LA LANGUE POÉTIQUE
INDO-EUROPÉENNE

*Actes du Colloque de travail
de la Société des Études Indo-Européennes
(Indogermanische Gesellschaft/
Society for Indo-European Studies)*

Paris, 22-24 octobre 2003

édités par Georges-Jean PINAULT et Daniel PETIT

INDO-EUROPEAN VERBAL ART IN LUVIAN

H. Craig MELCHERT
(University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill)

The misconception that Hittite as a literary or chancellery language was opposed to Luvian as a spoken or vernacular language[1] still persists[2]. As to spoken language, we must admit frankly that we actually know almost nothing of the true sociolinguistic situation in Anatolia during the middle of the second millennium BCE. Aside from a handful of letters and economic documents in Hieroglyphic Luvian and fragments of letters in Cuneiform Luvian, the extant written evidence for Luvian no more reflects colloquial speech than the bulk of our Hittite texts.

As already discussed by Watkins (1986: 61 and in more detail 1995: 144-151 and 335-339), CLuvian cultic and ritual texts show extensive evidence of formulaic language[3]. As first appreciated by Cancik (2002), HLuvian dedicatory inscriptions with their often extended historical narratives also represent carefully crafted texts. The language of both traditions reflects the deliberate and conscious use of a wide range of rhetorical devices that serve to organize a composition and heighten its communicative or performative power. Some of these devices belong to the established repertoire of Indo-European poetic language. Whether or not one wishes to apply the label « literary » or « poetic » to any of our Luvian texts, they unquestionably deserve to be recognized as examples of verbal art.

As a first example from HLuvian we may take the SÜDBURG inscription of King Suppiluliuma II from Hattusa, a composition of the late 13th century BCE[4]:

§1   *HATTI* REGIO *430 REL+*ra/i* *416-*wa/i-ní* INFRA *á-ka*
        Hatti   land   all   when/as to might   sub-   -jected
§2   VITIS *ta-mi-na   ma-sa₅ lu-ka   i(a)-ku-na*   *502.*300
        W.   Tamina Masa Lukka Ikuna   ____-ed
        MAGNUS.REX |FRO]NS-*zi/a*   PRAE
        great kings (dat.) prior (dat.)   before
§3   CRUS-*nú-pa*   PURUS.FONS-*ma*ₓ   MAGNUS.REX   HEROS   DEUS *430...
        now--but   Suppiluliuma   great king (dat.) hero   gods   all

---

1. E.g. Rosenkranz (1938: 382) or Bossert (1944: 5).
2. Cf. Puhvel (1994: 262).
3. I cannot pursue here the further issue explored by Watkins (1986: 60-62) and Eichner (1993: 106-111) that some CLuvian passages may represent metrical verse.
4. Text after Hawkins (1995:22) with revisions.

su-na-sa-ti CRUS
w/favor　　　stood
(plus 14 more narrative clauses)

§18　*zi/a+a-ti* DEUS.*202*　　*a-pa-ti* ANNUS *i(a)-zi/a*
here　　divine-earth-road　that year (loc.)　made
« When I subjected all the land(s) of Hatti to might—
Wiyanawanda, Tamina, Masa, Lukka, and Ikuna __ ed[5] in the face of prior
great kings, but now for Suppiluliuma the Great King all the gods [list
follows] stood with favor...(14 further narrative clauses)
—here a Divine Earth Road in that year I made. »

In his first edition of this inscription Hawkins (1995: 26 and 45) argued
that the initial temporal subordinate clause was resumed by the final clause
of the text. The claim that the nexus between the two clauses could be
sustained over fourteen intervening clauses seems at first sight extra-
ordinary, but Hawkins correctly cited a more modest parallel from
KARKAMIŠ A11 *b+c*[6]:

§7　*a-wa/i*　　|REL-*a-ti-i*　|(ANNUS)*u-si-i*　*ka-wa/i-za-na*(URBS)
conj.–part.　in which　　year (loc.)　　Kawean
|(CURRUS) *wa/i+ra/i-za-ni-ná*　|PES₂-*za-ha*
chariot　　　　I drove

§8　*a-pa-tá-za-pa-wa/i-ta*　(TERRA+*LA*+*LA*)*wa/i-li-li-tà-za* *a-mi-i-zi* |*tá-ti-i-zi*
to those–but–part.–part.　lands (dat.-loc.)　　　　my　　　fathers
AVUS-*ha-ti-zi-ha* |*348(-)*la/i/u-tà-li-zi-ha* |NEG₂-' (PES₂)*HWI-HWI-sà-tá-si*
grandfathers-and　predecessors-and　　not　　　march

