

## STUDIES IN THE HITTITE PHRASEOLOGICAL CONSTRUCTION II. ITS ORIGIN

Theo van den Hout

Als ich 1978 als junger Student Erich Neu zum ersten Mal in Wien im Rahmen einer Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft begegnete, war dies von entscheidender Bedeutung für meine spätere Laufbahn als Hethitologe. Im akademischen Jahr 1979-1980 hatte ich das Privileg, bei ihm studieren zu dürfen, und seitdem bin ich immer von seinen Arbeiten, seiner Arbeitsfreude, seiner steten Hilfsbereitschaft und seinem persönlichen Interesse tief beeindruckt gewesen. Ich möchte daher die folgenden Bemerkungen zur phraseologischen Konstruktion im Hethitischen, die ich in Anschluss an den ersten Teil dieser Untersuchung auch auf Englisch verfasse, seinem Andenken widmen.

### 1. Introduction

In part one of this study<sup>1</sup> the syntactic and semantic properties of the Hittite phraseological construction were discussed. The most important conclusions can be briefly summarized as follows. The phraseological form of *pai-* and *uwa-* usually stands in first position after another element in initial position with or without clitics (e.g. *nu =kan pāer ... kuener* “They went ... destroyed”). It can move into second position if a subordinate conjunction (*mān*, *maḥḥan*, *kuitman*) or indeterminate relative pronoun is added (*nu kuiš uizzi DUMU ... kiša* “Whatever son will come ... become”). Whether clauses where *pai-* and *uwa-* follow a freestanding subject in first position should be considered phraseological as well, is uncertain. If the phraseological verb itself takes up initial position, it mostly concerns a question, imperative or adhortative clause. Often, the verbs *pai-* and *uwa-* have lost their status as full motion verbs without, however, being grammaticalized to the extent, that it was no longer felt to be a verb. Agreement in person, number, tense and mode is practically without exception. A further development can be observed in *uwa-*, which is attested significantly more frequent than *pai-*. This is due to the fact that *uwa-* alone acquired an impersonal use (“it happened that ...”) probably developed out of its perfective aspect of “coming to a point/reaching a point, where ...”. The function of the phraseological construction is not only one of temporal consecutiveness but in addition describes the action of the phraseological clause as logically and almost causally following from the previous one. An apt translation is “thereupon.” Compare the following two representative examples:

- (1) I, the Great King, marched concealed with my troops (and) chariots. The Mighty Stormgod, My Lord, had called upon Ḫašammili, My Lord, and he kept me concealed, so that no one saw me. *nu =ššan pāun KUR<sup>URU</sup> Piggainarešša šašti walahḥun*  
Thereupon I attacked Piggainarešša in its sleep.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See my contribution to the FsHoffner 177-203. For abbreviations see *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (CHD), edd. H.G. Güterbock/H.A. Hoffner/Th. van den Hout, L-N (1989) xv-xxviii, P (1997) vii-xxvi, and Š vi-viii.

<sup>2</sup> KBo 4.4 iii 32-37, ed. A. Götze, AM 126-129.

- (2) Who will become king after me in future, let his brothers, his sons, his in-laws, further relatives and his troops be united! *nu=za uwaši*<sup>LÚ</sup> *KÚR-an utnē kuttani[t] tarahhan harši* Thereupon you will hold the enemies' country subdued with (your) might.<sup>3</sup>

In both cases the action described in the clause introduced by the phraseological verb logically and/or expectedly follows from the immediate preceding context. In (1) the help of the gods, especially that of Ḫašammili, enables Muršili to approach unseen and, as a consequence, to take the town of Piggainarešša unawares, "in its sleep." In Telipinu's Proclamation (2) the united support of the entire royal family rallying behind the king will result in a firm grasp of power by the king.<sup>4</sup>

## 2. Consecutive or serial?

The two terms found in linguistic theory to describe this kind of construction are consecutive and serial.<sup>5</sup> Often, the term consecutive is used for two (or more) verbs in uncoordinated sequence (or covert coordination) sharing the same features such as person, number, tense and mode, but still describing two distinct events or actions. Serial are combinations of two verbs likewise in uncoordinated sequence and sharing the same features, but describing a single event or aspect of an event. The second verb normally carries its full lexical meaning, whereas the first verb only modifies the meaning of the second one or that of the entire clause. In many languages, the first verb loses much of its verbal character and even grammaticalizes into an adverb, preposition, particle or any other non-verbal category (see below §3 for the quotative particle *-wa(-)/-war-* as an example of such a development in Hittite). Although this terminology is not shared by everybody<sup>6</sup> and the line between consecutive and serial will not always be easy to draw, it seems useful nevertheless.

Applying these terms to the Hittite material, a sequence like

<sup>3</sup> KBo 3.1+ ii 40-43, ed. I. Hoffmann, THeth. 11, 32-33.

<sup>4</sup> In practically all cases the relation between the clause with the phraseological verb and the preceding action is explicit, that is, the preceding action is given in the text. Only rarely does it seem to be implied as, for instance, in KBo 6.29 ii 25 (*pāiueni=war=an=kan kuennummēni* "Shall we, then, kill him (and bring you (his) head?)). Urḫitešsub is fleeing before Ḫattušili and on his way to Šamuḫa several of his men defect to Ḫattušili, whereupon they offer to kill Urḫitešsub for him and to bring his head to him. Since they could already have done so without consulting Ḫattušili first, they must have hoped to simply join him or they must have fallen into his hands rather than defected, as Ḫattušili wants us to believe. Their offer, then, has to be seen in relation to their reception by Ḫattušili. Their true dedication to Ḫattušili's cause was undoubtedly questioned at first upon which they must have offered to go back and kill him.

