OFFPRINT FROM

Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr.

on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday

Edited by

GARY BECKMAN
RICHARD BEAL
and
GREGORY MCMAHON

Studies in the Hittite Phraseological Construction I: Its Syntactic and Semantic Properties

THEO VAN DEN HOUT

Chicago

1. *General Description and Introduction*

In Hittite we encounter two verbs that can be used in a construction commonly known as the "phraseological" construction.[1] The verbs in question are the two verbs of movement *pai-* "to go" and *uṷa-* "to come." In the phraseological construction they are embedded in one and the same clause with another verb, the form of *pai-/uṷa-* having the same person, number, tense, and mode as the second verb. This clause can be either a main clause or any kind of subordinate clause. In its shortest form it consists of two verbs only. According to predominant word order in Hittite the second verb is almost always in final position in the clause but follows at any rate the form of *pai-/uṷa-*. While agreeing with the main verb, only finite forms of *pai-/uṷa-*, that is indicative or imperative, are attested in this construction. All kinds of constituents can separate the form of *pai-/uṷa-* and the second verb, but any form of conjunction or connective is lacking. The verbs *pai-* and *uṷa-* never occur with the various local adverbs with which they are so often combined when used as full motion verbs.[2] Although the exact semantics of the phraseological construction are not yet fully elucidated, in general two kinds of translation have been used up to now. The phraseological verb is either literally translated as a very short clause by itself, which is linked to the main verb through an inserted "(and)" or it is rendered by means of an impersonal expression like "it happened" with the main verb in a dependent "that"-clause.

The above description summarizes what seems to be generally known about the phraseological construction. After a brief survey of the *Forschungsgeschichte* (§2), several of the above descriptive elements will be commented upon and illustrated with examples (§§3–6). Initially, the translation will be as

---

1. The siglum KUB has been omitted in textual references. Part two of this study will appear in the memorial volume for Erich Neu, which will be published as *Hethitica* 16.

2. For the syntax of *pai-* and *uṷa-* as full motion verbs, see F. A. Tjerkstra, *Principles*.

literal as possible, putting the form of *pai-/uu̯a-* directly in front of the main verb separated by a dash. The phraseologically used verb will be underlined in the transcription.

Previous treatments of this construction (see §2) are not numerous. George Dunkel mentions a collection of 132 examples, "of which about one-third (41) involved a second person imperative"[3] but quotes only a few. The corpus for the present study amounts to over 160 passages with the phraseologically used form of *pai-/uu̯a-* in the indicative.

Important questions still remain to be answered. First of all, what is the exact meaning of the phraseological construction (§7)—that is, what do the forms of *pai-/uu̯a-* add to the meaning of the clause as compared with similar or identical clauses without them? Other questions concerning the difference between the two verbs, i.e., the function and meaning of the prefixes *pe-* and *u-* and to what extent they determined the choice of each of them in the phraseological construction, how the rise and development of the construction can be described, and whether it is specifically Hittite or also to be encountered in other Anatolian languages, will be dealt with in later installments.

It is with great pleasure that I dedicate this study to Harry Hoffner, to whom we owe not only important contributions on the culture, history, and literature of the Hittites, but also some of the finest linguistic studies on the Hittite language.

2. *Forschungsgeschichte*

One of the first to comment on the phraseological construction was Albrecht Götze, *Ḫatt.*, 109, who in 1925 briefly commented on the words *pāiu̯eni=u̯ar=an=kan kuennumēni* "Shall we go kill him?" in KBo 6.29 ii 25 and referred to other similar passages as having a "proleptic object." The first real discussion and the term "phraseological" we owe to Johannes Friedrich. In *SV* 1, 162–64 (1926), he described it as an asyndetic combination of *pai-/uu̯a-* with another verb and characterized their role as "fast wie eine Art Hilfsverb." He suggested that it might have been perceived synchronically as an adverb; the original meaning as a motion verb had at any rate been weakened. He also recognized the impersonal construction.[4] In his grammar (1940, 1st ed.; 1960, 2d ed.), however, Friedrich refrained from explicit remarks on the semantics of the phraseological construction.[5] In the translation of the

---

3. *MSS* 46 (1985): 57 with n. 57.

4. *SV* 1, 162 n. 2, referring to but not following Sommer-Ehelolf, *Pap.*, 72.

5. *HE*, 159–60 (§312). In a description of this construction on a synchronic level the terms asyndeton and asyndetic are fully justified and do not necessarily imply that "the initial motion verb and the final verb are separate, asyndetic clauses." D. Disterheft, *KZ* 97 (1984): 224, unduly criticizes Friedrich on this point.

examples that he gave he rendered both verb forms literally with an inserted "(and)," the translation most widely used since. Friedrich did not mention the impersonal interpretation again, however.

In her discussion of the phraseological use of *pai-/uua-*, Dorothy Disterheft (1984) opts for an adverbial function indicating "that the action of the following verb is performed immediately after the preceding one in the text." She reduces the motion verb in her translations to a mere "then" and uses the term "consecutive adverbial" for this construction.[6]

Several scholars interpret this use of motion verbs as aspectual. George Dunkel (1985 and 1998) focuses on the observation that the phraseological expression as a whole "is used only with a future value" and therefore suggests a perfective, i.e., non-durative aspect.[7] He wants to restrict the impersonal rendering to those cases where "no subject at all is expressed" and prefers "go/come (and) . . ." in all other cases, although it is not clear whether this brings out the perfective aspect any more than would a clause without a phraseological construction. Silvia Luraghi (1989) proposes a punctual or aoristic aspect viewing "an action in its globality," which in spite of its somewhat different terminology may come very close to Dunkel's thoughts.[8] Most recently (1997), however, she seems to have modified her view and discusses this construction under the heading of auxiliaries like *ḫar(k)-* and *eš-/aš-* + part. and *dai-* + supinum, although retaining the aspectual value.[9] According to her, there is a difference between the use of *pai-/uua-* in the present-future, which always has a future and exhortative value, whereas the same verbs in the preterite "underline a certain event as a point in time from where other events develop . . . 'it happened then.'" Andrew Garrett (1990) has only in a more general sense hinted at a possible aspectual value for this construction.[10]

Erich Neu (1995) compared the phraseological constructions in the Hurrian-Hittite Bilingual with the corresponding forms in the Hurrian original and described the character of the Hittite construction as basically emphatic.[11] In present forms of *pai-/uua-* this results in an analytical or affirmative future which is more outspoken than the usual praesens pro futuro.[12] The construction in the preterite seems to be emphatically used as well, according to Neu.

---

6. *KZ* 97 (1984): 226.

7. *MSS* 46 (1985): 63 and *MSS* 58 (1998): 51–53.

8. In *Historical Linguistics 1989. Papers from the 9th International Conference on Historical Linguistics*, ed. H. Aertsen and R. J. Jeffers (Amsterdam and Philadelphia, 1993), 272. Unfortunately, this hypothesis has not been further substantiated, and the article promised to do so in the earlier publication has to my knowledge never appeared.

9. *Hittite*, 42–44.

10. *JCS* 42 (1990): 231.

11. *FsStrunk*, 195–202, and most recently *FsWPSchmid*, 334–35.

12. *FsStrunk*, 199–200; another possible term Neu proposes is asseverative future. For a similar view, see already H. A. Hoffner, *AuOr* 5 (1987): 285.

In addition several individual authors have commented in text editions on specific passages containing a phraseological construction; their remarks will be discussed where necessary.

3. *The Phraseological Construction as a Single Clause*

3.1. That we are dealing with a single clause involving two fully inflected verbs and—at least from a synchronic point of view—not with a frequent form of asyndeton is clearly shown by the characteristic Anatolian phenomenon of the chain of enclitic elements attached to a connective or to the first accented word of the sentence. A Hittite clause usually starts with the connective *nu* or one of its older variants *šu* and *ta*. To this connective one or more enclitic elements can be attached, thus forming the first accented unit of a clause according to Wackernagel's Law. Often such enclitic elements in a phraseological construction demonstrably belong to the second verb and not to *uṷa-/pai-*. Compare:

(1) *n≠at uṷami INA* É.GAL-*lim memaḫḫi*[13]
     I will come—tell it to the palace.

The enclitic anaphoric pronoun *-at* "it" (nom.-acc.sg.n.) cannot belong to the first person sg. of the intransitive *uṷami* ("I come/will come"), but can only function as the object to the second verb *memaḫḫi* "I will tell."

The same can be argued for the following clause with the enclitic indirect object *–šmaš* "you" (pl.) followed by the enclitic direct object *–an* (here referring to Hitt. *ḫalki-* c. "grain"):

(2) *nu≈šmaš≈an uṷatteni* EGIR-*zian arḫa šarratteni*[14]
     Afterwards you come—split it up amongst yourselves.

In the following example where the clause is introduced by an adverb, the enclitic reflexive particle *–za* belongs to the second verb and not to *uit*:

(3) *namma≈z uit ABI* ᵈUTU-*ŠI tuk* ᵐ*Madduṷattan linkiṷaš≈šaš iēt*[15]
     Then the father of His Majesty came—made you, Madduwatta,
        his (≈*za*) sworn (vassal).

