



## 2.4 When Repetition Fails The Curious Case of the Hittite *Šar Tamḫāri*

Version 02

February 2024

Henry J. A. Lewis (University of Würzburg, [henry.lewis@uni-wuerzburg.de](mailto:henry.lewis@uni-wuerzburg.de))

**Abstract:** This showcase presents the best-preserved examples of poetic repetition and parallelism in the Hittite *Šar Tamḫāri*. Drawing on theoretical approaches to parallelism used in Assyriology and, more recently, Hittitology, it is shown that the text can be analysed fruitfully as a well-structured piece of literature. At the same time, numerous, seemingly inexplicable errors lead to an apparent total lapse in the text's poetics in places, raising questions concerning the ability and/or priorities of the scribe. The Akkadian recension is also briefly brought into dialogue with the Hittite text.

© Lewis 2024, Licence CC BY-NC-SA 4.0



European Research Council  
Established by the European Commission

This article results from research conducted under the auspices of the project REPAC “Repetition, Parallelism and Creativity: an Inquiry into the Construction of Meaning in Ancient Mesopotamian Literature and Erudition” (2019-2024, University of Vienna) that has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (Grant agreement no. 803060).

How to cite: Lewis, H.J.A., 2024, “When Repetition Fails—The Curious Case of the Hittite *Šar Tamḫāri*, Version 02,” Project REPAC (ERC Grant no. 803060), 2019-2024, at <https://doi.org/10.25365/phaidra.470> (accessed day/month/year).

## 1. Introduction

As a subset of the small field of Cuneiform studies, Hittitology has been slow to approach questions of poetics, let alone repetition and parallelism specifically. This is not to say that interest in the study of Hittite poetics has been absent (cf. already Hrozný 1929). But most analyses of Hittite poetics focussed largely on the question of a possible existence of metrical patterns among those texts designated šĪR, ‘song’ (esp. the *Song of Release*), or on works imported from Mesopotamia, whose native poetic features were better understood (for a history of Hittite poetics see Francia 2012a).

Only with the philological maturity of the field in the past two or three decades have scholars begun to investigate the poetic features of a broader range of Hittite texts. Notable contributions have included articles by Rita Francia (2010; 2012a; 2012b; 2018) and Calvert Watkins (1995; 2010). However, there are now two, recent monograph-length studies that have made poetics their principal focus with a concomitant, deeper engagement with theory: Daues and Rieken’s *Das persönliche Gebet bei den Hethitern* (2018; esp. Daues’ chapter 5); and Marineau’s *The Literary Effects of Discourse Patterns in Hittite Texts* (2020 PhD Thesis). The theories used in these studies are essentially the same as those found in Assyriological scholarship (Jakobson 1987; Berlin 2008; Jefferies/McIntyre 2010; cf. De Zorzi 2022). Thus, as in Assyriology, the concept of parallelism in Hittitology can be understood as “the activation of linguistic equivalences and/or contrasts within or among words, phrases, lines, or entire texts” (Berlin 2008, 151-152), as well as its function in emphasizing the poetic message (Berlin 2008, 141; De Zorzi 2022, 368).

The present contribution to REPAC focusses on a single text: the Hittite *Šar Tamḫāri*. The narrative is one of the most vexatious in Hittitology, largely due to the sheer number of, what seem to be, incomprehensible errors committed by the scribe, whether from a faulty understanding of Old/Middle Hittite or failed attempts at deliberate archaization (Rieken 2001). However, in the preparation of a new edition, some points of repetition and parallelism have emerged that bear witness to the text’s well-structured nature. At the same time, the scribe who copied this tablet endangered such a structure when he struggled to write repeated lines, raising the question as to why things went so wrong for him.

This showcase will demonstrate the cases of poetic parallelism and repetition in the surviving text, before explaining how it was almost undone by the scribe. The poetics of the Akkadian recension of the text (EA 359) are also brought into dialogue with the Hittite version, to see if their relationship can be in any way clarified.

The research for this showcase was conducted as part of the DFG Emmy Noether Junior Research Group, ‘The Hittite Annals: Origins, Purpose, and Afterlife’.

