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Poetic Meter and Phrasal Stress in Hittite

H. Craig Melchert

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

"Der merische Sandhi ist keine willkürliche poetische Literatur. Er beruht auf einer Verallgemeinerung der Sandhilge der Umgangs-

sprache, ist also nicht aus dem letzten identisch. (Kuryłowicz 1973:5)"

Calvert Watkins has always emphasized in his teaching and writings the above principle that poetic language is not a matter of unsanctioned invention, but rather the exploitation for artistic purposes of features present in natural language. We should accordingly be able to find a basis for putative features of a given poetic tradition in the usage of the corresponding ordinary language. I offer as a further illustration the role of phrasal stress in Hittite poetic meter.

McNeel (1963) concluded on the basis of substitution patterns in recurring formulae that the meter of the Hurro-Hittite epics of the Kumarih Cycle was not syllable-counting, but stress-based, consisting of lines with four stresses divided into two equal cola. Building on McNeel’s work, Dunford (1971) inferred certain facts about syntactic stress in Hittite. Recent studies of poetic meter in Anatolian have given these works scant attention (Eichner 1993:100) and none at all (Watkins 1995:247f).

This treatment undoubtedly reflects in part the premise that, as translation literature, the Hurro-Hittite epics are likely to be derivative in their stylistics and an unrelated source of information on native Hittite poetic practice. Data from the Hurro-Hittite Biligual (see Nea 1996) now casts serious doubt on this assumption. Stylistic features of the Hittite epic also found in the new text have no model in the Hurrian original.

To cite one well-known example, it can occur in the epic for subject or direct object to be doubled by a coreferential clitic pronoun: *naqtu šu-ta šu-ya-nu Kumbu-ti. And he arose, did Kumurta* (KÖB 33.102 ii 17 with dupl.): *peliyamwaw-ya-um šu ya-nu. SUDITUM. ‘Let the hunters indeed cast him* (down), the deer* (KÖB 32.14 ii 13-14). This clitic-doubling has no model in the Hurrian, but is rather the extension for stylistic effect of an attested, but relatively rare usage of Hittite pronouns; see Garret (1999:229 ff & 264f), with references to prior works.1 The same is true of other features such as the

1 Centre Néel (1996:1148-157) there is no basis for supposing that the clitic-doubling is a device to mark the "transitive character" of the Hurrian verb. First, many Hurrian transitives show no such feature in the Hittite translation. Second, clitic doubling also occurs with intransitives. Third, as Garret shows, the usage is found in Hittite prose where there is no reason to suppose a translation: *λυ-λυ εντατένταλ Kuzizwa navatas-

huwaters ‘And my father did not let him, Kizizwa, run’. (KÖB 3:28 ii 19).
frequent use of the construction with "supine" + dā dismiss. (e.g. memlekweren dail 'began to speak'). In sum, the Hitite had its own sense of elevated literary style, and we may reasonably assume that the stress-based meter described by McNeil and Dunford also reflects native tradition. If this is true, however, then we should take it seriously in ordinary Hitite language. It is this proposition which I intend to test here.

Dunford (1971:70f, 74) claims that certain words which we normally expect to carry stress may count as stressless for metrical purposes: e.g., an adnominal genitive. The question is: can we find any evidence for such a phenomenon in Hitite prose? Although there predictably is no direct marking of proodic features in Hitite written texts, one famous feature of the language can potentially furnish us relevant information. By so-called "Wackernagel's Law," unstressed anaphoric pronouns and various sentential particles appear as enclitics to the first accented word in a clause. The definition of "first accented word" is complicated by the use of certain sentence-initial conjunctions (see Hale 1987:46ff, and Garrett 1990:33f), but in general the sentential clinics are preceded in Hitite by only a single full lexical word, as we would expect. If Dunford is right, however, that in certain syntags (such as noun (gen.) + noun) one ordinarily stresses the second word, then we might expect to find occasional traces of this process. That is, we should be able to find such syntags preceding the Wackernagel clinics.

Before proceeding, I must deal with some potential hazards for such an investigation. As now widely known, "local" particles -kan and -sin do sometimes occur clause-internally (see Neus 1995:145ff). However, in both a handful of dubious cases, these clause-internal examples are enclitic to nouns in the dative-locative. All other instances of sequences preceding -kan or -sin thus may be counted as secure clause-initial cases.

