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New Light on Hittite Verse and Meter?

H. Craig Melchert
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

This essay elaborates on and confirms the analysis of Francia (2004) that some passages in the Hittite Ritual of Iriya reflect a popular tradition of oral composition in both form and content. More tentatively, I suggest that some lines may be in verse, with the same stress-based metrical pattern seen in Hurro-Hittite translation literature. The putative appearance of this pattern in a popular tradition raises the possibility that it is part of a native tradition and not the result of borrowing.

The Hittite ritual attributed to Iriya is attested in multiple copies, all quite fragmentary. The *incipit* indicates that its purpose is to remove various evils from a city: *UMMA ḫ铱y[(a l0]HAL nu)] mān URU-an išhanaš / linkiyaš pangauwaš lalaš aniyami* “Thus says Iriya, the seer: ‘When I treat a city for blood (crime), (false) oath, and slander...’ ” (KUB 30.35 i 1-2 with duplicate KUB 39.102 Ro 1-2). The list of evils varies throughout the ritual within typical limits, as illustrated in the citations below. Some of the passages of this ritual also are attested in what appear to be other distinct compositions. In one of these, the king appears as the officiant (KUB 33 i 8.12 and iv 5), while the ritual attributed to Banippi is for the occasion “when a person turns up his robe at his companion” (KUB 30.36 i 1-3).¹

Some of the later portions of the ritual as preserved show the typical “sympathetic magic” of many Luvo-Hittite rituals: manipulation of ritual

---

¹ Francia (2004:394) concludes that KUB 30.36 is a *Sammetastfel* and that the ritual of Banippi has nothing to do with that of Iriya, but given the other discrepancies in various versions of the text, I retain the possibility of multiple use of the same material. For the latest provisional organization of the texts under CTH 400 and 401 see Grodde (2005:307) and the online concordance of Silvin Košak at http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/.
objects and corresponding incantations of the form maḥhan... QATAMMA “as (this is/happens), so (let this be/happen).” For example, KUB 30.34 iv 14-18 describes the pouring of water back into a container and then into a sewer, followed by: kī wātar GIM-an arha ḥarakzi kī inan ʾēšar NĪŠ DINGIR-LIM pangauwaš EME-aš ḫūrkil arha QATAMMA ḥarakdu “As this water perishes, so let this illness, blood (crime), (false) oath, slander (and) perversion perish.”

Earlier in the ritual, however, we find a series of visits by the officiant to various landscape features to whom he appeals for help with his task of eliminating the evils. They respond with assurances that include apparent proverbial truths involving relevant natural phenomena of the respective landscapes. Attested are a riverbank, mountains, and marshes and springs. Francia (2004) has offered an insightful new analysis of these passages, arguing that the formulaic diction of these recitations reflects a popular oral tradition in both content and form. I believe that her interpretation is not only correct, but may also be elaborated and supported by further arguments as adduced below.

I will focus on the appeal made to the mountains and their response, since it is the best preserved, but a similar analysis can be made of the dialogue with the marshes and springs (for the text of which see Francia 2004:396-98). For reasons that will become apparent, I cite the passage in full in two versions, giving a running translation of the first:

A. KUB 30.36 ii
1 nuza namma LUL.1-an milit NINDA.GUR4.RA
    išpant[u]zi
2 dāi n-aš HUR.SAG.MEŠ paizzi nu kišan tezzi
3 HUR.SAG.MEŠ GAL-TIM pangawēš TUR.MEŠ-TIM
4 «ḥāriyaš nakkiyaš» kuit uwanun
5 kuit tāriyanun DUMU.LU₉₉.LU-UT-TI GU₄-un
6 mān ḥappuwi EGIR-an piššīer
7 nu=mušan šumešš=a HUR.SAG.MEŠ ḥarapten
8 UMMA HUR.SAG.MEŠ lē=ta nāhi wieš=ta
9 ḥarappuweni GIŠ-ru apel GIŠ KAPARU arṭa
10 iškuallau waršimaš=at apēl=pat
11 miyāš išhāt aliyanan=kan
12 aliyanzinaš apēl=pat miyāš kuenzi
13 [a]p[ūn]² = kan wēš = pat kuennummeni (contra Francia who reads aliya = kan)²
14 [iyanwa]n eššar pangauwaš EME-an
15 [(a)nda iššiy]aweni³ n = at it karuiliyaš (contra Francia who restores šarā tiyaweni)³
16 [(DINGIR.MEŠ-aš) pāš² n] = at = kan GAM-anda GE₆-i KI-i pēdandu