<sup>5</sup> See D. Lightfoot, *Principles of Diachronic Syntax* (Cambridge 1979), 213-228, D. Disterheft, *Diachronica* 3 (1986) 1-14, S. Luraghi in H. Aertsen/R.J. Jeffers (edd.), *Historical Linguistics 1989. Papers from the 9th International Conference on Historical Linguistics* (Amsterdam-Philadelphia 1993) (henceforth referred to as *Historical Linguistics 1989*), 267-281, C. Collins, *Linguistic Inquiry* 28 (1997) 461-497.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. D. Disterheft, *Diachronica* 3 (1986) 5, 11, maintaining that the condition of the two verbs together describing a single event is not necessary. For her the distinction between consecutive and serial is one of morphosyntax: serial are those constructions where the first verb has lost most or all of its verbal character. The position of *pai-/uwa-* in Hittite, the fact that clitics only go with the second verb, and that the two motion verbs are never accompanied by preverbs, are for her indicative of a reduced verbal status. Therefore, she terms this construction "serial." C. Collins, *Linguistic Inquiry* 28 (1997) 462f. with n. 3, does not use the term consecutive and defines as serial any succession of verbs and their complements sharing subject and tense but also an "internal" argument, i.e. any argument other than subject of an unergative or transitive verb.

- (3) [nu] = za kēdani EZEN-NI ezatten [e]kutten išpiyatten [n]inkatten<sup>7</sup>  
At this feast eat, [d]rink, satiate (and) [sa]tisfy yourselves!

- (4) The palace attendant that is [prese]nt, o[ffers] one sheep to the Sundeity of Heaven.  
They [c]ook the liver (and) heart on a fire. When they are done, I break three thick  
breads for the Sundeity. šēr = a = ššan<sup>UZU</sup> NÍG.GIG<sup>UZU</sup> ŠÀ kuirzi dāi<sup>8</sup>  
He (i.e., the palace attendant) cuts the liver (and) heart up over (the breads) (and) puts  
(them on the breads).

would fall under the category of consecutive. In (3-4) the activities expressed by the verbs are closely related in time and space and therefore can be joined in asyndeton. Or put differently, the asyndeton is an appropriate means to bring out that relation. Moreover, in both cases the initial particle seems to carry over from the first verb to the following: -za is required by all verbs in (3), and -šan is to be expected with dai- in (4) as well. However, the actions or events described by the verbs are clearly distinct. The same could be said of

- (5) t = aš paizzi DUMU.MEŠ.LUGAL DUMU.MUNUS.MEŠ.[(LUGAL)] pēran tiezzi<sup>9</sup>  
He goes (and) steps in front of the princes (and) princesses.

Here the relation between *paizzi* and *tiezzi* is strengthened by the single clitic subject -aš.  
The following two examples, on the other hand, would be serial:

- (6) [kuiš]š = an UL = ma uwatezzi nu uizzi [(apēdani U)]N-ši = pat idalauēšzi<sup>10</sup>  
[Whoev]er does not bring him, for that same person it will thereupon turn out badly.

- (7) n = aš<sup>URU</sup> Almina andan pait nu = šši<sup>LÚ</sup> KÚR zahḫiya menahḫanda namma UL kuiški  
mazzašta  
§ nu = za pait<sup>URU</sup> Alminan uetummanzi IŠBAT<sup>11</sup>  
He went into (the town of) Almina and the enemy no longer resisted him in battle.  
§ So thereupon he started to fortify Almina.

In the latter two cases the motion verbs *pai-* and *uwa-* have lost their full semantic property of motion verb<sup>12</sup> and we are no longer dealing with two distinct actions, but rather with a single event described as logically following the preceding action. Of course, (5) could be translated as serial as well and the line between consecutive and serial is difficult to draw in many cases. Since *pai-* and *uwa-* maintained their full verbal status morphologically, no formal distinction between the two can be made and in most cases the difference is purely semantic. I will therefore continue to use the term phraseological, when referring to the consecutive/serial construction involving the two motion verbs *pai-* and *uwa-*.

<sup>7</sup> KUB 36.97 iv? 4-6 (NS) = FsHoffner (29).

<sup>8</sup> KBo 15.25 rev. 7-8 (MH/NS), ed. Carruba, StBoT 2, 4f., with commentary *ibid.* 39; see also CHD Š s.v. -šan 1a1'h'; = FsHoffner (30).

<sup>9</sup> KBo 20.12+ i 7-8 (sim. *ibid.* i 2-3, OS), ed. E. Neu, StBoT 25, 63, cf. also *id.* StBoT 12, 10-11; = FsHoffner (18).

<sup>10</sup> KUB 11.1+ iv (33/25'-26') (OH/NS), ed. I. Hoffmann, THeth, 11, 54-55; = FsHoffner (40).

<sup>11</sup> KBo 5.6 i 6-9 (NH, = DŠ 28 A), ed. H.G. Güterbock, JCS 10 (1956) 90; = FsHoffner (41).

<sup>12</sup> See the discussion in FsHoffner referred to in the preceding two footnotes.