## 2. Manuscripts

The Hittite *Šar Tamḫāri* is listed on the *Konkordanz* of the *Hethitologie Portal Mainz* under CTH 310. The manuscripts paleographically date to the Hittite empire period (New Script, c. 1400-1200 BC; one duplicate shows Late New Script), but exhibit linguistic features that date to at least Middle Hittite (15<sup>th</sup> c. BC) and are possibly as old as Old Hittite (c. 1650-1500 BC) (Rieken 2001). Thus, the narrative is almost certainly more archaic than the tablets on which it is preserved.

Several fragments currently classified as CTH 310 on the *Konkordanz* ought to be treated with caution, since they cannot conclusively be identified as belonging to the *Šar Tamḫāri*. *In toto*, only CTH 310.1 (KBo 3.9), 310.3/5 (KBo 12.1 // KBo 22.6 + KBo 22.97), KUB 48.98, and 310.4 (KBo 13.46) belong with certainty to the text, though each (except for duplicate KBo 12.1) narrates the story in a slightly different way. The latter two, KUB 48.98 and KBo 13.46, appear to narrate a scene also found in KBo 22.6, and therefore add little to the story. Therefore, most of the following analysis draws upon KBo 22.6 + KBo 22.97, the largest and best-preserved manuscript. Reference to KBo 3.9 is made in the reconstruction of the story. For the only published edition see Güterbock 1969; for transliterations see Rieken 2001, Groddek 2008, Torri and Barsacchi 2018a, and 2018b.

### 3. The Story

Anyone familiar with the Akkadian *Šar Tamḫāri* (EA 359; see Westenholz 1997 and Haul 2009) will recognise that the Hittite recension shares in a similar plot, but the sequence of story-events is somewhat different, and the Hittite version adds its own scenes. As assessed by Güterbock (1969, 14), the text appears to be “keine wörtliche Übersetzung, sondern eine freie Nacherzählung der akkadisch überlieferten” (Güterbock 1969, 14). In addition, the beginning of the largest fragment (KBo 22.6+) is broken at its beginning, middle, and end. Large swathes of the plot must be inferred, leading to the following reconstruction (see also Gilan 2014, 54):

- 1) CTH 310.1 (KBo 3.9)— After a (possible?) list of epithets (Obv. 1'-7'), we find Sargon in the gatehouse (<sup>Ḫ</sup>*hilamni*) of Akkad (Obv. 8'). He is addressing someone about roads, presumably related to him by merchants (Obv. 10'), which lead to Puruṣḫanda (Obv. 9'-14').
- 2) CTH 310.3/5 (KBo 12.1 // KBo 22.6+ KBo 22.97)— At some point, Sargon goes to sleep and Ištar appears to him in a dream. She assures him that he will be victorious in his conquest of Puruṣḫanda. Sargon awakes and tells his heroes (some of whom had been reluctant to campaign) that Ištar has guaranteed him victory. Having set out, Sargon bridges and crosses the Tigris (<sup>Ḫ</sup>*Aranzah*), sacrificing to both the river and the bridge. (Obv. I 1'-20').
- 3) Obv. I 20'-29'— Meanwhile, Enlil appears in a dream to Nūr-Daḫḫi, the king of Puruṣḫanda. He warns him that Sargon is coming but assures him of his divine weapons (compared to destructive acts of nature) and lack of equal.
- 4) Obv. II 1'-16'— Though highly fragmentary, it appears as if Nūr-Daḫḫi and his people (warriors?) are in dialogue about the topographical difficulties one must face to reach Puruṣḫanda (Obv. II 4'-10'). Confounding Nūr-Daḫḫi's estimation, Sargon then, on a sudden, arrives (Obv. II 11'-16').
- 5) Rev. III 1'-13'— Sargon repeats Nūr-Daḫḫi's speech to him from the previous section (1'-7'). Nūr-Daḫḫi acknowledges Sargon's superiority in another speech (8'-13').

- 6) Rev. IV 1'-7'— An act of investiture is performed where Sargon is seated on a golden throne.
- 7) Rev. IV 8'-32"— Sargon remains in Puruṣḥanda for three years and five months. As he sets out for Akkad, his heroes remind him that they have 'done nothing' to the land. They urge him to cut down three types of trees in the gatehouse of Puruṣḥanda to make into different objects, tear down the walls of city, and make an image of himself with Nūr-Daḥḥi to install on the gates. Sargon acquiesces and the tablet breaks off.

