

## Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten

Herausgegeben von der Kommission für den Alten Orient  
der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz

Band 58

## Saeculum

Gedenkschrift für Heinrich Otten  
anlässlich seines 100. Geburtstags

Herausgegeben von Andreas Müller-Karpe,  
Elisabeth Rieken und Walter Sommerfeld



9 783447 103657

www.harrassowitz-verlag.de

StBoT

2015

58

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

# Alleged “Right Dislocation” in Hittite\*

H. Craig Melchert

Of the innumerable contributions made to Hittitology by Heinrich Otten, perhaps none is more important than his leading role in establishing the relative chronology of Hittite texts and manuscripts. See e. g. Otten 1964: 12–3, Otten & Souček 1969: 42–3, and Otten *apud* Rüster 1972: VII–XI. Despite recent debate regarding the possible need to redefine the boundaries between successive periods of the Hittite language (including perhaps the elimination of the notion of “Middle Hittite”),<sup>1</sup> the fundamental validity of an Old Hittite linguistic period has been confirmed beyond all doubt by the fact that the language found in the manuscripts defined as “Old Script” displays a coherent grammar with features not found in later periods.

One of the many results of our ability to distinguish Old Hittite compositions in Old Script from later copies has been the demonstration that certain linguistic features limited to copies (and not attested in original compositions of any period) are in fact artificial creations that do not reflect the genuine grammar of any period of Hittite, being based solely on copyists’ misunderstanding of older features no longer present in their own language. I cite as one example the use of enclitic possessive pronouns in *-e/it* with the vocative, animate nominative singular, and dative-locative singular (see for examples Houwink ten Cate 1967). This feature had been cited as a putative archaism with far-reaching implications (e. g. Josephson 1967: 133–4 and *passim*), but Otten (1973: 55–6) showed that this usage is restricted to New Script copies and never appears in Old Hittite texts in Old Script. As he indicates, it results from the misunderstanding of the copyists (whose grammar did not include enclitic possessive pronouns as a living feature),<sup>2</sup> who were misled by the use of the nominative-accusative singular

---

\* I am deeply indebted to Anthony Yates for reminding me of crucial references and data whose omission would have caused me acute embarrassment.

1 See most recently Rüster & Wilhelm 2012: 59–71 with ample references.

2 The handful of attested examples in New Hittite compositions are frozen expressions, and their use confirms this. On the NH use of *ištarni=šummi* (properly only ‘between us’) as a generalized ‘mutually’ (‘between us’, ‘between you’, ‘between them’) see Francia 1995: 95–7. Attempts by Mursili II in his annals to use an enclitic possessive to express ‘my troops’ results in incorrect as well as correct combinations: in KBo 2.5 ii 13 *tuzziāš=miš* is correctly nominative singular, but in the preceding ii 3 *tuzziyaš=miš* is wrongly used for accusative singular. Likewise *ibid.* iii 54.

neuter forms in *-et* with the nominative-accusative plural neuter (OH/OS *šākuwa=šmet* ‘their eyes’) and of the instrumental in *-it* with the ablative (OH/OS *iššaz=(š)mit* ‘from their mouths’). Since they themselves did not actively control the enclitic possessives, the copyists wrongly concluded that the forms in *-e/it* could be freely used with other cases.

Recent studies by Rizza (2007: espec. 73–5 and 171–2), Bauer (2011), and Rieken (2011) have led to the recognition of a different sort of artificial usage in some Hittite texts. They have demonstrated that certain word order configurations are restricted to ritual incantations or mythological narratives whose origins are clearly Hattic or Hurrian. They argue convincingly that whether or not we have direct evidence for the Hattic or Hurrian texts that served as models, these word orders reflect “translationese.” That is, in order to imitate the Hattic or Hurrian word order of major constituents, the Hittite scribes *just in this context* of translation either used word orders that are wholly ungrammatical in normal Hittite or Hittite word orders that are ungrammatical in the context employed (i. e., the usual discourse structure constraints on such orders are not obeyed).

