

### CTH 3: The conquest of Zalpa justified

Marina Zorman

Ljubljana

In 1973 Otten published his transcription and translation of the amazing fragment KBo XXII 2<sup>1</sup>, which paved the way for a thorough exploration of the origin, theme, and historical background of text known as the Tale of Zalpa<sup>2</sup>. Previous discussions have provided no common consensus on these issues. The widespread motifs of giving birth to a large number of children at the same time<sup>3</sup>, exposing a child in the wilderness or in a river<sup>4</sup>, and incest<sup>5</sup> make it difficult to determine whether the text is of genuine Hittite origin<sup>6</sup> or adapted from some other source<sup>7</sup>. With regard to the theme, several different proposals can be found in the literature as well. It has been assumed that the text may narrate the history of a town named Zalpa<sup>8</sup>, the imposition of the right to the throne<sup>9</sup>, the colonization of the Black Sea region<sup>10</sup>, or the struggle for power among two or three cities – that is, between Kaneš and Zalpa, Ḫattuša and Zalpa, or perhaps Zalpa, Neša, and Ḫattuša<sup>11</sup>. Moreover, some authors believe

<sup>1</sup> H. Otten, *Eine althethitische Erzählung um die Stadt Zalpa*. (StBoT 17). Wiesbaden 1973.

<sup>2</sup> CTH 3, now composed of the following fragments: A = KBo XXII 2, B = KBo III 38, C = KUB XLVIII 79, D = KUB XXIII 23, and E = KBo XXVI 126.

<sup>3</sup> The motif of a large number of children (and donkeys) is also used in the story of Paršu in the Rigveda 10.86.23, of Danaos and Aigyptos (for both, see C. Watkins, *How to Kill a Dragon*. Oxford etc. 1995, p. 53), of the crime in Gibeah (Judg. 19,22–28), and in the list of minor judges in the Bible (Judg. 10,1–5 and 12,7–15; M. Tsevat, “Two Old Testament Stories and Their Hittite Analogues”, *JAOS* 103.1 (1983), pp. 321–326.).

<sup>4</sup> In the legends of Moses, Sargon, Anum-Ḫirbi, Perseus, Oedipus, the Amazons, and Romulus and Remus (cf. Otten, StBoT 17, pp. 63 f.; A. Ünal, “Das Motiv der Kindesaussetzung in den altanatolischen Literaturen”, *Keilschriftliche Literaturen. Ausgewählte Vorträge der XXXII. RAI, Münster, 8.–12. 7. 1985.*; K. Hecker – W. Sommerfeld Hgg. Berlin 1986, p. 129; H. A. Hoffner, Jr., *Hittite Myths*. Atlanta, Georgia 1998, p. 81; G. Beckman, “Hittite and Hurrian Epic”, *A Companion to Ancient Epic*. J.M. Foley ed. Oxford 2005, pp. 255–264 ).

<sup>5</sup> In the Greek legend of Danae as well as in the Biblical story of Amnon and Tamar (2 Sam. 13).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. I. Singer, “Some Thoughts on Translated and Original Hittite Literature”, *IOS XV* (1995), p. 124; J. Klinger, *Untersuchungen zur Rekonstruktion der hattischen Kultschicht*. Wiesbaden 1996 (StBoT 37), pp. 117 ff.

<sup>7</sup> To date, it has been suggested that the text may be of Hattian (T. R. Bryce, *The Major Historical Texts of Early Hittite History*. Queensland 1982, p. 19, n. 6), Hurrian (Ünal, *Keilschriftliche Literaturen*, p. 130), Semitic (most recently G. Steiner, “Acemhüyük = kârum Zalpa ‘im Meer””, *Aspects of Art and Iconography: Anatolia and its Neighbors. Studies in Honor of Nimet Özgüç*. M. J. Mellink – E. Porada – T. Özgüç edd. Ankara 1993, p. 588 f.), or common Indo-European origin (Watkins, *How to Kill a Dragon*, p. 53).

<sup>8</sup> Otten, StBoT 17, pp. 62–66.

<sup>9</sup> Sh. R. Bin-Nun, *The Tawananna in the Hittite Kingdom*. Heidelberg 1975 (TH 5), p. 144 f.