## 4. Parallelism and Repetition in the Hittite *Šar Tamḥāri*

Parallelism exists on the macro- and microscopic scale in the preserved text, with symmetry occurring between scenes themselves and the details they contain. When analysing microstructures, the Hittite text is separated by clause as opposed to tablet line, as is customary in Hittite stylistic analyses (cf. 'colon' in Daues and Rieken 2018, 181).

### 4.1 Macro-Structures

#### 4.1.1 Ring-Composition

If the reconstruction of the story (above) is accurate, one can initially note that ring-composition is taking place: the action begins in the <sup>É</sup>*hīlamni* of Akkad and ends in the <sup>É</sup>*hīlamni* of Puruṣḥanda

The ring-composition can, however, only be adduced for the story (or 'plot'; see also Gilan 2000, 88). The manuscripts only partially attest to the phenomenon. KBo 22.6 may have preserved a scene in the <sup>É</sup>*hīlamni* of Akkad at its *incipit*, but that portion of the text is lost. Likewise, KBo 3.9 may have had a scene in the <sup>É</sup>*hīlamni* of Puruṣḥanda at its close.

A similar structuring may also have been used in a Mesopotamian version of the story. The Nineveh recension (K13228) seems to reflect the same opening as in KBo 3.9. However, the Amarna recension does not bear witness to this feature, beginning *in media res* (Meriggi 1973, 200; Westenholz 1997, 108).

#### 4.1.2 Parallel Dream Sequences

The text constructs the two dream sequences of Sargon and Nūr-Daḥḥi ((2) and (3) above) in parallel. Not only is the act of deity (Ištar/Enlil) visiting king (Sargon/Nūr-Daḥḥi) mirrored in both sequences, but the content of the speeches too. For example, though fragmentary, I understand KBo 22.6 Obv. I 5' to express Sargon's wish that his army is not hindered by adverse winds:

*tuzz]iš=šummiš* ĠR<sup>MEŠ</sup>-*uš* IM-*az lē* ... [ ] ... “may our ar[my] not (be hindered?) by (adverse) wind(s)!” [

This can be compared to Obv. I 26'-28', where Enlil reassures Nūr-Daḥḥi:

... ĠŠ <sup>TUKUL</sup> HI.A- <i>eš=w[a=tta</i> ( <sup>?</sup> )	... [Your(?)] weapons are like
<i>šalli ḫuwanti ḫatugai kar[itti tagawi]</i>	a great wind, a terrible fl[ood], water
<i>weteni takkantari</i>	[in spate].

A semantic parallel thus emerges: the weapons, compared by Enlil to a ‘a great wind’ (*šalli ḫuwanti*), resume Sargon’s wish for the army to be unhindered by adverse weather, though the repetition is stylistically varied through use of Sumerogram in the first instance and Hittite in the latter. Dramatic irony is thereby created: the ‘wind’ that the army will face is really the metaphorical wind of Nūr-Daḥḥi’s weapons.

There are subtle differences between parallels. Ištar, if we are to take Sargon’s address to the soldiers at face value, has guaranteed the king victory. In terms of narrative suspense, this is somewhat counterintuitive: the stakes are low for Sargon. But it casts a rather sombre shadow over Nūr-Daḥḥi in his dream. Whether this is a “lying dream like that of Agamemnon’s in Book 2 of the *Iliad*” as Bachvarova (2016, 172-173; see also Haul 2009, 270; Mouton 2007, 15; and Gentili 2000, 367-269) would have it is debatable. The obverse breaks off before the end of the speech, so that all we can say with certainty is that Enlil attempts to embolden Nūr-Daḥḥi, but not necessarily lie (unless *annauliš=w[a=[tta] Ú-UL kuiški ešzi*, ‘Equal [to you] is there no one’ (Obv. I. 25'-26') is a genuine (false) promise?). Thus, from a modern perspective, Nūr-Daḥḥi becomes a tragic figure, emboldened to fight, but doomed to fail (although whether a Hittite audience would perceive him as such is unprovable). One imagines that the parallels between these scenes were much fuller, but the broken tablet precludes further analysis.

