

Alter Orient und Altes Testament

Band 391

Hethitische Literatur

Überlieferungsprozesse, Textstrukturen, Ausdrucksformen und Nachwirken

Akten des Symposiums
vom 18. bis 20. Februar 2010 in Bonn

Herausgegeben von
Manfred Hutter und Sylvia Hutter-Braunsar

2011
Ugarit-Verlag
Münster

Hethitische Literatur.

Überlieferungsprozesse, Textstrukturen, Ausdrucksformen und
Nachwirken.

Akten des Symposiums vom 18. bis 20. Februar 2010 in Bonn.

Herausgegeben von Manfred Hutter und Sylvia Hutter-Braunsar

Alter Orient und Altes Testament, Band 391

891'.99809 -- dc22

© 2011 Ugarit-Verlag, Münster

www.ugarit-verlag.de

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

All rights preserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
electronic, mechanical, photo-copying, recording, or otherwise,
without the prior permission of the publisher.

Herstellung: Hubert & Co, Göttingen

Printed in Germany

ISBN 978-3-86835-063-0

Printed on acid-free paper

Vorwort

Die Diskussion über „Literatur“ in Kleinasien hat in den letzten Jahren neue Impulse erhalten, indem Fragen nach Überlieferungsgeschichte, Entstehung und Kompilation, aber auch nach Zweck und Trägerschaften solcher Texte aufgeworfen wurden. Genauso werden seit einiger Zeit auch literaturwissenschaftliche Theoriebildungen in der Erschließung kleinasiatischer Texte stärker berücksichtigt. Solche Fragestellungen wurden daher – im lockeren Anschluss an zwei in den Jahren 2003 und 2005 veranstaltete Tagungen, die sich primär auf religiöse Thematiken der anatolischen Überlieferung konzentrierten – in den Mittelpunkt eines Symposiums im Februar 2010 in der Abteilung für Religionswissenschaft des Instituts für Orient- und Asienwissenschaften der Universität Bonn gestellt. Den Bezug zu den beiden früheren Tagungen stellt nicht nur derselbe Publikationsort her, sondern auch inhaltlich sind zweifellos Berührungspunkte zwischen Religionsgeschichte und Literaturgeschichte im hethitischen Kleinasien gegeben; denn ein nicht geringer Teil der schriftlichen Überlieferung der Hethiter hängt mit Ritualen, Mythologien und der Tradierung religiöser Vorstellungen zusammen.

Als pragmatische Basis wurde „Literatur“ für die Fragestellung des Symposiums als überlieferungswürdiges Schriftgut einer Kultur verstanden, ohne diese Umschreibung für das Symposium allzu eng zu fassen. Dadurch war es im Rahmen der Beiträge möglich, eine Reihe von Fragen aufzuwerfen, die unterschiedliche Aspekte der literarischen Überlieferung der hethitischen Kultur je nach Interesse in den Mittelpunkt rücken konnten. Teilweise fokussierten die während des Symposiums diskutierten Fragen literaturwissenschaftliche Theoriebildungen, teilweise wurden auch Prozesse von Literaturproduktion und Weitergabe derselben skizziert, wobei auch stilistische Ausdrucksformen und Motive in dieser Funktion betrachtet wurden. Trotz der unterschiedlichen Zugangsweisen der Autorinnen und Autoren lassen sich im vorliegenden Band unschwer thematische Gemeinsamkeiten sehen. Fragen von Literaturtheorie und Literaturgattungen stehen v.a. im Mittelpunkt der Beiträge von Birgit Christiansen, Paola Dardano, Amir Gilan, Manfred Hutter, Maria Lepši und Jared L. Miller; komplementär zu diesem literaturwissenschaftlichen Block sind die Beiträge von Silvia Alaura, José L. García Ramón, Alwin Kloekhorst, Elisabeth Rieken und Zsolt Simon, die Motive und sprachliche Ausdrucksformen in anatolischen Texten untersuchen. Wie Literaturverständnis – sei es bezüglich der Aussagen eines Literaturwerkes oder sei es bezüglich der Konzeption eines solchen Werkes – auch durch den Vergleich von Texten gefördert wird, sieht man im vorliegenden Band bei den Beiträgen von Sylvia Hutter-Braunsar, Michel Mazoyer, Ian Rutherford, Karl Strobel und Joan Goodnick Westenholz. Schließlich seien als letzte – nicht minder wichtige – Gruppe die Beiträge von Gary Beckman, Carlo Corti, Magdalena Kapeluš und Piotr Taracha genannt, die ihr Hauptaugenmerk auf Rekonstruktion und Zusammenstellungen einzelner Texte legen – als Basis für zukünftige literaturwissenschaftliche Analysen dieser Texte.

Für den vorliegenden Band wurden die einzelnen Beiträge redaktionell weitestgehend vereinheitlicht, allerdings wurden Schreibungen von Namen, teilweise auch von Umschriften anatolischer Wörter, für die die Autorinnen und Autoren jeweils gute Gründe haben, in unterschiedlicher Form innerhalb der Texte belassen. Die redaktionelle Vereinheitlichung betraf daher in erster Linie Zitationsweisen und Abkürzungen, letztere lassen sich durch das beigegebene Abkürzungsverzeichnis aufschlüsseln.

Manfred Hutter / Sylvia Hutter-Braunsar

Inhaltsverzeichnis

SILVIA ALAURA Aspekte der Gesten- und Gebärdensprache im „Ullikummi-Lied“	9
GARY BECKMAN Primordial Obstetrics. “The Song of Emergence” (CTH 344)	25
BIRGIT CHRISTIANSEN Methoden zur Analyse von Texten des Traditionsgutes. Ihre Leistungen und Grenzen	35
CARLO CORTI “Words of the Clay”, “Words of the Water”. Introduction to the H̱utuši Magical Ritual	47
PAOLA DARDANO Erzählte Vergangenheit und kulturelles Gedächtnis im hethitischen Schrifttum. Die so genannte Palastchronik.....	63
JOSÉ L. GARCÍA RAMÓN Idiome in hethitischer Literatur und in griechischer Dichtung. Anatolische bzw. akkadische Lehnübersetzungen oder indogermanische Phraseologie?	83
AMIR GILAN Das Huhn, das Ei und die Schlange. Mythos und Ritual im Illuyanka-Text	99
MANFRED HUTTER Sammeltafeln – Zufallsprodukt von Schreibern oder Ausdruck von hethitischem Literaturverständnis?	115
SYLVIA HUTTER-BRAUN SAR Vergleichende Untersuchungen zu den Texten über eine aus Zorn verschwundene Gottheit	129
MAGDALENA KAPELUŚ On different texts of the Hittite royal funerary rituals. CTH 450 reconsidered	145
ALWIN KLOEKHORST Accentuation and Poetic Meter in Hittite	157

MARIA LEPŠI „Und Hattušili nahm uns bei der Hand“. Die so genannte Apologie (CTH 81) im Licht moderner Erzähltheorie.....	177
MICHEL MAZOYER A propos de la mythologie hittite. Innovation et tradition.....	187
JARED L. MILLER Die hethitischen Dienstanweisungen. Zwischen normativer Vorschrift und Traditionsliteratur	193
ELISABETH RIEKEN Fachsprachliche Merkmale in den hethitischen Ritualbeschreibungen	207
IAN RUTHERFORD Ea and the Beast. The Hittite Text and its relation to the Greek Poetry	217
ZSOLT SIMON Hethitische Topoi in der hieroglyphen-luwischen Historiographie. Bemerkungen zur Frage der Kontinuität	227
KARL STROBEL Die Geschichtsschreibung der Hethiter und frühe griechische Historiographie. Wertungsfragen im Lichte der Anatolisch-Ägäischen Koinē.....	245
PIOTR TARACHA Hittite Rituals as Literary Texts. What do we know about their original editions?.....	275
JOAN GOODNICK WESTENHOLZ The Transmission and Reception of the Sargonic Sagas in the Hittite World.....	285
INDEX Namen und Sachbegriffe	305
Ausführlich behandelte Texte.....	307
Abkürzungen	309

Accentuation and Poetic Meter in Hittite

Alwin Kloekhorst, Leiden

In his edition of the Song of Ullikummi, Güterbock (1951: 142) made an astonishing discovery, namely that this epic text is “written in verse or at least in a form that comes close to verse.” Yet, he had to admit that “it is not easy to describe these verses in detail or to establish anything like a metrical pattern. Should one count syllables or word stresses?” Only a decade later, in 1963, McNeill took up this question. According to him, all Hittite epic texts were written in verse, and by investigating substitution patterns in recurring formulae, he was able to show that the meter in these verses was not syllable counting but rather stress-based. Moreover, he was able to show that each verse contains four stresses, and that these stresses are divided into two equal cola. According to him, this meter must be taken over from the Hurrians, who took it over from Mesopotamia, where such a system is well-known. Since not each verse contains only four words, Durnford (1971) supposed that some words apparently do not count as stressed within the meter. On the basis of an analysis of “basic formulae and comparing their expanded variants” he tried to identify the “words and their contexts where stress does or does not appear” (1971: 69). His conclusions are, for instance, that all verb forms count as stressed; all nouns count as stressed; but adjectives count as unstressed; the sentence initial conjunction *nu* + enclitics counts as unstressed; the adverbs/postpositions *āppa*, *šarā*, *parā*, etc. count as unstressed; etc. Moreover, Durnford suggested that the same metrical system may underlie the famous ‘Song of Neša’, which would be an indication that the meter was not taken over from Mesopotamia, but was native Anatolian instead.