Then the seer takes for himself oil, honey, leavened bread (and) libations. He goes to the mountains and says as follows: “All mountains, great and small, why have I come «to the deep valleys»? Why have I exhausted myself? They have cast mankind behind the h. like a steer. Rally to me, you mountains!” The mountains say: “Fear not! We will rally to you. Its own crown tears apart the tree. Firewood, its own outgrowth, hides it. The aliyanzina-, its own offspring, kills the deer. We (will) kill [that o]ne⁷. We will [bi]nd⁷ the i, the blood (crime) (var. ‘tears’), and the slander (lit. tongue of the community). Go [and give⁴] them to the ancient gods. Let them carry them down into the dark earth.”⁴

B. KUB 30.33 i (major variants vs. A in bold)
12 LUGAL-uš ANA ḤUR.SAG.MEŠ kišan
tezzi ḤUR.SAG.MEŠ GAL-TT[M pangawēš TUR.MEŠ-T/IM]
13 kuit uwanum kuwat tariyanun DUMU.NAM.L[Ū.U₁₉.LU-UT-TI GU₄-un mān ḥappuwi]
14 EGIR-an piš =eš = yat nu = mu = kan šumešš = a ḤUR.SAG.MEŠ ḥarapten
15 [U]MMA ḤUR.SAG.MEŠ lē = ta nāhi wēš = ta ḥarpiya[ueni
GIŠ-ru apel]

² The traces in the published autograph are compatible with either Francia’s restoration or mine, but her reading requires an emendation to a-li-ya-<an>. I also see no reason why the mountains would promise to kill the deer. I tentatively assume that apūn refers to the instigator of the evils.
³ In her restoration Francia (2004:395) ignores the clear a[n- of B i 18, which argues for anda, frequent with išši- ‘to bind’. Restoration of the latter is further supported by the parallel with the earlier išši: compare kuenni...kuennummeni.
⁴ I assume, based on the variants cited below, that the correct original form of the last two sentences was rather: “We will give them to the ancient gods, and they will carry them down into the dark earth.”
16 [Gis\K]\APARRU ar\ha du\warn\ai Gis\ war\'ama\as = a[t ap\el = pat \\
miya\as i\sh\ai]
17 [a]\lyan = kan al\[i\ya]n\inan (sic!) ap\el miya\as ku\[en\i ...]
18 [(a)]\yau\wan i[\sha]\b\ru\pan\au\wa\as E\ME\-an a[nda \\
i\sha\i\wan\i] )
19 [n = a[t ka\[ru\i\ya\] DINGIR.ME\-a\sh p\i\wan\i n = at = kan \\
katt[anda GE\6-i K\i-p\ed\an\i]
(based on KBo 13.131 Ro 9 pedan\i)

I must differ with Francia on one major issue. She argues (2004:398-
99, 403) that textual variations in the recitation passages are all relatively 
minor and do not affect features of the orality of the original formulation 
(such as assonance, alliteration and rhythm). Some differences in the 
extant texts truly are minor: kuit (A ii 5) vs. k\\\u015fin (B i 13), p\\\i\sh\i\er (A ii 
6) vs. pi\xe9\es\e\'uat (B i 14), nu = mu = \\'\sh\\i\a (A ii 7) vs. nu = mu = kan (B i 14), 
wie\'\s (sic!) (A ii 8) vs. we\'\s (B i 15), h\\\'arapp\uan\i (A ii 9) vs. 
\\'\h\ar\pi\ya\[u\en\i (B i 15), war\\'i\ma\as (A ii 10) vs. Gis\ war\'i\ma\as (B i 16), 
ap\el = pat (A ii 12) vs. ap\el (B i 17). Even some of these, however, can 
affect the diction. Introduction of k\\\u015fin in B i 13 for the second kuit 
‘why?’ spoils the strict parallelism of the two clauses. On the other hand, 
\\'\h\ar\pi\ya\u\en\i of B i 15 matches the later pi\wan\i (and likely *i\sha\i\wan\i) 
better than the h\\\'arapp\uan\i of A ii 9.

