

A Note on Raising in Indo-European

Author(s): Gary B. Holland

*Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* (1982), pp. 158-169

Please see “How to cite” in the online sidebar for full citation information.

Please contact BLS regarding any further use of this work. BLS retains copyright for both print and screen forms of the publication. BLS may be contacted via <http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/bls/>.

---

*The Annual Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* is published online via [eLanguage](#), the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform.

## A Note on Raising in Indo-European

Gary B. Holland  
University of California, Berkeley

For the Neogrammarians, questions of raising and deletion were easily answerable, or rather simply did not arise, for they viewed a sentence like 'I want him to go' as having come about through the addition of a verbal noun or infinitive 'to go' to a fully formed sentence 'I want him'. The development of productive accusative with infinitive constructions, such as 'him to go', came about secondarily as a result of a reanalysis of the constituent structure of the sentence, a 'Verschiebung der syntaktischen Gliederung' (see Delbrück 1897, Brugmann 1904, Sommer 1931 among others).<sup>1</sup> The Neogrammarians derived support for this interpretation of infinitive phrases from the fact that many infinitives in the earlier IE languages have transparent nominal morphology, and hence are to be viewed as case forms of abstract nouns rather than as infinitives in a more modern sense. Furthermore, no distinctive infinitival morphology is reconstructible to Indo-European. To take the most striking situation, Vedic Sanskrit has nineteen different 'infinitive' forms, only three of which are never used as nominal case forms. Vedic infinitives (or verbal abstracts) are not marked for voice, tense, or aspect. In later Sanskrit, all of these forms fall into disuse except -tum. Hittite, on the other hand, has only two infinitives, in -anna and -uwanzi. The distribution of these two forms is determined solely by the morphological structure of the verb root: ablauting verbs take -anna, non-ablauting verbs take -uwanzi. There is no semantic distinction between the infinitive suffixes, and there is no marking for tense or voice. In contradistinction to Hittite and Vedic Sanskrit, Early Greek has a well developed infinitive system with suffixes clearly differentiated for tense and voice and to a limited extent for the morphological class of the verb.

The following are some typical sentences containing infinitive constructions in Greek, Sanskrit, Avestan, and Hittite. The first group of examples presents a few infinitive phrases from Greek:

- 1) humīn mēn theoī doīen ... ekpērsai Priámoio pólin, eũ d'  
 dat ptc nom 3pl inf gen acc adv ptc  
 you gods may give to sack Priam's city well  
 oĩkad' hikésthai  
 acc inf  
 home to come  
 'May the gods grant you to sack the city of Priam and to come home safely' (Iliad 1.18f.)
- 2) bē d' iénai  
 3sg ptc inf  
 went and to go  
 'he went to go' (Iliad 4.199)

- 3) mēdé m' aeídēn apérúke  
 neg acc inf 2sg  
 not me to sing prevent  
 'do not prevent me from singing' (Alkman 171P.)
- 4) hēméas g' ou pōs ésti methiémēnai polémoio  
 acc ptc neg ptc 3sg inf gen  
 us not at all is to desist battle  
 'It is not possible at all for us to desist from battle'  
 (Iliad 13.114)

In (1) the infinitive phrases are objects of doīten 'give' 3pl.opt. The controller of deletion in the infinitive phrases is the dative indirect object. One of the infinitives is transitive; the other is intransitive with an accusative adverbial goal (oíkade). In ex. (2) the subject of the infinitive is the subject of the main verb; both verbs are intransitive. The construction type of ex. (3) happens not to be attested in Homer, but it does appear in Alkman and should be old. It has the same surface structure as any other infinitive complement. Ex. (4) illustrates an impersonal construction made with 'be', 'it is not' = 'it is not possible', and the subject of the embedded infinitive is accusative.<sup>2</sup> Exx. (5-9) are Vedic Sanskrit:

