

# Toward the Reconstruction of an IE Poetic Area: The Evidence of Hittite Meter

Anthony D. Yates  
University of California–Los Angeles  
adyates@ucla.edu

## 1 A Greco-Anatolian Poetics?

- [1.1.] Indebtedness of Greek mythology to Anatolia now generally acknowledged, e.g. Burkert (1985:122-3): “For both...the succession and the battle [viz. Typhoeus] myth, there are detailed Hittite parallels; hence these myths must be regarded as borrowings from Asia Minor.”
- [1.2.] Also now clear that the Greek mythological tradition reflects not only themes and motifs borrowed from Anatolia, but also *linguistic* features of the source myths (see esp. Watkins (1995, 2000, 2007)); recent scholarship (e.g. Bachvarova 2002, 2005, 2009) has even embraced the possibility, first suggested by West (1988), of Greco-Hittite bilingual bards as mechanism for diffusion; this possibility supported by two examples adduced by Watkins:
- [1.3.] Hitt. *illuyankaš* → Gk. Typhoeus: Watkins (1995:451-55) observes in earliest representations of Typhoeus myth—Hom. *Il.* 2.782, Hes. *Theog.* 857 (cited in (1), below), and *hAp.* 333, 340—essentially arbitrary presence of denominative verb ἰμάσσειν ‘to lash’; no good explanation within Greek (pace West 1966, 2007)

(1) αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ μιν δάμασε πληγῆσιν **ιμάσσας**  
ἤριπε γυιωθεῖς, στονάχιζε δὲ γαῖα πελώρη

‘But when [Zeus] had conquered him and **lashed** him with strokes,  
[Typhoeus] fell down, lamed, and the monstrous earth groaned.’

(Hes. *Theog.* 857-58)

- [1.4.] Watkins (1995) argues for borrowing of Hittite verbal formula *išhimanta kaleliet* ‘he bound with a cord/cords’, emboldened in (2):

(2) ‘And Hupasiyas came  
and **bound the serpent with a cord/cords (iṣhimanta kaleliet)**.  
The Storm-god came and slew the serpent,  
and the gods were with him.’

(KBo 22.99 i 15´-18´)

Hitt. *išhimaš* ‘cord’ was rendered, very likely by a bilingual speaker, with semantically and *phonetically* similar Gk. ἰμάς ‘(leather) thong, strap’ in the collocation δῆσεν ἰμάντι / ἰμάσι ‘he bound with a strap(s)”; collocation subsequently remade as two separate *figurae etymologicae*, as schematized in (3).

- (3) Hitt. *išhimanta kaleliet* → Gk. δῆσεν ἰμάντι / ἰμάσι  
 Gk. δῆσεν δεσμῶνι / δεσμοῖσι ← Gk. ἰμάσεν ἰμάντι / ἰμάσι

*Semantics* of the original Hittite formula are continued in Pindar: δέδεται ‘is bound’ in (4) and δεσμός ‘bond’ in (5).

- (4) Αἴτνας ἐν... **δέδεται** κορυφαῖς  
 ‘[Typhoeus]... **is bound** in the heights of Aetna’

(Pind. *Pyth.* 1.27)

- (5) Αἴτνα **δεσμός**... ἀμφίκειται  
 ‘Aetna lies about [Typhoeus] as [his] **bond**.’

(Pind. *fr.* 92)

Meanwhile, arbitrary associative presence of the verb ἰμάσεν with the Typhoeus myth explained as perseverance of original *form* of the Hittite formula, even as semantic change has resulted in the loss of the binding motif; thus Watkins (1995:448-49): “linguistic evidence [which] points unequivocally to the Bronze Age second millenium as the time of the transmittal...from Anatolia to Hellas.”

[1.5.] Other crucial evidence in incipit of a Luwian poem, recorded by Hittite scribes:

- (6) *aḫ-ḫa-ta-ta a-la-ti a-ú-i-en-ta ú-i-lu-ša-ti*  
*aḫḫa=ta=ta alati awienta Wiluṣati*  
 ‘When they came from steep Wilusa’

(*KBo.* 4.11 rev. 46)

Anat. toponym Wilusa ~ Homeric (F)ἴλιος ‘Ilion; Troy’ long been recognized; Watkins (1994, 1995) argues for Greek calque of Luwian formula in (7):

- (7) Hom. (F)ἴλιος αἰπεινή ← Hitt. *alati...Wiluṣati*  
 ‘steep (W)ilion’ ‘steep Wilusa’  
 (*Il.* 9.419, 686; 15.215;  
 13.773; 15.558; 17.328)

Opening verse of a Luwian ‘Wilusiad’? (cf. Watkins 1994); for Bachvarova (2002:45), “this single line” constitutes “the best evidence that Hittites participated in the network of travelling poets who were the ancestors of the poets working in the oral tradition that eventually produced the *Iliad*.”