<sup>10</sup> H. A. Hoffner, Jr., “Histories and Historians of the Ancient Near East: The Hittites”, *Or* 49 (1980), p. 290.

<sup>11</sup> V. Haas, “Zalpa, die Stadt am Schwarzen Meer und das althethitische Königtum”, *MDOG* 109 (1977), pp. 15–26; R. L. Dieterle, “The Thirty Brothers”, *JIES* 15 (1987), pp. 169–214; Hoffner,

that the text was composed to serve as propaganda or to make evident the reasons for the hegemony of Ḫattuša<sup>12</sup>, for starting a new campaign against the native Hattian population<sup>13</sup>, and lately also against Zalpa<sup>14</sup>.

The question of the composition has been neglected so far. Otten's opinion that the initial portion is so different from the rest of the text – that it almost gives the impression that two different texts that have nothing in common except that they both mention the name of Zalpa happened to be written on the same tablet<sup>15</sup> – has not yet been disputed. At first glance, the thrilling opening portion indeed seems to turn to a tedious description of battles and rebellions following the gap between KBo XXII 2 and KBo III 38. However, a detailed examination of the composition provides sufficient reason to assume that the narrated events are sequenced according to the principle of gradation: in the course of the narrative, incidents blamed on Zalpa follow one another and gradually lead to the final catastrophe. Rhetorical figures and syntactic devices managing the flow of action are distributed throughout the entire text. Their use demonstrates the same skilful control over narration and may be considered proof that the final historical portion does not really differ in style or rhythm from the framing mythological narrative. Because the text was copied at least four times from the 15th to the 13th centuries BC, the purpose of this composition must have been to justify the conquest of Zalpa by the king of Ḫattuša. This conclusion is reached after exploring the following four aspects of the composition:

1. The relationship between the mythological and historical portion,
2. The narrative structure,
3. The style,
4. The purpose for telling the events.

#### *1. The relationship between the mythological and historical portion of the text*

The introductory part of the tale narrates mythic events that contrast with the everyday experiences of a human being but are nevertheless located in an identifiable geographical area: the Queen of Kaneš gives birth to thirty children at the same time, puts them into baskets, and sets them adrift in a river, which carries them to a city called Zalpa. Facts and imagined details are often mixed together in legends that have long been part of oral tradition<sup>16</sup>. In Central Europe, for example, there is the well-known motif of a sleeping king,

---

*Hittite Myths*, pp. 81 ff.

<sup>12</sup> Ünal, *Keilschriftliche Literaturen*; Singer, *IOS XV* (1995); Klinger, *StBoT* 37, pp. 121–126.

<sup>13</sup> A. Ünal, "Hethitische Mythen und Epen". *Weisheitstexte, Mythen und Epen. Mythen und Epen II*, K. Hecker, K. et al. Hgg. Güterloh 1994, p. 806.

<sup>14</sup> R. H. Beal, "The Predecessors of Ḫattušili I", *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the Occasion of His 65<sup>th</sup> Birthday*. G. Beckman – R. Beal – G. McMahon edd. Winona Lake, Indiana 2003, p. 24.

<sup>15</sup> Otten, *StBoT* 17, p. 63.

<sup>16</sup> See H. G. Güterbock, "Die historische Tradition und ihre literarische Gestaltung bei Babyloniern und Hethitern bis 1200", *ZA NF* 10 (1938), p. 96.

named Charlemagne in Germany, King Arthur in Great Britain, Little King Marko in Serbia, and King Matja• in Slovene folk-tales<sup>17</sup>. Researchers have long been convinced that King Matja• was actually the Hungarian king Matthias Corvinus († 1490), but now it has become clear that it is baseless to assume that the legends refer to a single historical figure<sup>18</sup>. The motifs of the Tale of Zalpa are equally widespread. They are used throughout Mesopotamian, Anatolian, Biblical, and Indo-European mythological tradition, and therefore the origin of the tale could hardly be identified in that way.

