

Hittite phrasal verbs in crosslinguistic perspective

Annette Teffeteller

Montreal

The anomalous situation within Hittite of finite forms of the motion verbs *pai-* and *uwa-* occurring in asyndeton with main verbs was described in some detail by Disterheft in 1984, following earlier brief mentions by Friedrich and others¹. The predominantly OV word order of Hittite optionally admits the verb in sentence-initial position as a mark of emphasis; this applies to indicative as well as imperative forms. However, the two verbs *pai-* ‘go’ and *uwa-* ‘come’ may appear in initial or in first position² (preceded by connectives with or without attached enclitics) in a clause which also has a verb in final position, the latter being not connected with the former by a conjunction but showing the same tense, mood, person, and number as the initial verb, e.g.:

- (1) kiššan memišta *ÚL*=war=šmaš=at ammuk ḥannaḥḫi DI-eššar
paiddu=wa=šmaš=at ^dIŠTAR-iš ^{URU}ninuwaš MUNUS.LUGAL-aš
ḥannāu (ABOT 48.7-9)

Thus he spoke: I will not decide the lawsuit for you; may Ishtar, queen of Ninevah,
go (and) decide it for you.

- (2) GI[M-a]n=ma=za **uit** ŠEŠ-YA [^mArnuwandaš DINGIR-LIM kišat] [^dU]TU-
ŠI=ma=za-kán ANA ^{GIŠ}ŠU.[A ABI-YA eṣḥaḥat]
(Friedrich 1930:6.19-20)

W[he]n my brother [Arnuwanda] went [(and) became a god], I, My Majesty,
sat on the thro[ne of my father].

¹ D. Disterheft, “Non-final verbs in Hittite”, *KZ* 97 (1984), pp. 221-27; J. Friedrich, *Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in Hethitischer Sprache* I. Leipzig 1926, pp. 162-64, and *id.*, *Hethitisches Elementarbuch*. Heidelberg 1960, pp. 159-60; W. P. Lehmann, *Proto-Indo-European Syntax*. Austin 1974, p. 120. See subsequently G. Dunkel, “IE horatory *éy, *éyte, Ved. éta...stávāma, Hitt. eḫu=wa it, Hom. εἰ δ’ ἄγε”, *MSS* 46 (1985), pp. 47-79, and *id.*, “Back to the future in Hittite”, *MSS* 58 (1998), pp. 51-55; D. Disterheft, “The structure and diachrony of consecutives”, *Diachronica* 3 (1986), pp. 1-14; S. Luraghi, *Old Hittite Sentence Structure*. London 1990, pp. 22-23, and *ead.*, “Verb serialization and word order: evidence from Hittite”, *Historical Linguistics, Papers from the 9th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, 1989*, H. Aertsen – R.T. Jeffers edd. Amsterdam – Philadelphia 1993, pp. 267-81. For additional references see Th. van den Hout, “Studies in the Hittite phraseological construction I: Its syntactic and semantic properties”, in *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, G. Beckman – R. Beal – G. McMahon edd. Winona Lake, IN 2003, pp. 177-203.

² First position is more usual, their occurrence in initial position being largely restricted to imperatives, questions, and the like. Occurrence in a position subsequent to first is rare.

(3) nu=ššan pāun KUR ^{URU}Piggainarešša šašti walahḫhun

(KBo 4.4, III 36)

I went (and) attacked Piggainaressa as it slept.

Disterheft dealt succinctly with previous efforts to interpret these constructions as 1) coordinate, asyndetic clauses:³ the syntax is against it: ‘all particles and objects of the second verb precede the first’⁴; 2) the *pai-/uwa-* forms as equivalent to connecting particles⁵: *pai-/uwa-* themselves occur with the ubiquitous connecting particle *nu* as well as with *ta-* and *mahḫan*⁶; and Disterheft showed that 3) a motion reading for *pai-/uwa-* in these constructions⁷ is inadmissible on grounds of both syntax (neither the usual preverbs nor the accusative of goal are used here) and the semantics of neighboring verbs (which typically render a motion sense for *pai-/uwa-* weak, redundant or simply inappropriate)⁸. Moreover, *pai-/uwa-* also occur alone as main verbs in regular sentence-final position, where, as Disterheft observed, they may have motion adverbs and accusatives of goal and where they clearly admit a motion reading⁹.

Disterheft concluded, then, that *pai-/uwa-* in these types of asyndetic double-verb constructions have ‘a “bleached” meaning with no motion implied’¹⁰. Further, starting from contexts in which the *pai-/uwa-* + main verb construction clearly indicates action that follows consecutively from the action of the preceding sentence, she proposed to interpret the motion verbs in these constructions as consecutive adverbials (‘then’), a usage she saw as having developed from and having subsequently ousted the original usage where physical movement was in fact involved¹¹.

This interpretation, however, while it was unquestionably an improvement on those rejected by Disterheft, itself lacks conviction. First, it disregards the fact that Hittite has a widely used temporal adverb *namma*¹² and that *namma* in fact occurs with ‘phraseological’ *uwa-*¹³. Moreover, while an adverbial sense for *pai-/uwa-*, indicating temporally consecutive action, may be made to fit some of the contexts in question, it is decidedly forced for others (e.g. (2) above). There are in fact no compelling positive reasons for adopting this interpretation, only the negative one that it is better than its predecessors. Furthermore, the sense yielded is weak whereas for such a strikingly atypical construction we would expect a stronger function.

³ Friedrich, *HE*, pp. 159-60.

