Analysis of a Hittite Oracular Document*

by Oğuz Soysal − Chicago

In memory of my mother

KBo. 18,151, a small tablet with an oracular report, is discussed here. It refers primarily to the fate and military fortune of a Hittite king, and contains names of the enemies of the Hittites on the South-eastern front. One of them, ᵐZikiltu, can be linked to Alalaḫ (level VII or IV). Historical and cultural characteristics of the content strongly plead for an Old Hittite time for the dating of the text. The female practitioner of the KIN-oracle in KBo. 18,151 seems to have a Hattian background which is reflected in the features of the language and in the cultural elements of this document.

In 1971, H. G. Güterbock published the copy of a small tablet as number 151 of KBo. 18. Even though this text does feature typical divination elements, it is not exactly an oracular text. Based on its appearance, the tablet was presented by the copyist in the Vorwort (p. III), and Inhaltsübersicht (p. VI) in the category of "Hittite Letters", and among "oracular reports in the small tablets". It did not take long for this text to attract the attention of Hittitologists, not only because of the characteristics of its language and orthography but also because of its content. In separate articles both published in 1974, A. Archi and A. Ünal/A. Kammenhuber analyzed KBo. 18,151[1].

---

[1] A. Archi: "Il sistema KIN della divinazione Ittita", OrAnt. 13 (1974) 113−144, especially 131 ff.; A. Ünal/A. Kammenhuber: "Das althethitische Losorakel KBo. XVIII 151", KZ 88 (1974) 157−180. Since both articles will be often referred to below, they are hereafter cited with this footnote.

This text is still frequently alluded to in the secondary literature, particularly because of problems in its dating[2].

This text contains procedures of a KIN- (lot, performance or symbol)[3] oracle which generally refer to the oracular determination of the fate of a Hittite king. Because some enemy names in this text point towards a military-political topic, Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1) 160, 166, 167 and 174 accurately interpreted KBo. 18,151 as being related to a divination regarding a planned military expedition (against the Hurrians). It is certain that we have to deal here with an unusual oracular text, not only because of the tablet's appearance but also because of its content. In this text no oracular questions are posed, and no interim results reported, favorable or unfavorable[4]. It is highly

---

[2] See the section on dating the text.

[3] Contrary to the terms currently in use in the secondary literature, "lot oracle" and more rarely "performance oracle", R. H. Beal, JAOS 112 (1992) 128, and in: Magic & Divination in the Ancient World (forthcoming) fn. 209, recommends naming this type of divination a "symbol oracle". Until the question of how KIN-oracles were performed is answered — whether the actions were carried out by animals, or whether there was some involvement by the practitioners (see recently A. Archi, in: Ägypten-Vorderasien-Turfan [1991] 89, and V. Haas/I. Wegner, MDOG 128 [1996] 106 f.) — an exact definition is not possible. If there were manipulations by the practitioners of the divination procedure, then "performance oracle" is the best candidate. The word *aniyatt-* "work, output, performance", which is the Hittite reading of the logogram KIN, also supports this assumption on the semantic level.

S. Košak, ZA 84 (1994) 289, calls attention to the divination text KUB 60,24 which mentions in obv.[?] 4' *pullē peššiya-* "to throw lots (= tokens?)". This phrase could be evidence for a real, but hitherto unproven, "lot oracle" amongst the Hittites. Thus, I agree with Beal's opinion that the qualification of KIN-oracle as "lot" must be abandoned for now (see also idem, in: The Context of Scripture, vol. I [1997] 207 fn. 2).

Shortly after completion of the present article, in March 1997, I had an opportunity to attend the lecture "KBo. 18,151: A Hittite KIN-oracle Reconsidered" given by A. M. Kitz at the 207th Meeting of the American Oriental Society in Miami. Based upon the comparison with lot-casting terminology and methods from Akkadian, Ancient Greek and Hebrew traditions, she indicated that KBo. 18,151 is a "lot oracle" where the procedure may have involved shaking, flying out, and falling of lots; cf. Abstracts of the Two Hundred and Seventh Meeting, p. 20. Since words such as *pul-* "lot", *pulai-* "to cast lots", or *(pullē) peššiya-* "to throw lots (= tokens?)", *watku-* "to jump out (said of lot/token?)" which may be typical of real lot oracles (see above) are neither mentioned in this, nor in any other KIN-oracle from Boğazköy, I cannot share her conclusion.

[4] Rare examples which contain only divination performances are KUB 18,5 + KUB 49,13 and KUB 49,82 (uncertain). However, the first mentioned is a bird oracle, and also differs from KBo. 18,151 in form (especially its large size). The latter example is a very poorly preserved KIN-oracle, and it does not offer us much information to

probable that KBo. 18,151 was prepared as a report in letter form containing the oracular performances[5] in response to another text with the fate-prediction question(s), which should also have been forwarded or even sent from a different place. If we are really dealing with a letter here, this implies that this communication had been carried out over a long distance. We know that the divination sector among the Hittites reached beyond the metropolis of Ḫattuša, and not only did it include provincial towns such as Maşat, Ortaköy, and Kuşaklı in Anatolia[6], but also those cosmopolitan cities housing foreign civilisations, such as Alalaḫ and Emar in Northern Syria. In addition to letters which were dedicated to oracular subjects, there are also report texts which are smaller and simpler in appearance, and very tiny tablets, the so-called "etiquettes", with only oracular features[7]. These types of documents, which have been published by H. G. Güterbock as KBo. 18,138, 141−151, contain either only the oracular question/inquiry (KBo. 18,144), or the performances and the results of the oracle (KBo. 18,143), with the exception of KBo. 18,142 which has the oracular question on the obverse and then gives the performances and result of the oracle in a careless handwriting on the reverse. Since the publication of KBo. 18, several more have been added to this type of document. Recently, a very small tablet (beginning with an allusion to the land of Alašiya) containing only the divination question has been published by H. Otten as KBo. 32,226. Among the oracular texts originating outside of Ḫattuša, we can count Mşt. 74/64 from Maşat Höyük and KuT 39 from Kuşaklı, which also contain only the oracular inquiries[8]. All these documents in the form of questions and re-

---

draw conclusions. Moreover, the sides of this tablet concern different subjects (obv. ii?: cultic matters; rev. iii?: oracle performances). On unusual oracular documents see Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1) 166, and H. Berman, JCS 34 (1982) 97, 98, 122, 123, 125.

[5] Cf. H. G. Güterbock, KBo. 18, p. III: "Nr. 151, … äußerlich ganz wie ein Brief aussehend, ein Orakelbericht".

[6] Preliminary and brief information on newly discovered divination texts from the Ortaköy and Kuşaklı excavations: A. Süel, Belleten LIX/225 (1995) 271, 276, 281; G. Wilhelm, MDOG 127 (1995) 41. For the oracular texts of Kuşaklı see now Haas/Wegner, MDOG 128, 105−120.

[7] These three kinds of tablets are listed by E. Laroche under CTH (suppl.) *581 (RHA 30 [1972] 113) "Lettres traitant d'oracles" without any distinction between them.

[8] S. Alp, HKM (1991) no. 115. Alp, ibid., XII, describes this document as a "small oracular text. Tag(-tablet)?". In a comparison of this Maşat tablet with KBo. 18,144, it is striking that both tablets end with two vertical signs ("2, MIN"?). It may not be an accident that this sign does not occur in KBo. 18,142, which also contains the

sponses are indications of the existence of communication over long distances in the divination sector. However, the most concrete example of this subject which also rests on a historical platform is the episode of Nuwanza, the "Chief of the Wine", narrated in the extended annals of Muršili II: In the ninth year of his rule, the Hittite king sent an order to Nuwanza, who was stationed in the Upper Land, ordering the relief of the city Kannuwara, which was under siege by Ḫayaša. However, before Nuwanza set out on his campaign, following the advice of the generals, he asked Muršili II to allow performances of bird and flesh oracles on the matter. Later, the results of the divinations were brought to him by prince Nanaziti (KBo. 4,4+ ii 16−57).

When it was necessary to perform a divination procedure in order to secure the approval of the gods on issues concerning the cult, military, etc., the oracular question was first inscribed on a tablet, then the oracle performances and results were added as a continuation of the text. When the oracle was concluded, the tablet was baked. In these tablets, the passages with the oracular questions were set down in conventional handwriting; however, the parts which contain the divination performances were carelessly written, due to the stress involved in recording the procedures with haste. Although the same scribe probably wrote both sides of the tablet, the striking differences between the ductus of the obv. (inquiry) and the rev. (performance and result) can

---

answer (with verdict) after the oracular inquiry. Thus, this mark could be understood as a technical symbol in the oracular correspondence requiring an answer on a separate tablet from the distant addressee. However, in the Kuşaklı tablet KuT 39, after the inquiry in obv. 4 we find two Winkelhakens and two verticals. This small tag-tablet has been recently published by G. Wilhelm, in: Kuşaklı-Sarissa, Bd. 1, Fasz. 1 (1997) sub no. 29 (cf. also remarks in p. 30). It reads as follows:

(1) *ták-šu-ul*
(2) *ze-en-nu-me-eš-na-aš*
(3) *ú-dą-i*
(4) ŠE-⌈*rù*⌉?
(lower edge) 𒀹𒁹𒁹

"(If) it shall bring the peace of ending (i. e. final peace), (then the verdict) should be favorable". Could this be a divination inquiry prior to a military expedition?

NB. The uncertain reading of "*rù* (= *aš*)" in line 4 follows a suggestion of G. Wilhelm (personal communication). According to his collation, the sign is not "*ru*" as the copy of KuT 39 would seem to indicate.

In addition to the above mentioned examples, P. Neve, Ḫattuša − Stadt der Götter und Tempel (1993) 43 and 49 (Abb. 126), introduced some small divination tablets (each a few cm. in diameter) newly discovered in Temple no. 30 at Boğazköy. However, we can say nothing about their content or textual character until their cuneiform edition.

be seen clearly in KBo. 18,142[9]. For oracular communications sent over long distances a different procedure was followed, in which the questions and their responses were written separately and mutually sent out to addressees. The tablets which contain only the question or the performance/result are the vehicles of these means of communication[10]. The document treated here, KBo. 18,151, is one of these, including the divination performances and also the final result as the response. According to the information on rev. 1, the text originated in the city of Ḫattuša. If this is the case, the question arises as to why the tablet was found at Boğazköy. For some unknown reason the tablet was not sent to its destination.

Compared to the typical KIN-oracles, the uniqueness in terminology and style manifest in KBo. 18,151 are consequences not only of the difference in genre (letter or report) but also of the early period to which it belongs (Old Hittite). These features have already been treated by Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1) 166 ff. In a separate section below, I will review these features and others which I have noticed as additions to Ünal/Kammenhuber. Although KBo. 18,151 has been fully analyzed and edited in the above-mentioned works, I see a new text edition as a necessity, so as to include some suggested readings based on collations from the tablet's photograph. I also will deal with a few details pertaining to the language and content before concentrating on a discussion of the dating of KBo. 18,151.

I. Transliteration and translation

Obv.

§ 1.   1   [ᵘ]ᵘ*Ḫa-at-tu-šu-ma-aš* ˢᵃˡŠU.⌈GI⌉
        2   ᵐ*Zi-⌈ki⌉-⟨il⟩-⌈tu⌉-uš   a-ra-i-iš*
        3   LUGAL-*aš na-ak-ki-še-et ta-a-aš*
        4   ⌈DINGIR.MEŠ⌉ *pa-ra-a pí-ta-a-aš*

§ 2.   5   *ni-pí-[š]a-aš* ᵈIŠKUR *a-ra-i-iš iš-tar-ni-ka-i-in ta-aš*
        6   LUGAL-*aš na-ak-ki-še-et ta-aš*
        7   ᵐ*Zi-ki-il-tu   ba-i-iš*

---

[9] Further samples of remarkable changes in the handwriting of oracular texts are cited by Berman, JCS 34, 94 fn. 5, and ibid., 122. For an example from Kuşaklı (KuT 26) see Haas/Wegner, MDOG 128, 106; see now KuSa. I/1, Nr. 17.

[10] There are also some passages in letters announcing that divination results will be or had been sent separately: A. Ünal, RHA 31 (1973) 53–54.

§ 3.   8   ⸢ḫur⸣-la-aš a-ra-i-iš ⸢na⸣-ak-ki-še-⸢et⸣¹ta-aš

       9   ḫa-ar-ka-an ta-aš ⸢uḷ⸣-ḫa-li-⸢iš⸣-še-et ta-aš

       10   DINGIR.MEŠ pa-ra-a   pí-ta-aš

§ 4.   11 ^{uru}Ḫa-at-tu-⸢ša⸣-aš ^{d}I-na-re-eš a-ra-i-iš

       12   iš-tar-ni-ka-i-in ta-aš ḫe-⸢en⸣-ka-an ⸢ta⸣-aš

       13   ḫa-ar-ka-an ta-aš ₗḫur-la(?) ba-iₗ-iš

§ 5.   14   [   ]-⸢x-x a-ra⸣-i-iš na-a[k-ki-še-e]ₗt ta-aₗš

       15   [DINGIR.MEŠ pa-ra-a] pí-ta-aš ⸢x⸣-[ ]

§ 6.   16   [   ](-)⸢x-ka⸣-[

(breaks off)

Rev.

