A new interpretation of the Old Hittite Zalpa-text (CTH 3.1)
Nēša as the capital under Ḫuzziịa I, Labarna I, and Ḫattušili I
Kloekhorst, A.

A New Interpretation of the Old Hittite Zalpa-Text (CTH 3.1): Nēša as the Capital under Ḫuzziia I, Labarna I, and Ḫattušili I

ALWIN KLOEKHORST

LEIDEN UNIVERSITY

This article discusses one of the main problems of the Zalpa-text, namely that its mythological part deals with the relations between Zalpa and Nēša, but leaves Ḫattuša unmentioned, whereas its historical part deals with the relations between Zalpa and Ḫattuša, but contains no reference to Nēša. Following Martínez' 2016 suggestion that in the text's historical part Ḫattuša does not have the function of capital of the kings who feature in this story, but is merely used as a military base for the campaigns against Zalpa, it will be argued that during the historical events described in the Zalpa-text these kings in fact ruled from Nēša. A major consequence of this interpretation is that Nēša was the capital during the reigns of the early Hittite kings Ḫuzziia I and Labarna I and also that Ḫattušili I ascended the throne there before he moved his court to Ḫattuša.

INTRODUCTION

The Old Hittite Zalpa-text (CTH 3.1)[1] consists of two parts: a mythological and a historical one. Although both parts deal with the city of Zalpa (hence the name "Zalpa-text"), the exact relationship between the two has not been satisfactorily explained. One of the main mysteries is the fact that the mythological introduction tells about adventurous events taking place between the cities Zalpa and Nēša, whereas the historical remainder deals with the military clashes between Zalpa and Ḫattuša. In the mythological part no mention is made of Ḫattuša, whereas in the historical part Nēša is fully absent from the storyline.[2]

In an attempt to solve the problem of the seeming mismatch between its two parts, in this article I will provide a new analysis of the Zalpa-text, focusing on the roles that the cities Ḫattuša and Nēša play in it.

IDENTIFYING THE PROTAGONISTS OF THE HISTORICAL PART OF THE ZALPA-TEXT

First it is important to determine the historical context of the Zalpa-text. This can be done by identifying the rulers who within the composition's historical part are described as launching several campaigns against Zalpa: *ABI ABI* LUGAL "the grandfather of the King," LUGAL ŠU.GI "the old King," and LUGAL "the King." Although in the literature several proposals for the identification of these three individuals can be found,[3] I follow Beal (2003: 22–25), who argues that they represent the following successive Hittite kings: "the King" = Ḫattušili I, "the old King" = his predecessor Labarna I (who was the husband of Ḫattušili I's aunt Taṷananna), and "the grandfather of the King" = Labarna I's predecessor, probably

---

1. See Otten 1973 and Holland and Zorman 2007 for editions.
2. See, e.g., Gilan 2015: 194 for a formulation of this problem.
3. E.g., Hoffner 1980; Pecchioli Daddi 1994; Klinger 1996: 117–23.

called Ḫuzziịa I[4] (the father of his wife Tau̯ananna and thus the grandfather of Ḫattušili I).[5] The attractiveness of Beal's proposal lies in the fact that the designations of the three successive kings from the Zalpa-text nicely fit the family relations among Ḫattušili I, Labarna I, and Ḫuzziịa I, as can be reconstructed on the basis of other Hittite sources. Especially the fact that the predecessor of "the King" is called "the old King" and not "the father of the King" is a perfect match with the relationship between Ḫattušili I and his predecessor Labarna I, who was not his father, but rather his uncle by marriage.[6]

THE ROLE OF ḪATTUŠA

In the historical part of the Zalpa-text, the city of Ḫattuša plays a central role: It is from there that all the campaigns against Zalpa are conducted, both during the times of "the grandfather of the King," and during the times of "the old King" and "the King" (who campaigned together). For instance, Ḫattuša is mentioned in a passage that refers to the signing of a peace treaty between the people of Zalpa and "the grandfather of the King" (KBo 3.38 obv. 19; see also below, n. 15). As Beal (2003: 24–25) explains, this is an interesting fact, since from the early years of Hittitology onward it has generally been assumed that after Ḫattuša was destroyed by Anitta (as told by the Anitta-text, CTH 1, and which according to the newest insights into the chronology of the *kārum*-period can be dated to ca. 1728 BCE[7]), it was Ḫattušili I who rebuilt the city and moved his court there from Kuššara, his original home town (but see below).[8] This establishment of Ḫattuša as the new capital of his kingdom would then be reflected in the fact that Ḫattušili I changed his given name Labarna to Ḫattušili, lit. "the man of Ḫattuša" (Beal 2003: 24–25, with references).

According to Beal, this idea has now become obsolete, since the view that "the King" of the Zalpa-text refers to Ḫattušili I means that Ḫattuša "was thriving much earlier [than the times of Ḫattušili I] and was already a capital under Ḫattušili's grandfather."[9] With regard to the name of Ḫattušili I, Beal states that "[o]ne could just as well argue that Ḫattušili originally bore this name and took the name Labarna when he was named heir of his uncle Labarna." Or, "[a]lternatively, he could have been named Labarna, but was called Ḫattušili after the place of his (presumed) birth to differentiate him from his uncle" (Beal 2003: 25 with n. 73).

---

4. Beal himself argues that the grandfather of Ḫattušili I can either be identified as PU-Šarruma or as Tudḫaliịa (2003: 31–35), two individuals who are mentioned in the relatively damaged initial part of the Offering Lists to Royal Ancestors (CTH 661). This idea has been refuted by Forlanini (2010: 116 n. 10, 117–18 with n. 18), however, who more convincingly equates the grandfather of Ḫattušili I with Ḫuzziịa, the man whose name is attested on the "cruciform seal" and in the first paragraph of the Offering Lists to Royal Ancestors, and who on the basis of these texts was identified by Dinçol et al. (1993: 104–6) as the predecessor of Labarna I. In order to distinguish this Ḫuzziịa from the later Old Hittite kings called Ḫuzziịa (the predecessors of Telipinu and Muu̯attalli I, respectively), De Martino (2016: 19–20) calls him "Ḫuzziịa I," which I will follow in this article.

5. Likewise, but less extensively, Sürenhagen 1998: 83 n. 39.

6. Beal's proposal is accepted by, e.g., Forlanini 2010: 117 and by Barjamovic, Hertel, and Larsen 2012: 50–51 n. 183. Although Gilan (2015: 208) too calls Beal's interpretations "überzeugend," he is skeptical about the identification of "the old King" as the predecessor of "the King."

7. Kryszat 2008: 207, followed by Barjamovic, Hertel, and Larsen 2012: 39 ("a date immediately prior to 1730 BC").

8. A theory first formulated by Forrer (1926: 6*, 11*), and still found in, e.g., Klengel 2011: 32. Cf. Beal 2003: 24 n. 65 for an overview of references in favor of this view.

9. Likewise Sürenhagen 1998: 83 n. 39: "Die seit E. Forrer […] weitverbreitete Annahme, daß Hattusili I. der Gründer der neuen Hauptstadt gewesen sei, […] wäre dann aufzugeben."

Again according to Beal, the idea that Ḫattuša had been rebuilt much earlier than the times of Ḫattušili I is supported by archaeological evidence. He refers to Neve (*apud* Bittel et al. 1984: 89), who states that "die Wiederaufbau Ḫattušas bald nach dem Ende der Karum-zeitlichen Siedlung […] erfolgt [ist]," which means that there was not "eine Generationen während Unterbrechung in der Besiedlung Ḫattušas."[10] According to Beal (ibid.), there may thus have been "less than a generation intervening," i.e., perhaps not more than ten or twenty years, between the destruction of Ḫattuša (ca. 1728 BCE) and its rebuilding, which can thus be dated to ca. 1720–1710 BCE. The resettlement of Ḫattuša would thus have been executed some sixty to seventy years before the traditionally assigned ascension date of Ḫattušili I (1650 BCE). As argued in Kloekhorst 2019: 249, if we take the average time span of a generation as twenty-five to thirty years, the rebuilding of Ḫattuša would have taken place at least two generations before the start of the reign of Ḫattušili I, i.e., more or less at the time that his grandfather Ḫuzziia I would have ascended the throne (two generations = fifty to sixty years before Ḫattušili I, i.e., around 1710–1700 BCE). Since both in the "cruciform seal" (Dinçol et al. 1993) and in the Offering Lists to the Royal Ancestors (CTH 661; more specifically KUB 36.121 obv. 1–3) Ḫuzziia I is the first to be mentioned in a list of early Hittite kings (thus Dinçol et al. 1993: 104–6), it makes sense to assume that it indeed was he who rebuilt Ḫattuša.[11]

DOUBTS ABOUT THE STATUS OF ḪATTUŠA IN THE ZALPA-TEXT

However, Beal's statement that the Zalpa-text shows that Ḫattuša "was already a capital under Ḫattušili's grandfather" (2003: 25) has recently been challenged by Martínez (2016). He argues that, although in the historical part of the Zalpa-text Ḫattuša indeed functions as the main center from which Zalpa is attacked, it cannot have been the capital of the Hittite kingdom[12] at that time. His argument centers on the following lines from the historical part of the Zalpa-text:

