Active and Passive in Hittite Infinitival Constructions

Gary Holland
University of California, Berkeley

The study of the syntax of Hittite infinitival constructions has largely been neglected. To be sure, there was a flurry of early scholarship devoted to establishing just what Hittite infinitives are and how they can be differentiated from their etymologically related verbal nouns: here, it suffices to mention the early textual notes of Götze (1930), Götze-Pedersen (1934), and Sommer (1932), and the monographs of Ose (1944), with the review by Goetze (1948), and Kammenhuber (published as a series of articles in *MIO* 1954-1955). The results of these studies are summarily presented in a few pages in Friedrich's *Hethitisches Elementarbuch* (1960), and apart from the discussions in Patri (2007) and Hoffner and Melchert (2008: 332ff.), there seems to have been little progress in this area since then. Elementary questions of control, deletion, and raising in infinitival constructions remain open.

In Section I, I give a few examples of different types of Hittite infinitive complements. These fall into well-known patterns.

I. Typical Hittite infinitival constructions.

1.   ᵈUTU*ŠI=wa*   *šumāš*   *walaḫḫuwanzi*   *uizzi* (KBo V 8 I 8)
        nom=my=quot   dat/acc   inf   3sg
        my majesty   you   smite   come

        'My majesty will come to smite you'

2.   EGIR-*pa=ya=aš=kan šešuanzi* GAM DU-*ri* (KUB V 1 I 61)
        adv=conj=nom=ptc   inf   adv 3sg
        back=and=he   sleep   down goes

        'And he goes back down to sleep'

3.   *nu=mu*   *tepnumanzi šanaḫta* (KUB XXI 15 I 14)
        conj=dat/acc   inf   3sg
        and=me   make little   he sought

        'and he sought to make me little'

4.   ᵐᵈLAMMA-*ašš=a kue* KARAŠ.ḪI.A   *INA* KUR ᵁᴿᵁ*nuḫašši ḫalki*ᴴᴵ·ᴬ-*uš*
        nom=conj   acc   acc   dat   acc
        Lamma=and   which troops   Nuhašši   grain

        ḫarnikuwanzi   *peḫudan ḫarta* … (KBo IV 4 II 63f.)
        inf   part   3sg
        destroy   brought had

        'And the troops which Mr. LAMMA had brought to Nuhašši to destroy the grain …'

5.   *nu=šši*   *ŪL parā iyanniyauwanzi ŪL kišari*   *ŪL=ma=šši* EGIR-*pa tiyauwanzi kišari*
         conn=dat neg prev inf   neg 3sg   neg=conn=dat prev inf   3sg
         and=him not   go forward   not becomes not=and=him back step   becomes
         (KUB VIII 53 IV 18-20)

         'it is not possible for him to go forward and it is not possible for him to step back'

Example (1) contains an intransitive verb and a transitive infinitive complement. In any syntactic theory, ᵈUTU*ŠI* (which must cover a Hittite nominative) is the subject both of *uizzi* and of the infinitive (in the latter case, it is the agent). The only ambiguity in this example is presented by *šumāš*, which can be either dative or accusative. Other examples make it clear that the dative reading is the correct one here, and that the underlying structure is "come to you (dat) to smite (you)". In one version of current generative theory the object position of the infinitive is an empty category; in earlier versions of the theory, the absence of the object of the infinitive is accounted for by EQUI-NP deletion (see Davies and Dubinsky 2004 for a recent survey of raising and control). A functional approach would establish a case hierarchy for Hittite, Nom. > Dat.-Loc./Abl.-Instr. > Acc. (so, too, Patri 2007: 155), with the highest ranked case for coreferential NPs taking precedence over the lower. In example (2) the enclitic pronoun -*aš* is subject of both the motion verb DU-*ri* and its intransitive infinitive complement *šešuanzi*. In example (3) the subject of *šanaḫta* and of the transitive infinitive *tepnumanzi* are the same, and on one reading the dat-loc/acc enclitic pronoun -*mu* is the object of both verbal forms. On another reading, *šanaḫta* could be interpreted as an auxiliary verb which obligatorily requires an infinitive complement. In that event, -*mu* would be the accusative or dative object of *tepnumanzi* (Hoffner and Melchert [2008: 333-334] give a selection of infinitives with dative, accustive, and ambiguously dative or accusative objects). In addition to an overt nominative subject (ᵐᵈLAMMA-*aš*), example (4) contains both a transitive finite verb and a transitive infinitive. The accusative object of the transitive verb (*kue* KARAŠ.ḪI.A) is in turn the subject of the infinitive, which also has an overt accusative object (*halki*ᴴᴵ·ᴬ-*uš*). This example is particularly valuable in that each of the nouns present carries a clear indication of its grammatical case, and thus provides an unimpeachable model for the interpretation of parallel examples without such clear grammatical marking. Example (5) shows an impersonal construction; the enclitic -*ši* functions as the dative experiencer in the matrix clause and as the notional subject of the intransitive infinitive.