       1   [   ](-)⸢x(-)x⸣(-)[

       2   ⸢ḫe-en⸣-ka-an [ta-aš(?)   ...   ta-aš(?)]

       3   ^{uru}Ḫa-aš-šu-⸢i⸣   [ba-i-iš]

§ 7.   4   na-at-⸢ta⸣ ^{uru}Ka-an-⸢ni-eš⸣ a-ra-i-[iš]

       5   na-ak-ki-⸢iš⸣-še-⸢et⸣ ta-aš ḫur-la-aš ul-ḫa-a[l-li-iš-š]e-et ta-aš

       6   i-ta-lu-⸢i⸣ [pí-t]a-aš

§ 8.   7   [i-t]a-⸢lu⸣-[wa?-an?-za ḫ]e-⸢en⸣-ka-an ⸢ta⸣-aš

       8   [   ]-⸢x-x⸣(-)[K]UR?-aš ⸢a⸣-aš-šu ar-ḫa tu-uḫ-še-et

§ 9.   9   LUGA[L] ⸢x-x⸣(-)ar-ši-ni-i ^{dI}Ḫal-⸢ma⸣-šu-ut ⸢ta⸣-aš

       10   LUGAL-aš p[i-r]a-an pí-tu-lị-ya-an ta-i-iš

       11   SAL.LUGAL p[i-ra-a]n(?) pí-tu-li-ya-an ta-i-iš

       12   DINGIR.MEŠ-a[š? pa-r]a-⸢a⸣   pa-i-it

§ 10.   13 ^{uru}⸢x⸣-[...]-⸢ša⸣¹?-tu-ma-aš a-ra-i-iš

       14   i-t[a-lu-uš i]š-ta-za-na-aš$^{ME.EŠ}$ ⸢ta⸣-aš

       15   LUGAL-⸢aš MÈ⸣¹? ta-aš ut-ni-ya-ta-an uš-tu-ul ta-aš

       16   ar-ši-in   ta-aš

       17   ⸢DINGIR⸣.MEŠ pa-ra-a   pí-ta-aš

§ 11.   18   ⸢A-aš-ki-li-aš a-ra-i-⸢iš⸣

       19   i-ta-⸢lu-wa⸣ ba-i-it

Obv.

§ 1.   1   The Old Woman of Ḫattuš(a) (says/reports thus):

       2   Ziki⟨l⟩tu arose.

       3   He took the difficulty of the king,

       4   (and) carried (it) out (to) the gods.

§ 2. 5 The Stormgod of the s[k]y arose. He took the illness,
       6 took the difficulty of the king,
       7 (and) gave (them back to) Zikiltu.

§ 3. 8 The Hurrian arose. He took his difficulty,
       9 took the destruction, took his attack,
      10 (and) carried (them) out (to) the gods.

§ 4. 11 The goddess Inare of Ḫattuš(a) arose.
      12 She took the illness, took the death,
      13 took the destruction, (and) gave (them back) to the Hurrian.

§ 5. 14 [...] arose. It took [hi]s diffi[culty,]
      15 (and) carried (them) [out (to) the gods.] ... [

§ 6. 16 (traces of two signs, then breaks off)

Rev.
       1 [...]
       2 [took] the death, [took the ...,]
       3 (and) [gave (them back?)] to the city of Ḫaššu(wa).

§ 7. 4 The city of Kanneš [did] not arise.
       5 It took his difficulty, took the atta[ck] of the Hurrian,
       6 (and) [car]ried (them) to the evil.

§ 8. 7 The evi[l] took the [d]eath,
       8 (and) [...] cut off the welfare of [the l]and?.

§ 9. 9 The kin[g of the land? of ...?](-)aršinī took the sacred throne.
      10 He put the worry b[ef]ore the king,
      11 he (also) put the worry b[efor]e? the queen.
      12 He went [forw]ard t[o] the gods.

§ 10. 13 The city of [...]š/gatuma? arose.
      14 It took the ev[il p]ersons,
      15 took the battle? of the king, took the sin of the nations,
      16 took the *arši-*,
      17 (and) carried (them) out (to) the gods.

§ 11. 18 Āškilia arose (saying):
      19 "The evil (one) has gone!"

II. Commentary.

Obv.[11] 2 and 7: According to Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1) 174, the person bearing the name twice mentioned in the text — once with a spelling error (^{m}Zi-$^{\lceil}ki^{\rceil}$-⟨il-⟩$^{\lceil}tu^{\rceil}$-$uš$) — is a Hittite general[12]. However, from a morphological perspective we can immediately recognize that the name is not of Anatolian origin: neither is it a typical Hittite-Luwian name, nor does it belong to the so-called "Cappadocian names" among which the non-Indo-European Hattian language is strongly represented. In this situation, a place of origin outside of Anatolia becomes probable. The first alternative that comes to mind is the Hurro-Semitic/Amorite milieu. In my opinion, the most fitting candidate for this would be Zikild/ta, who is documented in the texts from Alalaḫ levels VII and IV. In the list of proper names given by D. J. Wiseman, The Alalakh Tablets (1953) 153, we encounter the following persons[13]:

Zi-ki-$^{\lceil}il^{\rceil}$-da: AlT 19[!]:3 from level VII. The text number must be corrected to 24. The tablet belongs to the reign of Ammitakumma, the king of Alalaḫ. In this document, Zikilda and before him Nadina both bear the title $^{lú.meš}ku$-ut-tu-ru[14]. A copy of the tablet is provided by Wiseman, AlT, plate X, and more recently by Zeeb, UF 24,478.

Zi-gi-il-ta[!?]: (LÚ *A-la-la-aḫ*) AlT 58:27 from level VII. The tablet is dated with the name of Irkabtum, king of Yamḫad. As opposed to the reading *Zi-gi-il-ki-ba* by Wiseman, ibid., 152, the name should be emended as proposed here. The copy of the tablet is in Wiseman, ibid., plate XVII.

[*Zi-gi-il-te*]: AlT 270:13 from level VII. However, this must correspond to the Akkadian word *sikiltu(m)* "possession, acquisition"; see Wiseman, JCS 13 (1959) 29 and A. Goetze, ibid., 37.

Zi-ki-il-ta: AlT 148:16, 156:6, 217:18 from level IV.

Zi-ki-il₅-ta: AlT 137:3 from level IV.

Zi-ki-il[!?]-*ta*: AlT. 207:44 from level IV. Wiseman, AlT, 153 reads this as *Zi-ki-ia-ta*.

---

[11] For the contextual confirmation of the obv./rev. determination of the tablet given in the edition of KBo. 18 with question marks, see Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1) 163.

[12] According to Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1) 170 fn. 34, Güterbock has retracted his early proposal in KBo. 18, Indices (p. XIV), that despite the male determinative, Zikiltu may be the same person as the Old Woman from Ḫattuš(a) performing this divination (obv. 1).

[13] Since D. J. Wiseman does not provide the cuneiform copies of all tablets, some of the occurrences of Zikilta are based merely on his readings and commentaries, so that no certainty can be claimed here. Moreover, the index of his book is sometimes unreliable on the readings of the names and citing of their occurrences. Therefore, I refer to them only with reservation.

[14] This is mentioned both in AHw. I 519 and in CAD K 611 under *kutturu* as a profession/social class of unknown meaning. But F. Zeeb, UF 24 (1992) 464, interprets the passage in question as DUMU.MEŠ *Ku-ut-tu-ru* "the sons of Kutturu (= proper name)".

The interesting point in KBo. 18,151 is that besides the spelling error made once in the writing of Ziki⟨l⟩tu, the name has been set down in this Hittite document as a *u*-stem, although the occurrences in Alalaḫ end always with -*a*[15]. It is a fact that the proper names from the Syrian region are generally rendered into Hittite either retaining their original forms (Zukraši, Irkabtu, or occasionally with an *a*-theme vowel (like Aziru/Azira). The unusual case of the proper noun in KBo. 18,151 possibly occurred not so much due to the incorrect pronunciation of a foreign name in Hittite, but rather because of the ethnic origin and dialect of the Old Woman (= female practitioner) from Ḫattuš(a) who dictated the text. This assumption — as will be discussed below — is valid since in KBo. 18,151 not only Zikiltu, but also other proper names of Anatolian origin exhibit rare stems.

Even if Zikiltu in KBo. 18,151 did not originate in Alalaḫ, we might expect him to be a citizen of a city-state in Northern Syria which was initially under the sovereignty of the Hurro-Amorite Kingdom of Yamḫad (the Alalaḫ VII period), and was later dominated by the Mittanni Kingdom (the Alalaḫ IV period). The frequent attestation of personal names in the Boğazköy documents also known from Alalaḫ VII, like Atradu, Dada, Zukraši[16], and the fact that the latter of these was a general from Yamḫad who fought together with Zaluti against the Hittites under the command of Ḫattušili I near the city of Ḫaššu(wa), strengthen the possibility of Zikiltu's being a person from the same region, who exercised a military-administrative profession. But, contrary to Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1) 172 and 174, I hold the belief that Zikiltu was not an ally of the Hittite king, but was rather his enemy. Indeed, in KBo. 18,151 § 1, Zikiltu was involved in an action against the king in parallel to the actions that the enemy in § 3 (*ḫurla*-"the Hurrian") and the other foe in § 5 (the city of Ḫaššu(wa)?; see rev. 3) were engaged in. In contrast to Zukraši, we do not come across Zikiltu in the extant Hittite historical texts. However, it is not necessary for him to be a famous person like Zukraši. His inclusion in this oracle reflected his contemporary status — as the enemy whom the Hittite king had just planned to engage in combat.

In addition to the occurrences of the proper name Zikild/ta outside of Ḫattuša, there is another document recently introduced by M. Sal-

---

[15] In the Hittite-Anatolian onomasticon the alternation of *a/u* as final phoneme is observed only between masculine Zidand/ta and feminine Zidandu proper names; see E. Laroche, NH (1966) 329.

[16] For these persons and their attestations see C. Kühne, ZA 62 (1972) 242 ff.

vini in The Ḫabiru Prism of King Tunip-Teššup of Tikunani (1996). This text, in the form of a prism, is a list of 438 "*ḫabiru*-soldiers" whose names are mostly Hurrian or Semitic. Among these a ᵐ*Zi-ki-il-da* (vi 16) is mentioned. The document belongs to Tunip-Teššup, the king of Tikunan(i), a Hurrian city located in the Middle Euphrates region, between southeastern Anatolia and northern Syria. From an Akkadian letter of Ḫattušili I sent to this king (published in SMEA 34 [1994] 61−80 by Salvini), we deduce that Tunip-Teššup was a contemporary and vassal of the Hittite king Ḫattušili I. Thus, even though the Zikild/ta in question was not necessarily one of the persons in the Alalaḫ texts, he was clearly contemporaneous with the other person(s) sharing his name in the Alalaḫ VII period. Also, his military status in this list of persons fits the interpretations that I have made for the Zikiltu in KBo. 18,151 very well. The prism of Tunip-Teššup also includes names that are similar to and identical with the personal names of foreign individuals and enemies of the Hittites. These names are found in historical documents relating to military-political events which occurred in the Middle Euphrates region during the reign of Ḫattušili I; for example: ᵐ*I-ri-ya* (i 51, 52) cf. Iriyaya in the "Uršu-Text" KBo. 1,11 obv.ᶦ 28′; ᵐ*Ka-ni-ú* (vii 1) cf. Kaniu in the "Cannibal-Text" KBo. 3,60 ii 8 and 12.

The appearance of particular personal names as active symbols in divination proceedings is not characteristic only of KBo. 18,151; further and rare examples are found in Archi (see fn. 1) 144. Among these a person named Temete/i appears as an active oracular figure in KUB 5,1 iii 91−92 (ᵐ*Temeteiš⸗za* GÙB-*tar* INIM *šalli⸗ya waštul* ME-*aš /nu⸗kan* DINGIR.MEŠ-*aš* ⟨*paiš*⟩). As understood from this divination text, Temete/i is an official directing certain military operations in real life. But, unlike Zikiltu in KBo. 18,151, Temete/i is an ally or a commander of the Hittite army fighting against the hostile Kaškaen cities[17].

Obv. 3, 6, 8, 14; rev. 5: In this text *nakki-* (n.) is always used with the possessive pronoun -*šet* "his". The word which has been translated by Archi (see fn. 1) 133 and by Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1) 165, 169 fn. 31 as "difficulty" we find in CHD L−N, Fasc. 4 (1989) 368 under *nakki-* B with the meaning "honor, importance, power". Because it appears exclusively among the negative symbols in the course of this divination's proceedings (obv. 5: *ištarnikai-* "illness"; 9: *ḫarka-* "ruin")

---

[17] Cf. R. H. Beal, THeth. 20 (1992) 470−471; text edition by Ünal, THeth. 4 (1974) 32 ff.