Similarly the "local" particle *–kan* goes with the verb *kuen-* "to kill, destroy" and not with the simplex *pai-*:

(4) *nu≈kan pāir ŠA* KUR ᵁᴿᵁ*Kummāḫa* URU.DIDLI.ḪI.A *kuenir*[16]
     And the towns of (the land of) Kummaḫa they went—destroyed.

13. HKM 52:17–18 (MH/MS), ed. S. Alp, *HBM*, 216–17.

14. 13.4 iv 20 w. dupls. (MH/NS), ed. A. Süel, *Direktif Metni*, 76–77; for an English translation, see G. McMahon, *CoS* I, 220.

15. *Madd.*, obv. 13.

16. 23.72+ obv. 31 (MH/MS), transl. O. R. Gurney, *AAA* 27 (1948): 34.

Finally, if the phraseological construction is part of direct speech, both *pai-/ uṷa-* and the second verb share a single quotative particle *–ṷa(r)(-)*:

   (5) *nu=ṷa p̄air* ^{URU}*Taggašt[an]* ^{URU}*Ukuduipunann=a šapaši̯aua[n dāir]*[17]
       And they went—[began t]o spy on the towns of Taggašt[a] and
       Ukuduipuna.

These enclitic elements as well as the lack of any connective after the form of *pai-/uṷa-* show beyond any doubt the syntactic unity of this phraseological construction. This is well known and can be found in every discussion of this construction.

3.2. This is not to say, however, that asyndeton is unknown in Hittite and that at times there cannot be uncertainty whether or not we are dealing with a phraseological construction. Especially in the older language and in text genres like festivals or rituals the use of connectives seems to be relatively restricted. Compare from the Old Hittite Festival of Thunder (with a separate line here for each clause):

   (6) i   [LU(GAL *Ù* MUNUS.LUGAL *šarā tienzi*
        ii   *ar)]uṷanzi*
        iii LUGAL-*uš ḫūppari ši[pānti]*
        iv [(MUNUS.LUGAL-*š=a natta*
        v   GAL ^dIM ^d*U̯)]ašēzzili akuanzi*
        vi [(GIŠ ^dINANNA GAL.GAL ^{LÚ.MEŠ}*ḫallir*)]*eš* SÌR-*ru*
        vii ^{LÚ}SAGI GAL-*AM ē[pzi]*[18]
        The [k]ing and queen rise. They bow. The king li[bates] in a *ḫuppar*-vase
         but (*=a*) the queen (does) not. They drink the cup of the Storm-god (and)
         Wašezzili. The *ḫalliri*-men sing (accompanied by) the great
         Inanna-instrument. The cupbearer ta[kes] the cup.

The only connective used in this passage is the underlined adversative particle *–a* in iv. As a consequence, in a clause from the same composition

   (7) *t=aš paizzi* DUMU.MEŠ.LUGAL DUMU.MUNUS.MEŠ.[LUGAL]
       pēran tiēzzi[19]
       He goes. He steps in front of the princes (and) [prin]cesses.

it is hard to decide whether this is a case of asyndeton or of a phraseological construction, since the subject clitic nom.sg.c. *=aš* may go with either *paizzi* "he goes" or *tiēzzi* "he steps."[20] Because of the relatively scarce use Old Hittite scribes made of connectives and enclitics, we therefore can rarely be certain

---

   17. HKM 7:5–6 (MH/MS), ed. S. Alp, *HBM*, 128–29.
   18. KBo 17.11+ iv 7′–9′ (OS), ed. E. Neu, *StBoT* 25, 67, and cf. *StBoT* 12, 32–33.
   19. KBo 20.12+ i 7–8 (sim. i 2–3, OS), ed. E. Neu, *StBoT* 25, 63; cf. also *StBoT* 12, 10–11.
   20. According to the Watkins-Garrett rule, for which see A. Garrett, *JCS* 42 (1990): 227–42.

about the phraseological status of *pai-/uṇa-* in the indicative in Old Hittite script.[21] The only certain example I know of in Old Script is[22]

(8) *ta⸗kkan paizzi* ᴸᵁL[UL- (dupl. ᴸᵁ*tarašiṇan*)] *šipanti* [23]

   (The GUDU-priest from Dauniya takes a libation vessel) and he goes—
   dedicates the *tarašiṇa-*man. (The *tarašiṇa-*man then, however, rises and
   dances in a squatting position.)

First of all, the particle *⸗kan* is not to be expected with the simplex *pai-* without further complements.[24] Secondly, if one could nonetheless take the particle as belonging to *pai-* and suppose an asyndetic construction, we would be left with the verb *šipant-* without *⸗kan* meaning "to offer" in the sense of slaughtering the *tarašiṇa-*man, which already in view of the sequel is impossible.[25]

In later phases of the Hittite language asyndeton remains a not uncommon phenomenon. But in general some form of connective (*nu, šu, ta, ⸗ṇa, ⸗ma*) between clauses is the rule, and their absence seems to be restricted to specific circumstances.[26] One of those circumstances being "when the second clause is a (. . .) explanation or elaboration of the first," there is room for some arbitrariness, so that if there are no elements like the ones just mentioned (§3.1) to mark any clause boundary, analysis may become difficult. Sometimes comparable cases that do have such boundary markers may help out. Compare frequent questions in oracles such as:

(9) *pāimi* ᵐ*Kur ANA* URU-*LIM aṇan arḫa tittanumi* [27]

where one could translate:

   Should I go, that is, depose Kur in/for the city?

21. Note that at this point E. Neu, *FsStrunk*, 200 n. 24, speaks of phraseological constructions in Old Hittite *compositions* and only refers to examples in later copies. The Old Script example from the Zalpa-text KBo 22.2 rev. 10′ (ed. H. Otten, *StBoT* 17, 12–13) *INA* MU.3.KAM LUGAL-*uš pait* ᵁᴿᵁ*Zalpan araḫzanda uetet* "in the third year the king went (and) fortified Zalpa all around" contains no phraseological construction (so Otten, *StBoT* 17, 48; Dunkel, *MSS* 46 (1985): 75 n. 88) but only two clauses in asyndeton. For this, see below §4 on word order in phraseological constructions.

22. I owe this example to Petra Goedegebuure, whom I would like to thank here for sharing it with me.

23. KBo 17.43 i 8–9 (OS), ed. E. Neu, *StBoT* 25, 104; for dupl. cf. Neu, *StBoT* 26, 257.

24. On this see F. A. Tjerkstra, *Principles*, 50–51.

25. For (⸗*kan*) *šipant-*, see A. Goetze, *JCS* 23 (1970): 85–92. The unlikelihood of the particle ⸗*kan* with the simplex *pai-* virtually excludes the possibility of a carryover of this particle to the second part with *šipanti* (see immediately below ad (11)).

26. Cf. J. Friedrich, *HE*, 157–59 (§310), and *CHD* L–N, 466b–68a; for statistics on the use of the different connectives vis-à-vis one other, see *CHD* L–N, 468b, and J. Weitenberg, *StMed* 7, 307–53.

27. 5.24+ iv 21 (NH), ed. Th. van den Hout, *StBoT* 38, 264–65.

Comparable oracle questions, however, show that we are indeed dealing with the phraseological construction:

(10) *paimi=kan* ᵈUTU-*ŠI anduḫšan INA* ᵁᴿᵁ*Šamuḫa parā neḫḫi*²⁸
   Should I, My Majesty, go—send forth a man to the city of Šamuḫa?

The syntagma *para nai-* "to send forth/out" always takes the particle *=kan*, and as a consequence there is no case of asyndeton here.

Asyndeton frequently occurs in the juxtaposition of two or more verbs expressing closely related or simultaneous actions. In these cases, moreover, a single particle can be shared by the series of verbs used. Compare the single particle *=za* carrying over to all four imperatives in:

(11) *[nu]=za kēdani* EZEN-*ni ezatten [e]kutten išpiyatten [n]inkatten*²⁹
   At this feast eat, [d]rink, satiate, (and) [sa]tisfy yourselves!

The same asyndetic relation is also often found with the same verbs in the indicative.³⁰ To a certain extent the same could be argued in some cases with *pai-/uua-* in connection with another verb. Compare the following passage from the Myth of the Disappearing Sun-deity:

(12) ᵈIM-*aš* ᵈUTU-*i piēt ittten=ua* ᵈUTU-*un uuatet[ten] pāir* ᵈUTU-*un šanḫeškanzi*³¹
   The Storm-god sent to (find) the Sun-deity (saying): "Go, brin[g] the Sun-deity!" They went (and) start(ed)³² looking for the Sun-deity.

The going and searching might very well be viewed as two closely related and simultaneous actions. The verb *šanḫ-* in the sense "to look for, search for" does not require the presence of a local particle,³³ so that the lack of it cannot help us here in determining whether we are dealing with two sentences in asyndeton or with a phraseological construction. Moreover, the composition stems from the older language period so that the possibility of an asyndeton is to be reckoned with. The disagreement in tense between *pāir* (pret.) and *šanḫeškanzi* (pres.), on which see below §5 (36), adds to the uncertainties.