Other problems are graphic in nature. We must exclude certain examples where an entire syntagm is written logographically. Some elements which are surely phrases in Hitite are treated as compounds (at least written as a single word) when represented by logograms: e.g. baula puri- 'god/ghost' (E.DINGIRMES 'temple'. Since the latter is an indivisible unit, placement of sentential clinics after it is of no significance for the status of the Hitite phrase. The writer also with some frequency represent a broad noun and genitive nominal by juxtaposing them in that order. This practice is especially common with set phrases, but is not limited to them: e.g. LUGAL KUR 2A773 HATTI 'king of this land of Hitte'. Although the constituents are written with spacing, they are never allowed to be separated by other elements, including clinics. This is unsurprising, since it is the very juxtaposition that assures the genitival reading.

2 As per Dunford (1971:70, note 12), we speak of "unstressed" for metrical purposes, but the process in actual speech was likely a reduction, not total loss of stress.

On the other hand, there is plentiful evidence that nouns in the genitive may be graphically separated from their head nouns when the Akkadian preposition SA is employed: SA ARI SAVU WARRUNAWA iliphi IDI 'also recognized the title of his father' (KUB 19.29 iv 9). Likewise, there can also be separation when the genitive is written phonetically, but the head noun logographically: lirikyla waran- waraul = DINGIRMES [ 'The gods of the oath [... ] them'] (KBO 4.4 ii 11).

When we encounter similar syntags written wholly before the sentential clinics, we may tentatively conclude that this writing is not conditioned by a purely graphic convention. Aside from sequences written entirely phonetically (which are rare), the general principle to be followed is this: in order for an expression written before the sentential clinics to count as evidence for a phrase with a single stress, we must also find examples of the same type of phrase with the elements written separately before and after the clitic sequence. Only the latter give assurance that we are dealing with phrases with independent constituents each of which may potentially be stressed in the first place.

We may now turn to specific cases. Dunford (1971:74) summarizes his preliminary results based on the epic meter as follows: (1) all verbs, finite and non-finite, are stressed; (2) nouns are normally stressed, except dependent genitives and certain special cases (more below); (3) predicate adjectives are stressed, but attributive ones are not; (4) sentence-initial conjunctions and attached clinics are unstressed; (5) local adverbs/postpositions are unstressed, and probably also mew 'like'; (6) the conjunction mus 'when, if' is stressed.

These conclusions require some revision. First, we must make the same distinction for local adverbs that Dunford makes for nouns and adjectives. While the former may be unstressed as postpositions with nouns and as preverbs immediately before the verb, evidence from both the epic and ordinary language shows that these are stressed when occurring independently.

The example which Dunford (1971:74) finds problematic (mew=tu Wiškar iliphi pura) in PAULHI.A-A.3.4 mun aranzu 'His tears flowed (as if like streams)' becomes regular if we assume properly that the preverb pura ininitis is stressed. Confirmation for this comes from the frequent appearance of preverbs clause-initially before sentential clinics: arba wara walt=sa šarrakāt 'And they divided themselves' (KUB 14.155 iii 30).

Second and more seriously, Dunford makes no allowance for true optionality: the possibility the certain word classes or syntactic units may count as stressed or unstressed as the poet chooses. Such rigidity is unlikely typologically and directly contradicted by the evidence of Finne poesy. The examples cited above show already that dependent genitives or syntactic units may be stressed, and in fact this is overwhelmingly the normal situation in prose (for clause-initial cases, the only ones which we can control). If, as I shall show below, we do occasionally find evidence for noun (gen.) + noun as one stressed unit, it is unlikely that Hitite meter required this reading. It is far more
plausible that poetic language took advantage of this possibility to give the flexibility of conveying such a noun phrase as one or two stresses.

In fact contect that this principle extends to all word classes which may be stressed in prose. Darnford claims that attributive adjectives are unstressed, but in prose they may occur in stressed position (paragame
tan kOUHURAC-MES-ai
island 'I searched the high mountains', KUB 33.24 i 27), and evidence from the epic also requires this possibility: nu BU-l-an UD-KAM-ki LULUHUL-an
Il ullamatu
'He raises a bad day as an evil (one)' (KUB 33.96 i 6). The status of preverbs immediately before a verb is more complicated, but note that the example of clause-initial arpa cited above is separated from the verb only by the sentential clitics, not by any stressed element. This suggests that preverbs may be stressed in this position, and again some examples in the epic appear to demand such: nu wa-war-an nin kani
LULUHUL-fla
"payed tribute to her' (KUB 33.93

19-20). The first line has three assuredly stressed elements, and only the preverb járd 'up' can supply the needed fourth. In the second line one could count the attributive lánæz in as stressed (see above), but this would place the case between noun and attributive adjective, an unlikely possibility in my view.

