New Light on Hittite Verse and Meter?

H. Craig Melchert

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

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* ᵐ*Iriy*[(*a* ᴸᵁ̮ḪAL *nu*)] *mān* URU-*an išḫanaš / 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 objects and corresponding incantations of the form *maḫḫan…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 arḫa ḫarakzi kī inan ēšḫar NIŠ* DINGIR-*LIM pangauwaš* EME-*aš*

---

[1] Francia (2004: 394) concludes that KUB 30.36 is a *Sammeltafel* 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 Groddek (2005: 307) and the online concordance of Silvin Košak at http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/.

ḫūrkil arḫa QATAMMA *ḫarakdu* "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: 396-398). 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 *nu⸗za namma* ^LÚḪAL *Ì-an milit* NINDA.GUR$_4$.RA *išpant[u]zi*

2 *dāi n⸗aš* ḪUR.SAG.MEŠ *paizzi nu kišan tezzi*

3 ḪUR.SAG.MEŠ GAL-*TIM pangawēš* TUR.MEŠ-*TIM*

4 «*ḫāriyaš nakkīyaš*» *kuit uwanun*

5 *kuit tāriyanun* DUMU.LÚ.U$_{19}$.LU-*UT-TI* GU$_4$-*un*

6 *mān ḫappuwi* EGIR-*an piššiēr*

7 *nu⸗mu⸗ššan šumešš⸗a* ḪUR.SAG.MEŠ *ḫarapten*

8 *UMMA* ḪUR.SAG.MEŠ *lē⸗ta nāḫi wiēš⸗ta*

9 ḫarappuweni GIŠ-*ru apel* ^GIŠ*KAPARU arḫa*

10 *iškallau waršīmaš⸗at apēl⸗pat*

11 *mīyaš išḫāi aliyanan⸗kan*

12 *aliyanzinaš apēl⸗pat mīyaš kuenzi*

13 [*a*]*p*[*ū*]*n*^? *⸗kan wēš⸗pat kuennummēni* (contra Francia who reads *aliya⸗kan*)[2]

14 [*iyauwa*]*n ēšḫar pangauwaš* EME-*an*

15 [(*a*)*nda išḫiy*]*aweni*^? *n⸗at īt karuiliyaš* (contra Francia who restores *šarā tiyaweni*)[3]

16 [(DINGIR.MEŠ-*aš*) *pāi*^? *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, binds it. The *aliyanzina*-, its own offspring, kills the deer. *We* (will) kill [that o]ne^?. We will [bi]nd^? the *i.*, the blood

---

[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 *išḫi*- 'to bind'. Restoration of the latter is further supported by the parallel with the earlier *išḫāi*: compare *kuenzi…kuennummēni*.

(crime) (var. 'tears'), and the slander (lit. tongue of the community). Go [and give?] 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* ḪUR.SAG.MEŠ *kišan tezzi* ḪUR.SAG.MEŠ GAL-*TI*[*M pangawēš*
    TUR.MEŠ-*TIM*]

13 *kuit uwanun kuwat tariyanun* DUMU.NAM.L[Ú.U₁₉.LU-*UT-TI* GU₄-*un mān*
    ḫappuwi]

14 EGIR-*an piš«eš»yat nu ⸗mu ⸗kan šumešš ⸗a* ḪUR.SAG.MEŠ [*ḫarapten*]

15 [*U*]*MMA* ḪUR.SAG.MEŠ *lē ⸗ta nāḫi wēš ⸗ta ḫarpiya*[*ueni* GIŠ-*ru apel*]

16 [^GIŠ*K*]*APARRU arḫa* **duwarnai** ^GIŠ*waršamaš ⸗a*[*t apēl ⸗pat mīyaš išḫāi*]

17 [*ali*]*yan ⸗kan al*[*iya*]*nzinan* (sic!) *apēl miyaš ku*[*enzi …*]

18 [(↖)*iy*]*auwan* **i[šḫa]ḫru** *panqauwaš* EME-*an a*[*nda išḫiyaweni?*]

19 [*n ⸗a*]*t ka*[*ruiliyaš*] DINGIR.MEŠ-*aš* **piyaweni** *n ⸗at ⸗kan katt*[*anda* GE₆-*i* KI-*i*
    pēdanzi] (based on KBo 13.131 Ro 9 **pedanzi**)

I must differ with Francia on one major issue. She argues (2004: 398-399, 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. *kuwat* (B i 13), *piššiēr* (A ii 6) vs. *piš«eš»yat* (B i 14), *nu ⸗mu ⸗ššan* (A ii 7) vs. *nu ⸗mu ⸗kan* (B i 14), *wiēš* (sic!) (A ii 8) vs. *wēš* (B i 15),

---

[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."