- 5) tát paśún evāsmā etát pári dadāti gúptyai  
 conn acc ptc-dat adv prev 3sg inf  
 thus animals him now gives to guard  
 'Thus he gives him the animals now to guard' (Śatapathabrāhmaṇa 2.4.1.5)
- 6) úpo emi cikitúšo vipṛčham  
 prev-ptc lsg acc inf  
 I go wise to ask  
 'I go to the wise to inquire' (Ṛgveda 7.86.3)
- 7) tvám Indra srávitavá apás kaḥ  
 nom voc inf acc 2sg  
 you Indra to flow waters made  
 'You, O Indra, made the waters flow' (ṚV. 7.21.3)
- 8) bhúyo vā dātum arhasi  
 acc ptc inf 2sg  
 more or to give are able  
 'Or you are able to give more' (ṚV. 5.79.10)
- 9) rāyāḥ syāma dharúṇaṃ dhiyádhayi  
 gen lpl acc inf  
 wealth we are foundation to place  
 'We should place the foundation of wealth' (ṚV. 7.34.24)

In ex. (5) the dative object of the upper verb has controlled subject deletion of the infinitive, while the accusative object of the upper verb has controlled object deletion of the infinitive. The infinitive in ex. (6) expresses purpose and depends from an intransitive verb of motion. Ex. (7) is very much like a periphrasis of a causative. The infinitive in ex. (8) depends from an auxiliary

verb arhasi 'you are able'. Ex. (9) shows another idiom using the verb 'be'. Here 'be' plus infinitive expresses obligation, and it takes a personal subject and optative mood.

The next three examples are Avestan:

- 10) yezī ahiā ašā pōi maṭ xšaiiehī  
 conj gen instr inf abl 2sg  
 if it Aša to ward off me are able  
 'If you are able to ward it off from me through Aša' (Yasna 44.15)
- 11) taṭ nē mazdā vīduanōi vaocā  
 acc acc voc inf 2sg  
 that us Mazda to know tell  
 'Tell us that, O Mazda, (for us) to know' (Yasna 31.3)
- 12) utaiiūtī tōuīšīm gattōi vasəmī  
 acc acc inf lsg  
 eternal strength to come I wish, want  
 'I want eternal strength to come' (Yasna 43.1)

Ex. (10) contains a finite verb that occurs both as an independent verb and as a quasi-auxiliary. The object of the infinitive is the genitive pronoun ahiā. Ex. (11) has a structure similar to that of (5) but with 'teīī' rather than 'give'. Finally, the structure of (12) is ambiguous; the accusative noun phrase may be the object of the upper verb and hence it may have controlled deletion of the coreferential subject of the infinitive, or the entire infinitive phrase may be the object of the verb vasəmī 'I want'.

Exx. (13-18) are Hittite. In ex. (13) the infinitive expresses purpose and depends on an intransitive motion verb:

- 13) d<sub>UTU</sub>-šI-wa šu-ma-a-aš wa-al-aḫ-ḫu-wa-an-zi ú-iz-zi  
 nom -quot dat-loc/acc inf 3sg  
 majesty-my you to strike comes  
 'My majesty comes to smite you' 'comes to you to smite (you)'  
 (KBo V 8 I 8)

The role of the pronoun šumaš 'you' is ambiguous, since this form can be either dative-locative or accusative. Hence it is unclear whether it should be taken as the goal of the verb uizzi or the object of the infinitive walḫuwanzi. If the former, then one may assume that it has controlled deletion of the object of the infinitive.

- 14) EGIR-pa-ya -aš -kán še-šu-an-zi GAM DU-ri  
 adv -conj-nom-ptc inf adv 3 sg  
 back -and -he to sleep down goes  
 'And he goes back down to sleep' (KUB V 1 I 61)

In ex. (14) the subject of the finite verb and that of the infinitive are the same; both verbs are intransitive.

- 15) <sup>d</sup>LAMA-aš-ša ku-e KARAŠ.ĤI.A I-NA KUR <sup>uru</sup>nu-ħaš-ši  
 nom -conj acc acc dat  
 Lama god-and which troops  
 ĥal-ki.ĤI.A-uš ĥar-ni-in-ku-wa-an-zi pí-e-ħu-da-an ĥar-ta  
 acc inf part 3sg  
 grain to destroy brought had  
 'And which troops the LAMA god had brought to Nuħašši to destroy  
 the grain . . . ' (KBo IV 4 II 63f.)

The structure of ex. (15) is somewhat different, since the accusative object of the matrix verb is also the subject of the transitive infinitive which also has an accusative object.

