AKKADIAN *šumma immeru* TEXTS
AND THEIR HURRO-HITTITE COUNTERPARTS

Harry A. Hoffner, Jr.
Oriental Institute

From the beginnings of the discipline of Hittitology it has been recognized that the Hittites, like other peoples of the ancient Near East, sought information from the gods by means of oracular inquiry.[1] An oft-quoted passage from a prayer of King Muršili II shows the various avenues open to a king for ascertaining the will of the gods:

> "If, on the other hand, people are dying for some other reason, either let me see it in a dream, or let it be found out by an oracle, or let a prophet declare it, or let all the priests find out by incubation whatever I suggest to them."[2]

In this statement the king enumerates four methods: (1) dream, (2) oracle, (3) prophet, and (4) incubation. The second, "oracles," itself comprises various types: extispicy (liver oracles), augury, snake oracles, the so-called "KIN-oracles," and something which Laroche in his *Catalogue des textes hittites* [henceforth CTH] called "Clinomancie."[3] In the following essay I would like to contribute to the understanding of this last-named type of oracle.

The starting point for my investigation was interest in the term *pakmariti*, a rare word which occurs exclusively in portions of three Hittite oracle texts KUB 16.40, KUB 18.1, and KUB 6.27 which belong to Laroche's type "clinomancie." He chose this name because of the prominent role played in them by the word *šaštaš* "bed, bedding." Not only does each oracular observation invariably include a statement about the "bed(ding)," specifically whether it is "right-hand" or "left-hand," but a kind of summary line in KUB 16.40 obv. 12 at the end of a group of these passages, reads *šaštan=kan ištama arḫa ariwe[n(i?)]* "we investigated the *šašta*-throughout." This surely shows the central importance of the "bedding." But it has been known for some time that the examples

of this type of divination which Laroche in CTH called "clinomancie" are actually "extispicies preceded by observation of the behavior of the sacrificial animal before it is slaughtered."[4] While I was discussing these passages with my colleague Hans Güterbock, he recalled an Akkadian text describing the behavior of sacrificial sheep, which was published by Erich Ebeling in his book *Tod und Leben nach den Vorstellungen der Babylonier*,[5] and was first recognized as omens by W. von Soden (OLZ 1934 416). Ebeling's main text was a Berlin tablet, VAT 9518, which he supplemented with a Berlin museum photograph of a tablet fragment then in Constantinople. Each paragraph of the text begins with the words *šumma immeru* "if a sheep" (written BE UDU, and initially misread by Ebeling as Akkadian *bēlu*, "lord," which he took to be a liturgical address to the god). In following up on this lead, I received helpful suggestions, bibliographical and otherwise, from Bob Biggs and Erica Reiner.

In the same year in which von Soden pointed out the true nature of Ebeling's text in a review of the book, Bruno Meissner also published a short article in *Archiv für Orientforschung* (1933-34) which discussed this type of divination text, using six further examples, four from the British Museum published in CT 28, 30, 31 and 41, one from the Louvre, and one from the Berlin Museum, a different tablet from Ebeling's.[6] Meissner pointed out that these *šumma immeru* texts formed a subdivision of the omen series *šumma izbu*, which deals with monstrous animal births.

When I followed up on this clue, it became apparent to me that there is indeed a relationship between the Hittite divination procedure which Laroche had called

---

1. Gurney 1981 and Hoffner 1987.
2. Translation of Goetze 1969, p. 396.
3. Laroche 1971, page 99.

4. Berman 1982, page 125, citing Kammenhuber and Ünal 1967 13. ("Eine andere Variante führt ebenfalls der LÚ.ḪAL aus, und zwar anscheinend zuerst am lebenden Schaf (UDU-iš) und dann an dessen KUŠ.MEŠ"). But although these scholars refer to the relevant Hittite passages known at that time, they made no attempt to understand the details, nor did they indicate that the Hittite practice was based upon the Akkadian *šumma immeru* texts.
5. Ebeling 1931 pp. 41-44.
6. Meissner 1933-1934.