§9　*a-mu-pa-wa/i* *a-mi-i-sa* DOMINUS-*na-ni-i-sa*
me–but–part.　my　lord
CAELUM (DEUS)TONITRUS-*sa*
storm-god of heaven
(DEUS)*kar-hu-ha-sá* (DEUS)*ku+AVIS-pa-pa-sa-ha* *a-mi-ya-ti*
Karhuha　　　　Kubaba-and　　　my (abl.-inst.)
"IUSTITIA"-*wa/i-na-ti* (LITUUS)*á-za-ta*
justice (abl.-inst.)　　　loved
(plus five more narrative clauses)

§15　|*za-zi-ha-wa/i-mi-i* (DOMUS.SUPER)*ha+ra/i-sà-tá-ni-zi* *a-pa-ti-i*
these–also–part.–reflex.　　　　towers　　　in that
("ANNUS")*u-si* |AEDIFICARE+*MI-ha*
year (dat.-loc.)　I built
« In which year I drove the Kawean chariot—
To those lands my fathers and grandfathers and *predecessors* had not
marched, but me my lord the Storm-god of Heaven, Karhuha, and Kubaba
loved on account of my justice...
— also these *towers* in that year I built for myself. »

Unfortunately, Hawkins did not fully exploit the parallels between the
two passages and seriously undercut the force of his analysis by wrongly

---

5. The logographically written verb is a *hapax*, but the context calls for « resisted,
rebelled » or similar.
6. Text as per Hawkins (2000: 103).

claiming that the introductory subordinate temporal clause formed part of
the narrative in each case. It is clear that this is false in the KARKAMIŠ
passage, where the driving of the chariot by the author has nothing
whatever to do with the failure of his predecessors to conquer certain lands.
Nor does the action of certain countries in the time of *earlier* kings in
SÜDBURG clause §2 form any logical progression with the action of the
current king in §1. What we actually have in both texts is an extended,
self-contained narrative demarcated by *enclosure in* a subordinate-main
clause pair (« when...then ») that provides a frame for the narrative. In each
case the subordinate clause describes a martial act, while the main clause
refers to building the structure that carries the inscription. For the frequent
linkage of a military exploit and building activity see Cancik (2002: 80).
Whereas in KARKAMIŠ the framing temporal clauses set off the narrative
from the rest of a larger text, in SÜDBURG the frame remarkably is
employed to surround the entire text. The use of this literary device is
surely in part responsible for the unexpected failure of the king's name to
appear in the first clause of a royal inscription[7].

The parallel between the two texts extends also to the opening of the
respective narratives, each of which illustrates the well-known topos by
which an author achieves a success not attained by his predecessors[8]. Both
texts exploit established Luvian syntactic movement rules for rhetorical
effect[9]. In SÜDBURG, the contrast is heightened by extraposition of the
phrase « before prior great kings » in §2 combined with fronting of
« Suppiluliuma, great king » in §3, placing the two noun phrases directly on
each side of the pivot phrase /nanum–pa/ « but now »[10]. The KARKAMIŠ
text is content to underscore the same contrast merely by fronting and use
of the stressed pronoun *amu* in §9. KARKAMIŠ also uses fronting in the
opening clause §8 to highlight « those lands », the main topic of the entire
narrative. Finally, the direct object referring to the thing built (and bearer
of the text!) is fronted in the resumptive clause in both texts (« divine earth
road » in SÜDBURG §18 and « these *towers* » in KARKAMIŠ A11 *b+c*
§15)[11].

We find a second striking example of the artful use of syntactic
manipulation for rhetorical purposes in the closing of the HLuvian version

---

7. Cf. Hawkins (1995: 20).
8. See Cancik (2002: 80) for a comparison with §12ab of the Hittite « Apology » of
Hattusili.
9. The unmarked word order in Luvian is SOV.
10. For the reading of CRUS-*nú-pa* as /nanum–pa/ see Melchert (1997)
11. The pervasive parallelism between SÜDBURG and KARKAMIŠ A11 *b+c*
amply confirms Hawkins' analysis of the final clause in SÜDBURG as
describing the *building* of the structure that bears the inscription. I do not find
credible the alternative analyses by Börker-Klähn (1998) and Masson (2000:
128ff.)

of the famous KARATEPE bilingual inscription of Azatiwada[12]:

§LXXIV

> POST-*na-wa/i* *ARHA*[13] ("CRUS⟨ᵚ⟩)*ta-za-tu* | *ara/i-zi* OMNIS-*MI-zi*
> after–part.   away   let stand   times all
> (OCULUS)*á-za-ti-wa/i-tà-sa* | *á-ta/i₅-ma-za*
> of Azatiwada   name