Because of the gap between the mythological and historical part of the text, it is difficult to identify the manner of transition between them. To illustrate the mode of the transition from the days of yore to more recent events in a historical narration, I quote a short Slovene tale about King Matja•<sup>19</sup>:

*King Matja• was a good king. There was no other money at his time but gold coins; therefore it was really “a golden age”. Under the linden trees our grandfathers were making merry all day long drinking wine from shiny glasses. King Matja• was a Slovenian king, our fellow countryman. He was chosen king by the people in Gosposvetsko polje. He lived in a castle called Krn. His door was open night and day so anyone could beg him for mercy and justice. But because he was rich, the other kings became envious. It happened that a great army coming from the west attacked him. In the bloody battle, his whole army was killed with the exception of one hundred of his loyal soldiers. Since he was a good king, he survived. The mountain near Rečice miraculously opened and hid him from his enemies. There he is still resting with his heroes and when his beard will grow long enough to wind nine times round the table, the mountain will give him back so that he will happily lead the Slovenian nation.*

*Some people have been lucky enough to happen upon him. A blacksmith from Rečice who was searching for the whitethorn wood for the handle of a hammer found the cave in the mountain. He saw King Matja• sitting and napping by the stone table. On the table lay a big bag of gold. He took it and became a rich man.*

*Legend has it that each New Year’s Eve one can see the cave in the mountain.*

The tale opens by setting the scene: once upon a time the legendary hero King Matja• lived in the Austrian part of Carinthia with an ethnic Slovene population, and life was easy and carefree during his reign. What follows are two events succeeding one another. Although the first event (i.e., a lost battle) happened at a forgotten time, the narration gives detailed information on it and on the king’s miraculous rescue in the underground near a place called Rečice, where he is still sleeping today. The second event happened much later, and it is still within living memory: while searching for a particular kind of wood for the handle of a hammer, a blacksmith from Rečice happened upon King Matja• and was rewarded by him with a great deal of money.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. I. Grafenauer, *Slovenske pripovedke o kralju Matja•u = Slowenische Sagen von Matthias Corvinus*. Ljubljana 1951, pp. 251–262.

<sup>18</sup> Discussed in V. Gogala, *Sen kralja Matja•a: pot v osrčje srednjeevropskega mita*. Ljubljana 2002.

<sup>19</sup> Adapted from K. Brenk, *Babica pripoveduje*. Ljubljana 1979, pp. 15–17.

These two compositions have much in common. Several events located in the same area are sequenced chronologically. Although those situated further back in time could not possibly happen in real life and are therefore assumed to be pure fiction, those dating from the time closer to the narrator give the impression of being more realistic. In the Tale of Zalpa, the events sequenced are the alleged rebellions of three or even four generations of princes<sup>20</sup>. If only they were true and reported as they really happened<sup>21</sup>, that would actually be the only formal difference between both tales. But as Quintilian said and we all know, “pure fiction” and “actual records of history” have something in common: namely, that we may discuss the credibility of both. Therefore it is only reasonable to assume that even the events in Zalpa were narrated to meet the needs of Hittite ideology. This assumption can be proven by examining the concluding portion of the text delivered in two versions: the Middle-Hittite original and its slightly modified copy dated to the 13th century<sup>22</sup>. In Otten’s view, the copyist made the necessary “improvements” in grammar and in content because even he could no longer understand the obsolete language of the original<sup>23</sup>. What Otten overlooked is the ideological character of the “improvements.” A closer look at the text provides evidence that the copyist has endeavored to present the conquest of Zalpa and especially the part played by the king of Ḫattuša in a slightly different light than was done in the original. In the later version, the following changes were made:

a) Zalpa attacked Ḫattuša with more troops:

A Vo 6’ I ME ÉRIN<sup>MES</sup>-za(-)e-a na-at-ta šu-wa ku-it na-at-ta a-kir<sup>24</sup>  
 B Vo 22’ I ME ÉRIN<sup>MES</sup> ŠU-ŠI ku-it Ú-UL a-ki-ir

b) The king of Ḫattuša decided to use force after a longer siege:

A Vo 11’ MU II<sup>KAM</sup> kat-ta-an e-eš-ta  
 B 27’–28’ MU III<sup>KAM</sup> kat-ta [e-eš-]ta

c) He spared the defeated city:

A Vo 15’ nu URU-an ḫar-ni-ik-ta  
 B Vo 32’ nu URU<sup>LAM</sup> E[L-Q]E

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Klinger, StBoT 37, p. 117.