⁴ Disterheft, *KZ* 97 (1984), p. 224; cf. Luraghi, *Old Hittite*, p. 23.

⁵ Lehmann, *PIE Syntax*, p. 120.

⁶ Disterheft, *KZ* 97 (1984), pp. 223-4.

⁷ By Güterbock and others: H. G. Güterbock, “The song of Ullikumi. Revised text of the Hittite version of a Hurrian myth”, *JCS* 6 (1952), pp. 8-42.

⁸ Disterheft, *KZ* 97 (1984), p. 225; cf. Luraghi, *Old Hittite*, p. 23.

⁹ Disterheft, *KZ* 97 (1984), p. 225.

¹⁰ Disterheft, *KZ* 97 (1984), p. 225.

¹¹ Disterheft, *KZ* 97 (1984), pp. 226-27.

¹² CHD, *sv*.

¹³ E.g., KUB 29.8.2.22, CHD *sv* *namma* 5.b.

This is where the question stood for two decades, until the recent appearance of van den Hout's valuable and excellently detailed discussion of the 'Hittite phraseological construction'¹⁴ - the first of a projected two-part study¹⁵. Van den Hout considers Disterheft's proposals and, while judging her interpretation to be 'in a general sense...correct', sees her notion of 'temporal consecutiveness' as insufficient and her translation 'with a simple "then"' as too 'colorless'¹⁶.

Van den Hout takes the phraseological verb as 'anticipat[ing] the categories of person and tense of the main verb', and as 'bring[ing] out the subject's initial reaction to the action contained in the *preceding* context'. He concludes: 'It then seems that *in addition* to the temporal consecutiveness, the clause with the phraseological verb can indicate an action that also follows logically or expectedly from the preceding action. In this sense the phraseological construction can be said to mark a relation that is causal in a general way'¹⁷. Thus for Disterheft's '*post hoc*' van den Hout suggests '*propter hoc*'.

In the second part of his study van den Hout addresses the question of the origin of the phraseological construction and its status within Anatolian. The first issue we will return to. For the second question he surveys the meagre corpus of Luwian (and the virtually non-existent corpus of Palaic) and concludes that 'the Hittite phraseological construction was an inner-Hittite development not shared by any of her Anatolian sister languages'¹⁸.

But - Anatolian considerations aside - this type of construction is not unique to Hittite; on the contrary, it is found in a wide range of languages worldwide. A consideration of similar constructions crosslinguistically may help us to gain a better understanding of the semantics - and the pragmatics - involved.

Monoclausal constructions with two finite verbs are found in many of the world's languages. They are generally termed 'consecutive constructions' if the inclusion of a connective is allowed and 'serial verbs' if not¹⁹. The definition of categories is problematic, however. While

¹⁴ van den Hout, *Studies* I.

¹⁵ See now van den Hout, "Studies in the Hittite phraseological construction II: Its origin", *Hethitica* 16 (forthcoming when this paper went to print). I am most grateful to Professor van den Hout for a pre-publication copy of the second part of his study, which he very generously sent to me following the Rome conference at which this paper was presented. Thanks to Professor van den Hout's kindness, I have been able to take into account in the published paper his discussion of the origin of the phraseological construction.

¹⁶ van den Hout, *Studies* I, p. 195.

¹⁷ van den Hout I, p. 196 ('*in addition*': emphasis original; '*preceding*': emphasis mine. I draw attention to the suggestion that the phraseological verb 'brings out the subject's initial reaction to the action contained in the *preceding* context' because I think that exactly the opposite is happening, as detailed in the following text.)

¹⁸ *Studies* II §5. It would seem unwise, however, to rule out the possibility of similar constructions outside Hittite on the basis of the very limited corpus of extra-Hittite Anatolian available to us. Moreover, it is by no means certain that the examples from Cuneiform Luwian cited by van den Hout (*Studies* II §5, example 34) do not reflect the phraseological construction.

¹⁹ The term 'consecutive' is also used of two or more verbs in asyndeton (sharing person, number, tense, etc.), describing two distinct events or actions (see van den Hout, *Studies* II §2) but here one must make a

some researchers do not consider English constructions such as 'Why did you go and do that?!', which include the connective 'and' (and similar constructions in other languages from Tok Pisin to Akkadian)²⁰ to be 'serial verbs', others would allow their inclusion in a more broadly-defined category²¹. In prototypical serial constructions, the second verb retains lexical robustness, while

separate judgement in each case as to whether we are dealing with a single clause or two or more coordinated (or indeed subordinated) clauses in asyndeton (and a very good case indeed would have to be made for a single-clause interpretation when we clearly have reference to distinct events).

²⁰ For Tok Pisin see J. W. M. Verhaar, *Toward a Reference Grammar of Tok Pisin*. Honolulu 1995; for Akkadian, F. R. Kraus, *Sonderformen akkadischer Parataxe: die Koppelungen. Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde*; 50/1. Amsterdam - Oxford 1987.

²¹ E.g., A.M. Zwicky, "What are we talking about when we talk about serial verbs?", in *When Verbs Collide: Papers from the 1990 Ohio State Mini-Conference on Serial Verbs*, The Ohio State University Working Papers in Linguistics, No. 39, B. D. Joseph - A. M. Zwicky edd. Columbus, OH 1990, p. 10:

While garden-variety serials are unmarked, as is the *go V* construction in English, there are both coordinatively marked serials (in English, *try and V*, as in *I'll try and see what's wrong; up and V*, as in *They'll up and bite you*; and *go and V*, as in *They'll go and bite you*) and subordinatively marked serials (English *go to V*, as in *I'll go to see what's wrong*).