However, apart from the fact that *pai-* and *uwa-* did not always retain their full semantic property, the basic difference between sentences like (3) and (4) on the one hand and (5)-(7) on the other is word order: in the former the two verbs are not separated by any other constituents whereas the essential characteristic of the phraseological construction with *pai-* and *uwa-* is the fact that other constituents as a rule do appear between the two verbs.

### 3. Existing views on the origin of the phraseological construction

The most explicit theory on the origin of the phraseological construction involving *pai-* and *uwa-* has been put forward by George Dunkel.<sup>13</sup> He explains it as an extension of originally asyndetic clauses introduced by imperatives *it*, *itten* or *eḫu* “go/come (on)!” of the type:

(12) *nu īt* <sup>dUTU</sup> <sup>1</sup> *-i* <sup>dIM</sup> *ya mēm[(i)]ški*<sup>14</sup>

Now go, tell (it) to the Sungod and the Stormgod!

(13) *itten māḫḫanda are[(š = šmeš)] šumešš = a apeniššan īšten*<sup>15</sup>

Go, you (pl.) too perform (services) just like [your] colleague[s]!

(14) *eḫu pāiwani*<sup>16</sup>

Come, let us go!

Just like in a regular phraseological construction, clitics can stress the syntactic unity of the clause:

(15) *[ī]t = wa* <sup>dUTU-un</sup> *uwate*<sup>17</sup>

“[G]o, search for the Sungod!”

(16) *itten = wa* <sup>dUTU-un</sup> *uwate[itten]*<sup>18</sup>

“Go (plur.), search (plur.) for the Sungod!”

(17) *n = an itten zaḫḫeškitten*<sup>19</sup>

Now go (plur.), fight (plur.) him!

(18) *eḫ[u = w]a = za* <sup>INA KUR</sup> <sup>HUR.SAG</sup> *[Ḫari]yati ēšḫut*<sup>20</sup>

G[o], live on mount [Ḫari]yati!

From such second person imperative clauses with *it*, *itten* or *eḫu* the construction spread through first person (indicative) adhortative clauses (*paimi*, *paiwe/ani* and *uwami/uwaweni* “I will/want to go/come, Let us go/come”) to the third person indicative of *pai-* and *uwa-*. An important intermediate stage is that where in a speech situation involving a speaker and addressee, the answer to a command (“go, do that!”) is formulated by repeating the same words in the first person indicative (“Yes, I will go, do that”).

<sup>13</sup> MSS 46 (1985) 59-62, see also his later article *ibid.* MSS 58 (1998) 51-55.

<sup>14</sup> KBo 17.1 iii 5-6 (OS) w. dupl., ed. H. Otten, StBoT 8, 30f.

<sup>15</sup> KBo 6.2+KBo 22.62 iii 19-20 (= Laws §55, OS) w. dupls., ed. H.A. Hoffner, Laws 66-68.

<sup>16</sup> KUB 29.1 i 10 (OH/NS), ed. G. Kellerman, Diss. 10, 25.

<sup>17</sup> VBoT 58 i 26 (OH/NS), translit. E. Laroche, Myth. 23, translation H. Hoffner, Hittite Myths<sup>2</sup> 28.

<sup>18</sup> VBoT 58 i 21 (OH/NS, cf. *sim. ibid.* 27, 29, 32), translit., E. Laroche, Myth. 23, translation H.

Hoffner, Hittite Myths<sup>2</sup> 28, cf. FsHoffner (12).

<sup>19</sup> KBo 26.65 iv 14 (= KUB 33.106++, Ullik. 3rd tabl., NS), ed. H.G. Güterbock, JCS 6 (1952) 30-31.

<sup>20</sup> KUB 14.1+ obv. 17 (MS), ed. A. Götze, Madd. 4f.

While endorsing the basic assumptions of Dunkel's theory Silvia Luraghi elaborates on the specific position in the sentence of phraseologically used *pai-* and *uwa-*, an issue not commented upon by Dunkel.<sup>21</sup> She starts from the premise that by the time our (Old) Hittite sources begin to flow Hittite had given up the relatively free word order of Proto-Indo-European (PIE) for a rigid Subject-Object-Verb (SOV) structure. From a typological point of view Luraghi compares the Hittite quotative particle *-wa(r-)* and the Latin form *inquit* "he/she says/said" which is usually found embedded in the direct speech it is supposed to introduce. The Hittite particle *-wa(r-)* originated from a full verb *\*werh<sub>1</sub>-* "to speak, say" which subsequently developed into a clitic attached to the initial element of direct speech. That it became a clitic is due to the fact that already within PIE verbs of speaking could be embedded in direct speech, immediately or almost immediately following the element in initial position as illustrated by Latin *inquit*. When Hittite had rigorously generalized the SOV word order, it reanalyzed and grammaticalized the originally orthotone but embedded full verb form *\*werh<sub>1</sub>t* "he/she says/said" into the particle as we know it, since its position no longer reflected standard Hittite word order. Now, in the case of motion verbs, imperatives of the type seen above in (12-18) mostly occupied clause initial position in PIE as well, just as we observe it with Hittite *it*, *itten* and *ehu* in (13-16) and (18).<sup>22</sup> However, Luraghi adduces the Latin *eam ipsus i roga* "go ask her yourself"<sup>23</sup> to show that a so-called Post-Wackernagel position for the imperative with preceding pronouns (*eam ipsus*) was possible in PIE as well. It is this word order variant which in Hittite would then have been generalized in the phraseological construction.