<sup>21</sup> Cf., e.g., Otten, StBoT 17, p. 63, and Beal, *Fs Hoffner*, pp. 21–24.

<sup>22</sup> A Vo 4’–15’ and B Vo 20’–32’, dated by Košak, <http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk>, and Otten, StBoT 17, p. 1.

<sup>23</sup> For these comments on the differences between both versions, cf. Otten, StBoT 17, p. 45–56.

<sup>24</sup> Petra Goedegebuure has brought to my attention that the spelling ÉRIN<sup>MES</sup>-za-ya na-at-ta (cf. her unpublished dissertation *Reference, Deixis and Focus in Hittite. The Demonstratives ka- ‘this’, apa- ‘that’ and asi- ‘yon’*. University Amsterdam 2003, pp. 176–177, and my handout for the congress) is impossible.

If the verb *E[L-Q]E*, translated by Otten<sup>25</sup> as “er nahm ein (die Stadt)” was really used in the copy as an equivalent for *ḫarnink-*, it means that the king’s military intervention was misrepresented. The destruction of the city was no longer mentioned. The exact Akkadian parallel for *ḫarnink-* would be *HULLUQU* ‘to destroy, ruin’.

d) The conquest is described less dramatically, as already observed by Otten, who nevertheless made incorrect inferences about what motivated the changes<sup>26</sup>: due to the slight (mainly grammatical) changes, emphasis was moved from the crucial points in the act of invasion (coming to the city, proclaiming himself king, destruction of the city) to the description of the events following it:

A Vo 14’–15’ *ša-aš ša-ra-a URU-ya. pa-it ú-uk-wa LUGAL-uš-mi-iš ki-iš-ḫa Û ÉRIN<sup>MEŠ</sup> kat-ti-iš-mi nu URU-an ḫar-ni-ik-ta*  
 B Vo 31’–32’ *ša-aš A-NA LÚ<sup>MEŠ</sup> URU<sup>LIM</sup> te-e[t] ú-uk-wa LUGAL-uš-me-e[t] [ki-iš-ḫa-]at Û ÉRIN<sup>MEŠ</sup> kat-te-eš-ši nu URU<sup>LAM</sup> E[L-Q]E*

Putting it another way, in the later copy Zalpa was ascribed more blame and the king of Hattuša more merit.

## 2. The narrative structure

A narrative has two necessary features: a story or a sequence of events, and a discourse or a mode of presentation<sup>27</sup>. Events are basically presented in the form of past tense transitive clauses, for example:

*Then Sir Bedivere departed, and went to the sword, and lightly took it up, and went to the water side, and there he bound the girdle about the hilts, and then he threw the sword as far into the water as he might, and there came an arm and an hand above the water and met it, and caught it and so shook it thrice and brandished, and then vanished away the hand with the sword in the water<sup>28</sup>.*

This type of clause represents the basic unit of a narrative discourse. Narrated this way, a story makes rapid progress from one event to another, but it quickly becomes monotonous. Therefore it is necessary to slow down the flow of action, to report important details, and to draw attention to particular words or circumstances to increase the interest of the addressees. In addition, the narrator has the right to highlight exactly those events and circumstances that suit his own purposes for telling the story and he may portray them from whatever point of view he wants. He may provide background information or allude to potential complications.

<sup>25</sup> StBoT 17, p. 82.

<sup>26</sup> Otten, StBoT 17, p. 55: “Im folgenden findet diese langjährige Belagerung ein überraschendes Ende, zu abrupt für den Abschreiber, der wenigstens zur Einführung der direkten Rede noch ein *verbum dicendi* einfügt ... was auch eine Modelung der weiteren Zusammenhänge nach sich zog...”

<sup>27</sup> See *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*. J. L. Mey – R. E. Asher edd. Amsterdam 1998, p. 629.

<sup>28</sup> The Passing of Arthur from the Morte Darthur of Sir Thomas Malory.