I would prefer the first mentioned meaning. Note that later in CHD P, Fasc. 1 (1994) 49, the translation given for *nakki-* is also "difficulty".

That *nakki-* in our text belongs to the king (LUGAL-*aš*) is especially emphasized in obv. 3 and 6. Although the word "king" is not paired with "difficulty" again, *nakki-* must be attributed to the king also in three subsequent lines (obv. 8, 14, rev. 5), referred to as just -*šet* "his" in order to conserve space on the tablet.

Obv. 5: According to the files of the Chicago Hittite Dictionary Project the spelling of the word *nepiš(a)-* "sky, heaven" with initial *ni-°* is unique only to KBo. 18,151; for the occurrences *nepiš(a)-* see CHD L−N, 448. Kammenhuber, THeth 9 (1979) 223, cites [...](-)*x*(-)*ni-pi-ša-az* in KUB 44,56 obv. 8' as a possible second occurrence for this *ni-°* writing; however, in this acephalic condition it could have another referent. KUB 44,56 contains a purification ritual, and due to both its content (cf. rev. 2, 15: *l/tabar[na]*, rev. 9: ᵈŠulin[katte]) and its syntactical features (cf. rev. rt. col. 1, 8, 9: particles and pronouns suffixed to the predicate), it is probably of Hattian origin.

For the occurrences of *nepišaš* ᵈIŠKUR "the Stormgod of the sky", which all are from the Old and Middle Hittite periods, see provisionally Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1) 170; additions to these are: KBo. 3,7 i 2; KBo. 3,22 rev. 51, 56; KUB 23,12 ii (19'); KUB 33,24 i 29'; KUB 57,86:6'.

The arising of Ziki⟨l⟩tu and delivering of negative things to the gods by him in the previous paragraph forces the Stormgod of the sky in line 5 to react, since he is a member of the divine group on the king's side. Thus, the general designation DINGIR.MEŠ in line 4 and the specific god *nipišaš* ᵈIŠKUR in line 5 are closely connected within the oracle procedures. The same relationship and oracular proceeding exist between DINGIR.MEŠ and ᵘʳᵘḪattušaš ᵈInare in obv. 10−11.

Obv. 9; rev. 5: *ulḫal(l)i-* occurs in this text twice and in both cases with the possessive pronoun -*šet* "his". It is an *i*-stem, neuter noun. As stated in Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1) 169, *ulḫal(l)i-* should have a negative or ominous connotation as do *nakki-* (obv. 8, rev. 5) and *ḫarka-* (obv. 9) which accompany it. In Archi (see n. 1) 133 and 134, one step further is taken and the word is seen to be related to *walḫ-* "to strike, to hit" and is translated as "attack". Based on the Old Hittite phonetic alternation of *w/u* as in initially *walkeššaraḫḫ-/ulkeš-šaraḫḫ-*, *war-/ur-*, *waštul/uštul* (this appears already in our text rev. 15) one may postulate the formation of *walḫ-+-alli* (adjectival suffix) with the meaning "pertaining to strike/hit > attack". In rev. 5, this word is

directly connected to the Hurrian (enemy), and this alludes to the most important military problem of the Hittites during the Old Kingdom, which was the Hurrian threat[18]. The fear of this force — also reflected in an Old Hittite song in KBo. 3,40 rev. 13'−15' — seems to appear in oracle KBo. 18,151 with the same negative/ominous connotation.

Obv. 11: Surprisingly, the name of the goddess in the nominative case appears here as ^{d}*I-na-re-eš* instead of in the usual *a*-stem[19]. From what we know of the (Hattian-)Hittite pantheon, and because of the pret. sg. 3 predicates in KBo. 18,151 obv. 11−13 (*arāiš, taš, baīš*) that refer to this goddess, ^{d}Inareš clearly cannot represent a collective plural form like ^{d}Gulšeš, ^{d}Šalawaneš etc.[19a]. This feature must be interpreted, along with the proper name Zikiltu, as an example of the abnormal use of theme vowels in our text, a characteristic of the native language of the Old Woman; see below.

The goddess Inar(a) of Hattian origin as is specified in our text belongs to the city of Ḫattuš(a). "The Inar(a) of Ḫattuša" is alluded to only in documents from the Old Hittite Period, and rarely at that: KBo. 17,5 ii 6 // KBo. 17,4 ii (2'). It is remarkable that the same goddess is also mentioned in the Old Hittite "Puḫanu-Chronicle" KUB 31,4 + KBo. 3,41 obv. 20 ff. along with the Hittite officials (generals?) Zidi and Š[uppiy]aḫšu in a military context concerning an expedition against the city of Ḫalpa (= Aleppo).

Obv. 12−13: These lines clearly show that the symbols which occur together in this oracle are always of the same negative character. Fortunately, we know the meaning of each of the three consecutive elements here: *ištarnikai-* "illness", *ḫenkan* "death, plague" and *ḫarka-* "ruin, destruction".

Obv. 13: The traces of the two signs found before $_⌊ba-i_⌋$-*iš* are read as LU[GAL?]-*i?* "to the king" by Archi (see fn. 1) 132, and as *aš-šu* "good (thing)" by Ünal/Kammenhuber (see fn. 1) 164. As for the traces I do not prefer either of the readings. However, in the Boğazköy texts, the spelling *aš-šu* is very seldom documented, and it seems unlikely for the age of the language of our document (see below). Indeed, the spelling

[18] Cf. Archi (see n. 1) 133: "l'attacco(?) del hurrita".
[19] For the occurrences of this goddess and writing of her name in the Boğazköy documents see Kammenhuber, ZA 66 (1976) 68−88 and RlA 5 (1976−80) 89−90. The supposition of O. Carruba; Problemi di sostrato nelle lingue indoeuropee (1983) 89, that Inar(a) may have been of Indo-European origin is unprovable with the currently available philological and cultural information; see J. Friedrich, Fs. G. Hirt II (1936) 223 n. 1.
[19a] Contra B. H. L. van Gessel, Onomasticon of the Hittite Pantheon, Part I (1998) 188.

a-aš-šu appears in rev. 8 of our text. Moreover, the verb *pai-* "to give" requires a dative object just as in § 2 (there line 7: to Zikiltu). Accordingly, Archi's interpretation is more probable. However, there still remains the question of why the goddess Inar(e) should give all the negative symbols to the king. It should be remembered that this goddess is on the side of the Hittite king as already suggested by Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1) 172 f. In retaliation for the "king's difficulty" which has been delivered up in § 1 to the gods by the enemy Zikiltu (to the detriment of the Hittite king), the ominous things are returned to him by the Stormgod of the sky in § 2, who is on the side of the Hittite king (Ünal/Kammenhuber: loc. cit.). According to this interpretation, the calamitous things in § 4 must be given to *ḫurla-* "the Hurrian (enemy)", who has transferred them in § 3 to the gods (against the Hittite king). Therefore, I would propose ₍*ḫur-li*₎ or better ₍*ḫur-la*₎ (i.e. Old Hittite allative, "to the Hurrian")[20] as the broken indirect object. Because of the parallelism between § 2 and § 4, and also due to the space in the damaged part in this line, I discount another dative possibility ₍*aš-šu-i*₎ "to the good".

Obv. 14: According to the analogies noted above, the partly broken object at the beginning of the line must be one of the opponents of the Hittite king. Since at the end of this phrase the evil thing(s) are given (back?) to the enemy city of Ḫaššu(wa) (rev. 3), the best candidate for the completion of obv. 14 is, as expected, the city itself. However, the narrowness of the broken portion and the traces of the signs do not permit the word to be restored as ᵘʳᵘ*Ḫa-aš-šu-(wa-)aš*. Because KBo. 18,151 mostly ignores the *a*-theme vowel in proper names (see below), instead of Ḫaššu(wa), one could expect a form like Ḫaššu. This appears primarily in the Akkadian documents from Boğazköy and represents the city's original name. Although a reading such as [ᵘʳᵘ*Ḫa-š*]₍*u-uš*₎(?) (i.e. the nominative case in Hittite) fits the traces of the signs well, it is doubtful in two respects: First of all, to date we have not encountered Hittite nominative or accusative forms where this city name is declined in the *u*-stem. Secondly, there is no occurrence in Hittite of this city name without geminate -*šš*- (here, rev. 3). Perhaps the beginning of line 14 should be restored with something

---

[20] The Winkelhakens of the first sign are more clearly visible according to the collation of the photograph. That Old Hittite used, beside the dative form *ḫurli*, also an allative form *ḫurla* (inanimate class!), is revealed in KBo. 3,46 + KUB 26,75 obv. 33: *ḫurla·ma·ššan ḫenkan šiya[ir]* "But (the gods) sho[t] the death/plague at the Hurrian".

else pertaining to the city of Ḫaššu(wa), the name of a person or a god, etc.

Rev. 3: For the completion of the broken portion following the city name ᵘʳᵘḪaššui (dative; the stem is Ḫaššu(w)a or Ḫaššu) after a long hiatus, Archi (see fn. 1) 132 suggests [ba-a-iš(?)], and Ünal/Kammenhuber (see fn. 1) 164 propose [(pa-ra-a pí-ta-aš)]. The formal convention of this text, by which only one word may stand at the end of a long blank space after the preceding word(s) (e. g. obv. 4, 7, 10, rev. 12, 16, 17) supports Archi's suggestion. Furthermore, in KBo. 18,151, the compound verb parā pita "to carry out" is used as an action directed only towards the gods (obv. 4, 10, rev. 17), and this does not fit the other dative objects like ᵘʳᵘḪaššui here or italui in rev. 6 (see below). After the restoration and interpretation of this line as ᵘʳᵘḪa-aš-šu-i [ba-i-iš] "It (the agent which is not preserved, but it may be something on the side of the Hittite king) [gave (back)] (the evil things) to the city of Ḫaššu(wa)", the oracle proceedings in § 6 here are parallel to those in § 2 and § 4.

Rev. 4: Being a common gender word in Hittite (ḫappira-), the city which is the subject of the sentences in lines 4−6 should have the nominative ending -š. Therefore, contra Archi (see n. 1) 132 and Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1) 164, the last damaged sign of the word is hardly "še". I prefer the reading ⌜ᵘʳᵘ⌝Ka-an-⌜ni-eš⌝!, which − despite the difficulties of Güterbock's copy − is supported by my collation of the tablet photograph. There, most probably because of the hasty writing, one of the Winkelhakens of the sign is missing. In this form the city is represented in our text by its earlier Hattian name[21]. Although the spelling ᵘʳᵘKa-ni-eš appears in Boğazköy documents, there is no other example from Boğazköy or Kültepe with a geminated middle consonant[22]. The form in KBo. 18,151 represents, of course, no exact Hittite nominative case (cf. ᵘʳᵘḪakp/miš : nom. ᵘʳᵘḪakpiššaš, and ᵘʳᵘKargamiš : nom. ᵘʳᵘKargamišaš), but the ending -š of the original city name seems to be an improvised solution to denote the nominative case. Besides this, as the form ᵈᶦḪalmašut (acc.!) in rev. 9 shows, this text does not use the common gender carefully, or, simply ignores it (see also below).

Because of the proposal made above, it is no longer necessary to argue that the place name in KBo. 18,151 is identical to the north

---

[21] Cf. Archi (see n. 1) 133.

[22] For the occurrences of this city see G. F. del Monte/J. Tischler, RGTC 6 (1978) 169; for additions see del Monte, RGTC 6/2 (1992) 62 f. (Boğazköy), and K. Nashef, RGTC 4 (1991) 65 ff. (Kültepe).

Syrian city *Ga-ni/ne-šu*[KI] in the Ebla texts; see M. C. Astour, in: Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft von Ebla. Akten der Internationalen Tagung Heidelberg 4.–7. November 1986 (1988) 153 and in: Fs. D. Young (1996) 226.

It is in this text that we come across for the first time in a KIN-oracle the expression *natta araīš* "it did not arise". In later KIN-oracles, without exception, the semi-logographic predicate GUB-*iš/ir* is used with subjects who "arise" in order to execute the action, and there is no special term for "not arising". The emphasis given by *natta araīš* in KBo. 18,151 would then be a sign of textual archaism which is not an economical use for the usual oracle text[23]. The condition of "not arising" in this line carries over into lines 7 and 9 of the reverse because the active symbols there continue their actions without "arising". For line 7, as will be mentioned below, there is no need for restoration of the verb *arāi-*, and it does not even occur in line 9[24]. It would seem that after line 4 of the reverse it is not necessary to mention the state of "not arising" as customary in the usual KIN-oracle examples. In KBo. 18,151, as a consequence of the combination and comparison of the preliminary actions done with or without "arising", we come across the following situations:

1. In the event of "arising" (the subjects in this oracle text are the whole of the active symbols), the final actions in the consecutive paragraphs repeat respectively. It concerns a certain reciprocation between them: the "carrying out" (= *parā pita-*: obv. 4, 10, 15, rev. 17) of some (negative) things to the gods by the king's enemies, and the "giving (back), returning" of these by the gods in retaliation (= *bai-*: obv. 7, 13, rev. [3]; see above). The only exception in the last paragraph of the text is that in this case the final result of the divination is stated; it is not an oracular proceeding. Every (negative) action which begins with the state of arising, promotes the (positive) active symbols on the other (i. e. king's) side to arise and execute a counter-action in the following paragraph.