Other discrepancies are far more serious. As already noted, the 
divergent introductions, one involving the seer and the other the king, 
reflect two different redactions of the ritual. The phrase h\\'ar\i\ya\'s nakk\\'i\ya\'\s 
‘to the deep valleys’ in text A is a false interpolation based on the cliché 
‘high mountains...deep valleys’, as in the Telipinu Myth, KUB 17.10 i 
24-26. This phrase was assuredly not in text B, where there is too little 
space for it. Its absence in the original is confirmed by the parallel 
passages with the river bank and the marshes and springs, where the 
phrase kuit uwanun kuit tariyanun immediately follows direct address. 
The imperative forms i\\'\sh\\i\lla\u of A ii 10 and p\\\'e\d\an\du of A ii 16 cannot 
be correct in statements of truths and are due to a false assimilation to the 
more common pattern by which desired results are expressed by the 
imperative (as in the passage with water cited above). On the other hand, 
while the present indicative du\warn\ai of B i 16 is correct for a gnomic

\footnote{Contra Francia (2004:397) aruna\'s \\SU\-u\'-a\'s (KUB 30.34 iii 11) is nominative singular 
(as a vocative) ‘marsh of the sea’, not dative-locative plural.}
statement, alliteration with ʾišḥai of the following clause suggests that A has preserved the correct lexeme. We should therefore restore an original but unattested ʾišḳallai that has been altered in both extant versions.

As indicated earlier, there is considerable variation throughout the ritual in the list of evils to be removed, and unsurprisingly in this recitation A ii 14 has [(ָ)]iyauwa][n ʾišḥar pangauwaš EME-an, but B i 18 shows [(ָ)]iyauwa][n ʾišḥa][hru pangauwaš EME-an, with ‘tears’ instead of ‘blood’. The alliterating pair ʾiyauwaš ʾišḥaḥru appears also in B i 9, followed immediately by a different set of four in B i 9-10: [pangauwaš] EME-Za ʾišḥanaza ʾišḥaḥruwaza lenkiyaza]. It is clear that this list could be manipulated for stylistic purposes (the last version cited shows a chiastic alliterative figure lālaza* ʾišḥanaza ʾišḥaḥruwaza lenkiyaza), and it is likely that there was more than one acceptable variant even in the presumed oral composition.

In sum, we must acknowledge that the distance between the putative original oral formulation of these dialogue passages and the form in which we have them attested is considerably greater than Francia has suggested. Miller (2004:469-532) has presented a thorough and highly nuanced treatment of the relationship of oral tradition to written composition in the Kizzuwatna rituals. I see no reason not to suppose a similarly long and complex redactional and compositional history for the rituals that contain our recitations. This history means that we cannot realistically hope to recover all the formal features of the earlier oral version. We are on somewhat firmer ground in regard to the content, to which I will first turn.

Francia (2004:392 and 399-401) rightly stresses that the popular tradition of the recitations is reflected in their allusions to aspects of daily life that would have been best known to common folk. She cites in particular the expression of A ii 5-6: DUMU.LŪ.U₁₉.LU-UT-TI GU₁-UN mān ḫappuwi EGIR-an piṣṣīr “They have thrown mankind behind the h. like a steer.” As she indicates, the phrase obviously refers to the impotence of the suffering humans for whom the ritual is being performed, but the exact nuance of this rustic simile eludes us. The truisms uttered by the mountains as they assure their help belong to the same sphere, and here I think that further progress can be made in understanding their relevance.