- [1.6.] Complicated claim: Bachvarova (2002, 2009) sees pattern of convergence of Near Eastern mytho-poetic material at Hattusa, brought by travelling bards; Hurrian poets transmitted Mesopotamian myths to the Hittites, who could have mediated access of 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium Greco-Hittite bilingual poets to a comprehensive Near Eastern mytho-poetic tradition
- [1.7.] Idea attractive, but premature for two reasons:
- i. linguistic evidence for bilingual poetic contact essentially restricted to the two items discussed above
  - ii. limited understanding of Anatolian and, in particular, Hittite poetic traditions in Bronze Age
- [1.8.] My view: important questions to answer about Hittite poetic tradition—including the meter employed—before we are in a position to evaluate the possibility that Hittite poets were intermediaries in diffusion of mytho-poetic material to Greece

## 2 Problems of Hittite Meter

- [2.1.] Meter of Hittite poetry until recently neglected, both from the perspective of comparative poetics, and within Anatolian (e.g. Eichner 1993:100 n.13); two possible reasons: first, nothing in Hittite resembling what is traditionally understood as Indo-European poetic meter, as reconstructed primarily on the basis of quantity-sensitive, syllable-counting meters in Vedic and Greek lyric, which descend from common prototype (Meillet (1923); cf. West (2007:45ff., with summary and lit.))
- [2.2.] Other reason: long held assumption that both the poetry and meter purely derivative from Hurrian, therefore cannot be show anything about native Hittite poetics; this notion begins with Güterbock's (1951) discovery that the 'Song of Ullikummi' is a metrical text, though recorded like ordinary prose; metricality suggested by title *SÌR*<sup>d</sup> *Ullikummi* (*SÌR* = Hitt. *išhamaiš* 'song') and opening stanza concluding in (8).

(8) *dapiy[aš šiunaš addan] ||*<sup>d</sup> *Kumarbin išhamihhi*  
 'Of Kumarbi, father of all the gods, I (shall) sing.'

(KUB 17.7+ i 3-4)

cf. Hom. *Il.* 1.1 μῆνιν ἄειδε θεά ; RV 1.32.1a *prá vocam*

Güterbock's edition of 'Ullikummi' (1951; 1952) attempts to render the text in verse.

- [2.3.] Significant step forward in McNeill (1963) who, observing recurring formulae in 'Ullikummi' and similarity to Homeric Greek, attempted to establish their basic templates; McNeill concludes that every verse line has four stresses divided into two equal cola by a central caesura, the same metrical pattern found in Sumerian and Akkadian epic; hence assumption that 'Song of Ullikummi' and all Hittite epic came to Hittites via Hurrian, both myth and meter simply taken over in Hittite translation; some support for this in irregular/ungrammatical Hittite verse lines, explained as imitating Hurrian word order

[2.4.] Since then, two important pieces of evidence:

- i. Hurro-Hittite bilingual, which shows stylistic features in the Hittite version that have no model in the Hurrian, such as clitic doubling and the frequent use of the so-called ‘supine’ construction, e.g. *memiškewan daiš* ‘he began to speak’ (cf. Neu 1996; Melchert 1998).

Clitic doubling = verb takes clitic subj./obj. coreferential with postposed nominal subj./object; ‘supine’ construction = verb *dai-* ‘put’ or *tiya-* ‘step’ + verbal noun in *-wan*, typically with inceptive sense

- ii. ‘Song of a Neša’, a native composition, reflects same meter (cf. Durnford 1971; Melchert 1998); so too probably ‘Ritual of Iriya’ (Melchert 2007)

Hence, Melchert (1998): “In sum, the Hittites had their own sense of elevated, literary style, and we may reasonably assume that the stress-based meter discovered by McNeill and Durnford also reflects native tradition.”

