

Translation Strategies in the Hurro-Hittite Bilingual from Boğazköy*

H. CRAIG MELCHERT

(University of California, Los Angeles)

1. THE TEXT

The text to be analyzed is attested in manuscripts in Middle Hittite language and “Middle Script” (early 14th century BCE). Errors show that the extant version is *not* the original translation (although the latter is surely early MH). E.g., there is false use of the geminating conjunction *-a* ‘also’ for non-geminating *-a* (contrastive). The text also shows both *anda* and *andan* as locative ‘in’ (see on this problem in MH Salisbury 1999: 70-71). The fact that we are dealing with a copy must be borne in mind when we consider inconsistencies in the Hittite translator’s treatment of similar structures in the Hurrian text.¹

The Hurro-Hittite bilingual is treated by Neu (1996) in his *editio princeps* as a single composition, the “Song of Release” (Hittite SÌR *parā tarnumaš*). However, there is disagreement whether the series of parables treated here belongs to the same composition as the story of Ebla (compare e.g. Wilhelm 2001: 84). The translation techniques used are likely similar in all parts of the text, but we cannot be assured that all of it is the work of a single translator. The selected passage is “wisdom literature”: a parable ostensibly telling the story of an animal with a following exegesis explaining that it is actually a moral lesson about a human.

For purposes of orientation, I offer the following summary translation (based on the Hittite version, following Hoffner 1998: 69, after Wilhelm and Beckman, contra Neu 1996: 75): “A mountain drove a deer away from its body. The deer went over to another mountain. It grew fat and insolent. It began to curse «back at» the mountain: ‘Would that a fire burn up the mountain on which I am grazing! Would that the Storm-god strike it! Would that a fire burn it up!’ When the mountain heard (thus), it became sick in its heart, and the mountain cursed back at the deer: ‘Is the deer that I made fat now cursing back at me? Let the hunters fell the deer, but let the fowlers take it! Let the hunters take its flesh, but let the fowlers take its hide!’—It is not a deer, it is a person. It is that man who ran away from his city and arrived

* I thank Mary Bachvarova for sharing with me her forthcoming paper on the meter of Hurrian narrative song and for very helpful discussion and references. I am of course solely responsible for all views expressed here.

¹ I retain here the standard view of the Hittite as a translation of a preexisting Hurrian composition. Bachvarova (forthcoming) suggests rather that a single bilingual bard may have composed both versions of the song as we have it. The problems of adaptation remain the same: how to come up with Hittite equivalences for the Hurrian.

in another land. He would be (sought to be) insolent, and he began to do evil to the city in return, and the gods of the city hold him accursed.—Leave aside that story! I will tell you another story. Listen to my message. I will tell you a (piece of) wisdom.”

2. THE PROBLEM

Some of the strategies used by the translator were *required* by differences in the two languages. The major challenge was the very rich Hurrian inventory of non-finite verbal forms to express subordinate actions, for which Hittite *had to* substitute subordinate clauses (including relative clauses). Others were *optional*, most notably imitating Hurrian word order. Such imitation of Hurrian or Hattic models sometimes (but not always) led to sequences that would be ungrammatical in native Hittite contexts (see Rizza 2007, Rieken 2011, and Bauer 2011). These are of two kinds: (1) permissible word orders, but not with the correct pragmatic value of native Hittite; (2) wholly ungrammatical word orders (i.e., not attested in native Hittite compositions). It is clear, however, that the translator did not always follow the Hurrian word order. What factors motivated his choice to imitate or not?

3. EXAMPLES

A. Hittite order after the Hurrian

Hu *na-a-li i-te-[e]-i-né-eš pa-pa-an-ni-iš me-la-aḫ-ḫu-um*
 deer from body mountain (erg.) drove away

Hi *aliyan[an]=za apel tuēgga[š=šaš]² ḪUR.SAG-aš awan arḫa šuwēt*
 deer =refl. its limbs (D-LPI) mountain away pushed

“A mountain drove away a deer from its body.”

B. Hittite order not after the Hurrian

Hu *na-a-li pa-pa-an-ni-iš ši-ta-ar-na ku-lu-u-ru-um*

² As per Goedegebuure (2010: 61), the existing sign before the break can hardly be *-az* (contra Neu 1996: 75) and almost certainly is to be read *-aš*. However, her own reading and restoration *tuēggaš[=ššet]*, i.e., a neuter nom.-acc. singular, is quite impossible in terms of Hittite morphology and syntax. First of all, there is no evidence whatsoever for *tuekka-* as anything except animate gender. The entry in KBo 1.51 rev. 11 is to be read *[RA-MA-]NU = [u]-e-kán-[za]*. For the derivative in *-ant-* as the Hittite word for emphatic ‘self’ see §49 of the Hittite Laws (KBo 6.2 ii 54): “If a *hippara*-man steals, they shall [] him, *tuekkanza=šiš=pat šarnkzi* “he himself alone shall make restitution.” Compare Hoffner 1997: 59-60. Second, an accusative cannot possibly be used in the meaning ‘from his body’, pace Goedegebuure. Since *tuekka-* frequently appears in the plural with the sense ‘limbs’, one may simply read and restore a dative-locative plural, which from Old Hittite often is used instead of the ablative for place from which. Both morphology and syntax are entirely regular.

deer mountain (erg.) curses kept saying

Hi *nu* HUR.SAG-*aš* *aliyanan* *āppa* *ḫuwarzašta*
conj. mountain deer back cursed

“The mountain cursed back at the deer.” (Hittite version!)

C. Imitated word order grammatical in Hittite (usually with a pronominal object or subject *and* additive or contrastive focus):

Hu *ḫa-a-i-te* *ka-re-e-na-šu-uš*
let take fowlers (erg.)

