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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. $^d$UTU $^{	ext{SI}}$=wa šumāš walahḫuwanzi 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 šanahta (KUB XXI 15 I 14)
   conj=dat/acc inf 3sg
   and=me make little he sought
   'and he sought to make me little'

4. mdr LAMMA-ašš=a kue KARA $^H$I.A INA KUR $^U$RU nuḫašši ḫalki $^H$I.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 iyanniyaumwanzi 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, dUTUŠI (which must cover a Hittite nominative) is the subject both of uizzī
and of the infinitive (in the latter case, it is the agent). The only ambiguity in this example is
presented by šumâš, 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, accusative, 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 KARAŠḪI.A) is in turn the subject of the infinitive, which also has an
overt accusative object (halkaḪI.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=nna ŠA URU aripšā iwarr URU hattušši 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 dUTUŠI 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 šaruwaawanzi. 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 Ḥattuši: 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 šaruwaawanzi? 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. Ḥattuša can be read as a metonym for the army of Ḥattuša, 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. | ISTU KUR URUKUB.BABBAR-ti LÛ 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. | LÛ MUNNABTUM=ma EGIR-pa SUM-anzı 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 LÛ-LUM=ma MUNUS-za=ši=kan anda pāuwanzı 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 LÛ 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 LÛ 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 LÚMUNNABTUM 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 (aštawar, 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, -za(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 =šī 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 LÚMUNNABTUM 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 =šī and =kan shows that it is a constituent of the clause to which they belong. In context, the natural referent of =šī is the male divinity mentioned in the previous clause:

\[
\text{mān DINGIR-LUM LÚ-LUM}=\text{ma MUNUS-za}=\text{šī}=\text{kan anda pāuwanzi ŪL āra}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>conj</th>
<th>nom</th>
<th>nom=ptc</th>
<th>nom=dat=ptc</th>
<th>prev</th>
<th>inf</th>
<th>neg</th>
<th>adv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>if</td>
<td>divinity</td>
<td>male=but</td>
<td>woman</td>
<td>=him=ptc</td>
<td>in go</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>right</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'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 anda 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 \textit{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 \textit{LÚ MUNNABTUM} = ma \textit{EGIR-pa SUM-anzi UL 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.KUR₄,RA pär-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 \textit{paršiyauanzi} is built on a transitive verb stem, bread is the substance that is broken, and the Sumerogram \textit{NU.GÁL} has the noun \textit{NINDA.KUR₄,RA} as its subject. In any event, NINDA.KUR₄,RA is the notional object of the infinitive \textit{päršiyauanzi}. 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 -\textit{war} (Melchert, p.c.).

A further argument for the raising interpretation of \textit{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×ŠÁ (ḫandāi-) and \textit{eš}- with infinitive complements:

1. \textit{parā tiyanna}=ma=kan \textit{MUNUS annanzaš DAM ĕpirwa SI×ŠÁ-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. \textit{n=as katta ašanna kuit SI×ŠÁ-at} \textit{n=an katta ašaššun} (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. \textit{nu=šši GUD pūḫugariš pīyawanzi IZI-it waḫnumanztı} \textit{MUŠEN.ḪI.A waḫnumanžı}
   conn=dat nom nom inf instr inf nom inf
   and=him ox substitute give/send fire burn birds burn
SI×SÁ-\textit{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. \begin{verbatim}$n=aš$ \textit{pidi}=šš\textit{INA KUR Ê DINGIR-LIM p\check{I}yawanzi SI×SÁ-\textit{at}}
\end{verbatim}
\begin{verbatim}
conn=nom dat-loc=dat-loc dat-loc gen inf 3sg
\end{verbatim}
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. \begin{verbatim}$\text{DINGIR}\,\text{LUM}=\text{kan kuiš ANA d}\text{UTU-ŠI tarnumanzi SI×SÁ-\textit{at}}$ (KBo V 6 II 57 f.)
\end{verbatim}
\begin{verbatim}
nom =ptc nom dat inf 3sg
divinity which My Sun allow establish
\end{verbatim}