In section II, I give two examples whose infinitives can be read as either active or passive.

II. Two ambiguous examples

1.   *BELI=NI=wa=nnaš ŠA* ᵁᴿᵁ*aripšā iwar* ᵁᴿᵁ*ḫattuši šāruwauwanzi lē maniyaḫti*
         voc=poss=quot=acc   gen   postp dat-loc inf   neg 2sg
         lord=our   =us   Aripšā   like   Hattuša plunder   not hand over

         'do not, our lord, hand us over to Hattuša to plunder (= to be plundered) like Aripšā'
         (KBo IV 4 IV 20f.)

2.   *nu namma MAḪAR* ᵈUTU*ŠI argamušša utummanzi ŪL tarnai* (KUB XIV 1 rev. 32)
         conn adv prep   acc   inf   not 3sg
         and furthermore   my majesty tribute bring   not allow

'furthermore, he does not allow the tribute to be brought before my majesty'

In example (1) of this section, the enclitic pronoun *-naš* functions as the object of *maniyaḫti*, but also as the notional object of the infinitive *šāruwauwanzi*. The question here is whether *-naš* is the grammatical subject of the infinitive or not, that is, can the infinitive, or better, the infinitive construction, be read as passive? Part of the answer to this question depends on the interpretation assigned to *Ḫattuši*: it is clearly the recipient in the matrix clause, as is shown by its dative ending, but does it also function as the agent of the transitive infinitive *šāruwauwanzi*? If not, then the passive reading of the infinitival construction is guaranteed. This question cannot be answered with an appeal to the semantics of the construction, since both an active and a passive reading make good sense in context. Hattuša can be read as a metonym for the army of Hattuša, but it doesn't have to be read in this manner. In example (2), the syntax is rather different from that of example (1) because of the verb *tarnai*, which requires an infinitive complement. Here, a passive reading of the infinitive seems natural because a potential agent of *utummanzi* is not present in the sentence, or indeed in this section of the text.

Is there positive evidence for a passive reading of embedded transitive infinitives? As part of an attempt to answer this question I present the examples in section III.

III.   *ŪL āra* with infinitive complements:

1.   *IŠTU* KUR ^{URU}KÙ.BABBAR-*ti* ^{LÚ}*MUNNABTUM* EGIR-*pa piyanna ŪL āra*

abl		nom	prev	inf	neg adv
Hatti		fugitive	back	give	not right

'a fugitive (is) not right to give back (= to be given back) from Hatti' (KBo V 4 Obv. 38)

2.   ^{LÚ}*MUNNABTUM=ma* EGIR-*pa* SUM-*anzi ŪL āra* (KUB XXII 70 Rev. 63)

nom	=conj	prev	inf	neg adv
fugitive	=and	back	to give	not right

'a fugitive is not right to give back (= to be given back)'

3.   *mān* DINGIR-*LUM* LÚ-*LUM=ma* MUNUS-*za=ši=kan anda pāuwanzi ŪL āra*

conj	nom	nom=ptc	nom	=dat=ptc	prev inf	neg adv
if	divinity	male=but	woman	=him=ptc	in go	not right