---

[23] Besides the distinctive archaic features of the language of KBo. 18,151 – this oracle is perhaps our oldest sample of its genre – there are also many full writings which one does not expect in a divination document. In contrast to New Hittite examples, the oracle symbols are found here in their full syllabic writing. For the Hittite words, the plene-writings and the CV-VC spellings (instead of newer CVC) are preferred; cf. Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1) 168 and 180.

[24] Thus, the explanation of Ünal/Kammenhuber (see fn. 1) 173 that *arāi-* could not be written due to the short length of space there is unnecessary.

2. In the case of "not arising" (the subjects in this oracle text are active symbols other than the gods), the last actions can be varied without showing any reciprocation: "to carry" (= *pita-*: rev. 6, without preverb *parā-*!; see below), "to cut off" (= *arḫa tuḫš-*: rev. 8), "to go forward" (= *parā pai-*: rev. 12). An action executed without arising does not always require a counter-action from the other side. Hence, another active symbol from the same side can carry out the actions in the consecutive paragraph (just like the enemy actions mentioned one after the other in rev. 7, 9, 13).

Rev. 5—6: Because the predicate *ta-aš* "took" at the end of the line 5 was overlooked in Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1) 164—165, a change of the subject (*ḫurlaš*) in the third sentence of this paragraph was suggested: "Der Hurriter brachte ...". However, in KBo. 18,151 each of the actions of the oracular progression belongs to the same agent named at the beginning of the first sentence of each paragraph. That is, a change of subject does not occur within the confines of the same paragraph[25]. This means the city of Kanneš is the only agent of the actions in lines 4—6. Moreover, contrary to Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1) 164, there is not enough space in the broken portion for the restoration of [*pa-ra-a pí-t*]*a-aš*. Agreeing with Archi (see n. 1) 132, I prefer the form without *parā* for the verb in question: *i-ta-lu-i̯* [*pí-t*]*a-aš*. It should be also noted that in KBo. 18,151 obv. 4, 10, rev. 17 a wide gap is left between the words *parā* and *pitaš* which does not fit the appearance of rev. 6.

On the expression *ḫurlaš ulḫalli꞊ššet* "of the Hurrian, his attack" = "the Hurrian attack" see under section III, below. Thus, lines 5—6 should be read now as follows: It (= the city of Kanneš) took his (= the king's) difficulty, took the Hurrian atta[ck], (and) [carr]ied (them) to the evil".

italu "evil", which appears for the first time in rev. 6 after contacted by ᵘʳᵘ*Kanneš*, and then becomes active as a negative figure in the following line, is most probably the main concern of this divination procedure. Note that with its disappearance in rev. 19, KBo. 18,151 is concluded.

Rev. 7: Both Archi (see n. 1) 132 and Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1) 164 restore the break after [*i-t*]*a-lu* as [*a-ra-i-iš*]. However, it is not obligatory to use the verb *arāi-* here, since the subject in the following

---

[25] The change of subject between Āškalia and *italu* in the last paragraph of KBo. 18,151 is not in contradiction, because the sentence in the last line does not describe an oracle development, but rather announces the final verdict.

paragraph, the "king of the land[?] [...[?]](-)aršinī", takes the object there without "arising". In addition, the damaged part of rev. line 7 which follows [i-t]a-lu, begins immediately after the end of the sign "lu", and this gap should be filled with a case ending for [i-t]a-lu-[...] rather than with a second word like [a-ra-i-iš]. In order for the word italu (n.) "evil, bad" to be the subject for the following transitive predicate taš "took", it needs to be personified with the -ant- extension and thus transformed to common gender. Therefore, I suggest the interpretation [i-t]a-lu-[(wa-an-)za ḫ]e-en-ka-an ta-aš "[e]vi[l] (thing) took [d]eath". This also eliminates the argument − which is totally dependent on this text portion − as to whether a neuter noun (italu) could become the subject of a transitive verb (see Kammenhuber in Fs. W. Winter [1985] 455, versus J. J. S. Weitenberg, MSS 48 [1987] 227 fn. 2, and E. Neu, HS 102 [1989] 11.) Although to date we have not encountered the form *idltalu(w)anza in any Boğazköy document[26], its semi-logographic writing ḪUL-lu-u-wa-an-za does appear in the oracle text KUB 50,71 obv. 16, dating to a period later than KBo. 18,151.

Rev. 8: The positive symbol a-aš-šu which has been cut off (arḫa tuḫš-) by the "evil (thing)" does not stand alone but rather belongs to the preceding broken word in the genitive case. One expects to find here an oracular expression such as "well-being of the house, of the land" known from the later KIN-oracles. Due to visible traces of the broken sign (confirmed by collation) I propose [K]UR[?]-aš a-aš-šu "well-being, welfare of the land"[27]. For the spelling KUR-aš(-ša) instead of the more frequently encountered KUR-e-aš(-ša) in oracle texts see KUB 5,1 i 45b and KUB 22,64 iii 8'.

Rev. 9: The accusative object ḫal-ḫal-˹ma˺-šu-ut which precedes the transitive predicate ta-aš "took" at the end of the line is identified as ḫalmašu(i)t- "throne" by Archi (see fn. 1) 132 ff. through an emendation of {ḪAL}[28]. Ünal/Kammenhuber (see fn. 1) 169 and 175, however, separate ḫalḫalmašut from ḫalmašu(i)t-, and take it as a hapax of unknown meaning. In Friedrich/Kammenhuber, HW² Lfg. 11 (1991) 27 the word is listed under a separate lemma, followed by words with similar initial

---

[26] Instead of this, forms such as i-du-la-wa-an-za, i-da-(a-)la-u-wa-an-za or semi-logo-graphic ḪUL-u-wa-za and ḪUL-u-(wa-)an-za are used.

[27] According to collation of the photograph, the traces right before "aš" look rather like three Winkelhakens, so that the sign is clearly not "ta". Therefore, the interpretation [t]a-aš "[n]ahm es" by Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1) 164 f., and also other genitive options such as [ut-ni-ya-an[?]-t]a-aš (for utniya(n)t- cf. rev. 15) etc. must be excluded.

[28] Cf. the scribal errors categorized by Chr. Rüster, in: Fs. H. Otten² (1988) 304 f. sub nr. 4 as resulting from dittography or redundant sign usage.

sound, such as *ḫalḫaldana-*, *ḫalḫaltumari-*, *ḫalḫalwališ*(?), *ḫalḫalzana-*.
Because the concept of "dais, throne (god)" is a symbol frequently en-
countered in the KIN-oracles (in New Hittite always in logographic writ-
ing $^{d/giš}$DAG), I agree with Archi's emendation. However, another expla-
nation may be proposed: The first "*ḫal*" sign may be a dittographic error
made in anticipation of the following "*ḫal*". In writing the divine deter-
minative for "throne (god)" the Hittite scribe passed on to following
"*ḫal*" before adding the finishing vertical of the sign "*an/*^{d}" : ^{dl}*Ḫal-⌐ma¹-
šu-ut*.

It is exceptional in a Hittite document for this divine (actually a
goddess) name − or rather designation for the concept of the "sacred
throne" − to be in neuter gender of the *t*-stem. Nevertheless, the word
is of Hattian origin, which does have a consonantal stem. The Hattian
nominal chains *ka-a-ḫa(-a)-an-wa$_a$-šu-it-tu(-ú)-un* and *ka(-a)-ḫa-an-
wa$_a$-šu-id-du(-ú)-un* (KUB 2,2+KUB 48,1 iii 16, 20, 24 // KBo. 21,110
obv. 2′, 5′, 8′) contain this word in its full form: here it is with the
prefix *ka-* and the oblique ending *-un*. Because it is a loan word, it
appeared with various theme vowels (*-a*, *-e/i*, and even *-u*) and was
transformed into common gender in Hittite[29]. Also both the Hattian
form ^{d}Ḫanwa$_a$šūīt in a recitation (KUB 1,17 vi 32) and the Old Hittite
nominative form ^{d}Ḫalmaššuiz (c., *^{d}*Ḫalmassuit-s*) point to a con-
sonantal stem. Thus, in KBo. 18,151, whether it refers to the goddess
herself or to the sacred throne, ^{d}Ḫalmašut represents the oldest form
of the word fully reflecting its Hattian origin. This undeclined, neuter
form is preferred here over the expected accusative common form
(*^{d}Ḫalmašuitan) required by the context in rev. line 9.

Because in KBo. 18,151 ^{d}Ḫalmašut is − unlike ^{d}IŠKUR and ^{d}Inare −
in the passive position, it points to the sacred throne rather than to the
goddess herself. In our text, the "(sacred) throne" is taken by the king of
the enemy [...?](-)aršinī-land[7] and the "worry" is placed before the Hit-
tite royal couple. What is symbolized here is the loss of the throne as an
unfavorable feature in the oracular proceeding. Naturally this misfor-
tune concerns not only the king but also the queen and must be the
reason for the sole allusion to the queen in this oracle. It is interesting
that − contrary to obv. 5, 11 and rev. 1 f. − the gods on the king's side
remain inactive against the hostile actions toward the royal couple. This
might be because the enemies act here without "arising", and at the end

---

[29] For the occurrences see Friedrich/Kammenhuber, HW² Lfg. 11, 69 ff.; J. Puhvel,
HED 3 (1991) 41 ff.

of the paragraph they do not deliver anything negative to the gods (*parā pita-*), but they just go forward to them (*parā pai-*).

Rev. 13: The partly preserved name of the city is read with reserve as Š[eraš]šatumaš by Archi (see n. 1) 132 f., and as x[...]š/gatumaš by Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1) 164 in which they suggest here an ethnicon formation with the *-u(m)na*-suffix. There is indeed a city called Šeraššatt[a] known from KBo. 16,53 rev. 33. However, both the hand copy of Güterbock and my collation of the tablet's photograph confirm that the first sign of the city name cannot be "*še*". Since in the text no person appears in connection with this city, the subject of the sentence here is the city alone in nominative case, just like Kanneš in rev. 4. Therefore, no ethnicon affix is required with this toponym. Both their foreign-sounding names and their hostile position against the (Hittite) king in the oracular proceeding (see below) make it conceivable that the city of x[...]š/gatuma in this line and the land? of [...?](-) aršinī in rev. 9 (in genitive construction) were located in a region outside the Hittite borders, possibly in the direction of Ḫaššu(wa)-Ḫurri and of the home town of Zikilta[30].

Rev. 14: In my opinion, the partly preserved *i-t[a-lu ...]* at the beginning of the line is not a substantive, but an adjective modifying the following accusative plural word [*i*]*š-ta-za-na-aš*(-*me-eš*). Consequently, it should be completed as *i-t[a-lu-uš]* for grammatical congruence[31]. Collation from the photograph illustrates that the sign "*ta*" in the text is shorter than in Güterbock's copy, and that the following broken space is large enough to include an additional "*uš*" sign. The analysis of the word *išta⟨n⟩zanaš*, which due to context should be in the accusative case[32] becomes highly problematic together with the signs "*me-eš*" attached to it. In the secondary literature, the word is rendered as with the enclitic possessive pronoun "their" (*išta⟨n⟩zana(š)=šmeš*) in this passage. Although a plural accusative

---

[30] For the view that the land? [...?](-)aršinī should be kept apart from the western Anatolian city Aršani, see Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1) 167 fn. 22.

[31] So far, a plural accusative common form *idl taluš is not attested in the Hittite texts. Instead, the semi-logographic writing of ḪUL-*lu-uš* is found; for a list of occurrences see J. J. S. Weitenberg, HUS, 213.

[32] Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1) 165, 174, 176 and N. Oettinger, KZ 94 (1980) 58 take the case as plural dative-locative, but Puhvel, HED 2 (1984) 470 has disputed this. However, Puhvel's interpretation of *italu* (n.) as agent of the transitive(!) verb *ta-* "to take" ("evil took hold of their souls") cannot be correct either due to remarks on rev. 7 and to the fact that the only subject of the paragraph in question is the town x[...]š/gatuma in rev. 13.

form *iš-ta-an-za-na-aš* exists in KBo. 3,21 ii 4, it is not grammatically possible to connect the enclitic possessive pronoun in nominative(!) plural to this form. With a certain reserve, I therefore offer the reading of *[l]š-ta-za-na-aš*^{ME.EŠ}33 because I also assume that the possessive "their" is not required by the context here[34]. This form would be the exact equivalent of the Middle Hittite Akkadographic plural occurrences NA-AP-ŠA-TÚ (KBo. 5,7 obv. 11 and KUB 13,8 obv. 16, 17) and especially NA-AP-ŠA-TE^{MEŠ} (KUB 36,117:12')[35]. All these stand for "(living) persons" (but in our text passage specifically for "evil persons") rather than for "souls" because the plural post-determinative MEŠ is used for animate beings (in contrast to this see GIDIM.ḪI.A "dead persons, spirits"). The spelling of the plural sign as ME.EŠ in our text is characteristic of both Old and Middle Hittite. The existence of the more common "MEŠ" sign in KBo. 18,151 obv. 4, 10, rev. 12 and 17 is not evidence against the acceptance of "ME.EŠ" since other texts in the typical old ductus such as KBo. 20,1 obv. ii? 5' and KBo. 22,2 obv. 1, 7 etc. also use both forms together.