The conjunction múm 'if, whenever; whom' calls for special comment. Darnford counts it as stressed, based on the following example: múm E-a-SAL il addár itamatu
'When Ea heard the words' (KUB 33.106 ii 45). However, we also find at least once múaghun: nu múaghun DINGER-MES il mention itamatu
(KUB 33.106 i 2'). Elsewhere we find the ambiguous spelling GIM-um. All other occurrences are restored. Darnford follows Gitterbeck (1952:15 & passim) in reading and restoring múm in all cases. Available evidence makes an equally good argument for múaghun.

On the other hand, the following example suggests that múm must count as unstressed: múm Kumaði INIM-MES-um il memiswamumu zuñin
'When Kumabili finished speaking the words' (KUB 33.93 ii 26). Darnford (1971:71) tries to escape this assumption with múm addár may be unstressed when it is the direct object of a periphrastic verb with infinitive or supine. His arguments do not hold—neither the infinitive nor supine is in any sense a direct object of the finite verb, and there is no syntactic motivation for the direct object to be unstressed here any more than elsewhere. In any case, this argument will not do for the following example (with the highly plausible restoration of Gitterbeck's 1951:146, after the parallel test): múm-za Kumaði
biu楠tar iz ni-pet-am dú
'When Kumabili had taken wisdom to/before him'

Even if one read LULUHUL-an as antistatik hwappam against Gitterbeck 1951:147, this would not help, since by Darnford's system, neither attributive adjective would be stressed, and the line would remain a stress short

múna' (KUB 33.96 i 11). With already four other stressed elements present, múm must count as unstressed. Likewise in the previous example.

This is in fact what we would expect. The very use of múm 'whom' with the preterite argues that the Hurro-Hittite epis was Old or Middle Hittite compositions (see Gitterbeck & Hoffner 1983:148). We also know that múm did not count as a stressed element at this period. The evidence comes from its interaction with the contrastive conjunction/particle =ma. The latter is not strictly a Wackenagel particle, but it regularly appears as enclitic to the first stressed word in a clause. However, as long recognized, in Old and Middle Hittite =ma was never attached to clause-initial múm or zúia 'it', but to the next full word, as in the frequent formula múm =ma 'But if not...': see Gitterbeck & Hoffner 1983:97, following Ungnad. Only in Neo-Hittite does this status of múm change (múm =ma UL, etc.)

The evidence of our last two examples for unstressed múm is thus what we would expect for an older composition, based on prose usage. The single example for stressed múm with which we began may be explained in one of two ways. First, it could reflect the beginnings of the later practice (whose origin and motivation remain to be explained). Second, it may be simply a faulty spelling out by a later scribe of a GIM-um (=múaghun) of his archetype, based on the frequent use in the text of múm 'whom'.

We come finally to the verb. As noted, Darnford assumes that the verb is always stressed, in all its forms. He gives no account of the following: nu Kumaðili ANA Mukalana LSUKKAL-šu memiswamumu [dud] 'Kumaðili began to speak to Mukalana, his vizier' (KUB 33.102 ii 30-31). I see only two solutions. One is to assume that the appositive 'visor' counts as a single stress unit with Mukalana. The other is to suppose that the supine plus its finite verb can count as a single stress. In support of the latter I may cite the apparent equivalence of áppa memiswaz and áppa memiswamumu dud in: nu grame
ìmpalshi ISGIR-PA memiswaz (KUB 33.102 ii 4), where the 'implicates KUB 17.7 i 15 and KUB 33.98 in 2 have memiswamumu. Darnford (1971:71) assumes that the finite verb is an error, since for him the line is a stress short, but for the stressed preverb see above.2 Whether independent support can be found in prose for supine plus finite verb as a single stress unit remains to be seen.3