For a review of the generative literature on these types of construction (and a lament that previous studies are so often ignored by researchers in this area) see G. K. Pullum, "Constraints on intransitive quasi-serial verb constructions in modern colloquial English", in *When Verbs Collide*, pp. 223-24. (Pullum's lament echoed (independently) that of E. Coseriu, "<<Tomo y me voy>>, ein Problem vergleichender europäischer Syntax", *Vox Romanica* 25 (1966), pp. 13-55, who deplored 'the fragmentation of scholarship on this construction between philologies' (Dunkel, *MSS* 58 (1998), p. 54)). Pullum also notes (pp. 224-25) that

in addition to the parallels to the English *go get* construction that are often noted in languages with serial verbs there are serial verb languages that have exact analogs of the *go & get* construction. For example, Hyman ["Consecutivization in Fe²", *Journal of African Languages* 10 (1971), pp. 29-43] discusses what he calls 'co-ordinate consecutivization' in Fe², and gives examples such as (18):

a ka sá? nzā wúzā
he PAST come &-eat food
'He came and ate'.
(Hyman 1971:31)

The V2 here shows a reduced prefixal form of a coordinate conjunction morpheme (coincidentally identical in phonological shape to its English equivalent, *n-*).

the first verb marks aspectual, adverbial, temporal, *vel sim.* features on the second verb. Examples of undisputed serial constructions include²²:

- (4) erí edein bí àku bó mi (Ijo)
 he knife the take come PAST
 'He brought the knife'.
- (5) kofe naki Amba kiri (Sebba)
 Kofe hit Amba kill
 'Kofe struck Amba dead'.

That constructions of the go-and-V type, with two verbs joined by an overt connective, do not constitute two coordinated clauses but instead form a single syntactic unit is indicated by various types of syntactic evidence; for instance, as pointed out by Stefanowitsch,

the construction allows a violation of what generative grammarians have called the 'island constraint' (or more recently, 'subjacency'). For example, it is possible to say *Who shall we go and see on Sunday*, where the *wh*-pronoun has been 'moved out' of the coordinate structure *go and see who*, indicating the unitary syntactic status of *go and see*²³.

Another crucial point concerning the go-and-V construction is that, while serial verbs often occur in restricted sets, languages which allow heavy use of serialization will not infrequently admit a wide range of verbs into this usage. In English, on the other hand - and in many other languages, including Hittite - the type of double-verb construction in question here is restricted to a minimal set of *motion* verbs. Apparently something interesting is going on crosslinguistically with just this type of syntactic structure and just with motion verbs²⁴.

We find such double-verb constructions pairing verbs of 'going' with main verbs where the first verb of the pair is not genuinely coordinate with the second either semantically or

²² Examples from P. A. M. Seuren, "Serial verb constructions", in *When Verbs Collide*, pp. 19 and 25. Cf. E. Schiller, "On the definition and distribution of serial verb constructions", in *When Verbs Collide*, pp. 34-64; W. A. Foley and M. Olson, "Clausehood and verb serialization", in *Grammar Inside and Outside the Clause: Some Approaches to Theory from the Field*, J. Nichols - A. C. Woodbury edd. Cambridge 1985, pp. 17-60; M. Sebba, *The Syntax of Serial Verbs*. Amsterdam 1987; C. Lefebvre, ed., *Serial Verbs: Grammatical, Comparative and Cognitive Approaches*. Amsterdam 1991; D. Dreissels, "Typology", in *African Languages: An Introduction*, B. Heine - D. Nurse edd. Cambridge 2000, Chapter 9.

²³ A. Stefanowitsch, "The go-and-VERB construction in a cross-linguistic perspective: Image-schema blending and the construal of events", *High Desert Linguistics Society* 2. Albuquerque, New Mexico 1999, p. 124. Stefanowitsch notes that this syntactic property of the go-and-V construction was first pointed out by J. R. Ross, *Infinite Syntax!*. Norwood, NH 1986 (= *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*, PhD Thesis, MIT 1967).

²⁴ See below, text and n. 26, on apparent exceptions, e.g., 'up', 'took'.

syntactically in Indo-European languages of various periods from Ancient Greek to Modern English²⁵. In this type of syntagm the 'motion' verb plays a semantic role that does not (at least not *necessarily*) involve any real sense of motion. For example, the NE colloquial expression

(6) He went and hit me.

is, as Carden and Pesetsky remark, 'a close paraphrase' of the equally colloquial 'He up and hit me', and both expressions imply 'that the event is in some sense unexpected'²⁶. Not confined to the spoken language, this construction finds a place in sober scholarly writing as well, for instance, in Martin West's lively account of the unlikely origins of the Anatolian Rock-Lord, Ullikummi²⁷:

(7) Kumarbi plans evil against the Weather-god.
He goes and lies with a huge rock, which duly
gives birth to a stone child, Ullikummi.

or in poetic discourse, as in Donne's song on the impossibility of woman's faithfulness, the ironic tone of which is set by the opening imperative:

(8) Go and catch a falling star; get with child a mandrake root.

The usage is attested in Latin from the early period; it is especially common in the imperative (with or without connective) to introduce impatient or emphatic commands, e.g.,

(9) *i, redde aurum*
(Plautus, *Aulularia* 828)
'come, give back the gold'.

a subcategory has *i* (*eat*, etc.) *nunc* (*et*) as a formula introducing ironic commands, e.g.,

(10) *i nunc et dubita ferre quod ille tulit!*
(Ovid, *Ars Amatoria* 2.222)
'go now and shrink from bearing what he [*sc.* Hercules] bore'
(*sc.* 'if you dare': i.e., 'do not shrink from it').