KBo 3.38 obv.
19. *a-pu-u-uš-š=a* URUḫa-at-tu-ši ták-šu-u[l … A-BI A-B]I LUGAL=ma
20. URUḫu-ur-ma-an A-NA A-BI LUGAL ŠU.G[I] x […] x [...] x URUḫa-at-tu-ša-aš-š=a
21. Ù LÚ.MEŠŠU.GI URUZA-AL-PA kat-te-i[=š-…] x […] x […] DUMU-an ú-e-ke-e[r]
22. nu-u=š-ma-aš mḫa-ak-kar-pí-li-in DU[MU …] x ki-iš-ša[-an]
23. ụa-tar-na-aḫ-ḫi-iš …

And they (i.e., the men of Zalpa and "the grandfather of the King") [signed] a peace treaty in Ḫattuša,[13] and the [gran]dfather of the King [gave/commissioned] the city of Ḫurma to the father of the old King.[14] The elders of both Ḫattuša and of Zalpa besides/with x[...] requested a son. And to them he commissioned Ḫakkarpili, so[n of? ...] with the following words: …

---

10. Cf. Schachner and Krügner 2019: 207, who state that in the areas from the northern part of Ḫattuša excavated in 2017 and 2018, "die hethitische Bebauung unmittelbar auf die der *kārum*-Zeit [folgt]," and that—depending on absolute datings—"kein Hiatus zwischen den Epochen vorzuliegen scheint."

11. Thus also Barjamovic, Hertel, and Larsen 2012: 51.

12. With the term "Hittite kingdom" I refer to the kingdom ruled by Ḫuzziia I, Labarna I, and Ḫattušili I, regardless of where their main court(s) may have been situated. In the same vein, I will refer to these kings as "early Hittite kings," with which I indicate that they are the earliest known members of the dynasty that during the largest part of its history ruled from Ḫattuša.

13. See n. 15 for this translation.

14. Following Klinger 1996: 116–17.

The crucial part here is ^{URU}*ḫattušašš=a* Ù ^{LÚ.MEŠ}ŠU.GI ^{URU}*ZALPA katte*[*=š-* …] DUMU-*an ụeke*[*r*]. In this sentence, it is in principle possible to view ^{URU}*ḫattušaš* as a nominative form, which, through the coordinating conjunction Ù, would be paired to the nominative form ^{LÚ.MEŠ}ŠU.GI "the elders." This would yield the translation "Both the city of Ḫattuša and the elders of Zalpa …" Another possibility is to view ^{URU}*ḫattušaš* as a genitive form which, through the coordinating conjunction Ù, would be paired to the genitive "of Zalpa" that underlies the Sumerographic expression ^{LÚ.MEŠ}ŠU.GI ^{URU}*ZALPA*. This would yield the translation "The elders of Ḫattuša as well as of Zalpa …" Whichever of these two translations one chooses, it is clear that (the representatives of) both Ḫattuša and Zalpa are the subject of the sentence, which ends with "requested a son."

According to Martínez (2016: 180), this request must be viewed as a part of the negotiations surrounding the peace treaty between "the grandfather of the King" and the city of Zalpa about the terms of its new position within the kingdom. In his view, "[t]he 'elders of Zalpa' do not want to be a second rate city within the wider Hittite empire—they want to be a prominent and influential city. The best way to ensure that prominence is with a ruler who has significant status in the Hittite political hierarchy," i.e., a prince. And indeed, it can be no coincidence that in the preceding line it is told how "the [grand]father of the King [gave/commissioned] the city of Ḫurma to the father of the old King," who was undoubtedly a royal prince. This apparently was the reason for the elders of Zalpa to ask for such a ruler as well.

However, as Martínez (p. 180), notes, it seems "quite odd" that also (the elders of) Ḫattuša would ask for a prince to rule them, if Ḫattuša were at that time the seat of the royal court: it would then of course have fallen under the direct control of the king himself. Also, if the request for a prince was not made for Ḫattuša itself, but only for Zalpa, then the text still implies that the elders of Ḫattuša supported the elders of Zalpa in this request, which, too, would be odd if Ḫattuša were the capital city: "One would think that in such a treaty negotiation, the king and the leaders of Ḫattuša, the capital city, would present a united front" (p. 181). These considerations have led Martínez to think that during these events Ḫattuša was not the capital city of the early Hittite kings, but rather a "forward operating base" from which the campaign against Zalpa had been launched. Moreover, in his view, in all other instances in the Zalpa-text where Ḫattuša is mentioned it may have had that function.[15] He

---

15. In the first line of the cited passage, KBo 3.38 obv. 19, we find the unfortunately broken clause *apūšš=a* ^{URU}*ḫattuši takšu*[*l* …] It is generally assumed that acc.pl. *apūš* should in this sentence be interpreted as having the function of a nominative, "they" (as is normal in New Hittite texts, cf. Otten 1973: 40), and that it probably refers back to LÚ^{ME.EŠ} ^{URU}*ZALPA* "the people of Zalpa" as mentioned in the preceding line, possibly in combination with "the grandfather of the King," the main protagonist of this section. This implies that the nom.-acc.sg. form *takšul* "peace treaty" should be the object of the sentence, probably of a verb "they signed" that is lost in the break. The noun ^{URU}*ḫattuši* is interpreted by some scholars as denoting the party with which the people of Zalpa signed a peace treaty, cf. the translations "Und selbige (gegenüber) Ḫattuša Friede […" (Otten 1973: 9), "…] a treaty with Ḫattuša" (Holland and Zorman 2007: 42), or "Und jene [schlossen] mit Ḫattuša Fried[en" (Gilan 2015: 184). However, the dat.-loc. form ^{URU}*ḫattuši* could just as well refer to the location where the treaty is signed, cf. the translation "… und diese [schlossen] in Ḫattuša einen Vertrag" (Helck 1983: 277) and the remarks by Beal 2003: 25 ("Ḫattuša is mentioned as the place of the treaty signing") and Martínez 2016: 181 ("The location of this treaty signing is Ḫattuša," cf. also his explicit defense in favor of this interpretation in 2016: 181 n. 19). From a linguistic point of view, I favor the latter interpretation. According to Beal (2003: 25), this passage indicates that Ḫattuša must have been the capital at the time of the treaty signing, but according to Martínez (2016: 182) this need not be the case: as a forward operating base, Ḫattuša could also have been a "logical place to sign the treaty," since it was "easily accessible by both parties." To my mind, one could go a step further and state that the fact that it is detailed where the treaty was signed indicates that this took place at a location that for the intended audience of the Zalpa-text would have been unexpected. This may then, therefore, specifically indicate that Ḫattuša was *not* the capital at this time.

therefore concludes that this interpretation of the role of Ḫattuša in the Zalpa-text "removes any literary evidence for Ḫattuša as the capital under Labarna I" (p. 182).

According to Martínez, this idea is supported by the fact that Labarna I is absent from the Offering Lists to Royal Ancestors (CTH 661), in which, according to Forlanini (2010: 117), are mentioned the names of all deceased kings, queens, and princes whose remains were present in Ḫattuša, either because they died there or because these remains had been brought there at a later time. As Martínez argues, "[i]f the capital was Hattuša during the reign of Labarna I, this absence would be inexplicable," and we therefore "can safely rule out Hattuša as the capital under Labarna I."

To my mind, this is an attractive argument, with interesting implications. If, after his death, Labarna I's remains were not interred at Ḫattuša because at that moment his court was not situated at Ḫattuša but in some other city, this implies that his successor Ḫattušili I's ascension to the throne, which must have been effectuated the moment Labarna I died, did not take place in Ḫattuša either, but in that other city. (It will be discussed below which city this could have been.) However, it cannot be denied that during the (larger part of the) reign of Ḫattušili I the capital of his kingdom clearly was Ḫattuša. This implies that Ḫattušili I, at some moment during his reign, moved the royal court from that other city to Ḫattuša. This would, of course, fit the traditional idea that Ḫattušili I's given name was Labarna, and that he took on the name Ḫattušili "of Ḫattuša" as his regnal name because of the establishment of Ḫattuša as the capital of his kingdom. The only difference with the old view is that Ḫattušili I did not *rebuild* the city: this had been done already before the time of his grandfather's campaigns against Zalpa.

Another indication that Ḫattušili I's ascension to the throne did not take place in Ḫattuša but somewhere else is provided by the Telipinu-text (CTH 19).[16] This edict starts with a summary of the problems regarding the succession to the Hittite throne from the times of Labarna I up to the time of Telipinu himself. In this text, Labarna I is introduced with the words: [kar]ū ᵐlabarnaš LUGAL.GAL ēšta "In the past, Labarna was Great King" (§1). His successor Ḫattušili I is introduced with the words: EGIR-*ŠU=ma* ᵐḫattušīliš ḫaššu̯ēt "Afterward Ḫattušīli became king" (§5). However, the next king, Muršili I, is introduced with the sentence *mān* ᵐmuršiliš ᵁᴿᵁḫattuši LU[GAL-]ēt "When Muršili became king in Ḫattuša" (§8). This explicit mentioning of the fact that Muršili became king *in Ḫattuša* does not make sense if his predecessor Ḫattušili I would have ascended the throne in Ḫattuša as well. However, in a scenario in which Ḫattušili I ascended the throne in the city that was the capital during the reign of his predecessor Labarna I, and in which only later on he moved the royal court to Ḫattuša, this statement would indeed make sense: Muršili I would then have been the first king of his lineage who ascended the throne in Ḫattuša itself.[17]

All in all, I find it an attractive idea of Martínez that during the reign of Labarna I ("the old King" of the Zalpa-text), Ḫattuša was not the capital of his kingdom. The question thus arises: which city did have this function?