One of these constructions is what is described in current terminology as “right dislocation” with “clitic doubling.” That is, as illustrated in (1), either the subject or direct object of a clause appears to the right of the clause-final finite verb, and when possible by the rules of Hittite grammar, it is accompanied by a proleptic coreferential pronoun:<sup>3</sup>

- (1) KUB 33.102 ii 17 (with dupl. KUB 33.98+36.8 ii 15) (MH/NS; CTH 345 Song of Ullikummi)  
*n=aš šarā t[(īyat<sup>d</sup> Ku)]marbiš*  
 ‘He stood up, (did) Kumarbi.’

It has long been acknowledged that right dislocation occurs with particular frequency in translations from Hurrian (e. g. McCone 1979: 470) and may be motivated in these instances by a desire to imitate foreign word order (Hoffner & Melchert 2008: 409). However, Hoffner and Melchert, *loc. cit.*, claim that there are rare (precisely three!) examples of this construction in native Hittite contexts. I will argue in what follows that these do not exist.

The key to my argument consists of sentences of the following type:

- (2) KBo 17.1 i 4’–6’ (OH/OS; CTH 416 Ritual for the Royal Couple)  
 LUGAL-*uš* [III]-*iš* GUD-*un* I *šīnann=a allappahhi* MUNUS.LUGAL-*ašš=a=an* III-*iš* [*al*]*llappahhi partaunit=uš* LUGAL-*un* MUNUS.  
LUGAL-*ann=a ašaškezzi*

<sup>3</sup> Clitic doubling is not possible with intransitive verbs that do not take enclitic subject pronouns. On this point see Hoffner & Melchert 2008: 280–3 with references.

“The king spits on the cow and the one figurine three times. The queen also spits on them three times. One seats (i. e. signals to sit down) them, the king and queen, with a wing.”

- (3) KUB 13.4 i 50 (MH/NS; CTH 264 Instructions for Temple Officials)  
*našma=at=kan mān šarā tiyanda kuwapi datteni*  
 ‘Or if you ever take them, the served up things ...’
- (4) KBo 16.47 Ro 6–7 (MH/MS; CTH 28 Pre-Imperial Treaty)  
*māḫhan=ma=at=mu ANA dUTU-ŠI [āšš]awes n=uš apeniššan*  
*maniyahḫiškemi*  
 ‘As they are good to me, His Majesty, so I will command them.’
- (5) KBo 3.28 ii 17–19 (OH/NS; CTH 9 Palace Chronicles)  
*attaš=maš ḫaršanī dÍD-ya mekkeš paprešker š=uš ABI LUGAL natta*  
*ḫwišnuškēt mKizzuwaš=pat ANA SAG ABI=YA dÍD-ya papretta š=an*  
*attaš=miš mKizzuwan nat<ta> ḫue<š>nūt*  
 ‘Many proved guilty in the river ordeal towards the person of my father, and the father of the king did not let them live. Kizzuwa himself proved guilty in the river ordeal towards the person of my father, and my father did not let him, Kizzuwa(!), live.’
- (6) HKM 10: 8–12 (MH/MS; Maṣat Letter)  
<sup>URU</sup>*Lišipra=wa kuin aš[e]šḫ[i] nu=war=an=za imma 3 ME É-TUM*  
*arnumi namma=wa=kan LÚ.MEŠ SIG<sub>5</sub> MAḪAR dUTU-ŠI parā nehḫi*  
*appezziyaz=ma=wa URU-an arnumeni*  
 ‘The city Lisipra that I am (re)settling, I am indeed relocating it, three hundred households (of it). Next I will send the leaders before His Majesty. Afterwards we will relocate the (entire) city.’
- (7) KUB 44.63 ii 7’–9’ (?/NS; CTH 461; Medical Ritual)  
*nu=šši=kan išḫar arḫa tarnai māḫhan=ma=at=ši=kan išḫar arḫa*  
*tarnai nu=šši=kan kī Ú anda tarnai*  
 (He immediately strikes him on the head, once or twice,) ‘and lets out blood out of him. As soon as he lets it, the blood, out, he lets in this herb.’