§LXXV

> (DEUS)LUNA+*MI-sa-wa/i*   (DEUS)SOL-*ha* REL-*ri+i á-ta/i₄-ma-za*
> of Moon   –part.   of Sun –and as   name
> "CRUS"-*i*
> stands

> « Hereafter may Azatiwada's name continue to stand for all ages, as the
> Moon's and the Sun's name stands. »[14]

Clause §LXXIV shows fronting of *three* constituents. The unmarked word order would be /azatiwadas–wa adaman–za ‖ arinzi taniminzi ‖ a:ppan arha ‖ tazatu/. For the fronting of multiple constituents in HLuvian one may compare KARATEPE §VI. For fronting of three constituents compare also the colophon of the Hittite Bronze Tablet, Bo 86/299 iv 30ff.[15] In our passage the multiple fronting serves a variety of rhetorical purposes.

The fronting of the adverbial phrase /a:ppan arha/ « hereafter » has an iconic function, representing that the designated period of time begins with the moment of the utterance and extends from there (schematically, |→...). Fronting of the verb *tazatu* produces a chiasmus *tazatu...tai* that frames the rest of the utterance and underscores that the action is to begin now and extend indefinitely. Note also the use of the marked stem *taza-* to emphasize duration in the clause referring to Azatiwada[16]. Finally, fronting of the temporal phrase /arinzi taniminzi/ leaves the noun phrases « Azatiwada's name » and « the Moon's and the Sun's name » immediately juxtaposed, assuring the desired association by which the ruler's name will be as immortal as that of the two gods[17].

---

12. Text with Hawkins (2000: 58). I cite the text after version Hu. The opening of the less well preserved Ho. differs.
13. Contra Hawkins (2000: 67) the *ARHA* of Hu. is *not* an error to be emended! Its function is to indicate that the period « after » marked by /a:ppan/ begins from the present point and extends indefinitely « away » from there (thus precisely « *here*after »). Compare in HLuvian CUM-*ni ARHA ta-* (i.e. /kattan arha ta-/) « take away from (beside) ».
14. Translation with Hawkins (2000:58).
15. For the text see Otten (1988: 26-28).
16. For other examples of the use of the suffixes *-sa-* and *-za-* in Luvian to explicitly mark various realizations of imperfective aspect see Melchert (2003: 205).
17. I wish to underscore that the fronting of /arinzi taniminzi/ here is motivated not by any desire to « topicalize » or « focus » the *moved* constituent (its surface third position can hardly be said to give it any prominence), but rather in order

The examples just offered could easily be multiplied, but they should suffice to demonstrate that the HLuvian dedicatory texts at our disposal emphatically are not unreflecting and spontaneous « simple prose » derived from the patterns of ordinary speech. They are on the contrary the products of a highly developed and in some cases remarkably sophisticated compositional technique.

Most of our CLuvian texts consist of incantations recited as part of cathartic rituals. Here the verbal art serves not to enhance communicative effectiveness, but to heighten the efficacy of the associated ritual. An extended passage from the Ritual of Puriyanni (KUB 35.54 ii 49-iii 11) illustrates several of the verbal techniques employed[18]:

(1)   [*šļāndu–(w)ata*   *parnantinzi* [*ḫ*]*ūmmatiš ḫaššanittiš ḫuwaœœuršantinzi*
    release(imv.)–them house   pediment hearth   ?-s
    tiyammiš tarušantiš ad[*duwal–za utar–ša*]   *halliš–ša parattan*[*–za*]
    earth   statue   evil   word   illness   impurity
    puwatil–za [*n*]*anuntarri–š*[*a*] *irœūwašša*   *parittaruwašš*[*a*]
    past   present   of the *upright* (?)   of the *supine* (?)
    ulantalliyan huitw[*aliyan*]
    of the dead of the living

(2)   *a–(a)ta āppa zaštanza* DINGIR.MEŠ-*anza parran niš*[19]
    conj.–it back these here gods (dat.-loc.) before do not
    immarašša ᵈIŠKUR-*aššan–za halliš–ša*
    of open field of Storm-god   illness

(3)   *a–(a)ta–tta* *pari patzadu* MÁŠ.GAL-*iš māuwāti p*[*ā*]*rtāti*
    conj.–it–part. out let carry goat   w/four *legs* (?)
    mannakunati SI-*nati a–(a)ta–*[*tt*]*a pari patzadu*
    w/short   horns conj.–it–part. out let carry
    « Let the house, pediment, hearth, *h*-s, earth, statue release them—the evil word, illness (and) impurity, past (and) present, of the *upright* (and) of the *supine*, of the dead (and) of the living. Let it not (come) back before these here gods—the illness of the Storm-god of the open country. Let the goat carry it out with its four *legs* (and) with its short horns. Let it carry it out! »

We notice first of all the use of alliteration and merisms[20]. Second, in clauses (1) and (3) the verb and preverb + verb have been fronted[21]. This movement reflects the fundamental underlying premise of this type of Luvo-Hittite ritual: the very utterance of a wish brings its realization,

---

to leave another constituent in a particular position. This fact suggests that the discourse factors governing the use of movement rules in Hittite and Luvian are even more complex than previously acknowledged.