'if the divinity is a male, it is not permitted for a woman to go in to him'
(*CHD* s.v. natta b2' a' 1'' e')

In example (1) of this section, the Akkadian nominative ^{LÚ}*MUNNABTUM* is the subject of the expression *ŪL āra*. It also appears to function as the notional object of the transitive infinitive EGIR-*pa piyanna* 'to give back'. The only manner in which ^{LÚ}*MUNNABTUM*, or rather, the Hittite nominative presumably underlying it, can be its subject is if it has been raised from its original object position in the infinitive phrase. This entails a passive interpretation of the infinitival construction. Example (2) shows a comparable structure with

minor local variants. This expression is a formula in treaty texts. Example (3) shows the clear nominative MUNUS-*za* as the subject of the *ŪL āra* expression and the subject of the intransitive infinitive *pāuwanzi*; thus, this sentence can be translated 'if the divinity is a male, a woman is not permitted to go in to him'.

Yoram Cohen, however, in his study of the *natta āra* construction, poses the question whether the nouns in examples (2) and (3) (and in similar examples) are subjects of the sentences or objects of the infinitives. He notes that

> "in all the examples present in the corpus, there is no clear nominative case which marks the substantive as the subject of the sentence. It is true that the Akkadogram ᴸᵁ*MUNNABTUM* is consistently found in the nominative, but since one should not expect correct Akkadian case marking in Hittite, this criterion is not solid enough. The rest of the substantives encountered in the corpus are neuter (*aštauwar*, *ešhar*, *uttar*, *kuit*, *ezzan* and GIŠ-*ru*), and thus their nominative and accusative forms are identical. If these are taken to be in the accusative case, then what we might be facing in this construction is an infinitive as the subject of the sentence with a substantive object." (2002: 13)

Cohen then proceeds to a discussion and a reanalysis of example (4) (above), since this is the sole instance in this type of construction in which the phonetic complementation clearly indicates a Hittite nominative case, -*z*(*a*). A propos of this example he observes:

> "However, one should consider that in this last example, MUNUS is in extraposition: the word is topicalized, outside of the main sentence. The enclitic =*ši* might be taken to refer back to the logical subject of the sentence (the woman). The grammatical subject is the infinitive. The sentence can be understood thus: 'The woman – for her it is forbidden to enter.' ...
> With no certain example of a nominative case in Hittite, presently there is no way to demonstrate formally that the *natta āra* expression exhibits a *nominativus cum infinitivo* construction apart from relying on the Akkadian nominative ᴸᵁ*MUNNABTUM* as the sole criterion for this construction." (2002: 13-14)

Cohen's reanalysis of example (4) must, however, be rejected. The type of extraposition he refers to requires some indication of the clause boundary, and the simple fact that MUNUS-*za* serves as host for the enclitics =*ši* and =*kan* shows that it is a constituent of the clause to which they belong. In context, the natural referent of =*ši* is the male divinity mentioned in the previous clause:

mān	DINGIR-*LUM*	LÚ-*LUM*=*ma*	MUNUS-*za*=*ši*=*kan*	*anda*	*pāuwanzi*	*ŪL āra*
conj nom		nom=ptc	nom	=dat=ptc	prev inf	neg adv
if divinity		male=but	woman	=him=ptc in	go	not right

'if the divinity is a male, it is not permitted for a woman to go in to him' (*CHD* s.v. *natta* b2' a' 1'' e')

Consequently, MUNUS-*za* should stand as the nominative subject of the infinitive *anda pāuwanzi*, and as the subject of *ŪL āra*, and the raising analysis of this construction is validated. Although a*nda pāuwanzi* is an infinitive built on an intransitive verb stem, the fact

that it can take a nominative subject makes it highly likely that the consistently nominative Akkadogram ^{LÚ}*MUNNABTUM* covers a Hittite nominative. After all, Cohen's sole reason for rejecting this as a Hittite nominative is that "one should not expect correct Akkadian case marking in Hittite", but in this formulaic expression, very important in the treaties, the Hittites got the Akkadian case right.