- 16) nu -mu te-ip-nu-ma-an-zi ša-an-aĥ-ta  
 conn-acc inf 3sg  
 and -me to make little he sought  
 'And he sought to make me little' (KUB XXI 15 I 14)
- 17) nu KUR.KUR.ĤI.A <sup>lú</sup>KUR ... ku-i-e-eš-ma -az šu-me-en-za-an  
 conn nom nom nom -conj-ptc gen  
 and lands enemy which -but your  
 É.ĤI.A DINGIR.MEŠ-KU-NU ar-ħa wa-ar-nu-um-ma-an-zi  
 acc acc prev inf  
 temples your to burn  
 i-la-li-iš-kán-zi  
 3pl  
 desire  
 'And the enemy lands ... which desire to burn up your temples'  
 (KUB XXIV 1 III 21f.)

The subject of the finite verb, on one reading of ex. (16), is also the subject of the infinitive, and the object of the finite verb is the object of the infinitive. That is, *šanħta* 'sought' functions more or less like an auxiliary: it may occur independently as a transitive verb or it may occur in close conjunction with infinitives. The structure of ex. (17) is similar to that of ex. (16), but has the matrix verb *ilališkanzi* 'they desire'. The impersonal verb in ex. (18) *ŪL kišari*, literally 'it does not become' = 'it is not possible', here has an embedded infinitive complement with a dative subject and is analogous to the Greek example in (4).

- 18) nu -uš-ši <sup>Ū</sup>UL pa-ra-a i-ya-an-ni-ya-u-wa-an-zi <sup>Ū</sup>UL  
 conn-dat neg preverb inf neg  
 and -him not forth to go not  
 ki-ša-ri <sup>Ū</sup>UL-ma -aš-ši EGIR-pa ti-ya-u-wa-an-zi ki-ša-ri  
 3sg neg -conj-dat prev inf 3sg  
 becomes not -but -him back to step becomes  
 'It is not possible for him to go further, it is not possible  
 for him to step back' (KUB VIII 53 IV 18-20)

The preceding examples will suffice to give a general idea of the kinds of infinitive complements that are found. Most of the

examples have been chosen to illustrate the range of matrix verbs that take infinitive complements. In contrast with English, with its variety of complementizers and complement types, in these languages there appears from a surface structure perspective to be only one basic construction, without complementizer. Generally speaking, the infinitives are equivalent to consecutive or purpose clauses, and in many of them it is unclear whether raising or Equi-NP deletion has applied.

All of the languages discussed here have an active : passive (or active : medio-passive) distinction in the morphology of finite verbs. Only one of them, however, makes an active : medio-passive distinction in infinitive morphology. Although it has overtly marked medio-passive infinitives, Greek, in common with Hittite, Vedic Sanskrit, and Avestan, may use active (or at least diathetically neutral) infinitives in passive meaning. The development of the Greek infinitive system is generally regarded as a late feature of the language. A number of examples of infinitives used in apparently passive meaning are discussed below.<sup>3</sup>

The first examples are Hittite:

- 19) BE-LI-NI-wa -an-na-aš ŠA<sup>uru</sup> a-ri-ip-ša-a i-wa-ar  
 voc -quot-acc gen ptc  
 lord-our -us Aripša like  
 uru<sub>ba</sub>-at-tu-ši ša-a-ru-wa-ú-wa-an-zi li-e ma-ni-ya-aḫ-ti  
 dat/loc inf neg 2sg  
 Ḫattuša to plunder not hand over  
 'Our Lord, do not hand us over to Ḫattuša to be plundered like  
 Aripša' (KBo IV 7 IV 20f.)
- 20) nu nam-ma MA-ḪAR UTU-ŠI ar-ga-mu-uš-ša  
 conj adv acc  
 and furthermore before my majesty tribute  
 ú-tum-ma-an-zi Ú-UL tar-na-i  
 inf neg 3sg  
 to bring not lets  
 'and furthermore, he does not allow the tribute to be brought  
 before my Majesty' (KUB XIV 1 Obv. 32)

I have translated the infinitives as passive in both instances, but ex. (19) could also be translated 'do not hand us over to Ḫattuša to plunder like Aripša' or conceivably 'to be plundered by Ḫattuša'. Ex. (20) is more straightforwardly passive, since there is no overt NP to control subject deletion of the infinitive.