²⁵ A. Teffeteller, "ΑΥΤΟΣ ΑΠΟΥΡΑΣ, *Iliad* 1.356", *CQ* 40 (1990), pp. 16-20, with references.

²⁶ G. Carden – D. Pesetsky, "Double-verb constructions, markedness, and a fake co-ordination", *Chicago Linguistic Society* 13, 1977, p. 49. See Pullum, *When Verbs Collide*, p. 236 n. 7, for 'take' used as a substitute for 'go', e.g., 'The bottle took and broke', a usage said (by F. Th. Visser, *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*, 3.1: *Syntactical Units with Two Verbs*. Leiden 1969, p. 1399n.) to be 'Anglo-Irish'. Cf. Coseriu, *Vox Romanica* 25 (1966), pp. 13-55.

²⁷ M. L. West, *Hesiod. Theogony*. Oxford 1966, p. 21.

The usage is common in Modern Greek; Antonis Samarakis, for instance, in one of his short stories uses the phrase

- (11) Ἡ βροχὴ ὅχι μόνο δὲν ἔλεγε νὰ κόψει, ἴσια ἴσια ὅσο
πῆγαινε καὶ δυνάμωνε
'Not only was the rain not letting up; on the contrary, it was getting heavier and heavier' (πῆγαινε καὶ δυνάμωνε, 'going and getting stronger')²⁸.

In Ancient Greek the construction is recast to conform to that language's characteristic surface syntax of finite verb + participle in place of coordinate (or, as the case may be, pseudo-coordinate) finite forms; it is most common with the participle ἰών, although other forms occur as well (optionally, the verb of 'going' may appear in finite form with the 'main' verb in participle)²⁹, e.g., Homer *Iliad* 1.137-8, Agamemnon to Achilles:

- (12) ἐγὼ δέ κεν αὐτὸς ἔλωμαι / ἢ τεδὸν ἢ Αἴαντος ἰὼν γέρας
'I will go and take your prize of honour or that of Aias'.

The fact that ἰών here does not involve true motion is shown by Nestor's description of the event to Agamemnon himself - *after* the narrative has reported the removal of the woman (the 'prize of honour') from Achilles, *not* by Agamemnon, who did not in fact go to Achilles' camp, but by his heralds - as

- (13) κούρην / χωμένου Ἀχιλλῆος ἔβης κλισίῃθεν ἀπούρας (Il. 9).
'you went and took away the girl from Achilles' tent'.

Again, in the *Odyssey* 6.282, Nausicaa imagines one of her neighbours indulging in malicious gossip if she should be seen with the stranger (not yet known to her as Odysseus):

- (14) βέλτερον, εἰ καὶ αὐτὴ περ ἐποιχομένη πόσιν εὔρεν / ἄλλοθεν,
'Better, if she has gone and found herself a husband from abroad'.

In Sophocles' *Antigone* 768, Creon scornfully dismisses his son's wrath and the chorus' fears for its consequences with

- (15) δράτω, φρονεῖτω μεῖζον ἢ κατ' ἄνδρ' ἰών.

²⁸ A. Samarakis, 'Grafeion Ideon', in *Arnoumai*. Athens 1974, p. 28. Cf. B. D. Joseph, "On arguing for serial verbs (with special reference to Modern Greek)", in *When Verbs Collide*, pp. 77-90.

²⁹ Cf. C. Watkins, 'Some Indo-European verb phrases and their transformations', *MSS* 33 (1975), pp. 96-97.

τὰ δ' οὖν κόρα τάδ' οὐκ ἀπαλλάξει μόρου

'Let him act so, let him go and show more than a man's pride! But he shall not save those two girls from death!'³⁰

In Euripides' *Bacchae* 343, Pentheus rejects his grandfather Cadmus, who, cajoling him to join in the Bacchic rites, attempts to garland him with ivy:

(16) οὐ μὴ προσοίσεις χεῖρα, βακχεύσεις δ' ἰών

'Do not put forth your hand to me; go and play the bacchant!'³¹.

At *Iliad* 22.122-5 Hector rebukes himself in scorn and self-reproach for temporarily yielding to the temptation to supplicate Achilles: 'What am I thinking?!', he says,

(17) μὴ μιν ἐγὼ μὲν ἴκωμαι ἰών, ὁ δέ μ' οὐκ ἐλεήσει
οὐδέ τί μ' αἰδέσεται, κτενέει δέ με γυμνὸν ἐόντα
αὐτῶς ὥς τε γυναῖκα

'let me not go and approach him [lit.: 'going come to him']
and he not pity me nor show me any respect, but kill me
when I am unarmed [γυμνὸν: 'naked'], as if I were a woman'.

Helen's bitter taunt to Aphrodite, who is leading her against her will to Paris (*Il.* 3.406), uses the same participle (in the feminine form here) to express her scorn:

(18) ἦσο παρ' αὐτὸν ἰοῦσα
'You go and sit beside him!'

'Give up Olympus', she says, 'and spend all your time worrying over him and looking after him, until he makes *you* his wife - or his slave!' An extraordinary speech for a mortal to make to a deity, and it brings a swift and menacing threat from the goddess, which has the intended effect of reducing the recalcitrant Helen to fear and silent compliance.