Paola Cotticelli–Kurras (1991: 56) has also (implicitly) denied a raising analysis of this construction , asserting that the infinitive in ^{LÚ}*MUNABTUM=ma* EGIR-*pa* SUM-*anzi* *ŪL āra* (KUB XXII 70 Rev. 63) (= Example 2, Section III) is active in meaning. She states that "Ähnliche Konstruktionen wie in KUB XII 12 V 32 unter Kapitel IX, § 1. bestätigen jedoch die aktive Bedeutung des Infinitivs. In the relevant section (1991: 90) we find "KUB XII 12 V 32 (mit KBo XXXIII 194 Rs. VI 16f. und Dupl. KBo XXXIII 189 Rs. 4f.) NINDA.KUR$_4$.RA *pár-ši-ya-u-an-zi* NU.GÁL "Dickes Brot zum Brechen (ist) nicht vorhanden" without further comment. I find Cotticelli-Kurras' assertion that such examples "bestätigen die aktive Bedeutung des Infinitivs" incomprehensible. The infinitive *paršiyauanzi* is built on a transitive verb stem, bread is the substance that is broken, and the Sumerogram NU.GÁL has the noun NINDA.KUR$_4$.RA as its subject. In any event, NINDA.KUR$_4$.RA is the notional object of the infinitive *páršiyauanzi*. Furthermore, Coticelli-Kurras' and Cohen's analyses of these constructions requires that the entire infinitival construction be the subject of the finite verb. Since there appears to be no convincing example of a bare infinitive as subject of a finite clause, this view is presumably erroneous. To say things like "to err is human" the Hittites apparently used verbal nouns in -*war* (Melchert, p.c.).

A further argument for the raising interpretation of ^{LÚ}*MUNNABTUM* as a Hittite nominative as well as an Akkadian nominative is provided by the (impersonal) constructions with infinitive complements which unquestionably take a Hittite nominative subject, and unquestionably show object to subject raising. I present a selection of these in section IV.

IV. Hittite nominatives as subjects of SI×SÁ (*ḫandāi-*) and *eš-* with infinitive complements:

1. *parā tiyanna=ma=kan* ^{MUNUS}*annanzaš* DAM ^m*pirwa* SI×SÁ-*at*
    prev inf   =conj=ptc   nom   nom   gen   3sg
    forth step   and   Annanzas wife Pirwa establish

    'And Annanzas, the wife of Pirwa, was established (by oracle) to step forth'

2. *n=aš*   *katta ašanna kuit* SI×SÁ-*at*   *n=an*   *katta ašašḫun* (KBo IV 8 II 6f.)
    conn=nom prev inf   conj 3sg   conn=acc prev 1sg
    and=she   to outlaw since establish   and=her   outlaw

    'since she was established (by oracle) to be banished, I banished her'

3. *nu=šši*   GUD *pūḫugariš pīyawanzi* IZI-*it waḫnumanzi* MUŠEN.ḪI.A *waḫnumanzi*
    conn=dat nom nom   inf   instr inf   nom   inf
    and=him ox   substitute give/send fire burn   birds   burn

SI×SÁ-*at* (KBo IV 2 iii 50f.; CTH 406, Götze-Pedersen 1934, Lebrun 1985)
3sg
establish

'and for him a substitute ox was established (by oracle) to be given/sent to be burned (and) birds to be burned'

4. *n=aš   pidi=šši INA* KUR ^URU*kummanni INA* É DINGIR-*LIM pīyawanzi* SI×SÁ-*at*
    conn=nom dat-loc=dat-loc dat-loc   dat-loc gen   inf   3sg
    and=he place=his Kummanna land   temple divinity   give/send   establish
    (KBo IV 2 iii 52f.)