ḪURMA AS THE CAPITAL UNDER LABARNA I?

According to Martínez, "[c]ollecting the sparse evidence concerning the reign of Labarna I reveals repeated references to the city of Hurma" (2016: 182), and he therefore assumes that during the reign of Labarna I Ḫurma was the seat of his kingship. Although Martínez' observation that Labarna I and his wife Tau̯ananna are relatively often associated with

---

16. See Hoffmann 1984 for an edition of this text.
17. Thus also Klinger 1996: 123.

Ḫurma seems to be correct, this does not necessarily mean that Ḫurma functioned as the capital during Labarna I's reign. As we read in the Zalpa-text, "the grandfather of the King" (= Ḫuzziia I) had given Ḫurma to the father of "the old King" (= Labarna I).[18] It is therefore quite possible that Labarna I was born there and/or spent his childhood there (thus also Martínez 2016: 183). One could even speculate that he himself had succeeded his father as prince / governor of Ḫurma before he followed his father-in-law as king of the Hittite kingdom. Any associations between the royal pair Labarna I / Tauananna and Ḫurma might thus be traced back to the time that they were the ruling couple of this city, before Labarna I became king. These associations therefore do not necessarily say anything about which city functioned as capital during his reign.

In fact, the statement that Ḫurma was given by "the grandfather of the King" (Ḫuzziia I) to the father of "the old King" (Labarna I) already by itself indicates that at least during the reign of Ḫuzziia I, Ḫurma was not the capital of the kingdom: the king would never have given away authority over the seat of his court to someone else. Martínez is aware of this, and he therefore assumes that at the time of Ḫuzziia I the royal court was in fact situated in Nēša, but that Labarna I "moved the Hittite capital from Neša to his hometown of Hurma" (Martínez 2016: 182), only for it to be moved a third time by Labarna I's successor Ḫattušili I, namely to Ḫattuša. This seems unnecessarily complicated to me. Although I agree with Martínez that it is likely that Nēša was the capital during the reign of Ḫuzziia I, I assume that it retained this function during the reign of Labarna I, and was still the capital when Ḫattušili I succeeded his uncle and ascended the throne. This follows from the following considerations.

CONNECTING MYTH AND HISTORY IN THE ZALPA-TEXT:
NĒŠA AS THE CAPITAL UNDER ḪUZZIIA I AND LABARNA I

The mythological part of the Zalpa-text famously starts with narrating how the Queen of Nēša gives birth to thirty sons at once. She then puts them in baskets on the river, which brings them to the land Zalpuua on the sea. There they are picked up from the sea by the gods and raised by them. Later on, the sons go in search of their mother, who in the meantime had given birth again, this time to thirty daughters. When the sons approach Nēša, the gods make them unrecognizable to their mother, and she gives them her daughters to marry. The sons do not recognize that the girls are their sisters; only the youngest son is aware of this and warns his brothers not to touch their sisters. At this point, the Old Hittite tablet containing the

---

18. KBo 3.38 obv. (19) [*ABI AB*]*I* LUGAL=*ma* (20) ᵁᴿᵁ*ḫurman ANA ABI* LUGAL ŠU.G[I] x […] x […] x "And/but the [grandfa]ther of the King [gave] Ḫurma to the father of the ol[d] King," cf. Klinger 1996: 118. Since the sentence contains both a direct and an indirect object, there can be no doubt that the verb that must be restored is "to give" *vel sim.* Note that Klinger (loc.cit.) on the basis of this passage assumes that "'the grandfather of the King' should in fact have been called 'the grandfather of the old King'," and that in the historical part of the Zalpa-text we are dealing with four generations. This idea is probably prompted by the idea that "the father of the old King" should have been the grandfather of the King, and that therefore the man called "the grandfather of the King" should in fact be someone else, and therefore the grandfather of "the old King." Yet this is only necessary in a scenario in which "the old King" is the father of "the King." Since this man is not called "the father of the King," however, such a scenario is unlikely, and there is therefore no need to assume that "the father of the old King" was in fact the grandfather of "the King." Within Beal's scenario, "the father of the old King" would be the father of Labarna I, and thus not equal to "the grandfather of the King," who was rather Labarna I's father-in-law. Therefore, "the grandfather of the King" (= Ḫuzziia I) and "the father of the old King" (= the father of Labarna I) can be regarded as belonging to the same generation, which removes the necessity to assume the presence of four generations.

Zalpa-text, KBo 22.2,[19] breaks off, so we do not know exactly what happened between the thirty sons and the thirty daughters of the Queen of Nēša: did they get married?

The New Hittite duplicate KBo 3.38 starts with a paragraph which, according to Otten (1973: 36), "die Erzählung von Bo 70/10 [= KBo 22.2] unmittelbar fortsetzt." Since this paragraph starts with [*mā*]*n lukkattati* "when it became light," the text could, in Otten's view, "die Ereignisse nach der Hochzeitsnacht wiederaufnehmen." In this first paragraph of KBo 3.38 (the right part of which is unfortunately broken) we read that when it became light someone (the youngest son?) went(?) to the city of Zalpa, and that several deities performed some actions, among them, the Sun-Goddess who formulated the benediction [… *p*]*aiddu mīi̯aru* "[he/she/it] must proceed to thrive!" The last sentence of the paragraph starts with Zalpuu̯a in the nominative case, but unfortunately the rest of the line is unreadable.

The second paragraph of KBo 3.38 starts with the sentence *mān appezzii̯an kurur k*[*iš*]*at*? "When later on enmity a[ro]se," and is the introduction of the historical part of this composition, in which the campaigns of the early Hittite kings against Zalpa are described.

As was mentioned earlier, there is no consensus on the exact relationship between the mythological introduction and the historical remainder of the Zalpa-text.[20] One problem is that we do not know the end of the mythological part: did the princes and princesses commit incest or not?[21] Another problem is that the mythological part deals with the relationship between Nēsa and Zalpa, without Ḫattuša being a part of the story, whereas the historical part is concerned with the attacks on Zalpa undertaken from Ḫattuša, without mentioning Nēša. In the following, I will focus on the second problem.

To my mind, a crucial indication of the relationship between the two parts of the Zalpa-text is the clause that introduces the historical narrative: *mān appezzii̯an kurur k*[*iš*]*at*? "When later on enmity a[ro]se" (KBo 3.38 obv. 7). It contains several important aspects.[22]

1. The use of the word *appezzii̯an* "later (on)" puts the two parts of the Zalpa-text in a chronological order: the mythological narrative precedes the historical story.

2. The clause represents a change of state. At the end of the period described by the mythological part there apparently was no enmity,[23] which only arose at a later period, during the reign of "the grandfather of the King."[24]

3. The use of the conjunction *mān* "when," implies that the rise of the enmity was the cause of the events to follow.

4. It is not made explicit between which parties the enmity arose. This implies that the author of this text assumed that this was clear from the context. Since the sections preceding this sentence deal with the interactions between Nēša and Zalpa, it follows that the enmity

19. The paleographic dating of KBo 22.2 is debated: e.g., CHD dates it as "OS," whereas Hetkonk rather dates it as "mh." = MS. Cf. Kloekhorst and Waal 2019: 190–91 for a discussion, where arguments are given in favor of an OS dating.

20. Cf. Holland and Zorman 2007: 104–8 and Gilan 2015: 189–213 for overviews and discussions of earlier views.

21. The broken last lines of the obverse of KBo 22.2 are unfortunately multi-interpretable. Compare, e.g., CHD Š: 103, which reads them as (19) [… *n*]*u lē šaliktumari* (20) [… *UL*] *ara nu k*[*att*]*i=šmi š*[*ešteni lē*?] "Do not violate [them]. It is [not] right! [Do not sl]eep with them!" vs. Gilan (2015: 183), who reads (19) [... *n*]*u le-e ša-li-ik-tu-ma-ri* (20) [... *na-at-ta*] ⌜*a-a-ra*⌝ *nu* ⌜*kat-ti-iš-mi*⌝ *š*[*e-eš-ker*? ...] "Berührt (sie) nicht! [Es ist nicht] richtig,' aber [sie] schl[iefen] mit ihnen."

22. See Kloekhorst 2019: 257–58 for a rudimentary version of the following analysis.

23. This fits the fact that the mythological part ends with a benediction by the Sun-Goddess, "woraus man nun an und für sich eine gedeihliche Entwicklung abzuleiten geneigt wäre" (Otten 1973: 64).