Hi *dāndu=ma=an* ^{LÚ.MEŠ} MUŠEN.DÙ-*TIM*
let take=but=it fowlers

“But let the fowlers take it.”

D. Imitated word order permitted, but not as used pragmatically:

Hu *an-ti ta-a-ḫi* *ma-a-an-ni* *a-ar-ti-i-ta-ni* [t]ù-ú-*ri*
that man (it) is his city he *abandoned*(?)

Hi *apāš* LÚ-*aš* *apel=kan* URU-*az* *kuiš* *arḫa* *ḫuwaiš*
that man his=part. from city who away ran

“It is that man who ran away from his city.”

E. Imitated word order ungrammatical in native Hittite compositions

Hu *ku-u-le-eš* *an-ti ti-i-ib-ša-a-ri*
leave aside(modal) that story (or sim.)

Hi *arḫa* *dālešten* *apāt* *uttar*
away let (Imv2Pl) that word/matter

“Leave aside that word!”

F. Ungrammatical word order and other ungrammaticality

Hu *ku-ut-te* *na-a-li* *ke-e-bi-il-la-a-šu-uš*
shall fell deer hunters (erg.)

Hi *peššiyandu=ya=an* *aliyanan* ^{LÚ.MEŠ} ŠĀIDUTIM
let fell=**also**(!)=it deer hunters

“Let the hunters fell it, the deer!”

Example D is ungrammatical in Hittite because postposed relative clauses are either non-restrictive or indefinite (see Garrett 1994: 47-49) and cannot be used in the identifying function employed here. As shown by Bauer (2011), fronting of finite verbs, including imperatives, only occurs in Hittite with additive or contrastive focus (marked by *-a/-ya* and *-a/-ma* respectively). Both E and F are thus ungrammatical in Hittite. So is the fronting of the preverb along with the verb in example E. In this case the translator simply ignored the problem. Contra Neu (1996: 114), *-ya-* in example F cannot reflect a hiatus-filling glide, which in the environment of a preceding *-u-* could only have been *-w-*. In this instance, the translator apparently marked the fronted verb with additive *-ya-*, in order to justify the fronting, despite the fact that the sense ‘also’ does not fit the passage. However, even this act of desperation was unsuccessful, since V O S order is still ungrammatical in Hittite even with such fronting. What would have led the translator to ignore the Hurrian word order in B, while resorting to increasing degrees of ungrammaticality in D, E, and F?

4. POSSIBLE MOTIVATIONS FOR CHOICE OF IMITATING WORD ORDER OR NOT

4.1 Rhetorical Effect

Some choices of the translator may be motivated in terms of achieving a desired rhetorical effect or avoiding an infelicitous pragmatic value. The double fronting of both the direct object and dative-locative noun phrase ahead of the subject in example A above (grammatical in Hittite, but highly marked pragmatically) puts the topic of the story (the deer) in the prominent first position, and separation of ‘his limbs’ from the preverbs and verb ‘pushed away’ has an iconic effect. But example B follows two other clauses about *the mountain*, and fronting of the object ‘the deer’ (as in the Hurrian) would have had the odd effect of focusing on ‘the deer’ (“The mountain cursed back at *the deer*”), as if some other target were in question.

The ungrammatical fronting in F, when combined with the grammatical fronting in C, which in the text follows F immediately, preserves the contrastive parallelism of the Hurrian V (O) S order: fell deer hunters/take (it) fowlers = ‘Let the hunters *fell* the deer, but let the fowlers *take* it!’. Note that the fronting in C is grammatical in Hittite only because the clause involves a clitic direct object pronoun, not a full noun. The translator obviously felt that at this dramatic highpoint of the story maintaining the charged effect of the Hurrian word order was worth the cost of ungrammaticality in the Hittite of F.

The ungrammatical fronting in E imitating the Hurrian produces a chiasmus with the following clause (a rhetorical device well-attested in Hittite): *arḥa dālešten apāt uttar / nu=šmaš tamai uttar memiškemi* “Leave aside that story! To you another story I will tell.”

4.2 Sovereignty of the Translator

Before suggesting a second motivation for the translator’s choice of when to follow or not follow the Hurrian word order, I must underscore the sovereignty with which the translator treats the Hurrian original. That is, he freely chooses to omit features of the original text *and* to add things that are nowhere in the Hurrian. For the examples I refer readers to the appendix with the complete text glossed word-by-word. In clauses §§1, 2, 7, 12, and 25 the translator has fronted the Hittite preverbs or not, according to his wishes (Hurrian has no such category, since such modifications of the sense of the verb are expressed by affixes). Clause §3 *n=aš warkešta* ‘he became fat’ in the Hittite has no equivalent in the Hurrian. In §§7 and 9 the translator varied the Hittite word order versus the Hurrian. In §§12, 14, and 25 the specification *āppa* ‘back, in return’ is not in the Hurrian. The translator has used in §14 a rhetorical yes/no question ‘Is the deer cursing me back?’ instead of translating Hurrian *iyat* ‘why?’. He has also in the same sentence added the contrastive (but here mostly rhetorical) *kinuna* ‘now’. In §19 he has focused on ‘not’, rather than ‘deer’, although focusing on ‘deer’ would have imitated the Hurrian word order with a natural Hittite word order! Finally, in §28 the translator repeats the noun *uttar*, while the Hurrian text merely says ‘another’. The Hittite does not attempt to reproduce the volitional sense of the Hurrian “I want to tell you another story,” but underscores ‘begin to speak’ (see Neu 1996: 123).