The two Homeric examples (21) and (22) are again ambiguous:

- 21) Héktora d' ou ti / dósō Priamídēn purì daptēmen  
 acc ptc neg ptc 1sg acc dat inf  
 Hektor but not I will give Priam's son fire to devour  
 'But I will not give Hektor, son of Priam, to be devoured by  
 fire' (Iliad 23.183-183)

- 22) polloi mèn gàr emoì Trōes ... kteínein  
 nom ptc ptc dat nom inf  
 many for me Trojans to kill  
 'For many Trojans are to be killed by me' 'For there are many  
 Trojans for me to kill' (Iliad 6.227)

In ex. (21) by Homeric convention 'fire' may be regarded as animate, and hence we may also have the translation 'to give Hector to fire (for it) to devour (him)'. Ex. (22) contains an infinitive embedded into a nominal sentence. Of course, if emoì 'me' had been omitted, the infinitive would necessarily have to be interpreted as passive.

- 23) tāvāñ ayám pátave sómo astu  
 nom nom inf nom 3sg  
 so great this to drink soma let be  
 'let this soma be drunk to so great (an extent)' (RV. 1.108.2)
- 24) vayā asya práhutā asur áttave  
 nom gen nom 3pl inf  
 branches his offered were to eat  
 'His branches were offered to be eaten' (RV. 10.92.3)

The infinitive in (23) is obligatorily passive because of the presence of astu. Ex. (24) too is obligatorily passive. Here there is a form of 'be' with a past passive participle 'were offered', and the infinitive has to be passive for the simple reason that there is no other way to interpret it.

- 25) ašauuanəm tē ašaonaṭ āfiieiḍiiāi mraomī uruuaḍəm uruuaḍaṭ  
 acc dat abl inf 1sg acc abl  
 righteous you righteous to help I say friend friend  
 'I say to you the righteous (man) is to be helped by the right-  
 eous (man), the friend by the friend' (Yasna 71.13)
- 26) yō ništaiieiti kərətāe sraošiḡm  
 nom 3sg inf acc  
 who orders to perform punishment  
 'Who orders the punishment to be performed' (Yašt 10.109)

In the two Avestan examples (25) and (26) a passive reading is inescapable. Ex. (25) makes sense only if we assume a deleted 'be' form and consequent meaning of obligation, while in (26) a passive reading is forced by the absence of potential agents. These are both verbs of saying.

The following group of infinitive constructions shows clear passive meaning for the infinitive. Here, however, verbs which are usually impersonal are found with overt nominative subjects.<sup>4</sup>

- 27) IŠTU KUR uru KÙ.BABBAR-ti Iú MU-NAB-TUM EGIR-pa pí-ya-an-na  
 abl nom prev inf  
 Hatti fugitive back to give  
Ú-UL a-a-ra  
 neg adv  
 not right

- 'A fugitive from Hatti is not right to give (=to be given) back'  
(KBo V 4 Obv. 38)
- 28) <sup>10</sup> MU-NAB-TUM-ma EGIR SUM-u-an-zi Ú-UL a-a-ra  
 nom -ptc prev inf neg adv  
 fugitive -but back to give not right  
 'A fugitive is not right to give (=to be given) back'  
 (KUB XXII 70 Rev. 63)

Examples (27) and (28) contain the phrase ÚL āra 'it (is) not right, not allowed'; āra 'right' is an adverb, and <sup>10</sup>MUNABTUM is an Akkadi-  
 an nominative (presumably Hittite nominative too).<sup>5</sup>