24. Cf. Klinger 1996: 121.

arose between these two cities (cf. Klinger 1996: 117: "zwischen Kaniš und Zalpa wohlge-merkt!").

In other words, this clause indicates that the rise of enmity between the cities of Nēša and Zalpa was the incentive for a series of events that included several campaigns against Zalpa by "the grandfather of the King" (= Ḫuzziia I), "the old King" (= Labarna I), and "the King" (= Ḫattušili I). This implies that these campaigns against Zalpa were launched *on behalf of Nēša*. At the same time, however, the three men who undertake these campaigns can be regarded as early *Hittite* kings in the sense that they belong to the dynasty that, at least from ca. 1650 BCE onward, ruled from Ḫattuša. To these considerations we may add Martínez' suggestion that during the events described in the historical part of the Zalpa-text, Ḫattuša did not function as the capital of the kingdom ruled by these three kings.

In order to account for these three elements, I propose that the kings who figure in the historical part of the Zalpa-text, i.e., Ḫuzziia I, Labarna I, and Ḫattušili I, in fact ruled from Nēša when the events of the Zalpa-text took place and when this text was composed (at the very beginning of the reign of Ḫattušili I).[25] The fact that in this text they are never referred to as "kings of Nēša" need not be a surprise: To the audience for which this composition was intended it would have been obvious that these kings were the kings of Nēša, and this therefore did not need to be specified. Moreover, the fact that in the historical part of the Zalpa-text Nēša is not mentioned at all, whereas Ḫattuša plays a prominent role there, can now be explained by assuming (following Martínez 2016) that during the campaigns against Zalpa it was not the capital that was used as the military base, but rather the city of Ḫattuša: its more northerly position made it a much more strategic place to operate from than Nēša.

THE ARCHAEOLOGICALLY DETERMINED END DATE OF THE PALACE AT NĒŠA

If Nēša was indeed the seat of the royal court during the reigns of Ḫuzziia I and Labarna I, and during the very first part of the reign of Ḫattušili I (commencing ca. 1650 BCE), this would mean that a physical palace must have been present in Nēša up to that time. From the archaeological literature regarding the site where Nēša was situated, modern-day Kültepe, it is not fully clear whether this assumption can be substantiated.

As is well known, in Kültepe tens of thousands of Old Assyrian tablets have been found, which date to the period of ca. 1940–1710 BCE (dates according to the Middle Chronology), and on the basis of which we get a glimpse of the political history of the city of Nēša. We can therefore reconstruct with some confidence the sequence of kings that ruled over Nēša in the 18th century BCE.[26] Prior to 1790 BCE, Nēša was ruled by a king called Ḫurmili. He may have been succeeded by a king called Paḫanu, about whom not much is known, and who may have ruled for only a short time.[27] He was succeeded by the kings Inar (ruling ca. 1790–1775 BCE) and Waršama (ruling ca. 1775–1750 BCE), respectively, whom we know to have been father and son. Around 1750 BCE, Pitḫāna, king of Kuššara, conquered Nēša and took over power. He was succeeded by his son Anitta (around 1740 BCE?[28]), the author of

25. According to Beal (2003: 24), the Zalpa-text may "have been composed as a prelude to a new Hittite campaign against Zalpa," namely the one that is recorded in the Annals of Ḫattušili I. Since this latter campaign takes place in the first year described in the Annals, this implies that the Zalpa-text was composed at the very beginning of Ḫattušili I's reign. This would fit a scenario in which he ascended the throne in Nēša and then moved his court to Ḫattuša.

26. Cf. Barjamovic, Hertel, and Larsen 2012: 35–40; Larsen 2015: 32–34.

27. Cf. Günbattı 2014: 112–19; Larsen 2015: 32.

28. Thus Larsen 2015: 34.

the so-called Anitta-text (which was found in the archives of Ḫattuša: CTH 1).[29] From this text, we know that during his reign Anitta went on several campaigns, against, e.g., Ḫattuša, Zalpuṷa, and Šalatiṷara, and thus expanded his kingdom to such an extent that he even acquires the status of Great King (LUGAL GAL). The last Nēšite king whose name is known from the Old Assyrian texts is Zuzu,[30] who must have succeeded Anitta around 1725 BCE. The latest dated text found in Kültepe / Nēša stems from 1717 BCE, and after that date we do not have any further historical information on Nēša.

From archaeological excavations, we know that the mound of Kültepe was home to two palatial structures: one that is called the "Old Palace" (dating to mound level 8), and one that is called the "Late Palace," or "Waršama's Palace" (dating to mound level 7).[31] For the present discussion, only the latter is relevant. As we know from dendrochronological studies, Waršama's Palace (built on top of the Old Palace that had been destroyed by fire) was constructed with timber that was cut in 1835/32 BCE (Barjamovic, Hertel, and Larsen 2012: 29), with repairs made with timber cut in 1813/10, 1811/08, and 1774/71 BCE (Larsen 2015: 31). This palace, too, was destroyed by fire, but it is not fully clear when this fire took place. The latest datable text found at its site (kt g/t 35, cf. Balkan 1955) stems from the reign of Waršama (hence "Waršama's Palace"),[32] and should thus stem from before ca. 1750 BCE. Does this mean that the palace was destroyed shortly after this date? If so, it would mean that the kings who succeeded Waršama, viz. Pitḫāna, Anitta, and Zuzu, should have ruled from a different palace.

Thus far, such a palace has not been reported by the excavators of Kültepe, and at this moment it therefore seems best to assume that these latter three kings, too, ruled from Waršama's Palace.[33] This implies that the fire that destroyed it should be dated to at least after the reign of Zuzu. The absence of objects that can be assuredly dated to the times of Pitḫāna, Anitta, and Zuzu may be linked to the fact that the ruins of Waršama's Palace as they have been excavated look rather odd. As Larsen (2015: 31) notices, "significant rooms

---

29. See Neu 1974 for an edition of this text.

30. Cf. Kryszat 2008: 207–8.

31. According to Özgüç (1999: 138–39), level 8 contained a second palace, namely one on the south terrace of the mound (thus also Kulakoğlu 2011: 1015). However, according to Larsen (2015: 34–36), this monumental structure should rather be interpreted as a "customs building," not a palace.

32. Balkan 1957; Larsen 2015: 31.

33. Note, however, that the so-called "Anitta dagger" (a bronze spearhead containing the inscription É.GAL *a-ni-ta ru-ba-im* "Palace of King Anitta"), which was found on the Kültepe mound in the 1950s (Balkan 1955: 78), stems from a building that lies to the southwest of Waršama's Palace and that is described by Kulakoğlu (2011: 1018–19) as follows: "The rectangular structure, 7.5 m wide and 18 m long, had four sections. The northern and southern walls extend to the east and west, forming antehalls at the front and at the back of the building, thereby giving the appearance of a megaron. The spearhead with the Anitta inscription was discovered on the floor of the large room in CII/83." According to Özgüç, this building is an "official storage building" because "[t]he eastern half of the small room was full of large and unworked blocks of obsidian" (1999: 123–24). This is followed by, e.g., Larsen (2015: 37), who calls this building "a kind of warehouse." However, Özgüç does state that "[t]his solid building, well guarded, is not only a storehouse of unworked obsidian but probably had another kind of function also. In particular, the fact that the long wall [extending over 50 m, A.K.] which we believe enclosed the temples [built by Anitta, A.K.] was connected with our building, gives rise to thought. Our building may have formed a complex with the nearby temples […]. The hearth in the larger room, and kitchenware of common daily use indicate that the building was inhabited" (1999: 127). So we are dealing with a solid building that was well guarded, inhabited, contained a megaron-like room with antehalls, which may have been part of a larger complex that included the temples built by Anitta, and which contained a bronze spearhead carrying the inscription "Palace of King Anitta." It therefore seems worthwhile to investigate how large this complex in fact was, and whether it could be interpreted as a palace that could have been inhabited by Anitta.

such as a throne room or private suites for the royal family are impossible to recognize." Moreover, "[t]he excavator could not even establish where doorways had connected rooms."

Furthermore, "[n]o ovens or hearths were found, so it is unlikely that any of these rooms were used as living space." He therefore states that although "[i]t is not known how many storeys the palace had or how they were built, […] stairway rooms in the northern sector indicate that there was at least one upper floor […], and the rooms that are now visible may well have functioned as a kind of basement." In other words, it seems quite likely that the story (or stories) that contained the throne room of the Nēšite king, the living quarters of the royal family, as well as administrative spaces (including archives?) have been totally lost to us.

One could argue that it may be expected that during the fire that ended the palace these stories would have collapsed, and that the objects they housed would have fallen down to lower levels. This does not seem to be the case, however. As Kulakoğlu (2011: 1018) states, the objects that have been found in the ruins of the palace were only small and consist merely of pottery, stamp seals, and bullae. He therefore concludes that "[t]he finer ware of the palace, metal items, cult objects, works of art, and the archive were either removed before the fire or collected by the newcomers." If this is indeed what happened, it could explain the absence of objects that can be securely dated to the reigns of Piṭḫāna, Anitta, and Zuzu. Nothing would then stand in the way of dating the destruction of Waršama's Palace to at least after Zuzu's reign.