4.3 Demands of Meter?

Since many of the omissions and additions just cited are difficult to motivate purely in terms of rhetorical effects, I wish to suggest with all due caution another possible motivation for the translator’s varying choices: the requirements of the meter. For Hittite stress-based meter (four stresses to a line consisting of two cola) precisely in Hurrian translation literature (SÌR, i.e. Hittite *išḥamāi-* ‘song’) see McNeil 1963, Durnford 1971, and Melchert 1998. Such a metrical reading of most of the present parable is *possible*.³ I present the parable in a tentative scansion, with | between stress units and || separating the cola:

³ Bachvarova (forthcoming) also assumes that the Hittite version of the “Song of Release” is in the same metrical form as the other Hurro-Hittite “songs” (SÌR), but the fact that her scansions do not always match mine betrays the uncertainty of the metrical analysis.

1. *aliyan[an]=za | apel tuēgga[š=šaš] || HUR.SAG-aš | awan arḥa šuwēt*
2. *nu=šš[an] aliyaš | parā || tamēdani HUR.SAG-i | pa[it]*
3. *n=aš warkešta | n=aš šūllēt || nu «āppa» HUR.SAG-an | ḥurzakewan daiš*
4. *wešiyaḥhari | kuedani HUR.SAG-i || mān=an paḥḥuenanza | arḥa warnuzi*
5. ^dIM-aš=man=an | walaḥzi || paḥḥuenanza=man=an | arḥa warnuzi
6. HUR.SAG-aš=a¹⁴ maḥḥan | ištamašta || nu=šši=kan ŠÀ=ŠU anda | ištarakkiat
7. *nu HUR.SAG-aš | aliyanan || āppa | ḥuwarzašta*
8. *aliyanan kuin | warganunun || kinuna=mu | āppa ḥurzakezi*
9. *peššiyandu=ya=an | aliyanan | LÚ.MEŠ ŠĀIDUTIM*
10. *dāndu=ma=an | LÚ.MEŠ MUŠEN.DÙ-TIM (can be a two-word phrase)*
11. *UZUĪ | LÚ.MEŠ ŠĀIDUTIM | dandu*
12. *KUŠ=ma | LÚ.MEŠ MUŠEN.DÙ-TIM | dandu*
13. *ŪL=ma | aliyanaš || nu antuwaḥḥaš | apāš LÚ-aš*
14. *apel=kan URU-az | kuiš || arḥa | ḥuwaiš*
15. *n=ašta tamēdani KUR-ya | āraš || man=aš | šūllet*
16. *nu=ššan EGIR-pa | URU-ri || idālu | takkiškewan daiš*
17. *URU-yaš=an | DINGIR.MEŠ || ḥuwartan | ḥarkanzi*
18. *arḥa dālešten | apāt uttar || nu=šmaš tamai uttar | memiškemi*
19. *ḥatreššar | ištamaš[ket]en || ḥattātar=ma=šmaš | memiškemi*

Most of the lines of the parable may be scanned in the known meter according to already established rules.⁵ I mention some of them here: (1) attributive adjectives and dependent genitives may be counted as a single stress unit with their head noun (*tamēdani HUR.SAG-i* and *apel tuēgga[š=šaš]*) or not (*URU-yaš=an | DINGIR.MEŠ*); (2) likewise preverbs that immediately precede the finite verb may count as one stress unit with the verb (*āppa ḥurzakezi*) or not (*āppa | ḥuwarzašta*); (3) the “supine” plus following *dai-* ‘set’ in the sense ‘begin to X’ can be counted as a single stress unit or not (*takkiškewan daiš* above versus *memiškeuan | daiš* in line 8 of the second parable discussed below); (4) contra Melchert

⁴ The manuscript has HURSAG-aš-ša with the incorrect geminating conjunction ‘also’, which is impossible in the context. The original clearly had the non-geminating -a marking change of topic.

⁵ See Kloekhorst (2011: 168-74) for arguments that in at least some cases of “phrasal stress” it was the first constituent whose word stress was lost or reduced, while the last constituent retained it.

(1998: 486-7) there is also flexibility in whether subordinating conjunctions count as independent stressed units or not (*man=aš* | *šūllet* versus *mān=an pahhuenanza*).⁶

Metrical demands can explain immediately several of the otherwise unmotivated additions of the translator cited above. His expansion of *šūllet* ‘became insolent’ (= Hurrian *wu-ú-ru te-e-lu tap-šu-ú*) into two clauses *n=aš warkešta n=aš šūllēt* ‘He became fat and insolent’ in line 3 versus *man=aš šūllet* in line 15, where he made no such change, may be directly attributed to the need for an extra half-line in the first instance, but not the second. Further, the addition of *āppa* ‘back (at)’ in line 7, which fits the context, but is by no means required and is lacking in the Hurrian, may reflect the need for one more stressed word in the second half line. Finally, the repetitive *nu antuwaḥḥaš apāš LÚ-aš* ‘It is a person. It is that man (who ran away from his own city)’, where merely *apāš LÚ-aš* would have been sufficient, likewise was needed to fill the second half-line in line 13.