In 1998, Melchert tried to determine whether the stressed or unstressed nature of specific word categories as proposed by Durnford can also be proven to exist on the basis of evidence from prose texts. He did so by investigating the placement of sentence initial enclitics, which are thought to be always attached to the first stressed word in a sentence. In this way, Melchert was able to confirm several of Durnford’s assumptions, although some others needed to be adapted. Recently, Melchert (2007) has argued that also a recitation passage within the Ritual of Irija may contain this meter, and since this recitation seems to reflect a native Anatolian tradition, it would be another argument to regard the meter as not being borrowed from Mesopotamia, but rather as an independent, native Anatolian tradition as well.¹

In a recent article, I have presented my views on the connection between plene and non-plene spelling of the vowel *e* and the place of accentuation in words

¹ Since a similar meter is attested in the oldest Germanic poetry (cf. e.g. Sievers 1893: 22-36), it may be possible that this meter is inherited from Proto-Indo-European.

(Kloekhorst fthc.).² My findings can be schematized thus, first for the Old Hittite period:

		PIE	OH		
				closed	open
accented	polysyll.	* <i>é̄</i> * <i>éh₁</i> * <i>éi</i> * <i>ói</i>	/é̄/	(-)Ce-e-eC(-)	(-)Ce-e-CV(-)
		* <i>é</i>	/é/	(-)Ce-eC(-)	(-)Ce(-e)-CV
	monosyll.	* <i>é̄</i> * <i>éh₁</i> * <i>éi</i> * <i>ói</i>	/é̄/	Ce-e-eC	Ce-e
		* <i>é</i>			
unaccented		* <i>ē</i> * <i>eh₁</i> * <i>ei</i> * <i>oi</i>	/e/	(-)Ce-eC(-)	(-)Ce-CV(-)
		* <i>e</i>	/i/, /a/	(-)Ci-iC(-)	(-)Ca-CV(-)

Thus, for the Old Hittite period, the following applies. In closed syllables, plene spelling of *e* indicates the presence of an accented long /é̄/, which reflects PIE accented **é̄*, **éh₁*, **éi* or **ói* (in monosyllables also **é*). Absence of plene spelling can either indicate the presence of an accented short /é/, which reflects PIE accented **é*, or the presence of an unaccented short /e/, which then reflects PIE unaccented **ē*, **eh₁*, **ei* or **oi*. This means that in closed syllables the presence of plene spelling of *e* directly correlates with the presence of accentuation, but the reverse is not true: absence of plene spelling of *e* does not on its own prove lack of accentuation. In open syllables, consistent plene spelling of *e* (i.e. in ca. 90% of the attestations) indicates the presence of an accented long /é̄/, which reflects PIE accented **é̄*, **éh₁*, **éi* or **ói*. Plene spelling in about 50% of the attestations indicates the presence of an accented short /é/, which goes back to accented PIE **é*. Absence of plene spelling indicates the presence of an unaccented short /e/, which goes back to PIE unaccented **ē*, **eh₁*, **ei* or **oi*. This means that in open syllables the presence of plene spelling of *e* directly correlates with the presence of accentuation, whereas the consistent ab-

² These are the first preliminary outcomes of my research project dealing with the correlation between plene spelling and accentuation in Hittite, in which a discussion of plene spelling of the vowels *a*, *i* and *u* will be incorporated as well.

sence of plene spelling of *e* directly correlates with absence of accentuation. At the end of the OH period, the long /*é*/ is being shortened in polysyllabic words, merging with short /*é*/, bringing consequences for the Middle Hittite and Neo-Hittite period.

		PIE	MH and NH		
				closed	open
accented	polysyll.	* <i>é̄</i> * <i>éh₁</i> * <i>éi</i> * <i>ói</i>	/é/	(-)Ce-eC(-)	(-)Ce(-e)-CV(-)
		* <i>é</i>			
accented	monosyll.	* <i>é̄</i> * <i>éh₁</i> * <i>éi</i> * <i>ói</i>	/é/	Ce-e-eC	Ce-e
		* <i>é</i>			
unaccented		* <i>ē</i> * <i>eh₁</i> * <i>ei</i> * <i>oi</i>	/e/	(-)Ce-eC(-)	(-)Ce-CV(-)
		* <i>e</i>			

This means that for the Middle Hittite and Neo-Hittite period we can only use information from open syllables when it comes to determining the presence or absence of accentuation: when the vowel *e* is spelled plene (in ca. 50% of its attestations), it is accented, when it is consistently spelled non-plene, it is unaccented.³

It is important to realize that these considerations are only valid for *e* that follows a consonant. If *e* follows another vowel (*CaeC*, *CieC*, *CueC*), the presence of plene spelling is irrelevant when it comes to determining vowel length and subsequent accentuation.⁴

In the present article, it is my aim to discuss whether these new insights into the correlation between plene spelling of *e* and the place of accentuation can confirm the works of McNeill, Durnford and Melchert. Since the 1998 article by Melchert is the most recent discussion of poetic meter, I will use this as a starting point.

³ Note, however, that from the MH period onwards short accented /*é*/ in internal syllables (i.e. non-initial and non-final syllables) starts to be consistently spelled non-plene as well, which means that in this position it cannot be distinguished from unaccented /*e*/ anymore.

⁴ This is because in the sequence *Cu-e-eC* the sign E more or less functions as a glide, comparable to the sign ʾA in *Cu-ʾa-aC*. Similarly in *Ci-e-eC*, which is equivalent to *Ci-ʾa-aC*.

According to Melchert, “any element normally stressed in prose may also count as stressed in poetry” (1998: 488). The interesting words are of course the ones that do not count as stressed in the epic meter. Melchert investigated whether their lack of accentuation could also be shown on the basis of these words’ interaction with the sentence initial particles in prose texts. I will now discuss whether we can show lack of accentuation of these words on the basis of absence of plene spelling of *e* as well. I will therefore treat each word category for which we must assume lack of accentuation either on the basis of their behavior in epic texts or their interaction with sentence initial particles, and try to determine whether additional evidence on the basis of absence of plene spelling of *e* can be found.

Melchert explicitly distinguishes between words that show a consistent lack of stress, and words that are only occasionally unstressed. In the following I will make this distinction as well and first focus on the words that are consistently unstressed.

1. *nu, ta, šu*

In the following examples from epic texts, we see that the sentence initial conjunction *nu* does not count as stressed, not only when it stands on its own, but also when enclitics are attached to it.

KUB 33.106 ii 7-9:

nu mahhan ^d*Hepadduš* | ^d*Tašmišun aušta nu=kan* ^d*Hepaduš šuhhaz* | *katta mauššuuanzi uakkareš[keu]an tiiat*. ‘When Hēpat saw Tašmišu, Hēpat began to stir so that she would fall off the roof’.

KUB 33.93 + KUB 36.7a + KUB 17.7 iii 31:

nu=uar=an [*nepiš*]aš ^dUTU-uš ^d[*SĪN-ašš=a*] | [*lē uua[nz]i*]. ‘The Sun-god of Heaven and the Moon-god must not see him!’