The common denominator among these proverbial sayings is that they all refer to examples in nature where paradoxically something that is subordinate to something else (as part to whole or as product to source)
turns on and unexpectedly harms or destroys the latter. The first instance is the most straightforward. Francia (2004:395) interprets GIŠ-ru apel GIŠ KAPAR<\R>Ur arha iškallau as “L'albero la sua cima tagli pure!”. However, the neuter noun GIŠ-ru cannot be the subject of a transitive verb (Garrett 1990). In any case, to say that a tree breaks its crown makes no sense in the context. The subject is rather GIŠ KAPARRU: in a violent windstorm it is the soft, leafy, rather insubstantial top of a tree that is seized by the wind and surprisingly leads to the splitting of the hard and sturdy trunk, the principal part of the tree from which it grows.6

Key to understanding the other two proverbs is the sense of miyaš. Francia (2004:400) correctly derives this noun from the verb màa/-miya- ‘to grow’ and suggests ‘essenza, essence’ for its meaning. However, she is closer to the mark with her alternative ‘ciò che è cresciuto da, that which has grown from’, i.e. ‘outgrowth, offspring’ (Fr. rejeton): miya- is an animate result noun of the same type as ḫarga- ‘destruction’ < ḫarq- ‘to perish’. As per Watkins (2002:879-82), wars(t)ma- means ‘firewood’, which is the product of the tree. What it means for the firewood to “bind” the tree is explicated by a parable in the Hurro-Hittite Bilingual (see for the text Neu 1996:95-97). Given the right combination of temperature and moisture, new green shoots (parštuas) can grow from the cut wood of a woodpile (thus correctly Neu 1997 vs. Neu 1996:212 ‘moss’ and Hoffner 1998:72 ‘bark(?’) ). With sufficient time these shoots can cover much of the surface of a neglected woodpile. Since Hitt. tāru- is both ‘tree’ and ‘wood’, the new shoots of the woodpile can be said to bind the tāru-.

The real-world basis for the third statement by the mountains remains unclear, in part due to our inability to identify with precision the species of the animals represented by aliyan- and aliyanzina-. For a thorough discussion of this problem see Collins (2003, especially 80-81). We know that the aliyan- is a cervid and that it is a proverbially gentle animal in Hittite: aliyaš = wa UL wäi UL = ma = wa wäki UL = ma = wa išparrezi “The deer does not cry out, does not bite, and does not kick” (Madduwa Text, KUB 14.1 Vo 91).7 The aliyanzina- has horns and

---

6 While I have not been able to carry out the exhaustive search needed to confirm it, I suspect that the fronting of the direct object GIŠ-ru here and of aliyanan in its clause is due to a Hittite requirement that the antecedent precede apel in the sense ‘(its) own’.

7 If Collins (2004:80) is correct in identifying aliyan- as ‘red deer’, then the reference to its not crying out must apply to the female, since the male of the species has a distinctive rutting call (Geist 1998:176). Collins indeed suggests that Hitt. kûrala- is the specific
occurs in the context of deer (KILAM Festival, KBo 10.24 i 1-7). Whether this animal is another form of deer, another cervid, or an ovicaprid that merely resembled a deer for the Hittites cannot be determined. In any case, I have thus far found no basis for the slaying of a deer by such an animal. Nevertheless, it is clear from our text that the Hittites viewed the aliyanzina- animal as the offspring of the aliyan- and as an animal that on occasion killed the latter. The proverbially gentle nature of the aliyan- would have given this observation significant shock value.

It is perhaps not accidental that it is the last of the three truisms that we do fully understand. The three statements of the mountains appear to be arranged in ascending hierarchical order of both specialized knowledge and incredibility. As indicated above, all belong to the province of ordinary people who live and work in the natural world—not to that of courtiers, temple priests, or scribes. However, almost anyone who lives in a forested environment may have occasion to observe how a mighty tree is split by having its crown seized by a violent wind. Far fewer people are likely to know that fresh shoots can grow from a pile of cut wood, and those who have not observed it may well find it implausible. That a deer may be slain by a closely related animal strains credulity even further and qualifies as arcane lore.