Examples of this kind have generally been overlooked or ignored.<sup>4</sup> Garrett (1990: 263–5) discusses the type briefly, but gives an analysis (by no means convincing) only of (2). Sideltsev (2011) offers the only comprehensive treatment. His analysis has the merit of recognizing that the construction involves apposition, but he wrongly ascribes no discourse function to this use of apposition, and his conception of “clitic doubling” is seriously flawed, leading him to a false division of what is a unitary phenomenon.<sup>5</sup>

The problem is that neither Garrett nor Sideltsev recognizes that the enclitic pronoun in all of these examples appears in its normal function of an anaphoric pronoun referring back to an antecedent in a previous clause, to which it is quite properly “bound.” Garrett (1990: 265) dismisses this possibility on the grounds that “... unemphatic pronouns are used only in contexts where their reference is clear and no additional information (like apposition) is added.” This claim is manifestly too strong: in real language use the antecedents of unemphatic pronouns is by no means always unambiguous, nor is disambiguation the only possible motivation for apposition to unemphatic (clitic) pronouns. While such use of apposition is predictably rare, I contend that it is motivated in all of the genuine examples attested in Hittite of an enclitic pronoun accompanied by a non-dislocated noun phrase.

The enclitic pronoun *-uš* ‘them’ in example (2) is fulfilling its usual role as an unemphatic anaphoric pronoun, accompanied by LUGAL-*un* MUNUS.LUGAL-*ann=a* ‘the king and queen’ as a disambiguating appositional phrase. As Kaspars Ozolins (pers. comm.) has pointed out to me, there is in fact another pair of grammatically animate noun phrases in the immediately preceding context: the (model) cow and the figurine. Therefore, although it might seem that the verb ‘seats’ would make the referents of the direct object clear enough, one cannot exclude that the writer felt the need to disambiguate the ‘them’

4 Luraghi (1990: 154) duly includes (2) as her example 401#<sup>a</sup>, but nowhere discusses its extraordinary structure. Rizza (2007: 76) claims that the enclitic pronoun in this example is “cataphoric,” but does not explain how this can occur in a descriptive passage of a ritual that is not a translation and shows normal OV word order, or what discourse function such a construction might have. Francia (2006: 351) merely labels the pronoun in (6) “pleonastic.”

5 He also includes sentences that do not belong here. As per Garrett (1990: 259) and others, *n=an* <sup>L<sup>U</sup></sup> *antiyantān ēpzi* ‘He takes him as a live-in son-in-law’ (KBo 6.3 ii 28; OH/NS Laws) is not a case of apposition at all, since the noun is predicative. Against Bawanypeck (2005: 22–3) and Sideltsev (2011: 81) there is no proven “clitic doubling” in KBo 4.2 i 5–6 (OH?/NS; Ritual of Huwarlu): *[n]u=ššan* <sup>DUG</sup> DÍLIM.GAL Ì *tianzi šerr=a=an* <sup>DUG</sup> DÍLIM.GAL Ì *[ištapp]anzi* ‘They set (down) an oil dish, and they also plug up the oil dish at the top.’ Since this text shows other signs that it may be an OH composition (NB archaic D-LSg *kēti* in i 21), *-an* may be the OH particle *-an* reinforcing the notion of putting a plug *into* the mouth of the dish. The alleged example from KBo 17.105+ iii 2–3 (MH/MS; CTH 433) cited by Sideltsev (2011: 85, 87) is likely to reflect merely an agreement error (*n=an=šan* for correct *n=at=šan*), typical in rituals reflecting a Luvian or Hurrian background. See on this point Brosch forthcoming.

by adding the apposition ‘(namely) the king and the queen’.<sup>6</sup> In the context of example (3) the antecedent for =*at* ‘it’, the served up food and drink, is separated from the pronoun by no less than three intervening clauses (see Sturtevant & Bechtel 1935: 150). Under these circumstances, I submit that the disambiguating *šarā tiyanda* ‘the (things) served up’ was sorely needed.