From the linguistic point of view, all these features may be accomplished by the use of particular syntactic structures, such as relative, final, and consecutive clauses, negation, present or future tense, modality, questions, quotations, repetitions, certain particles, and so on. Because each step aside from the basic narrative syntax inevitably retards the flow of action and shifts attention to things that were important for the narrator, the analysis of the narrative syntax allows us to reconstruct the rhythmic pattern of the narrative, which reveals its structure and provides insight into the narrator's intentions.

Among syntactic devices used in the Tale of Zalpa to manage the flow of action and direct the listener's awareness are direct speech<sup>29</sup>, rhetorical questions<sup>30</sup>, inverted word

<sup>29</sup> A Ro 1–2 *UMMA ŠI=MA kī=wa kuit walkuan ḥāšḥun*

A Ro 8–9 *nu taršikanzi kāni=wa tunnakkiš inutten nu=wa ANŠE-iš arkatta*

A Ro 10 *UMMA LÚ<sup>MES</sup> URU<sup>LIM</sup> kuwapit arumen nu ANŠE-iš arkatta*

A Ro 11–12 *UMMA DUMU<sup>MES</sup> ueš=a kuwapit arumen nu MUNUS-z[a ] DUMU x [ ḥ]aši nu=zza anzaš I-ŠU ḥāšta*

A Ro 12–13 *UMMA LÚ<sup>MES</sup> URU<sup>LIM</sup> āšma anzel MUNUS.LUGAL<sup>URU</sup> Kaniš XXX MUNUS.DUMU*

*I-ŠU ḥāšta Û DUMU.NITA<sup>MES</sup> merir*

A Ro 14–15 *nu=zza DUMU.NITA<sup>MES</sup> karti=šmi peran mēmir kuin=wa šanḥiškiueni UMMA=NI šan uemiyauen uwatten<sup>URU</sup> Nēša paiwani*

B Ro 5'–6' *UMMA<sup>D</sup> UTU=MA [ ] paiddu mīyaru<sup>URU</sup> Zalpūwaš [*

D Ro 2' *pāu nu=wa mekki*

B Ro 33'+ D Ro 3' *UMMA<sup>m</sup> Ḥakkarpili-MA ta=wa mān [ ] LUGAL-i uēkmi*

D Ro 4' *UMMA ŠU=MA kiššan=wa [*

D Ro 5'–7' *<sup>URU</sup>Ga-[ ] pāueni [ ] taluga anzel [ ]<sup>m</sup> Kišwaš=ša uit nu LUGAL-i memišta (B*

*Ro 35' -]ueni nu=wa=nnaš<sup>GIŠ</sup> TUKUL šu[-)*

B Vo 9' *nu=wa uwa[-*

B Vo 10' *'DINGIR<sup>MES</sup>=wa [*

B Vo 12' *nu=wa-[*

A Vo 4'–6' *<sup>m</sup>Ḥappiš ANA LÚ<sup>MES</sup> URU<sup>URU</sup> Zalpa taršikizzi ūk=wa atti=mi natta āššuš šu=wa<sup>URU</sup> Ḥattuša ḥengani pāun Û DUMU<sup>MES</sup> URU<sup>URU</sup> Zalpa katti=mmi I ME ÉRIN<sup>MES</sup> za=ya natta šu=wa kuit natta akir*

B Vo 20'–22' *<sup>m</sup>Ḥappiš ANA LÚ<sup>MES</sup> URU<sup>URU</sup> Zalpa taraškizzi ūk=wa atti=mi ÛL āššuš šu=wa<sup>URU</sup> Ḥattuši ḥingani pāun Û DUMU<sup>MES</sup> URU<sup>URU</sup> Zalpa katte=mi I ME ÉRIN<sup>MES</sup> ŠUŠI kuit ÛL akir*

A Vo 15' *ūk=wa LUGAL-ušmiš kišḥa (Û ÉRIN<sup>MES</sup> kattišmi)*

B Vo 31'–32' *šaš ANA LÚ<sup>MES</sup> URU<sup>LIM</sup> tet ūk=wa LUGAL-ušmet kišḥat*

Direct speech is probably also in the following passages (for omitting *-wa(r)*, see B.W. Fortson, "A New Study of Hittite *-wa(r)*", *JCS* 50 (1998), pp. 21–34.