### 3. Objections to the existing views

As rightly seen by Luraghi, the specific constraints for the position of the phraseological verb in the clause as outlined above and described in some detail in the first installment of this study constitutes a problem for Dunkel's explanation. It does not account for the unmarked first position after an initial element with or without clitics or the second position after a subordinate conjunction or relative pronoun. Starting from imperative sentences where initial position seems to be the unmarked one, the same position might have been expected as the basic one for *pai-* and *uwa-*.

A second objection to Dunkel's theory is that it fails to explain, why the phraseological construction is only found with *pai-* and *uwa-*. If the root *i-* as preserved in the imperative forms *it*, *itten* and *ehu* had indeed been the (sole) starting point, one would have expected the extension to indicative forms through the paradigm of the deponent verb *iya-/iye-* (or Old Hittite *ya-/ye-* with at least two active forms<sup>24</sup>) as well. In spite of its deponent status synchronically *iya-/iye-* is most likely to have been associated most closely with especially the two isolated imperative forms *it* and *itten*. Even if the two motion verbs *pai-* and *uwa-* had still been transparent as composita containing the root *i-*, according to the principle

<sup>21</sup> Historical Linguistics 1989, 275-278.

<sup>22</sup> Compare Dunkel's remark (MSS 46 (1985) 78 n. 121) for not including imperatives in his statistics of phraseological motion verbs.

<sup>23</sup> Plautus, Menaechmi 637 (IV.2, 75), ed. A. Gratwick, Plautus, Menaechmi (Cambridge 1993), 99.

<sup>24</sup> KBo 22.2 obv. 7 *ya-an-zi* (OS, ed. H. Otten, StBoT 17, 6f.; cf. dupl./par. KBo 26.126 (= HFAC 2), 3' -e]n-zi), cf. N. Oettinger, Stammbildung 348f., H.C. Melchert, AHP 129; and (KUB 33.66+) KBo 40.333 iii 6 *i-ez-zi* (OH-MH?/MS, ed. D. Groddek, ZA 89 (1999) 38, 40, cf. commentary ibid. 46, 47). For an overview of the medio-passive forms see E. Neu, StBoT 5, s.v.; for *i-e-et-ta* KBo 17.43 i 10' (OS) see E. Neu, StBoT 25, 105.

mentioned by Dunkel that the crucial stage is the one where an addressee repeats the imperatives of the speech partner whereupon “the shifting between imperative and indicative modes often leads to new indicative formations based on the imperative”<sup>25</sup> one would have expected the phraseological construction to involve at least the verb *iya-/iye-* as well. Yet, to my knowledge this most neutral *verbum eundi* or its imperfective-inceptive derivation *iyanna/i-*<sup>26</sup> “to set out, start to walk” are never found used phraseologically the way *pai-* and *uwa-* are. It is true that the sg. *it* and *eḫu* function as the suppletive sg. 2 imperatives to *pai-* and *uwa-*<sup>27</sup> respectively but for the pl. 2 this only partially true in the sense that imperatives *paitten* and *uwatten* do exist beside *itten*. The pl. 2 imperative *uwatten* is even used phraseologically in the MH/NS Ritual for Deities of the Netherworld:

(19) *nu=za uwatten ezzatten ekutten*<sup>28</sup>  
Come, eat, (and) drink!

Since the particle *-za* is not normally expected with the motion verb *uwa-* this clause fulfills the basic requirement of a phraseological construction. A similar example for *paitten* does not seem to be attested.<sup>29</sup>

Following Dunkel, Luraghi’s position faces the same objections but she does try to solve the word order problem. Although the — highly uncertain!<sup>30</sup> — Latin example from Plautus may furnish a model for a non-initial position of a phraseological imperative, it has to be borne in mind that while for phraseological indicatives in Hittite first position after a sentence connective with or without clitics is the unmarked situation, phraseological imperatives normally occupy initial position.<sup>31</sup> It thus remains hard to explain the unmarked first position starting from imperatives as per Dunkel and Luraghi and it remains to be seen whether interjected or embedded imperatives like *it* and *itten* played a role in the development of the Hittite phraseological construction.

#### 4. An alternative proposal

An alternative solution may be sought in the fact that for Old Hittite, as we saw, it is very difficult to find certain examples of the phraseological construction. Only one attestation seems certain:

(20) *ta=kkan paizzi* <sup>LÚ</sup>L[UL- (dupl. <sup>LÚ</sup>*tarašijan*)] *šipanti*<sup>32</sup>

<sup>25</sup> MSS 46 (1985) 61.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Hoffner/Melchert., GsImparati 378.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. HE 1, 90.

<sup>28</sup> KBo 10.45 iv 12 (MH/MS, ed. H. Otten, ZA 54 (1961) 136f.).

<sup>29</sup> The attestations quoted in CHD P 21a are all non-phraseological; for a further likely instance cf. KUB 57.4 rev. 6 (NS).

<sup>30</sup> Some editions do not print the *i*, others bracket it. The *i*, moreover, is metrically suspect, cf. P. Thoresby Jones, T. Macci Plauti Menaechmi (Oxford 1918), 165f., A. Gratwick, Plautus, Menaechmi (Cambridge 1993), 201. A less problematic parallel might have been Terentius’ Adelphoe 917 *tu illas abi et transduce* “Off you go! And bring them over!”, for \**tu abi et illas transduce*. This is described as an example of hyperbaton (cf. R.H. Martin, Terence, Adelphoe (Oxford 1976) 230, quoting another instance involving *properare* “to hasten”), which is often metrically motivated.