I must also openly concede that two passages in the parable do not fit the four-stress, two-cola meter. The first of these is the second half of line 3, which contains one too many stressed units. It is clear that preverbs separated from their verb must count as a stress unit, so that one cannot “save” the meter by reading *āppa* ḪUR.SAG-*an* as a single stress unit (which also makes no sense syntactically). However, I believe that there is an independent reason to take the presence of *āppa* here as a mistake of the copyist, who wrongly repeated the preverb from lines 7 and 8, where it makes sense. It was the presence of *āppa* in line 3 that misled Neu (1996: 75) into assuming that the deer was cursing the former mountain, but as noted by Hoffner (1968: 69), following Wilhelm and Beckman, this makes no sense in the context. It is the *new* mountain, who has treated the deer well, whom the ungrateful deer curses. Since the deer’s initial curse is precisely

⁶ The argument I made there for a change from OH unaccented *mān* ‘when(ever); if’ to later accented *mān* was based on a misunderstanding of the syntax of the contrastive focus conjunction *-ma* (likewise that of Kloekhorst 2011: 162). As suggested by its long vowel, *mān* was surely accented in ordinary speech at all periods. In OH only individual words could receive contrastive focus, hence *-ma* was never attached to a subordinating conjunction. Later, however, by a reanalysis whole clauses could be focused (see Rieken 2000: 414ff.) and in this case *-ma* unsurprisingly was attached to the initial word, including a subordinating conjunction. Thus we expect *mān* to count as stressed metrically, and it is the cases where it does not that require explanation. The likely basis for these is that the closely related *maḥḥan* was probably not (fully) stressed when in non-initial position (a frequent occurrence, but a much less common alternative for *mān* in the sense ‘when, if’), and this option was exploited for both conjunctions in poetic texts, in initial as well as non-initial position. Once again (see Melchert 1998 at length) “phrasal stress” is artificially extended in poetry versus prose.

unmotivated, it cannot be cursing ‘back’. This sense fits only the return curse by the mountain. I therefore feel justified in deleting *āppa* from line 3, which also restores correct meter.⁷

No such explanation, however, can account for the very different structure of lines 9-12, which simply cannot be made to fit the 2:2 metrical scheme. It is true that we do not know for sure whether ‘hunter’ and ‘fowler’ were single words or two-word phrases. In the latter case, they would be metrically flexible, counting as either one or two stresses. This means that lines 9, 11 and 12 could contain four stressed words, but this is impossible for line 10. In any case, even if we attributed four stresses to lines 11 and 12, they would not divide sensibly into two cola (the caesura would fall in the middle of the noun phrases for ‘hunter’ and ‘fowler’). I see no reasonable way to scan these lines except as containing three stresses, with the proviso that ‘fowler’ was in fact a two-word phrase that could count as two stresses in line 10, but only one in line 12. Why would these four lines not conform to the meter of the rest? In the oral presentation of this paper, I very tentatively suggested that, because this curse by the mountain is the climax of the entire story, the translator wished to highlight it precisely by a different metrical pattern, and one that was perhaps also closer to the original Hurrian.

Reexamination of only selected portions of the Song of Ullikummi points to a different result. While most of the Ullikummi text can be scanned as four-stress lines of (2:2) with a caesura, some lines simply cannot be so read. Furthermore, their structure is of a very particular kind

(Ullikummi, First Tablet, Copy C, KUB 33.102+ ii 7-11; Güterbock 1951: 149)

kuwat=wa | É-ri IGI-anda || ka[rtimmiy]auwanza | uet

nu=wa É-er | katkatte[(maš | ē)]pta

SAG.GEME.ÌR.MEŠ=ya | *naḥšaraza | ē[(pta)]*

[(t)]uk=wa IGI-anda | ^{GIŠ}ERIN-pi || kar[(ū | duwa)]rnan

⁷ Allowing ourselves the option of emending the received text, on the basis that we are dealing with copies, obviously adds an undesirable element of arbitrariness. However, even a cursory glance at the text of the Song of Ullikummi (for which see Güterbock 1951-2) confirms that such errors are plentiful. Version A (KUB 17.7+ i 8) of the First Tablet reads: *nu ^dU-ni :tarpanallin šallanu[(škezzi)]*, which is metrically short by one stress. Version B (KUB 33.98+:7-8) has correctly: *nu ^dU-ni | menaḥḥanda || :tarpanallin | šallanuškezzi* “He is raising a rebel against the Storm-god” (Güterbock 1951: 147). If we did not happen to have the second copy, we would have had some hesitation in emending the first. In the next two lines (A i 9-10 = B 9-10), the text of A is too short, while that in B is too long. We can cautiously reconstruct a metrically correct version from the two, but we must openly concede that we *are* reconstructing.

“Why did you come in anger against (my) house,
so that trembling seized the house,
and fear seized the servants?

For you the cedar has already been broken.”

The first and fourth lines quoted are in the standard meter, but just as for our curse passage in the parable, the second and third lines can only be scanned as short lines with three stresses and no caesura. Readers will also immediately notice the other shared feature: in both cases we are facing overtly *contrastive* structures with three constituents: subject, object, and verb. Lines 11 and 12 of our curse match exactly the lines from Ullikummi: both show O S V word order, with contrasting subject and object, but a shared verb. The larger context of the Ullikummi passage shows that it is this contrastive structure that is defining, since one cannot speak of a climax in the narrative.⁸

It is not difficult to find further confirmation of this pattern. It occurs again in Kumarbi’s command regarding Ullikummi (KUB 17.7+ iii 15-16; Güterbock 1951: 156):

INA UD.1.KAM=war=aš | AMMADU | pargauēškaddaru

INA ITU.1.KAM=ma=war=aš | IKU-an | pargauēš[kadd]aru

“In one day let him grow an ell, but in one month let him grow an IKU.”⁹

I therefore conclude that the Hittite “epic meter” did not consist strictly of uniform lines with four stresses and a caesura, but also included shorter lines of three stresses used at least for contrastive structures (perhaps also for other purposes). In our parable the contrastive structure clearly is taken from the Hurrian original, but if the latter is itself metrical, the

⁸ Anyone familiar with the opening of the Telipinu myth can hardly resist comparing the first Ullikummi passage cited above with KUB 17.10 i 5: ^{GIŠ}*luttāuš kammarāš IŠBAT É-er tuḫḫuiš [IŠBAT]* “Mist seized the windows; smoke seized the house” (likewise with O S V word order). Whether some mythical passages based on Hattic originals are metrical is a question that cannot be addressed here.

