

71) SpTU 1 72: *šumma immeru* and *šumma izbu* in Late Babylonian Uruk\* — The Late Babylonian cola-commentary published as SpTU 1 72 (W 22307/12) bears a colophon that labels the text as: *šātu u šūt pī ša šumma imme[ru (...)] / aḥūtu ša šumma izbu ša pī ummāni mals[ūtu<sup>ld</sup> anu-ikšur(?)] / mašmašši šeḥri mār šangī<sup>d</sup>[ninurta]*, “Lemmata and oral explanations of *šumma imme[ru (...)]*, / *aḥū*-omens of *šumma izbu*, following the sayings of a master(-scholar), read[ing of Anu-ikšur(?),] / junior ritual expert, ‘son’ of Šangī-[Ninurta]” (SpTU 1 72 r. 21–23; cf. Frahm 2011: 53, 209). Although tablets with *aḥū*-omens from *šumma izbu* are known (Leichty 1970: 22, 199; CT 28 3–4, K 3966; CT 27 49, K 4031; perhaps CT 28 32, K 3838+; cf. KAL 1 47), the source text behind SpTU 1 72 has thus far defied identification, though in the original publication one topic of the commentary was already suspected to be the behavior of the sacrificial sheep (Hunger 1976: 74). A large but fragmentary manuscript from Assurbanipal’s library now confirms that one source being commented on by SpTU 1 72 was the series *šumma immeru* (Meissner 1933/1934; Leichty 1993). The following is a comparison of the source-text citations in SpTU 1 72 with the same sequence of words and phrases found in the text of the Neo-Assyrian manuscript K 2180 + K 4106 (CT 41 10a) + K 6756 (AMT 101.1) + K 6939 (CT 41 10b) + K 6983 + K 8345 (CT 41 10b) + K 8912 + K 14855 (with line numbers in parentheses):

SpTU 1 72	K 2180+ obv.
‘IZI <sup>1</sup> .GAR (15’)	‘IZI <sup>1</sup> .GAR (13’ = CT 41 10a:2’)
‘tas <sup>1</sup> -ri-ir-ru (16’)	tas-ri-ir-ru (13’)
A.GAR.GAR-šu i-‘šar <sup>1</sup> -ra-ar (18’)	[A.GAR(?)].‘GAR <sup>2</sup> -šu <sup>1</sup> i-šar-ra-ar (14’ = CT 41 10a:3’)
[U]R <sub>5</sub> .US (22’)	UR <sub>5</sub> .US (16’)
NA.NE (22’)	NA.NE (17’ = CT 41 10a:6’)
ú-zaq-qa-pi (23’)	ú-zaq-qa-pi (19’ = CT 41 10a:8’)
‘BAR <sup>1</sup> UDU GAZ KUR (r. 2)	BAR UDU GAZ KUR (20’)
na-ra-ṭu (r. 3)	ú-nar-raṭ (21’)
U.NINDA (r. 3)	U.NINDA (22’ = CT 41 10a:11’)
ul-lu-šu (r. 4)	ul-lu-uš (22’)
gaba <sup>1</sup> (DUḥ)-raḥ-ḥa (r. 4)	gaba-raḥ-ḥu (29’)
ú-da-ap-pir (r. 5)	ú-da-ap-pir (33’)

The Uruk commentary then provides a lengthy quotation that is nearly identical in content and orthography to the source text from Nineveh:

KI KUN-su GAR GU-su GAR NUN KUR-su BAL-su (SpTU 1 72 r. 5–6)

BE UDU TAG-ma KI KUN-su GAR GU-su GAR NUN KUR-su BAL-su (K 2180+ obv. 34’ = CT 41 10a:23’)

This sequence of key words and phrases proves beyond doubt that both tablets refer to the same text, further illustrating the existence of connections between the scribal traditions of NA Nineveh and LB Uruk (Beaulieu 2010).

The remaining items referenced for comment in SpTU 1 72 do not match up quite so tidily with a specific known source, but it must be kept in mind that the subsequent text of *šumma immeru* is not well known at present. Either the hypothetical source text for SpTU 1 72 was itself a collective that contained other material, or the