A special case is the short letter HKM 35:

(13a) *zig=a=kan* ᵐ*Pipappaš* ÉRIN.MEŠ UKU.UŠ *pariian liliuaḫḫūuanzi uuate n=an=kan tuzziia anda uuate*

---

28. 32.130 obv. 4 (MH/MS, cf. S. Košak, *StBoT* 39, 41 n. 2), ed. R. Lebrun, *Samuha*, 168–69.
29. 36.97 iv⁽ʔ⁾ 4–6 (NS).
30. Cf. for instance *HW²* II, 130b–31a, for *adanzi akuuanzi* "they eat (and) drink."
31. VBoT 58 i 21–22 (pre-NH/NS), ed. E. Laroche, *Myth.*, 23; G. C. Moore, *Diss.*, 167 ("They went (and) searched"); H. A. Hoffner, *Hittite Myths*, 27 ("They went. They search . . .").
32. For this translation of the *-ške*-suffix, see H. C. Melchert, *3rdHitt.Cong.*, 415.
33. Cf. H. A. Hoffner, *StMed* 7, 140–45.

> You, Pipappa, bring over quickly the heavily armed troops and bring them
> to the army!

The message then ends:

(13b) *mān UL=ma uu̯aši ḫarakši*

These words contain two clauses but can be analyzed in two different ways:
either

(13c) *mān UL=ma uu̯aši / ḫarakši*
       If you won't come however, you'll die!

or

(13d) *mān UL=ma / uu̯aši ḫarakši*
       If not however, you'll come—die!

From a grammatical point of view both analyses seem possible. However, be-
cause *mān UL=ma* "if not however" is a frequently attested "fixed idiom,"[34] it
is attractive to explain the following two verbs as another—extremely short—
phraseological construction. The more so perhaps, since one would strictly
taken expect **mān UL=ma uu̯ateši* "If you will not bring" instead of *mān UL=
ma uu̯aši* "If you will not come." For more on this passage see below, §6.

In conclusion, we can say that the phraseological construction is estab-
lished from the Old Hittite period onwards, although theoretically in many
older cases doubt is possible.

4. *The Position of Phraseological* pai-/uu̯a- *in the Clause*

The unmarked position of the phraseologically used form of *pai-/uu̯a-* is
that immediately following the connectives *nu, ta* or *šu* with or without en-
clitics, or following some other constituent in initial position taking possible
enclitics. This position can be referred to as the first position. Under specific
circumstances the phraseological verb itself moves into initial position or can
take up second position. Only rarely does it move further back in the clause.

For the first position after *nu, ta*, or *šu* we have already seen several ex-
amples: compare (1–5) and (7–8). Instead of these connectives we can find
adverbs like *namma* "then" in (3)[35] or temporal and/or conditional conjunc-
tions such as *mān, maḫḫan*/GIM-*an* or *kuitman* in initial position, almost al-
ways followed by one of the enclitic conjunctions *=ma* or *=i̯a*. For various
reasons we may find some other constituent in initial position instead of a
connective like *nu* as in (14):

---

34. So *CHD* L–N, 156b; compare within the corpus of the Maṣat-letters, for instance, HKM
52, 17–18.

35. Compare also 29.8 ii 20–22 (see *CHD* L–N, 386b); for EGIR-*anta* "afterwards," cf. 14.1+
rev. 55 (ed. *Madd.*, 32–33).

(14) [*nu=u̯*]*a uizzi šumenzan* ^{GIŠ}TUKUL.ḪI.A*=KUNU* [*ḫarpa*]*nalliuš*
ḫ*ullaniu̯an dāi* ^{A.ŠA}ḫ*aršāuar=ma=u̯a=šmaš uizzi* [*u̯*]*alliįanni māi*[36]
[And] your weapons will come—begin to fight the [enem]ies, while
(your) fields will come—grow to your [f]ame.

Here we have two phraseological constructions, the first one (*nu=u̯a uizzi
. . . dāi*) with the phraseological verb in unmarked first position, but the use of
the enclitic conjunction *=ma* in the second clause—normally excluding *nu*—
forces the subject into initial position. Although a word order **uizzi=ma* fol-
lowed by the subject would have been possible, the subject was probably pre-
ferred because "fields" is the main contrasting element in the two clauses
bound by *=ma*. In all such cases the phraseological verb can still be said to
occupy the first position.

If a clause is introduced by the subordinate conjunctions *mān, maḫḫan/*
GIM-*an*, or *kuitman* not followed by an enclitic conjunction but preceded by
nu, the phraseological verb regularly follows the subordinate conjunction.
Compare (15–16):

(15) *nu mān uizzi* É ^dUTU ^{URU}PÚ-*na parā* [ḫ*a*]*ppinešzi*[37]
And if the temple of the Sungoddess of Arinna comes—becomes
richer, . . .

(16) *nu=u̯a=kan mān uit namma kuitki āššan nu=u̯ar=*[*a*]*t namma arḫa
tarnandu*[38]
And if anything else came—(is) remaining, they must further let it go.

There is, however, also one example of non-initial *mān* following the form of
pai-/uu̯a-:

(17) ^m*Maraššantaš=ma kuit* ṬUPPU ḫ*arzi n–at uizzi mān udai n–at
lē dattari*[39]
And if Maraššanta comes—brings the tablet which he has in his
possession, it must not be taken into account!

Similarly, the need for an indeterminate relative pronoun in (18), which ac-
cording to Hittite grammar should be in first or initial position, causes *uizzi* to
move into second position:[40]

(18) *n*]*u*? *kuiš uizzi* DUMU*=IA* DUMU.DUMU*=IA* ^{URU}KÙ.BABBAR-*ši*
LUGAL-*uš kiša*[41]

36. KBo 32.19 iii 43′–44′ (MH/MS), ed. E. Neu, *StBoT* 32, 392–93.

37. 26.43(+) obv. 56 (NH), ed. F. Imparati, *RHA* 32 (1974): 30–31.

38. HKM 66:16–19 (MH/MS), ed. S. Alp, *HBM*, 246–47.

39. *Brt.* ii 2–3 (NH), ed. H. Otten, *StBoT* Bh. 1, 14–15.

40. For the close relationship between conditional and indeterminate relative clauses explain-
ing their identical position, see A. Garrett, *Sprache* 36 (1994): 44–45.

41. KBo 6.28+ rev. 18–19 (NH), ed. F. Imparati, *SMEA* 18 (1977): 39.

> A]nd whatever son (or) grandson of mine will come—become king
> in Ḫattuša, . . .

The combination of a topicalized constituent in initial position and the conjunction *mān* can be seen in (19):

(19) *z(ig)]=a=šši mān pāiši apūn* [(*memiian* EGIR)*-pa mema(tti)*][42]
But if [you] go—re]pea]t that matter to him . . .

The need to stress the subject by way of an explicit personal pronoun *zig=* in initial position as well as the presence of the conjunction *mān* "if" pushes *paiši* "you go/will go" even further back. This same phrase with minor variations but with the same position for the phraseological verb is repeated twice over in the immediately following context.

More than half of those cases where *pai-/uṷa-* itself takes up initial position concern questions, imperatives, or adhortations. Compare the following examples:

(20) *uiddu=ṷa* DUMU ᵐ*Šaparta anda u[e]miiaddu*[43]
Let the son of Šaparta come—a[r]rive!

(21) *pāiṷani=ṷar=an šanḫeškiueni iiandan kinun uṷandan* IGI.ḪI.A-*in*[44]
Let us go—search for it, the going knee, the seeing eye!

In the case of some imperatives, however, one wonders whether they are part of a true phraseological construction or a mere interjection: for this see below §5. For questions see above (9–10) and (22), where the phraseological verb even takes precedence over the interrogative pronoun *kuit*:

(22) *paiši kuit iiaši*[45]
What will you go—do?

The following example nicely illustrates the unmarked first position of a normal statement as opposed to the initial position in a question:

(23) *nu* ᵈUTU-*ŠI kiššan ariianun paimi=kan* ᵈUTU-*ŠI antuḫšan INA*
ᵁᴿᵁ*Šamūḫa parā neḫḫi* § *nu=ššan paizzi INA* ᵁᴿᵁ*Šamūḫa ANA* ᵈ*IŠTAR*
ṢERI mukeššar pedi=pat pāi[46]
I, My Majesty, conducted the following oracle investigation: Should I, My Majesty, go—send forth a man to Šamuḫa?

---

42. KBo 19.44+ rev. 2–3 (= *Ḫuqq.* iii 12–13; MH/MS), ed. J. Friedrich, *SV* 2, 122–23.

43. HKM 66:22–23 (MH/MS), ed. S. Alp, *HBM*, 246–47.

44. 9.34 iii 33′ (MH/NS), ed. M. Hutter, *Behexung*, 38–39.