⁹ For still another example see KUB 17.7+ iv 49-50 (Güterbock 1951: 161): *[(a)]šanna=šši | ^{GIŠ}ŠÚ.A-an | tiyandu # adanna=ma=šši | ^{GIŠ}BANŠUR-un | unuwa[n]du* “Let them place a chair for him to sit; let them adorn a table for him to eat.”

pattern must be a different one, since the Hurrian lines appear to show a 3:2:3:2 pattern (see §§15-18 in the appendix).¹⁰

In Melchert (2007: 124-7), following Francia (2004), I very tentatively suggested that certain portions of the Hittite ritual of Iriya reflect an oral tradition and also may be scanned metrically. While the first five putative verse lines scanned nicely in the standard 2:2 pattern, I had to concede serious difficulties in imposing this scheme on the remaining lines. I was not then aware of the three-stress pattern in contrastive sets just described. I repeat here the composite text of those lines reconstructed from the two extant versions (see Melchert 2007 for details), now scanned as lines of three stresses:¹¹

GIŠ-*ru* | *apēl*^{GIŠ} *KAPAR*<*R*>*U* | *arḥa iškallāi*

waršīmaš=at | *apēl=pat mīyaš* | *išḥāi*

aliyanan=kan | *aliyanzinaš apēl=pat mīyaš* | *kuenzi*

[]*x=kan* | *wēš=pat* | *kuennumēni*

iyawan išḥaḥru | *pangauwaš EME-an* | [*anda išḥiy*]*aweni*

n=at karuwiliyaš | *DINGIR.MEŠ-aš* | *piyaweni*

n=at=kan GAM-anda | *GE₆-i KI-i* | *pēdanzi*

“Its own crown tears apart the tree. Firewood, its own outgrowth, binds it. The *aliyanzina-*, its own offspring, kills the deer. *We* will kill []. We will bind the *i.*, tears, and slander (lit. tongue of the community). We will give/send them to the ancient gods, and they will carry them down to the dark earth.”

The first three lines cite instances from nature where something subordinate to or dependent on something else unexpectedly turns on and harms the latter. Note once again the contrastive fronting of the NP objects in the first and third sentences and the parallel, but nevertheless contrastive verbs. In good Indo-European fashion, these truisms are cited in order to assure

¹⁰ By the analysis of Bachvarova (forthcoming), the Hurrian curse scans 2:3 2:3, clearly also distinct from the usual 2:2 of the rest of the parable. So that the marked Hittite pattern would be matched by one in the Hurrian, although the implementation would differ.

¹¹ The only line where there is any problem with such a scansion is the fifth. If the obscure word *iyawan* is a noun for some evil, as it appears to be, it is questionable whether it can be scanned as one stress with *išḥaḥru* ‘tears’. However, as discussed in Melchert (2007: 121), the list of evils here is a canonical, but highly flexible one, with various expansions and alternatives. The attested version in our text may easily have been altered by a copyist with no sense that the passage is in verse.

that the following aims are achieved, which are likewise contrastive in that the agency of the actions has changed to that of the speakers—marked by the focus particle: *wēš=pat* ‘we (and no one else)’.

I therefore conclude that the three-stress line used for contrastive structures is native Hittite, just like the four-stress line with caesura (on the latter in the “Song of Nesa” see Melchert 1998: 492-3). That Hittite “strophic” meter might combine longer and shorter lines is hardly surprising (see the remarks of Watkins 1995: 255ff. and *passim* on such patterns elsewhere in Indo-European verse). What clearly *is* modeled on the Hurrian is the V O S of *peššiyandu=ya=an | aliyanan | ^{LÚ.MEŠ}ŠĀIDUTIM*. I reiterate that this line (= example F above in section 3) is one of the most ungrammatical sentences in the entire Hittite text, suggesting that the translator in fact was at pains in this passage to imitate the Hurrian very closely.

A complete review of the metrical status of the “Song of Release” cannot be undertaken here. However, it does seem reasonable to test the claim of metricality on at least one more of the parables. I therefore offer a similar tentative scanned version of the parable of the coppersmith and the cup (KBo 32.14 ii 42 – iii 5; Neu 1998: 81-83):

1. *teššummin | ^{LÚ}SIMUG || walliyanni | lāḫuš*
2. *lāḫuš=an | tiššāit || n=an šuppišduwarit | daiš*
3. *n=an gulašta | nu=šši=šta maišti || anda | lālukkišnut*
4. *lāḫuš=ma=an kuiš | n=an āppa || marlānza URUDU-aš | ḫurzakewan daiš*
5. *mān=wa=mu | lāḫuš kuiš || man=wa=šši=kan kiššaraš | arḫa duwarnattari*
6. *kunnaš=man=wa=šši=kan | išḫunaūš || arḫa | wišūriyattari*
7. *maḫḫan ^{LÚ}SIMUG | ištamašta || nu=šši=šta ŠĀ=ŠU anda | ištarakkiat*
8. *nu=za ^{LÚ}SIMUG | PANI ŠĀ=ŠU || memiškeuan | daiš*
9. *kuwat=wa | URUDU-an kuin || lāḫun | nu=wa=mu āppa ḫūrzaeki*
10. *teššummi=ya | ^{LÚ}SIMUG || ḫūrtāin | tet*
11. *walaḫdu=ya=an | ^dIŠKUR-aš | teššummin*
12. *nu=šši šuppišduwariuš | arḫa | šakkuriēd<du>*
13. *teššummiš=kan | anda amiyari | maušdu*
14. *šuppišduwariyēš=ma=kan | anda ÍD-i | muwāntaru*
15. *ŪL=ma | teššummiš || nu antuwaḫḫaš | apāš DUMU=ŠU*
16. *ANA ABI=ŠU | kuiš || menaḫḫanta | kūrur*
17. *šallešta=aš | n=aš mēani || āraš | n=ašta namma*
18. *attaš=šan | anda || ŪL | aušzi*