A Ro 19 [ ] *-uš=za nēkušummuš daškēueni nu lē šaliktumari*

B Ro 12' *TUŠMET Û DUMU.MUNUS-YA ANA MI-x*

B Ro 22'–23' *kiššan watarnaḥḥiš kuit ḥanti[ ]*

B Ro 27'–28' *nu=šmaš memišta kī=mu LUGAL-uš paišta[ ] HUL-lu ḥarzi nu kurur ēpten*

B Ro 30'–32' *GÍR-anza karašdu<sup>m</sup> Kišwaš=ša tet iš-[ ] ANA<sup>HUR.SAG</sup> Tapazzili ḥullit x[ ]*

*ḥullir<sup>GIŠ</sup> TUKUL GÍD.DA*

D Ro 16'–18' [ ] *taraškizzi [ ]-ḥun [ ] nu eḥu pāiši*

D Vo 11'–12' [ ] *ABI=YA [ ] AḤI=YA*

B Vo 15'–17' *ug=a=šmaš [ ]-erit [ ] ug=a=kan talit takku apā[- ] ug=a=šmaš*

*<sup>GIŠ</sup> intaluzzit šunnaḥḥi ḥatrāit ša=aš iya*

order<sup>31</sup>, particles *-a*<sup>32</sup>, *-(a)šta*<sup>33</sup>, *-pat*<sup>34</sup>, *-šan*<sup>35</sup> and conjunction *šaš*<sup>36</sup>, alternations between past and present tense<sup>37</sup>, and some subordinate clauses<sup>38</sup>. In addition to the main part of the

<sup>30</sup> A Ro 2 *kī=wa kuit*

A Ro 10 *kuwapit arumen nu ANŠE-iš arkatta*

A Ro 11 *ueš=a kuwapit arumen*

A Ro 14 *kuin=wa šanḫiškiuēni*

A Vo 6' (Û DUMU<sup>MEŠ</sup> URU<sup>URU</sup> *Zalpa katti=mmi*) I ME ÉRIN<sup>MEŠ</sup> *za=ya natta šu=wa kuit natta akir*

<sup>31</sup> B Ro 6' *paiddu mīyaru URU<sup>URU</sup> Zalpuwaš*

<sup>32</sup> A Ro 3 *ÍD-š=a*

A Ro 4 DINGIR<sup>DIDLI</sup> *-š=a*

A Ro 11 *ueš=a*

A Ro 18 *appezziyaš=a=ššan*

A Vo 7' LUGAL-š=a

A Vo 8' <sup>m</sup>*Ḫappiš=a*

A Vo 9' <sup>m</sup>*Tamnaššun=a*

B Vo 15' *ug=a=šmaš*

B Vo 16' *ug=a=kan*

B Vo 29' *še-a*

<sup>33</sup> B Ro 15' [*ḫu*]llit ešta I ŠUŠI É[ ]x; cf. J. Boley, “-ašta vs. -kán with -anda”, III. *Uluslararası Hititoloji Kongresi Bildirileri, Çorum 16–22 Eylül 1996 = Acts of the III<sup>d</sup> International Congress of Hittitology, Çorum, September 16–22, 1996*. S. Alp – A. Süel edd. Ankara 1998, p. 82.

<sup>34</sup> B Ro 14' [*ḫu*]llanzanni=*pat* BA.ÚŠ ŠA x [ ]<sup>URU</sup>*Zalp[a*; cf. H. A. Hoffner, Jr., “The Hittite Particle *-pat*”, *Festschrift Heinrich Otten*, E. Neu – Ch. Rüster Hgg. Wiesbaden 1973, p. 107 f.

<sup>35</sup> A Ro 14 *UMMA=NI-šan uemiyauen*; cf. Boley (1992: 11); for different reading see F. Starke, “Ḫalmašuit im Anitta-Text und die hethitische Ideologie vom Königtum”, *ZA* 69 (1979), p. 51.