18. For the text see Starke (1985: 53).
19. The expected verb *awīti* « come » is lacking. This may be either an error or a permissible ellipsis.
20. For the latter figure see Watkins (1995: 45-47).
21. As in Hittite, fronted constituents in Luvian may appear in absolute initial position or immediately following a sentence-initial conjunction and any clitics. The two positions are functionally equivalent.

provided that it is linked with an indisputable truth[22]. The verb thus has a performative force similar to « I promise » or « I swear » in modern English, and it is fronted to give it maximum prominence and heighten its effect. In the present case the required truth is assured by the accompanying ritual action of driving away the scapegoat. For a different type of appeal to truth see further below. Fronting of the operative verb does have the disadvantage that by the time the rest of the sentence is uttered the force of the verb is diminished. This problem is solved in (3) above by repeating the anaphoric pronoun and verb, producing a reinforcing echo effect.

Clause (1) also shows « right-dislocation » of the direct object (marked above by single underline)[23]. In the present example this movement has an iconic value, the evils to be distanced being distanced as far as possible syntactically. That this is the likely motivation is confirmed by clause (2), where it is the subject referring to the evil to be removed that is right-dislocated.

Right-dislocation may have other motivations, however, as illustrated by a passage from the *dupadupar–ša* Ritual[24]:

> [ḫ]ā̆in–ti–(y)a[ta *malli* ai]yaru   *tapāruwa* [ḫir]ūta [tatarriyamna]
> oil–reflex.–they honey let become   ?   oaths   curses
> [uw]alanteya ḫūitwa[lieya ānnieya tāt]ieya nānieya nānašri[eya --]
> of the dead of the living of mother father of brother sister
> lūlahieya   ḫ[apirieya   kuwarš]aššan tūliyašša[n puwatil nanun]tariyāl
> of mt. dweller of bedouin of *regiment* of assembly past   present
> « Let them become oil (and) honey—the *t.*, the oaths, the curses, of the dead (and) of the living, of the mothers (and) of the fathers, of the brothers (and) of the sisters, of the mountain-dwellers (and) of the bedouin, of the *regiment* (and) of the assembly, past (and) present. »

Besides a remarkable set of six merisms, this sentence also shows fronting of the predicate nouns « oil » and « honey » (thus making prominent the desired end result of the clause). This movement, however, would have still left behind the operative verb *aiyaru* « let become ». It could have likewise been fronted, but here alternatively the long intervening subject has been right-dislocated (shown by the clitic doubling with *-ata*), producing the desired effect of unifying the entire predicate in the prominent initial position in the sentence.

22. This belief system is surely inherited (see e.g. Watkins 1995: 85 with refs.), even if the way it is applied in Luvo-Hittite ritual is innovative.

23. On the distinction between « right dislocation » and « extraposition » see Melchert (2003: 201) and compare that between « left-dislocation » and « fronting » in Hittite (Garrett 1994: 37-38). Note that the « clitic-doubling » required by the former (here *-ata*) assures us that the direct object has in fact been right-dislocated, its surface position not being due merely to the fronting of the verb.

24. KUB 9.6+ i 26-31 ; cf. for text Starke (1985: 112-113)

Right-dislocation serves a similar purpose in the following example from the Ritual of Puriyanni[25]:

> [w]ār–ša kuwatīn æa[l]āl [a–](a)ta   ælāl āšdu   zā [p]arnan–za
> water   as   pure conj.–they pure let be this house
> [DI]NGIR.MEŠ–ninzi ḫūḫḫurša[nt]inzi [d]āru–ša tiyammiš ḫ[ū]mmatiš
> gods   ?   statue earth   pediment
> [GU]NNI–tiš ᴳᴵˢkattaluz[zi]–ša a–(a)ta ḫalāl āšd[u]
> hearth   threshold   conj.–they pure let be
> « As water is pure, let them be pure—this house, the ḫ-gods, the statue, the earth, the pediment, the hearth, the threshold. Let them be pure ! »

Here the fulfillment of the desired effect, the purification of the house and its contents, does not depend on a truth realized by a ritual action, but rather on an established fact of life, the purity of water[26]. In this case, then, the right-dislocation of the long subject not only places the operative predicate *ḫalāl āšdu* in the prominent position in its own clause, but also crucially brings it close to the *ḫalāl* of the preceding truth clause, thus reinforcing the linkage between them. Once again this movement does result in attenuation of the force of the predicate by the time the very long subject has been recited, and we find the same solution to this problem as above : echoic repetition of the anaphoric pronoun and predicate.