According to Melchert, this is the case in prose texts as well, because “the conjunctions *nu* and *ta* never undergo vowel-lengthening when occurring alone” (1998: 492 n. 15). Yet, he could also have given examples of the following type:

n=aš duuan=ma parā [...] (KUB 21.38 obv. 14).

nu=ta kē=ma ... (KBo 5.3 ii 11).

nu=ua=mu=kan zik=ma anda [*lē*] *dalijaši* (KUB 21.16 i 19-20).

nu=ua tuppa^{HI.A} =*ma* *kue ŠA* [...] (KUB 43.76 rev. 6).

In all cases, the enclitic particle =*ma* is attached to the second word in the sentence, which indicates that this was the first stressed word, implying that the preceding word, consisting of *nu* + enclitic particles, was unstressed.

Not only do these examples show that *nu* + enclitics is unstressed, they also prove that the enclitic conjunction =*ma* behaves fundamentally differently from the other sentence initial particles (the quotative particle =*ua(r)*, the enclitic personal pronoun =*a-*, the dat.loc. particles =*mmu*, =*tta*, =*nnāš* and =*šmaš*, the reflexive =*z*, and the local particles =*an*, =*ašta*, =*ap(a)*, =*kkan* and =*ššan*). The latter group is always attached to the first word in the sentence irrespective of whether this word was stressed or not, whereas =*ma* is always attached to the first stressed word.⁵

⁵ The same goes for the particle =*ja* when used as a sentence conjunction.

Therewith only the placement of =*ma* can be used as definite proof for or against accentuation of a certain word.

Evidence based on the absence of plene spelling of *e* supports the unstressed character of *nu* + particles. For instance, the word *n=e* ‘and they’, which must reflect **n(u)oi*, is always spelled without plene vowel, *ne*, indicating that it was unstressed. Compare, for instance, the word *kē* ‘these’, going back to accented **kói*, which is always spelled with a plene vowel, *ke-e*.

The OH conjunctions *ta* and *šu* do not occur in the epic texts. Since they display the same syntactic behavior as *nu*, it is nevertheless fair to assume that they were unstressed as well. For *ta*, this might be supported by the following context: *ta* ^{GIS}ŠUKUR=*ma* ... (KUB 10.21 i 20).⁶ Here, the addition of =*ma* to ^{GIS}ŠUKUR seems to indicate that this was the first stressed word of the sentence, implying that *ta* was unstressed. Moreover, the word *t=e* ‘and they’, which must reflect **t=oi*, is always spelled without a plene vowel, *te*, indicating that it was unstressed.

For *šu*, I know of no cases where we find the conjunction =*ma* attached to the word following it (but this could well be due to the fact that the number of attestations of *šu* is considerably low). Nevertheless, the one attestation of *š=e* ‘and they’ without plene spelling, *še* (KBo 22.2 rev. 13), points to absence of stress as well.⁷

⁶ Note that the context seems corrupt, however: KUB 10.21 i (19) ... ^{GIS}*kal-mu-uš=ma=ša-an* (20) ^{GIS}DAG-*ti* ZAG-*az da-a-i ta* ^{GIS}ŠUKUR=*ma* (21) DUMU.É.GAL ^{GIS}ŠUKUR *har-zi*. ‘He places the lituus to the right of the throne. The palace servant holds a spear’. We see that ^{GIS}ŠUKUR ‘spear’ is mentioned twice. This is probably mistaken, since parallel texts show either ^{GIS}ŠUKUR=*ma har-zi* ‘He holds a spear’ (IBoT 3.56,4, KUB 25.16 i 11) or DUMU.É.GAL=*ma* ^{GIS}ŠUKUR *har-zi* ‘the palace servant holds a spear’ (KUB 10.3 i 25), both with ^{GIS}ŠUKUR mentioned only once. Perhaps the phrase *ta* ^{GIS}ŠUKUR=*ma* DUMU.É.GAL ^{GIS}ŠUKUR *har-zi* is a conflation of, on the one hand, ^{GIS}ŠUKUR=*ma har-zi* and, on the other, an unattested *ta* DUMU.É.GAL ^{GIS}ŠUKUR *har-zi*. If so, this example is non-probative.

⁷ Other indications that the sentence initial conjunctions *nu*, *ta* and *šu* were unstressed, i.e. were used proclitically, are that they never occur at the end of a line, and that in some OS texts there is no word space between *nu* and a following word (cf. CHD L-N: 461 for examples). Moreover, the fact that all enclitic particles attached to *nu*, *ta* and *šu* have a geminated initial consonant, also when this geminate is etymologically unexpected (=šši, =ššan, =nmaš, =mmu (CHD L-N: 311)), may be caused by the proclitic nature of these particle chains: in contrast with the fact that consonants were lenited in posttonic position (Eichner’s second lenition rule), I assume that in pretonic position they were geminated. Since Watkins 1963, the sentence initial conjunctions *nu*, *ta*, *šu* are generally connected with the Old Irish sentence initial conjunctions *no*, *to*, *se*, which means that we must reconstruct PIE **nu*, **to*, **so* (cf. also Kloekhorst 2008: 607-8, 772, 801). Moreover, Watkins argued that the syntactic behavior of these particles, namely that in both languages they can take enclitic personal pronouns, must be inherited from PIE. When it comes to accentuation, it is interesting to see that in Old Irish, *no*, *to*, *se* + enclitics are unstressed (Thurneysen 1946: 27f.). According to Watkins, “[t]his situation cannot be an inherited one” (1963: 40) because PIE **nu*, **to*, **so* occur “in initial position in the sentence and [are] therefore accented” (1963: 16). This assumption seems to be based on the idea that in Hittite, *nu*, *ta*, *šu* + enclitics are accented. Since we have now seen that this is not the case, we can assume that the lack of stress in OIr. *no*, *to*, *se* + enclitics and in Hitt. *nu*, *ta*, *šu* + enclitics rather is an inherited feature.

2. *mān* ‘when, if’

In the epic texts, the conjunction *mān* ‘when, if’ never counts as stressed in the meter:⁸

KUB 33.93 iii 26:

mān ^dKumarbiš ^{INIM}^{MES}-ar | *mem*[*iauuanz*]i *zi*[*nn*]it. ‘When Kumarbi had ceased to speak the words’.

This is supported by evidence from prose texts, where we come across the following type of sentences many times:

mān ^dUTU^{ŠI}=*ma* ... (KUB 26.17 i 4).
mān ^{URU}Hattuša=*ma* ... (KBo 8.42 obv. 5).
mān=aš šalliešta=*ma* (KBo 3.7 iii 6).
mān=aš=apa lahḫaz=*ma* ... (KUB 11.1 i 7).
mān=an išḫaš=šiš=*a* ... (KBo 6.3 iii 65).
mān=mu=kan annaz=*ma* ... (KUB 30.10 rev. 20).
mān=naš paprašzi=*ma* (KUB 13.3 iii 31).
mān=*ua* mijari=*ma* (KUB 33.120 iii 11).
mā(n)=*uar*=ašta arḫa=*ma* ... (KUB 17.6 i 21).
mān=za ABI ABI=*IA*=*ma* ... (KUB 19.12 iii 12).
 Etc.

In all these examples, the conjunction =*ma* (or non-geminating =*a*) is not attached to *mān*, but rather to the word following it, indicating that that word was the first stressed one, and that *mān* therefore must have been unstressed.⁹ Again, we see that the quotative particle =*ua*(*r*), the enclitic pronoun =*a*-, the reflexive =*z* and the enclitic local particles =*apa*, =*ašta*, =*kan*, etc., are attached to unstressed *mān*.

Since *mān* does not contain the vowel *e*, the new insights into the correlation between plene spelling of *e* and accentuation do not yield any additional evidence in this case.¹⁰

3. Relative pronoun *kui*-

The relative pronoun *kui*- counts as unstressed in the following examples from epic texts:

⁸ The only seeming exception, *mān* ^dE.A-aš | *uddār* *ištamašta* ‘When Ea heard the words’ (KUB 33.106 iii 45) is explained by Melchert (1998: 487) as “a faulty spelling out by a later scribe of GIM-an (= *maḫhan* [which did carry the stress, A.K.]) of his archetype, based on the frequent use in the text of *mān* ‘when’.”

⁹ Only in NH times, *mān* starts occurring with =*ma* attached to it, *mān*=*ma* (cf. CHD L-N: 98f.), indicating that from that time onwards it could be stressed. Cases with a double =*ma*, like *mān*=*ma*=*ua*=za *ammuk*=*ma* ... (KBo 6.29 ii 6) seem to represent a transitional stage between the older and the younger situation.