[2.5.] Little doubt, then, that Hittite metrical texts may offer insights about the native Hittite poetic tradition which bear crucially on larger questions of Greco-Anatolian poetic contact; however, meter presents some complex problems

[2.6.] Since McNeill (1963), generally assumed that every verse line has four stressed elements which are divided into two equal cola by a central caesura; his analysis based on formulaic lines, esp. speech introductions as in (9-11), with stressed elements underlined:

(9)  ${}^d\text{U-}a\check{s} \text{ } \underline{\text{Tašmišui}} \parallel \underline{\text{memiškiwan}} \underline{\text{daiš}}$   
 ‘The Storm-god began to speak to Tasmisu.’  
(KUB 17.7 iv 49)

(10)  $[\text{nu } \underline{\text{arunaš}} \text{ } {}^d\text{Impalur}] \underline{\text{iya}} \underline{\text{appa}} \parallel \underline{\text{memiškiwan}} \underline{\text{daiš}}$   
 ‘And the Sea began to reply to Impaluri.’  
(KUB 17.7+ ii 15)

(11)  $\text{nu } {}^d\text{Impaluriš} \underline{\text{uddar}} \underline{\text{aruni}} \underline{\text{appa}} \parallel \underline{\text{memiškiwan}} \underline{\text{daiš}}$   
 ‘And Impaluri began to speak words in reply to the Sea.’  
(KUB 17.7+ ii 9-10)

Crucial for McNeill was the number of *irreducible* elements in these lines: all three can be reduced to the formulaic template in (12):

(12) TEMPLATE:  
 $\underline{\text{X}}_{\text{subj.}} \underline{\text{Y}}_{\text{ind.obj.}} \parallel \underline{\text{memiškiwan}} \underline{\text{daiš}}$   
 ‘X began to speak to Y’

[2.7.] Building on McNeill, Durnford (1971) addresses lines which appear to have more than four stressed elements (e.g. (10-11), above); he argues for ‘syntactic’ stress, though unclear about what he means by ‘syntactic’; certain elements are always stressed, while others—typically, those which may cohere closely with another stressed element, such as preverbs, attributive adjectives, or adnominal genitives—count as unstressed for metrical purposes; thus (13) is also unproblematic:

- (13) *nu arunaš<sup>d</sup> Impaluriya appa memiškiwan daiš*  
'And the Sea began to reply to Impaluri.'

(KUB 17.7 ii 15)

- [2.8.] Durnford's analysis is refined by Melchert (1998), who argues instead for *phrasal stress*; this analysis essentially correct, will serve as a point of departure in our discussion below
- [2.9.] Before proceeding, one more complication; Melchert (forthcoming) suggests that some lines better analyzed as having just three stresses; hence, basically two unknowns:
- i. What is the structure of a verse line?
  - ii. What constitutes a phonological phrase?

### 3 New Approaches to Hittite Meter

- [3.1.] Insight of Melchert (1998) that stress is not 'syntactic' but rather 'phrasal' is important; we know that phonological processes such as stress assignment do not have direct access to syntactic structure; rather, an interaction between the syntactic and phonological components of the grammar, generally referred to as the *syntax-phonology interface*; syntactic factors important in determining prosodic constituency, not the only factor

- [3.2.] *Prosody* here refers not to poetic meter, but to phonological elements at the level of the syllable and above and the properties they show, including intonation, accentuation, and the like; these elements organized into progressively larger units according to PROSODIC HIERARCHY; evidence for the PROSODIC HIERARCHY comes from the fact that certain phonological rules (e.g. stress assignment) apply only within these units (or *prosodic domains*).

The PROSODIC HIERARCHY is a widely-accepted theory proposed by Selkirk (1978, 1980), and further developed in the works of Nespor and Vogel (1982, 1986), Hayes (1989, 1990), and Inkelas and Zec (1990, 1995); see also the accessible introduction in Chapter 16 of Gussenhoven and Jacobs (2011)

- [3.3.] A practical example: Greek cliticization; cliticization sensitive to prosodic constituency, hence 'Wackernagel clitics' gives us some of our best evidence for reconstructing the prosody of ancient Indo-European languages.

See now within Indo-European the profitable analyses of Devine and Stephens (1994) (Greek), Fortson (2008) (Latin), Garrett (1990, 1999) (Anatolian, Ogam Irish), Goldstein (2010) (Greek), and (esp.) Hale (1987, 1995) (Greek, Vedic).