19. ŠA ABI=ŠU DINGIR.MEŠ | *kuin* || *ḫurwartaṅ* | *ḫarkaṅzi*

“A coppersmith cast a cup for glory. He cast it, he shaped it, and he set it with decorations. He engraved it and made (the decorations) shine on it in brilliance. But then the foolish cup began to curse back at the one who had cast it: ‘Would that the hand of the one who cast me be broken off! Would that his right arm muscle be shriveled!’ When the coppersmith heard, he became sick in his heart, and the coppersmith began to speak to himself: ‘Why does the cup that I cast curse back at me?’ The coppersmith also said a curse on the cup: ‘Let the Storm-god strike it, the cup! Let him knock off the decorations from it! Let the cup fall into a canal, but let the decorations fall into a river!’ It is not a cup. It is a person. It is that son who was hostile to his father. He grew and reached maturity and no longer regarded his father. The gods of his father hold him accursed.”

Most of this parable can also be scanned in the recognized four-stress, two-cola meter, but one must not gloss over certain difficulties. First, several of the caesura are in rather awkward places vis-à-vis the clause boundaries: in lines 3, 4, and 17 as scanned, the caesura is in the middle of the second of the two clauses. One must either accept this unusual mismatch between metrical boundary and clause boundary or suppose that the caesura is irregularly after the first stress unit, thus giving a 1:3 line. In line 9 the caesura comes in the middle of the relative clause. While this is likewise surprising, I note that the same thing occurs in the comparable passage of the very similarly constructed parable about the builder and the tower (KBo 32.14 rev. 45; Neu 1996: 91): *kuwat* | *wetenun* || *kuin kuttan* | *nu=mu ḫūrzaḳezi* “Why is the wall I built cursing me?”. Once again the alternative is to allow for 1:3 division of the two cola.

Lines 17-18 also show enjambment, in that the opening phrase *n=ašta namma* of the clause *n=ašta namma attāš=šan anda ŪL aušzi* ‘he no longer regards his father’ is separated from the rest and metrically assigned to the preceding verse line. As shown by Dunkel (1996), some forms of enjambment are compatible with oral composition, and the present case of what he terms “necessary” enjambment is among them. One may further note that the fronting of *namma* of the phrase *natta (ŪL) namma* ‘no longer’ suggests that it was highlighted, so its being given further prominence by being enjambed is not out of order. Nevertheless, the need to appeal to such measures to explain away exceptions to the basic 2:2 pattern inevitably casts some doubt on the overall metrical analysis.

Be that as it may, some additional support *for* the metrical scansion comes from the fact that we find the very same exceptional three-stress pattern in the curse of the coppersmith

that we met in the curse by the mountain in the first parable. Lines 13 and 14 show the same contrastive structure discussed earlier, with contrasting subject and object and a shared verb. Line 11, *walaḥdu=ya=an* | ^dIŠKUR-aš | *teššummin* ‘Let the Storm-god strike the cup!’, can also only be read as three stressed words, and this is the most likely reading of line 12, *nu=šši šuppišduwariuš* | *arḥa* | *šakkuriēd<du>* ‘Let him knock off the decorations from it!’ (although the preverb and verb could in principle be read as one stress unit). Note further the same ungrammatical use of additive focus *-ya-* in the fronting of *walaḥdu* in line 11. Once again this appears to be an attempt to motivate the otherwise ungrammatical fronting of the verb without focus. In this case, however, the translator *did* at least achieve grammatical Hittite word order by not following the V O S of the Hurrian model (*i-ti₇-ie ka-a-zi Te-eš-šu-u-pa-aš*) and using V S O. While it is mildly surprising that the fronted preverb *anda* would form a stress unit with the *following* dative-locatives *amiyari* and *ÍD-i*, this is at least far more plausible than preverb plus accusative in the putative *āppa* ḪUR.SAG-*an* in line 3 of the first parable (see above for other reasons to regard this example as an error). And we find this same three-stress line likewise in the curse of the builder against the ungrateful tower (KBo 32.14 rev. 46; Neu 1996: 91), as well as the same ungrammatical use of additive focus *-ya-*: *walaḥdu=ya=an* ^dIŠKUR-aš AN.ZA.GÀR “Let the Storm-god strike it, the tower!”. Note, however, that lines 11 and 12 in the second parable are not contrastive, though they undeniably represent a dramatic turn from the preceding narrative. The functional role of the three-stress line requires further study.

Only a far more thorough investigation of the possible metrical structure of the “Song of Release” can affirm or deny the suggestion made here that metrical considerations played a role in the Hittite translator’s decisions regarding whether to follow the Hurrian word order and whether to insert new material into the text that is lacking in the Hurrian version. I do hope to have shown that the translator by no means followed the Hurrian model slavishly, but made careful and conscious choices, whether or not we can discern the motivations in every instance.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Bachvarova, Mary. forthcoming: “The Meter of Hurrian Narrative Song”. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*.