¹⁰ *mān* is often reconstructed as **món* or similar (e.g. Kloekhorst 2008: 552). This has now become impossible. In fact, we might even have to abandon the assumption that *ma-a-an* contains a long /ā/, since a pre-Hittite unstressed long */ā/ would have been shortened. This might imply that *ma-a-an* actually was disyllabic, /maʔan/.

KUB 33.102 ii 32f.:

memian=da *kuin mema[hhi]* | *n[u=mu GĚSTU-an parā]* *ēp*. ‘Which word I speak to you, hold your ear inclined to me (for it)’.

KUB 33.106 iii 52f.:

nu=kan karuūiīia ^{URUDU} *ardāla* [*pa*] *rā tīandu* | *nepiš tekann=a* *kuēz arha kuerer*. ‘Let them bring out the primeval saw with which they cut apart heaven and earth.’

KUB 12.65 iii 6f.:

uddani=ma=ua=ta *kuedani halziššai* | *nu=ua uttar liliuan*. ‘The matter about which he calls you is an urgent matter’.

Although Melchert (1998) does not treat the relative pronoun, there is support for its lack of stress to be found in prose texts: the sentence initial conjunction =*ma* is not attached to *kui-* when it is the first word of a sentence, but rather to the word following it, which indicates that *kui-* is unstressed:¹¹

kuiš=an āppa=ma ... (KBo 6.2 i 53).

kuiš=za ^{LU} *ASĪRUM=ma* ... (KBo 6.4 iv 38).

kuiš kinuzzi=ma (KUB 13.9 iii 8).

Again, we see that the other particles like =*a-*, =*z*, etc., are attached to unstressed *kui-*, because their placement is irrespective of stress.

Since in the inflected forms of *kui-* that contain the vowel *e*, this vowel always follows the vowel *u* (*kuedani*, *kuez*, *kue*), and since in this position the presence or absence of plene spelling of *e* cannot be used as an argument in favor of or against vowel length / accentuation (cf. above), we can neither confirm nor deny the unstressed nature of *kui-* from this point of view.¹²

4. *takku* ‘if’

This word, which only occurs in OH texts, is unattested in the epic texts, which are composed at a later date. Melchert (1998) therefore does not treat this word. Nevertheless, since in prose texts the conjunction =*ma* is never attached to *takku*, but always to the word following it, it is clear that just as *nu*, *ta*, *šu*, *mān* and *kui-*, *takku* was unstressed as well, always used proclitically:

takku šahhan=a ... (KBo 6.2 ii 25).

takkuu=at=an parna=ma ... (KBo 6.2 ii 35).

takku=šše A.ŠĀ^{HLA}-š=*a* ... (KBo 6.2 ii 39).

Since *takku* does not contain the vowel *e*, the new insights into the plene spelling of *e* do not yield additional support.¹³

¹¹ Cf. CHD L-N: 97f.

¹² Note that in Greek the indefinite pronoun τις ‘any one’ < **k^wi-* and in Vedic Sanskrit the particle *cid* ‘even, indeed’ < **k^wid*, which is the only remnant in that language of the PIE relative pronoun **k^wi-*, are always unaccented as well. This indicates that already in PIE the relative pronoun **k^wi-*, from which also Hittite *kui-* is derived, was unaccented.

¹³ Nevertheless, the word *takku* is commonly compared with Gr. τότε ‘at that time, then’, which means that it must reflect **tok^we*. If this word had been accented, **tók^we*, we would

5. *našma* ‘or’

As far as I know, *našma* ‘or’ is unattested in epic texts. Melchert (1998) therefore does not treat this word. Nevertheless, also *našma* is one of the words that never carries the particle =*ma*, which instead is attached to the word following it:

našma=ua=t[t]a HUL-*lauuahzi=ma* (KBo 19.73a + KUB 21.1 iii 20).
našm=an=kan ANA ^dUTU^{šI}=*ma* ... (KBo 5.4 obv. 9).

Since *našma* does not contain the vowel *e*, the new insights into the plene spelling of *e* do not yield additional support.

6. *mān* ‘as, like’

The combination noun + *mān* ‘as, like’ always counts as one stress unit within the epic texts:

KUB 33.113 i 16f.:

nu=šši=kan išhahru [par]ā | PA₅^{HIA}-*uš mān aršanzi*. ‘His tears flow forth like streams’.

KUB 33.93 iii 17f.:

nu=uar[=aš=kan] NÍ.TE-az arha | ^{GIŠ}*šiiatal mān uatkut*. ‘Out from the body like a *šiiatal* he jumped’.

KUB 33.93 iii 21f.:

^dU-*an=ma=ua* GUL-*ahdu* | *nu=uar[=an e]zzan GIM-an arha puššaiddu* || *lalakuešan=ma=uar=an=[kan GIM-an] GÌR-it* | *anda pašihaiddu*. ‘He must hit the Storm-god, and pound him like salt; like an ant he must crush him with his feet’.

According to Melchert (1998: 491), in prose texts no “direct evidence” can be found that would show that a combination of noun + *mān* ‘as, like’ counts as one stress unit. This is not surprising, since it is likely that in this combination the noun was accented, and *mān* acted as an unstressed postclitic. So, if this sequence occurred at the beginning of a sentence containing the conjunction =*ma*, we would expect to find NOUN=*ma mān*. And this is exactly what is attested:

RŠ 25.421, 36f.:¹⁴

^{GIŠ}KIRI₆-*aš=m=aš GIM-an ilaliian[za] dammetaruntit šūanza*. ‘She is like a desirable garden, filled with luxuriant growth’.

KUB 33.93 iii 22:

lalakuešan=mā=uar=an=[kan GIM-an] GÌR-it anda pašihaiddu. ‘Like an ant he must crush him with his feet’.

have expected a Hittite outcome ***ta-a-ku* (with long /ā/ and lenited /-g^w/, cf. Kloekhorst 2008: 816). Therefore, the presence of short /a/ and unlenited /k^w/ in *takku* /tak^w/ supports the view that this word was unstressed.

¹⁴ Cf. CHD L-N: 146 for this and other examples.

As with the conjunction *mān* ‘when, if’ above, the new insights into the correlation between plene spelling of *e* and accentuation do not yield additional support in this case.

The words that we have thus far treated count as unstressed in the meter and in prose texts in all their occurrences, indicating that they were inherently unstressed. There is also a group of words and syntagms where stress loss or reduction is not a regular phenomenon, but for which Melchert assumes that they can count as stressed or unstressed “as the poet chooses” (1998: 485).

7. Local adverbs

Durnford (1971: 74) claimed that local adverbs (*peran*, *āppa*, *kattan*, etc.) always count as unstressed in the meter of the epic texts. Melchert disagrees with this, however. According to him the local adverbs “certainly are stressed when used independently” (1998: 485), which indeed seems to be the case in the following examples from epic texts:

KUB 33.113 i 16f.:

nu=šši=kan išhahru parā | PA₅^{HLA}-uš mān aršanzi. ‘His tears flow forth like streams’.

KUB 33.93 iv 23:

uitenaz=aš=kan arha | uet NA₄-aš. ‘Out from the water he came, the stone’.

This is supported by evidence from prose texts, for instance in the following examples, where the local adverbs *peran*, *katta* and *arha* take the enclitic conjunction *=ma*, indicating that they are stressed:¹⁵

KBo 3.6 i 24:

peran=m=at=mu^{m.d} SĪN^dU-aš DUMU^mZidā manijahhešket. ‘But under me, Armatarhunda, son of Zidā, administered it’.

KBo 5.3 i 33f.:

katta=ma=tta DUMU^{MEŠ}=KA pahhašhi katta=ma tuel DUMU^{MEŠ} ammel DUMU=IA pahšari. ‘And after you, I will protect your sons, and after (us), my son will protect your sons’.

KBo 16.47 obv. 10f.:

mān=mu=kan arha=ma kuiški išparzazi. ‘If someone escapes from me’.

When the local adverbs are used as postpositions with nouns or as preverbs immediately before verbs, they can count as unstressed in the meter, however, as seen in the following examples from epic texts:

KUB 33.96 i 5:

^dKumarbiš=za hat<ta>tar | ZI-ni pe<r>an da[škezzi]. ‘Kumarbi took wisdom unto his mind’.