- [3.4.] Conjunctive particle δέ in Homeric Greek almost always occurs after the first word in its sentence, showing 'Wackernagel's Law' (see Hale 1995:21-28); typical example in (14):

- (14) πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν  
'And many mighty souls he sent forth to Hades.'

(Hom. *Il.* 1.3)

However, a few systematic exceptions to this general rule;  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  instead follows the governed noun in a sentence-initial prepositional phrase in (15):

- (15)  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\prime \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon \delta\prime$   $\acute{\alpha}\iota\mu\alpha \kappa\epsilon\lambda\alpha\iota\nu\acute{\omicron}\nu, // \nu\acute{\iota}\zeta\prime \upsilon\delta\alpha\tau\iota \lambda\iota\alpha\rho\acute{\omega}\iota$   
 ‘**And from it** wash the black blood // with warm water.’

(Hom. *Il.* 11.829-30)

This type best explained as result of prosodic domain formation, in this case between  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{o}$  +  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ ; this blocks the phonological process which would normally place the clitic after the first word from accessing the juncture between them

- [3.5.] Some exceptions to exceptions: when the object of the preposition is not a bare noun, but is rather modified by an attributive adjective, we find the pattern in (16):

- (16)  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{o} \delta\prime$   $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\kappa\epsilon\omicron\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\rho\gamma\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\iota\omicron // \acute{\alpha}\iota\mu\alpha \mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\nu \kappa\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\rho\upsilon\zeta\epsilon$   
 ‘**And from** the grievous wound // dark blood gushed.’

(Hom. *Il.* 11.812-13)

Prosodic domain formation between noun and preposition blocked by domain formation with attributive adjective; contrast between these two prosodic structures can be schematized as in (17):

- (17) [ $\acute{\alpha}\pi\prime \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ ] [ $\acute{\alpha}\iota\mu\alpha\dots$ ] vs. [ $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{o}$ ] [ $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\kappa\epsilon\omicron\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\rho\gamma\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\iota\omicron$ ]

- [3.6.] Greek reflects typologically common processes of prosodic domain formation, with support also in other ancient Indo-European languages, e.g. Vedic Sanskrit (see again, Hale 1995); in RV, normal external sandhi treatment of word final *-s* before a word beginning with *p/k* is visarga ( $\hbar$ ), as in (18):

- (18)  $d\acute{a}s\acute{a}p\acute{a}t\acute{n}\bar{r} \acute{a}higop\acute{a} at\acute{i}\acute{s}t\acute{h}an$   
 $n\acute{r}uddh\acute{a} \acute{a}p\acute{a}\hbar pa\acute{n}\acute{i}neva g\acute{a}v\acute{a}\hbar$   
 ‘The waters—having a Dāsa as their master, a serpent as their keeper—  
 stood  
 obstructed, like cows by a Paṇi.’

(RV I.32.11ab)

- [3.7.] However, occasional examples where final *-s* is preserved (‘close sandhi’), occurring especially before a word-initial *-p* in same environments noted for Greek, i.e. prepositional (or in this case, postpositional) phrases and noun + attributive adjective:

- (19)  $div\acute{a}s \acute{p}\acute{a}ri pratham\acute{a}m jaj\acute{n}\acute{e} agn\acute{i}\hbar$   
 ‘Agni was born first **from heaven.**’

(RV X.45.1a)

- (20) *dhiyá yád vísve amítā ákr̥ṇvan*  
**d,yaúṣ pitá janitá satyám ukṣan**  
 ‘(The treasure) which all the immortals created with their insight,  
 (which) **Father Sky** (as) begetter (created) – (that) they sprinkled (so it  
 became) real.’

(RV IV.1.10d)

Also Vedic evidence for prosodic domains noun + adnominal genitive and preverb + verb:

- (21) *samrājā ugrá vṛṣabhā divás pátī*  
 ‘(Mitra and Varuna are) the two rulers, the mighty bulls, the **lords of the sky...**’

(RV V.63.3a)

- (22) *vṛstīm diváh pári srava*  
 ‘**Make the rain flow from heaven.**’

(RV IX.39.2c)

Latter example especially informative; noun + postposition *diváh pári* shows visarga-formation, though normally in RV reflects the ‘close sandhi’ treatment with preservation of final *-s*, as in (19), above; in the case of (22), they are blocked by prosodic domain formation between preposition—now preverb—and verb; contrast in prosodic constituency between (22) and alternative pattern of domain formation in (23):

Expected RUKI on the initial *s-* of *srava* within a prosodic domain is prevented by ‘*tisrá*-rule’; see Hale (1995, 1998) for details.