<sup>31</sup> See I §4.

<sup>32</sup> KBo 17.43 i 8-9 (OS) = I (8), ed. E. Neu, StBoT 25, 104, for dupl. cf. Neu, StBoT 26, 257; for discussion see FsHoffner (8).

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

The fact that the simplex *pai-* without any constituents indicating origin or direction does not warrant the use of the particle *-kan* and, moreover, that *šipant-* without that particle would mean “to offer” in the sense of “to slaughter” as opposed to *≠kan šipand-* “to consecrate, dedicate”, makes it highly likely that we are dealing here with a true phraseological construction in Old Script.<sup>33</sup> But other cases in Old Hittite are ambiguous at best. Even the presence of certain clitics may not be of any help as in

- (5) *t= aš paizzi* DUMU.MEŠ.LUGAL DUMU.MUNUS.MEŠ.[LUGAL] *pēran tiezzi*  
He goes (and) steps in front of the princes (and) princesses.

Simple clauses of this kind (connective +/- enclitics — *pai-/uwa-* — asyndetically followed by another clause) can be found several times in Old Hittite texts. Compare the following additional examples in Old Script:

- (21) *t]= aš paizzi* <sup>LÚ.MEŠ</sup> *MEŠEDI-an pēran tiezzi*<sup>34</sup>  
He goes (and) steps in front of the bodyguards.  
(22) *n= aš uizzi* DAM <sup>LÚ</sup> *GUDU<sub>12</sub>-aš katt[(a tiēzzi)]*<sup>35</sup>  
He comes (and) steps next to the priest's wife.

From Old Hittite compositions in later copies we can add the following:

- (23) *apāšš= a uit* LUGAL-*i tet ... apāšš= a uit* QATAMMA IQBI<sup>36</sup>  
Then one came (and) said to the king ... the other too came (and) spoke likewise.  
(24) *nu uiz[zi šA AMA=ŠU ŠEŠ.MEŠ=ŠU NIN.MEŠ=ŠU=ya / u]ddār ištamaški[zz]*<sup>37</sup>  
H[e will] come (and) listen each time to the [w]ords [of his mother, his brothers and his sisters].  
(25) *nu lē uizzi app[izziy]an* [KUR-*e=mit ḫarnamniy]azi*<sup>38</sup>  
Do not let him come (and) la[te]r [sti]r up [my country]!  
(26) *nu paiuwen* KUR <sup>URU</sup> *Ilanzura*<sup>KI</sup> *parḫuen*<sup>39</sup>  
We went (and) attacked the country (of) Ilanzura.  
(27) *š= e pāir* ḪUR.SAG-*i š[annapil]i paḫhur parir*<sup>40</sup>

<sup>33</sup> See A. Goetze, JCS 23 (1970) 85-92; for some exceptions cf. G. McMahon, AS 25, 67 n. 55. It is difficult to prove that this rule was already productive in Old Hittite but the body of Old Hittite ritual texts as collected and analyzed by Erich Neu in StBoT 25 and 26 shows no apparent exceptions (for *išpant-/šipant-* see StBoT 26, 80-82). In most cases liquids are the object of the verb and it has no particle. Only once does *šipant-* with certainty have *-kan*, where the object is a black lamb (Bo 3752 = StBoT 25 no. 104 ii 3'; ). In other passages with animals as possible objects of *šipant-* no sentence beginning has been preserved (StBoT 25 no. 56 i 14', iii 15", no. 74 r.col. 3'). The normal verb for “to slaughter” seems to be *ḫuek-*.

<sup>34</sup> KBo 20.12+ i 2-3 (OS), ed. E. Neu, StBoT 25, 63, cf. also id., StBoT 12, 10-11.

<sup>35</sup> KBo 17.15 rev.! 18' w. dupls., translit. E. Neu, StBoT 25, 74.

<sup>36</sup> KBo 3.34 ii 4, 6, ed. P. Dardano, Aneddoto 44-45.

<sup>37</sup> KUB 1.16 ii 20-21 (OH/NS), ed. F. Sommer/A. Falkenstein, HAB 4f.

<sup>38</sup> KUB 1.16 ii 29 (OH/NS), ed. F. Sommer/A. Falkenstein, HAB 4f.

<sup>39</sup> KBo 3.60 iii 11' (OH/NS), ed. H. Güterbock, ZA 44 (1938) 108f.

They went (and) made a fire on a deserted mountain.  
 (28) *ta uwami kī āppa ūk at/la-x*<sup>41</sup>  
 I (will) come (and) this I (will) ... [ ... ] back/again.

All of the above examples look as if they might be phraseological constructions. The nominative of the enclitic pronoun *-a-* occurring with certain types of intransitive verbs only<sup>42</sup>, *≠aš* in (5), (21) and (22) can go with both *paizzi/uizzi* and *tiezzi*, so they very well could be phraseological constructions indeed. Because of that same particle, however, (27) with certainty cannot be an example of a phraseological construction: since *parai-* “to blow on, fan (a fire)” is a transitive verb, the enclitic nom.pl. *≠e* can only belong to *pāir* and we are therefore clearly dealing with two asyndetically joined clauses.

How close asyndeton and two coordinated clauses can be, is clear from the following Middle Hittite pair:

- (29a) *n≠aš paizzi* <sup>Giš</sup> *huluganni* *GÜB-za* <sup>Giš</sup> *UMBIN kattan tiyazzi*<sup>43</sup>  
 He goes-takes a stand to the left of the cart next to the wheel.  
 (29b) *n≠aš paizzi ta* <sup>Giš</sup> *huluganni* <sup>Giš</sup> *UMBIN GÜB-laz tiyazzi*<sup>44</sup>  
 He goes and takes a stand at the left wheel of the cart.