¹⁵ Melchert (1998: 485) cites as an example *arha=uar=at=za šarrandat* ‘And they divided themselves’ (KUB 14.15+ iii 30), but this example is non-probative: as we have seen above, the enclitics *=uar=at=za* are attached to the first word in a sentence irrespective of whether it was stressed or not. In this case, they therefore do not prove accentuation of *arha*.

KUB 33.93 iii 24:

DINGIR^{MEŠ} =ma=ua=kan hūmanduš [nepiš]az GAM | MUŠEN^{HLA} GIM-an išhuuāu. ‘All the gods he shall scatter down from heaven like birds’.

KUB 33.95 + KUB 33.93 iv 7:

nu=kan ANA ^dKumarbi[i DUMU-an] | genuuaz arha dāer. ‘They took the child away from Kumarbi’s knees’.

KUB 33.98 ii 15f., with dupl. KUB 33.102 ii 17f.:

[(n=aš š)]arā tīat ^dKumarbiš | [(nu=šši ^dD)]impaluriš peran i[i]attat. ‘He got up, Kumarbi, and Impaluri went before him’.

Yet, there are also cases where local adverbs in these functions must be counted as stressed in the meter:

KUB 33.93 iii 17f.:

nu=uar[=aš=kan] NÍ.TE-az arha | ^{GIŠ}šīatal mān uatkut. ‘Out from the body like a šīatal he jumped’.

KUB 33.93 iii 19:

nu=uar=aš=kan nepiši [LUGAL-ezn]anni | UGU paiddu. ‘Let him go up to heaven to kingship’.

On the basis of examples like these, Melchert assumes that the local adverbs could be used both stressed and unstressed, depending on what was required by the meter. From prose texts, Melchert gives one example where a local adverb, in this case GAM (= katta), seems to be unstressed:

KUB 40.88 iv 18:

GAM tīaūazi=šij=at SUM-un. ‘I gave it to him for setting down’.

This is a remarkable example. The particles =šši and =at belong to the class of enclitics that are attached to the first word of a sentence irrespective of whether this is stressed or not. So this example does not necessarily show that GAM (katta) was unstressed, but rather that it was not regarded as a separate word that could take enclitics at all. In fact, it seems that here GAM tīaūazi functions as a compound.¹⁶ Melchert (1998: 490f.) points out that since we are here dealing with a preverb followed by an infinitive, and since no evidence for stress reduction is available for the combination preverb + finite verb, we may have to assume that the stress reduction in preverb + verb only took place when the verb was nominalized, and that from this use the stress reduction was in poetry extended to preverb + finite verb as well (especially through supine + dai-/ti- constructions). It could well be, however, that the absence of evidence in favor of stress reduction in the combination preverb + finite verb is due to the fact that finite verbs in principle always stand in sentence final position, which means that only in sentences consisting solely of preverb + finite verb or in sentences where the verb would be fronted to sentence initial position we would be able to determine whether the preverb was stressed or not: if we found PREVERB=ma VERB, the preverb would be stressed, if we found PREVERB VERB=ma, the preverb would be unstressed. Since the number of sentences

¹⁶ Similarly Melchert (1998: 490) who states that this syntagm “is virtually equivalent to a compound”. Compare also cases like ^{LÚ}parāuūant- ‘supervisor’, litt. parā + uūant- ‘forth seer’, where the placement of the determinative LÚ as well as the absence of word space indicates that the word functioned as a compound.

consisting of a verb form only or in which a verb form is fronted is considerably low, it may therefore not have to be significant that sentences of the type PREVERB VERB=*ma* are lacking.¹⁷

The other type of sentences that according to Melchert (1998: 488) show that the local adverbs can be unstressed also in prose texts, are sentences starting in two local adverbs:

KUB 27.67 iii 22:

EGIR-*an katta=ja=šmaš=an=kan iškišaz h[ui]ttijai*. ‘He pulls it down behind from their backs’.

KUB 43.23 rev. 17-19:

kattašarā=ma taknāz šuḫmiliš taganzipaš taknāšš=a ^dUTU-*uš ANA LUGAL āššu ḫuišūatar tarḫuili* ^{Giš}*tūri piškeddu*. ‘May down from the earth upwards, the *šuḫmili-* earth and the Sun-goddess of the earth give to the king goods, life (and) a victorious weapon’.

KBo 21.22 rev. 37:

kattašara=at=kan NA₄-ta uedan. ‘It was built with stone from bottom to top’.

KBo 12.75, 4:

[*pe*]ran *arḫa=ua=mu īt*. ‘Go away (from) before me!’.

KUB 7.1 ii 21f.:

sēr katt=at nepišaza 1 LIM MUL^{H¹A} *ḫukkiškanzi*. ‘Down from heaven above, the thousand stars will conjure it’.

KBo 14.20 ii 20f.:

šer katta=ja=šši [...] | *šer katta=m=at [...]*.

Again, the placement of the enclitics rather shows that the combinations of the two local adverbs function as compounds, which is supported by the absence of word space in some of them.

For the use of local adverbs as postpositions to nouns, Melchert is not able to give any examples from prose texts where the adverb can be shown to be unstressed. This is not surprising, since we would expect that in such combinations the postposition is the unstressed one, which means that it would always be the preceding noun to take the conjunction =*ma*: NOUN=*ma* POSTPOSITION.

Now we will look at the evidence based on presence or absence of plene spelling of *e*. In OH texts, the local adverb *šēr* ‘on top’ is always spelled plene, *še-e-er*, which indicates that it contains an accented long /*ē*/: /*šēr*/. Also *mēnaḫḫanda* ‘facing, opposite’ is consistently spelled plene, *me-e-na-aḫ-ḫa-an-da*, indicating that it contains an accented long /*ē*/ as well: /*mēnaHanta*/. The adverb *pēran* ‘before, in front of’ is spelled plene, *pé-e-ra-an* in about 50% of the cases, the other attestations showing non-plene spelling, *pé-ra-an*. According to the rules set out above, this means that it contains an accented short /*é*/: /*péran*/. On the basis of these spellings, we must conclude that in OH times these three adverbs in principle are always stressed, also when used in combination with nouns and verb forms. We know that

¹⁷ It cannot be denied that sentences of the type PREVERB=*ma* VERB do occur, e.g. *parā=m=aš paiz[zi]* ‘he will go forth’ (KBo 40.195 obv. 3), *anda=m=an=kan aušta* ‘he saw him inside’ (KUB 9.34 iii 43), but it is quite possible that the adverbs in these examples have to be regarded as free-standing ones (‘furthermore, he will go’, ‘additionally, he saw him’), and not as preverbs that belong to the verb.

the local adverbs originally are case forms of substantives (*šēr* probably is an old loc.sg. to a root noun **ser-* ‘top’, *mēnaḥḥanda* might be built up from old all.sg. forms of *mēni/a-* ‘face’ and *ḥant-* ‘forehead’, and *pēran* probably is an old acc.sg. to a root noun **per-* ‘front’), which in the course of time became petrified and were grammaticalized as adverbs. Their original character as nominal forms can still be deduced from the fact that in older texts they can take enclitic possessive pronouns: *šēr=šamet* ‘on top of them’ (lit. ‘on their top’), *pēra(n)=ššet* ‘before him’ (lit. ‘located to his front’).¹⁸

This situation changes in MH and NH texts, however. Here we find a dramatic decrease of the number of plene spellings of *e*, which drops to virtual zero in all three words: *še-er*, *me-na-aḥ-ḥa-an-da*, *pé-ra-an*. Moreover, also the ability to take enclitic possessive pronouns disappears in MH times. Both facts indicate that from that period onwards these words had been fully grammaticalized as adverbs, and were not regarded as substantives anymore, but instead were now mostly used either as postclitics to nouns or proclitics to verb forms, with which they lost their independent stress. This loss of stress then caused shortening of their *e*, which therefore is not spelled plene anymore. So I interpret the total loss of plene spelling in *šer*, *menaḥḥanda* and *peran* from MH times onwards as an indication for their loss of accentuation: /*ser*/, /*menaHanta*/ and /*peran*/.