## 4.2 Micro-Structures

### 4.2.1 *The Speeches of Nūr-Daḥḥi/Sargon*

A better preserved example of parallelism is the repeated speech of Sargon/Nūr-Daḥḥi, which can only be analysed between Rev. III 2'-6', where it is least broken (story sections (4) and (5) above). In these lines we find a combination of a syntactic parallelism and semantic chiasmus. The speech was likely first related by Nūr-Daḥḥi to reassure himself and/or his troops/people, insofar as the king believes that the difficult topographical features on the road to Puruṣḥanda will stop Sargon. The features are organised as follows:

- (A) [Ú-U]L=*war=an aranz*[i... ]*ḫatugaeš p[arga]ueš* ĤUR.SAG<sup>MEŠ</sup>-*uš* [ ]  
 (B) Ú-UL=*war=an [ar]anzi arunaš l[elḫurtimas*(<sup>?</sup>) ]  
 (C) Ú-UL=*war=an ar[a]nzi* Ú.SAL<sup>HI.A</sup>-*uš nadu[wanteš=(y)a] ḫatugaeš wa[rḥ]ueš* KASKAL<sup>HI.A</sup>-*uš*

- (A) Will they not stop hi[m ... ] The fearsome, lofty mountains [...]  
 (B) Will they not [s]top him, the f[lloodwaters?] of the sea?  
 (C) Will they not stop him, the re[edy] meadows [and] fearsome, rugged paths?

The fronted negative rhetorical question, *Ú-UL=war=an aranzi*, makes the parallelism clear, with the final instance applying to two geographical features rather than one. This asymmetrical end reminds one of a notable Indo-European stylistic figure, termed by Watkins (2010, 329-335) the *a a b* triad: “the main verb occurs triadically, twice as one lexical item and the third time climactically as a semantically similar but more highly marked variant.” Here however the triad is of substantives, not verbs. The variant in the speech above of two topographical features for one emphasizes the difficulty of the journey, the accumulation of features mirroring the accumulation of difficulties.

A chiasmic ordering of the speech, by semantic field, is also evident: earth (‘mountains’); water (‘floodwaters’); water (‘meadows’); earth (‘paths’). This chiasmic pattern is reinforced by the adjectives qualifying the nouns: both HUR.SAG<sup>MEŠ</sup> and KASKAL<sup>HL.A</sup> have two adjectives and share one in *ḥatugaeš*; conversely, *arunaš* and Ú.SAL<sup>HL.A</sup> are modified by one adjective each, the former, however, in a genitive construction *arunaš l[elḥurtimaš<sup>(?)</sup>]* that is akin to the adjective-description (‘floodwaters of the sea’ = ‘flooding sea’) and thus stylistically varied again.

An alternative interpretation of the same passage could also be suggested (see Marineau 2020, 45-46, for discussion of Fabb’s (2004) ‘formal multiplicity’ as aesthetic): Rev. III 2’-4’ (A+B) represent the perimeters of the landscape, the mountains and the sea, whereas Rev. III 5’-6’ (C) the area in between these natural borders, the meadows and the roads. The speech thus emphasizes the expanse of territory by framing the extremes of the landscape, a technique already present in Sargonic inscriptions (e.g., Rimuš E2.1.2.9, 1-17) and popular in OB literature, termed merism: “conceptual totality is expressed, *concretum pro abstracto*, by the use of two antipodal terms” (Wasserman 2003, 61). Our example differs slightly, in that the ‘middle area’ is, unlike in typical merism, ‘defined’ (‘meadows’ and ‘roads’), when normally the area between extremes is left unsaid. Regardless, the text still engages in a very similar kind of poetics.

Further, if it is correct to suggest that the Akkadian and Hittite versions are related here (Gilan 2000, 64-65; 83; Soysal 2017, 221 fn. 21), then we can validly recognise the creativity of the Hittite scribe in their re-ordering and choice of certain elements to create an effect. The Akkadian recension reads (EA 359, Rev. 17’-18’; cf. Westenholz 1997, 126-127; Haul 2009, 422-423 and 440-442):

[a]dīni Šarru-kēn(LUGAL.GI-en) lā illakannāši liklaššu<sup>1</sup> kibru mīlu šadû(HUR.SAG) gapšu  
līpušu apu qilta lišāpīšu ḥubūta qalla kiš<sup>1</sup>šari

“[T]ill now Sargon has not come to us: may the riverbank, the flood, (and) the mighty mountain hold him back!