- (23) [*diváh*] [*pári srava*] vs. <sup>X</sup>[*divás pári*] [*srava*]

Each of these four types of prosodic domains—noun + adposition, noun + attributive adjective, noun + genitive, and verb + preverb—found also in Hittite meter

- [3.8.] Melchert (1998) examines Wackernagel clitics in prose texts to determine whether the prosodic units assumed by Durnford (1971) on basis of meter are present the ordinary language. Melchert finds examples where clitic behavior points to prosodic domains of the types just discussed, whose unitary treatment seems to be required by meter; e.g. in (24) conjunctive particle *ma* attaches to the the genitive *karšuwaš* ‘of cutting’, rather than first word <sup>LU</sup>*MEŠEDI* ‘bodyguard’; same principal must apply (twice!) to verse line in (25):

- (24) PROSE:  
<sup>LU</sup>*MEŠEDI karšuwaš* = *ma* = *šmaš* [*katt*]*i* = *šmi iyatta*  
 ‘The ‘**bodyguard of cutting**’ walks with them.’

(KUB 11.39 i 10)

- (25) POETRY:  
halz[eššai=wa=šmaš<sup>d</sup>Kumarbiš || šiunaš addaš šiunaš parna.  
 ‘He calls you, Kumarbi, **father of the gods**, to **the house of the gods.**’

(KUB 36.7 + KUB 17.7 iii 43-44)

[3.9.] Evidence more limited, but also support for combinations of noun + attributive adjective and preverb + verb as single prosodic domains; exx. in (26) and (27) respectively, with corresponding exx. from poetry in (28) and (29):

- (26) PROSE:  
 LU.MES **SANGA šuppaēš=a=za**  
 ‘the **sacralized priests**’

(KUB 23.21 iii 4)

- (27) PROSE:  
**GAM tīyawazi=š<sup>i</sup>(y)=at** SUM-*un*  
 ‘I gave to to him **for setting down.**’

(KUB 40.88 iv 18)

- (28) POETRY  
pataš=šaš=ma=za <sup>KUŠ</sup>ESIR.ḪIA-*uš* || liliwanduš huwanduš šarkuit  
 ‘And on his feet (as) shoes he put on **the swift winds.**’

(KUB 33.106 ii 3-4)

- (29) POETRY:  
*nu=kan ANA* <sup>d</sup>Kumarbi[i DUMU-*an* || *genuaz arḫa dāer.*  
 ‘They **took away** the child from Kumarbi’s knees.’

(KUB 33.98+ ii 15-16)

[3.10.] Before proceeding further, should be noted that while Melchert (1998) argues for ‘phrasal’ stress, he does not operate with an explicit theory of prosodic phonology; nevertheless, his findings are consistent with this approach, which is further recommended on two grounds:

[3.11.] First, clear cases in various languages where stress assignment processes are sensitive to prosodic constituency above the level of the word—especially the phonological phrase, e.g. the English ‘rhythm rule’; second, this approach can provide a unified account of exceptional cases in Greek, Vedic, and Hittite; consider two Hittite examples:

[3.12.] *šiunaš addaš* ‘father of the gods’ regularly treated as a single unit as in (25), above; in (30), however, there must be two stresses before caesura; *dappiyaš šiunaš* ‘all the gods’ more likely prosodic constituent in view of syntactic bracketing, hence analysis in (30) with normal prosodic domain formation noun + genitive blocked by prosodic bond between noun and attributive adjective:

- (30) dapiy[aš šiunaš addan] || <sup>d</sup>Kumarbin *išḫamihhi*  
 ‘Of Kumarbi, **father of all the gods**, I (shall) sing.’