- 29) na -aš pí-di -iš-ši I-NA KUR <sup>uru</sup> kum-ma-an-ni I-NA  
 conn-nom dat/loc-dat/loc dat/loc  
 and -it place -his Kummanni  
 É DINGIR-LIM pí-i-ya-u-wa-an-zi SIXŠÁ-at  
 dat/loc inf 3sg  
 temple of the gods to give was established by oracle  
 'And it (i.e. scape ox) was established (by oracle) to give  
 (=to be given) in his stead at Kummanni in the temple of the  
 gods' (KBo IV 2 III 52f.)
- 30) nu-uš-ši GUD pu-u-ḫu-ga-ri-iš pi-i-ya-u-wa-an-zi IZI-it  
 conn -dat nom nom inf instr  
 and -him ox expiatory to give fire  
 wa-aḫ-nu-ma-an-zi MUŠEN.ḪI.A wa-aḫ-nu-um-ma-an-zi SIXŠÁ-at  
 inf nom inf 3sg  
 to burn birds to burn was estab-  
 lished by oracle  
 'And a scape ox was established (by oracle) to give (=to be  
 given) to him (i.e. the God) to burn (=to be burned) (and)  
 birds to burn (=to be burned)' (KBo IV 2 III 50f.)

Example (29) shows a nominative subject with another impersonal verb SIXŠÁ- (ḫandāi-) 'to establish, ordain by oracle' (medium tantum). Here again, the usual construction is with a dative subject of the infinitive or no personal referent at all, as is the case here. The same impersonal matrix verb is used in ex. (30) with two asyndetically linked nominative subjects, GUD puhugariš 'scape ox' (nom) and MUŠEN.ḪI.A 'birds' (nom). The first of these is in turn the underlying object of the following infinitives piyauwanzi 'to give' and wahnumanzi 'to burn'; the second infinitive is clearly dependent from the first (notwithstanding the translation given by Götze-Pedersen 1934:ad loc.). The second of these, MUŠEN.ḪI.A 'birds' is the underlying object of the repeated infinitive wahnumanzi. All these infinitives have to be interpreted as passives; there are no overt agents in the context. The dative -ši refers to the god to whom the animals are offered.

The Homeric sentence given in (31) shows exactly the same structure as the Hittite ex. (27): a nominal sentence with adverb as predicate has an embedded infinitive with nominative subject.



- 31) tēlóthi d' húlē aksémen eks óreos  
 adv ptc nom inf prep gen  
 far and firewood to bring from mountain  
 'Firewood is far to bring (=to be brought) from the mountain'  
 (Iliad 24.662-663)

Here too, the infinitive has to be read as a passive, even though it is active in form, and even though Greek has a passive infinitive at its disposal.

- 32) tóphra dè rhēíteroi polemízein ēsan Akhaioí  
 conj ptc nom inf 3pl nom  
 then and easier to fight were Achaeans  
 'And then the Achaeans were easier to fight (=to be fought)'  
 (Iliad 18.258)

In light of the preceding examples in this section, it would seem best to extend the same analysis to ex. (32) and interpret the infinitive as passive in this instance too. This example shows clearly that an analog to Tough movement existed in Homeric Greek; it differs from the preceding examples in that it has an adjective (with concord) as predicate rather than an adverb.

The Vedic sentences in (33) and (34) have negatives with deleted 'be'; the infinitives are obligatorily passive:

- 33) náišá gávyūtir ápabhartavá u  
 neg-nom nom inf ptc  
 not-this cow pasture to plunder  
 'This cow pasture is not to plunder (=to be plundered)'  
 (RV. 10.14.26)
- 34) ná vaḥ pratimái sukṛtāni  
 neg gen inf nom  
 not your to measure good deeds  
 'your good deeds are not to measure (=to be measured)'  
 (RV. 3.60.4)
- 35) hiiatū-cā gēuś jaidiīai mraoī  
 conj -conn nom inf 3sg  
 since-and cow to kill said  
 'and since the cow is said to kill (=to be killed)' (Yasna 33.14)

Finally, the Avestan example (35) shows how far such a construction can be taken: the cow (nom.) is underlying object of jaidiīai 'to kill'. Presumably this infinitive is to be viewed as depending from a deleted form of 'be': 'it is to kill the cow' = 'one must kill the cow, the cow must be killed'. This assemblage is then further embedded into an impersonal construction 'it is said' (so-called aorist passive) with the cow ending its derivational existence as the surface subject of the sentence.

Although there are ambiguities of analysis in the sentences in exx. (1-18), many of which could show either subject-to-object raising or deletion, there are none in the examples just discussed (exx.