"clinomancie" and these *šumma immeru* texts. According to von Soden's citations from Ebeling's text in AHw, it is Old Babylonian. Other OB texts which represent the same genre were subsequently published by Goetze in YOS 10 47-54. Most recently, two more, one only preserved as a fragment, have come to light in the excavations of Meskene-Emar.[7] Here too there is one almost fully preserved tablet and one small fragment of a second. The scribe of the almost fully preserved Meskene tablet is identified in the colophon as one Adad-malik, son of Adad-qarrād, who was both a scribe and a *bārû* (lú-ḫal). Of all the examples of *šumma immeru* texts now known the closest parallels to the Hittite material are to be found in the Ebeling text and the Meskene one. Since I lack the expertise to handle all of the intricacies of the Assyriological material, my interest here will be to use the Akkadian texts merely to elucidate where possible the Hittite texts.

Šumma immeru texts from Meskene, like most of the Yale tablets published in YOS 10 and the British Museum tablet which Gadd published in CT 41 12, deal with descriptions of the sheep itself: its size, color, *etc.*, rather than with its actual behavior as it is being readied for slaughter. The closest parallels to the Hittite examples come from the Ebeling text.[8] It is interesting that in the Hittite examples the observation of the sheep's behavior is always followed by and linked to the observation of its entrails after slaughter. So far none of the Akkadian texts show this feature. In the Hittite divination procedure the animal observed is of the sheep variety. The Sumerogram UDU is used, but with a Hittite phonetic complement different from the customary one. Usually the nominative case of the word for "sheep" is written UDU-*uš*, showing that the underlying Hittite noun was a u-stem. In all but one example in our texts the word is written UDU-*iš*, as an i-stem. If we had only one occurrence of the word, we could perhaps assume a scribal error of the sign *iš* for *uš*. The difference is slight at Bogazköy. But with so many examples this explanation becomes impossible. In one text[9] the word is written exclusively as UDU.ŠIR-*iš*, "ram,"[10] which seems to offer an explanation for the other writings. The writing UDU-*iš* is merely an abbreviated writing of UDU.ŠIR-*iš*. All of the animals being observed would then be males.

In each oracular observation two sheep were observed in succession. In a typical text, after the question to be answered from the observation is posed, the test is established: "If this statement is true, then let the first ram be favorable, but the second one unfavorable."[11] Most of the preserved examples request that the two sheep would have different outcomes. There is however one text with at least three examples which ask for the same outcome, one of which reads: "If it will not become ... for me, when My Majesty goes quickly to the city of Alni[...] and ..., then let both sheep show favorable outcomes."[12]

Although certain significant behavior of the sheep as it was led to slaughter was noted in each case, the pronouncement "favorable" or "unfavorable" was only made after the exta were also examined. It was therefore the combination of behavior of the live animal and configuration of its exta which determined the outcome. This fits well with Meissner's description of the Akkadian examples: "They actually believed they could draw conclusions as to the configuration of its entrails on the basis of all kinds of outward signs of the sacrificial animal, with the result that the expert was in a position even before the slaughtering to make approximate statements regarding what the exta would show."[13]

As for what behavior was considered "favorable" and what "unfavorable," we may use KUB 50.90 obv. 4-9 which describes the desired outcome.

(4) IGI-*zi-iš* UDU-*iš* IGI-*z*[*i*] *ḫa-a-li* IGI-*zi-iš ša-aš-ta-aš* ZAG-*aš* EGIR-*p*[*a*]

(5) *kam-zu-ri-ti pa-ak-ma-ri-ti-ma-za ar-ḫa pí-ip-pa-aš* ZAG-*an* ZAG.UDU-*an pa-an*[-...]

(6-7) IGI-*zi* SU.MEŠ (*there follows a description of extispicy*)... SIG$_5$

(7) EGIR UDU-*iš* IGI-*zi ḫa-a-li*

(8) IGI-*zi-iš ša-aš-ta-aš* GÙB-*aš kam-zu-ri-ti pa-ak-ma-ri-ti* UL *ku-i*[*t-ki* DÙ-*at*]

(9) EGIR SU.MEŠ SAG.ME NU.SIG$_5$

"The first ram (showed the following): in (its) first pen (*ḫāli*) (its) first bed(ding) was right-hand; afterwards (EGIR-*pa*) it (the ram) was at *kamzuriti*; but at the *pakmariti* it turned itself over. [It ...ed] its right shoulder ... The first (animal's) entrails (showed the following): (*there follows a description of what was observed in the animal's entrails, followed by the verdict*) Favorable."