(KUB 17.7+ i 3-4)



Closely parallel to Greek process in (16), where noun + attributive adjective forms a prosodic domain, preventing formation of a domain preposition + noun

- [3.13.] Interesting case of genitive + noun, Hitt. *nēpišaš<sup>d</sup>Ištanuš* ‘Sun-god of Heaven’, precisely type of locus where unitary treatment expected; in (31), however, noun and genitive must each count as stressed:

(31) *<sup>d</sup>Ulluk[ummiš=a=za n]epišaš || <sup>d</sup>Ištan[un] šakuškezzi.*  
 ‘And Ullikummi saw the **Sun-god of Heaven.**’

(KUB 33.92 + KUB 36.10 iii 19-20)

- [3.14.] This ‘exception’ readily interpretable in a theory of prosodic domains! As per Hale (1995:42-46), Vedic poetry fewer and fewer phonological processes permitted over increasingly strong metrical boundaries (caesura, line, hemistich, etc.-); these facts reflect typologically relationship between the Prosodic Hierarchy and meter (see Hayes 1989); ex. in (32) shows *divás pári* with rare visarga as it straddles the caesura boundary:

(32) *trír yád diváh || pári muhūrtám āgāt*  
 ‘When thrice he quickly came here **from heaven.**’

(RV III.53.8c)

Caesura (in trimeter) constitutes a sufficient prosodic break to block formation of a prosodic domain noun + postposition

- [3.15.] Hittite example in (31) to be explained in the same way: central caesura prevents the formation of a prosodic domain genitive + noun, which therefore count as independently stressed; *n.b.* counter-evidence to claim of Kloekhorst (2011) that “these [noun + genitive] combinations effectively were compounds”, since real compounds cannot occur over caesura
- [3.16.] (At last) the poetic dimension of this approach; Vedic and Hittite examples of noun + adjective or noun + genitive forming a prosodic domain often look like inherited phraseology, e.g.:

	Vedic	Greek	Latin	Proto-Indo-European
(33)	<i>dyáuš pitā</i> ‘Father Sky’	Ζεὺς πατήρ “	<i>Iuppiter</i> “	<i>*dyéws ph<sub>2</sub>tér</i> “

cf. Hitt. *nēpišaš<sup>d</sup>Ištanuš* ‘Sun-god of Heaven’ (titular address of a deity)

- [3.17.] Similarly, Hitt. *šiuṇaš addaš* ‘father of the gods’, with close parallels in Greek and Latin:

	Hittite	Greek	Latin
(34)	<i>šiuṇaš addaš</i> ‘father of the gods’  (KUB 36.7+ iii 43-44)	πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε ‘father of men and gods’  (Hom. <i>Il.</i> 16.458)	<i>pater deum hominumque</i> ‘father of gods and men’  (Liv. 1.12.5)

Note that while prototypical order for these structures in Greek and Latin is noun + genitive, generally held that Hittite preserves an older stage of Proto-Indo-European, which is also reflected in (e.g.) the archaic univerbation in (35):

(35) Gk. δεσπότης, Av. *dəṅg paitī* < \**dems pot-* ‘master of the house’

[3.18.] These expressions likely fixed expressions already in proto-language and treated as poetic formulae; special prosodic status in both Vedic and Hittite suggests close connection between prosody and poetic phraseology; reasonable assumption that poetic formulae consistently form single prosodic domains in Hittite, unless explicitly blocked (as in (30) and (31)); hence, recurring collocations with consistent single stress probably poetic formulae

[3.19.] Formulae are important! May yield insight into native Hittite poetic tradition (oral? cf. Francia (2004); Melchert (2007)), and into the experience of Greek poets encountering this tradition; further, possibly useful diagnostic in evaluating metrical structure of uncertain verse lines

[3.20.] This twofold utility illustrated by Hitt. *dankuiš daganzipaš* (= GE<sub>6</sub>-*iš* KI-*aš*) ‘the dark earth’ (5x in the ‘Song of Ullikummi’, as well as in Hurro-Hittite bilingual); normally single stressed as in the unambiguous four-beat line in (36):

(36) *nu=war=an dankuwai daganzipi pedatten || nuntarnutten=wa liliwahten*  
 ‘Carry him **to the dark earth!** Hurry, make haste!’