In the case of examples (4) and (5) the motivation for the apposition to the enclitic anaphoric pronoun is not disambiguation, but rather a pragmatic insistence on the identity of the referent. In treaties and instructions the Hittite king is obsessive about underscoring his status and repeats his title at every opportunity. In the context of KBo 16.47 the identity of the first person referent is never in doubt over the span of Ro 4–14, but the Hittite king repeats his title twice more after the clause cited as example (4). See also example (9) below, where the king’s fixation on his title is even more egregious. Likewise in example (5) from the Palace Chronicle, I cannot accept the claim of Sideltsev (2011: 87) that =*an* ... <sup>m</sup>*Kizzuwan* is a case of clitic doubling to mark that Kizzuwa has gone from non-topic to topic. Once again, the enclitic pronoun is functioning as an ordinary anaphoric pronoun governed by its antecedent <sup>m</sup>*Kizzuwaš=pat* in the preceding clause. Repetition of the personal name in the second clause has the same function as the particle =*pat* in the first: to underscore the special status of this individual and the surprise that he would be proven guilty and left to his fate by the king’s father. Whether this reflects his particularly high rank or an especially close personal relationship to the king we cannot know.

As correctly seen by Beal (1992: 511–2), in example (6) the =*an* ‘it’ resumes the relative noun phrase <sup>URU</sup>*Lišipra kuin* in perfectly normal fashion, and ‘three hundred households’ stands in partitive apposition to it.<sup>7</sup> Thus in this case the apposition has its typical function of adding further information, not that of disambiguation or emphasis.

Finally, example (7) almost surely is a compromise construction. The scribe began to write *maḥḥan=ma=at=ši =kan arḥa tarnai* ‘as soon as he lets it out’, the normal follow-up to ‘he lets the blood out of him’, but then wanted to contrast letting *the blood out with letting the herb in* (i. e., into the intentional cut made by the blow to the head), so he had to insert the noun phrase *išḥar*. Failure to delete the =*at* produced what certainly is a pleonastic use of the enclitic pronoun, but we are dealing with a mere “performance error,” common enough

6 Since a few lines later in the same ritual the ‘troops’ (surely again models thereof) are said to ‘sit’ on *šarruwa*-bread (KBo 17.1 i 30), it is not so outlandish to think that the model cow and figurine might be ‘seated’ somewhere. Garrett’s attempt (1990: 263–4) to take this example as predicative in the sense ‘seat as king and queen’ is not credible. The status of the royal couple as king and queen is clearly already established in the context of the ritual, so they could not be seated in any other guise, and such a sentence would be wholly tautological and meaningless.

7 Contra Hoffner (2009: 13, 378), it is the previous citizens of Lisipra who are being relocated, to be replaced by new Hittite settlers, as shown by Hoffner’s own translation of the clause ‘Afterwards, we will relocate the (entire) city’. The latter can only refer to Lisipra.

in real language use, not a genuine case of clitic doubling with a non-dislocated noun phrase. Since in every case cited the enclitic pronoun is anaphoric and bound by its antecedent in a preceding clause, none of these examples can properly be described as showing “clitic doubling” in the proper sense: i. e., a clitic pronoun copying a co-referential noun phrase in the same clause.