Space limitations preclude treatment of further passages in detail. Interested readers are referred to the striking passage in KBo 13.260 ii 8-29[27], where we find eight pairs of strictly parallel clauses of the form X–ti–(y)an kuiš a[ta] a–ti X lādd[u] « The one who has made it an X for himself, let him take the X for himself », with eight different nouns in the X slot. These are followed by four equally parallel clauses of the form « to X (dat.) Y (acc.) *piyandu* » = « Let them give Y to the X ». Two of these further show the well-known figure of English « sweets to the sweet » (*ḫattayanza–wa ḫatta...mannauwanza–pa mannu*), while the last recipient consists of a rhyming epithet and noun : *ipamanz(aš)–pa ḫuipamanza*, approximately equal to « the pernicious malicious ones » (or vice-versa). Despite our unfortunate ignorance of much of the vocabulary, if one reads this passage aloud, one cannot fail to appreciate the effectiveness of the repetitive structures in language that clearly was meant to cast a spell.

I have focused in the preceding discussion on trying to demonstrate the widespread use of various rhetorical figures and other formal devices in both forms of Luvian that attest to a high degree of compositional sophistication. Do these practices reflect a « literary tradition » ? If so, what were the modes of transmission, and what degree of continuity was there between the first and second millennium or between Hittite and Luvian ?

25. KUB 35.54 iii 25-30 ; Starke (1985: 69).

26. Just as Azatiwada's wish for eternal fame is made to depend on the eternity of the sun and the moon.

27. Starke (1985: 260-261).

To these questions I have no ready response and close merely with the caveat that the answers may well be quite different for HLuvian historical narratives and CLuvian ritual incantations.

REFERENCES

BÖRKER-KLÄHN, J., 1998. « ^DKASKAL.KUR : bauen oder "feiern" ? », in S. de Martino and F. Imparati (eds.), *Studi e testi I*, Eothen 9, Firenze, 9-18.

BOSSERT, H. T., 1944. *Ein hethitisches Königssiegel*, Istanbuler Forschungen 18, Berlin.

CANCIK, H., 2002. « Die luwische Historiographie », in *Die Hethiter und ihr Reich. Das Volk der 1000 Götter*, Bonn, 78-81.

EICHNER, H., 1993. « Probleme von Vers und Metrum in epichorischer Dichtung Altkleinasiens », *Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse, Denkschriften*, 238. Band, 97-169.

GARRETT, A., 1994. « Relative Clause Syntax in Lycian and Hittite », *Die Sprache*, 36, 29-69.

HAWKINS, J. D., 1995. *The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattusa (SÜDBURG)*, StBoT Beiheft 3. Wiesbaden.

—, 2000. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions. Volume 1. Inscriptions of the Iron Age*, Studies in Indo-European Language and Culture 8.1. Berlin / New York.

MASSON, E., 2000. « Le complexe cultuel du "Südburg" : quelques réflexions », *Archivum Anatolicum*, 4, 121-141.

MELCHERT, H. C., 1997. Review of J. David Hawkins, *The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattusa (SÜDBURG)*, BSOAS, 60, 347.

—, 2003. « Language », in H.C. Melchert (ed.), *The Luwians*, Handbook of Oriental Studies. Section One. The Near and Middle East, Volume 68. Leiden / Boston, 170-210.

OTTEN, H., 1988. *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy. Ein Staatsvertrag Tutœalijas IV*, StBoT Beiheft 1, Wiesbaden.

PUHVEL, J., 1994. « Anatolian : Autochthon or Interloper ? », *Journal of Indo-European Studies*, 22, 251-263.

ROSENKRANZ, B., 1938. « Die Stellung des Luvischen im Ḫatti-Reiche », *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 56, 265-284.

STARKE, F., 1985. *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift*, StBoT 30, Wiesbaden.

WATKINS, C., 1986. « The Language of the Trojans », in M. Mellink (ed.), *Troy and the Trojan War. A Symposium Held at Bryn Mawr College. October, 1984*, Bryn Mawr, 45-62.

—, 1995. *How to Kill a Dragon. Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*, New York / Oxford.

TABLE DES MATIÈRES