45. 28.4 ii 25 (NS), ed. E. Laroche, *Myth.*, 16; H. A. Hoffner, *Hittite Myths*, 34.

46. 32.130 obv. 3–7 (cf. (10) above); in spite of the verb *ariia-* "to inquire into (through oracle)" and the initial position of *paimi* both R. Lebrun, *Samuha*, 168–69, and I. Wegner, *AOATS* 36, 135, translate the first phraseological clause as a declarative sentence.

§ So, he will go—give in Šamuḫa to Ištar of the Steppe an invocation ritual right there on the spot.

In the remaining examples of the phraseological verb in initial position *=ma* or *=ịa* are the connecting elements forcing the form of *pai-/uụa-* or another part of the sentence into first position. The choice of the former may be explained by assuming that putting any other constituent in initial position might have given the latter too prominent a place as we saw in (14); compare, e.g.:

(24) *nepišan=mu=kan kuụapi daganzipann=a š[e]r ueter nu UL kuitki*
    šaggaḫḫun uēr=ma AN-iš kuụapi tekann=a ^{URUDU}*kuruzzit arḫa kuerer*[47]
    (Upelluri began to speak to Ea:) "When they built heaven and earth u[po]n me, I was completely unaware and when they came—cut heaven and earth apart with the *kuruzzi,* (I was completely unaware of that as well)."

In the first clause there was no alternative to putting the first of the two objects in initial position: quoted speech never starts with *nu*[48] and the conjunction *kuụapi* usually does not stand in initial position.[49] In the last clause, however, the phraseological *uēr* offered itself as a suitable clause opening, since putting the instrumental ^{URUDU}*kuruzzit* in initial position would have topicalized it, which was not called for. Similar reasons explain in a satisfactory way most such cases and are a sign that the phraseological verb was not felt to have the same status as the main verb or the other constituents and did not have the full lexical meaning of a motion verb either.

We may conclude that the position of the phraseological verb was subject to specific rules, which in some cases make it possible to distinguish whether we are dealing with such a construction or not. Whether clauses of the structure *nu* (or another constituent in initial position[50]) + non-clitic subject + *pai-/uụa-* followed asyndetically by at least another verb form should according to the above rules not be considered phraseological constructions but as two asyndetic clauses sharing the same subject, remains to be seen. Compare, for instance, (25) and (26):

(25) *nu LÚ* ^{GIŠ}GIDRU *paizzi* ^{NINDA}*purpuruš LUGAL-i kattan šuḫḫāi*[51]
    The staff-bearer goes—pours *p.*-breads down before the king.
    (or: The staff-bearer goes (and) he pours *p.*-breads down before the king.)

---

47. *Ullik.* 3rd tabl. iii 40′–43′ (NS), ed. H. G. Güterbock, *JCS* 6 (1952): 28–29.

48. Cf. *CHD* L–N, 466b (*nu* A h 2′).

49. Cf. R. Sternemann, *MIO* 11 (1965): 390–92. A similar example can be found in 43.55 v 6′–10′.

50. For this, see already above n. 21 (§3.2) on the alleged example of an Old Script phraseological construction in the Zalpa-text.

51. KBo 10.24 iv 26–28 (OH/NS), ed. I. Singer, *StBoT* 28, 20; this example is taken as phraseological by *CHD* P, 23a-b.

(26) *nu* MUNUS *pai̯zzi ḫarnāui UŠKEN*[52]
      The woman goes—bows to the birth-stool. (or: The woman goes (and) she
      bows to the birth-stool.)

We may end this section with two difficult cases. Difficult to account for is the
sequel to (15):

(27) *nu mān* <u>*ui̯zzi*</u> É ᵈUTU ᵁᴿᵁPÚ-*na parā ḫappinešzi . . . mānn⊀a* É ᵈUTU
      ᵁᴿᵁPÚ-*na* <u>*ui̯zzi*</u> *parā ašiu̯a[ntešzi*[53]
      And if the temple of the Sun-goddess of Arinna comes—becomes richer,
         . . . and if the temple of the Sun-goddess of Arinna comes—[becomes
      im]poverished, . . .

The obvious parallelism of the two clauses and the impersonally used *ui̯zzi*
(on this see below §8) make it unlikely that we are dealing with the combina-
tion of a phraseological construction and two asyndetic clauses. It remains
unclear, however, why the scribe inserted É ᵈUTU ᵁᴿᵁPÚ-*na* "the temple of
the Sun-goddess of Arinna" between the conjunction *mān*, now opening the
subordinate clause, and *ui̯zzi*.

Suspicious is the passage from the prayer of Gaššuliyawiya, with one of
the rare examples of a present form of *pai-/u̯u̯a-* in initial position that is nei-
ther an imperative nor a question:

(28) *n⊀aš ḫattulešdu namma* <u>*ui̯zzi*</u> ˡ*Gaššulii̯au̯ii̯aš zilatii̯a tuk* DINGIR-*LAM*
      u̯alliškizzi[54]
      May she be healthy again (and) Gaššuliyawiya will come—start praising
      you, o deity, in the future!

That *namma* belongs to the first sentence with *ḫattulešdu* rather than introduc-
ing the next one seems to follow from the almost identical passage earlier in
the prayer:

(29) *n⊀aš ḫaddulešdu namma nu* <u>*ui̯zzi*</u> DUMU.MUNUS.GAL *zilatii̯a tuk*
      DINGIR-*LAM u̯alliškizzi*[55]

The fact that the text has *nu* here as opposed to rev. 24' may point to a scribal
mistake in the latter passage.

5. *Agreement between* pai-/uu̯a- *and the Second Verb*

As a rule, the form of *pai-/uu̯a-* agrees with the main verb in the clause
as to person, number, tense, and mode. There are only a few exceptions to

52. 9.22 ii 33–34 (NH), ed. G. Beckman, *StBoT* 29, 92–93.
53. 26.43(+) obv. 56–57 (NH), ed. F. Imparati, *RHA* 32 (1974): 30–31.
54. KBo 4.6 rev. 23'–25' (NH), ed. J. Tischler, *Gass.*, 16–17.
55. KBo 4.6 obv. 18'–19' (NH), ed. J. Tischler, *Gass.*, 12–13.

this rule and even fewer that can be considered obvious mistakes. Lack of agreement can be observed in number, person, and tense. First of all, however, *pai-/uṷa-* can occur in so-called nominal sentences, where the copula or existential verb *eš-/aš-* "to be" is left unexpressed, thus resulting in a phraseological construction without a main verb:

(30) *nu=ṷa uizzi zilatiṷa ANA* KUR-*TI* [*apāš* (EN-*aš*)][56]
In future [that] one will come—(be) lord to the country!

(31) *nu=ṷa u|(izzi)| tuēl=p|(at* ᴱ*karimmi*)| *nakkiṷaḫḫan*[57]
And your temple especially will come—(be) revered.

and compare (16) above.

In (32) the 3.sg. imperative *paiddu* "he/she shall go!" and the second verb do not show number agreement:

(32) *paiddu=ṷa innarauṷanteš innarauṷanteš paḫḫašnuanteš ašandu*[58]
Let the strong ones go (sing.)—be strong (and) protected(?).

There is room for some uncertainty as to whether we are dealing with a real phraseological construction here. The imperative *paiddu* might as well be an adhortatory interjection not specifically linked with the following verb.[59] This is probably even more true for

(33) *uṷatten* ᵁᴿᵁ*Nēša paiṷani*[60]
Come, let us go to Neša!

where there is incongruence of person: *uṷatten* 2.pl. versus *paiṷani* 1.pl. The fact that *paiddu* in (32) takes the enclitic quotative particle *=ṷa* is nothing to be surprised at in the case of such interjections, compare:

(34) *ehu=ṷa pāiṷeni adumin|i*[61]
Come, let us go eat!

and compare (11) above.

Interesting is the lack of agreement in number between the second 3.sg. *uizzi* and the 3.pl. *mallanzi* "they mill/grind" in

---

56. *Kup.* §4 D 27 (NS), ed. J. Friedrich, *SV* 1, 110–11.

57. 30.19+ iv 4–5 (w. dupl., NS), ed. H. Otten, *HTR*, 44–45.

58. KBo 17.88+ iii 23′–24′ (MS), ed. J. Klinger, *StBoT* 37, 320–21; for the repeated *innarauṷanteš* see ibid. 351; cf. also *CHD* P, 10a. Both Klinger and *CHD* translate the passage as a phraseological construction, but *CHD* duly notices the disagreement.

59. In [(*paid*)*du=ṷar=a*]*n=šan* NÍG.SI.SÁ-*an ŠUM-an ḫalzeššandu* (*StBoT* 14 A iii 20, ed. J. Siegelová, *StBoT* 14) "Let them go (sing.)—name him 'The Just One!'" it cannot be excluded that the main manuscript had regular *pāndu* while the duplicate 36.59 ii 13′f. had a different construction in which *paiddu* was correct.