It is usually assumed that the epic texts from the Kumarbi cycle are composed in the MH period, i.e. the period in which the grammaticalization of these words to unstressed adverbs was taking place. It therefore seems likely to me that the fact that local adverbs could be used both as stressed and as unstressed in the meter reflects this transitional situation.¹⁹

8. Adnominal genitive + head noun

In epic texts, we sometimes come across examples where a combination genitive + head noun seems to count as one stress unit. For instance, in the following verse, where the combination ^d*Kumarbijaš uddār* ‘Kumarbi’s words’ takes up one slot in the meter:

¹⁸ There are no examples for *mēnaḥḥanda* + enclitic possessive pronoun, but this is probably due to the rarity of this adverb in OH texts.

¹⁹ The fact that also in NH texts the local adverbs sometimes seem to carry the stress, e.g. in *peran=m=at=mu* (KUB 1.1 i 27 (NH), with duplicates), but then still show no plene spelling, is in my view comparable to the situation of e.g. English *the* and *there*. These words are in principle unstressed, and this is the reason why their initial consonant, which goes back to OE *þ-*, is voiced: [ðə / ði] and [ðə(r)] (whereas OE *þ-* in stressed words yielded voiceless [θ-], e.g. *theft*, *thin*, *thick*, etc.). Although synchronically *the* and *there* are in principle unstressed, they can sometimes be used in stressed position as well (‘he is *the* man’; ‘it is over *there*’), but this does not affect the pronunciation of the initial consonant: [ði:] and [ðeə(r)]. In the same way the Hittite local adverbs, which from the MH period onwards became unstressed and thereby lost their vowel length (reflected in the absence of plene spelling), can sometimes secondarily be stressed, namely when used as freestanding adverbs, but then still show the phonetics of their unstressed variants.

KUB 12.65 iii 5:

^d*Mukišanuš* ^d*Kumarbiiaš uddār* | *aruni EGIR-pa memiškeuuan dā[iš]*.
‘Mukišanu began to repeat Kumarbi’s words to the sea’.

Similarly in the following verse, where the combinations DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš *addaš* ‘father of the gods’ and DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš *parna* ‘to the house of the gods’ each constitute a single stress unit:

KUB 36.7a + KUB 17.7 iii 43f.:

halz[eš]šai=ua=šmaš ^d*Kumarbiš* | DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš *addaš* DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš *parna*.
‘He calls you, Kumarbi, father of the gods, to the house of the gods’.

This might not always be the case, however. In the following example, both *nepišaš* ‘of heaven’ and ^dUTU-*un* ‘Sun-god’ seem to count as stressed elements:²⁰

KUB 33.92 + KUB 36.10 iii 19f.:

^d*Ulluk[ummiš=a=za n]epišaš* | ^dUT[U-*un*] *šakuiškezzi*. ‘Ullukummi saw the Sun-god of heaven’.

Melchert (1998: 488f.) gives the following examples from prose texts where he assumes stress reduction in combinations of genitive + head noun as well:

KBo 11.39 i 10:

[^{LÚ}ME]š*EDI karšuuaš=ma=šmaš* [*katt*]i=*smi iḫatta*. ‘The bodyguard of cutting walks with them’.

KUB 30.16 + KUB 39.1 i 7:

1 GU₄.APIN.LÁ *šarlumaš=kan apel ZI-ni šipandanzi*. ‘They consecrate one plow-ox of exaltation to his soul’.

KUB 30.27 rev. 8:

1 GU₄ *āšgaš=ma=kan* 8 UDU=*ja akkantaš ZI-ni BAL-ti*. ‘He consecrates one cow of the gate and eight sheep to the soul of the dead’.

KBo 2.13 obv. 12:

NINDA.GUR₄.RA^{MEŠ} DUG₇ *haršijaš=(š)maš peran pē ḫarkanzi*. ‘They hold out before them leavened loaves of the pithoi’.

KBo 2.13 obv. 20:

NINDA.GUR₄.RA^{MEŠ} *tarnaš=(š)maš paršijanzi*. ‘They break for them leavened loaves of (one) *tarna*-(size)’.

It is remarkable, however, that in these examples not only the conjunction =*ma* follows the second word in the sentence, which indeed indicates that it must have been the first stressed one, but also the particles =*šmaš* and =*kan* do. Since these are always attached to the first word in a sentence irrespective of whether it is stressed or not, their position seems to rather indicate that the first word was not perceived as an element that could take enclitics at all. This might mean that these combinations effectively were compounds.²¹ This would fit Melchert’s observation that in all these

²⁰ Some caution is necessary since the sentence is not fully attested. KUB 33.92 + KUB 36.10 iii 19-20 has ^d*Ul-lu-k[um-... n]e-pi-ša-aš* ^dUT[U-...] *ša-ku-iš-ke-ez-zi*, whereas KUB 33.93 iv 31 has [...-]an ^dUTU-*un* *ša-ku-iš-ke-ez-zi*, in which the [...-]an before ^dUTU-*un* is remarkable (perhaps this tablet contained gen.pl. *nepišan* ‘of heavens’?). Yet, I follow Güterbock’s reading of this sentence (1951: 158).

²¹ Compare Neu 1986, who treats instances like ^{LÚ}*mukišanaš* EN-*aš* ‘lord of the ritual’ (KBo 14.86 i 7), ^{LÚ}*manijaḫijaš* EN-*aš* ‘chef of administration’ (HKM 31 obv. 14f.), ^{LÚ}*MEŠ* *uddanaš*

cases the combination head noun + genitive constitutes a set phrase: “the genitive defines the head noun as a peculiar subtype of a larger class” (1998: 489). However, it is also remarkable that in all cases the word order is head noun + genitive (whereas normally in Hittite the order is genitive + head noun) and that the head noun is spelled logographically. It is therefore difficult to decide whether these cases can really be used as additional support for the fact that in epic texts the sequence genitive + head noun can count as a single stress unit.

I believe that evidence on the basis of absence of plene spelling of *e* can, however. The noun *nēpiš-* ‘heaven’ is generally thought to reflect PIE **nēb^hes-*,²² containing a short accentend **é*. According to the new insights into the plene spelling of *e*, this **é* should yield Hittite short accented /él/, which is in open syllables spelled with a plene spelling in 50% of the cases: *ne-(e-)pí-iš* / *ne-(e-)pí-š^o*. This is indeed the case when the word is attested independently.²³ When part of the syntagm *nepišaš* ^dUTU ‘Sun-god of heaven’, however, the number of plene spellings in *nepiš-* is much lower: I have counted twelve attestations without plene spelling, *ne-pí-ša-aš* (KBo 4.8 ii 19, KUB 6.45+ iii 14, 19, 20, 23, KUB 6.46 iii 43, 59 (2x), 62, KUB 17.7+ iv 41, KUB 36.10 iii 19) vs. only one with, *ne-e-pí-ša-aš* (KBo 17.5 ii 4). This is a significant aberration from the normal distribution of plene vs. non-plene spelled forms, which indicates that in the syntagm *nepišaš* ^dUTU, the word *nepišaš* was often unaccented.²⁴ Note that on the basis of the sole observation that in epic texts syntagms of the type *nepišaš* ^dUTU count as a single stress unit for the meter, we were not able to decide which of the two words was the stressed, and which was the unstressed one. The evidence on the basis of absence of plene spelling of *e* now clearly tells us that it is the genitive (in this case *nepišaš*) that had lost its stress.

The combination ‘Sun-god of heaven’ is a fixed expression,²⁵ of course, and it therefore does not seem impossible to me that it is indeed the case that only on the basis of stress loss in the genitive of fixed expressions like these, “[this] practice may have been extended in poetic language to all such syntagms” (Melchert 1998: 491).

išhēš ‘lords of the words’ (KUB 30.68 obv. 6), where the determinative that actually belongs to the head noun is placed before the preceding genitive, indicating that these combinations more or less function as compounds.

²² Cf. Kloekhorst 2008: 603f.

²³ Cf. the attestations cited in CHD L-N: 448.

²⁴ Often, but not exclusively. Not only the plene spelling in *ne-e-pí-ša-aš* ^dUTU-*i* (KBo 17.5 ii 4), but also the placement of the particle =*ma* in *nepišaš=ma=mu* ^dUTU-*uš* (KUB 6.45+ iii 69f.) indicates that sometimes *nepišaš* indeed was accented.

²⁵ Note however, that evidence on the basis of absence of plene spelling is only significant if a certain combination is attested a considerable number of times. Since the Hittite corpus is limited, in practice only fixed expressions are attested often enough to allow to perform statistically significant calculations on them.