I stress that the paradoxical and to some extent incredible nature of the verities recited by the mountains is a crucial part of their force. Francia (2004:400) is correct that in the synchronic context the relationship of the stated truisms to desired ritual effect is likely one of similis similibus euocantur: kuenzi ‘kills’...kuemmumeni ‘we will kill’ and probably išḫāi ‘binds’...anda išḫiyaweni ‘we will bind’. However, it is noteworthy that the formulation of that relationship here is implicit, quite different from that of the explicit simile type mahhan...QATAMMA “as (this is/happens), so (let this be/happen),” which is typical in Hittite rituals based on Hattic tradition. Further, while the mahhan...QATAMMA formula follows a matching manipulation of ritual objects, the truths recited by the mountains appear abruptly following their assurance of help, with nothing to indicate their relevance to the issue at hand. I therefore find it likely that the formulaic recitations of the mountains reflect the inherited Indo-European notion of the “Act of Truth” or “Ruler’s Truth,” according to which the solemn statement of a

word for the male red deer or hart, while aliyan- would have been the generic term and that for the female.
true fact can bring about a desired result (see Watkins 1979 with references). In any case, the striking examples cited by the mountains certainly qualify as “mighty truths” that pack a formidable rhetorical “punch.”

Francia (2004:404-07), following Carruba (1995:569-70 and 597), cites a number of formal features pointing to original oral transmission of the recitations in which the folk wisdom just discussed is embedded. Most striking is the rhetorical question kuit uwanun kuit tariyanun “Why have I come? Why have I exerted myself?” that opens all three invocations. This key phrase consists of two clauses with perfectly parallel grammatical structure, rhyming verbs and in all likelihood also isosyllability (read /taryanun/) and matching accent patterns. As Francia points out, we also find alliteration (aliyanaŋ = kan aliyanzinaš apēl, iyauwan išhabru, dankuwaı daganzipí), likely alliteration and assonance together (*iškaláí, išháí), and perhaps further assonance (*harpiyawení, *išhiyawení, piyawení), although the repeated first plural present-future verbs obviously may be due merely to the structure of the dialogue.8

Francia (2004:406-07) also notes that at least the clauses stating the verities each contain nearly the same number of stressed words and appear to show a very similar rhythmic structure. This observation raises the possibility that the lines are in fact metrical, a point she does not pursue. McNeil (1963) argued for stress-based meter in Hittite versions of the Hurro-Hittite epics of the Kurnaqu Cycle, with lines of four stresses divided into two equal cola. This analysis presupposed phrasal stress in Hittite, as elaborated by Durnford (1971). In Melchert (1998) I presented confirmatory evidence from ordinary Hittite prose for the existence of phrasal stress, offering minor revisions to Durnford’s conclusions.

McNeil prudently left open the issue of the source or model for both stress-based meter and for the specific verse form used in the Hurro-Hittite epics: native or borrowed? I suggested in Melchert (1998:492-93) that McNeil’s analysis could also be applied to the Hittite “Song of Nesa,” generally acknowledged to be a native composition. I repeat that

---

8 The popular oral tradition behind the recitation passages must be a living one. The rhyming verb from tariyanun is an innovation for tarihun (Oettinger 1979:475), and the fixed phrase dankuı daganzipo- “dark earth” is likely of Hurrian origin (Oettinger 1989/90). In the absence of any Old Hittite linguistic features, we may conclude that the original oral formulations are no older than Middle Hittite.
analysis here, with revisions (I use | to divide stress groups, || to mark the caesura): 9

Nešaš TÚG.H.I.A | Nešaš TÚG.H.I.A || tiya = mu | tiya (TÚG.H.I.A
= wašpa)
nu = mu annaš = maš katta | arnut || tiya = mu | tiya
nu = mu uwaš = maš katta | arnut || tiya = mu | tiya

Clothes of Nesa, clothes of Nesa, bind on me, bind!
Bring me to my mother—bind me, bind!
Bring me to my nurse?—bind me, bind!