This has in fact been done by Özgüç (1999: 134), who links the destruction of Waršama's Palace to the burnt layer that marks the end of level 1b of Kültepe's lower town, the *kārum* Kaniš (the Akkadian name of Nēša): "the palace and the town of Karum level Ib were destroyed and abandoned due to the same conflagration." On the basis of the Old Assyrian tablets found in this layer, the end of Lower Town level 1b can be dated relatively precisely: the latest dated text from this level stems from 1717 BCE (according to the Middle Chronology),[34] and Barjamovic, Hertel, and Larsen (2012: 40) therefore assume (p. 51) that the end of Lower Town level Ib may be dated to a few years after that, ca. 1710 BCE. Özgüç moreover states that after this destruction, "[o]n the mound of Kaniš, […] no new palace, fortifications, or large buildings were constructed, but the entire citadel turned into a heap of ruins" (1999: 136).[35]

It is questionable whether this latter statement is correct. After the fire that destroyed Lower Town level 1b, the area was quickly rebuilt: the subsequent level 1a "appears to have followed directly upon the destruction by fire of the houses in level 1b" (Larsen 2015: 40). Would such a quick rebuilding be possible if the governmental and administrative buildings on the mound had been fully destroyed, never to be restored again? Moreover, Lower Town level 1a seems to have been functioning for several decades. And although no texts have been found in this layer (yet?), and although there are "indications of a decreasing level of prosperity," there are reasons to believe that also during level 1a "at least some foreign travellers and traders still came to the city" (Barjamovic, Hertel, and Larsen 2012: 52). This implies the existence of a functioning administration and therefore the presence of at least some governmental buildings.

---

34. This text, kt 01/k 207 = KEL G (Günbattı 2008) contains an eponym list that spans the period REL 111 = 1862 BCE to REL 255 = 1718 BCE (cf. Barjamovic, Hertel, and Larsen 2012: 92–97), and this tablet is therefore dated by Barjamovic, Hertel, and Larsen (e.g., 2012: 40) to 1718 BCE. However, the tablet itself "is dated to the month of *Ab šarrānum*, in the year following that of Anāk(u)-ina-Aššur, which is the last eponym in the list" (Günbattı 2008: 111), and thus in fact stems from 1717 BCE. I would like to thank Jan Gerrit Dercksen for pointing this out to me.

35. Likewise Barjamovic, Hertel, and Larsen 2012: 51: "no major governmental building at Kültepe appears to be contemporary with the 1a stratum [which succeeded level Ib, A.K.]."

Since the end date of Waršama's Palace cannot be established with certainty on the basis of the materials excavated at the mound, Özgüç's statement that the destruction of Waršama's Palace is to be equated with the end of Lower Town level 1b cannot be independently proven. It therefore is just as possible to hypothesize that the fire that destroyed level 1b of the lower town did not affect the mound, and that Waršama's Palace remained intact during this event and was still functioning as such during the times of Lower Town level 1a. The fact that no objects have been found in the palace that can assuredly be dated to the period of Lower Town level 1a (i.e., to after ca. 1710 BCE) can be explained in the same way as why no objects have been found stemming from the reigns of Pitḫāna, Anitta, and Zuzu: Not only are the stories that should have housed these objects entirely lost to us, they also seem to have been almost completely cleared before the fire broke out that destroyed the palace.

The end date of Lower Town level 1a is not fully clear. As Kulakoğlu (2008: 18) states, initially "the length of the period that elapsed from the Assyrian Trading Colonies Period to the beginning of the Old Hittite Kingdom Period […] was […] considered to have been very long," but, in the light of new evidence, "the hiatus from the […] abandonment of Kültepe to the Old Hittite Kingdom Period diminishes." Especially research executed by Emre (1995: 183; 1999: 45) suggests that "layer Ib and especially layer Ia continued […] into the reigns of Abi-ešuh and Ammi-ditana," who ruled in Babylon from 1711–1684 BCE and 1683–1640s BCE, respectively. Kulakoğlu himself therefore recently stated that "it would seem that all of Kültepe, both the mound and the lower town, were totally evacuated at some point after 1650 BC" (2014: 87).

All in all, we see that the archaeological evidence for dating the end of the royal palace in Nēša is inconclusive. Özgüç's statement that its destruction must be contemporary with the end of Lower Town level 1b (ca. 1710 BCE) cannot be independently proven. It cannot therefore be excluded that the Nēšite palace was unaffected by the fire that destroyed level 1b and remained in use during Lower Town level 1a. If this latter level indeed lasted until after 1650 BCE, as Kulakoğlu implies, it would seem possible that the Nēšite palace existed until this time as well. I therefore conclude that the consequence of my interpretation of the Zalpa-text, namely that Nēša was the seat of the court of the early Hittite kings until the beginning of the reign of Ḫattušili I (ca. 1650 BCE), is not necessarily contradicted by the archaeological evidence.

CONTINUITY BETWEEN THE DYNASTY OF ḪUZZIIA I AND THE NĒŠITE *KĀRUM*-PERIOD?

If it is indeed correct that Nēša was the capital during the reigns of Ḫuzziia I, Labarna I, and Ḫattušili I (in the latter case until he moved the court to Ḫattuša), we may ask ourselves if there was any continuity between this dynasty and the last kings of Nēša, who are known from the Old Assyrian sources stemming from the *kārum* Kaniš. Traditionally, some kind of continuity has indeed been assumed. As Gilan (2015: 200–201) states, "obwohl ihre Ansichten über die genaue Natur und Qualität dieser Verbindung weit voneinander abweichen, gehen viele Hethitologen von einer Art Kontinuität zwischen der Kuššara-Dynastie von Pitḫāna und Anitta und dem hethitischen Königshaus aus." In order to find out exactly what kind of continuity this may have been, we have to look more closely into the details regarding the last known kings of Nēša and the reign of Ḫuzziia I.[36]

---

36. Cf. Kloekhorst 2019: 251–52.

The last three kings who are attested in the Old Assyrian texts from Kültepe are Pitḫāna, Anitta, and Zuzu, respectively. As was mentioned above as well, in the case of Pitḫāna and Anitta, we know quite a bit about these kings, because of the so-called Anitta-text (CTH 1), in which it is related how Pitḫāna, king of Kuššara, conquers Nēša, and later on is succeeded by his son Anitta, who expands the kingdom. According to Barjamovic, Hertel, and Larsen (2012: 39–40), the reigns of Pitḫāna and Anitta can be dated to ca. 1750–1725 BCE. In the case of Zuzu, the last Nēšite king whose name is known from Old Assyrian sources,[37] and who must have succeeded Anitta, we know much less. One of the uncertainties is what his relationship was to his predecessor Anitta. Since in kt 89/k 369, Zuzu carries the title LUGAL GAL *a-la-aḫ-zi-na* "Great King of Alaḫzina," Kryszat (2008: 210) suggests that he may not have been a son of Anitta's, but rather was a usurper from outside Nēša. However, since the toponym Alaḫzina is not attested anywhere else in the Old Assyrian corpus, it is difficult to evaluate this title. Moreover, on the basis of the phrase *a-ni-ta ru-ba-e ša a-ku-wa* (OIP 27, 1: 1–2) "Anitta, King of Amkuwa,"[38] attested on a tablet from Ališar (Amkuwa), we may conclude that his predecessor Anitta could use different titles according to in which town within his kingdom he was present at that moment for performing administrative duties. The fact that Anitta's successor Zuzu occurs with the title "Great King of Alaḫzina" only on a single tablet therefore may mean nothing more than that Alaḫzina at that moment was a part of the Nēšite kingdom, and that Zuzu had sealed this tablet there (although it was excavated at Kültepe / Nēša). I therefore do not see pressing arguments to view Zuzu as someone who conquered Nēša. Moreover, as far as I am aware, there are no archaeological traces pointing to a hostile takeover of the city in this period. According to Barjamovic, Hertel, and Larsen (2012: 40, 51), Zuzu's reign, which started ca. 1725 BCE, may have gone until ca. 1710 BCE.

In the case of Ḫuzziia I, we have seen above that the beginning of his reign may be dated to ca. 1710–1700 BCE. This date would more or less coincide with the end date of Zuzu's reign as assumed by Barjamovic, Hertel, and Larsen. Moreover, these scholars point out that "the fact that [in the Zalpa-text] the man referred to as the 'grandfather of the king' [= Ḫuzziia I, A.K.] held control over Hurama, implies that the territory between Hurama and Hattuša—including Kanesh—was […] under his control" (2012: 51). This interesting observation constitutes independent support for the idea that Ḫuzziia I was king of Nēša. However, according to Barjamovic, Hertel, and Larsen, Ḫuzziia I started his career as king of Ḫattuša (which he may have rebuilt at the beginning of his reign, ca. 1710 BCE, cf. above), and then "conquered the region around Kanesh," and caused "the destruction of the Waršama Palace and the end of the Ib settlement in the lower town of Kanesh" (ibid.).

