIR-štu₃ šu₂-DINGIR-štu₃ šu₂-pal-ka akmis...
35 VAT 13632 rev. 3–5 reads: ayyār an 19-kam […] ina nunbatu inneppēš ša Aššur-mudammiq. The appearance of Aššur-mudammiq’s name in both the text and commentary was already noticed by Maul 2010: 213 n. 82.
36 Panayotov 2009: 64.
37 As charted in Fadhil 2012: 41.
38 Panayotov 2009: 25, giving the manuscripts as K 2106+, K 3285, and VAT 9030.
39 As charted in Fadhil 2012: 41.
40 Pedersén 1986: 50.
41 It is a matter of speculation whether these presumed scribes from Aššur could have been playing fast and loose with scribal protocols by inserting their names into incantations or prayers.
42 Abusch 2002: 97, explaining that the Maqlû series “was not a collection of incantations, but rather the script of a single long ceremony”.
43 As charted in Fadhil 2012: 41.
44 See Lenzi 2011: 26–27 for a discussion of Šuilla prayers composed by the ašipu-exorcist.
45 Panayotov 2009: 25, giving the manuscripts as K 2106+, K 3285, and VAT 9030.
Abusch believes, acting like an āšipu, or would it be the incantation-priest himself, reciting the Maqlû incantations, e.g. Mr. Aššur-šaliq, Mr. Balassi, or Mr. Aššur-mudammīq? And if the latter, why would the incantation-priest claim to be bewitched and behexed and troubled by demons?

The answer may be quite straightforward. In a Maqlû-like ceremony, the priest recites prayers – even for himself – which are also meant for anyone present who is listening. An incantation-priest, like everyone else, is just as likely to get ill or be attacked by demons, or even be behexed by a witch. Like in Udug-hul incantations, the āšipu had to protect himself in the same way that he protects his patients. So it seems more likely that Maqlû incantations were not recited by a patient acting like a messenger of the gods, but rather by the āšipu himself, with his own personal worries and troubles, including fear of witchcraft. In fact, as we know from Udug-hul incantations, the usual role of the incantation-priest acting in a ceremonial capacity was first to recite the incantations on behalf of himself and by extension for anyone else also present.43

We can find other later evidence to support the idea that the speaker in magical texts may have been the exorcist rather than the patient. Interesting parallels can be found in later Syriac incantation bowls from Mesopotamia, which frequently refer to someone ‘speaking’ in these spells in the first person. The client is usually mentioned by name as the object of the demonic attack, but in the course of his duty to protect the client, the exorcist speaks directly to the demons in the first person. Here are a few citations from Syriac bowls (published by M. Moriggi, with bowl citations): “I am speaking” (ʾnʾ ‘mmrn’, no. 22.4) or “I declare” (ʾnʾ qrynʾ, no. 14: 24), or “I will show you” (lkwn mhwyn ʾn no. 10.6), and to remove any doubt, in one case the bowl reads, “I wrote (it) but God heals” (ʾnʾ ktbtʾ lhʾ nʾsʾ, no. 28: 13).44 In these spells, the speaker is none other than the writer or performer of the incantation, not the client mentioned in the bowls.

In conclusion, this small fragment of a tablet from the Iraq Museum raises interesting questions, simply by making us think about the larger framework into which this tablet fits. The idea that the incantation priest himself is subject to possible attack by demons is of central importance, since he must protect and heal himself before he can do so for others. This means that the incantation priest himself was not thought of as blameless or perfect or even worthy to act on behalf of others, and therefore he was entitled to ask for the same protection and divine favor as for his clients. But the āšipu had an advantage over ordinary individuals, since he knew the rituals and the incantations and he could act as Marduk’s messenger, because of his priestly status and training. It is likely, therefore, that just as Udug-hul incantations began with a request to protect the āšipu who was reciting the text, in a similar way the speaker of Maqlû incantations was this very same āšipu, who was now acting out his role as messenger of the gods, on his own behalf and on behalf of everyone else who may have been present at the Maqlû ceremony.
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نص أوثوكي لمنوتي (أودوك – خول) في نص جديد من المتحف العراقي

وهو عبارة عن نص غير ضيق، يشير إلى اكتشاف حيوي في المتحف العراقي، الذي تمت تداولاته عدة مراحل، وفي النهاية، فإن النص يمكن تلخيصه بعبارت="أودوك هو لجنه البحث (UDUG.HUL)، التي تشير إلى إعداد نص ذو أهمية كبيرة في التشريحة للغة البنائية من صناعة عمياء (UDUG.HUL)، إن تلك النص قد تشير إلى طقطقة من بين الرؤساء، التي هي كاهن الآلهة عليه أن يحمي نفسه أولاً قبل أن يصرف المريض، على الرغم من أنه هذه النص قد عرفت من اللوح الثالث للتنكاسة (UDUG.HUL)، فقد اكتسب أن المعبد المتعود من مدينة متروك يقومون أحياناً بإدخال إسمهم الخاص في التشريحة والوصول غير المعروف والمجددة، وطريقة أخرى من أجل الحياة، وتمكن حمايتهم الخاص من الشر، وهذا النص المعاصر كتب غير معروف من مواقع أخرى.

UCBU LEMNU (UDUG‐HUL) IN A NEW TEXT FROM THE IRAQ MUSEUM