The existence of at least a few undeniable examples of apposition to enclitic anaphoric pronouns like those above where the appositional noun phrase has undergone no movement leads me to interpret the following example (8), the first of the alleged native Hittite examples of right dislocation, in the same fashion, with the difference that the appositional noun phrase has undergone extraposition, which certainly is a feature of regular Hittite grammar,<sup>8</sup> thus producing *the surface appearance* of right dislocation with clitic doubling. Once again I cite ample preceding context in order to justify the interpretation of the appositional phrase as disambiguating:

- (8) KUB 26.1 iv 11–14 (NH/NS; CTH 255 Instructions for the LÚ.MEŠ SAG)

[n]ašma mān memiaš kuiški ēšzi [na]šma=aš 𐎎kuništayalliš=pat kuiški  
 [(naš)]ma=aš ŠA MUNUS-TI 𐎎UTU=ŠI=ma=tta punušmi n=**an** lē  
 šannatti *memian*

“Or if there is some matter, whether it is something k. or it is about a woman, and I His Majesty interrogate you, do not conceal it, the matter.”

In this instance there are no less than three intervening clauses between the antecedent *memiaš* and the anaphoric pronoun *-an*. That the writer felt the need to remind the reader of the antecedent by adding the appositional *memian* thus seems plausible. The fact that it is extraposed does tend to suggest that he may have added it as an afterthought.

In the other two putative examples of right dislocation with clitic doubling in native Hittite context it is unlikely that disambiguation was the motivation for the use of an appositional noun phrase with an enclitic anaphoric pronoun, but I believe that the true motivations are not obscure.

- (9) KBo 5.3 i 14–16 (MH/NS; Treaty of Šuppiluliuma I with Hukkana)

namma=ma=za damain BELAM kui«e»š=aš kuiš [UN-aš] ANA 𐎎UTU-  
 ŠI EGIR-an arḫa lē kuinki šakti 𐎎UTU-ŠI-i[n=za=pát] šāk paḫši=ya=**an**  
 𐎎UTU-ŠI

“Furthermore do not recognize another lord, whatever (sort of) person he may be, behind the back of His Majesty. Recognize [only] His Majesty, and also protect him, His Majesty!”

<sup>8</sup> See Luraghi 1990: 21 and Hoffner & Melchert 2008: 408, with examples such as the following from the Hittite Laws (KBo 6.3 i 2): *U 4 SAG.DU pāi LÚ-n=aku MUNUS-n=aku* “and shall give four persons – male or female.”

Hoffner & Melchert (2008: 409, note 8) cited the final clause in this passage as a third example of right dislocation with clitic doubling, albeit with fronting of the verb with the additive focus particle =*ya* ‘also’. But the only motivation for this analysis was the need to account for the apparent clitic doubling. Whatever the putative discourse function of rightward dislocation might be, it surely is implausible to suppose that it was applied in this case, only to be effectively undone by the fronting of the verb, so that <sup>d</sup>UTU-ŠI in fact is descriptively *in situ* in the position of a direct object, just like the appositional noun phrases in examples (2) to (7) cited above. There is no positive evidence whatsoever that <sup>d</sup>UTU-ŠI was ever to the right of the finite verb. In this case the unexpected use of <sup>d</sup>UTU-ŠI ‘His Majesty’ in apposition to -*an* ‘him’ has nothing to do with disambiguation (the antecedent of -*an* is unmistakable), but once again reflects merely the egotistical fixation of the Hittite king, who in this passage repeats his title in five consecutive clauses and a total of seven times in eight consecutive clauses (see Friedrich 1930: 107–8 and Akdoğan 2011: 8).

- (10) Bo 86/299 iii 79–81 (NH/NS; Treaty of Tutḫaliya IV with Kuruntiya)  
*nu kāša apēdani memiyani LIM DINGIR.MEŠ tuliya ḫalziyanteš nu*  
*uškandu ištamaššandu=ya n=at kutruwēš ašandu <sup>d</sup>UTU ŠAMÊ <sup>d</sup>UTU*  
<sup>URU</sup>*Arinna ...* (list of more than fifty deities follows)

“The thousand gods have been called to assembly in the aforementioned matter. Let them see and hear. Let them be witnesses, the Sun-god of Heaven, the Sun-goddess of Arinna, etc.”