60. *StBoT* 17 A obv. 15 (OS), ed. H. Otten, *StBoT* 17, 6–7; another example of this kind can be found in 14.15+ iii 37–38 (NH, ed. A. Götze, *AM*, 54–55).

61. 33.115 iii 10′ (pre-NH/NS), ed. H. A. Hoffner, *FsOtten*², 155–56.

(35) [*nu*] <u>*uizzi*</u> ^dU-*aš* ^{URU}*Kummiiaš* UR.SAG-*uš* LUGAL-*uš* ^{GIŠ}APIN-*an*
      [*apaši*]*la ēpzi nu* <u>*uizzi*</u>=*ma* ^d*IŠTAR-iš* ^d*Hepatušš*=*a* [^{NA₄}A]RA₅ *apāšila*
      mallanzi[62]

      The Storm-god [hims]elf, the heroic king of Kummiya, will come—take
      the plough while Ištar and Hepat themselves will come—handle the
      [m]ill.

The parallelism with *uizzi* of the preceding clause may have led the scribe to
start here with the 3.sg. as well,[63] but to speak of a mistake would not be jus-
tified since the scribe can be said to have combined both possibilities which
Hittite agreement rules offered him.[64]

A case of disagreement in tense might be (compare already above (12)):

(36) <u>*pāir*</u> ^dUTU-*un šanheškanzi n*=*an* UL *uemiianzi*[65]
      They went—start searching for the Sun-god but do not find him.

The present tense of both *šanheškanzi* (as opposed to the preterite *pāir*) and
uemiianzi is probably "used to indicate unbounded or open-ended states and
activities."[66] This may be taken as an indication of the "secondary" character
of *pāir* vis-à-vis the main verb. On the other hand, we already (§3.2) had rea-
son to doubt the true phraseological character of this passage and *pāir* may also
be punctual ("They set out. They started searching but . . .") and an indepen-
dent sentence. So in view of the fact that other clear examples of disagreement
in tense seem to be lacking, it might be better to leave it out of consideration.

A real mistake may be found in the following passage from Muršili's
prayer to the Sun-goddess of Arinna:

(37) *nu* <u>*uizzi*</u> *ANA* DINGIR.MEŠ NINDA.GU[(R₄.RA.ḪI.A ^{DUG}*išpanduzzi*)]
      ^{UDU}*auliušš*=*a karš*[(*antari*)][67]

      Thick breads, wine rations, and sheep offerings to the gods they will
      comes(!)—neglect.

The plural of the main verb *karšantari* in manuscript A (as opposed to
the singular *uizzi*) is not only confirmed by both duplicates, but the spelling
kar-š[*a*- allows only the restoration of a plural.[68]

---

62. 33.103 ii 6–8, ed. J. Siegelová, *StBoT* 14, 46–47 (lines 13–15).

63. Cf. D. Disterheft, *KZ* 97 (1984): 223–24.

64. For verbal agreement with two separate subjects, see W. Drohla, *Kongruenz*, 85–86. There
is no need to take the disagreement as a possible indication of the impersonal use of the phraseo-
logical construction as suggested by G. Dunkel, *MSS* 46 (1985): 78.

65. See above (12).

66. So H. C. Melchert, *3rdHitt.Cong.*, 416.

67. 24.3+ ii 14′–15′ (w. dupls, pre-NH/NS), ed. O. R. Gurney, *AAA* 27 (1940): 26–27;
R. Lebrun, *Hymnes*, 160, 169.

68. Compare the spellings and forms in E. Neu, *StBoT* 5, 82. According to G. Dunkel, *MSS* 46
(1985): 78, the incongruence might suggest an impersonal use of *uizzi* (see §6).

6. pai- and uṷa- *as Motion Verbs in the Phraseological Construction*

It has often been noted that *pai-/uṷa-* have lost most of their true function of motion verbs in the phraseological construction. The "secondary" character of the phraseological verb as compared to the main verb was already hinted at in some cases where the phraseological verb occupied clause initial position (cf. §4). That also from a semantic point of view *pai-/uṷa-* are not independent and full motion verbs is clear for a number of reasons. First of all, the verbs with which they are combined sometimes preclude any idea of motion. Compare, e.g.

(38) *nu* ¹*Ištapariịaš* MUNUS.LUGAL BA.ÚŠ EGIR-*pa*⸗*ma* <u>*uit*</u> ᵐ*Ammunaš* DUMU.LUGAL BA.ÚŠ⁶⁹
Ištapariya, the queen, died, and later Ammuna, the prince, came—died.

(39) GI[M-*a*]*n*⸗*ma*⸗*za* <u>*uit*</u> ŠEŠ-IA [ᵐ*Arnuṷandaš* DINGIR-*LIM kišat*]⁷⁰
W[he]n my brother [Arnuwanda] came—[became a god], (I, My Majesty, sat down on my father's throne).

In neither of these cases is it meant that the person who died came to a certain spot and subsequently died there. In (38) it is the sole event of dying which is important, and in (39) the temporal clause serves to indicate the exact moment and situation in which the new king came to power. In both cases a translation "he came (and) died" is impossible, and contrary to Dunkel's assertion an impersonal interpretation ("it happens/happened that . . .") seems the only one justifiable so far.⁷¹

The same is true for

(40) [*kuiš*]*š*⸗*an UL*⸗*ma uṷatezzi nu* <u>*uizzi*</u> [(*apēdani* U)]N-*ši*⸗*pat idalauēšzi*⁷²
[Whoev]er does not bring him, for that same person it will come—turn out badly.

With *apēdani* UN-*ši* "that person" referring back to the relative pronoun *kuiš*, which is the subject of *uṷatezzi*, the main verb *idalaṷēšzi* "it will turn out

---

69. KBo 3.1+ ii 31–32 (OH/NS), ed. I. Hoffmann, *THeth* 11, 30–31.

70. 19.49+ i 19 (NH), ed. J. Friedrich, *SV* 2, 6–7.

71. Cf. G. Dunkel, *MSS* 46 (1985): 59: "The impersonal translation is still sometimes used, though lacking all justification. I suggest using it only when no subject at all is expressed; where any overt subject is present, the personal "go/come (and) . . ." translation is preferable. At no time is hypotaxis involved." The fact that a modern rendering by way of hypotaxis ("it happens that . . .") often gives good results in these cases by no means implies that the modern translator interprets the Hittite construction as such.

72. 11.1+ iv (33/) 25′–26′ (OH/NS), ed. I. Hoffmann, *THeth* 11, 54–55.

badly" cannot but be impersonal, as is even acknowledged by Dunkel,[73] and this thus rules out the literal meaning "to come" for *uizzi*. The latter can only be taken in a more metaphorical sense of "it will come to pass that." This so-called impersonal use is not restricted to 3.sg. forms as shown by, e.g.

(13b) *mān UL=ma uuaši ḫarakši*

Here too a literal interpretation of *uuaši* "you will come (and die)" is impossible: this would lead to the contradictory message "If you do not come with the troops, you will come (and) die." The essential message is that the person in question will die if he does *not* show up with his troops. The form *uuaši* can only be taken in the impersonal sense "it will happen that you'll die" > "you will end up dead." It may at this point be remarked that in the truly impersonal examples only *uua-* seems to be attested.

Sometimes a translation "to come/go (and) do something" seems possible but is highly unlikely in the wider context. Compare for *pai-* "to go":

(41)   *n=aš* URU*Almina andan pait nu=šši* LÚKÚR *zaḫḫiia menaḫḫanda namma*
          UL kuiški mazzašta
       § *nu=za pait* URU*Alminan uetummanzi IṢBAT* [74]
       He went into (the town of) Almina and no further enemy resisted him in
          battle.
       § So he went—started to fortify Almina.

Since in lines 6–7 the king is already explicitly said to have reached and entered Almina, a translation of *pait* as "He went (and) . . ." is not only redundant but also illogical. A similar situation is found in

(42)   [*n=aš ap*]*iia paizzi n=at=za=kan paizzi ēp*[*zi*][75]
       [At that] moment she goes and goes—take[s] it.

and other examples.[76] For *uua-* compare:

(43)   *nu=war=an=kan IŠTU É.GAL-LIM katta uiēr uit=ma=ua*
          MUNUS'.LUGAL URU*Utruliaz ANA* dUTU-*ŠI EGIR-pa IŠPUR*[77]
       They sent her (i.e. the queen) down from the palace, but the queen came—
          sent back (a message) from (the town of) Utruli to His Majesty.

Because of cultic irregularities the queen had been temporarily banned from the court and the only way of communicating with her husband was by writing a letter. Translating "the queen came (and) . . ." would be in contradiction to the preceding clause and the indication of direction *ANA* dUTU-*ŠI*.

73. *MSS* 46 (1985): 59 and 74 n. 77.

74. *DŠ* 28 A i 6–9 (NH), ed. H. G. Güterbock, *JCS* 10 (1956): 90.