May the reed thicket make a forest, may it make appear to him a wood, a forest of knots(?)”

Despite the challenging Akkadian, the shared elements of flood, mountain, and reed thicket emerge. A tricolon in *kibru mīlu šadû* is observable, in addition to a parallelly formed set of statements in EA 359 rev. 8’-9’ (Haul 2009, 264). According to Westenholz (1997, 107), “The outstanding feature of the poetic structure [of the Amarna recension] is the abundant use of parallelism. Many lines contain several synonymous-parallel clauses, usually incremental in

nature”. It is much the same in the Hittite text, but the parallelisms are arranged differently. Therefore, by an analysis of the parallelism and repetition of these lines, the Hittite “freie Nacherzählung” is shown to be much more, and the programmatic remark of Francia (2012a, 82) is handily confirmed: “Gli Ittiti andarono alla ricerca di uno stile proprio, non limitandosi a riportare pedissequamente il testo di partenza, ma andando alla ricerca di espedienti stilistici tali da conferire alla traduzione una struttura poetica e un’originalità propria.”

#### 4.2.2 *The Destruction of the Gatehouse*

What original poetic structure was gained, however, was almost undone by the scribe towards the end of the composition. In story section (7) we read (rev. 14'-22'; the Hittite following has been emended due to a series of problematic clitic chains):

(A) <sup>GIŠ</sup> pāini=w[a=tt]a kuit <sup>É</sup> hīlamni=šit arta	(A) The tamarisk, which stands for you in his gatehouse,
(B) nu=war=a(t)=št[a] karša(n)du	(B) Let them cut it ou[t]
(C) nu=war=at <sup>URU</sup> A-GA-DE <sup>D</sup> IŠTAR-aš [ <sup>GIŠ</sup> TUKUL <sup>HL.A</sup> ]-e[š] iyandu	(C) And make it into weapons of Ištar of Akkad!
(D) <sup>GIŠ</sup> hikkarza=ma=wa=ta kuit <sup>1</sup> <sup>É</sup> hīlamni	(D) The <i>hikkar</i> -tree, which (is) in the gatehouse for you,
(E) nu=war=a(t)=⟨š⟩ta karšandu	(E) Let them cut it out
(F) n=at <sup>1</sup> =apa <sup>GIŠ</sup> BANŠUR <sup>MEŠ</sup> iyandu	(F) And make it into tables,
(G) ta=za=kan <sup>LÚ</sup> . <sup>MEŠ</sup> UR.SAG=šummiš azzikkandu	(G) So that upon (them) our heroes may dine!
(H) [ <sup>GI</sup> ] <sup>š</sup> halaššar=ma=wa <sup>1</sup> =ta <sup>1</sup> kuit <sup>É</sup> hīlamni=šet	(H) The <i>halaššar</i> -tree, which (is) in his gatehouse for you,
(I) [nu=w]ar=a(t)=šta karšan(du)	(I) Let them cut it out
(J) ta=šan <sup>GIŠ</sup> GU <sup>4</sup> .SI.AŠ iyandu	(J) And make a battering-ram,
(K) ta BĀD-eššar walhiškeddu	(K) So that it may begin to ram the wall!

The content of these lines is repeated immediately after Sargon is said to acquiesce to the soldiers’ demands (rev. 27'-30'), only now as a narrative *summary* (narrative-time less than story-time) and not narrative *scene* (story-time and narrative-time are contemporaneous), e.g.: [<sup>GIŠ</sup>hika]r=ašta karšada nu=at<sup>1</sup>=a[pa <sup>GI</sup>]<sup>š</sup>BANŠUR<sup>MEŠ</sup>-uš DÙ-at ta=za=kan [<sup>LÚ</sup><sup>MEŠ</sup> U]R.SAG-iš adanna ti[e]r, ‘He cut out the [*hika*]r-tree and made it<sup>1</sup> in[to] tables, so that upon (them) [the her]oes began to eat’ (rev. 28'-29'). Not only was the relative clause omitted, but the scribe also used short-forms of previous words (the tree name (Güterbock 1969, 25) and Sumerogram DÙ for Hitt. *iya*-). The result is to have the repeated lines convey the same content as their previous iteration in a faster manner (9 lines vs. 4 lines), demonstrating narrative *speed* (for these narratological terms see Genette 1980 and 1988). It is also suggestive that more attention is to be paid to the direct speech version, perhaps not unsurprising in a text that prizes dialogue (as can be seen above in 4.2.1).