But to ask ourselves whether in examples (5), (21-26, 28) and (29a) we have genuine phraseological constructions or just asyndetically joined clauses is probably academic. It is striking that such a use of *pai-* and *uwa-*, where to our feeling the short clause containing the motion verb is almost redundant<sup>45</sup>, is especially frequent in Old(er) Hittite. The fact that all of the above passages except for (27) (and of course (29b)) can be interpreted as phraseological constructions and sometimes both verbs, describing two continuous and closely related actions, can share the same clitic subject, seems to be a more likely point of departure for the later phraseological construction.

In such short independent clauses of a structure

- a. connective +/- clitics — *pai-/uwa-*
- b. overt subject +/- clitics — *pai-/uwa-*
- c. connective +/- clitics — subordin.conj./relat.pron. — *pai-/uwa-*

the form of *pai-* or *uwa-* takes up the usual final position of any verb. Once another clause with the same subject asyndetically joins the preceding clause with the motion verb and the two are considered a unity, the motion verb finds itself in first (a-b) or second position (c, after subordinating conjunctions like *mān* or *kuwapi* or the relative pronoun) in a phraseological construction. It is the unmarked word order with verb-final position of separate clauses which in combination with asyndeton gave rise to the phraseological

<sup>40</sup> KBo 3.34 i 2-3 (OH/NS), ed. P. Dardano, Aneddoto 28-29.

<sup>41</sup> KBo 40.368, 3' (OH/NS), for the dating cf. H. Hoffner, JCS 49 (1997) 107.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. in detail A. Garrett in A.L. Halpern/A.M. Zwicky (edd.), *Approaching Second. Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena* (Stanford, CA 1996), 85-133.

<sup>43</sup> IBoT 1.36 ii 13-14 (MH/MS), ed. H.G. Güterbock - Th. van den Hout, AS 24, 14-15 = FsHoffner (48a).

<sup>44</sup> IBoT 1.36 ii 42-43 (MH/MS), ed. H.G. Güterbock - Th. van den Hout, AS 24, 18-19 (where *n≠aš paizzi* was inadvertently left untranslated) = FsHoffner (48b).

<sup>45</sup> See I §7.

construction. This approach seems to account easier for the specific position of the verbs *pai-* and *uwa-* than the one starting from imperative clauses with *it*, *itten* and *eḫu*.

As stated above and earlier, the majority of phraseological constructions with the form of *pai-* and *uwa-* in initial position concerns imperative clauses and questions. But even for the indicative clauses with initial *pai-/uwa-* we do not have to depend on imperative clauses with *it/itten* to account for their position. Again, we can go back to Old Hittite word order. Apart from the regular SOV structure the older language still shows quite a few examples for a VSO order. For the motion verbs compare the following examples:

- (30) *uēt* NIM.LÀL-*aš* <sup>GIŠ</sup> *ḫuppari anda* <sup>KUŠ</sup> *kuršan = šan daiš uēt* <sup>d</sup> *Miyadanzipaš* <sup>GIŠ</sup> *īppiaš kattan ešadi*<sup>46</sup>

The bee came (and) put its hunting bag in the (wooden) *ḫuppar*-container.

*Miyadanzipa* came (and) sat down under the *īppiaš*-tree.

- (31) *pait* NIM.LÀL-*aš* *n = an arnut* <sup>KUŠ</sup> *kuršan*<sup>47</sup>

The bee went and brought it, the hunting bag.

- (32) *pāit = aš* [MUN]US-*za n = aš = za ITTI* <sup>m</sup> *Appu waššanza šeškit*

She went, [the wom]an, and she went to sleep with Appu, fully dressed.<sup>48</sup>

- (33) *pait = aš* <sup>d</sup> *Ḫapantaliyaš n = aš = ši kattan tīet*<sup>49</sup>

*Ḫapantaliya* went and stepped next to him.

Whereas in (31-33) the subjects NIM.LÀL-*aš*, MUNUS-*za* and <sup>d</sup>*Ḫapantaliyaš* because of the obvious clause boundary (i.e. the following sentence connectives *nu* in *n = an*, *n = aš* and *n = aš = ši* respectively) belong to *pait* “he/she went” only, NIM.LÀL-*aš* and <sup>d</sup>*Miyadanzipaš* in (30) can be considered to bind the two verbs *uēt* and *daiš/ešadi* together into a unity with the subject strategically in the middle.

The sharing of a single particle by both the motion verb and the following one in the case of intransitives was crucial to the feeling of such sequences as a syntactic unity. We can distinguish three types of these sequences (where clitic<sub>1</sub> + verb stands for any sequence of a subject clitic and a verb, i.e., either *n = aš pait* or *pait = aš*):

- a. clitic<sub>1</sub> + verb — connective — clitic<sub>1</sub> + verb (e.g. (32-33))
- b. clitic<sub>1</sub> + verb — connective — ∅ verb (e.g. (29b))
- c. clitic<sub>1</sub> + verb — ∅ — ∅ verb (e.g. (5, 21, 22, 29a))

These three are not necessarily chronological stages of ever increasing reduction but rather stylistic choices of growing unity of which the last one eventually led to the placing of clitics which could strictly taken only go with the second verb as observed in (19). Although with an intransitive second verb c might already be considered phraseological, only sequences like (20) are unequivocally phraseological.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>46</sup> KUB 33.59 iii 11-13 (OS), translit. E. Laroche, Myth. 90, translation H. Hoffner, Hittite Myths<sup>2</sup> 31; for the script see E. Neu, Hethitica 6 (1985) 151.