"The second (*lit.* subsequent) ram (showed the following): in (its) first pen (its) first bed(ding) was left-hand; at *kamzuriti* (and) *pakmariti* [it did] noth[ing]; the second (animal's) entrails (showed the following): SAG.ME. (Verdict:) Unfavorable."

7. Arnaud 1987, pp. 318-23, numbers 698-99.
8. In AHw von Soden designates the Ebeling text as "aB" (Old Babylonian). The CAD references to this text ("behavior of the sacrificial lamb") mention no date.
9. KUB 16.29 + 16.81 obv. 9, 14, 19.
10. Friedrich and Kammenhuber 1975-1984 pp. 191f. notes the occurrence of both UDU-*iš* and UDU.ŠIR-*iš*, but fails to observe that the usual complementation for UDU is UDU-*uš* or to conclude, as I do, that UDU-*iš* stands for UDU.ŠIR-*iš*.

11. KUB 16.40 obv.? 3-4; KUB 18.11 rev. 3-4, 12; KUB 50.90 obv. 3, cf. KUB 6.14 rev. 18.
12. KUB 50.90 obv. 10-11, cf. also *ibid.* rev. 19-20, 25-26.
13. "Und wirklich glaubte man, aus allerlei äusserlichen Anzeichen des Opfertieres Schlüsse auf die Beschaffenheit seiner Eingeweide ziehen zu können, so dass der Kundige schon vor der Schlachtung ungefähre Angaben über den Befund der exta zu machen in der Lage war" (Meissner 1933-1934, p. 118).

Since this was precisely the combination proposed, the oracle's answer was to confirm the test statement.

In another case the questioner proposed that both sheep should be favorable.[14] In this case the first pen and first bed(ding) of the first ram were right-hand, as before, but the animal did nothing at *kamzuriti* (and) *pakmariti*; its entrails contain no *nipašuri*-sign, with the result that the ram was deemed "unfavorable."

Although in several other cases there is a correlation between the animal doing nothing at *kamzuriti* and *pakmariti* and the outcome "unfavorable," even though the description of the extispicy in each case differs, we have at least one instance where the animal "does nothing at *kamzuriti* and *pakmariti*" and yet the outcome is "favorable."[15] It is therefore not yet clear to me what combination of sheep behavior before sacrifice and entrail configuration after sacrifice was required to produce "favorable" and "unfavorable" outcomes.

But in spite of this negative result, there is much of interest to be learned from the description of the sheep's actions. So far, in the examples quoted we have seen two kinds of behavior at *pakmariti*: (1) the animal "turns itself over," or (2) it does nothing. In a *šumma immeru* text edited in Ebeling, *Tod und Leben* 42, rev. 3 we read *ištu imni ana šuméli ittabalakkat* "(the sheep) turns itself (over?) from the right to the left." This is surely the source of the Hittite *kamzuriti pa-ak-ma-ri-ti≈ma≈za arḫa pippaš* "(the sheep) turned itself (over?) at *kamzuriti* (and) *pakmariti*." In spite of the Akkadian example's "from the right to the left," it is impossible to translate *kamzuriti* and *pakmariti* with "on the left (and) on the right," since the normal Hittite words for "right" and "left" occur in the same contexts, written ZAG-*aš* and GÙB-*laš*, and in one example which we have already cited above, the sheep "does nothing" at *kamzuriti* and *pakmariti*, a situation in which "left" and "right" would apparently be meaningless.

A third Akkadian expression employed in the *šumma immeru* texts is *uznu imittu šuméla imḫaṣ* "(the sheep's) right ear flips (to) the left," cf. *šumma zibbatum ištu imittim ana šumélim imaḫḫaṣ* "If (the sheep's) tail flips from the right to the left."[16] This may be reflected in the Hittite version's uses of the verb *ḫue/inu-* "to reverse the direction of something, cause something to go in a different direction," cf. ZAG-*an≈za* KUŠE.SIR GÙB-*laz ḫuinut* "(s)he reversed/changed the right shoe to the left (foot)" KBo 13.86 obv. 4-5, *etc.* Cf. also *nu≈šši* TÚGḫupiki appezzi [(piran ḫuinut)] / ḫantezzi≈ma≈za appezziaz [(ḫuinut)] "she changed the rear veil to the front and the front one to the rear" KUB 33.67 i 30-31 (CTH 333).[17] Although the verb *ḫuinu-* seems to have been the more exact term

for the action, one passage substitutes a near synonym, the verb *amu-*.[18]