<sup>36</sup> For the function of *šaš*, see J. Boley, “How Old Hittite Changed the World”, *Šarnikzel. Hethitologische Studien zum Gedenken an Emil Orgetorix Forrer (19. 2. 1894–10. 1. 1986)*. D. Groddek – S. Rößle Hgg. Dresden 2004, pp. 193 ff.

B Vo 17' *šunnaḫḫi ḫatrāit [(šaš iya)- ]*

B Vo 18' <sup>URU</sup>*Zalpašš=a IKKIR [(š)aš URU<sup>URU</sup>x[ ] arḫ)a pait*

A Vo 7' LUGAL-ša IŠME *šaš yanniš* (B Vo 22' [LUGAL-u=-š]a IŠME *šaš iyanniš*)

A Vo 14' Û LUGAL ŠU.GI *apīya tāliš šaš šarā URU-ya pait*

<sup>37</sup> A Ro 7–8 DUMU.NITA<sup>MEŠ</sup> *āppa URU<sup>URU</sup> Nēša yanzi nu ANŠE-in nannianzi*

A Ro 16–17 *nu AMA-ŠUNU [ -u]š natta ganešzi*

B Vo 17' <sup>URU</sup>*Kummanni EGIR-pa paizzi*

A Vo 12' Û LÚ<sup>MEŠ</sup> URU<sup>LIM</sup> *natta pianzi*

B Vo 29' Û LÚ<sup>MEŠ</sup> URU<sup>LIM</sup> *ŪL pianzi*

<sup>38</sup> A Ro 6 *mān MU<sup>BLA</sup> ištarna pāir nu MUNUS.LUGAL namma XXX MUNUS.DUMU ḫāšta*

A Ro 8 *mān URU<sup>URU</sup> Tamar[- ] arir nu taršikanzi*

A Ro 15 *mān URU<sup>URU</sup> Nēša pāir nu=šmaš DINGIR<sup>DIDLI</sup> -eš tamaīn karātan daīr*

B Ro 2' *mān lukkattati URU<sup>URU</sup> Zalpa pa[-*

B Ro 7' *mān appezziyan kurur kišat [*

B Ro 23' *kuit ḫanti [*

B Ro 25' *tupalān kuēl SAG.DU-i [*

mythological introduction (A Ro 2 and 6–20), the highlighted passages of the story – which can be recognized by the use of these devices – include the god’s blessing of Zalpa (B Ro 2’–6’), the homicide of the king’s daughter (B Ro 9’–12’), the affair with Ḫakkarpili (B Ro 23’–32’, D Ro 2’–10’), some badly preserved parts of D (Ro 16’–18’, Vo 11’–12’) and B (Vo 8’–17’), Ḫappi’s incitation to war (A Vo 4’–6’) and some aspects of the conquest (i.e., the beginning of the siege, A Vo 10’), the refusal of the citizens to obey the king’s order (A Vo 12’), and the conquest of the city (A Vo 15’). In contrast, the military actions following the rebellions<sup>39</sup> are given far less attention and are reported in the form of simple narrative clauses (B Ro 13’–22’, A Vo 7’–14’). One can see that the story progresses with a dynamic rhythm. The pattern of sequencing events provides sufficient evidence for alternations between retardations and accelerations also in the historical portion of the text. This can be considered proof of a vivid, unified structure of the entire composition.

### 3. The stylistic features

There is a series of tropes and figures used in the text; the following are noticeable even to a non-expert:

- a) Metonymy: the name *Zalpa* is used metonymically for inhabitants of the town:

B Ro 13’ *nu*<sup>URU</sup> *Zalpa* *INA* <sup>HUR.SAG</sup> *Kapa-x* [

- b) Personification: the expression meaning the ‘genius of the Earth’ is used with a determinative for a human being:

B Ro 3’ <sup>MUNUS</sup> *Dagazipašš=a*

- c) Rhetorical question: 5 times in A; for the quotations, see note 30 above.

- d) Exclamation:

D Ro 18’ *eḫu*

- e) Iteration: at least *takku* and *ug=a* in B Vo 14’–17’; for the quotation, see antithesis below.