Once again the =*at* ‘they’ in the third clause is functioning in its normal role as an anaphoric pronoun, referring back to the ‘thousand gods’ two clauses earlier. However, ‘they’ is further specified by listing in apposition more than fifty of the most important of the thousand gods by name (typical practice in lists of divine witnesses in treaties). That such a long list is extraposed beyond the verb by “heavy NP shift” is to be expected, since otherwise one would have to wait an unconscionably long time to come to the important predicate *kutruwēš ašandu* ‘let be witnesses’. The conceivable alternative formulation of simply *nu <sup>d</sup>UTU ŠAMÊ <sup>d</sup>UTU <sup>URU</sup>Arinna ... kutruwēš ašandu* was avoided for the same reason.

The clauses cited above as examples (8) to (10) are to my knowledge the only alleged cases of right dislocation with clitic doubling in native Hittite contexts. All others are found in translation literature. I believe that the putative native Hittite examples are all better analyzed as rare (but motivated!) instances of ordinary enclitic anaphoric pronouns accompanied by appositional noun phrases, as we find in examples (2) to (7) and (9), which *cannot* be described as right dislocation. In the case of examples (8) and (10), extraposition of the appositional noun phrase produced *the appearance* of right dislocation plus clitic doubling. I assert that this rare but existing and grammatical configuration was

then exploited by Hittite scribes in translating Hattic and Hurrian passages as a means of imitating foreign word order of major constituents.<sup>9</sup> Its status as translationese is shown not only by its restriction to translation contexts, but also by its artificiality, since in those contexts it does not have the discourse function of the few rare Hittite examples of anaphoric enclitic pronoun plus appositional noun phrase. The example given as (1) from the Song of Ullikummi, where there is no antecedent for the enclitic pronoun, would thus have been ungrammatical in ordinary Hittite, just like the examples of fronted finite verbs in incantations cited by Rieken (2011).

I close with a note on the diachronic implications of this finding. McCone (1979: 470–1) wrongly (like everyone else) viewed the many examples from translation literature as part of regular Hittite grammar. He further failed to distinguish between the construction with proleptic pronoun and postposed subject or direct object and examples of extraposition of other constituents (see footnote 8 above). Finally, he wrongly concluded that the former as well as the latter was an archaism inherited from Proto-Indo-European. However, if my analysis of the native Hittite examples discussed above is correct, then the artificial Hittite “right dislocation with clitic doubling” did in fact originate in certain instances of extraposition of non-arguments, thus supporting the claim of McCone 1979 and Gonda 1959 that extraposition was a syntactic device of Proto-Indo-European.<sup>10</sup>

## Bibliography

- Akdoğan, Rukiye (2011). “Huqqana Antlaşması (A Nüshası) Transkripsiyon ve Ter-cümesi”. In: *Höyük 4*, 1–73.
- Bauer, Anna (2011). “Verberststellung im Hethitischen”. In: *Indogermanistik und Linguistik im Dialog: Akten der XIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 21. bis 27. September 2008 in Salzburg*. Ed. by Thomas Krisch & Thomas Lindner. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 39–48.
- Bawanypeck, Daliah (2005). *Die Rituale der Auguren*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Beal, Richard (1992). *The Organisation of the Hittite Military*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Brosch, Cyril (forthcoming). *Genus- und Numerusinkongruenzen im Hethitischen – Willkür oder Regel?*

---

<sup>9</sup> I personally find it likely that, once established as a pattern in direct translation from Hattic and Hurrian, this construction was also used freely to create incantations with suitable “foreign coloration,” even in the absence of a direct model.