75. KUB 7.53 + 12.58 iv 16–17 (NH), ed. A. Goetze, *Tunn.*, 22–23.

76. A similar case is KBo 2.5 ii 5–6 (NH, ed. A. Götze, *AM*, 182).

77. 22.70 obv. 16–17, ed. A. Ünal, *THeth* 6, 58–59.

For phraseologically used *uя̯a-* another interesting indication is provided by those instances where it is combined with *pai-* in the full meaning "to go":

(44) *mān UL≠ma n≠ašta u̯u̯atteni IŠTU* SAG.DU.ḪI.A≠*KUNU paittani*[78]
      If not, however, you will come—"go with your heads" (i.e. pay with your life).

(45) GIM-*an≠ma u̯it* ŠEŠ-IA *ku̯u̯api INA* KUR *Miзrī pait*[79]
      When then my brother came—went to Egypt, . . .

In neither passage is it possible to take *uя̯a-* literally as first coming somewhere and subsequently going from that place to anywhere else. In (42) Ḫattušili's brother Muwatalli is last (ibid. ii 53) explicitly said to be staying in the city of Tarḫuntašša and is thus not coming anywhere. A likely third example is:

(46) [(*maḫḫan–m*)]*a u̯ēr* MU.ḪI.A-*uš* EGIR-*anda pāir*[80]
      But as the years came—went by, . . .

The editors of this famous text, known as *Muršilis Sprachlähmung*, A. Götze and H. Pedersen, translated "Als aber die Jahre kamen (und) hintereinander vergingen, . . ." taking this as two asyndetic clauses.[81] The word order characteristic for the phraseological construction, however, makes it more likely to interpret it with *CHD* as done here.[82] I know of no examples where phraseologically used *pai-* is combined with *uя̯a-* "to come," or where the same verb is used both phraseologically and as a main verb within one clause. I know of only one passage where *pai-* is attested with the deponent verb *iя̯a-* "to march, walk, go," which is indifferent as to direction:

(47) *n≠aš paizзi* ᴳᴵˢUMBIN-*laз iя̯atta*[83]
      He goes—walks on the left of the wheel.

To what extent the notion of direction inherent in the prefix *u-* was still felt in examples (44–46) is something we will have to get back to below (§8).

Finally, a comparison of virtually identical or parallel passages with a single clause containing a phraseological construction on the one hand, and two clauses on the other—of which the first has a form of *pai-/uя̯a-* as its main

78. 31.101 rev. 24′–25′ (MS), ed. E. Neu, *Kadmos* 21 (1982): 170–72 with literature.

79. *StBoT* 24 ii 69 (NH), ed. H. Otten, *StBoT* 24, 16–17.

80. 43.50+ obv. 6 (with dupls., NH), ed. A. Götze-H. Pedersen, *MSpr.*, 4–5.

81. Similarly H. M. Kümmel, *TUAT* II/2, 289 ("Als aber die Jahre kamen und vorbeigingen, . . ."); a free rendering is given by G. Beckman apud G. Frantz-Szabó in J. Sasson et al., *CANE*, 2010 (". . . when years later . . .").

82. So with the *CHD* P, 38a ("But as the years proceeded to pass"). Uncertain is the passage HKM 96:12′–16′ (*uя̯aši INA* KUR ᵁᴿᵁ*Ḫāя̯aša* [*pāiši*] . . . *nu≠za uя̯aši* ÉRIN.MEŠ.ḪI.A *nininku̯u̯anzi* [*pāiš*]*i* "and you will come[—go] to Ḫayaša . . . and you will come—[go] to mobilize troops," MH/MS, ed. S. Alp, *HBM*, 300–1), where *pai-* is twice broken away.

83. IBoT 1.36 iv 11–12 (MH/MS), ed. H. G. Güterbock and Th. van den Hout, *AS* 24, 32–33.

verb, followed by a second clause introduced by a conjunction and another verb in the same person, number, tense, and mode as the preceding form of *pai-/uṵa-* —shows that the difference between the two must have been slight. Compare the following two pairs of passages, each from the same text:

(48a) *n⸗aš paizzi* ᴳᴵˢ*ḫuluganni* GÙB-*za* ᴳᴵˢUMBIN *kattan tiiazzi*[84]
He goes—takes a stand to the left of the cart next to the wheel.

(48b) *n⸗aš paizzi ta* ᴳᴵˢ*ḫuluganni* ᴳᴵˢUMBIN GÙB-*laz tiiazzi*[85]
He goes and takes a stand at the left wheel of the cart.

(49a) *nu pāir* KUR ᵁᴿᵁ*Amka* GUL-*aḫḫir*[86]
They went—attacked Amka.

(49b) *nu⸗ṵar⸗at uēr nu⸗ṵa šumel* [*irḫ*]*an* KUR ᵁᴿᵁ*Amga ṵalaḫḫir*[87]
They came and attacked your [territ]ory, the land Amga.

The number of such pairs can easily be augmented.[88] In general it can be observed that sentences of the type (48b) and (49b) as well as their asyndetic counterparts (25–26) occur very frequently in Hittite, a point we will have to come back to shortly. One can also juxtapose passages from the same text with (a) and (b) without a phraseological construction but otherwise fully parallel:

(50a) *nu ABI ABI⸗IA apēdaš ṵalaḫḫūṵanzi iiattat ABU⸗IA ANA ABI ABI⸗IA laḫḫi* GAM-*an⸗pat iia*[*ttat*] *nu ANA ABI ABI⸗IA* DINGIR.MEŠ *piran ḫūiēr nu pait* KUR ᵁᴿᵁ*Māšša* ᵁᴿᵁ*Kammala⸗ia ḫarnik*[*ta*][89]
And my grandfather went to attack those (countries). My father wen[t] right next to my grandfather on campaign. The gods marched before my grandfather and he went—destroy[ed] the countries Māšša and Kammala.

(50b) *nu ABI ABI⸗IA apēdaš* [*ANA* UR]U.DIDLI.ḪI.A *ṵalḫuṵanzi pait* [*nu*] *ANA ABI* [*ABI⸗I*]*A* DINGIR.MEŠ *piran ḫūiēr nu* ᵁᴿᵁ*Katharii*[*an*] ᵁᴿᵁ*Ga*[*zza*]*pann⸗a ḫarnik*[*ta*][90]

---

84. IBoT 1.36 ii 13–14 (MH/MS), ed. H. G. Güterbock and Th. van den Hout, *AS* 24, 14–15.

85. IBoT 1.36 ii 42–43 (MH/MS), ed. H. G. Güterbock and Th. van den Hout, *AS* 24, 18–19 (where *n⸗aš paizzi* was inadvertently left untranslated).

86. *DŠ* 28 A iii 3–4 (NH), ed. H. G. Güterbock, *JCS* 10 (1956): 94.

87. *DŠ* 28 A iv 7–8 (NH), ed. H. G. Güterbock, *JCS* 10 (1956): 97.

88. Compare also *Kup.* §6 C8–9 and §9 C35, and see the passages adduced by Dunkel, *MSS* 46 (1985): 75 n. 88, although his example from *CTH* 376 (24.3+ ii 15′–17′ w. dupls.) contrasted with *CTH* 378 III (14.12 rev. 10′–11′) is doubtful since the *⸗ia* may not be a conjunction but adverbial "too": in the alleged substitution of the main verb for an infinitive in Laws §55 (*uēr . . . aruṵā*[*nzi*]) the second verb form is better taken as a regular 3.pl.pres. with Hoffner, *Laws*, 67.

89. *DŠ* 13 E i 10–14 (NH), ed. H. G. Güterbock, *JCS* 10 (1956): 65.

90. *DŠ* 13 D iv 33–35 (NH), ed. H. G. Güterbock, *JCS* 10 (1956): 66.

> And my grandfather went to attack those [tow]ns. The gods marched
> before m[y grand]father and he destroy[ed] the towns Kaṭḥariya and
> Ga[zza]pa.

The impression these passages leave is almost one of conflicting evidence.
Examples (50a–b) suggest that the force of the phraseological construction
was relatively weak and that with the additional evidence of (38–47) the
original value of motion verbs was only weakly felt. Examples (48–49), how-
ever, suggest that the latter could still be felt clearly.

7. *The Semantics of the Phraseological Construction*

In the introduction we referred to the two basic ways of translating a
phraseological construction: either by rendering *pai-* and *uu̯a-* literally and
inserting "(and)," or by using the impersonal translation "it happens/happened
that . . ." Dorothy Disterheft seems to have been one of the first to tackle
the problem of the semantics of this construction.[91] Starting from such sen-
tences as

(51) ᴸ�Ꭴ*MEŠEDI ḫaššan āppan dāi t꞊aš paizzi* DUMU.MEŠ.LUGAL
      DUMU.MUNUS.MEŠ.[(LUGAL)] *pēran tiēzzi*[92]
      The guard puts the hearth behind and goes—takes a stand in front of the
      princes (and) princesses.

she writes: "In these passages there are two separate sentences where the ac-
tion of the second sentence follows consecutively from the previous one. In
such cases the second action is contained in the *pāi-/uu̯a-* construction, which
only seems to indicate that the action of that particular sentence temporally
follows the preceding one. Thus, a more accurate translation for the motion
verbs in these sentences would be something like adverbial 'then.' "[93] In (51)
this results in a translation

> The guard puts the hearth behind and *then* takes a stand in front of the
> princes (and) princesses.