Rev. 15: The traces after LUGAL-*aš* "the king's" allow for at most two signs. Therefore, it is likely that there exists an oracle symbol written as logogram. This would be unique considering that in this text the symbols are otherwise spelled out phonetically. However, due to the scribe's awareness of the space limitation in this line (also obv. 5 and rev. 5) he may have decided to use a logogram. The traces of these signs are recognized as KISLAḪ? "threshing floor", by Archi (see n. 1) 132, and as ^{giš}ERIM/NUNUZ (^{giš}ÉRIN/RÍN) "scales" by Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1) 164, 169—170 and fn. 33. To date, however, neither of these items has been found in any of the KIN-oracles[36]. Furthermore,

---

[33] Although there are examples of the plural post-determinative "ḪI.A" used with syllabically written nouns (*ḫalki*^{ḪI.A}, ^{mu}*ḫuwaši*^{ḪI.A}, *kurur(i)*^{ḪI.A}, *waštul*^{ḪI.A}), the use of "MEŠ" in this context is very rare. The only occurrence I can cite here is KUB 23,101 ii 19: *up-pé-eš-šar*^{MEŠ}-*ma-[a]t-ta ku-e up-pa-aḫ-ḫu-u[n]* "but the gifts which I sen[t] to you". Cf. also Kammenhuber, MIO 2 (1954) 404 w. fn. 6.

[34] Otherwise the question of the referent of the plural possessive "their" remains unanswered.

[35] Cf. H. Otten, HTR (1958) 124; Kammenhuber, ZA 56 (1964) 151, 191 and ZA 57 (1965) 182; also Alp, ḪBM (1991) 314.

[36] The ritual procedure in KBo. 21,22 obv. 18'—20', however, shows that in Hittite thought the term "scales" is connected to the fortune of the royal couple: "Behold, I lift the scales and I offer the long years of *labarna*. Behold, I lift the scales and I offer the long years of *tawananna*!"; see Otten, HTR 132; Archi, in: Fs. P. Meriggi[2] I (1979) 45 ff.; E. Neu, WO 11 (1980) 81 ff.; Puhvel, in: Fs. F. J. Oinas (1982) 194. Furthermore, Otten, ibid., 131—132, also mentions a ceremony with scales in KBo. 17,95 iii 5'—11' in which the king personally took part.

the negative symbols "evil persons" and "the sin of the nations" simultaneously alluded to necessitate a symbol of a similar (i. e. negative) character. From my collation of the tablet's photograph, I believe there are more traces than on H. G. Güterbock's copy. I therefore suggest the reading [A]G².ʾÉRIN⁷ (= ΜÈ) "battle". For ΜÈ LUGAL "the king's battle" as an oracular term from later periods see Archi (see n. 1) 140.

Rev. 16: For the same reasons as above, *ar-ši-in* (here in accusative case) must likewise point to something negative, in contrast to the meaning attributed to it by Archi (see n. 1) 133: "la coltivazione", and by Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1) 165: "Pflanzung(??)" in connection with *arši-* (c.) known from the Hittite laws and generally translated as "cultivation, planting etc.". Thus, *ar-ši-in* here should be kept apart from *arši-* (c.), and should be considered for now a hapax; see Friedrich/Kammenhuber, HW² Lfg. 5 (1980) 346 under *arši-³*.

Rev. 18−19: Here ᶠÀškilia becomes active after the enemy in the previous paragraph arose and transferred the negative things to the gods. The female name Àškilia is strongly reminiscent of Àškaliya which is known from other Boğazköy documents, and was frequently used in the Old Hittite period, but as a masculine name. Considering only the time of the reign of Ḥattušili I, we encounter three different persons with this name:

1. The former lord of the city of Ḥurma who fell out of favor with the king. He was later demoted and sent as "administrator" to the city of Ankuwa where he died in destitution (KBo. 3.34 ii 8−14);
2. The prince who was executed because he rebelled against the king (KBo. 3.35 i 11'−12' // KBo. 13.45:2'−3'). He is also among the witnesses listed in the donation text of İnandık İK 174−66 rev. 24;
3. The scribe of İnandık İK 174−66 (and of some other similar documents) is the third person bearing this name.

The above-mentioned persons will be discussed in detail in my forthcoming work entitled "Der althethitische Exempla-Erlaß KBo. 3.34".

In the Anatolian anthroponyms of the second millennium B. C. we have numerous examples of personal names that can be either masculine or feminine[37]. For this reason, despite the interior *ila* vowel change, that Àškilia and Àškaliya are the same name is not a daring assumption. It is also possible that the form containing *-i-* is the female

---

[37] E. Laroche, NH (1966) nrs. 50, 569, 662, 720, 816, 841, 1096, 1173, 1259, 1461, 1586; additions: idem, Hethitica 4 (1981) nrs. 102.a, 746. Some of these belong to the category of Cappadocian proper names.

variant; however, a similar alternation is observed in the masculine personal name Tuthaliya: As it occurs in the Boğazköy texts it is spelled without exception as *Du/Tu-ut-ḫa-li-ya(-aš)*, but in the Kültepe documents from an earlier period in addition to this form, it is also written as *Du(=Tu)-ut-ḫi-li-al-áš*[38]. Because the latter form was not used during Hittite times, it should probably be ascribed only to the Kültepe tradition. Therefore, the form in *-i-* may be older and represent the origin of the name. I believe that the same relationship exists between Aškilia and Aškaliya[39].

E. Laroche, NH 338, in order to keep Aškaliya within the domain of Hittite vocabulary posited a relationship with *aška-* "door" (and the hypothetical derivation *aškali(ya)-* "doorman"). This has been widely accepted in the secondary literature[40]. Within the royal family, especially in the Old Hittite period, the Hattian (and Cappadocian) proper name tradition was common, so a Hattian origin for the name Aškaliya is possible since it was borne also by an Old Hittite prince (see above). The Hattian word *a-aš-ka-i-e-li* in KUB 28,47 rt. col. 8' (and *a-aš-ka-i-⸢e⸣-[li]* in its dupl.? KUB 28,58 rev. rt. col. 2), whose meaning is unknown, supports this claim at least on a phonetic level. Note also the Hurrian words *a-aš-ka-le-e* and *a-aš-ki-li* listed by E. Laroche, RHA 34 (1976) 61.

For the morphological analysis of *i-ta-lu-wa* in the last line there are three possibilities to consider:

1. A so far unattested abstract noun **idaluwar* (n.) "evil" in which the loss of the *-r* in the final sound could refer to an earlier language stage. However, there is another word in Hittite with this meaning, namely *idaluwatar* (n.);
2. A so far unattested **idaluwa* as a possible plural nominative-accusative form of *italu-* (n.); cf. Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1) 173[41];
3. *italu* plus the *-wa* particle of quoted speech.

---

[38] I deem it sufficient to cite only two documents here: Kt 88/k 713:9, 16, 20, 25, 29 (V. Donbaz, in: Fs N. Özgüç [1993] 145–146) and Kt 88/k 1050:18 (S. Bayram, Belleten LV/213 [1991] 301).

[39] The spelling ᵐ*A-aš-ki-li-pát* in KBo. 3,34 ii 19 is probably a scribal error caused by the dative case of the name (i. e. vowel harmony before *-li*). Note that the duplicate KBo. 3,36 obv. 24' gives the correct form [ᵐ]⸢A⸣-[aš-k]a-li-pát.

[40] Cf. J. Tischler, in: Fs. G. Neumann (1982) 440 and 442.

[41] Suggested with reserve. Weitenberg, HUS 212, however, takes *i-ta-lu-wa* without hesitation as a neuter substantive in pl. nom.-acc. The singular predicate of the sentence (*bait* "it went"), of course, contradicts this interpretation.

Following Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1) 165 and 173 I believe the last alternative to be the most appropriate. With the acceptance of this alternative, an announcement given orally of the oracle result by the practitioner takes its logical place in the final line of our text as is customary in some other divination texts. Despite the fact that quoted speech is unusual for KIN-oracles, we know that the favorable or unfavorable results of the bird oracles were formulated as the quoted speech by the practitioners in the closing lines of the paragraphs "*UMMA* ᵐ... (name of the diviner) SI×SÁ-*at⸗wa* (*ḫantaittat⸗wa*)/*arḫa⸗wa peššir*". In addition, Berman, JCS 34, 121−122, pointed to the KIN-oracle fragment KUB 49,79 which also includes dialogues by the female practitioners aside from the divination performances (i 10′, 19′: *UMMA* ˢᵃˡ·ᵐᵉˢŠU.GI; 11′, 20′, 21′: *nu⸗wa, nu⸗war⸗an*). Furthermore, *UM-M[A* ...] in line 12′, the end of the paragraph, possibly gives an interim oracle result from the women's mouths[42]. In KBo. 18,151, the person who states that the divination has been concluded with a favorable result saying "The evil (one) has gone!" can be none other than ᶠĀškilia herself. This is the ˢᵃˡŠU.GI "Old Woman (= female practitioner)" from Ḫattuš(a) who carries out the present oracle, referred to in obv. 1 by her profession alone[43]. With this identification, whether KBo. 18,151 is the oracle record itself or merely an oracular report-letter, our text is saved from being anonymous, also answering the question why and with which position Āškilia was included at the end of the document. I do not think that the fact that she carried out the action of *arāi-* "to arise", which in reality was an act particular to the active oracle symbols, is an obstacle to the identification suggested above. Although in the KIN-oracles of later periods one does not normally encounter a practitioner participating in the oracular procedures as a symbol, it seems to be an exceptional case in our document, not only because of its linguistic features but also because of a multitude of differences in its praxis as compared with the others (see below).

III. On the dating and the origin of the document

The dating of KBo. 18,151 is highly problematic. Güterbock states in the preface to KBo. 18 (p. III) that the tablet features old language

---

[42] For further examples of quoted speech by practitioners of oracular proceedings which are marked with the particle -*wa* see Berman, ibid., 122 fn. 12.

[43] However, Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1) 171, had considered this identification unlikely.

and orthography[44]. Going into more detail in the table of contents (p. VI), he adds that the script is archaic but that it does not show the typical old ductus characteristics as seen in K.Bo. 7,14 + (the Zukraši Text) and in K.Bo. 17,1 (StBoT 8). Archi and Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1), who fully analyzed the text, also believe it to be Old Hittite[45]. However, some scholars hold the belief that K.Bo. 18,151 dates instead to the Middle Hittite period[46]. The criteria for the dating of this document are as follows:

1. Findspot of the tablet: According to the information provided by Güterbock in KBo. 18, pp. VI and XI, the tablet 806/w was uncovered in stratum IVb under room 3 of Building "M" at Büyükkale (Planquadrat x−y/18−19). Although the findspot does not allow us to date it precisely, it is at least an indication of archaism. Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1) 163 and 166 (with further references) want to assign this level to an "early stage of the Empire period", namely the time of Arnuwanda I and Ašmunikal or their immediate predecessors (ca. 1400 B. C.), or somewhat earlier. One can ascertain that this is far from proving a dating of the tablet in the Old Hittite period, but on the contrary, would rather support the alternative of "Middle Hittite". Keeping in mind that the place where a tablet is found does not always provide trustworthy evidence for its dating, the question arises, whether the location of K.Bo. 18,151 was primary, or had it already been moved in Hittite times for (re-)storage or for some other reason? As Güterbock remarked in K.Bo. 18, p. III, the oracular reports (and also some letters) which had lost their importance were removed from the archives and disposed of by the Hittites. These may even have been used later as filling material. In our case the displacement idea gains more validity because K.Bo. 18,151 was probably prepared to be sent outside of Ḫattuša, but was surprisingly uncovered in Boğazköy (see above).

[44] Also see Laroche, CTH suppl. (RHA 30, 127) sub no. *827: "Oracles en langue archaïque".

[45] Also see recently Kammenhuber, in Fs. W. Winter (1985) 455: "its language is Old Hittite"; Archi (as fn. 3) 88 f.: "in archaic language and old ductus, probably from the 16th century".

[46] H. C. Melchert, Ablative and Instrumental in Hittite (1977) 100, 123 f.: "Middle Hittite?"; E. Neu, KZ 93 (1979) 68: "the text KBo. 18,151 is mh.", HS 102, 11: "Lot oracle originated from the Middle Hittite period"; N. Oettinger, Stammbildung, 527 fn. 21: "Middle Hittite", 579: "in Middle Hittite ductus", KZ 94, 58 and in: Gs. H. Kronasser (1982) 175: "Middle Hittite"; Weitenberg, HUS 206, 212: "in Middle Hittite ductus"; M. Schuol, AoF 21 (1994) 91 with fn. 110 "Middle Hittite period; writing of 15th century".