In this reconstruction, Ḫuzziia I should be viewed as an outside aggressor who destroyed Nēša and incorporated its region into a kingdom ruled from Ḫattuša. I find this scenario problematic.[39] First of all, we have seen above that it is uncertain whether the fire that ended level 1b of the lower town of Nēša (which must be dated to after 1717 BCE) also affected its mound and the palace. There is therefore no proof that the destruction of Waršama's Palace can be dated to the time that Ḫuzziia I came to power. Second, there are several arguments that speak against the view that Ḫuzziia I destroyed Nēša:[40]

1. One of the oldest compositions present in the archives of Ḫattuša is the Anitta-text (CTH 1), written by Anitta, king of Nēša (reigned ca. 1740–1725 BCE). From the contents of the text, there can be no doubt that it was composed and recorded in Nēša (although it

---

37. Cf. Kryszat 2008: 207–8.
38. Read thus by Kryszat 2008: 196–200.
39. Cf. also Kloekhorst 2019: 258–62.
40. Cf. Kloekhorst 2019: 254–56.

is unclear in which language, on what medium, and in which script).[41] The fact that this originally Nēšite composition was present in the Hittite archives at Ḫattuša implies that at a certain point in time it was transferred from Nēša to Ḫattuša. Although it is unclear in what form exactly, one or more physical objects[42] containing this composition must have at a certain point been taken from Nēša to Ḫattuša. Moreover, in Ḫattuša the text was not only archived, but underwent maintenance as well: in later times copies of it were made. All this does not fit a scenario in which the founder of the Hittite royal family ruling in Ḫattuša had no ties with Nēša and was responsible for its destruction. Instead, the presence of the Anitta-text in Ḫattuša implies a peaceful transfer of (a part of) an archive[43] from Nēša to Ḫattuša, which must have been a deliberate choice by one of the early Hittite kings.

2. Hittite, the language used by the Hittite royal family, is in Hittite called ᵁᴿᵁ*nišili, nāšili, nešumnili, kanišumnili* "in Nēšite; in the language of the people of Nēša /Kaniš."[44] This indicates that the speakers of Hittite themselves regarded their language as originating from Nēša.[45] This would be difficult to explain if the Hittite royal family had no ties with Nēša at all, and if its founder would have been responsible for the destruction of Nēša.

3. Ḫattušili I had a close connection with the city of Kuššara: At the beginning of the Hittite version of his Annals (KBo 10.2 i 1–2), he is not only called LUGAL.GAL [LUGAL KUR ᵁᴿᵁḪATT]I "Great King, King of the Land of Ḫatti," but also LÚ ᵁᴿᵁ*KUŠŠAR* "Man of Kuššara";[46] and when at the end of his life he becomes ill and calls the council of elders together to deliver his political testament, announcing that he has chosen Muršili to be his heir, he does so in Kuššara.[47] Already from the early years of Hittitology these facts have often been interpreted as indicating that Kuššara was Ḫattušili's original capital before he moved his court to Ḫattuša.[48] Since Kuššara is also the city that was originally the seat of Pitḫāna's kingship whence he conquered Nēša, it has often been assumed that Ḫattušili I is a descendant of the same Kuššaran dynasty to which Pitḫāna and Anitta belonged.[49]

Criticism of this view has been formulated as well, however, e.g., by Sürenhagen (1998: 83 n. 39), who states that LÚ ᵁᴿᵁ*KUŠŠAR* "auch 'Herr von Kussar' im Sinne eines Lehns-

---

41. See Kloekhorst and Waal 2019: 194–95 for a discussion.

42. The theory that the Anitta-text was transferred from Nēša to Ḫattuša orally (e.g., Carruba 2001: 68–69) does not seem credible: the text contains too many pieces of detailed information. Cf. Kloekhorst and Waal 2019: 194.

43. To my mind, there may have been more compositions by Anitta that ended up in the archives of Ḫattuša, e.g., the Royal Reprimand of the Dignitaries (KBo 22.1) (cf. Kloekhorst and Waal 2019: 198–99) and the Palace Chronicle (CTH 8) (cf. Kloekhorst 2020).

44. Cf. CHD L–N: 454. The word *kanišumni*[*li*] is attested at KUB 41.14: 8.

45. See Kloekhorst 2019: 233–68 for a treatment of the relationship between Hittite as spoken in Ḫattuša and the Hittite dialect that was spoken in Nēša.

46. This designation as "Man of Kuššara" is only found in the Hittite version of the Annals, not in its Akkadian version, and it is therefore sometimes seen as a New Hittite introduction into the text (cf. De Martino 2003: 30 n. 75, with references). Nevertheless, since this designation is also found in later genealogies (cf. Klengel 1999: 35), there can be no doubt that it reflects an authentic phenomenon. An anonymous reviewer cogently suggests that in fact the entire phrase ᵐ*ḫattušili* LUGAL.GAL [LUGAL KUR ᵁᴿᵁḪAT]TI LÚ ᵁᴿᵁ*KUŠŠAR* "Great King Ḫattušili, King of Ḫattuša, Man of Kuššara" must be viewed as a New Hittite addition, which functions as a sort of gloss to LUGAL.GAL *tabarna* "Great King Tabarna," which is found as the sole description of this text's protagonist in the Akkadian version of this composition. According to the reviewer, this is an additional argument for the authenticity of the designation "Man of Kuššara": just as there can be no doubt that the addition of the name Ḫattušili is historically accurate, so must the designation "Man of Kuššara" likewise be based on a historical reality.

47. Cf. the colophon of Ḫattušili I's Political Testament (CTH 6), which reads (in Akkadian): (1) … *inūma* (2) LUGAL GAL *tabarna ina* ᵁᴿᵁ*kuššar*ᴷᴵ *imraṣṣuma* TUR-*am* ᵐ*mu*[*ršili*] (3) *ana* LUGAL-*rūtim uwarru* "When the Great King Tabarna fell ill in Kuššara and appointed young Mu[ršili] to kingship" (e.g., Gilan 2015: 83).

48. E.g., Klinger 1996: 123; Klengel 2011: 32; De Martino 2016: 22.

49. E.g., Bryce 2005: 62.

trägers bedeuten kann" and therefore need not be interpreted as a "Hinweis auf [Ḫattušili I's] dynastische Herkunft." In the same vein, Klengel remarks that the announcement of Ḫattušili I's political testament in Kuššara is not an argument to assume "daß Kuššar […] als Ursprungsort der Dynastie gelten muß oder sein Sterbeort war" (1999: 36 n. 10).

As argued in Kloekhorst 2019: 255–56, I believe that these views are too cautious. Kuššara clearly was more than just one of the cities of Ḫattušili I's kingdom. It seems quite possible that he may have been born there, or that it played some other important role in his life.[50] If Kuššara indeed was Ḫattušili I's place of birth, it must have been a part of the kingdom ruled by his family from at least ca. 1680 BCE onward (or even earlier, depending on Ḫattušili I's age when he ascended the throne). The gap between this date and the end of the reign of Anitta (ca. 1725 BCE), whose kingdom certainly included Kuššara, would thus be no more than forty-five years. It cannot of course be fully excluded that in these forty-five years a change of power in Kuššara had taken place, which would remove the need for connecting the family of Ḫattušili I to the dynasty of Pitḫāna and Anitta. Nevertheless, in view of the two preceding arguments, I regard Ḫattušili I's self-designation as "man of Kuššara" as a suggestive additional argument for assuming that there were family ties between Ḫattušili I and the Kuššaran dynasty of Pitḫāna and Anitta. If so, it would mean that Ḫattušili I's grandfather, Ḫuzziia I, was related to Pitḫāna and Anitta as well, which would speak against viewing him as an outside aggressor who destroyed Nēša.

4. As we have seen above as well, the fact that Nēša figures prominently in the mythological introduction to the Zalpa-text, which was probably composed at the commission of Ḫattušili I (Beal 2003: 22–25), would be remarkable if there were no connection between Ḫattušili I and Nēša, and even more so if his grandfather Ḫuzziia I had been responsible for Nēša's destruction.

On the basis of these arguments I conclude that Barjamovic, Hertel, and Larsen's observation (2012: 51) that the Zalpa-text's "grandfather of the King" = Ḫuzziia I held sway over the area encompassing Nēša does not mean, as they would have it, that after he had rebuilt Ḫattuša and established a power base there, he must have conquered Nēša and violently ended Zuzu's reign. I propose that the situation may rather have been the other way around: Ḫuzziia I ruled over Nēša because he was the *rightful heir* to the throne of Nēša.[51] Since it is likely that at that moment in time the Nēšite kingdom included the site of Ḫattuša (as it had been conquered some twenty years earlier by his predecessor's predecessor Anitta), we may assume that with ascending the Nēšite throne Ḫuzziia I also became ruler over the Ḫattuša region, and decided to rebuild the city, probably because of its strategic position.

In other words, this scenario entails that Ḫuzziia I, whom the Hittites regarded as the founder of their royal dynasty, in fact started out his career as king of Nēša. This means that the link between the early Hittite kings and Nēša is a direct one: their lineage continues the Nēšite dynasty. This line of thought is wholly in agreement with the fact that one or more compositions by an earlier Nēšite ruler were kept in the Ḫattuša archives, and that the Hittites called their own language "Nešite." Moreover, if we assume that the Nēšite kingdom as

---

50. E.g., Klinger 1996: 123 mentions the possibility that Ḫattušili I "während der Herrschaft seines Vorgängers in Kuššar als Gouverneur tätig war."