The construction occurs widely in modern languages, both within and outside the Indo-European family. Examples are found in Polish, Swedish, Modern Hebrew, Japanese, etc., in a variety of uses - to express surprise, unexpectedness, annoyance, etc. - but also to express a notion of progression, sometimes of proceeding without hesitation or without regard to obstacles. Occasionally actual motion is involved - but the construction is available for a host of

³⁰ H. Lloyd-Jones' translation, Loeb ed., 1994.

³¹ J. C. Kamerbeek notes that the ἰών here is 'almost an expletive', *The Plays of Sophocles: Commentaries*, III: *The Antigone*, Leiden, 1978; cf. R. C. Jebb, *Sophocles: The Plays and Fragments*, III: *The Antigone*, Amsterdam, 1962: the participle ἰών 'scornfully suggests some daring enterprise'. Compare *Ajax* 304, *Oedipus Tyrannus* 460-62, *Agamemnon* 1289.

contexts where no motion at all is required. Some random samples from the literature include the following³².

Swedish:

- (19) Han har gått och gift sig.
He has gone and married Refl.
'He went and got married.'
- (20) Och så går han och berättar det för sin fru!
and so goes he and tells it to his wife
'And then he goes and tells it to his wife.'

Spanish:

- (21) Y entonces, el niño va y se cae
and then the boy goes and Refl falls
'And then, the boy (suddenly/unexpectedly) falls.'

Hebrew:

- (22) Kulam paxadu liftoax et ha-kufsa, aval Dan halax ve asa et ze
everyone was-afraid to-open DO the-box but Dan went and did DO it
'Everyone was afraid to open the box, but Dan just did it.'
- (23) Dan halax ve kana lo etmol shaon xadash
Dan went and bought him yesterday watch new
'Dan went and bought himself a new watch yesterday.'

English shows clearly the range of meanings the construction can convey. An indication of that range is given in the following sentences, which register surprise at an unexpected turn of events - with disapproval in the first three (with overtones of annoyance, disgust, exasperation) and admiration in the last³³:

³² Stefanowitsch, *High Desert* 2, 1999, pp. 125-27.

³³ These examples are from Stefanovitch, *High Desert* 2, 1999, p. 124. An interesting example of the construction, showing clearly the perception of deviation from an expected path on the part of a third party (see further text below) with attendant (professed) exasperation on the part of the speaker, is found in J. R. R. Tolkien's *The Fellowship of the Ring* (opening of Chapter 3):

Merry and Pippin were indignant when they heard
that Sam had crept into the Council, and had been
chosen as Frodo's companion.

- (24) a. Look what you've gone and done!
 b. He's gone and lost his job.
 c. It was going to be a surprise, but he went and told her.
 d. Nobody thought he could climb Everest, but he went and did it!

An interesting variation on the go-and-V construction is the typically American - and especially southern American - colloquial use of 'go ahead' to express a 'progressive' sense; the following rather poignant example is from a resident of Biloxi, Mississippi, interviewed by ABC News on the day before the hurricane Katrina struck the Gulf Coast:

- (25) The best thing for us is just to go ahead and leave.

The 'go-and-VERB' construction, as these examples indicate, is used to convey a variety of speaker perspectives on the action (or state) denoted by the main verb; these may range from simple surprise to admiration to defiance to disapproval and scorn. Underlying all of these responses is a notion, more pronounced in some cases, less so in others, that the action is in some way unexpected or untoward or somehow exceptional, for good or ill. In this type of construction the 'motion' verb is displaced from its proper domain; it functions not as a true verb indicating movement but as a pragmatic marker, signaling an *attitude* to the action indicated by the main verb³⁴. Precisely what that attitude is can be gleaned only from consideration of the context in which the construction appears and it is manifestly an easier task to discern the emotional context of a phrase in a Greek tragedy (for all the difficulties that may entail) than to infer the import of an idiomatic usage in the annals of a Hittite king or in a Hittite translation of a Sumerian prayer. Nevertheless, it is apparent that the Hittite texts in question invariably admit the reading advanced here³⁵, that many invite it, and that some in fact demand it.

For instance, the unexpectedness of the death of Suppiluliuma's son Arnuwanda, which left the throne to his younger brother Mursili, is conveyed by the go-(and)-V construction (= (2) above):

- (26) GI[M-a]n-ma-za **uit** ŠEŠ-YA [^marnuandas DINGIR-LIM kišat]
 [dU]TU-ŠI-ma za=kán ANA ^{GIŠ}ŠU.[A A-BI-YA ešhaḫat]
 (Friedrich 1930:6.19-20)

'It's most unfair,' said Pippin. 'Instead of throwing him out, and clapping him in chains, Elrond goes and rewards him for his cheek!'

³⁴ The 'motion' verb has, as it were, no locutionary force, but only illocutionary force.

³⁵ Although some may have varying degrees of true motion involved as well.

W[he]n my brother [Arnuwanda] went³⁶ [(and) became a god],
I, My Majesty, [sat] on the thro[ne of my father].

Similarly:

- (27) nu^f Ištapariyaš MUNUS.LUGAL BA.ÚS EGIR-pa=ma **uit**
^mAmmunaš DUMU.LUGAL BA.ÚS
 (KBo 3.1+ii 31-32)
 Istapariya, the queen, died, and later Ammuna, the prince, went (and) died³⁷

Defiance, not motion, is indicated by *uizzi* in Kup. §4 D26-27:

- (28) nu=war=aš=mu DUMU-aš ēšzi nu=wa **uizzi** zilatiya ANA KUR-TI
 [ēšzi] EN-aš
 (Kup. §4 D26-27)
 He is my son and henceforth he will go (and) be lord in the land.