The parallelism of the reported version is fuller: the actions are demanded as a tricolon, each of which can be distinguished into three clauses: tree in gatehouse; cut; and fabricate. Each clause then corresponds to a parallel clause in the next iteration, thus: (A)—(D)—(H); (B)—(E)—(I); and (C)—(F+G)—(J+K).

Immediately it becomes apparent that the final two members of the tricolon are more elaborate than the first. They add a desired result to the act of fabrication. Thus, a triad of *a b b* emerges, a kind of reverse of the pattern adduced for the speech of Sargon/Nūr-Daḥḥi (*a a b*).

A rhyming pattern is also produced from the repeated use of the 3<sup>rd</sup> imperative ending *-du* that occurs at the end of each clause following the introductory tree-clause. And for the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> instances of the rhyme, the same verb is repeated: *karš-* (‘to cut (out)’) and *iya-* (‘do, make’).

The resulting effect is to depict the soldiers demanding Sargon destroy Purušḫanda in a chant-like manner, i.e., repetitively and in quasi-rhyme. Such a depiction is reminiscent of the *Soldier’s Song* (CTH 16; KBo 40.368), notably “with ‘young men/warriors’ attempting to ‘cut’ (*karsikanzi*) a mountain and singing a song” (Weeden 2013, 89).

But these considerations are only borne out of an emended text. The poetic qualities of the above lines were almost completely corrupted by a struggling scribe and their many errors (see also Gilan 2000, 56; Rieken 2001, 579-584). Each clause makes use of different clitics, or falsely attaches clitics to different words or clauses (e.g., (B), *nu=war=a(t)=št[a]*; and (E) *nu=war=a(t)=(š)ta*, written *nu-wa-ra-at-ta*). Interestingly, the duplicate of this tablet (KBo 12.1) also preserves the same errors in its extant overlaps, suggesting another scribe struggled with their copying. The repeated relative clause uses *arta* (*ar-*, ‘to stand’) once, only to erase it twice thereafter. More than an error, the double erasure exhibits intentional disregard for poetic structure. And the parallel exhortation to ‘cut’ (*karšandu*) is written only once correctly, despite occurring three times: the first iteration omits *-an*, and the third *-du*! Notwithstanding these errors, the scribe also made a perplexing choice in opting for (the still grammatically acceptable) conjunction *ta* in (J), when they had twice previously used *nu* (C + F).

In order to maintain the poetic style of these lines, the scribe had simply to write the repetitions verbatim with minor substitutions: interchange of tree-type and product made. Why he had such difficulty in doing so is a mystery.

One reason might simply be that the maintenance of a poetic structure was not the scribe’s priority. Many of these errors have been accounted for by Rieken (2001) as failures in deliberate archaization—a later scribe attempted to make their copy appear older, but had a faulty understanding of Old/Middle Hittite. Thus, in an attempt to archaize, the scribe neglected the parallelism of these lines (e.g. the conjunction *ta* in (J) when *nu* would have made better grammatical sense and preserved the parallelism; cf. *CHD* (L-N s.v., ‘nu A’, 468b) for *ta* as “properly only [conjunctive in nature in] OH”). In addition, if the scribe were unaccustomed to earlier language features, their confused use of older clitics might have a knock-on effect on the parallelism. One could also suggest that, if the scribe were still learning their craft, these skilful aspects of writing were still beyond them.

In short, there is no clear answer. But the Hittite *Šar Tamḫāri* is a telling reminder of the pitfalls of applying stylistic, parallelistic analyses to Hittite texts, especially when it comes to contrasts (‘foregrounding by deviation’): “In Hittite, deviation can be difficult to detect due in large part to the uncertainty of whether a perceived deviation was caused by scribal error or deliberate intention” (Marineau 2020, 44).