ḫarappuweni (A ii 9) vs. *ḫarpiya*[*ueni*] (B i 15), *waršīmaš* (A ii 10) vs. ^{GIŠ}*waršamaš* (B i 16), *apēl꞊pat* (A ii 12) vs. *apēl* (B i 17). Even some of these, however, can affect the diction. Introduction of *kuwat* in B i 13 for the second *kuit* 'why?' spoils the strict parallelism of the two clauses. On the other hand, *ḫarpiyaueni* of B i 15 matches the later *piyaweni* (and likely **išḫiyaweni*) better than the *ḫarappuweni* 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 *ḫāriyaš nakkīyaš* '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.[5] The imperative forms *iškallau* of A ii 10 and *pēdandu* 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 *duwarnai* of B i 16 is correct for a gnomic statement, alliteration with *išḫāi* of the following clause suggests that A has preserved the correct lexeme. We should therefore restore an original but unattested **iškallai* 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 ēšḫar pangauwaš*

---

[5] Contra Francia (2004: 397) *arunaš ṢUṢU-aš* (KUB 30.34 iii 11) is nominative singular (as a vocative) 'marsh of the sea', not dative-locative plural.

EME-*an*, but B i 18 shows [(ᴬ)*iy*]*auwan i*[*šḫa*]*ḫru panqauwaš* EME-*an*, with 'tears' instead of 'blood'. The alliterating pair ᴬ*iyauwan išḫaḫru* appears also in B i 9, followed immediately by a different set of four in B i 9-10: [*pangawaš*] EME-*za išḫanaza išḫaḫruwaza lenkiy*[*aza*]. It is clear that this list could be manipulated for stylistic purposes (the last version cited shows a chiastic alliterative figure *lālaza* išḫanaza išḫaḫruwaza 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.LÚ.U₁₉.LU-*UT-TI* GU₄-*un mān ḫappuwi* EGIR-*an piššiēr* "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>U arḫa 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 *mīyaš*. Francia (2004: 400) correctly derives this noun from the verb *māi-/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' (French *rejeton*): *mīya-* is an animate result noun of the same type as *ḫarga-* 'destruction' < *ḫark-* 'to perish'. As per Watkins (2002: 879-882), *warš(ī)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** (*parštuēš*) 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

---

[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 *apēl* in the sense '(its) own'.

much of the surface of a neglected woodpile. Since Hittite *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 ŪL wāi ŪL⸗ma⸗wa wāki ŪL⸗ma⸗wa išparrezzi* "The deer does not cry out, does not bite, and does not kick" (Madduwatta Text, KUB 14.1 Vo 91).[7] The *aliyanzina-* has horns and 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

---

[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 Hittite *kūrala-* is the specific word for the male red deer or hart, while *aliyan-* would have been the generic term and that for the female.

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 *similia similibus euocantur*: *kuenzi* 'kills'…*kuennumeni* '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 *maḫḫan…QATAMMA* "as (this is/happens), so (let this be/happen)," which is typical in Hittite rituals based on Hattic tradition. Further, while the *maḫḫan…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 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: 404-407), following Carruba (1995: 569-570 & 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 isosyllabicity (read /taryanun/) and matching accent patterns. As Francia

points out, we also find alliteration (***a**liyanan⹀kan **a**liyanzinaš **a**pēl*, ***i**yauwan išḫaḫru*, ***da**nkuwai*

da**ganzipi*), likely alliteration and assonance together (*iškall**ai*, *išḫ**āi***), and perhaps further

assonance (*ḫarp**iyaweni***, **išḫ**iyaweni**, p**iyaweni***), although the repeated first plural present-future

verbs obviously may be due merely to the structure of the dialogue.[8]

Francia (2004: 406-407) 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 Kumarbi 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: 492-493) that McNeil's analysis could also be applied to the Hittite "Song of

---

[8] The popular oral tradition behind the recitation passages must be a living one. The rhyming

verb from *tariyanun* is an innovation for *tariḫḫun* (Oettinger 1979: 475), and the fixed phrase

dankui- daganzipa- '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.

Nesa", generally acknowledged to be a native composition. I repeat that analysis here, with

revisions (I use | to divide stress groups, || to mark the caesura):[9]

> *Nešaš* TÚG.ḪI.A | *Nešaš* TÚG.ḪI.A || *tiya ⸗mu* | *tiya* (TÚG.ḪI.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 by McNeil independently for the Hurro-Hittite

epics based on word substitution patterns also fits the Song of Nesa. As emphasized in Melchert

(1998: 483-484), 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

---

[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.ḪI.A as

wašpa 'shroud' in this context see Watkins (1969: 238-240). For *arnu-* as 'bring for burial'

compare the Hittite Laws §5 (Hoffner 1997: 19).