51. If Zuzu was indeed an outside usurper, as Kryszat (2008: 210) has it, we may assume that Ḫuzziia I was a relative of Pitḫāna and Anitta who recaptured the Nēšite throne for the Kuššaran dynasty. The destruction of the lower town of Nēša by fire around 1710 BCE may then be viewed as linked to this event. However, if Zuzu was the rightful successor of Anitta (as suggested above), it is likely that Ḫuzziia I in his turn was the legitimate successor of Zuzu. The burning down of Nēša's lower town would then be unrelated to Ḫuzziia I's ascension to the Nēšite throne.

inherited by Ḫuzziịa I also included the city of Kuššara, the original hometown of his predecessor Pitḫāna, this would explain the special position that Ḫattušili I attached to this city.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST A CONNECTION BETWEEN
THE EARLY HITTITE KINGS AND NĒŠA

In his recent book on Old Hittite literature, Gilan (2015: 194–201) comes to the exact opposite conclusion to the one formulated above.[52] In a chapter dealing with the question of whether the mythological part of the Zalpa-text can be seen as a foundation myth of the Hittite kingdom, he tries to answer the sub-question "Haben die 'Hethiter' selbst Kaneš/Neša als ihren Herkunftsort betrachtet?" by offering a discussion "[ü]ber die frühe hethitische Ethnizität" (pp. 194–95). He offers the following arguments on the basis of which he states that to him "die moderne Hethitologie mit der Stadt Kaneš/Neša weitaus mehr verbunden [scheint] zu sein, als es die Hethiter je waren" (p. 201).[53]

1. The fact that the Hittite language is called "Nēšite" is interpreted by Gilan (p. 198) as merely an indication "dass die 'Hethiter' den Ursprung ihrer Sprache in diese Gegend sahen, nicht aber notwendigerweise, dass sie selbst von dort stammten. Sprache ist nicht zwangsläufig ein Kriterium für ethnische Identität." Although I agree with this latter statement, I do think that he brushes over this fact too easily. In a time in which modern inventions like the telephone, radio, television, etc., were not yet in existence, the only way for a language to spread to a new region is that (some of) its speakers physically moved there. The presence in Ḫattuša of a language that, also according to Gilan, originally stemmed from Nēša implies that at a certain point in time speakers of that language relocated from Nēša to Ḫattuša. Moreover, these speakers must have been significant enough in number or in social class that their language was able to become the dominant language at (the court of) Ḫattuša. This would fit in perfectly with the view that the Hittite royal family originated from Nēša.

2. Within the Hittite state cult, the deities who are venerated by the "singers of Kaniš / Nēša" do not seem to occupy a special position (Gilan 2015: 199). However, in a religious system in which every city had its own pantheon and local cult,[54] it is not surprising that with the relocation of the court the deities of the former capital would become less important. Moreover, with the Hittites' willingness to incorporate new gods and goddesses into their state cult, the expansion of the kingdom would have caused the number of deities to grow rapidly, simply pushing the old Nēšite ones into the background.

3. After the destruction of Nēša "hat sich kein hethitische Großkönig verpflichtet gefühlt, die Stadt wieder aufzubauen" (Gilan 2015: 199). However, it will be shown below that Nēša may have been deliberately abandoned because its surroundings had become uninhabitable. If that were the case, it would be no surprise that Nēša was not restored by the Hittite kings.

4. Pitḫāna and Anitta are not mentioned in the Offering Lists to Royal Ancestors (CTH 661), and none of the Hittite kings "stellte sich mit diesen beiden in eine Reihe" (Gilan 2015: 200). However, if Forlanini (2010: 117) is correct in his proposal that in the Offering Lists the names of all deceased royals whose remains were present in Ḫattuša are mentioned, but not those of the ones whose remains were deposited elsewhere, the absence of Pitḫāna and Anitta from these lists may reflect that their bones were not buried in Ḫattuša, but in Nēša. And although it indeed seems true that the later Hittite kings saw Ḫuzziịa I as the founder

---

52. See now also Gilan 2018: 8–11, in which he repeats his skepticism concerning the idea that there was an "affinity" between Ḫattuša and Nēša.

53. Cf. also Kloekhorst 2019: 262–63 for a discussion of these arguments.

54. Cf. Haas 1994: 539–615.

of the Hittite kingdom (if this is how his presence on the "cruciform seal" and in the first paragraph of the Offering Lists should be interpreted, cf. n. 4),[55] the fact that the Anitta-text as composed by Anitta was not only kept in the archives of Ḫattuša, but was also maintained there, shows that the Hittite kings were aware of their link with Nēša.

Another argument that is sometimes used against a connection between the early Hittite kings and the Nēšite dynasty of Pitḫāna and Anitta is the following:

5. In the Anitta-text, Anitta tells how he conquered and destroyed Ḫattuša, and then pronounces the following curse (KBo 3.22 rev. 49–51):

49. *kuiš ammel āppan* LUGAL-*uš kīšar*[*i*]
50. *nu* ᵁᴿᵁ*ḫattušan āppa ašāš*[*i*]
51. *n=an nepišaš* ᵈIM-*aš ḫazziē*[*ttu*]

Whoever after me will become king and will resettle Ḫattuša, may the storm-god of heaven strike him!

The fact that Ḫattuša was nevertheless rebuilt not long afterward by one of the early Hittite kings (irrespective of whether this was Ḫuzziia I, as argued for by Beal 2003 and followed in this article, or Ḫattušili I, as traditionally assumed) and was even made the Hittite capital could therefore be viewed as an argument against a connection between the Hittite kings and the dynasty of Anitta. However, as Bryce (2005: 68–69) cogently remarks, Ḫattuša "had certain natural advantages which, irrespective of the new dynasty's lineage, must have outweighed any consideration of Anitta's curse." This argument therefore is of not much value.[56]

All in all, the arguments as offered by Gilan and others do not outweigh those presented here, which clearly point to a direct connection between the early kings of the Hittite dynasty and Nēša.

ḪATTUŠILI I MOVES HIS COURT FROM NĒŠA TO ḪATTUŠA

The ultimate consequence of the idea that during the historical events described in the Zalpa-text its protagonists ruled from Nēša is that it must have been Ḫattušili I who moved the Nēšite court to Ḫattuša. As discussed above, the archaeological records regarding the Nēšite palace show that "[t]he finer ware of the palace, metal items, cult objects, works of art, and the archive were […] removed before the fire" (Kulakoğlu 2011: 1018). Such a deliberate and careful removal of all precious items, including the archive, before the palace burnt down fits well with an intended and planned move of the Nēšite court to another place. Moreover, the history of the Hittite kingdom contains several parallels for a deliberate relocation of the royal court from one place to another. For instance, Muuattalli II (reigned 1295–1272 BCE) moved the court from Ḫattuša to Tarḫuntašša, and later on it was moved back to Ḫattuša by Muuattalli's son, Urḫi-Tešup.[57] But the last known Hittite king, Šuppiluliuma II (reigned 1207–? BCE), may have also attempted to move his court elsewhere when he abandoned Ḫattuša (although it is unknown whether he was able to reach a new place).[58]

---

55. The mention of Ḫuzziia I in the Offering Lists would then imply that his remains were present in Ḫattuša. Does this mean that, during the move of the Nēšite court to Ḫattuša, his remains were brought along by his grandson Ḫattušili I?

56. Cf. Kloekhorst 2019: 261 with n. 1107.

57. Cf. Bryce 2005: 230–33, 254–55.

58. Cf. Bryce 2005: 345; 2012: 9–12.

In Ḫattušili I's case, the reason for the relocation of his court from Nēša to Ḫattuša may have been quite practical. It has recently been argued by Kulakoğlu (2014) that the abandonment of Nēša may have been a voluntary one in reaction to rising water levels that caused the surroundings of the city to become too swampy to be habitable. The reason for Ḫattušili I to choose Ḫattuša as his new capital could then be that its location in the surrounding landscape makes it very defensible.[59] Moreover, during the campaigns against Zalpa, which Ḫattušili I had conducted together with his predecessor Labarna I, he must have come to know Ḫattuša as an excellent military base.

WHAT ABOUT KUŠŠARA?

It is necessary here to consider the status of the city of Kuššara. As we have seen, at the beginning of his Annals, Ḫattušili I is not only called "King of the land of Ḫatti," but also "Man of Kuššara" (KBo 10.2 i 1–2). Moreover, at the end of his life, when he becomes ill, he goes to Kuššara to deliver his political testament (CTH 6). These facts have often been seen as an indication that Ḫattušili I first ruled from Kuššara, and later moved his court from there to Ḫattuša. This would contradict the view, presented in this article, that Ḫattušili I's initial capital was Nēša. To my mind, however, the relationship between Ḫattušili I and Kuššara may be viewed in the same way as the relationship between Labarna I and the city of Ḫurma. I thus assume that Ḫattušili I originally was a prince in Kuššara,[60] but that Kuššara belonged to the larger kingdom of Nēša. When Ḫattušili I succeeded his uncle Labarna I as Great King, he did so by ascending the throne in Nēša.