## 5. Conclusion

This short survey on the largest parallelistic and repetitive features of the Hittite *Šar Tamḫāri* represents the tip of what was almost certainly once an iceberg of poetic structure. It is highly plausible that the text made use of more stylistic features no longer extant. Nevertheless, the stylistics of the composition are clear.

Parallelism and repetition feature most prominently in the speeches of the *Šar Tamḫāri*. While this may be because the majority of the text (and Hittite literature in general; Weeden 2013, 80) is dialogue, it may also be no coincidence that the Hittite *Song of Release* also exhibits a high degree of poetic style in its direct speeches (Francia 2010, 65-71). Perhaps this was where the scribes working with foreign material felt most comfortable in applying such features, though this remains supposition.

Working with imported literature did not, however, limit a scribe's poetic capabilities. Indeed, they could apply their own native stylistics. This was shown when comparing the Hittite and Akkadian versions of *Šar Tamḫāri*: the latter, often assumed to be the *Vorlage*, also exhibited parallelism, but of a different arrangement to the Hittite version. The result cannot determine which version of the text came first. But it does suggest that the Hittite text shared the same preferences for parallelism, while simultaneously freely reworking parallelism in its own way. There is, then, a shared poetic goal, only achieved via different means. This may have bearing on the possible Hittite origins of the Amarna recension (Beckman apud Westenholz 1997, 105), insofar as both attempted the same stylistics. But the differences are also in line with what one finds between the Akkadian and Hittite versions of the *Annals of Hattušili I* (Marineau 2020, 68-69), helping attest to a native poetics applied to works of 'translation'.

Towards the text's end, however, our understanding of the poetic structure of the Hittite *Šar Tamḫāri* is problematised by what seems to be a plethora of errors. While their causes remain speculative, one reason could be due to priorities: the scribe who wrote our most complete manuscript was concerned with archaizing as opposed to stylistic arrangement. As such, the Hittite *Šar Tamḫāri* demonstrates that scribes were not solely concerned with the specific poetics of parallelism and repetition, but rather had a repertoire to draw upon. Part of that repertoire, I suspect, is archaizing: the conscious use of an older register in a newer text to imbue the latter with an antique quality. Such a consideration is borne, nonetheless, from the fruitful avenue of research into parallelism and repetition.

## Bibliography

**Bachvarova, M.R. 2016**, *From Hittite to Homer: The Anatolian Background of Ancient Homeric Epic*. Cambridge.

**Berlin, A. 2008**, *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism*. Grand Rapids.

**Daes, A./Rieken, E. 2018**, *Das persönliche Gebet bei den Hethitern: Eine textlinguistische Untersuchung*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 63. Wiesbaden.

**De Zorzi, N. 2019**, 'Literature as Scholarship: Some Reflections on Repetition with Variation and the Construction of Meaning in the Šamaš Hymn 112-117', *Kaskal* 16, 159-182.

-2022, 'Parallelism and Analogical Thought in Babylonian Poetry – Case Studies from Ludlul bēl nēmeqi, the Babylonian Theodicy, and the Šamaš Hymn', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 112, 367-394.

**Fabb, N. 2004**, *Language and Literary Structure: The Linguistic Analysis of Form in Verse and Narrative*. Cambridge.

**Francia, R. 2010**, 'The Poetic Style of the Direct Speeches in the Hittite 'Parables' of the 'Epos der Freilassung' in J. Klinger/E. Rieken/C. Rüter (eds.) *Investigationes Anatolicae. Gedenkschrift für Erich Neu*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 52. Wiesbaden, 65-72.

-2012a, 'Storia degli Studi sulla Poesia Ittita e una Nuova Chiave di Lettura di un Testo 'Classico': CTH 414', *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici: Supplemento* 1, 79-106.

-2012b, 'La Struttura 'Poetica' degli Exempla Ittiti nel 'Canto della Liberazione', *Centro Mediterraneo Preclassico* 3 (3), 77-107.

-2018, 'The Grammar of Hittite Poetry' in E. Rieken (ed.) *100 Jahre Entzifferung des Hethitischen: Morphosyntaktische Kategorien in Sprachgeschichte und Forschung: Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 21. bis 23. September 2015 in Marburg*. Wiesbaden, 83-90.