2. Sign forms and ductus characteristics: The signs in the text are represented in their archaic forms. In the following I list the characteristic signs taken as criteria for text dating with one example representing each: "*ak*" (obv. 3), "*gi*" (obv. 1), "*it*" (obv. 3), "*ki*" (obv. 3), "*li*" (obv. 9), "*na*" (obv. 11), "*ni*" (obv. 5), "*ta*" (obv. 10), "*tar*" (obv. 5), "URU" (obv. 11; but in rev. 4 with a slightly different form) and perhaps also "ME.EŠ" (rev. 14; for reading see above). Most of these match both the Old and the Middle Hittite sign forms and therefore do not help much with the exact dating of KBo. 18,151. However, the sign "*ak*" which appears frequently in this text clearly differs from the Middle Hittite forms, approaching rather the Old Hittite forms listed in Chr. Rüster, StBoT 20 (1972) Nr. 14, Sp. I, III and IV. In addition, KBo. 22,1, which is not included in StBoT 20 and written in typical old ductus, has in obv. 11′ an almost identical form of the sign "*ak*" in KBo. 18,151 obv. 3, 8, and rev. 5. Furthermore, in KBo. 18,151 there is a "*ša*" that begins not with two but with four horizontals. There are also "*ta*" signs where the internal small verticals are very lightly inscribed or are even absent (obv. 3, 4, 5, 6, 8 etc.)[47]. This is observed in KBo. 20,10+ (i 9, 10, ii 5, 7), which is also written in typical old ductus. However, whether the absence of the internal small verticals of "*ta*" signs in KBo. 18,151 is due to real paleographic characteristics, or to the stenography of the oracular recording is a subject for further debate[48].

The style of writing in KBo. 18,151 is quite neat when compared to the careless oracular recording as seen in KBo. 18,142 rev. 8 ff. (see above). Moreover, the announcement of the final divination result at the end of the tablet gives the impression that KBo. 18,151 may have been prepared as a careful copy in the form of a report from an original divination record[49]. Whether KBo. 18,151 is a divination text or an oracular report in the form of a letter, we do not expect such an elegant, official chancellery handwriting from the Hittite scribe as that used in the literary and administrative genres. In this light, I believe that for KBo. 18,151 we cannot make firm judgements such as "typical old ductus" (ca. late 17th and 16th centuries B. C.), "similar to typical old ductus" or "Middle Hittite ductus" (see bibl. in fn. 46). Thus, more reserved qualifications are preferable; cf. Güterbock, KBo. 18, p. VI:

[47] Cf. Güterbock, KBo. 18, p. VI, and Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1) 180.

[48] As found also in KBo. 18,151 rev. 4 ("*eš*" with a missing wedge) and rev. 9 ("*ḫal*" instead "ᵈ", i. e. with a missing vertical).

[49] See also below.

"Die Schrift ist nicht die typisch alte (...), wirkt aber etwas al-
tertümlich (...)"; Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1) 163: "Die Sprache ist
alt; der Duktus ist jedoch nicht der als typisch alt geltende"; Güter-
bock/Hoffner, CHD P Fasc. 1, 20, 32 and 49: "atypical OS". I cannot
share Astour's belief that it is "a Middle Hittite copy of an Old Hittite
oracular text" in Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft von Ebla (see p. 99) 153,
where he compromises between these two differing views on the dating
of our document[50]. If one considers its appearance and contents, KBo.
18,151 falls into the category of oracular letter/report, and there is no
evidence that these texts were copied in the later periods. They were
rather discarded by the Hittites (see above, under 1). Moreover, it
would also remain unexplained why KBo. 18,151 should have been
recopied in a typical letter format (i. e. small and with rounded cor-
ners).

3. Characteristics of the language: Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1)
174—180 have analyzed the features of the language in detail and have
classified it as Old Hittite. Having no further point to add here, I defer
to their study. But see Melchert, Ablative and Instrumental, 123 f.,
who maintains that there is no evidence which proves KBo. 18,151 is
Old Hittite.

4. Characteristics pertaining to the content: Despite the doubts ex-
pressed in points 1 and 2 above, the suggestion in point 3 — that KBo.
18,151 originated in the Old Hittite period — is in my opinion further
supported by the historical and cultural elements in this document.
These are as follows:

4 a. *ḫurla-* (c.) "the Hurrian (enemy)". In a list I presented in Hethi-
tica 7 (1987) 246—248 fn. 236 taking into consideration all of the
known documents, I stated that the use of the word *ḫurla-* without a
determinative is unique to Old Hittite. It always signifies "the Hurrian
enemy". The latest text where this is attested is the Telipinu Edict,
which has reached us only through late copies. Beginning with the
Middle Hittite documents, *ḫurla-* appears with determinatives: lú, uru
etc.

Since in the Mesopotamian/North Syrian written tradition a form
ḫurla- designating the Hurrians is not yet attested, this word may have
belonged exclusively to the Anatolian culture. However, we do not
possess any information about its origin indicating whether it is a gen-

---

[50] See also S. de Martino, SMEA 34 (1994) 157.

uine Hittite word or whether it is borrowed from a foreign language. According to Tischler, HEG I (1983) 304 f., there is no evidence for a Hittite innovation. In spite of this uncertainty I want to point out that this word may appear in the Hattian passages of a very modernized Hattian-Hittite bilingual text, KUB 28,9 + KUB 44,60. While in the Hittite part of KUB 44,60 iii 4 ^{uru}Ḫurlaš is mentioned, in the Hattian part of KUB 28,9 i 10' + KUB 44,60 i 19' we encounter the word (-complex) wa_a-a-ḫur-⌈la-x⌉$^{?}$-⌈x⌉ (perhaps to be read wa_a-a-ḫur-⌈la-a⌉$^{?}$-[a]n$^{?}$), which is strongly reminiscent of ḫurla-. Although in the partly preserved part of its Hittite translation in KUB 44,60 ii 19'−20' no word referring to the Hurrian(s) remains, a word with L[ú ...] exists. Because this passage and KUB 44,60 iii 3−4, where ^{uru}Ḫurlaš is mentioned, are similar in their contents (both narrate the gold and silver booty from a battle or siege), it is quite possible that the missing parts of KUB 44,60 ii 19'−20' also contain a word for Hurrian(s) (at least after L[ú ...]). If this proposal is correct, one can interpret the Hattian word(-complex) wa_a-a-ḫur-⌈la-a⌉$^{?}$-[a]n$^{?}$ as a collective-plural form in genitive case wa_a=ḫurla=n "of the Hurrians" comparable to wa_a-aš-ḫa-$wu_ú$-ú-un (wa_a=šḫap=un "of the gods").

4 b. ^{uru}Ḫaššu(wa). It is known that Ḫattušili I and Telipinu engaged in military operations against this city, which was one of the leading enemies of the Hittites during the Old Kingdom. The name of the city is also mentioned in KUB 31,64 + ii 34', which dates to the reign of Muršili I or more likely Ḫantili I[51]. The account of the destruction of Ḫaššuwa which is mentioned in the Telipinu Edict KBo. 3,1 + ii 17' and in a similar narrative in KBo. 12,8 iv 14'−15' gives us a terminus ante quem for this city's military-political prominence in Anatolian history in the second millennium B. C. Thereafter, we encounter the name of the city occasionally, but only in religious contexts of Boğazköy documents, such as KBo. 4,13 + i 44' and KUB 48,99:7'. Contrary to P. Meriggi's views in WZKM 58 (1962) 77−78, the occurrences of Ḫaššu(wa) in the historical contexts are limited to Old Kingdom records[52]. We now know with certainty that KUB 23,20, which was cited by him, originally belonged to the Annals of Ḫattušili I (CTH: 4. II. C.). On the other hand, the partly preserved ^{uru}Ḫaššu[...]

---

[51] On the text and its controversial dating see recently de Martino, AoF 22 (1995) 282−296 (= Muršili I) and O. Soysal, AoF 25 (1998) 28 ff. (= Ḫantili I).

[52] Güterbock, RlA 4/2−3 (1973) 137. On this city see del Monte/Tischler, RGTC 6, 97 ff., and in addition del Monte, RGTC 6/2, 35.

in KUB 26,83[53] iii 5, treated and dated in the Middle Hittite period
by O. Carruba in SMEA 18 (1977) 165, cannot be restored only as
Ḫaššu[wa] as he suggests. It could be another toponym, e. g. Ḫaš(š)una
or Ḫaš(š)uwanta.

4 c. The personal names Aškilia and Zikiltu. The first name was
frequently used during the reign of Ḫattušili I, and is perhaps re-
presented here in its oldest (and original?) form (see comments to rev.
18−19). The name Zikiltu, which is of foreign origin, is also attested
sometime during the Old Hittite period between the reigns of Ḫattuši-
li I and Telipinu. This is suggested by those identical personal names
(but with slight variations) which appear in the *ḫabiru*-list of Tunip-
Teššup, the king of Tikunan(i) and the vassal of Ḫattušili I (early
16th century), in the documents from Alalaḫ VII (in the time of Irkab-
tum of Yamḫad and Ammitakumma of Alalaḫ, i. e. late 17th/early 16th
century), and from Alalaḫ IV (whose earliest periods fall approx-
imately in the late 16th/early 15th century)[54]. If Zikiltu in KBo. 18,151
could be linked directly to Alalaḫ, it would then be appropriate
to date the text to the reign of Ḫattušili I, since he was the only Hit-
tite king who organized expeditions against both Ḫaššu(wa) and Ala-
laḫ.

For a brief discussion of KBo. 18,151 on a historical basis, see also
S. de Martino, OrAnt. 28 (1989) 19−20 and Hethitica 11 (1992) 29−
30. More recently, Astour, in: Fs. D. Young, 226 fn. 96, connects the
pessimistic content of KBo. 18,151 to an ill-fated Syrian expedition of
Ḫantili I.

---

[53] The left column (iv) of this fragment of historical nature appears to be written
entirely in Akkadian. The words [...] *i-li-ya ú-še-l⌈i⌉* "I dedicated [to] my deity" which
belong to column iv, and are written curving upwards to the right between the
column dividers, could be the counterpart of the Hittite line placed on the same
level in the opposite column iii 13': *nu ku-u-uš A-NA* ᵈU DINGIR-[...] "and these (= the
spoils mentioned in iii 12') to the Stormgod, [my?] god". However, the appearance
of this tablet is not that of a real bilingual text.

[54] The first phase of stratum Alalaḫ IV covers the reign of king Idrimi lasting at least
30 years. H. Klengel, UF 13 (1981) 270, dates Idrimi to the "early 15th century".
This would correspond to the end of the Old Hittite kingdom in Anatolia (ca. time
of Telipinu and his immediate successors). It is known that Idrimi, backed by the
powerful Mitanni state, had pursued an aggressive foreign policy against the Hit-
tites. In his statue inscription, lines 64−80, he proudly narrated that he captured
and pillaged seven Hittite towns. The Hittites, however, were unable to respond to
this; see M. Dietrich/O. Loretz, UF 13 (1981) 206 and H. Klengel, ibid., 277−278.
Immediately after Idrimi, Alalaḫ entered a period silent with respect to political and
military activities.

4 d. That KBo. 18,151 is archaic is also supported by the divinities mentioned in the oracle procedures. Here, perhaps indicating an older, matriarchal tradition, goddesses from the Hattian pantheon Inar(a) and also Ḫalmašut play a significant role. Inar(a) is known to be a protective goddess. Ḫalmašuitt(a), on the other hand, is an important symbol of the ideology of kingship especially during the Old Hittite period[55]. Because the third deity in KBo. 18,151 "the Stormgod of the sky (*nipišaš*)" is written with the logogram ^{d}IŠKUR (instead of the later ^{d}U), the pronunciation behind it cannot be determined. This could be the Hittite/Luwian god Tarḫu(nt)-, or the Hattian god Taru. We should remember that the Anitta Text (KBo. 3,22 obv. 2, 20, rev. 46, 51, 56, 57 and dupls.), the oldest Hittite historical document reaching back to the Early Kuššara Dynasty, mentions both this god (*nepišaš* ^{d}IŠKUR) and the Hattian deity ^{d}Ḫalmaššuitta as the primary gods in the narration. Thus the deities in KBo. 18,151 fit well into the early tradition of the genuine Hattian-Hittite pantheon which is restricted to the Old Hittite texts[56].