And in the difficult naming-construction of KUB 24.8.3.16 we can force no motion reading from *paiddu*:

- (29) **paiddu** NÍG.SI.SÁ-an ŠUM-an ešdu
 (KUB 24.8.3.16)
 his name shall go (and) be 'Just'³⁸.

paiddu here appears to mark the antithetical naming of this child in opposition to the name given his elder brother 'Evil'³⁹.

Hittite military campaigns followed a regular pattern: the army went on campaign in the spring and retired to home camp (e.g., Suppiluliuma to Hattusa) for the winter. An unusual winter attack is recorded with the go-(and)-V construction, KUB 34.23.1.30:

³⁶ Here and elsewhere I translate forms of *uwa-* 'come' into English with forms of 'go' because the latter is the verb used in the corresponding English construction. On the whole, Hittite constructions with *uwa-* appear to fall into a category which English might express by 'up-and-V'. See further below.

³⁷ Again, this expression could be translated into colloquial English as 'up and died'.

³⁸ Or 'Right'. E. A. Hahn (*Naming-Constructions in Some Indo-European Languages*, APA Philological Monograph 27, 1969, pp. 24-27) discusses the interpretations of Friedrich (ZA 15.221) and Güterbock (JAOS 65.250) and proposes as her own interpretation the partitive apposition, 'he/his name shall be Just'.

³⁹ Or 'Bad'. As Hahn notes (*Naming-Constructions* p. 27 n. 95), it may be significant that the matched pair of phrases repeating the naming process shows an interesting variation in the use of the particles *-šan* and *-kán*, in both cases with the same verb *da-(a)-iš*.

- (30)glimmanti **pait**-pat
]x-šeni walaḥta (KUB 34.23, I 30)
 even in the winter (he) went (and)
 attacked (the country of) ...x-seni⁴⁰.

While Suppiluliuma is occupied with Murmuriga and Carchemish, the Egyptians unexpectedly attack Kadesh⁴¹. Angered, as he himself declares, at what he considers a treacherous, unprovoked attack, Suppiluliuma, in a retaliatory counter-attack, sends troops against the Egyptian territory of Amka⁴². This campaign is reported by Mursili as follows (KBo 5.6.3.1-6):

- (31) While my father was down in the country of Carchemish,
 he sent Lupakki and Tarhunta-zalma forth into the country
 of Amka.

nu **pāir** KUR ^{URU}Amka GUL-aḥḥir
 They went (and) attacked Amka

and brought back prisoners, cattle and sheep before my
 father. When the people of Egypt heard of the attack on
 Amka, they were afraid.

This is clearly not just another in a series of annexations designed to provide the Hittite king with additional wealth and power; this is a deliberate, defiant move in response to Egyptian aggression and it achieves the desired effect of shocking the Egyptians into making overtures of peace (although these turn out to be deceptive in the end).

Finally, the two separate actions of deployment of an army in a particular territory followed by the attack on that territory are concisely reported in the following brief passage:

- (32) nu *INA* ^{URU}Palḥuišša **pāun** nu ^{URU}palḥuiššan GUL-ḥun
 (KUB 14.16, II 9)

I went to Palhuissa. I attacked Palhuissa.

Here we have two separate clauses, each introduced by *nu*, with the verb of each clause in the usual final position and *pāun* taking the locative/allative construction *INA* ^{URU}palḥuišša. On the other hand, the element of surprise inherent in a night attack is conveyed by the go-(and)-V construction of KBo 4.4.3.36 (= (3) above):

⁴⁰ Güterbock's translation, *JCS* 10 (1956), p. 84.

⁴¹ KBo 5.6.2.21-33.

⁴² KBo 5.6.E3.4.1-8, Güterbock *JCS* 10 (1956), p. 97. Cf. T. Bryce, *The Kingdom of the Hittites*, 2nd ed. Oxford 2005, pp. 177-178, 181.

- (33) nu=ššan pāun KUR^{URU} piggainarešša šašti walaḥḥun
(KBo 4.4.3.36)

I went (and) attacked Piggainaressa as it slept.

So as we see, the Hittite go-and-V construction shows the same types of semantic/pragmatic meaning and usage found in similar syntactic constructions in other languages of the world, ancient and modern: a general notion of unexpectedness of action and events, provoking consternation, disapproval, admiration, expressing defiance, etc. It would be very remarkable indeed if, on the one hand, languages from Ancient Greek to Modern Hebrew used this type of construction - and specifically with *motion* verbs - for a common function while on the other hand Hittite used precisely the same type of construction - and precisely restricted to motion verbs- for a completely different purpose. On the contrary, a crosslinguistic perspective shows clearly that Hittite takes its place among other languages of the world in the use of the go-and-V 'phraseological' construction.

A reading of the construction which yields a '*post hoc*' (temporally consecutive) interpretation has nothing in particular to recommend it. Within a narrative discourse - given the linear nature of language, spoken or written - *everything* that is not otherwise indicated is '*post hoc*'. Similarly, within a proximate discourse context - assuming a reasonable degree of coherency in the discourse - everything that is not marked to the contrary is also '*propter hoc*' (logically consecutive). An anomalous syntactic construction of the go-and-V type is not needed (and would not be expected) to mark such basic (*unmarked*) notions. As a highly marked syntactic construction, the go-and-V syntagm conveys a correspondingly highly marked semantic/pragmatic content⁴³.