    'and he (= the ox) was established by oracle to be given/sent in his (Muršili's) place in the temple of the god in Kummanna'

5. DINGIR^*LUM*=*kan kuiš ANA* ^d UTU-*ŠI tarnumanzi* SI×SÁ-*at* (KBo V 6 II 57 f.)
    nom   =ptc nom   dat   inf   3sg
    divinity   which   My Sun allow   establish

    'the divinity which was established (by oracle) to be allowed to my majesty.

The verb *ḫandāi-* (SI×SÁ) regularly takes nominative subjects that are the notional objects of the transitive infinitive complements that cooccur with it. It further takes nominative subjects that are the subjects of its intransitive infinitive complements. To illustrate the latter point, in example (1) of this section, ^MUNUS*annanzaš* is a clear nominative, it controls concord of SI×SÁ-*at* (3sg.middle), and it is the subject of the intransitive infinitive *parā tiyanna*. Here we have subject to subject raising. In example (2) the nominative enclitic pronoun -*aš* is the subject of SI×SÁ-*at* but also the notional object of *katta ašanna*.   This notional object has been raised into subject position in the matrix clause. Example (3) again contains a nominative subject of SI×SÁ-*at*, this time the noun phrase GUD *pūhugariš*, which is aso the notional object of the embedded transitive infinitive *pīyawanzi*, either "send" or "give", depending on the analysis of the verb stem. GUD *pūḫugariš* is also the notional object of *waḫnumanzi*, as is MUŠEN.ḪI.A of the second occurrence of this infinitive. In each of the cases in this example, a passive reading of the transitive infinitives seems inescapable, especially in view of the presence of the instrumental IZI-*it*. Example (4) shows much the same syntactic pattern, but with the nominative enclitic pronoun -*aš* rather than a noun-adjective collocation.

In section V, I give two further examples. The first shows the construction under discussion with clear nominative marking of the notional object of the transitive infinitive in URU-*LUM kuiš ... piyanna* (and another in *AŠRU kuitki ... piyanna*, but since the noun is neuter, the case-marking is ambiguous). Presumably, there is a deleted *ēšzi* after *ŪL* ZI-*anza*. The second also has a clear nominative marking on the place name ^URU*Tiyaššiltaš* which is the notional object of the transitive infinitive *šipanduwanzi*. There is a further twist to this example, since ^URU*Tiyaššiltaš* is also the notional object of the participle *appanza*.

V.   Two miscellaneous examples with deleted *eš-*

1. *mān* URU-*LUM kuiš našma AŠRU kuitki ANA* ᵐ*ulmi-*ᵈU-*up* LUGAL KUR
   conj nom   nom conj nom nom   dat   dat   gen
   if   city   a   or place a   Ulmitešub king   land

   ᵁᴿᵁᵈU-*tašša piyanna ŪL* ZI-*anza* … (KBo 4.10 Vo 18; van den Hout 1995)
   gen   inf   neg nom
   Tarḫuntašša give   not desire

   'if some city or place to be given to Ulmitešup (is) not the desire (of the king) …'

2. [*kē*]*z=ma=kan* ᵁᴿᵁ*Tiyaššiltaš QADU* A.ŠÀ.GÀR=*ŠU* [*IN*]*A* ᵁᴿᵁ*Timmuḫala*
   abl=conj=ptc   nom   instr   =poss   dat-loc
   from there   Tiyaššiltaš   fields   =its   Timmuhala

   šipanduwanzi anda appanza (KUB 19.37 ii 21-22 (NH))
   inf   prev nom
   make sacred   in   taken

   'in this direction (the city) Tiyašiltaš with its fields and meadows (is) combined with
   (the city) Timmuhala for the purpose of being made sacrosanct (to a deity)' (Hoffner
   and Melchert 2008: 334)

Sylvain Patri (2007: 148-149) has recently discussed three of the examples presented here,
arguing against their interpretation as passives:

> l'hypothèse selon laquelle cette construction serait interprétable comme passive est,
> pour sa part, clairement démentie par le témoignage de (2.99 [= V. 1]) où la présence
> du sujet au nominatif animé ZI-*anza* [= *istantsant-s*] et non au cas ablatif-
> instrumental marquant normalement l'agent d'une organisation passive indique que la
> construction n'est ni passive ni impersonnelle (2007: 148).