- Bauer, Anna. 2011: "Verberststellung im Hethitischen". In *Indogermanistik und Linguistik im Dialog. Akten der XIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft* (21. bis 27. September 2008 in Salzburg), ed. T. Krisch and T. Lindner. Wiesbaden, 39-48.
- Dunkel, George. 1996: "The Relative Stylistic Orality of Plautus and Terence, as Measured by Enjambment-Types; with Remarks on Enjambment in Literary Saturnians and Menander". *Die Sprache* 38, 201-212.
- Durnford, Stephen P. B. 1971: "Some Evidence for Syntactic Stress in Hittite". *Anatolian Studies* 21, 69-75.
- Francia, Rita. 2004: "'Montagne grandi (e) piccole, (sapete) perchè sono venuto?' (in margine a due recitative del Rituale di Iriya CTH 400-401)". *Orientalia* 73, 390-408.
- Garrett, Andrew. 1994: "Relative Clause Syntax in Lycian and Hittite". *Die Sprache* 36, 29-69.
- Goedegebuure, Petra. 2010: "Deictic-Emphatic -i and the Anatolian Demonstratives". In *Ex Anatolia Lux. Anatolian and Indo-European studies in honor of H. Craig Melchert on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*, ed. R. Kim, N. Oettinger, E. Rieken, and M. Weiss. Ann Arbor/New York, 55-67.
- Güterbock, Hans G. 1951-2: "The Song of Ullikummi. Revised Text of the Hittite Version of a Hurrian Myth". *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 5, 135-61, 6, 8-42.
- Hoffner, Harry A. Jr. 1997: *The Laws of the Hittites*. Leiden/New York/Köln.
 ——. 1998: *Hittite Myths*. Second edition. Atlanta.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin. 2011: "Accentuation and Poetic Meter in Hittite". In *Hethitische Literatur. Überlieferungsprozesse, Textstrukturen, Ausdrucksformen, und Nachwirken. Akten des Symposiums vom 18. bis 20. Februar 2010 in Bonn*, ed. by M. Hutter and S. Hutter-Braunsar. Münster, 157-176.
- McNeil, I. 1963: "The Metre of the Hittite Epic". *Anatolian Studies* 13, 237-242.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1998: "Poetic Meter and Phrasal Stress in Hittite". In *Mir Curad. Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*, ed. J. Jasanoff, H. C. Melchert, and L. Oliver. Innsbruck, 483-494.
- . 2007: "New Light on Hittite Verse and Meter?". In *Proceedings of the 18th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference. Los Angeles. November 3-4, 2006*, ed. by K. Jones-Bley et al. Washington DC, 117-128.
- Neu, Erich. 1996: *Das hurritische Epos der Freilassung I. Untersuchungen zu einem hurritisch-hethitischen Textensemble aus Ḫattuša*. Wiesbaden.

- Rieken, Elisabeth. 2000: "Die Partikeln *-a*, *-ja*, *-ma* im Althethischen und das Akkadogram *Ù*". In *125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz*, ed. M. Ofitsch and C. Zinko. Graz, 411-419.
- . 2011: "Verberststellung in hethitischen Übersetzungstexten". In *Indogermanistik und Linguistik im Dialog. Akten der XIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft* (21. bis 27. September 2008 in Salzburg), ed. T. Krisch and T. Lindner. Wiesbaden, 498-507.
- Rizza, Alfredo. 2007: *I pronomi enclitici nei testi etei di traduzione dal hattico*. Pavia.
- Salisbury, Donna. 1999: "*anda* and *andan* in Neo-Hittite". *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 51, 61-72.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1995. *How to Kill a Dragon. Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*. New York/Oxford.
- Wilhelm, Gernot. 2001: "D. Epische Texte. Das hurritisch-hethitische 'Lied der Freilassung'". In *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments. Ergänzungslieferung*, ed. M. Dietrich et al. Gütersloh, 82-91.

Appendix

Parable of the Ungrateful Deer (KBo 32.14 i 1-25//ii 1-25; Neu 1996: 74-77) [clauses numbered per the Hittite]

§1 ‘A mountain drove away a deer from its body.’

Hu *na-a-li i-te-[e]-i-né-eš pa-pa-an-ni-iš me-la-aḫ-ḫu-um*
 deer from body mountain (erg.) drove away

Hi *aliyan[an]=za apel tuēgga[š=šaš] ḪUR.SAG-aš awan arḫa šuwēt*
 deer=refl. his limbs (D-LPI) mountain away pushed

§2 ‘The deer went over to another mountain.’

Hu *na-a-li u-ul-bi-i-ni pa-pa-an-ni ḫa-pa-a-na-ab*
 deer another mountain went to

Hi *nu=šš[an] aliyaš parā tamēdani ḪUR.SAG-i pa[it]*
 conj.=part. deer forth to another mountain went

§§3-4 ‘He grew fat and insolent.’ (Hittite version!)

Hu *wu_i-ú-ru [t]e-e-lu tap-šu-ú*
 (very unclear; see Neu 1996: 103; but equivalent only to second Hittite clause)

Hi *n=aš wargešta n=aš šüllēt*
 conj.=he grew fat conj.=he became insolent

§5 ‘It began to curse «back at» the mountain.’

Hu *pa-pa-an-ni šī-ta-ri-il-lu-um*
 mountain began to curse

Hi *nu «āppa» ḪUR.SAG-an ḫurzakewan daiš*
 conj. «back» mountain to cursing set

§§6-7 ‘Would that a fire burn up the mountain on which I am grazing!’

Hu *a-a-i na-ú-ni-i-e pa-a-pa-an-ni a-me-la-a-an-ni ta-a-ar-re-eš*
 if of grazing[?] mountain may burn fire (erg.)

Hi *wešiyahḫari kuedani ḪUR.SAG-i mān=an pahḫuenanza arḫa warnuzi*
 I am grazing on which mountain opt.=it fire burn up

§8 ‘Would that the Storm-god strike it!’

Hu *i-ti-la-a-an-ni Te-eš-u-up-pa-aš*
 may strike Teššub

Hi ^dIM-*aš=man=an walaḫzi*
 Storm-god=opt.=it strike

§9 ‘Would that a fire burn it up!’