Moreover, the cities Ḫattuš(a) and Kanneš which are on the side of the Hittite king in the oracle procedures are of Hattian origin, and they are represented here with their original names[57]. Hattian elements are dominant in the text, revealing the ethnic milieu of the KIN-oracle KBo. 18,151, which may also be in a close relationship to the ethnicity of Āškilia, the Old Woman from Ḫattuš(a), who performs the oracle. I suggest that Āškilia might have been a native Hattian who spoke Hittite with a particular accent. I want to point out some of the linguistic features in KBo. 18,151, assuming that certain peculiarities are pertinent only to this text and illustrate not only the archaism of the language but also dialectal differences: *nipiš(a)*- (obv. 5) as opposed to the customary *nepiš(a)*-[58]; voiced (media) 3. sg. pret. verbal forms *baiš* and *bait* (obv. 7, 13, rev. 19) instead of usual voiceless (tenuis) forms *paiš* and *pait*[59]. On the other hand, voiceless 3. sg. pret. verbal forms

---

[55] Archi, SMEA 1 (1966) 76–120; F. Starke, ZA 69 (1979) 47–120.

[56] See Kammenhuber, KZ 83 (1969) 283, 284 and Or. 41 (1972) 295.

[57] Kanneš is the alternative for the Hittite form Neša. Neither the ethnic suffix *-um(n)a-* in obv. 1, nor the genitive ending *-aš* in obv. 11 excludes the possibility that the other place-name is also to be pronounced here in its Hattian original form *^{uru}Ḫattuš.

[58] Even if Kammenhuber is right in her assumption that in KUB 44,56 obv. 8' the spelling *ni-pi-ša-az* is attested, this text too possibly goes back to a Hattian origin; see comments for obv. 5.

[59] A phonetical *p/b* alternation is often seen also in the Hattian language, e. g. *i-ta-a-ba* (KUB 28,15 rev. lt. col. 33', 34', 35') for *i-ta-a-pa* (KUB 28,54 lt. col. 4), *ga-az-zi-iḫ-ba-li* (KUB 28,53 ii 9') for *ka-a-az-zi-iḫ-pa-li* (KUB 28,58 rev. rt. col. 4) and *ba-la* (KUB 2,2 + KUB 48,1 iii 19, 20) for *pa-la* (KBo. 19,162 obv. 10, 12 etc.).

taš/tāš and *taīš* are used (obv. 3, 5, rev. 10, 11 etc.) in contrast to the voiced *daš/dāš* and *daiš/dāiš*. Furthermore, the consistent nasal reduction before consonants such as *ištarni⟨n⟩kaīn*, *išta⟨n⟩zanaš* and *utniya⟨n⟩tan* (obv. 5, 12, rev. 14, 15) is a rarely encountered phenomenon. One might argue that the first three cases do not exemplify phonological peculiarities but rather problems in the orthography (*ni·né* and *ba·pá* alternations). However, this argument is not conclusive because the theme-vowels in the proper names have also not been used correctly in KBo. 18,151 (ᵈInare, ᵐZikiltu instead of ᵈInara, ᵐZikilta) or they are simply ignored (ᵘʳᵘ*Kanneš*, ᵈ¹*Ḫalmašut*; the latter neglecting also the common gender of the word, see comments on rev. 9). All these points lead to the conclusion that we have here a phonological convention rather than an orthographic one[60]. Other possible Hattian features reflected in the language of KBo. 18,151 are those constructions with genitivus possessivus like LUGAL-*aš nakki·šet* "of the king, his difficulty" (obv. 3, 6), *ḫurlaš ulḫa[lli·š]šet* "of the Hurrian, his attack" (rev. 5). Such formations are used mostly in the Old Hittite and are particularly concentrated in the passages of the Old Hittite ritual for "the· royal couple" (CTH 416), as has been pointed out by Otten/ Souček, StBoT 8 (1969) 61. It is thought that this ritual had a Hattian cultural background (see below). Since the use of genitivus possessivus is unsuitable for Hittite syntax, it seems rather to indicate Hattian influence than be a genuine Hittite feature. This same construction is frequently found in Hattian documents: *tabarna·n katte ... le·ašaḫ* "of the *tabarna*-king, his evil", ᵈ*Katahziwuri·n še·alip* "of the goddess Katahziwuri, her· words" and ᵘʳᵘ*Ḫattuša·n te·wašḫap* "of the town of Ḫattuša, its/her? deities" etc.[61]

---

[60] On the linguistic characteristics of foreign practitioners/authors (e. g. of Luwian origin) in Hittite texts and their mistakes in Hittite see briefly Oettinger, KZ 94, 49. On this matter KBo. 8,66 is of interest as well, described by Otten MDOG 87 (1955) 24 as "Kissenförmiges Täfelchen mit Beschwörungstext" (idem, KBo. 8, Inhaltsübersicht [p. V]: "Gebetsamulett?"). This small tablet shows some archaic features (sign forms and the usage of ᵈIŠKUR in obv. 2); its dating, however, cannot be assured. The unusual phonology and strange word structure make the text almost unintelligible; cf. Laroche, CTH 826 "Étiquette: invocation(?) en hittite barbare". The media-writing in ᵈUTU-*uš-da* (obv. 1) for *-ta* "you (acc.)" is also remarkable.

[61] See also [*Ḫ]abarnaš É-ir·šet* "of [*Ḫ]abarna, his house*", the Hittite counterpart of a missing Hattian passage in the Old Hittite bilingual text KUB 36,110 rev. rt. col. 13', and *arunaš tēga(n)·ššet* "of the sea, its bottom", the Hittite translation of another Hattian composition in (KUB 28,8+) KBo. 37,48 obv. 9'. For the use of genitivus possessivus in Hattian and its influence on Hittite see Kammenhuber, RHA 20 (1962) 17−18 and HbOr. (Altkleinasiatische Sprachen, 1969) 482 ff.

It is commonly acknowledged that the KIN is the oldest type of oracle used by the Hittites, and that it originated in Anatolia[62]. That this kind of oracle in the Old Hittite period should be performed by a Hattian woman, a native of Ḫattuš(a) − as KBo. 18,151 indicates in addition to other Hattian features − is important for determining its origin, and also for determining the ethnic group which I believe monopolized the divination sector at that time in Hittite society. After the Old Kingdom, already in the early stages of the Middle Kingdom, while the Hattian influences gradually lost their effect on Hittite religious life, ritual, magic and possibly the divination sector as well fell under the monopoly of the Luwian and Hurrian population. Consequently, new types of oracular practices (SU[63], šašta-, MUŠEN ḪURRI) appeared whose terminologies and performers had close ties to the Hurro-Luwian culture of Kizzuwatna.

In his article in OrAnt. 28, 18 f. and 20 f. de Martino pointed out the intimate relationship between the Old Hittite queen Ḫaštayar(a) and the Old Women/female magicians (sal.mešŠU.GI) who played a significant role in the palace affairs in the final years of Ḫattušili I. De Martino also underscored the possible foreign origins (Luwian and especially Hurrian) of the magicians. However, the possibility of a Hattian origin that I proposed above was not considered; likewise Kammenhuber, THeth 7 (1976) 14. Based on the statistical data, it appears that the women bearing the title salŠU.GI and acting as practitioners of rituals, magic and oracles were predominantly Luwian and Hurrian[64]. However, this is true only for the 14th century B. C. and

---

[62] See recently Archi (as fn. 3) 88 f.

[63] Taking into consideration some liver models from Boğazköy which are inscribed with old script, Schuol, AoF 21, 86 f. and 93 f., maintains that SU-oracles were practiced already in Old Hittite times. There is not yet a single oracular text which concretely proves this assumption. The earliest oracle examples compiled by her in chronological order (ibid., 94 ff.) are dated as Middle Hittite. The bilingual (Akkadian-Hittite) Old Hittite liver models, whose inscriptions actually go back to the Old Babylonian "omina tradition", may have been stored in Ḫattuša as cultural imports for literary purposes as well, and not only for educational ones. Therefore, I do not see that they were necessarily used for practical purposes. Although Schuol's assumption is not to be rejected either, the following observation can be made with certainty: according to the available divination materials from Ḫattuša, the practice of the SU-oracles was effective first during the Middle Kingdom (e. g. KBo. 8,55 and KBo. 16,97, see Schuol, ibid., 102 f.). This was clearly under Hurro-Luwian cultural influences, since the terminologies of both these oracular texts are borrowed from these languages, not directly from Akkadian.

[64] Kammenhuber, THeth. 7, 119−129; cf. also G. Szabó, THeth. 1 (1971) 104 with fn. 64; Haas/Wilhelm, AOATS 3 (1974) 19 and fn. 1.

later, and does not prove that the profession of ^{sal}ŠU.GI did not exist in the Hattian culture that was dominant in earlier Hittite society[65]. H.-S. Schuster, HHB (1974) 45 with fn. 159, and C. Kühne, ZA 70 (1980) 99 have already emphasized the rare attestation of the "Old Women" in the Hattian-Hittite cultic milieu. Particularly revealing for this matter is the colophon entry DUB.2.KAM ŠA ʿKu-ru-ru ^{sal}ŠU.GI-aš "The second tablet of the Old Woman Kururu" of text 950/c[66], which throughout contains conjurations in Hattian. That the "Old Women" were active within the Hattian-Hittite cult is revealed also by KUB 20,54 + KBo. 13,122 iv 1−10 (// KUB 55,2 obv. 5′−7′ and rev. 1− 5). In this text there is first a conversation between a palace member (DUMU.É.GAL) and an Old Woman (^{sal}ŠU.GI) (iv 1−5 // obv. 5′−7′, rev. 1−2), followed by the praises of the Old Woman (iv 5−10 // rev. 2−5). That both passages are Hittite translations from the original Hattian is revealed by two Hattian fragments with the same narration: KUB 48,15 obv. 7−13 (dialogue), 14−17 (praise) and KUB 28,74 rev. rt. col. 1′−5′ (praise); for the parallelism of these texts see G. F. del Monte, OrAnt. 23 (1984) 171 ff.

IV. Observations on the system of the KIN-oracle in KBo. 18,151

Because KBo. 18,151 is not fully preserved, it is not possible to understand exactly the type of system in which the oracle operates. Moreover, what we have here is a brief report(-letter), not a regular divination text. However, there are clear parallels in the consecutive developments of the oracular procedures which enable us to attempt an interpretation concerning the fate of the king, the prime subject of the oracle. It is appropriate to list first the technical and stylistic characteristics that distinguish KBo. 18,151 from other KIN-oracles. The differences are due to two reasons:

1. The early date of KBo. 18,151, and the ethnic background of its practitioner,

2. The genre of the text, namely a short report, rather than a full divination record.

---

[65] As advocated by Kammenhuber, ibid., 120 fn. 210a, and in: HbOr. (Altkleinasiatische Sprachen) 435.

[66] For this, then unpublished text (now edited as KBo. 37,23) cf. Kammenhuber, HbOr. (Altkleinasiatische Sprachen) 435; THeth. 7, 120 fn. 210a; H.-S. Schuster, HHB 34, 45.

The observable features are the following (those already pointed out by Ünal/Kammenhuber [see n. 1] have been indicated by the bibliographic references in parentheses):

a. The names of the oracle symbols and the verbs have been written out phonetically; therefore, the writing is not economical (Ünal/Kammenhuber [see n. 1] 168 f.) [due to 1].

b. There is no oracular question in the text (Ünal/Kammenhuber [see n. 1] 166) [2][67].

c. The interim results (SIG$_5$, NU.SIG$_5$) which are generally located at the end of the paragraphs in the standard divination texts are not provided in KBo. 18,151. However, the pleasant and unpleasant circumstances in the narration of the oracle make clear whether the paragraph conclusions are favorable or unfavorable for the Hittite king (see below) [2][68].

d. Notwithstanding long, complicated proceedings, investigations and interpretations which continue for paragraphs, in most cases no final result is attained in the regular divination texts. However, the end of KBo. 18,151 does provide a final result. The favorable result is announced not with the customary SIG$_5$-formula but with the phrase "the evil (one) has gone!" (Ünal/Kammenhuber [see n. 1] 173)[69]. Thus, the interim results (c) and final result (d) have not been specified through terminus technicus, but they have rather been left to the interpretation of the receiver of the tablet [2][70].

e. Aside from KUB 49,79, which is not well-preserved and is of a more recent period, KBo. 18,151 is the only KIN-oracle where the result is announced by its female practitioner in her own words (see comments on rev. 18−19) [1 or 2?].

f. Whereas the action of arising (arāi-/GUB) pertains only to the gods/divinized things in other KIN-oracles, in KBo. 18,151 this is executed by other agents as well (Ziki⟨l⟩tu, ḫurla-, Āškilia etc.) [1 or 2?].

g. natta arāi- "to not arise", antonym for the action of "arising", is found only in this text as a technical term of the divination proceed-

---

[67] Also see above fn. 4.

[68] Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1) 166−167, however, ascribe this feature to the antiquity of the oracle in KBo. 18,151.

[69] Contrary to this, another oracle-report (KBo. 18,142) gives the favorable result with the usual term SIG$_5$.