9. (Asyndetic) pairs

In the epic texts, we come across examples like the following, in which the pairs *nepiš tekann=a* ‘heaven and earth’ and *adanna akuuanna* ‘to eat and to drink’ seem to count as a single stress unit:

KUB 33.106 iii 52f.:²⁶
nu=kan karuuiiia ^{URUDU}*ardāla* [pa]rā *tiiandu* | *nepiš tekann=a* *kuēz arha*
kuerer. ‘Let them bring out the primeval saw with which they cut apart heaven
 and earth’.

KUB 33.102 ii 24f.:²⁷
^{GIŠ}*BANŠUR-un=ma*[=ua=šš]i *peran tiiandu* | *adanna=ua=šš*[i a]*kuuanna*
udandu. ‘They must put a table before him, they must bring him to eat and to
 drink’.

Melchert (1998: 489 n. 10) states that such practice can also be found in prose texts, namely in the following example, where, according to him, the pair LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL ‘king (and) queen’ would constitute one stress unit:

KUB 11.35 i 16f.:
 LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL=*kan* ^É*halentūaz uanzi*. ‘The king (and) queen
 come from the palace’.

This example is non-probative, however, since, as we have seen above, the placement of =*kan* does not depend on the place of the stress. It is more likely that the combination LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL is perceived as one logogram and that this is the reason why =*kan* is postponed to after MUNUS.LUGAL. I therefore believe that phonetically this sentence must have been *haššuš=kan haššuššarašš=a halentūaz uanzi*. Nevertheless, the fact that the combination LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL was apparently used as one logogram could well indicate that the pair *haššuš haššuššarašš=a* constituted one stress unit.

Better evidence can be found on the basis of absence of plene spelling of *e*. As stated before, the noun *nēpiš-* ‘heaven’ shows in principle a 50% ratio between spellings with and without plene *e*, indicating the presence of a short accented /é/ in an open syllable: /nébis-/. In the combination ‘heaven and earth’, the number of plene spellings in *nēpiš-* is significantly lower than when it occurs independently, however. I have collected 22 examples without plene spelling (*ne-pí-iš te-kán* (KUB 6.45 iii 10), *ne-pí-iš te-e-kán-n=a* (KUB 8.41 ii 6, 12, KUB 12.49 i 3, KUB 31.143 ii 21, iii 8, StBoT 25.111 ii 16), *ne-pí-iš te-kán-n=a* (KBo 6.29+ ii 12f., KUB 19.6+ iv 26, KUB 33.106 iii 53), *ne-pí-ša-aš ták-na-aš* (KUB 41.8 iv 8), *ne-pí-ša-aš KI-aš-š=a* (KUB 6.45 i 36, KUB 21.38 obv. 12, KUB 24.3 i 35-6), *ne-pí-ša-aš da-ga-zi-pa-aš-š=a* (KUB 6.46 i 37), *ne-pí-ša-aš da[-ga-an-zi-pa-aš]* (KUB 41.19 i 7), *ne-pí-ši ták-ni-i* (KBo 5.2 iii 5, KBo 14.143 i 9), *ne-pí-ši da-ga-an-zi[-pí]* (KBo 19.112

²⁶ Although a scansion *nu=kan karuuiiia* ^{URUDU}*ardāla* | [pa]rā *tiiandu* || *nepiš tekann=a* *kuēz* | *arha kuerer* cannot be fully excluded.

²⁷ Note that the dupl. KUB 33.98 ii 20f. has [^{GIŠ}BANŠUR-un=ma=šš]i *peran tiiandu* | [*nu*]=šš*i adanna udandu*, in which we find *nu=šš*i adanna** in the place where KUB 33.102 has the pair *adanna=ua=šš*i akuuanna**. This proves that the pair must count as a single stress unit.

rev. 12), *ne-pí-ša-az ták-na-az* (KUB 6.46 iii 63, KUB 12.57 iv 4), *ne-pí-ša-az KI-az* (KUB 6.45 iii 23)), vs. only two with plene spelling (*ne-e-pí-is te-e-kán-n=a* [StBoT 25.3 iii 1, StBoT 25.4 ii 52]). These numbers are significant and indicate that within the pair ‘heaven and earth’ the word *nepiš-* was unaccented in most cases. Again it must be noted that on the basis of the sole observation that in the epic texts pairs of the type ‘heaven and earth’ count as a single stress unit for the meter, we are unable to decide which of the two words was the stressed, and which was the unstressed one. The evidence from the absence of plene spelling of *e* now clearly tells us that it is the first member (in this case *nepiš*) that had lost its stress.

10. Attributive adjective + noun

In the following examples from epic texts, we see that a combination of attributive adjective + noun, namely *liliūanduš* IM^{MEŠ}-*uš* ‘swift winds’ and DINGIR^{MEŠ} *hūmanduš* ‘all the gods’,²⁸ counts as a single stress unit:

KUB 36.7a + KUB 17.7 iii 40f.:

I|N|A |G|IR^{MEŠ}=K|A|=ma=za ^{KUŠ}E.SIR^{HIA}=uš | liliūanduš IM^{MEŠ}-uš šark[ui].
‘On your feet as shoes, the swift winds you must put’.

KUB 33.93 iii 24:

DINGIR^{MEŠ}=ma=ua=kan hūmanduš [nepiš]az GAM | MUŠEN^{HIA} GIM-an išhuūūu. ‘He shall scatter all the gods down from heaven like birds’.

It is not always the case that attributive adjective + head noun counts as one stress unit, however, which indicates that the stress reduction in such combinations was optional:

KUB 33.96 i 6:

nu HUL-un UD.KAM-an | LÚ HUL-an šallan[uškezzi]. ‘He raises a bad day as an evil one’.

From prose texts, Melchert (1998: 490) adduces the following example:

KUB 17.21 iii 4:

^{LÚ.MEŠ}SANGA *šuppaeš*=a=za ^{LÚ.MEŠ}SANGA ^{MUNUS.MEŠ}AMA.DINGIR^{LIM}
^{LÚ.MEŠ}GUDU₁₂ ... ‘Sacralized priests, priests, priestesses, anointed priests, ...’.

Since the combination ^{LÚ.MEŠ}SANGA *šuppaeš* ‘sacralized priests’ is followed by the sentence initial particles =a=za, Melchert concludes that it counts as one stress unit. Yet, it is again problematic that also the reflexive particle =z follows *šuppaeš*, whereas this particle normally is always attached to the first word in the sentence, irrespective of whether it is stressed or not. This seems to indicate that ^{LÚ.MEŠ}SANGA *šuppaeš* functions as a compound,²⁹ which matches the fact that Melchert assumes that ^{LÚ.MEŠ}SANGA *šuppaeš* ‘sacralized priests’ is a set phrase: according to him, all priests probably were sacralized, so the ^{LÚ.MEŠ}SANGA *šuppaeš*

²⁸ Although attributive adjectives regularly precede their head noun, the quantifier *humant-* regularly follows it, cf. Hoffner / Melchert 2008: 271.

²⁹ Although this would not fit the fact that earlier on in the text we find *šuppaeš* ^{LÚ.MEŠ}SAN[G]A (KUB 17.21 ii 10), with the reversed order.

must have been a specific kind of priests. Moreover, it is remarkable that in this case the order is head noun + adjective (the normal order being adjective + head noun).

When it comes to absence of plene spelling of *e*, I have unfortunately not been able to find statistically relevant evidence on this basis in favor of stress reduction in combinations of attributive adjective + head noun.

11. Supine + *dai-/ti-*

In the epic texts, the combinations of supine + *dai-/ti-* sometimes must be counted as a single stress unit:

KUB 33.98 ii 1f., with dupl. KUB 17.7 ii 15:³⁰

nu arunaš ANA^d[Impaluri] | EGIR-pa memiškeuuan dāiš. ‘The sea began to speak again to Impaluri’.

KUB 12.65 iii 5:

^dMukišanuš ^dKumarbiiaš uddār | aruni EGIR-pa memiškeuuan dā[iš].
‘Mukišanu began to repeat Kumarbi’s words to the sea’.

This is not always the case, however. Compare the following examples, which show that stress reduction in the combination supine + *dai-/ti-* was optional:

KUB 33.93 iii 15:

^dKumarbiš=za PANI Z[I=ŠU | memiškeuuan dāiš. ‘Kumarbi began to speak unto his mind’.