<sup>10</sup> I cannot here adequately respond to the very different analysis of right dislocation by Sideltsev (forthcoming), but for the reasons given above I see no evidence for any true right dislocations in native Hittite contexts, while on the other hand I see no grounds for attributing any genuine discourse function to any of the examples from translation literature or from incantations likely to reflect foreign models. I regard “right dislocation” as merely a descriptive label for an artificial usage found only in highly restricted contexts that does not belong to native Hittite grammar. I do not, of course, mean to deny that right dislocation may serve a true discourse function in other languages.

- Francia, Rita (1995). “Costruzione e valore del pronome possessive enclitico di prima plural in hittito”. In: *Studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici* 35, 93–9.
- (2006). “Scelte di linguaggio e anomalie nell’ufficio dello scriba ittita”. In: *L’ufficio e il documento. I luoghi, i modi, gli strumenti dell’amministrazione in Egitto e nel Vicino Oriente antico*. Ed. by Clelia Mora & Patrizia Piacentini. Milan: Cisalpino.
- Friedrich, Johannes (1930). *Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache*. Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft 34/1. Leipzig: Hinrich.
- Garrett, Andrew (1990). “The Syntax of Anatolian Pronominal Clitics”. PhD dissertation. Cambridge MA.
- Gonda, Jan (1959). “On Amplified Sentences and Similar Structures in the Veda”. In: *Four Studies in the Language of the Veda*. ‘s-Gravenhage: Mouton, 7–70.
- Hoffner, Harry A., Jr. (2009). *Letters from the Hittite Kingdom*. Atlanta: Society for Biblical Literature.
- Hoffner, Harry A., Jr. & H. Craig Melchert (2008). *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*. Part I: Reference Grammar. Winona Lake IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Houwink ten Cate, Philo H. J. (1967). “The Ending *-d* of the Hittite Possessive Pronoun”. In: *Revue hittite et asianique* 24 (fasc. 79), 123–32.
- Josephson, Folke (1967). “Pronominal Adverbs of Anatolian: Formation and Function”. In: *Revue hittite et asianique* 24 (fasc. 79), 133–54.
- Luraghi, Silvia (1990). *Old Hittite Sentence Structure*. London/New York: Routledge.
- McCone, Kim (1979). “The Diachronic Possibilities of the Indo-European ‘Amplified’ Sentence: A Case History from Anatolian”. In: *Studies in Diachronic, Synchronic, and Typological Linguistics: Festschrift for Oswald Szemerényi on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*. Ed. by Bela Brogyanyi. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 467–87.
- Otten, Heinrich (1964). “Schrift, Sprache und Literatur der Hethiter”. In: *Neuere Hethiterforschung*. Ed. by Gerold Walser. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 11–22.
- (1973). *Eine althethitische Erzählung um die Stadt Zalpa*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten Heft 17. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Otten, Heinrich & Vladimír Souček (1969). *Ein althethitisches Ritual für das Königspaar*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 8. Harrassowitz.
- Rieken, Elisabeth (2011). “Verberststellung in hethitischen Übersetzungstexten”. In: *Indogermanistik und Linguistik im Dialog: Akten der XIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 21. bis 27. September 2008 in Salzburg*. Ed. by Thomas Krisch & Thomas Lindner. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 498–507.
- Rizza, Alfredo (2007). *I pronomi enclitici nei testi etei di traduzione dal hattico*. Studia Mediterranea 20. Pavia: Iuculano.
- Rüster, Christel (1972). *Hethitische Keilschrift-Paläographie*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 20. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Rüster, Christel & Gernot Wilhelm (2012). *Landschenkungsurkunden hethitischer Könige*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten Beiheft 4. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Sideltsev, Andrej V. (2011). “Clitic Doubling: A New Syntactic Category in Hittite”. In: *Altorientalische Forschungen* 38, 81–91.
- (forthcoming). “The Origin of Hittite Right Dislocations”.
- Sturtevant, Edgar H. & George Bechtel (1935). *A Hittite Chrestomathy*. Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America.