**Genette, G. 1980**, *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Ithaca.

**Genette, G. 1988**, *Narrative Discourse Revisited*. Ithaca.

**Gentili, P. 2000**, 'Il Re Sognatore' in S. Graziani (ed.) *Studi sul Vicino Oriente Antico Dedicati alla Memoria di Luigi Cagni*. Istituto Universitario Orientale Dipartimento di Studi Asiatici Series Minor 61. Napoli, 355-373.

**Gilan, A. 2000**, *Sargon in Anatolia: The "King of Battle" in a Hittite Context* [MA Thesis]. Freie Universität Berlin.

-2014, 'Epic and History in Hittite Anatolia: In Search of a Local Hero' in D. Konstan/K.A. Raaflaub (eds.) *Epic and History*. New York, 61-65.

**Groddek, D. 2008**, *Hethitische Texte in Transkription KBo 22*. Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 31. Wiesbaden.

**Güterbock, H.G. 1969**, 'Ein neues Bruchstück der Sargon-Erzählung ,König der Schlacht', *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient Gesellschaft* 101, 14-16.

**Haul, M. 2009**, *Stele und Legende: Untersuchungen zu den keilschriftlichen Erzählwerken über die Könige von Akkade*, *Göttinger Beiträge zum Alten Orient* 4. Göttingen.

**Hrozný, B. 1929**, 'L'invasion des Indo-Europeens en Asie Mineure vers 2000 av. J.-C. ', *Archiv Orientalni* 1, 273-299.

**Jakobson, R. 1987**, *Language in Literature*. Cambridge.

**Jeffries, L./McIntyre, D. 2010**, *Stylistics*. Cambridge.

**Marineau, R.N. 2020**, *The Literary Effects of Discourse Patterns in Hittite Texts* [PhD Thesis]. University of Chicago.

**Meriggi, P. 1973**, 'Zu einigen Stellen hethitischer historischer Texte', in E. Neu/Ch. Rüter (eds.) *Festschrift Heinrich Otten*. 27. Dezember 1973. Wiesbaden, 199–208.

- Rieken, E. 2001**, ‘Die hethitische *šar-tamḫāri*-Text: archaisch oder archaisierend?’, in G. Wilhelm (ed.) *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie. Würzburg, 4.–8. Oktober 1999*. Wiesbaden, 576–585.
- Mouton, A. 2007**, *Rêves Hittites. Contribution à une Histoire et une Anthropologie du Rêve en Anatolie Ancienne*. Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 28. Leiden/Boston.
- Soysal, O. 2017**, ‘Sargon, Nūr-Dagal/N ve Puruṣanda’, in Ö. Süleyman/H. Hüryılmaz/A. Türker (eds.) *Samsat'tan Acemhöyük'e eski uygarlıkların izinde: Aliye Öztan'a armağan (From Samosata to Acemhöyük trailing the ancient civilizations: studies presented to honour of Aliye Öztan)*. İzmir, 217–229.
- Torri, G./Barsacchi, F.G. 2018a**, *Hethitische Texte in Transkription KBo 12*. Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 50. Wiesbaden.
- 2018b**, *Hethitische Texte in Transkription KBo 13*. Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 51. Wiesbaden.
- Wasserman, N. 2003**, *Style and Form in Old-Babylonian Literary Texts*. Cuneiform Monographs 27. Leiden/Boston.
- Watkins, C. 1995**, *How to Kill a Dragon. Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*. New York/Oxford.
- 2010**, ‘An Indo-European Stylistic Figure in Hittite: The a a b Triad and the Climatic Formula ... V<sub>1</sub> ... V<sub>1</sub> ... V<sub>j</sub>’, in J. Klinger/E. Rieken/C. Rüster (eds.) *Investigationes Anatolicae. Gedenkschrift für Erich Neu*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 52. Wiesbaden, 329–335.
- Weeden, M. 2013**, ‘Poetry and War among the Hittites’, in H. Kennedy (ed.) *Warfare and Poetry in the Middle East*. London, 73–98.
- Westenholz, J.G. 1997**, *Legends of the Kings of Akkade*. Mesopotamian Civilizations 7. Winona Lake.