27-35). In each of these, the surface nominative noun is clearly the underlying object of the embedded infinitive, and it appears as the surface subject of the impersonal expression (respectively it is not right, it is established, it is far, it is easy, it is not = one must not, it is said). Furthermore, the presence of the nominative noun forces a passive reading of the infinitive. These similarities cannot be due to chance or to parallel development.

The most recent book length study of IE infinitive constructions, Disterheft 1980, maintains that 'subject equi is the earliest type of infinitive complementation while deletion controlled by object and subject raising (both to object and subject) were independently added to the various grammars [of early IE languages] at widely divergent dates' (1980:192). Disterheft also maintains that the following three uses of infinitives can be posited for Indo-European:<sup>6</sup>

1. the imperative infinitive,
2. predicate in purpose clauses,
3. complements to verbs whose subject controls coreference.

Disterheft bases her arguments on an investigation of Vedic Sanskrit, Avestan, Hittite, and Old (Middle) Irish data. I think that at least two additional categories should be added to her list:

4. narrative infinitive,<sup>7</sup>
5. infinitive complements to impersonal verbs.

Furthermore, there seems to be no evidence for the relative chronology of infinitive constructions she posits.

The evidence for infinitive complementation to impersonal verbs is drawn from the three oldest IE traditions: Homeric Greek, Old Indo-Iranian, and Hittite legal phraseology. The examples of these constructions are not numerous, but they have a wide distribution and share notable characteristics which cannot have come about as a result of secondary, language specific developments. These constructions with rather sophisticated subject raising presuppose a fully developed system of infinitival complementation in Indo-European. Hence, arguments about the historically observable development of infinitives from verbal nouns need to be reconsidered; one would not expect subject raising to occur with abstract nouns. Furthermore, these constructions are not later than any of the other types of infinitive (-like) syntagms traditionally reconstructed to Indo-European; in fact, they may be earlier given the non-productive nature of their occurrence, especially with adverbs. Moreover, the fact that the infinitives in certain cases can only be given a passive reading, even when the language otherwise has passive infinitives at its disposal, argues for their archaic nature. It also supports the notion that Indo-European had a semantic category passive in its earliest conceivable stages. It would seem, then, that raising at least in connection with impersonal upper verbs must have been a feature of the syntax of IE infinitives: 'John is easy to please' has a very long IE pedigree.

## Notes

1. The phrase is from Brugmann (1904:604). This analysis of accusative with infinitive constructions could be labeled 'lowering'. This explanation is still maintained in Schwyzer-Debrunner (1950:374).
2. Dative subjects of embedded infinitives in this construction are found in Homer too, cf. *Odyssey* (1.261-262):

óphra hoi eíē /ioùs khríesthai khalkéreas  
 conj dat 3sg acc inf acc  
 so that him would be arrows to anoint bronze fitted  
 'so that it would be possible for him to anoint the bronze fitted arrows'

In later Greek *gínetai* 'becomes' is used in this meaning.

3. Compare the idiom with 'become' in the Hittite ex. (18). E. Adelaide Hahn (1966:397f.) argues with her usual acuity for the 'original voicelessness' of verbal nouns and adjectives in Indo-European, comparing the distinction traditionally made between subjective and objective genitives with nouns that denote action without forming part of a verbal paradigm, as in *amor matris* 'the mother's love' or 'the love for the mother', where the difference in diathesis is simply a matter of nomenclature or of translation. On the basis of the evidence I cite below, I prefer to regard verbal nouns and infinitives as neutral with respect to voice since there are syntactic environments (not considered by Hahn) which force an interpretation as passive.

In fn. 11 of the paper, Hahn cites such English examples as the apples are ready to eat or for eating, which although active in form are 'seemingly passive'. She notes further that 'we can substitute a true passive (periphrastic) form, and say the apples are ready to be eaten.' However, there seem to be some semantic distinctions between such sentences as, say, there are lots of dishes to do or to be done, although they are difficult to define. Such overt differentiation is of course impossible in a language like Hittite.

4. The examples cited here involve object to subject raising. Since the predicates of the matrix sentences all contain adverbs, this type of raising would not be possible in English. The controversy about subject to object raising (cf. Chomsky 1973, Postal 1974) does not concern us here.