This, then, is the function of the Hittite go-and-V construction. The remaining questions are:

1) How does the construction convey its meaning? That is, why do *motion* verbs serve as pragmatic markers to convey the sense that we have seen in this construction with motion verbs crosslinguistically?

2) Within Hittite, how did this syntactic structure arise?

The first question has not been addressed in the literature on the Hittite construction. That is, whatever function has been proposed by various scholars for the go-and-V construction, no one has asked *why* motion verbs should be used in monoclausal structures to convey whatever sense is in each case assumed⁴⁴. Nor has the question been widely addressed by linguists

⁴³ Dunkel (MSS 58 [1998], pp. 52-53) points out the problems with Neu's interpretation of the construction as expressing an affirmative or asseverative future ("Futur im Hethitischen?", in *Verba et structurae* (Festschrift K. Strunk), H. Hettrich et al. edd. 1995, pp. 195-202), but Dunkel's own suggestion (based on the fact that 'the single function from which the asyndetic construction is absolutely excluded is that of a simple or durative present' [p. 53]) that the construction expresses perfective (i.e., non-durative) aspect does not account for the evident uses of the construction nor for its typological parallels.

⁴⁴ Though see Disterheft, KZ 97 (1984).

concerned with similar structures in modern languages. A notable exception is the work of Stefanowitsch, particularly in his 1999 *High Desert* paper⁴⁵. Stefanowitsch explains the syntactic and semantic properties of this construction in terms of 'image-schema blending':

Image schemas are defined as general patterns which we abstract over recurrent experiences, they 'emerge as meaningful structures for us chiefly at the level of our bodily movements through space, our manipulation of objects, and our perceptual interactions' (Johnson 1987:29). Such schemas are non-linguistic, involve all sensory modalities, and there is evidence that they are acquired during the first year of life, i.e. before language acquisition proper sets in⁴⁶.

All uses of the go-and-V construction, in Stefanowitsch's view,

are motivated by a combination of the image schematic properties of the verb *go* and the more richly specified semantics of whichever second verb occurs in a particular expression. ...the image-schematic properties evoked by *go* are blended (or 'fused') with the event structure of the second verb to allow the speaker to construe the event denoted by the second verb in accordance with the image-schematic meaning of *go*⁴⁷.

Remarking that 'syntactic evidence indicates that [in English and in other languages where the construction is found] the two verbs are not simply coordinated, but that they form a single syntactic unit', Stefanowitsch suggests that the *and* in go-and-V constructions 'does not function as a coordinator, but as a semantic instruction to blend (a variant of) the image-schematic structure evoked by *go* with the event structure evoked by the main verb'⁴⁸.

Whatever the details of the explanation, and whatever the theoretical framework within which the explanation is attempted, it seems clear that the basic underlying notion which accounts for the use of motion verbs to convey the function of the go-and-V construction is indeed, as argued by Stefanowitsch, the concept of deviation from an expected path (even when

⁴⁵ Stefanowitsch, *High Desert* 2, 1999, pp. 123-34. Cf. L. Ekberg, "The cognitive basis of the meaning and function of cross-linguistic take and V", *Perspectives on Language and Conceptualization*, Belgian Journal of Linguistics 8, J. Nuyts – E. Pederson edd. 1993, pp. 21-42.

⁴⁶ Stefanowitsch, *High Desert* 2, 1999, p. 128; M. Johnson, *The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination, and Reason*. Chicago 1987.

⁴⁷ Stefanowitsch, *High Desert* 2, 1999, p. 123; see also pp. 130-32.

⁴⁸ Stefanowitsch, *High Desert* 2, 1999, pp. 124, 130.

that deviation is *from an expected deviation* back to the original path - thus accounting for notions of 'progression-against-obstacles' (some of the 'go ahead' types))⁴⁹.

With regard to the final question: How did this syntactic structure arise within Hittite⁵⁰?, we have competing theories from Dunkel and van den Hout. While van den Hout suggests an origin in asyndetic clauses with finite verb forms, Dunkel explains the phraseological construction with *pai-* and *uwa-* as originating in imperative structures, with initial imperatives of a verb of 'going' followed by a second clause in asyndeton⁵¹. Examples of such structures include:

- (34) eḫu pāiwani
Come, let us go!
- (35) [ī]t=wa ^dUTU-un uwate
[G]o, search for the Sungod!
- (36) n=an itten zaḫḫeškitten
Now go (pl.) fight (pl.) him!⁵²

⁴⁹ See the discussion by Stefanowitsch, *High Desert* 2, 1999, pp. 128-29. Stefanowitsch notes further (p. 132) that 'The semantic similarity of these constructions [across languages] is due to the fact that the conceptual structure [underlying them] is independent of language; the slight variation in the exact set of meanings associated with it in any particular language is due to the fact that conceptual structure manifests itself in language-specific ways.'

⁵⁰ I retain the traditional form of the question as to the development 'within Hittite', even though it is unlikely that the construction is in fact a Hittite innovation. Dunkel (*MSS* 46 [1985], p. 60) considers it to be 'an innovation of pre-Hittite' but in fact, while the typological parallels show that genetic filiation is not a prerequisite for the occurrence of the construction, its uses in Hittite, Homeric Greek, and Plautine Latin point to a Proto-Indo-European usage.