(KUB 33.102+ iii 4’)

Lends support, then, to analysis of Melchert(fc.) of (37) in the Ritual of Iriya as a three-beat line, which as often patterns as a couplet with a preceding three-beat line:

(37) *n=at karuwiliyaš šiunaš piyaweni*  
*n=at=kan kattanda dankuwai daganzipi pēdanzi*  
 ‘We shall send them to the primordial gods,  
 and carry them down **to the dark earth.**’

(KUB 30.33 i 19)

[3.21.] Other interesting aspect of this formula is possibility of Greek borrowing (see Oettinger 1989):

(38) Hitt. *dankuiš daganzipaš* ‘dark earth’ → Gk. γαῖα μέλαινα ‘id.’  
 (= GE<sub>6</sub>-*iš* KI-*aš*)

Greek formula (8x in Hom., Hes.) seems to show not only a basic 1-to-1 semantic identity with Hittite, but also similarity in functional range

Hence, probably borrowing rather than inheritance, and to be separated from IE comparanda, e.g. Old Irish *domun donn* ‘the brown earth’.

[3.2.2.] (Greco-)Hittite formula thus facilitates metrical reconstruction and provides perspective into a bilingual Greek poet's interaction with Hittite poetry; Hittite formulae perhaps perceived as salient, recognized by a Greek poet for familiar poetic function or creative potential—and in some cases, adapted for his own use

## 4 Preliminary Conclusions & Future Research

[4.1.] PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS: Following Melchert (1998), Hittite poetry is sensitive 'phrasal stress', which is in some way operative at level of prosodic domains; consequently, investigation of meter demands requires an approach which incorporates attention to poetic phraseology (esp. formularity) and a formal theory of prosodic phonology, in this case, the Prosodic Hierarchy.

[4.2.] NEXT STEP: a systematic reevaluation of the meter used in the Hurro-Hittite epics and the native Hittite metrical texts, applying advances in our understanding of the meter; our approach may shed light on some outstanding questions, e.g. function of the three-beat (catalectic?) lines and relationship to more regular four-beat lines (strophic structures?); could any other well-known Hittite myths (Telepinu, Illuyankaš) be metrical?

[4.3.] Addressing questions of this kind will lead to a more nuanced understanding of the Hittite poetic tradition, which in turn will permit a more realistic assessment of larger issues regarding the Greco-Anatolian poetic interface.

## References

- Bachvarova, M. R. (2002). *From Hittite to Homer: The Role of Anatolians in the Transmission of Epic and Prayer Motifs from the Near East to the Greeks*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Chicago.
- Bachvarova, M. R. (2005). The Eastern Mediterranean Epic Tradition from *Bilgames* and *Akka* to the *Song of Release* to Homer's *Iliad*. *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 45, 131–53.
- Bachvarova, M. R. (2009). Hittite and Greek perspectives on travelling poets, texts, and festivals. In R. Hunter and I. C. Rutherford (Eds.), *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travel, Locality, and Panhellenism*, pp. 23–44. Cambridge, UK/New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Burkert, W. (1985). *Greek Religion*. Oxford/Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Devine, A. M. and L. D. Stephens (1994). *The Prosody of Greek Speech*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Durnford, S. P. (1971). Some Evidence for Syntactic Stress in Hittite. *Anatolian Studies* 21, 69–75.

- Eichner, H. (1993). Probleme von Vers und Metrum in epichorischer Dichtung Altkleinasiens. In G. Dobesch and G. Rehrenböck (Eds.), *Hundert Jahre Kleinasiatische Kommission der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Fortson, B. W. (2008). *Language and Rhythm in Plautus: Synchronic and Diachronic Studies*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Francia, R. (2004). Montagne grandi (e) piccole, (sapete) perchè sono venuto? (in margine a due recitative del rituale di iriya *cth* 400-401). *Orientalia* 73(4), 390–408.
- Garrett, A. (1990). *The Syntax of Anatolian Pronominal Clitics*. Ph. D. thesis, Harvard University.
- Garrett, A. (1999). On the Prosodic Phonology of Ogam Irish. *Ériu* 50, 139–160.
- Goldstein, D. M. (2010). *Wackernagel's Law in Fifth-Century Greek*. Ph. D. thesis, University of California-Berkeley.
- Gussenhoven, C. and H. Jacobs (2011). *Understanding Phonology* (3 ed.). London: Routledge.
- Güterbock, H. G. (1951). The Song of Ullikummi Revised Text of the Hittite Version of a Hurrian Myth. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 5(4), 135–61.
- Güterbock, H. G. (1952). The Song of Ullikummi Revised Text of the Hittite Version of a Hurrian Myth (Continued). *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 6(1), 8–42.
- Hale, M. (1987). *Studies in the Comparative Syntax of the Oldest Indo-European Languages*. Ph. D. thesis, Harvard University.
- Hale, M. (1995). Wackernagel's Law: Phonology & Syntax in the Rigveda. Unpublished ms.
- Hale, M. (1998). Post-Lexical RUKI and the *tisrá*-Rule. In J. H. Jasanoff, H. C. Melchert, and L. Oliver (Eds.), *Mír Curad: Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*, pp. 213–222. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Hayes, B. (1989). The Prosodic Hierarchy in Meter. In P. Kiparsky and G. Youmans (Eds.), *Phonetics and Phonology, Volume I: Rhythm and Meter*, pp. 201–260. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Hayes, B. (1990). Precompiled Phrasal phonology. In S. Inkelas and D. Zec (Eds.), *The Syntax-Phonology Connection*. Stanford, CA/Chicago, IL: Center for the Study of Language and Information and University of Chicago Press.
- Inkelas, S. and D. Zec (1990). Prosodically Constrained Syntax. In S. Inkelas and D. Zec (Eds.), *The Phonology-Syntax Connection*, pp. 365–378. Stanford, CA/Chicago, IL: Center for the Study of Language and Information and University of Chicago Press.
- Inkelas, S. and D. Zec (1995). Syntax-phonology Interface. In J. A. Goldsmith (Ed.), *The Handbook of Phonological Theory*, pp. 535–549. Oxford/Malden, MA: Blackwell.