---

B Ro 26’ *mān*<sup>m</sup> *Ḫakkarpiliš*<sup>URU</sup> *Zalpa* *pa* [-

D Ro 3’ *ta=wa mān* [

B Vo 14’–17’ *takku* [ -i]t [ ] *ug=a=šmaš* [ -]erit // [ ] *ug=a=kan talit // takku*

*apā* [- ] *ug=a=šmaš*<sup>GIŠ</sup> *intaluzzit šunnaḫḫi*

A Vo 6’ I *ME ÉRIN*<sup>MEŠ</sup> *-za=ya natta šu=wa kuit natta akir*

B Vo 22’ I *ME ÉRIN*<sup>MEŠ</sup> *ŠUŠI kuit ŪL akir*

<sup>39</sup> Except the disobedience of the citizens in A Vo 12’ just mentioned.

f) Parallelism:

A Ro 1 XXX DUMU<sup>MEŠ</sup> I<sup>EN</sup> MU-anti *ḥāšta*

A Ro 6 XXX MUNUS.DUMU *ḥāšta*

A Ro 10 UMMA LÚ<sup>MEŠ</sup> URU<sup>LIM</sup>

A Ro 11 UMMA DUMU<sup>MEŠ</sup>

g) Antithesis: ‘the elder brothers : the youngest one’ in A Ro 18 and ‘he : I’ in B Vo 14’–17’:

A Ro 18 *ḥantēzziaš* DUMU<sup>MEŠ</sup> *nikušmuš natta ganeššir appezziḥaš=a=ššan*

B Vo 14’ *takku*[ -i]t [ ] *ug=a=šmaš* [ -]erit // [ ] *ug=a=kan talit* // *takku apā*[- ] *ug=a=šmaš*<sup>GIŠ</sup> *intaluzzit šunnaḥḥi*

h) Inverted word order:

B Ro 6’ *mīyaru*<sup>URU</sup> *Zalpūwaš*

i) Dialogue: at least in A Ro 8–13 and in D Ro 3’–4’; for the quotations, see note 29 above.

j) Inner monologue:

A Ro 13–14 *nu=zza* DUMU.NITA<sup>MEŠ</sup> *karti=šmi peran mēmir kuin=wa šanḥiškiueni UMMANI šan uemiyauen*

k) Gradation: see the discussion of the composition further below.

In sum, there are 11 different types of tropes and figures altogether appearing in the mythological as well as in the historical portion of the text. Taking into account the dynamic rhythmic pattern described above and its skilful composition discussed in the next section, one can conclude that the overall impression of the historical portion as just a tedious description of a series of rebellions that has nothing to do with the mythological introduction is obviously due only to the turn from imaginary to more realistic events and the gap in the text that makes it difficult to understand the transition from one universe into another. The analysis of the narrative structure and the style do not confirm this.

---

#### 4. The purpose for telling the events

In his paper “Another View of Hittite Literature”, Theo van den Hout<sup>40</sup> states that the Hittites copied only those genres of texts that were meant to be passed on to later generations and kept for centuries in the collections. Among the texts with duplicates there are also historical texts that were composed with the aim of justifying contemporary behavior. According to van den Hout’s observations on Hittite society, history was the foundation of the present and was meant to be learned from<sup>41</sup>. Within this sphere one must therefore seek the reasons for composing and copying this historical document.

The purpose for telling the events may be identified by examining the logic of linking them together, because each of them must somehow contribute to the sense of the whole. Events can be linked together simply because they are likely to succeed one another, or they can be the result of the particular emotional activity of a character or a common practice. A further motive to link them can be the narrator’s convictions of what is suitable and right, which depend on the ideology of a certain community. The Tale of Zalpa narrates a series of events that oppose Hittite ideology. Starting with the inadmissible relationship of the princes of Zalpa with their own sisters and proceeding through the repeated disobedience of the princes and citizens of this town, the destruction of the city turns out to be the only possible outcome. The justification of the king’s decision to proclaim himself king of Zalpa was of course a sufficient reason to keep several copies of this composition for at least two hundred years in the tablet collections of the Hittite capital.

---

<sup>40</sup> See *Anatolia Antica. Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati*. S. de Martino – F. Pecchioli Daddi edd. Firenze 2002, Tomo II, pp. 857–878.

<sup>41</sup> See *Anatolia Antica*, p. 875.