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 ḪUR.SAG.MEŠ | *pangawēš || šallaēš* | kappiēš*

2 kuit | uwanun || kuit | tāriyanun

3 antuḫšatar* | GU₄-un mān || ḫappuwi āppan* | piššiēr

4 nu ⸗mu ⸗ššan šumešš ⸗a ḪUR.SAG.MEŠ | ḫarapten || ḪUR.SAG.MEŠ | taranzi*

5 lē ⸗ta | nāḫi || wēš ⸗ta | ḫarpiyaweni

6 tāru* | apel ᴳᴵˢKAPARRU || arḫa | *iškallai

7 waršīmaš ⸗at | apēl(⸗pat) || mīyaš | išḫāi

8 aliyanan ⸗kan | aliyanzinaš || apēl(⸗pat) mīyaš | kuenzi

9 [a]p[ū]n? ⸗kan ?? || wēš ⸗pat | kuennummēni

10 iyauwan | išḫaḫru || pangauwaš lālan* | anda išḫiyaweni

11 n ⸗at karuiliyaš šiunaš* | piyaweni || n ⸗at ⸗kan kattanda dankuwai* daganzipi* |
     pedanzi

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 ḪUR.SAG.MEŠ pangawēš 'all

the mountains' could instead form a single stress group).[10] 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 *mīyaš* 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 problematic in terms of its content. As indicated above, Francia's reading [*aliy*]*a=kan* requires an emendation and makes little sense in context. My own restoration [*apū*]*n* 'that one' leaves one looking for an antecedent (even if one chooses the singular variant *piš«eš»yat* for the verb in line 3, it is hard to believe that the unexpressed subject of that clause could serve as the antecedent for *apūn* 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.

---

[10] The recited word order is surely that given, based on the sense. The unexpected written word order in which *pangawēš* follows ḪUR.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.

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.

References

Carruba, Onofrio

1995   Poesia e metrica in Anatolia. In: *Studia classica Iohanni Tarditi oblata*, Luigi Belloni, Guido Milanese, and Antonietta Porro (eds.). Milano: Vita e pensiero, 567-602.

Collins, Billie Jean

2003   On the Trail of the Deer: Hittite *kūrala-*. In*: Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr.*, Gary Beckman, Richard Beal, and Gregory McMahon (eds.). Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 73-82.

Durnford, Stephen

1971   Some Evidence for Syntactic Stress in Hittite. *Anatolian Studies* 21.69-75.

Francia, Rita

2004   "Montagne grandi (e) piccolo, (sapete) perchè sono venuto?" (in margine a due recitative del Rituale di Iriya *CTH* 400-401). *Orientalia* 73(4):390-408.

Garrett, Andrew

1990 The origin of NP split ergativity. *Language* 66:261-296.

Geist, Valerius

  1998 *Deer of the World. Their Evolution, Behavior, and Ecology*. Mechanicsburg:

      Stackpole Books.

Groddek, Detlev

  2005 Review of *Textfunde von Büyükkale aus den Jahren 1955-1959 (Keilschrifttexte aus*

      Boğazköy 46. Heft), Heinrich Otten, Christel Rüster, Gernot Wilhelm. *Bibliotheca*

      Orientalis 62:307-309.

Hoffner, Harry A. Jr.

  1997 *The Laws of the Hittites*. Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill.

  1998 *Hittite Myths*. Second Edition. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

  2003 Daily Life among the Hittites. In: *Life and Culture in the Ancient Near East*, Richard

      Averbeck, Mark Chavalas and David Weisberg (eds.). Bethesda: CDL Press, 95-

      118.

McNeil, Ian

  1963 The Metre of the Hittite Epic. *Anatolian Studies* 13.237-242.

Melchert, H. Craig

  1998 Poetic Meter and Phrasal Stress in Hittite. In: *Mír Curad. Studies in Honor of*

      Calvert Watkins, Jay Jasanoff, H. Craig Melchert and Lisi Oliver (eds.). Innsbruck:

      Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 483-494.

Miller, Jared

  2004 *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals*

      (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 46). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Neu, Erich

1996   *Das hurritische Epos der Freilassung I* (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 32).

Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

1997   Zur Bedeutung von hethitisch ^{GIŠ}*pár-aš-tu-e-eš* in der hurritisch-hethitischen

Bilingue. *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utiles*. 145:133.

Oettinger, Norbert

1979   *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums*. Nürnberg: Hans Carl.

1989/90 Die 'dunkle Erde' im Hethitischen und Griechischen. *Welt des Orients* 20/21:83-98.

Watkins, Calvert

1969   A Latin-Hittite etymology. *Language* 45.235-242. [Reprinted in *Selected Writings*,

Lisi Oliver (ed.). Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität

Innsbruck (1994)414-421.]

1979   *Is tre ḟír flathemon*: Marginalia to *Audacht Morainn. Ériu* 30.181-198. [Reprinted in:

Selected Writings, Lisi Oliver (ed.). Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der

Universität Innsbruck (1994), 626-643.]

2002   Some Indo-European Logs. In: *Anatolia Antica. Studi in memoria di Fiorella

Imparati*, Stefano de Martino and Franca Pecchioli Daddi (eds.). Firenze: LoGisma

editore, 879-884