[70] That the final decision about the divination transactions or results reported from a distance belongs to the addressee is reflected in KBo. 18,140 obv. 3′ ff.: "Look, we have sent away the divination. Take care of (it). Either take (it) in (= accept), or as (you want)!"; see Güterbock, KBo. 18, Inhaltsübersicht (p. VI).

ing. In the later tradition this is no longer the case, probably due to an economizing trend in the writing [1].

h. The agents of the actions are single individuals; in KBo. 18,151 there is no collective-plural verb [?].

i. Passive (and negative) symbols *arši-*, *ḫarka-*, *ištarnikai-*, *it*[*aluš* *i*]*štazanaš*^{ME.EŠ} (pl. acc.), *nakki*, *pituliya-*, (*ḫurlaš*) *ulḫali*, *utniyatan uš-tul* make their appearance only in this oracle (Ünal/Kammenhuber [see n. 1] 169 f.) [1].

j. This text documents for the first time a practitioner appearing as an active symbol during the oracle procedure (see comments on rev. 18−19) [1].

k. *nipišaš* ^dIŠKUR and ^{uru}Ḫattušaš ^dInare as active symbols are attested to date only in this oracle. Aside from the general term DIN-GIR.MEŠ, the gods designated with the same function in the other KIN-oracles are ^{d/giš}DAG, ^dMAḪ, ^dU, ^dUTU AN^E, ^dUTU ŠAMÊ (Ünal/Kammenhuber [see n. 1] 170) [1].

l. KBo. 18,151 includes some verbal compounds which are not encountered in other KIN-oracles: *parā pita-* "to carry out" (obv. 4, 10, (15), rev. (6), 17, *arḫa tuḫš-* "to cut off" (rev. 8), *parā pai-* "to go forward" (rev. 12) (Ünal/Kammenhuber [see n. 1] 169) [1 or 2?].

m. The first two paragraphs of KBo. 18,151 are clearly affiliated with each other with respect to content. Here a consecutive oracular development is revealed, and its scheme is: (negative) attack → (positive) counter-attack/defense. This may also be true for §§ 3−4 and §§ 5−6 as far as the text is preserved [1 or 2?].

n. For syntactic and stylistic differences see Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1) 167 f. [1 or 2].

The main concern of KBo. 18,151 is the fate of the Hittite king and his reign which is represented by the "(sacred) throne". However, it is noteworthy that almost all of the passive symbols given and taken in connection with the fate of the king − aside from several of unknown meaning − have a negative connotation. Two exceptions "[…]'s good/welfare" (rev. 8) and the "(sacred) throne" (rev. 9) are of a positive nature, but are used also to the king's disadvantage by the active symbols of the opposite (i. e. enemy) side. Throughout the oracle, the offensive position that the hostile active symbols (Zikiltu, *ḫurla-*, Ḫaš-šu(wa)?, *italu-*, the king of the land? of […?](-)aršinī, the city of x[…]š/gatuma?) hold against the Hittite king consists of the arising itself, the taking of the passive symbols which are negative in nature, and then delivery to the gods (*arāi-/tā-/parā pita-*; obv. 3−4, 8−10, 14−[15?], rev. 14−17). Apart from this, other disadvantages to the king are − each happening only once − the cutting off of […]'s good/welfare by

evil (rev. 8), and the seizing of the (sacred) throne, placing the worry in front of the royal couple and finally the approach of the gods by the enemy (rev. 9−12). In most cases the negative actions are cancelled out by the members of the king's side, led primarily by the gods. Thus we observe that this oracle, from beginning to end, entails the defense/ protection of the king against evil. The following synopsis reviews the oracular developments as described in KBo. 18,151:

§ 1 a. Symbolic action: The (enemy) Ziki⟨l⟩tu arises, taking a negative thing of the king and transferring it to the gods.

b. Interpretation: The enemy appeals to the gods for a mishap to befall the king.

c. The interim result expected in the oracle (is not given in the text): Evil (agent) − the evil (object) − to the good (indirect object) → *Unfavorable[71].

§ 2 a. The Stormgod of the sky (on the king's side) arises, taking the negative things and giving them (back) to Zikiltu.

b. The appeals of the enemy are rejected by the god.

c. Good (agent) − the evil (object) − to the evil (indirect object) → *Favorable.

§ 3 a. The Hurrian (enemy) arises, taking the negative things and transferring them to the gods.

b. same as § 1.b.

c. same as § 1.c. *Unfavorable.

§ 4 a. The "protective goddess" Inare of Ḫattuša (on the king's side) arises, taking the negative things, and giving them (back) to the Hurrian.

b. same as § 2.b.

c. same as § 2.c. *Favorable.

§ 5. a. The (enemy) [x] arises, taking the negative thing [and transferring it to the gods].

b. same as § 1.b.

c. same as § 1.c. *Unfavorable.

§ 6 a. [x] (on the king's side) [arises?, taking] the negative thing(s), [and giving them (back?)] to the enemy city of Ḫaššu(wa).

b. same as § 2.b.

c. same as § 2.c. *Favorable.

---

[71] This scheme corresponds with the formula "(simbolo) n(egativo) − (simbolo) n(ega-tivo) − (simbolo) p(ositivo)" given by Archi (see n. 1) 121−122 under "risultati sfavorevoli".

§ 7 a. The city of Kanneš (on the king's side) without arising, takes the negative things and carries them to the "evil".

b. Negative things are kept away (from the king).

c. Good (agent) − the evil (object) − to the evil (indirect object) → *Favorable.

§ 8 a. The evil (against the king) takes the negative thing(s), and cuts off the "[land]'s⁷ good/welfare".

b. The action by Kanneš in § 7 is repulsed by the "evil".

c. Evil (agent) − the evil (action) − to the good (indirect object) → *Unfavorable.

§ 9 a. The (enemy) king of the land⁷ of [...⁷](-)aršinī seizes the (sacred) throne − which is the symbol of rule − and puts the "worry" before the royal couple and then approaches the gods.

b. The Hittite royal couple is faced with the threat of losing their throne.

c. Evil (agent) − the evil (action) − to the good (indirect object) → *Unfavorable.

§ 10 a. The (enemy) city of x[...]š/gatuma⁷ arises, taking the negative things and transferring them to the gods.

b. same as § 1.b.

c. same as § 1.c. *Unfavorable.

§ 11 a. The lady Āškilia (on the king's side) arises and proclaims that the "evil" has gone.

b−c. *Favorable oracle result for the king.

The divination progression follows a particular scheme between §§ 1−6, but from § 7 on it operates differently. Here, parallel to § 1, § 3 and § 5, one expects the action of "arising" by a negative symbol. However, in § 7, the text includes for the first time actions of the city Kanneš on the king's side performed "without arising". After this, when the action of Kanneš is apparently rendered ineffective by the "evil", the divination process arrives at a critical stage disadvantageous to the king (and the queen)[72], thereby intensifying the tension in the narration. In §§ 1−6, each of the negative actions is immediately repulsed by the participants on the king's side. In contrast, the attacks of the enemies in §§ 8−9 are not defended from the king's side. From this point on some of the enemies also perform their actions "without arising". One can think of this as pertaining to, or, as a result of the

---

[72] It is conceivable that Kanneš achieves no success against the "evil (thing)", and that in the course of the divination it turns into a disadvantage for the king, caused by the "not arising" of Kanneš.

"not arising" of the city of Kanneš in § 6. Toward the end of the tablet, the divination procedures (from § 10 on) assume their usual course again. That is, the enemy arises and transfers the negative things to the gods. Based on the parallelism with the beginning of the text, one expects a god to arise in defence; surprisingly, this task is realized in the following paragraph not by a god but by a human being, namely the Old Woman Aškilia[73]. In addition, Aškilia does not give back the negative things to the enemy as did the gods. She only reports that the evil is gone and proclaims the final and positive oracle outcome for the Hittite king. This peculiarity may be because there is no more space on the tablet, so the oracular proceeding is brought to an end (or cut off reasonably) and the result is reported. The fact that the final and "happy" result is reached in the last line of a very small tablet would make us first think that KBo. 18,151 may have been manipulated so as to give only a verdict in favor of the king. More probable is that the oracle procedures here were recopied from original records, abridged and reported in KBo. 18,151.

Since in KBo. 18,151 the Stormgod of the sky and the protective goddess of the city Ḫattuš(a) personally defend the Hittite king against his enemies, and, since the divination has also ended with a positive result, one may conclude that divine approval is given for a projected expedition. Therefore, it should not be too far off to determine the purpose of the divination presented in KBo. 18,151 as providing trust and morale[74]. Although different in practice, there are some flesh oracles (extispicy) in the Mesopotamian tradition which are also used for military purposes. The Assyrian technical term for this type is *šīr tal ikilti* "confidence, encouragement oracle"[75].

The prime thought in KBo. 18,151, which is prevalent in the oracular procedures executed for the welfare of the king, is also reflected in other Hittite documents: The unfavorable circumstances and things

---

[73] Since the Old Woman Aškilia appears during the divination proceeding as a mediator between the gods and the king, she should be considered the earthly representative of the gods. Therefore, it would not be a surprise if she were acting also on behalf of the gods. In the Old Hittite Puḫanu-Chronicle KBo. 3,40, Puḫanu, the author of the text, is in charge as a kind of messenger between the gods and the Hittite king, and announces the divine decision (through an oracle?) that the Stormgod will now support the king (rev. 9'–11'); see Soysal, Hethitica 7 (1987) 202, 218, 249 fn. 249 and Hethitica 14 (1999) 130 f.

[74] Divination of this type and purpose should be kept apart from those oracles of a logistic-strategic character in the later periods which attempted to determine the routes and other details of the military campaigns (e. g. KUB 5,1), or to choose the yearly deployments (e. g. KBo. 22,264).

[75] On this topic see M. Weippert, ZAW 84 (1972) 466, 467, 472, 474 and 484.

that the enemies cause should be prevented by the gods from reaching the king. Then these should be returned to the enemies. A similar model is found in the passages of the Old Hittite ritual for the royal couple (CTH 416). This ritual has been treated by Otten/Souček, in StBoT 8 and later by Neu, in StBoT 25 (1980) 4 ff. I present below the translation of the relevant passages following the line numbers set out by Neu:

StBoT 25 no. 3 iii 10−13 // no. 4 iii 10−13 // no. 6 iii 3′−5′: "(Thou,) the Sungod (and) the Stormgod! Look, for the king, for the queen and for their children in Ḫattuša, I buried (in the ground) their illness, bloodshed, evil (and) their reason to fear. It may not rise once again. (Thou, O god,) carry them to the enemie(s)!"

StBoT 25 no. 3 iv 2−4: "[I] too[k] (away) [the ...], the [ho]rrible (thing), the evil, the illness, the impurity. [It] may not return. Let (the gods?) carry it [to] the enemies!"

StBoT 25 no. 7 iv? 5′−10′: [Behold?], I [too]k (away) the ache, the pain, and the worry from the king and queen. I took (them) from their chair, their bed, their heart and their [b]ody. The Sungod of the s[k]y, [the ... god], the Sungoddess of the earth, take thou (away) [the ...], the ache, the pain, [the ...] of the [king] and [q]ueen, [and g]ive [them to the enemie(s)?!]"

As stated in StBoT 8, ·103 ff., 107, the ritual in question clearly displays features of Hattian culture and has some similarities to other religious texts of Hattian origin. The repetitive motif of "taking away/ removing evil things" is strongly reminiscent of those magical passages in the "Telipinu Myth" (CTH 324), in the ritual for the "Laying of the Foundation of a Palace" (CTH 414), and perhaps also in the Hattian "Ritual of Ḫutuši" (CTH 732) where various spells against evil take place[76]. The oracle of KBo. 18,151, the subject of this article, is in principle founded on the same motif. Therefore, in addition to the above mentioned compositions, we may regard it as a surviving witness to the same pre-Hittite culture.

---

[76] The Ritual for the Royal Couple: StBoT 25 no. 3 i 11′−13′ (// no. 4 i 6′−8′), iv 14− 15 (// no. 4 iv 10), iv 30−31 (// no. 4 iv 26−27), iv 39−40 (// no. 4 iv 35−36), no. 4 ii 5′−7′ (// no. 5 ii 10−12 // StBoT 26 no. 151 ii 3′−5′); The Telipinu Myth: KUB 17,10 iii 9−12, KUB 33,1:9′−12′; The Ritual for the Laying of the Foundation of a Palace: KUB 29,1 ii 18−22 (// KUB 29,2 ii 10′−13′), 32−38; The Ritual of Ḫutuši: In this text, preceding the Hattian incantations in KUB 28,63 lt. col. 1′−7′, KUB 28,82 ii 14′−15′, 26′, 28′−31′, there is mentioned first "the king tabarna", and then *waašāḫ alēp* "the evil tongues", or repeatedly *lēašaḫ* "his evil (thing)" (H.-S. Schuster, HHB 30 and fn. 109). On this in general see also H. Otten/Vl. Souček, StBoT 8, 107; Ünal/Kammenhuber (see n. 1) 169 fn. 32; Starke, ZA 69, 88 with fn. 85; M. Giorgieri, RIL 124 (1990) 270−271, 273−275 and SMEA 29 (1992) 84−86.