Although in a general sense this is certainly correct, we may legitimately ask
whether the "temporal consecutiveness" is not already often present in a nor-
mal sequence of two clauses with the same tense and without any adverbs or
conjunctions explicitly expressing the opposite. A translation with a simple
"then" may be too "colorless" and, moreover, overlaps with the adverb
namma (i.e. *namma* 1 in *CHD* s.v.) in the sense of "then, next, after that."[94]

---

91. *KZ* 97 (1984): 221–27.
92. KBo 20.12+ i 7–8 (*StBoT* 12, 10–11) OS.
93. *KZ* 97 (1984): 226.
94. See *CHD* L–N, 379–80.

As opposed to *namma*, the phraseological verb anticipates the categories of person and tense of the main verb. Especially the former category seems to be important here: The phraseological verb brings out the subject's initial reaction to the action contained in the preceding context. We already briefly saw (§4 with (25–26) and §6 with (48b–49b)) that clause sequences of a structure:

conjunction (+/-subject) *pai-/uṷa-* (+/-conjunction and constituents) verb

are frequently attested in Hittite texts. To our modern mind the first clause with the motion verb often sounds redundant and could be left out without any loss of meaning in the overall context. Compare, for instance

(52) *nu⸗za* ÉRIN.MEŠ [(*NARĀRU ŠA* KUR-*TI tepauṷaza* GAM-*an ēppūn*)]
      nu pāun nu⸗kan ᴸ[(ᵁKÚR *INA* ᵁᴿᵁ*Ḫaḫḫa damaššun*)]
      I took along the country's auxiliary troops in small numbers; I went and I
      oppressed the enemy in Ḫaḫḫa.[95]

The short clause with the motion verb (*pāun*) literally marks the transition from the preceding action ("I took along troops") to the one contained in the third clause ("I oppressed"), and the whole sequence seems to be mainly temporal. The phraseological construction is basically a shortened or syntactically reduced form of this.[96] The relationship between the purely temporally consecutive *namma* 1 and the phraseological construction can best be studied in the occasional passages where they occur next to one another, either in the same clause or in immediately adjacent clauses. 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. For *uṷa-* in direct context with *namma* 1, compare from the Prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal:

(53) LÚ.MEŠ ᵁᴿ[ᵁ(*G*)]*ašga⸗ma ḫalziṷani nu⸗šmaš* NÍG.BA.ḪI.A *piueni*
      namma⸗aš linganumani . . . § *nu⸗za uṷanzi* NÍG.BA.MEŠ *danzi namma*
      linkanzi[97]
      We will invite the Gašga-people and give them gifts. Then we will put
      them under oath: ("You must respect the offerings we send to the
      Storm-god of Nerik and let no one attack them while under way!")
      § Thereupon they will take the gifts (and) then swear the oath.

The second part of the quotation starting the new paragraph with the verbs *dā-* "to take" and *link-* "to swear an oath" runs parallel to the first part with

---

95. *StBoT* 24 ii 22–23, ed. *StBoT* 24, 10–11.

96. How this reduction came about will be shown later.

97. *CTH* 375.A iv 11–15 MH/MS, ed. E. von Schuler, *Kaškäer*, 160–61; R. Lebrun, *Hymnes*, 140, 147; cf. H.A. Hoffner, *EHGl.*, 72 n. 146, and *Laws*, 214–15.

the verbs *pai-/piịa-* "to give" and *linganu-* "to put under oath." The adverb *namma* twice gives the temporal sequence: first the giving/taking of the gifts and *then* the oath. The new element in the second part is the phraseological *uịanzi*. This describes the expected behavior of the Gašgaeans. Such a relationship between clauses that is both temporal and causal seems appropriately expressed by English "thereupon," German "darauf, daraufhin," and Turkish "bunun üzerine."[98] Another example involving *namma* and the phraseological construction—this time in the same clause—is (3):

> (3) The father of My Majesty saved you from Attaršiịa and you would have
> died without his help. § *namma꞊z uit ABI* ᵈUTU-*ŠI tuk* ᵐ*Madduụattan
> linkiịaš꞊šaš iēt*[99] Thereupon the father of His Majesty subsequently
> made you, Madduwatta, his sworn (vassal).

Whereas *namma* expresses merely the temporal sequence of events, the phraseological *uit* indicates in addition that the father of His Majesty took the next logical step arising from the preceding situation. The translations of *namma* (1. "then, next," 2. "once more, again," 3. "in addition, further(more)") all derive from its basic temporal meaning. Of course, *namma* will be found in contexts where an interpretation as proposed here for the phraseological construction fits as well, but then any temporal consecutive order of clauses— whether expressly marked as such (*namma, appa*/EGIR-*pa* etc.) or not—may by itself imply such a relation. It is the phraseological construction that makes it explicit.

For examples without *namma* or a similar adverb compare:

> (5) *kāša꞊ụa* ᴸᵁ.ᴹᴱˢ*šapašallēš pienun nu꞊ụa pāir* ᵁᴿᵁ*Taggašt[an]*
>   ᵁᴿᵁ*Ukuduipunann꞊a šapašiịaua[n dair]*[100]
>   (Kaššu says:) "Just now I have sent spies and they have thereupon
>   [started to] spy on (the towns of) Taggašt[a] and Ukuduipuna."

> (54) "The Hittite army just went for battle to (the town of) Ḫinduwa,
>   so block the road ahead of them and attack them!" So they brought forth
>   troops on the road to (the town of) Dalauwa, *nu uēr anzel*
>   ÉRIN.MEŠ-*TI* KASKAL-*an ēppir n꞊uš nininkir* and thereupon blocked
>   the road for our army and routed them.[101]

> (55) I, the Great King, marched concealed with my troops and chariots. The
>   mighty Storm-god, My Lord, had called for me Ḫašammili, My Lord, and

---

98. Compare *The New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*, which gives for *thereupon* the following meanings: "on that being done or said; (directly) after that," "in consequence of that," and "with reference to that."

99. *Madd.* obv. 13 (MH/MS), ed. A. Götze, *Madd.*, 4–5.

100. HKM 7:4–6 (MH/MS), ed. S. Alp, *HBM*, 128–29. Note the same sequence of "sending" and "spying" without phraseological *pai-*, ibid. 10f.

101. *Madd.* obv. 70–71 (MH/MS), ed. A. Götze, *Madd.*, 18–19.

he kept me concealed so that no one saw me. *nu₌ššan pāun* KUR
Piggainareišša šašti ualaḫḫun Thereupon I attacked (the country)
Piggainarešša in its sleep.[102]

(56) A priestess Iya reports an oracle investigation concerning a certain
person and asks for further investigations. § *nu uuauēn IŠTU*
MUŠEN.ḪI.A *namma arḫa kiššan ariiauen* Thereupon we conducted
further (*namma* 3) investigations through augury as follows: . . .[103]

Here too there is a causal relation between the clause with the phraseolog-
ical verb and the immediately preceding context: somebody sends spies, so
they spy; troops are ordered to block the road, so they block the road; the king
marches unseen, so he takes the enemy land unawares; an oracle is requested,
so an oracle is conducted. This interpretation also makes excellent sense in
those passages where a literal translation seems illogical:

(41) He went into (the town of) Almina and no further enemies resisted him in
battle. § *nu₌za pait* ᵁᴿᵁ*Alminan uetummanzi IṢBAT* He thereupon
started to fortify Almina.

Šuppiluliuma had been fortifying cities in the nearby region of Almina, but
the enemy had boasted that the latter city would never fall into his hands, so
after having taken the city in spite of the enemies' words the expected or logi-
cal next action in the present situation was its fortification.

As already said earlier, such a relation between clauses does not necessar-
ily have to be made explicit at all times, but the phraseological construction
emphasizes it. This explains the emphatic interpretation as proposed by Neu:
for instance, the prophecy of Teššub in (14) presents what will happen as a
consequence of the release of certain persons.

(14) And if you put the release into effect, I will praise your weapons . . .
[*nu₌u*]*a uizzi šumenzan* ᴳᴵˢTUKUL.ḪI.A–*KUNU* [*ḫarpa*]*nalliuš*
ḫullanniuan dāi [ᴬ⁻]ˢᴬ*ḫaršāuar₌ma₌ua₌šmaš uizzi* [*u*]*alliianni māi* [And]
thereupon your weapons will start defeating the [ene]mies, while your
fields will thereupon grow to your [f]ame!