Patri's interpretation of this example is surely incorrect, since ZI-*anza* cannot possibly be the
agent of the infinitive *piyanna*; it is merely a predicate nominative in a construction without
the finite verb *ēšzi*, as is clear from the translation given above (which, moreover, is
equivalent to the translations given in Friedrich's grammar, in van den Hout's edition, and by
Patri himself). Hence his argument is not probative.

The earliest of the examples cited is Middle Hittite, while the majority of the examples come
from the New Hittite period. In view of the relative infrequency of these constructions,
however, the lack of earlier Hittite evidence may well be accidental.

The constructions I have discussed in this paper are raising constructions and thus by
definition biclausal. Canonic passive constructions, on the other hand, are monoclausal. The
obvious similarities between these two construction types arise because the raising
construction in Hittite is limited to *eš-* 'be' (whether it is overtly present or not), and *ḫandāi-*
'establish (by oracle), set right, determine, arrange, fix', both unaccusative verbs (see Garrett
1990: 107-14 for a full discussion of unaccusative verbs in Hittite). Further, the infinitives in
raising constructions with *eš-* exhibit precisely the same voice alternations as participles do
that take *eš-* as auxiliary: passive in the case of transitive verbs, active in the case of

intransitive verbs.

Finally, I offer some comparative evidence to show that constructions with exactly comparable structures are found in other early Indo-European languages. These examples are repeated from an earlier publication (Holland 1982):

VI. Some Indo-European comparanda

Homeric Greek

1.   *tēlóthi d' húlē / aksémen eks óreos* (Iliad 24.662-663)
        adv   ptc nom inf   prep gen
        far and firewood to bring from mountain

        'and firewood (nom.) (is) far to bring (= to be brought) from the mountain'

2.   *óphra mèn hoûtos anèr Agamémnoni ménie díōi /*
        conj ptc nom   nom dat   3sg   dat
        while   that   man Agamemnon   raged shining,

        tóphra de   rhēíteroi polemízein ẽsan Akhaioí (Iliad 18.257-258)
        conj   conj   nom   inf   3pl   nom
        then   easier   to fight   were Achaeans

        'while that man raged against shining Agamemnon, then the Achaeans (nom) were easier to fight'

Vedic Sanskrit

3.   *ná-eṣā   gávyūtir ápabhartavā u* (RV 10.14.2b)
        neg-nom nom   inf
        not-this   cow-pasture to plunder

        'this cow pasture (nom.) (is) not to plunder (= not to be plundered)'

4.   *ná   vaḥ pratimái sukṛtāni* (RV 3.60.4)
        neg   gen   inf   nom-acc pl
        not   your measure good deeds

        'your good deeds (nom.) (are) not to measure (= to be measured)'

Avestan

5.   *hiiat̯-cā   gāuš jaidiiāi mraoī* (Yasna 32.14)
        conj-conn nom inf   instr
        when-and   cow to kill destructive action

        'and when with the destructive action (called) "let the cow be killed" ' (Humbach, Elfenbein, and Skjaervø 1991 Part I: 135, Part II: 89); lit.: 'the cow (nom) (is) to kill'

Lithuanian

6.   *reĩkia duoti žõdis* (Timberlake 1974: 88)
      3sg.   inf.   nom.
      be necessary give word

      '(your) word (nom.) is necessary to give (= must be given)'

In sum, I hope to have demonstrated in this paper that the three major classes of construction I have investigated in fact show raising of the notional objects of embedded transitive infinitives to subject position in their matrix clauses (and subject-to-subject raising with embedded intransitive infinitives). The verbs in the matrix clauses are *eš-* 'be', *ḫandāi-* (SI×SÁ) 'establish (by oracle), (*eš-*) *natta āra* 'be not right', and NU.GÁL 'not be, not exist'. I hope, too, that I have shown that these subjects are in fact nominative, even where the case-marking is ambiguous. I have also presented some comparative evidence from other early Indo-European languages to show the liklihood that this construction is inherited from the parent language.*

*An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 6th International Congress of Hittitology held in Çorum, Turkey. I have benefited from discussions of some of the ideas in this paper with Marina Zorman, Elisabeth Rieken, Alfredo Rizza, Line Mikkelsen, and Craig Melchert.