Hu *a-me-la-a-an-ni ta-a-ar-ri-iš*
 may strike fire (erg.)

Hi *paḫḫuenanza=man=an arḫa warnuzi*
 fire=opt.=it burn up

§§10-11 ‘When the mountain heard (thus), it became sick in its heart.’

Hu *pa-pa-a-ni ḫa-a-ši-i-ma-i pa-a-ru iš-ta-ni-i-ta*
 mountain having heard became ill inside

Hi ḪUR.SAG-*aš=a¹ maḫḫan ištamašta nu=šši=kan ŠÀ=ŠU anda ištarakkiat*
 mountain=conj. when heard conj.=him=part. heart in became ill

§12 ‘The mountain cursed back at the deer.’ (Hittite version!)

Hu *na-a-li pa-pa-an-ni-iš ši-ta-ar-na ku-lu-u-ru-um*
 deer mountain (erg.) curses kept saying

Hi *nu ḪUR.SAG-aš aliyanan āppa ḫuwarzašta*
 conj. mountain deer back cursed

§§13-14 ‘Is the deer that I made fat now cursing back at me?’ (Hittite version!)

Hu *i-ya-a-at še-e-du-i-li-ya-ni-iš ši-ta-a-ra na-a-al-li-iš*
 why fattened curses deer

Hi *aliyanan kuin warganunun kinuna=mu āppa ḫurzakezi*
 deer whom I made fat now=me back is cursing

§15 ‘Let the hunters fell the deer!’

Hu *ku-ut-te na-a-li ke-e-bi-il-la-a-šu-uš*
 shall fell deer hunters (erg.)

Hi *peššiyandu=ya=an aliyanan^{LÚ.MEŠ} ŠĀIDUTIM*
 let fell=**also**(!)=him deer hunters

§16 ‘But let the fowlers take him.’

Hu *ḫa-a-i-te ka-re-e-na-šu-uš*
let take fowlers (erg.)

Hi *dāndu=ma=an^{LÚ.MEŠ} MUŠEN.DÙ-TIM*
let take=but=him fowlers

§17 Let the hunters take the flesh/fat.’

Hu *ḫa-a-i-te-en₆ a-a-še [k]i-bé-e-il-la-šu-uš*
shall take (jussive) flesh hunters (erg.)

Hi *UZU¹ LÚ.MEŠ ŠĀIDUTIM dandu*
flesh hunters let take

§18 ‘But let the fowlers take the hide.’

Hu *a-aš-ḫi-i-ma ga-re-e-na-šu-uš*
hide=conj. fowlers (erg.)

Hi *KUŠ=ma^{LÚ.MEŠ} MUŠEN.DÙ-TIM dandu*
hide=conj. fowlers let take

§§19-20 ‘It is *not* a deer. It is a person.’ (emphasis in Hittite!)

Hu *[n]a-a-li ma-a-an-nu-u-bur ma-a-an-ni tar-šu-wa-a-ni*
deer is not is person/human

Hi *ŪL=ma aliyanaš nu antuwaḫḫaš*
not=conj. deer conj. person

§§21-22 ‘It is that man who ran away from his city.’

Hu *an-ti ta-a-ḫi ma-a-an-ni a-ar-ti-i-ta-ni [t]ù-ú-ri*
that man (it) is his city abandoned(?)

Hi *apāš LÚ-aš apel=kan URU-az kuiš arḫa ḫuwaiš*
that man his=part. from city who away ran

§23 ‘He arrived in another land.’

Hu *u-ul-wi₇-ne-e-ma a-am-mi-i-ib u-um-mi-in-ni*
another=conj. reached land

Hi *n=ašta tamēdani KUR-ya āraš*

conj.=part. another land arrived

§24 ‘He would become insolent’ (sought to become)

Hu *wu_i-ú-ru [t]e-e-lu tap-šu-ú*

(very unclear; see §§3-4 above)

Hi *man=aš šūllet*

opt.=he became insolent

§25 ‘He began to do evil to the city in return.’

Hu *a-ar-ti-i-ma a-ma-ri-il-lu-u-um*

city began to mistreat

Hi *nu=ššan EGIR-pa URU-ri idālu takkiškewan daiš*

conj.=part. back to city evil to doing set

§26 ‘The gods of the city hold him accursed.’ (for this reading see Neu 1996: 120 w/ note)

Hu *a-ar-ti-bi-né-eš e-ne-eš ši-ti-la-a-i*

of city gods having cursed

Hi *URU-yaš=an DINGIR.MEŠ huwartan harkanzi*

of city=him gods cursed hold

§27 ‘Leave aside that story!’ (Hittite lit. ‘word, matter’)

Hu *ku-u-le-eš an-ti ti-i-ib-ša-a-ri*

leave aside(modal) that story (or sim.)

Hi *arḥa dālešten apāt uttar*

away let (Imv2Pl) that word/matter

§28 ‘I will tell you another story!’ (Hittite lit. ‘word, matter’)

Hu *u-la-ab-wa_a ka₄-du-ul-li*

another=you(pl.) I want to tell

Hi *nu=šmaš tamai uttar memiškemi*

conj.=you(p.) other word I speak

§29 ‘Listen to my message!’

Hu *a-mu-u-ma-a-ap šal-ḥu-u-la*

message=you(pl.) listen!

Hi *ḫatreššar ištamaš[ket]en*
 message listen! (Imv2Pl)

§30 ‘I will tell you (a piece of) *wisdom*.’ (emphasis in Hittite)

Hu *ma-ta-a-ap-pa ka₄-du-ul-li*
 wisdom=you(pl.) I want to tell

Hi *ḫattātar=ma=šmaš memiškemi*
 wisdom=conj.=you(pl.) I speak