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

The verb \textit{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, \textit{MUNUS annanzaš} is a clear nominative, it controls concord of SI×SÁ-\textit{at} (3sg.middle), and it is the subject of the intransitive infinitive \textit{parâ tiyanna}. Here we have subject to subject raising. In example (2) the nominative enclitic pronoun -\textit{aš} is the subject of SI×SÁ-\textit{at} but also the notional object of \textit{katta aššanna}. This notional object has been raised into subject position in the matrix clause. Example (3) again contains a nominative subject of SI×SÁ-\textit{at}, this time the noun phrase GUD\textit{pūhugariš}, which is aso the notional object of the embedded transitive infinitive \textit{p\check{I}yawanzi}, either "send" or "give", depending on the analysis of the verb stem. GUD\textit{pūhugariš} is also the notional object of \textit{waḫnunanzi}, as is \textit{MUŠEN.HI.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-\textit{it}. Example (4) shows much the same syntactic pattern, but with the nominative enclitic pronoun -\textit{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 \textit{URU-LUM kuiš ... piyanna} (and another in \textit{AŠRU kuitki ... piyanna}, but since the noun is neuter, the case-marking is ambiguous). Presumably, there is a deleted \textit{ēšzi} after \textit{UL ZI-anza}. The second also has a clear nominative marking on the place name \textit{URU Tiyaššitaš} which is the notional object of the transitive infinitive \textit{šipandumünzi}. There is a further twist to this example, since \textit{URU Tiyaššitaš} is also the notional object of the participle \textit{appanza}.

V. Two miscellaneous examples with deleted \textit{eš-}
1. mān URU-LUM kuiš našma AŠRU kuiki ANA ṣulmi-dU-up LUGAL KUR
   conj nom nom conj nom nom dat dat gen
   if city a or place a Ulmitešub king land

URUd[U]-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 Tiyaššilaš QADU A.ŠÀ.GĀR=ŠU [IN]A URU Timmuḫala
   abl=conj=ptc nom instr =poss dat-loc
   from there Tiyaššilaš fields =its Timmuḫala

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

'in this direction (the city) Tiyaššilaš with its fields and meadows (is) combined with
(the city) Timmuḫala 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

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 ħandāi-
'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

Homerice Greek

1. \( \text{tēlōthi d' hūlē / aksēmen eks óreos} \) (Iliad 24.662-663)
   \[
   \begin{array}{llllll}
   \text{adv} & \text{ptc} & \text{nom} & \text{inf} & \text{prep} & \text{gen} \\
   \text{far and firewood to bring from mountain}
   \end{array}
   \]
   'and firewood (nom.) (is) far to bring (= to be brought) from the mountain'

2. \( \text{óphra mēn hoūtos anēr Agamēmnon mēnie diōi /} \)
   \[
   \begin{array}{llllllll}
   \text{conj} & \text{ptc} & \text{nom} & \text{nom} & \text{dat} & \text{3sg} & \text{dat} \\
   \text{while that man Agamemnon raged shining,}
   \end{array}
   \]
   \[
   \begin{array}{llllll}
   \text{tōphra de} & \text{rhēteroi polemīzein ēsan Akhaioī} \) (Iliad 18.257-258)
   \end{array}
   \]
   'while that man raged against shining Agamemnon, then the Achaeans (nom) were easier to fight'

Vedic Sanskrit

3. \( \text{nā-esā gāvyātīr āpabhartavā} \) (RV 10.14.2b)
   \[
   \begin{array}{llll}
   \text{neg-nom} & \text{nom} & \text{inf} \\
   \text{not-this cow-pasture to plunder}
   \end{array}
   \]
   'this cow pasture (nom.) (is) not to plunder (= not to be plundered)'

4. \( \text{nā vah pratimāi sukṛāni} \) (RV 3.60.4)
   \[
   \begin{array}{llllllll}
   \text{neg} & \text{gen} & \text{inf} & \text{nom-acc} & \text{pl} \\
   \text{not your measure good deeds}
   \end{array}
   \]
   'your good deeds (nom.) (are) not to measure (= to be measured)'

Avestan

5. \( \text{hiiat-cā gāuš jaiditāi mraō} \) (Yasna 32.14)
   \[
   \begin{array}{llllllll}
   \text{conj-conn} & \text{nom} & \text{inf} & \text{instr} \\
   \text{when-and cow to kill destructive action}
   \end{array}
   \]
   '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. rei̇kia duoti žōdis (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×SA) 'establish (by oracle), (eš-) natta āra 'be not right', and NU.GĀL '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 benefi̇ted from discussions of some of the ideas in this paper with Marina Zorman, Elisabeth Rieken, Alfredo Rizza, Line Mikkelsen, and Craig Melchert.
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