- Kloekhorst, A. (2011). Accentuation and Poetic Meter in Hittite. In M. Hutter and S. Hutter-Braunsar (Eds.), *Hethitische Literatur: Überlieferungsprozesse, Textstrukturen, Ausdrucksformen und Nachwirken*, pp. 157–176. Münster: Ugarit.
- McNeill, I. (1963). The Metre of the Hittite Epic. *Anatolian Studies* 13, 237–242.
- Meillet, A. (1923). *Les origines indo-européennes des mètres grecs*. Les presses universitaires de France.
- Melchert, H. C. (1998). Poetic Meter and Phrasal Stress in Hittite. In J. H. Jasanoff, H. C. Melchert, and L. Oliver (Eds.), *Mír Curad: Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*, pp. 483–494. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Melchert, H. C. (2007). New Light on Hittite Verse and Meter? In K. Jones-Bley, M. E. Huld, A. Della Volpe, and M. R. Dexter (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 18th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, Los Angeles, November 3-4 2006*, pp. 117–128.
- Melchert, H. C. (forthcoming). Translation Strategies in the Hurro-Hittite bilingual from boğazköy. In J. L. García Ramón (Ed.), *Strategies of Translation: languages in contact, poetic language. Proceedings of a Workshop at Cologne, December 2010*.
- Nespor, M. and I. Vogel (1982). Prosodic domains of external sandhi rules. In H. van der Hulst and N. Smith (Eds.), *The Structure of Phonological Representations*, Volume 1, pp. 222–255. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Nespor, M. and I. Vogel (1986). *Prosodic Phonology*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Neu, E. (1996). *Das hurritische Epos der Freilassung I: Untersuchungen zu einem hurritisch-hethitischen Textensemble*. Number 32 in Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten. Harrassowitz.
- Oettinger, N. (1989). Die ‘dunkle Erde’ im Hethitischen und Griechischen. *Die Welt des Orients* 20/21, 83–98.
- Selkirk, E. (1978). On prosodic structure and its relation to syntactic structure. In T. Fretheim (Ed.), *Norse Prosody*, Volume 2, pp. 111–140. Trondheim: Tapir.
- Selkirk, E. (1980). Prosodic domains in phonology: Sanskrit revisited. In M. Aronoff and M.-L. Kean (Eds.), *Juncture*, pp. 107–129. Saratoga, CA: Anima Libri.
- Watkins, C. (1995). *How To Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Watkins, C. (2000). A Distant Anatolian Echo in Pindar: The Origin of the Aegis Again. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 100, 1–14.
- Watkins, C. (2004[1994]). The Language of the Trojans. In *Selected Writings*, Volume III, pp. 700–717. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Watkins, C. (2007). The Golden Bowl: Thoughts on the New Sappho and its Asianic Background. *Classical Antiquity* 26(2), 305–324.

West, M. L. (1966). *Hesiod: Theogony*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

West, M. L. (1988). The Rise of the Greek Epic. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 108, 151–172.

West, M. L. (2007). *Indo-European Poetry and Myth*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.