KUB 36.7a + KUB 17.7 iii 37:

^dKumarbiš ANA^dImpal[ur]i | memiškeuuan dāiš. ‘Kumarbi began to speak to Impaluri’.

According to Melchert (1998: 491), there is no good evidence for supine + *dai-/ti-* in sentence initial position, which means that he is not able to prove whether this combination can act as a single stress unit in prose texts as well. He mentions the fact, however, that “the supine and its finite verb are never separated by any element (not even by the negative, which often does separate preverb and verb)”, which does seem to point to this.

Also evidence from the absence of plene spelling of *e* is inconclusive in this case. *A priori*, we would expect that if in the combination supine + *dai-/ti-* stress reduction took place, it would be the supine that lost its stress. Supines are almost always formed from *-ške/a-* imperfectives, and since within the paradigm of *-ške/a-* imperfectives the suffix *-ške/a-* is in principle always accented,³¹ we would expect that in supines it is as well, e.g. /memiskéuən/.³² We would expect that a short

³⁰ The duplicate KUB 33.102 ii 4 has *nu arunaš ANA^dImp[al]uri | EGIR-pa memiškezzi*, in which *memiškezzi* takes the place of *memiškeuuan dāiš* of KUB 33.98, proving that the latter must be regarded as a single stress unit.

³¹ Cf. Kloekhorst 2008: 135f.

³² The situation in supines derived from imperfective stems in *-anna/-anni-* is less clear. Here we find the weak variant of the imperfective suffix before the suffix *-uan*, e.g. *pijanniuan* ‘giving’, *ijanniuan* ‘going’. Since weak stems correlate with absence of accentuation, it seems as if we have to assume here accentuation of the supine suffix. Nevertheless,

accented /é/ in open syllables would in OH times be spelled plene in 50% of the cases. Unfortunately, we only have one attestation of a supine in *-škeuan* in OS texts: *da-me-eš-ke-ua-an* (KBo 22.1 obv. 4). Although this form does not show plene spelling, on its own it cannot be used as an argument in favor of or against accentuation of this form. From the MH period onwards, accented short /é/ in open internal syllables (i.e. non-initial and non-final syllables) starts being spelled without plene spelling, and therewith cannot be distinguished from unaccented /e/ anymore (cf. footnote 3). This means that the total absence in MH and NH compositions of plene spelling in supines in *°škeuan* is non-probative for determining whether it was accented or not. Nevertheless, it is remarkable that also in younger copies of OH compositions we never find plene spelling of the type *°š-ke-e-u-ua-an*.³³ Although it cannot be ascertained, this may indicate that also in prose texts supines in *°škeuan* were unstressed.

12. Sequences of unstressed words

In the epic texts, we sometimes see that a sequence of unstressed words occurs, i.e. instances where a combination of three words counts as a single stress unit. In the following example, this goes for the combination local adverb + supine + *dai-/ti-*:

KUB 12.65 iii 5:

^dMukišanuš ^dKumarbiišaš uddār | aruni EGIR-pa memiškeuuan dā[iš].
‘Mukišanu began to repeat Kumarbi’s words to the sea’.

We find the same for a combination of genitive + attributive adjective + head noun in the following example:

KUB 33.93 + KUB 36.7a + KUB 17.7 iii 32:

lē=m[a=uar=an auš]zi | ^dU-aš^{URU} Kumm[iiaš] UR.SAG-liuš LUGAL-uš. ‘He must not see him, the Storm-god, heroic king of Kummija’.

Also a combination of local adverb + local adverb + finite verb counts as one stress unit:

KUB 33.106 iii 54:

[nu=ka]n[?] ^dUllukummin^{NA4š} U.U-zin | GÌR^{MES} GAM-an arha ardu[meni]. ‘Let us saw off Ullukummi, the basalt stone, from under (his) feet’.

In his 1998 article, Melchert does not explicitly treat the question whether this practice can be found in prose texts as well. In the Hittite grammar that he wrote together with Hoffner, it is stated however, that they “are unaware of examples of postponement [of =ma] beyond the second position” (Hoffner / Melchert 2008: 396 note 10), which would imply that such sequencing of unstressed words does not occur in prose texts. This is false, however, as can be seen by the following example:

since these supines do not contain the vowel *e*, they are irrelevant for the present investigation.

³³ As far as I am aware, plene spelling in *°škeuan* is never attested. This contrasts with e.g. the oblique stem *ūiten-* ‘water’ (in which the accented short /é/ also stands in an internal syllable), which occasionally is spelled plene, *ū-i-te-e-n°*, in NH copies of older compositions, reflecting the OH length of the vowel.

KUB 14.8 rev. 34f.:

našma=kan mān [amm]uk=ma kuitki šarnikzel ḫanti išḫiattēni. ‘Or, if you will impose upon me some kind of separate compensation’.

Here the conjunction =*ma* is attached to the third word in the sentence, *ammuk*, implying that this word is the first stressed one and that both *našma* and *mān* are unstressed. Note again that the enclitic local particle =*kan* is attached to *našma*, the first element that could take enclitics. This proves that here we are really dealing with a sequence of two unstressed words, and not with a compound.

13. Conclusion

We can conclude that arguments based on the presence or absence of plene spelling of *e* form a welcome additional source for determining presence or lack of accentuation of specific words, which supports the evidence based on the placement of these words in the meter in epic texts and their interaction with the sentence initial conjunction =*ma*. We can now firmly establish that the following words were consistently unaccented: (1) *nu*, *ta*, *šu*, (2) *mān* ‘when, if’, (3) *kui-* (rel. pron.), (4) *takku* ‘if’, (5) *našma* ‘or’, and (6) *mān* ‘as, like’. Apart from the latter, all these words can, despite their unstressed character, take the quotative particle =*ua(r)*, the enclitic personal pronoun =*a-*, the dat.loc. particles =*mmu*, =*tta*, =*nnaš* and =*šmaš*, the reflexive =*z*, and the local particles =*an*, =*ašta*, =*ap(a)*, =*kkan* and =*ššan*, which are attached to the first word in a sentence irrespective of whether this was accented or not. For (7) local adverbs, we were able to establish that in OH they were still accented, but start to lose their accentuation from MH times onwards. For the combinations (8) adnominal genitive + head noun, (9) (asyndetic) pairs, (10) attributive adjective + noun, and (11) supine + *dai-/ti-*, we have found evidence that the first member occasionally can be unstressed, especially in set phrases. Moreover, we have seen examples in which a number of unstressed words can co-occur in one sequence.

Bibliography

- Durnford, Stephen P.B.:
 1971 Some Evidence for Syntactic Stress in Hittite, in: *AnSt* 21, 69-75.
 Güterbock, Hans Gustav:
 1951 The Song of Ullikummi. Revised Text of the Hittite Version of a Hurrian Myth, in: *JCS* 5, 135-161.
 Hoffner, Harry A. / Melchert, H. Craig:
 2008 A Grammar of the Hittite Language, Winona Lake, Indiana.
 Kloekhorst, Alwin:
 2008 Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon, Leiden.
 fithc. The Phonological Interpretation of Plene and Non-Plene Spelled *e* in Hittite, in: *The Sound of Indo-European – Selected papers from the conference held in Copenhagen 16-19 April 2009*.

McNeill, Ian:

1963 The Metre of the Hittite Epic, in: *AnSt* 13, 237-242.

Melchert, H. Craig:

1998 Poetic Meter and Phrasal Stress in Hittite, in: Jay H. Jasanoff / H. Craig Melchert / Lisi Olivier (eds.): *Mír Curad. Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*, Innsbruck, 483-495.

2007 New Light on Hittite Verse and Meter?, in: K. Jones-Bley et al. (eds.): *Proceedings of the Eighteenth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*, November 3-4, 2006, Washington, 117-128.

Neu, Erich:

1986 Zur unechten Nominalkomposition im Hethitischen, in: Annemarie Etter (ed.): *O-o-pe-ro-si. Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag*, Berlin, 107-116.

Sievers, Eduard:

1893 *Altgermanische Metrik*, Halle.

Thurneysen, Rudolf:

1946 *A Grammar of Old Irish*, Dublin.

Watkins, Calvert:

1963 Preliminaries to a Historical and Comparative Analysis of the Syntax of the Old Irish Verb, in: *Celtica* 6, 1-49.