2 An error is made less likely by two mere occurrences of the finite form in the same formula in KUB 36.13 i 18'-19' & 34'-35': nuwa ISTAB-IL LULUHUL-PA memiswaz 'hber began to speak (back) to her/him' and nu ISTAB-AN IL LULUHUL-PA memiswaz 'hber began to speak back to the Storm-deid'.
3 Further examples from the epic apparently requiring this pattern are found in KUB 33.102 ii 1-2 & 33.106 i 25. That supine and finite verb may both be stressed is not in question. Note: Kumaðili ANA Impalshi memiswaz (KUB 36.7a i 37)
Once we have acknowledged, contra Diamant, that any element normally associated with the concept of stress is not necessarily so in this case, we discover whether there is any evidence in the relevant literature to confirm our hypothesis. As with many other features of language, we have framed the question in a way that suggests a single, clear-cut answer, but in fact the evidence is more complex. The only type of phrase we have so far examined is the one consisting of two preverbs, where the first indicates the happening and the second the recipient of the action. For example, in the sentence "I go down from above" (KBP 71, 21, KB 14, 22), the first preverb indicates movement, while the second indicates the direction of the movement. Similarly, in the sentence "I pull the rope with the bare hand" (KBP 51, 10), the first preverb indicates the action of pulling, while the second indicates the instrument used. These examples suggest that the order of the preverbs is not arbitrary, but follows a pattern according to which the first preverb indicates the happening of the action, while the second indicates the recipient of the action. However, this pattern is not always observed, as in the sentence "I come down from above" (KBP 71, 21, KB 14, 22), where the first preverb indicates the direction of the movement, while the second indicates the action of coming. This suggests that the order of the preverbs can sometimes be reversed. Therefore, the evidence does not permit us to claim that the order of the preverbs is always the same, as we stated earlier. However, it does suggest that the order of the preverbs is not arbitrary, but follows a pattern according to which the first preverb indicates the happening of the action, while the second indicates the recipient of the action.
one example known to me of attributive head noun before a sentential clitic: LUMBAHSAHGAMAI \lum "LUMBAHSAHGAMAI\lum "LUMBAHSAHGAMAI; (KUB 17:21 ii 6) (dual). KUB 31.124 shows more archaic LUMBAHSAHGAMAI \lum "LUMBAHSAHGAMAI\lum "LUMBAHSAHGAMAI. Crucially, the same grouping occurs earlier in the text in a different order: LUMBAHSAHGAMAI \lum "LUMBAHSAHGAMAI\lum "LUMBAHSAHGAMAI (KUB 17:21 ii 10-11). This differing order suggests that the example is one of a particular subtype of noun, not simply 'sacralized prites' (which would be a very odd characterization, since nearly all the officiant named are sacralized). Thus once again we are dealing with a set phrase, a title. Second, while the order noun + attributive adjective is attested in Hilitte, it is in some sense 'marked'. The second occurrence cited shows that in this case the unmarked order is attributive plus noun. The reasoning just when the phrase occurs as a unit before the sentential clitic is surely significant, and this leads me to suspect the same for the occasional genitives. Limitations of space prevent me from pursuing the matter further here, but I am confident that the issue does not affect the claim that we have in all cases a two-word phrase acting as a single stress unit.

Turning to combinations of preverb plus verb, I may cite the following example in the phrasean inyamanyum SUM an 'I gave it to SUMA' for setting down' (KUB 40.88 iv 18). Further support is provided by the following: Kallalat paawangisaata UGU buanwanwantoo. I was made to swear an oath about desertion' (KUB 414 ii 46). Here Kallalat is the allative of a Luvian noun, but there can be no doubt of the overall use in the text cited that Kallalat pai’i ‘going allalaa’ is a fixed expression, comparable to the American military’s ‘going A.W.O.L.’ (‘absent without leave’). The allative noun is thus effectively a preverb (cf. arha ‘away’, generally agreed to be the old allative of the noun arha ‘boundary, limit’).

There is thus some evidence for preverb plus noun as a single stress unit. However, as Mark Hale and Andrew Garrett pointed out to me, it is probably not an accident that both of the examples cited are indicative, i.e. event nouns. There is a strong possibility that the stress loss here takes place only in nominalizations, where again katta buyoo’ar ‘setting down’ is virtually equivalent to a compound. There is no assurance that the phenomenon applies in prose to sequences of preverb plus finite verb. Given the prominence of the construction with supine plus daa-ruja in the epic, one could easily suppose that it is the

source from which the stress-loss rule was extended. We have already seen several examples showing that preverb plus finite verb must also count as two stress units in some cases.

I have found no evidence for supine plus finite daa-ruja clause-initially before the sentential clitics. This is hardly surprising, given the rarity of the construction in ordinary prose and the further requirement of marked clause initial position for the verb. As evidence for the sequence as a single stress unit I can cite only the fact that to my knowledge the supine and its finite verb are never separated by any element (not even by the negative, which often does separate preverbs and verbs). This observation is, of course, merely suggestive and without probative value.