References:

Cohen, Yoram. 2002. *Taboos and Prohibitions in Hittite Society. A Study of the Hittite Expression* natta āra ('*not permitted*'). Texte der Hethiter; Heft 24. Heidelberg: C. Winter.

Cotticelli, Paola. 1989. *ḫandāi-.* see Kammenhuber, A.

Cotticelli-Kurras, Paola. 1991. *Das hethitische Verb ‚sein'. Syntaktische Untersuchungen.* Texte der Hethiter; Heft 18. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Davies, William D. and Stanley Dubinsky. 2004. *The Grammar of Raising and Control.* Malden MA: Blackwell.

Friedrich, Johannes. 1960. *Hethitisches Elementarbuch I. Kurzgefasste Grammatik.* Zweite, verbesserte und erweiterte Auflage. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Garrett, Andrew James. 1990. *The Syntax of Anatolian Pronominal Clitics.* Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University.

Götze, Albrecht. 1930. *Neue Bruchstücke zum grossen Text des Hattušiliš und den Paralleltexten.* Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft; 34. Band = Hethitische Texte, Heft V. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Götze, Albrecht and Holger Pedersen. 1934. *Muršilis Sprachlähmung.* Det Kgl. Danske

Videnskabernes Selskab. Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser; XXI, I. København: Levin & Munksgaard.

Goetze, Albrecht. 1948. Review of F. Ose, *Supinum und Infinitiv im Hethitischen*, 1944. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 2:144-155.

Güterbock, Hans Gustav, Harry A. Hoffner, Jr., and Theo Ph. J. van den Hout (eds.) 1980 ff. *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

Hoffner, Harry A. and H. Craig Melchert. 2008. *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*, *1*: *Reference Grammar*. Languages of the Ancient Near East 1/1. Winona Lake IN: Eisenbrauns.

Holland, Gary B. 1982. A Note on Raising in Indo-European. *Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*: 158-169.

Hout, Theo van den. 1995. *Der Ulmitešub-Vertrag. Eine prosopographische Untersuchung*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten; Heft 38. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Humbach, Helmut in collaboration with Josef Elfenbein and Prods O. Skjaervø. 1991. *The Gathas of Zarathustra and other Old Avestan Texts*. Part I. Introduction, Text and Translation; Part II. Commentary. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Kammenhuber, Annelies. 1954a. Studien zum hethitischen Infinitiv-system I. *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* 2.44-77.

Kammenhuber, Annelies. 1954b. Studien zum hethitischen Infinitiv-system II. *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* 2.245-265.

Kammenhuber, Annelies. 1954c. Studien zum hethitischen Infinitiv-system III. *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* 2.403-444.

Kammenhuber, Annelies. 1955a. Studien zum hethitischen Infinitiv-system IV. *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* 3.31-57.

Kammenhuber, Annelies. 1955b. Studien zum hethitischen Infinitiv-system V. *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* 3.345-377.

Kammenhuber, A. 1989. *Materialien zu einem hethitischen Thesaurus*, Lieferung 11, Nr. 8. P. Cotticelli, *ḫandāi-*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Lebrun, René. 1985. L'aphasie de Mursili II = CTH 486. *Hethitica* 6:103-138.

Ose, Fritz. 1944. *Supinum und Infinitiv im Hethitischen*. Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft; XLII/2. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Patri, Sylvain. 2007. *L'alignement syntaxique dans les langues indo-européennes d'Anatolie*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten; Band 49. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Sommer, Ferdinand. 1932. *Die Aḫḫijawa-Urkunden*. Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Abteilung, N.F. 6. München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Timberlake, Alan. 1974. *The Nominative Object in Slavic, Baltic, and West Finnic*. Slavistische Beiträge; Band 82. München: Sagner.