⁵¹ Van den Hout, *Studies* II, §4, Dunkel, *MSS* 46 (1958), pp. 59-62; cf. *ibid.* *MSS* 58 (1998), pp. 51-55. Pullum, *When Verbs Collide*, p. 236 n. 3, notes that in his discussion of these types of imperative clauses he ignores citations in which a comma follows the *go* or *come* 'since these cannot be assumed to show the cohesion that characterizes the construction I am discussing here'. It may, however, be overly hasty to dismiss such collocations with punctuation out of hand, particularly when the punctuation is the result of an editorial decision, but perhaps even when it is original in the author's hand. For example, Marvell's 'Come little Infant, Love me now' does not appear to differ substantively in its syntactic structure from Marlowe's 'Come live with me and be my love' (which Pullum cites as a paradigmatic instance of the construction from 'the best English literature', p. 218), nor does Donne's 'Goe, and catche a falling starre', which I have cited above - in modern spelling and without punctuation - as an example of the literary use of the go-and-V construction. Pullum does, however, go on to say, interestingly, that 'it would be reasonable to conjecture that the historical origin of *Come kiss me* might be a sequence of imperatives (*Come! Kiss me!*), and that the non-imperative analogs might have been a later outgrowth.'

⁵² KUB 29.1.1.10; VboT 58.1.26; KBo 26.65.4.14; see van den Hout, *Studies* II §3; Dunkel, *MSS* 46, 1985, pp. 57-63.

While the structures in (34) and (35) could be either single clauses or two coordinated clauses in asyndeton, the position of the clitic pronoun *-an* in (36) indicates that here we have already a monoclausal structure⁵³. On Dunkel's interpretation, the construction spread from second person imperative clauses to first and third person indicative forms as a typical instance of the result of the 'speaker-hearer discontinuity' that leads to 'the actuation and spread of linguistic change'⁵⁴. As he notes, when a speaker gives commands to a hearer, the command is commonly incorporated into the response, a situation that has resulted in some cases in 'fully characterized imperatives [being] remade into indicatives', e. g., Greek *ἔσθι > ἔσθιω, Vedic *śrudhí* > **śrudhīyāmi* (ppe. *śrudhīyant-*). In just this way, a new morphosyntactic indicative structure could arise from the corresponding imperative structure⁵⁵. In narrative contexts especially it would be a simple matter for a reported command "She said, 'Go(,) search for the Sungod!'"⁵⁶ to be followed by the narrated action in compliance with that command, expressed in third-person forms: 'And he went (and) searched for the Sungod'. It is precisely the hortatory force of imperatives of verbs of 'going/coming', expressing the peremptory summoning and dismissing inherent in commands to 'come' or 'go', that translates in the corresponding indicative forms into the fundamental notion of deviation from a path recognized by Stefanowitsch⁵⁷. The imperatives 'go' and 'come' enjoin the addressee to depart from his path in order to fulfill the command; corresponding indicative forms indicate the addressee's past (accomplished) or future (projected) action in deviation from a path in response to the command. Once the monoclausal indicative structures are in place they are available for extension

⁵³ Van den Hout well adduces Terence, *Adelphoe* 917, *tu illas abi et transduce* for, as he observes, **tu abi et illas transduce*, 'Off you go! And bring them over!' The Latin and Hittite forms show that both languages have undergone a process akin to the well-known process within the Romance languages of clitic climbing, although in the latter case this process is restricted to sequences of finite verb + infinitive or other non-finite form. As R. Posner (*The Romance Languages*. Cambridge 1996, p. 263) points out, within the Romance group (with the exception of Rumanian) there has been 'an increase over time in the use of infinitival complementation. In resultant *finite verb + infinitive* sequences, where the two verbs share the same subject, a clitic pronoun object of the infinitive often attaches clitically to the (higher) finite verb.... It is assumed that this is an effect of the close cohesion (clause union or 'matiness') between the two verbs, which are treated syntactically as a single unit.' While van den Hout's model of the origin of the Hittite phraseological construction in separate asyndetic clauses, with *pai-/uwa-* in unmarked final position in a very short first clause, could work in purely syntactic terms with the addition of a version of clitic climbing, it does not account for the shifting semantics (and the pragmatic functions) of the verbs of 'going' in the phraseological construction.

⁵⁴ Dunkel, *MSS* 46 (1985), p. 60.

⁵⁵ Dunkel, *MSS* 46 (1985), p. 61.

⁵⁶ The parentheses around the comma are intended to indicate the ambiguity (for us as readers of Hittite texts and for the original speakers/hearers of the narrative in these texts) of a structure that can be either 'Go! Search!' or 'Go-search!'.

⁵⁷ See above, text and notes 45-49. The directional/deictic force of *pai-* and *uwa-* would account for their more frequent use in these constructions in preference to the 'most neutral *verbum eundi*' *iya-/iye-*, a usage seen by van den Hout as problematic for Dunkel's theory (*Studies* II §3).

(independent of imperative contexts) to all of the forms of tense and person in which we see them used⁵⁸.

⁵⁸ A number of years ago I profited from discussion of these issues with Joe Baruffi and my former colleague Charles R. Barton. It is a pleasure to record at last that debt of thanks. Preliminary results were presented to the Thirty-Seventh Annual Conference of the International Linguistic Association, Washington, D.C., April 1992: "Hittite *pai-luwa-* in asyndetic double-verb constructions", and to the Canadian Linguistic Association, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, May 1992: "Asymmetric verbal constructions in Hittite and Ancient Greek". My thanks go too to Craig Melchert, who read a penultimate draft of the present paper. Responsibility for the views set forth here is of course entirely my own.