At first sight, the examples discussed here appear to be quite similar to the 'nominative object' constructions of the North Russian dialects, of Baltic, and of Finnish studied by A. Timberlake (1974), e.g.

North Russian: zemlja paxat' 'it is necessary to plow the  
                   nom inf land (nom.)'  
                   land to plow

Lithuanian: reĩkia            dúoti      žĩdis      'it is necessary to  
                  3sg/pl            inf        nom        give your word (nom)'  
                  be necessary to give word

Timberlake (1974:88f.) discusses eight criteria for nominative objects; of these eight criteria two are 'cardinal properties', namely a 'systematically impersonal environment' and an animacy constraint (pronouns and masculine animate nouns are excluded). Although the constructions discussed here occur in systematically impersonal environments, there appears to be no constraint on animacy. Claiming that the Baltic and North Russian constructions are isolated within Indo-European, Timberlake (1974:127) discusses two Vedic examples of nominative with infinitives, where the nominative is notionally the object of the infinitive, and concludes that they are subjective on the grounds that there is agreement between subject and verb 'to be' (optative and imperative in his examples) and that there is no restriction on animacy. However, the examples adduced here are more directly comparable to the Baltic and North Russian constructions.

5. I follow A. Kammenhuber's (1954:260-261) interpretation of these examples. F. Ose (1944:82) took lúMU-NAB-TUM (an Akkadian nominative) as the object of the infinitives piyanna and SUM-anzi and interpreted it as concealing a Hittite accusative on the grounds that the Hittite scribes paid little or no attention to Akkadian morphology and that there was no possibility of putting this form in any direct relationship with UL āra, since āra is an indeclinable adverb. As Kammenhuber points out, however, clear Hittite nominatives do occur in constructions with āra:

na -aš A-NA <sup>d</sup>UTU-ŠI a-a-ra e-eš-du (KUB XIII 7 I 10)  
 conn-nom            dat            adv            3sg  
 'er soll Meiner Sonne (zu beliebiger Handlung) rechtens über-  
 antwortet werden'

Hence, lúMU-NAB-TUM should be interpreted as concealing a Hittite nominative, and these examples are to be translated as above. The comparative evidence I have assembled here adds further support to Kammenhuber's view.

6. These are of course the principal categories of infinitive uses reconstructed to Indo-European by Brugmann (1904:603f.).
7. I intend to discuss narrative infinitives elsewhere. Here I may say that they are found in Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Old Norse, and Hittite (although Disterheft uses Hittite evidence, she has not noted the existence of this infinitive use there).

### Bibliography

- Benveniste, Émile. 1935. *Les infinitifs avestiques*. Paris: Maisonneuve.
- Brugmann, Karl. 1904. *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Strassburg: Trübner.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1973. *Conditions on Transformations*. A Festschrift for Morris Halle, ed. Steven R. Anderson and Paul Kiparsky, 232-286. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Delbrück, Berthold. 1897. *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Zweiter Theil. Strassburg: Trübner.
- Disterheft, Dorothy. 1980. *The Syntactic Development of the Infinitive in Indo-European*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica.
- Götze, Albrecht and Holger Pedersen. 1934. *Muršilis Sprachföhmung*. Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. *Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser XXI*, 1.
- Kammenhuber, Annelies. 1954. *Studien zum hethitischen Infinitivsystem II*. MIO 2.245-265.
- Hahn, E. Adelaide. 1966. *Verbal Nouns and Adjectives in some Ancient Languages*. *Language* 42.378-398.
- Ose, Fritz. 1944. *Supinum und Infinitiv im Hethitischen*. *MVAeG XLII/1*. Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- Postal, Paul. 1974. *On Raising*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Schwyzler, Eduard and Albert Debrunner. 1950. *Griechische Grammatik*. Zweiter Band. *Syntax*. München: Beck.
- Sgall, Peter. 1958. *Die Infinitive im Rgveda*. *Acta Universitatis Carolinae* 2.135-268.
- Sommer, Ferdinand. 1931 [1959]. *Vergleichende Syntax der Schul-sprachen*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchhandlung.
- Timberlake, Alan. 1974. *The Nominative Object in Slavic, Baltic, and West Finnic*. *Slavistische Beiträge Band 82*. München: Sagner.