A fourth Akkadian expression which describes sheep behavior in the *šumma immeru* texts is: *lišānšu šuméla unaššak* "(the sheep) bites its tongue (on the) left."[19] Corresponding nicely to this is the following passage from a Hittite *šašta*-oracle: *kamzuriti≈kan* EME ZAG-*za parā udaš* / *n≈an waqaš* EGIR-*pa-ma≈an≈kan* UL *namma pédaš* "but at *kamzuriti* (the sheep) sticks its tongue out on the right side, bites it and doesn't bring it in again."[20]

The enigmatic opening words about the *ḫali* may be clarified by the following passage, which does not contain *pakmariti*: IGI-*zi ḫali* EGIR-*iš* UDU.ŠIR-*iš* / [... *n*]≈*an≈kan laknut šaštaza* IGI-*zi ḫali* 2-*uš* GÙB-*aš* EGIR-*zi ḫali* 2-*uš* ZAG-*aš* "In the first *ḫali* the second (lit. latter) ram [...ed the ...,] and knocked it over. With respect to the bed(ding)[21] in the first 'pen' (or 'watch') the two (sheep?) are left-hand; in the latter 'pen' or 'watch' the two are right-hand" (KUB 16.29 + 16.81 obv. 24-26 [oracle, NH]). This new passage seems to suggest that *ḫali* is a locative: either temporal "in the first watch" or spatial "in the first pen." No corresponding terms for "watch," "pen" or "bed(ding)" occur in the *šumma immeru* texts known to me. If the phrases in question should be translated as "in the first *ḫali* the first bed(ding) was right/left," it is possible that the sheep was observed in a pen to see on which side it lay down.

The Ebeling texts attest to other modes of behavior: *ina ṭeḫika iṣrit šārat zumrišu izziz* "it breaks wind, when you approach, and its hair stands up,"[22] *ištu naksu 2-šu 3-šu* [*iṣrit*] "[it breaks wind] two or three times after it has been slaughtered,"[23] *uznāšu tarṣā* "its two ears extend,"[24] *sibbassu unarraṭ* "it shakes its tail,"[25] *sibbassu imna u šuméla umaḫḫaṣ* "it flips its tail to the right and the left," *uzunšu unarraṭ* "it shakes its ear," *uzunšu ša imitti šumélta umaḫḫaṣ* "it flips its right ear over to the left," *ina inišu šuméli ibakki* "it weeps in its left eye," *ināšu pardā* "its two eyes are filled with terror,"[26] *lišānšu šuméla unaššak* "it bites its tongue on the left side," *ināšu uzzaqqapā* "its eyes bulge out," *issi* "it cries out," *kabbussu iddi* "it defecates," *réšišu išši* "it lifts its head," *kalissu i-ni-te-er* "its kidney is ...ed,"[27] etc.

The new texts from Emar add the following: *enūma takarrabu ippašar* "it is 'loosed', when you 'pray',"[28] *šinnéšu ikaṣṣaṣ* "it grinds/gnashes its teeth,"[29] *pâ-šu ipten-*

---

14. KUB 50.90 obv. 11ff.

15. KUB 18.11 rev. 4-6.

16. YOS 10 47:40 cited in CAD M/1 79b *sub* mng. 3i.

17. Also cf. *nu ḫantezzin* NINDA.GUR₄.RA *šarā* x [...] / *appezzin≈ma≈šši kattan ḫu[inuzi ...]* / *šer ḫuinuzi* (KBo 17.75 iv 3-5 (fest.)).

18. KUB 18.11 rev. 8, cited above.

19. Ebeling 1931, obv. 9.

20. KUB 18.11 rev. 8-9; cf. also KUB 16.40 rev.! 4-10, KUB 6.14 rev. 19-24, KUB 50.90 obv. 12-16, rev. 21-22, 26-28.

21. Lit. "from the bed(ding)" (ablative).

22. *Tod und Leben* p. 41 #9, line 1.

23. *Ibid.* rev. 1.

24. *Ibid.* obv. 2.

25. *Ibid.* obv. 3.

26. *Ibid.*

27. *Ibid.* p. 44, line 12.