I stress that only this analysis with phrasal stress can achieve a regular metrical pattern. As has been suggested, one could in principle treat the refrain tiya = mu tiya as a short line contrasting with the longer preceding clauses. However, the latter are not isosyllabic (8, 9, 9), nor do they contain the same number of stressed words (4, 3, 3). I readily concede that we have no assurance that the rhythm of this early “song” conforms to a strict metrical schema. However, it is at least noteworthy that the meter established independently by McNeil for the Hurro-Hittite epics based on word substitution patterns also fits the Song of Nesa. As emphasized in Melchert (1998:483-84), other stylistic features of the Hurro-Hittite translation literature suggest that the diction of the Hittite versions was based on exploitation of native linguistic devices, not on imitation of the Hurrian. The metrical pattern based on a similar exploitation of phrasal stress could thus also well be native.

If we apply this schema to the recitation portion of the encounter with the mountains in the ritual of Iriya, we arrive at the following (preceding asterisk marks a reconstruction of the text; following asterisk merely the assured phonetic reading of a word written logographically):

1 ḤUR.SAG.MEŠ | *pangawēš || šallaēš* | kappiēš*
2 kuit | uwanun || kuit | tāriyanun

9 Contrary to my and others’ interpretations, katta here is a postposition meaning only ‘(next) to’, as per Hoffner (2003:114). It must therefore be construed with and form a stress group with the preceding noun in the genitive annaš = maš. It is not a preverb with arnut. For TÚG.H.I.A as wašpa ‘shroud’ in this context see Watkins (1969:238-40). For arnu- as ‘bring for burial’ compare the Hittite Laws §5 (Hoffner 1997:19).
I am keenly aware that, in applying a formal schema that consists of units as small as two and four, there is a high risk that one can “find” what one is looking for in almost any set of data, whether it is really there or not. I would note, however, that the metrics of the lines given here as 2 and 5 are virtually imposed by their syntactic structure: they could be scanned no other way. The scansion given is also the most natural for line 1 (although ḤUR.SAG.MEŠ pangawēš ‘all the mountains’ could instead form a single stress group). Using patterns of phrasal stress established for the Hurro-Hittite epics, we can also scan lines 3, 6, 8 and 10 naturally into the schema of four stresses with a central caesura. Line 7 has the required four stresses, but the caesura between the modifier apēl ‘its own’ and miyaš is admittedly surprising. Line 11 cannot be made to fit the pattern as attested, since there is little chance that kattanda in position before the dative-locative phrase dankuwai daganzipi can form a single stress group with the latter. This problem could be “repaired” by supposing that the original order was dankuwai daganzipi kattanda pedanzi, where the preverb and verb may form a single stress group.

I can give no solution for line 9 as given. It clearly is one stress short for the schema proposed. I can only note that the line as attested is also

---

10 The recited word order is surely that given, based on the sense. The unexpected written word order in which pangawēš follows ḤUR.SAG.MEŠ GAL-TIM must reflect confusion due to the complications of written word order with attributive adjectives when the noun and adjective are written logographically. In such cases, the adjective is often written after the noun when we know that in spoken Hittite it preceded. As a further complication, the quantifier panku- can precede or follow its head noun.
problematic in terms of its content. As indicated above, Francia’s reading \textit{[aliya]}a=kan requires an emendation and makes little sense in context. My own restoration \textit{[apû]n ‘that one’} leaves one looking for an antecedent (even if one chooses the singular variant \textit{piššešyaṭ} for the verb in line 3, it is hard to believe that the unexpressed subject of that clause could serve as the antecedent for \textit{apûn eight clauses later}). I take this problem as some basis for supposing that the transmitted line is faulty, with an expressed noun referring to the instigator of the evils having been omitted. The ad hoc nature of this assumption remains manifest.

To expect the extant lines of the recitations to scan perfectly would in my view be unrealistic in any case, given the nature of the textual transmission discussed above. Our evidence simply does not allow for proof of a metrical schema, as opposed to rhythmical prose, which would show the same general features. I do believe that both the content and form of the recitation passages fully support the conclusion of Francia (2004:408): they deserve to be defined as "poetic," and they reflect a popular, oral tradition. As such, they merit serious consideration in any discussion of Anatolian verse and its relationship to the versification systems of other ancient Indo-European traditions.
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