<sup>47</sup> KUB 33.59 iii 5 (OS), translit. Laroche, Myth. 89, translation H. Hoffner, Hittite Myths<sup>2</sup> 30.

<sup>48</sup> KUB 24.8+ i 29-30, ed. J. Siegelová, StBoT 14, 6f. For the inchoative “went to sleep” as translation of the *-ške*-form *šeškit* cf. H.C. Melchert, III.Hitt.Kongr. 415.

<sup>49</sup> KUB 28.4 ii 22 (NS), translit. E. Laroche, Myth. 16, translation H. Hoffner, Hittite Myths<sup>2</sup> 36.

<sup>50</sup> An additional but tentative consideration I would like to offer is the following. As already observed by others, Old Hittite had an accusative of direction with both animate and inanimate nouns: cf. J. Friedrich, HE 120 (§201), H. Otten - V. Souček, StBoT 8, 62 with n. 6 and 7, E. Neu, Lok. 30-31 n. 67, S.

## 5. Phraseological constructions in the other Anatolian languages

Before we go any further, we need to ask ourselves to what extent the phraseological construction can claim to be of already Proto- or Common Anatolian descent. Dunkel, as we saw, traces the phraseological construction back to imperative sentences containing *it*, *itten* or *eḫu* and compares their forms and use with Vedic and Greek material. This leads him to “consider the phraseological construction as an innovation of pre-Hittite”<sup>51</sup>, while at the same time admitting, that one needs Luwian and Palaic evidence to claim it as a Common Anatolian feature.<sup>52</sup>

The only languages which offer comparable material are Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luwian. The Palaic corpus offers two possible forms of a root *i-* “to go, walk, march”: a 2.sg.imperative *iu* (*i-ú*), and a 1.pl.pres. *iuini* (*i-ú-i-ni*).<sup>53</sup> But neither context offers anything relating to the issues under discussion here. In Cuneiform Luwian we have three examples from a single early 14th century text of the root *i-* “to go” in clause initial position asyndetically followed by another verb in the same person, number, tense and mode.

- (34) [*i*]ūnni = wa <sup>d</sup>EN.ZU-anzanza kummayan[anza?/ ḫa]tayannanza āpan ḫizzaūn[ni] §  
*iyandu* = ku = wa zaššin DUMU-annašši[n] ānnin warallin uwata[ndu]  
 ( ... )  
 [p]a = wa *iyandu* <sup>d</sup>EN.ZU-inzi x[ ... ] kummayanza ḫatayannanza apan ḫizzaindu<sup>54</sup>  
 We will [go] (and) hand that (child) over [to the] sacred ... of the Months. §  
 [Let them] go (and) bring this child’s own mother!  
 ( ... )  
 Let the Months go hand over that (child) to the sacred ... !

On the one hand, the word order with the forms of *i-* in initial (*iūnni* =, *iyandu* =) or first position (*pa* = wa *iyandu*) as well as the sharing of a single particle = wa with the following verb in all three sentences has the looks of the Hittite phraseological construction. On the other hand, the Cuneiform Luwian attestations do not go beyond what Dunkel describes as the first stage of the PIE use of such imperatives in Anatolian<sup>55</sup> that he sees as eventually leading to the Hittite construction. Moreover, as we have seen<sup>56</sup>, in closely related actions a single particle can be shared by two or even more verbs in the same syntactic construction. There is no evidence for a similar use of *awi-* “to come” in Cuneiform Luwian.

---

Luraghi, KZ 99 (1986) 28-29, R. Francia, IL 19 (1996) 149-150. If, what was possible for animate nouns was possible for clitics referring to those nouns also, this may have contributed to a possible syntactic ambiguity in clauses like: [*nu* = w]ar = an paizzi kās NIM.LĀL-aš uemiy[azzi] (KUB 33.5 ii 12 (OH/NS), translit. Laroche, Myth. 40, transl. Hoffner, Hittite Myths 18) “Will this bee go (and) find him?”. If so, an interpretation “Will this bee go to him (and) find (him)?” cannot be ruled out and might have been instrumental in developing the phraseological construction as we know it.

<sup>51</sup> MSS 46 (1985) 60. One can rightly wonder, I think, about the reality of a “pre-Hittite” stage as distinct from Proto- or Common Anatolian.

<sup>52</sup> MSS 46 (1985) 74 n. 78.

<sup>53</sup> For *iu* see O. Carruba, StBoT 10, 58, for the text and its analysis see id., Pal. 2, 8-10. For *iuini* see Melchert, KZ 97 (1984) 30, AHP 199.

<sup>54</sup> KUB 35.103 ii 11'-14', iii 1-3 (ENS), translit. F. Starke, StBoT 30, 222; for the date see ibid. 218f.

<sup>55</sup> MSS 46 (1985) 60: “Given imperatives in the second person, a need then arose for equivalents in the first and third persons.”

<sup>56</sup> FsHoffner §3.2.