28. Msk 74203a, line 1.

29. *Ibid.* line 4.

ette,[30] *pâ-šu iptenette lišānšu ittanandi* "it keeps opening its mouth and sticking out its tongue,"[31] *kabbussu iddi* (= á.gar.gar-*šu* šub-*di*) "it drops its dung,"[32] *šinātešu ištien* "it urinates,"[33] *ināšu ana pānišu tarṣā* "its eyes are directed straight ahead," *uznāšu ana warkišu tarṣā* "its ears are turned back," *kišād imitti-šu unaššak* "it bites its neck on the right," *lišānšu ša imitti ulteneṣṣi* "it keeps sticking out its tongue on the right," *ḫurḫussu iḫarrur* "it makes a croaking sound in its throat," *qaqqassu ana warki imittišu ušaḫḫir, bamat imittišu laptat.*[34]

From the Hittite contexts we gather that the two terms *kamzuriti* and *pakmariti* are locatives. In the Ebeling texts the only elements which could correspond to Hittite locatives are the infinitival expressions following *ina, ana, ištu* and *lāma: ina ṭeḫika* "when you approach," *ina karābika* "when you utter the prayer," *ištu karbu* "after it has been consecrated," *ina/ana niqê* "at the moment of sacrifice,"[35] *ina ṭabāḫišu* "when it is slaughtered,"[36] *lāma teptûšu* "before its being opened up."[37] And from the Meskene texts we add: *enūma takarrabu* "when you utter the prayer," *ina nakāsi* "at the cutting (of the animal's throat)."[38] Since these expressions, which could correspond to Hittite locatives, express various points of time in the long procedure of bringing the victim to sacrifice, uttering the proper prayers, cutting its throat, and opening it up, it is likely that we must seek the meanings of *kamzuriti* and *pakmariti* in this area as well.[39] The types of sheep behavior at *pakmariti* mentioned in the texts, namely (1) sticking the tongue out and biting it and not drawing it back in, (2) turning over, and (3) doing nothing, are all possible at the moment of killing the sheep. It is not impossible that these terms, which entered Hittite via Hurrian, themselves go back to some Mesopotamian expression. But although in the Akkadian texts a fairly wide variety of terms are attested, even in one and the same text, in the Hittite examples we have only these two terms used repeatedly.

---

30. *Ibid.* line 6.
31. *Ibid.* line 7.
32. *Ibid.* line 9.
33. *Ibid.* line 10.
34. *Ibid.* lines 12, 14, 27, 31, 37, 39, and 45.
35. All examples from Ebeling 1931 41f.
36. YOS 10 47:22.
37. YOS 10 47:34.
38. Msk 74203a, lines 1 and 47.
39. Friedrich and Kammenhuber 1975-1984 pp. 191f. considers also a reading ÚTUL*zuriti*, which I think we can safely exclude.

Bibliography

Arnaud, D.

1987   *Emar VI/4. Textes de la bibliothèque: transcriptions et traductions. Mission archéologique de Meskéné-Emar. Recherches au pays d'Aštata. Synthèse no. 28*, Paris, Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations.

Berman, H.

1982   Review of *Hethitische Orakeltexte, Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköy, 49* and *Hethitische Orakeltexte, Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköy, 50* 1979 in JCS 34, pp. 118-126.

Ebeling, E.

1931   *Tod und Leben nach der Vorstellungen der Babylonier. 1. Teil: Texte.* Berlin und Leipzig, Walter de Gruyter.

Friedrich, J., and A. Kammenhuber

1975-84   *Hethitisches Wörterbuch* — Indogermanische Bibliothek. Zweite Reihe: Wörterbücher. Heidelberg, Carl Winter Verlag.

Goetze, A.

1969   "Hittite Prayers," in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, ed. Pritchard, James B., pp. 393-401. Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press.

Gurney, O. R.

1981   "The Babylonians and Hittites," in *Divination and Oracles*, ed. Loewe, M. and C. Blacker, pp. 142-173. London.

Hoffner, H. A., Jr.

1987   "Ancient Views of Prophecy and Fulfillment: Mesopotamia and Asia Minor," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 30 pp. 257-265.

Kammenhuber, A., and A. Ünal.

1967   *Orakelpraxis, Träume und Vorzeichenschau bei den Hethitiern.* Texte der Hethiter 7. Heidelberg, Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

Laroche, E.

1971   *Catalogue des textes hittites.* Études et Commentaires. Paris: Klincksieck.

Meissner, B.

1933-34   "Omina zur Erkenntnis der Eingeweide des Opfertieres," AfO 9, pp. 118-122.