More disturbing is the lack of direct evidence for noun plus postposition as a single stress unit, as the epic meter seems to require. It is not hard to find cases where the sentential clitics appear between noun and postposition. Clitics in an adpositional phrase would be typologically unremarkable, and I have cited suggestive evidence for such in Cuneiform Luvian (Melchert 1994:247). However, as Durnford rightly emphasizes, extrapolating such rules even from one closely related language to another is dangerous. The status of this feature of epic meter vis-a-vis the ordinary language must therefore remain open. The same applies to the sequence of noun plus postposition nin ‘like, as’. We have already discussed the evidence of the ordinary language for the construction nin ‘if, whenever’. In light of our investigation we may revise Durnford’s rules regarding stress and the epic meter as follows: (1) any element stressed in the ordinary language may also count as stressed metrically (this includes nouns, adjectives, verbs, and adverbs/preverbs in any role); (2) there is limited evidence in ordinary language for stress reduction/loss in fixed expressions of adnominal genitive plus head noun, asyndetic pairs, and attributive adjective plus noun, from which the practice may have been extended in poetic language to all such syntagms; (3) there is also evidence that a preverb may form a single stress unit with an immediately following nominalized verb form, again a usage which could have been extended for metrical purposes to cases with finite verb; (4) as per
Dunford, sentence-initial *nu* plus enclitics counts as unstressed; 15 (5) the conjunction *mān* 'if, whenever, when' is regularly treated as unstressed in the epic meter, following ordinary Old and Middle Hitite usage (the one apparent countexample may reflect a transmission error or the beginning of the Neo-Hittite practice by which *mān* is stressed); (6) evidence from prose is thus far lacking for noun plus postposition or noun plus *mān* 'as, like' as one stress unit; (7) the possibility that supine plus finite verb may form a single stress unit cannot be confirmed. Contra Dunford, there is neither evidence nor need for assuming that a direct object like adda-‘words’ ever is unstressed.

Like Dunford, we conclude our discussion by noting this scheme on the one famous piece of likely native Hitite poetry, the ‘Song of Nela’:

Nešaţi TUG.HLA Nešaţi TUG.HLA tiya=mu tiya  
nu=mu anna=mali katta arnut tiya=mu tiya  
nu=mu uwa=mai katta arnut tiya=mu tiya

- Clothes of Nesa, clothes of Nesa, bind me, bind!
- Bring me down (for burial) with my mother—bind me, bind!
- Bring me down (for burial) with my nurse (?)—bind me, bind!

Dunford, who wrongly assumes that adnominal genitives and preverbs must be counted as unstressed, at once concludes that we have three isometric lines of the same type as in the epic: four stresses divided into two equal cola. However, the obvious function of *tiya=mu tiya* as a refrain suggests the alternate analysis advocated by Ivanov, Eichner, and Watkins: alternating longer and shorter lines. We must test the various possibilities which the (optional) use of phrasal stress makes available in this case.

By any analysis *tiya=mu tiya* must count as two stresses. Parallelism also demands that the three preceding sequences be equivalent metrically. If all possibly stressed elements are counted as stressed, the first (half-)line would have four stresses (each adnominal genitive and head noun), but there is no way to find more than three in the remaining two lines (noun, preverb, and verb)—there is no match. If we assume that adnominal genitive plus head noun counts as a single unit, the first half-line has two stresses. We may also make the other two lines have two stresses, if we assume that preverb plus immediately following finite verb counts as one stress, for which see above. We therefore conclude with Dunford, but on independent grounds, that the Song of Nela consists also of equal lines of four stresses with two cola.

Our investigation has found support in ordinary Hitite prose (albeit necessarily limited in scope) for the fundamental claims of McNeil and Dunford (and independently Eichner) that Hitite poetry employed a stress-based meter. I have argued, however, that many of Dunford’s specific claims about the meter and Hitite syntactic stress must be seriously modified. First, we must make due allowance for optionality in the poetic use of stress loss/reduction. Second, available evidence suggests that such stress loss/reduction is a quite limited phenomenon in the ordinary language, and that the pattern of its usage in poetry represents a considerable extension. The exploitation of a feature of ordinary language for metrical purposes does support the idea that a stress-based meter is part of a native Hitite poetic tradition. This by no means settles the question of how the specific attested form of four stresses per line with two equal cola developed. Is this meter an independent Hitite invention, or an adaptation of a borrowed form which the Hitites found congenial with their native linguistic structure? This and other questions about Hitite meter remain to be answered.

---

15 The fact that the conjunctions *nu* and *ta* never undergo vowel-lengthening when occurring alone argues that they are indeed not fully stressed in ordinary Hitite (see Melchert 1994:151).

16 For previous treatments of the meter of this text see Ivanov (1965:166), Eichner (1993:100ff), Gamkrelidze & Ivanov (1995:738), and Watkins (1995:248). I now follow Watkins’ most recent interpretation by which the object of *annu* is the person to be buried (with the special sense of *annu* ‘found in the laws’). The preverb *katta* (surely *kattu* in the Old Hitite original with genitive) serves here for both ‘down’ and ‘with’.
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