It appears particularly well suited for those passages where any idea of
movement seems out of order. In an example like

(13d) *mān UL₌ma / uuaši ḫarakši*
If not however, you will come—die!

the addition of phraseological *uuaši* cannot be anything but emphatic: "You'll
end up dead!" A simple **mān UL₌ma / ḫarakši* "If not, however, you will die"

102. KBo 4.4+ iii 32–37 (NH), ed. *AM*, 126–29.
103. KuT 49:11–12 (MH/MS), ed. G. Wilhelm, *MDOG* 130 (1998): 178–79.

would have been enough to express the causal relationship between the two clauses, but the use of phraseological *uu̯aši* lends it the required emphasis. In a similar manner we can translate:

(40) [*kuiš*]*š=an UL=ma uu̯atezzi nu* <u>*uizzi*</u> *apēdani* UN-*ši=pat idalau̯ēšzi*
But [who]ever does not bring him, for that person it will <u>thereupon</u> turn
out badly!

The temporal-causal relationship likewise explains the perfective aspect as suggested by Dunkel: in many of the passages just quoted, the clause with the phraseological construction describes an action resulting from a preceding action.

8. *The Impersonal Phraseological* uu̯a-

In the preceding paragraphs we have come across several passages (13, 27, 38–40, 43–45) where the idea of motion seems to be improbable or even ruled out. In some of them (38–40, 43–45) the traditional translation by way of the expression "it happens/happened that . . ." fits well. It is striking that in these cases only the verb *uu̯a-* is found. To account for this it is useful to compare the verbs with which *pai-* and *uu̯a-* are combined within the phraseological construction (see Appendix below).

First of all it becomes apparent that *uu̯a-* occurs with many more verbs than *pai-*. This observation matches the significantly higher frequency overall of *uu̯a-* as a phraseological verb: approximately 60% *uu̯a-* to 40% *pai-*.[104] Secondly, only *uu̯a-* occurs with verbs indicating a state or change of state (*akk-, āšš-, ašiu̯antešš-, ḫappinešš-, idalau̯ešš-, kiš-, kururii̯aḫḫ-, mai-, nakkii̯aḫḫ-, naḫšarreške-, šeš-*). Thus it appears that *uu̯a-* had a wider range of usage than *pai-*. Both could be used to mark the transition from one action to another in the way described above (§7), with the choice between them ultimately depending on the point of view required by the context and regulated by the prefixes *pe-* or *u-*. But only *uu̯a-* could be combined with statives and fientives where the notion of real motion was absent.

This probably derives from the fact that the verb *uu̯a-* "to come" in the sense of "to reach" is inherently perfective—as opposed to *pai-*, which is either global or imperfective ("to go" in the sense of generally "being under way") or inchoative ("to go" in the sense of "to leave"). Its perfective aspect (or perhaps rather *Aktionsart*) enables the verb *uu̯a-* to indicate also the more metaphorical reaching of a point in time or in a chain of events (compare

---

104. Only indicative forms were counted. The pattern is already discernible in Dunkel's statistics, *MSS* 46 (1985): 72.

phrases with the verb "to come" in German: "es *kam* dazu, daß . . ." or English "it *came* about that . . ."). Passage (13) might be rephrased as

(13) You will come to the point where you will die!

In the 3.sg. this could lead to more impersonal cases such as:

(38) The blood of the whole royal family spread: *nu* ¹*Ištapariṇaš*
      MUNUS.LUGAL BA.ÚŠ EGIR-*pa⸗ma uit* ᵐ*Ammunaš* DUMU.LUGAL
      BA.ÚŠ Ištapariṇa, the queen, died and later it happened that Ammuna, the
      prince, died. (The "Men of the Gods," too, each said: "Behold, bloodshed
      is widespread in Ḫattuša.")

(39) GI[M-*a*]*n⸗ma⸗za uit* ŠEŠ-*IA* [ᵐ*Arnuṇandaš* DINGIR-*LIM kišat*]
      When it happened that my brother Arnuwanda became a god, (I, My
      Majesty, sat down on my father's throne).

(45) GIM-*an⸗ma uit* ŠEŠ-*IA kuṇapi INA* KUR *Mizri pait*
      When it happened that my brother went to Egypt, . . .

or the rare truly impersonal construction of (40)

(40) [*kuiš*]*š⸗an* UL⸗*ma uṇatezzi nu uizzi apēdani* UN-*ši⸗pat idalauēšzi*
      But [who] does not bring him, for that same person it will happen that it
      will turn out badly.

In the latter passage the phraseological clause again contains the result, so to speak ("it will thereupon turn out badly"), of the previously described action. This makes it likely that the impersonal use derives from the normal usage outlined above. In the other examples the temporal posteriority seems to be prominent. A translation with "thereupon" is nevertheless possible in these passages as well and may be taken to mark the described event as explicitly embedded in a series of events. Moreover, the adverb EGIR-*pa* "later, afterwards" of (38) makes it clear that here too the function of the phraseological construction cannot have been to mark a temporal relation only. It may well be that the death of Ammuna was felt to have been bound up with the death of his mother as in a chain of events ("and thereupon, Ammuna, the prince, afterwards died"), so it may also mark the climax of such a chain.

9. *Conclusions*

The verbs *pai-/uṇa-* within the phraseological construction indicate the transition between two actions that are closely and often causally related. The insertion of a motion verb into the context marks the transition or movement from one action to the other: by going or coming the subject's reaction or response to the previous action is introduced. Such an insertion is very typical of Hittite texts and can take different forms of decreasing syntactic autonomy,

compare the separate clauses of (25–26), (48b–49b), and (52) above. The next stage is represented by the phraseological construction.

Prerequisite is a preceding action that through a phraseologically construed clause is bound to the following action. A clause with a phraseological construction thus describes an action that stands in a general temporal-causal relationship to the action contained in the immediately preceding context. This relation can be aptly translated by way of English "thereupon" (German "darauf(hin)"), also in the impersonal use restricted to *uua*-. The translation using an inserted "(and)" is best reserved for true asyndeton as in (25–26).

Addendum

Only recently, I found a remark by Harry Hoffner himself suggesting a rendering for certain usages of the imperative 3.sg. *paiddu* "let him/her go (and do something)" similar to the one proposed here more generally for the phraseological construction. In JNES 27 (1968): 202 with n. 42 he translated this *paiddu* as "henceforth" in the name-giving passage in the Ullikummi story (cf. *CHD* L–N, 32b) and wrote: "I see no reason to translate *paiddu* in these instances as "let him go!" Instead, the form seems to be a rather specialized manner indicating futurity for the verb forms which follow it in sequence."

Appendix

uua- +	*pai-* +
ak- to die	
	aniia- to do, make
ar- (act.) to reach, arrive	
ariia- to investigate (per oracle)	
āšš- to remain, be left over	
ašiuanteš- to become poor	
auš- to see	
epp-/app- to take	*epp-/app-* to take
eš-/aš- to be	*eš-/aš-* to be (?)[a]
eš- (dep.) to sit down	*eš-* (dep.) to sit down
	ešša- to do, make
	ed-/ad- to eat

a. See above (32).

uua- +	*pai-* +
haliia- to kneel down	*haliia-* to kneel down
	halzai- to call
	hanna- to judge
happiness- to become rich	
har(k)- to have, hold	
	harnink- to destroy
hatkešnu- to close	
hatrai- to write, send	
huinu- to make run	
huittiia- to pull	
hulaliia- to wrap around	
hullanniia- to fight	
iia- (act.) to do, make	*iia-* (act.) to do, make
	iia- (dep.) to go, walk
immiia- to mix	
	išhiulahh- to regulate
išhuuai- to pour	
išparre- to spread	
ištamaš- to hear, listen	
idalauešš- to become evil	
kiš- to become, happen	
kuen- to kill, batter	*kuen-* to kill, batter
kuer- to cut	
kururiiahh- to take up enmity	
mai- to grow	
malle- to grind	
maniiah- to govern, show	
mema- to speak, say	*mema-* to speak, say
nahšarreške- to become frightened	
(*parā*) *nai-* to send out	(*parā*) *nai-* to send out
nakkiiahh- to become difficult	
pai- to go	

uua- +	*pai-* +
pai-/piịa- to give	*pai-/piịa-* to give
	parḫ- to chase
	peḫute- to lead
	piddaeške- to bring, carry
punuš- to question, ask	
šanḫ- to seek, search	*šanḫ-* to seek, search
	šapašiịa- to spy
šarra- to split, break	
šeš- to be lying down	
dā- to take, seize	*dā-* to take, seize
dai- to put, place	*dai-* to put, place
dammešḫai- to harm	
taninu- to bring into order	
tarḫ- to conquer	
	tarna- to let go
taštašiịa- to whisper	
tašuụaḫḫ- to blind	
te-/tar- to say, speak	*te-/tar-* to say, speak
tešḫaniške- to appear in a dream	
tiịa- to step	*tiịa-* to step
	tittanu- to put, place
uda- to bring	
ụaḫnu- to turn	*ụaḫnu-* to turn
	ụalleške- to praise (repeatedly)
ụalḫ- to attack	*ụalḫ-* to attack
ụarriịa- to come to rescue, help	
	ụarnu- to burn down
ụaštai- to sin	
ụemiịa- to find	
ụete- to build	*ụete-* to build
zinna- to stop, finish	