The considerably larger corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian texts offers two potential examples only. One is the late TOPADA inscription from the middle of the 8th century BC, likewise using the root *i*-:

- (35) *wa=s* (“PES<sub>2</sub>”) *ira apasati* (ANIMAL) EQUUS-*wati* OMNIS-*MI-ti* EXERCITUS-*lati=s* *ha apasin* FINES+*RA/I+HI*-NEG<sub>2</sub> *zari tarīta*<sup>57</sup>  
And he went (and) with all his chariots and troops established(?) his own frontier here(?).

As noted by David Hawkins, after the verb form (“PES<sub>2</sub>”) *ira* (= rhotacized /ita/) “the next verb follows asyndetically as with Hitt. *pai*-, and *uwa*-.”<sup>58</sup> However, Hieroglyphic Luwian seems to follow the same rules for the subject clitics as Hittite<sup>59</sup> and the clitic *s(a)* in *wa=s*, therefore, can only go with the intransitive *ira* and not with the transitive *tarīta* governing the accusative object *apasin irhin* “his frontier.” This implies, that syntactically we are dealing with two distinct clauses and that we have to assume asyndeton here just as in the Old Hittite example (27). As a consequence, this example has to be dismissed as evidence for the phraseological construction in Hieroglyphic Luwian.

The second passage attested on the BABYLON stela of uncertain date is more interesting.<sup>60</sup> It reads as follows:

- (36) *a<sup>n</sup>ta=pa=s* *wa=s* *ta* REL-*is* CRUS-*i* (“\*471”) *azai pazai*<sup>61</sup>  
(He) who comes in, eats, drinks, (... for him ...).

This passage had already been quoted as one of the few examples of asyndeton in Hieroglyphic Luwian and is accepted as such by Hawkins.<sup>62</sup> The verb CRUS(+*RA/I*)- is normally taken as “to stand”, read as *ta*-, and linked to Hitt. *tiya*- “to (take a) stand.” Taking it as a phraseological construction related to the Hittite one, does not recommend itself in spite of its resemblance to the Hittite phraseological construction. This would suppose an extension of the construction to verbs other than (those composed with) *i*- which in itself supposes a fully developed and productive construction using the latter stem. With the evidence at hand this seems highly unlikely. Again, we are in all likelihood dealing with a series of closely related actions. Like in Cuneiform Luwian, nothing comparable can be found with any of the other Hieroglyphic Luwian motion verbs.<sup>63</sup>

In all their scarceness these Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luwian attestations offer us some interesting insights vis-à-vis the Hittite construction. First of all, neither language has gone beyond the root *i*- concerning anything resembling the Hittite phraseological construction. In doing so, Cuneiform Luwian stays well within the confinements of an

<sup>57</sup> TOPADA §8, ed. J.D. Hawkins, CHLI I/2, 453.

<sup>58</sup> CHLI I/2, 456.

<sup>59</sup> See Melchert, IF 97 (1992) 45 n. 25, and A. Garrett, HS 105 (1992) 204, and id. in A.L. Halpern/A.M. Zwicky (edd.), *Approaching Second. Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena* (Stanford, CA 1996), 116 n. 13.

<sup>60</sup> Ed. J.D. Hawkins, CHLI I/2, 391-394.

<sup>61</sup> BABYLON 1 §10, ed. CHLI I/2, 392: “(He) who comes in, (and) eats(?) (and) drinks(?)”

<sup>62</sup> See the commentary by Hawkins, CHLI I/2, 394. P. Meriggi, Man. I, 98 mentions a few further examples of “verbal asyndeton”, not all of which are still relevant. Instances of asyndetically joined clauses are likewise rare, compare KARABURUN §4 (CHLI I/2, 481) and CEKKE §6a-b (CHLI I/1, 145), explained by Hawkins, CHLI I/2, 482, as explanatory parentheses.

<sup>63</sup> For a listing see J.D. Hawkins, *Kadmos* 19 (1980) 131.

adhortatory use, where asyndeton is the rule rather than the exception. Hieroglyphic Luwian only seemingly goes a step further with the 3.sg.pret. indicative and thus beyond the first stage as described by Dunkel. However, the passage in question cannot be considered phraseological and has to be added as a further example for the otherwise rare phenomenon of asyndeton in this language. That the asyndetic juxtaposition of clauses describing two closely related actions by the same subject, involves one with a motion verb is not surprising and we might even witness here an embryonic stage of what might - independently - have evolved into a phraseological-like construction. But since little more than half a century later the Hieroglyphic Luwian script ceased being used, we will probably never know.

##### 5. *Closing remarks*

The above passages from Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luwian show that the Hittite phraseological construction was an inner-Hittite development not shared by any of her Anatolian sister languages, and that, as a consequence, it is not to be projected back into Common Anatolian or even earlier. The fact that the construction is an inner-Hittite development, supports, I think, that it had little to do with the root *i-* preserved in its imperatives *it* and *itten* or the isolated *ehu*, and even less so with the Vedic and Greek parallels adduced by Dunkel. When this construction started to develop, the verbs *pai-* and *uwa-* seem to have been already fully dissociated from *iya-*. We can see the phraseological construction develop in Old Hittite, growing out of originally asyndetically joined clauses with unmarked word order describing two closely related actions, where the function of the motion verb is to bridge the logically following reaction to the one preceding the clause containing the motion verb. The syntactic unity of these clauses is often stressed by their sharing a single clitic subject. This then led to the next stage where the motion verb could be preceded by clitics which strictly taken could be combined with the second verb only. Although the preceding stage might already be called phraseological, only the latter can with certainty claim that name.