CONCLUSIONS

I have attempted to provide a solution to one of the main problems in understanding the internal coherence of the Zalpa-text, namely that its mythological part deals with the relations between Zalpa and Nēša, but leaves Ḫattuša unmentioned, whereas its historical part deals with the relations between Zalpa and Ḫattuša, but contains no reference to Nēša. It has been argued that a crucial step in understanding this mismatch is Martínez' 2016 suggestion that in the historical part of the Zalpa-text Ḫattuša does not have the function of the capital of the kings whose actions are described there, but merely functions as a military base for the campaigns against Zalpa. In the present article it is argued that the problem of the Zalpa-text can be solved by assuming that during the events described in its historical part these kings in fact ruled from Nēša. The city's absence in the story line of the historical part can then be explained by assuming that to the intended audience of the Zalpa-text it must have been obvious that Nēša was the capital from which the protagonists of the story reigned: it simply did not need to be made explicit. A major consequence of this interpretation is that Nēša was the capital during the reigns of the early Hittite kings Ḫuzziia I and Labarna I and that Ḫattušili I too ascended the throne there before he moved his court to Ḫattuša.

ABBREVIATIONS

CHD = H. G. Güterbock, H. A. Hoffner, and Th. P. J. van den Hout, eds., *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (Chicago, 1983ff.).

CTH = E. Laroche, *Catalogue des textes hittites* (Paris, 1971) (with suppl. in *Revue hittite et asianique* 30 [1972]: 94–133 and *Revue hittite et asianique* 32 [1973]: 68–71).

59. Cf. Bryce 2005: 69.
60. Thus also Sürenhagen 1998: 83 n. 39.

Hetkonk = S. Košak, *Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln, Online-Datenbank*, www.hethport. uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/.

REFERENCES

Balkan, K. 1955. *Kaniš Kārum'unun kronoloji problemleri hakkında müşahedeler* (Observations on the chronological problems of the Kārum Kaniš). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Baskımevi.

———. 1957. *Letter of King Anum-Ḫirbi of Mama to King Warshama of Kanish*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

Barjamovic, G., T. Hertel, and M. T. Larsen. 2012. *Ups and Downs at Kanesh: Chronology, History and Society in the Old Assyrian Period*. Leiden: NINO.

Beal, R. H. 2003. The Predecessors of Ḫattušili I. In *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. G. Beckman, R. H. Beal, and G. McMahon. Pp. 13–35. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Bittel, K. et al. 1984. *Boğazköy VI: Funde aus den Grabungen bis 1979*. Berlin: Gebrüder Mann Verlag.

Bryce, T. R. 2005. *The Kingdom of the Hittites. New Edition*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

———. 2012. *The World of the Neo-Hittite Kingdoms: A Political and Military History*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

Carruba, O. 2001. Anitta res gestae: Paralipomena I. In *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie, Würzburg, 4.–8. Oktober 1999*, ed. G. Wilhelm. Pp. 51–72. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

De Martino, S. 2003. *Annali e Res gestae antico ittiti.* Pavia: Italian Univ. Press.

———. 2016. *Da Kussara a Karkemish: Storia del Regno Ittita.* Turin: LoGisma.

Dinçol, A. M., B. Dinçol, D. J. Hawkins, and G. Wilhelm. 1993. The "Cruciform Seal" from Boğazköy-Ḫattuša. *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 43: 87–106.

Emre, K. 1995. Pilgrim-Flasks from Level I of the Karum of Kaniš. *Bulletin of the Middle Eastern Culture Center in Japan* 8: 173–200.

———. 1999. Syrian Bottles from the Karum of Kaniš. *Bulletin of the Middle Eastern Culture Center in Japan* 11: 39–50.

Forlanini, M. 2010. An Attempt at Reconstructing the Branches of the Hittite Royal Family of the Early Kingdom Period. In *Pax Hethitica: Studies on the Hittites and Their Neighbours in Honour of Itamar Singer*, ed. Y. Cohen, A. Gilan, and J. Miller. Pp. 115–35. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Forrer, E. 1926. *Geschichtliche Texte aus Boghazköi.* Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Gilan, A. 2015. *Formen und Inhalte althethitischer historischer Literatur.* Heidelberg: Winter.

———. 2018. In Search of a Distant Past: Forms of Historical Conciousness in Hittite Anatolia. *Anadolu / Anatolia* 44: 1–23.

Günbattı, C. 2008. An Eponym List (KEL G) from Kültepe. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 35: 103–32.

———. 2014. *Harsamna kralı Hurmeli'ye gönderilen mektup ve Kaniš kralları* (The Letter Sent to Hurmeli King of Harsamna and the Kings of Kaniš). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

Haas, V. 1994. *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion.* Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Helck, W. 1983. Zur ältesten Geschichte des Hatti-Reiches. In *Beiträge zur Altertumskunde Kleinasiens: Festschrift für Kurt Bittel*, ed. R. M. Boehmer and H. Hauptmann. Pp. 271–81. Mainz: von Zabern.

Hoffmann, I. 1984. *Der Erlaß Telipinus.* Heidelberg: Winter.

Hoffner, H. A. Jr. 1980. Histories and Historians of the Ancient Near East: The Hittites. *Orientalia* 49: 283–332.

Holland, G. B., and M. Zorman. 2007. *The Tale of Zalpa: Myth, Morality, and Coherence in a Hittite Narrative*. Pavia: Italian Univ. Press.

Klengel, H. 1999. *Geschichte des hethitischen Reiches.* Leiden: Brill.

———. 2011. History of the Hittites. In *Insights into Hittite History and Archaeology*, ed. H. Genz and D. P. Mielke. Pp. 31–46. Leuven: Peeters.

Klinger, J. 1996. *Untersuchungen zur Rekonstruktion der hattischen Kultschicht.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Kloekhorst, A. 2019. *Kanišite Hittite: The Earliest Attested Record of Indo-European.* Leiden: Brill.

———. 2020. The Authorship of the Old Hittite Palace Chronicle (CTH 8): A Case for Anitta. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 72: 143–55.

———, and W. J. I. Waal. 2019. A Hittite Scribal Tradition Predating the Tablet Collections of Ḫattuša? The Origin of the "Cushion-Shaped" Tablets KBo 3.22, KBo 17.21+, KBo 22.1, and KBo 22.2. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 109: 189–203.

Kryszat, G. 2008. Herrscher, Kult und Kulttradition in Anatolien nach den Quellen aus den altassyrischen Handelskolonien—Teil 3/2: Grundlagen fur eine neue Rekonstruktion der Geschichte Anatoliens und der assyrischen Handelskolonien in spätaltassyrischer Zeit, II. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 35: 195–219.

Kulakoğlu, F. 2008. A Hittite God from Kültepe. In *Old Assyrian Studies in Memory of Paul Garelli*, ed. C. Michel. Pp. 13–19. Leiden: NINO.

———. 2011. Kültepe-Kaneš: A Second Millennium B.C.E. Trading Center on the Central Plateau. In *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Anatolia, 10,000–323 B.C.E.*, ed. S. S. Steadman and G. McMahon. Pp. 1012–30. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

———. 2014. Kanesh after the Assyrian Colony Period: Current Research at Kültepe and the Question of the End of the Bronze Age Settlement. In *Current Research at Kültepe-Kanesh: An Interdisciplinary and Integrative Approach to Trade Networks, Internationalism, and Identity*, ed. A. Levent et al. Pp. 85–94. Atlanta: Lockwood Press.

Larsen, M. T. 2015. *Ancient Kanesh: A Merchant Colony in Bronze Age Anatolia*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Martínez, J. 2016. The Evidence for Hurma as Early Hittite Capital in the Old Kingdom. In *Anatolica et Indogermanica: Studia linguistica in honorem Johannis Tischler septuagenarii dedicata*, ed. H. Marquardt, S. Reichmuth, and J. V. García Trabazo. Pp. 173–90. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.

Neu, E. 1974. *Der Anitta-Text.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Otten, H. 1973. *Eine althethitische Erzählung um die Stadt Zalpa.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Özgüç, T. 1999. *Kültepe-Kaniš/Neša sayarları ve mabetleri* (The Palaces and Temples of Kültepe-Kaniš/Neša). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

Pecchioli Daddi, F. 1994. Il Re, il Padre del Re, il Nonne del Re. *Orientis Antiqui Miscellanea* 1: 75–91.

Schachner, A., and D. Krüger. 2019. Boğazköy-Ḫattuša, Türkei: Die Grabung in der nördlichen Unterstadt von Ḫattuša. Die Arbeiten der Jahre 2017 und 2018. In *E-Forschungsberichte des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts*. Pp. 206–11.

Sürenhagen, D. 1998. Verwandtschaftsbeziehungen und Erbrecht im althethitischen Königshaus vor Telipinu: Ein erneuter Erklärungsversuch. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 25: 75–94.