scribe behind SpTU 1 72 was interested in making connections between *šumma immeru* (itself taken to be *aḫû*-omens of *šumma izbu*) and other divinatory literature, in particular the extispicy series *bārûtu*. The text of SpTU 1 72 proceeds with two unambiguous references to *bārûtu*: ME.NI (r. 7), *ne-pel-ku-ú* (r. 8), which corresponds with *pān tākalti* 5:1 (Koch-Westenholz 2000: 328; cf. STT 308 iii 29'); and NA GIN<sub>7</sub> *šer-ret pa-ri-is* (r. 8), which corresponds with *manzāzu* 3:37 (Koch-Westenholz 2000: 95). Similarly, the orthography AB.ZA.MI (r. 10) is so far known in the later first millennium only from liver omens (TCL 6 3 r. 35'; BRM 4 13:37; Robson 2008: 213–214). Other entries are more challenging to pin down. The expression *nim-šu-šu* (r. 9) occurs in *šumma immeru* (CAD N/2 235b; cf. Fincke 2011), but if it is described as KAL (r. 9) in the unknown source text, then the only partial parallel would be OB in date (YOS 10 47:35; cf. CT 31 32 r. 15'). DAR (r. 11) is found in texts treating extispicy and teratology (CAD Š/2 193–194 sub *šatāqu*); and *ki-im-da-šu* (r. 12) is not terribly common in divinatory texts but does occur in *šumma izbu* Tablet 2:67 (CAD K 377a sub *kimtu*). BUR (r. 13), glossed *šilu* or *pilšu*, occurs mainly in texts pertaining to extispicy, but there are a few examples from the teratological literature and LB text commentaries (CAD Š/2 452; CAD P 378, 380). Because the source text(s) are unknown, in many instances it is difficult to determine even the head word or phrase in SpTU 1 72 that prompts comment, let alone a discernable sequence that could be matched to another text: the verb *šit-ri-id-ma / šit-ru-du* (r. 13–14) is simply uncommon (Streck 2003: 71–72); SA.MUD (r. 17) is a common orthography in extispicy omens (CAD G 72a sub *gilittu*); *ni-kit-ti* (r. 18) is uncommon in the omen literature of any period (CAD N/2 223); SILIM (r. 18) could simply refer to the *šulmu*, a well-known feature of the liver; the behavior of the AB (r. 18) is the first topic of Tablet 19 of the series *šumma izbu* (Leichty 1970: 177–179; Moren 1980: 55–60); in divinatory literature *ša-da-da* (r. 19) occurs mostly in extispicy texts (CAD Š/1 29–30 sub *šadādu*); due to the lacuna at the end of r. 19, *na-a-šu* (r. 20) may not even be from the source text; and finally the enigmatic A (r. 20) is followed by a lacuna.

Meissner's pioneering reconstruction of the first section of the series *šumma immeru* demonstrated beyond doubt that the text circulated in LB Uruk (TCL 6 7; Meissner 1933/1934, MS E). More significant to the present discussion, however, is the fact that the association of *šumma immeru* with *šumma izbu* appears to be firmly grounded in Uruk's scribal traditions, since the catchline of LKU 124 is the incipit of *šumma immeru* (Meissner 1933/1934: 118–119, MS F; Moren 1980: 67–70). That is to say, the attribution found in the colophon of SpTU 1 72 is probably not a mistake on the part of the Urukian scribe (Fincke 2011: 473) but rather a familiar association between two series that both dealt with reading and interpreting animal physiognomy and behavior (cf. *šumma izbu* Tablet 17, Leichty 1970: 171–172).

Finally, the unpublished cola commentary BM 48239 (upper portion of a single-column tablet, probably from Babylon, catalogued in Frahm 2011: 210) begins with a quotation of the first line of its source text, which corresponds to the first fragmentary line (obv. 37') in the last preserved section on the obverse of K 2180+. Only the very end of BM 48239's colophon remains, and no series name is preserved; in any case, our expectations should be modest, since the colophons written in late-first millennium Babylon tend to be more laconic than those produced in Uruk. Thus, for the time being it remains unclear whether the association between the series *šumma immeru* and *šumma izbu* was a development unique to Uruk in this period.

\*Unpublished sources are cited and discussed by the kind permission of the Trustees of the British Museum. Research support was provided by the Richard B. Salomon Faculty Research Award, Brown University.

## References

- BEAULIEU, P.-A. 2010. The Afterlife of Assyrian Scholarship in Hellenistic Babylonia. In *Gazing on the Deep: Ancient Near Eastern and Other Studies in Honor of Tzvi Abusch*, ed. J. Stackert et al., Bethesda, Md., 1–18.
- FINCKE, J. C. 2011. Neue Erkenntnisse zur 21. Tafel der diagnostischen Omenserie SA.GIG und zur Überlieferung diagnostischer Omentexte in Hattuša. *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 68: 472–476.
- FRAHM, E. 2011. *Babylonian and Assyrian Text Commentaries: Origins of Interpretation*. GMTR 5. Münster.
- HUNGER, H. 1976. *Spätbabylonische Texte aus Uruk, Teil 1*. Berlin.
- KOCH-WESTENHOLZ, U. 2000. *Babylonian Liver Omens: The Chapters Manzāzu, Padānu and Pān Tākalti of the Babylonian Extispicy Series Mainly from Aššurbanipal's Library*. Carsten Niebuhr Institute Publications 25. Copenhagen.
- LEICHTY, E. 1970. *The Omen Series Šumma Izbu*. Texts from Cuneiform Sources 4. Locust Valley, NY.
- . 1993. Ritual, “Sacrifice,” and Divination in Mesopotamia. In *Ritual and Sacrifice in the Ancient Near East*, ed. J. Quaegebeur. *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 55. Leuven, 237–242.
- MEISSNER, B. 1933/1934. Omina zur Erkenntnis der Eingeweide des Opfertieres. *Archiv für Orientforschung* 9: 118–122, 329–330.
- MOREN, S. M. 1980. Šumma Izbu XIX: New Light on the Animal Omens. *Archiv für Orientforschung* 27: 53–70.
- ROBSON, E. 2008. The Long Career of a Favorite Figure: The *apsamikku* in Neo-Babylonian Mathematics. In *From the Banks of the Euphrates: Studies in Honor of Alice Louise Slotsky*, ed. Micah Ross. Winona Lake, Ind., 211–226.
- STRECK, M. P. 2003. *Die akkadischen Verbalstämme mit ta-Infix*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 303. Münster.

Matthew RUTZ <Matthew\_Rutz@brown.edu>

Department of Egyptology and Assyriology, Brown University