

John Benjamins Publishing Company



This is a contribution from *Studies in Language* 44:4
© 2020. John Benjamins Publishing Company

This electronic file may not be altered in any way. The author(s) of this article is/are permitted to use this PDF file to generate printed copies to be used by way of offprints, for their personal use only.

Permission is granted by the publishers to post this file on a closed server which is accessible only to members (students and faculty) of the author's/s' institute. It is not permitted to post this PDF on the internet, or to share it on sites such as Mendeley, ResearchGate, Academia.edu.

Please see our rights policy on <https://benjamins.com/content/customers/rights>

For any other use of this material prior written permission should be obtained from the publishers or through the Copyright Clearance Center (for USA: www.copyright.com).

Please contact rights@benjamins.nl or consult our website: www.benjamins.com

From verb to New Event Marker

A new look at the Hittite *pai-* and *uwa-* constructions

Silvia Luraghi

University of Pavia | National Research University Higher School of Economics

In Hittite, deictic motion verbs *pai-* ‘go’ and *uwa-* ‘come’ may co-occur in a monoclausal structure with a second verb that carries the lexical meaning. As yet, their exact function remains obscure. I argue that motion verbs involved in such construction underwent transcategorization and function as New Event Markers. I show that this development is best explained as an instance of constructionalization involving both the motion verbs and the second verb in the clause, which is based on a pragmatic inference arising when motion verbs were used without a spatial complement. Either motion verb contributes a different semantics to the construction based on the different perspective regarding the deictic center identified by the ego, whereby *pai-* ‘go’ (motion originating from the deictic center) marks an event as close in time and controlled, while *uwa-* ‘come’ (motion originating outside the deictic center) indicates distance in time and possible lack of control.

Keywords: motion verbs, New Event Marker, deictic center, constructionalization

1. Introduction

Hittite has two deictic motion verbs, *pai-* ‘go’, formed with the prefix *pe-* ‘thither’, which indicates motion away from the deictic center identified with the speaker, and *uwa-* ‘come’, formed with the prefix *u-* ‘hither’, which contrariwise indicates motion toward the speaker (Kloekhorst 2008: 660–661, 909–910). These prefixes also occur in other pairs of deictic verbs, such as *penna-* ‘drive (there)’ and *unna-* ‘drive (here)’, but only the verb pair constituted by *pai-* and *uwa-* has undergone a peculiar process, by which the two verbs can occur in contexts in which they

no longer convey their proper meaning, and do not function as predicate of an independent clause. This is best exemplified by occurrences such as (1), in which, clearly, no motion is indicated.

- (1) GI[M]-an= ma= za uit ŠEŠ- YA [(^mArnuwandas
 when CONN PTC come.PRT.3SG brother my A.NOM
 DINGIR^{LIM} *kisat*)]
 god become.PRT.3SG
 ‘When my brother Arnuwanda (came) became a god (=died).’
 (KUB 19.49 i 19)¹

In (1) the semantic information concerning the event encoded in the sentence is conveyed only by the second verb (the speaker’s brother died). Syntactically, we have to do with a monoclausal structure rather than with two asyndetically coordinated clauses, as shown by the fact that P2 clitics precede the motion verb, but have scope on the second verb (in this case, the particle =za which usually accompanies the verb *kis-* when it means ‘become something’; see Hoffner & Melchert 2008: 324–329). On the referential plane, we find a single event denoted by two fully inflected verbs, which share the same TAM and agreement categories.

This type of construction, traditionally called ‘phraseological’ (Friedrich 1960: 159–160), was first described as an instance of verb serialization based on typological parallels in Luraghi (1993) followed by Garrett (1990);² see further Luraghi (1996, 1998), Yates (2014) and van den Hout (2010) on the origin of the construction. In this paper, I would like to pursue further the issue of the meaning and function of the construction, including different motivations for the use of either motion verb, also based on the findings in Rieken (2010) concerning differences in their distribution. Rather than focusing on the process of grammaticalization undergone by the two verbs, I propose a constructional approach, and consider the construction formed by the motion verb plus the second, agreeing verb as a single linguistic unit.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 I briefly introduce the notions of ‘construction’ and ‘constructionalization’, and describe the construction of the two motion verbs in this perspective (2.1). I then propose a unified account of the discourse function of the construction, by which both motion verbs are shown

1. Hittite texts are referred to following the common practice of citing the edition. Texts quoted in this paper belong to the following editions:

ABoT = *Ankara Arkeoloji Müzesinde bulunan Bogazköy Tabletleri*

KBo = *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*

KUB = *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi*

2. The paper published as Luraghi (1993) was read at the 9th ICHL in New Brunswick in 1989.

to behave as New Event Markers (2.2), and describe the constructionalization process that gave rise to the construction (2.3). Following this, I address the issue of the different distribution of either verb across tenses, moods, and semantic features of the whole construction, which I explain based on their different deictic meaning (2.4). In Section 3 I discuss the possible origin of the construction, and the reason for its increasing frequency in the course of the attested history of Hittite. I also speculate on possible further developments of the construction, had written attestations not ended abruptly after the fall of the Hittite empire. Section 4 contains the conclusion.

2. The *pai-* and *uwa-* plus agreeing verb construction

Among issues addressed in the literature concerning the nature of *pai-* and *uwa-* in the construction discussed in this paper is whether they should be regarded as serialized verbs, or as consecutives (for a summary, see van den Hout 2003). Some have even cast doubts on whether the term ‘serial’ can be used at all in a language in which only motion verbs occur in such construction (Yates 2014).³ In addition, in typological literature there is some disagreement on whether items of verbal origin that only have grammatical function and no longer express their meaning must be considered serial verbs or not (compare for example Haspelmath 2016 and Aikhenvald 2018, especially pp.20–52). To avoid further terminological discussion, which does not seem to be especially insightful for the purposes of the present paper, I will refrain from using either term.⁴ Rather, I will regard the construction as a holistic unit, in which either motion verb is accompanied by a verb that bears the same inflectional morphology, and a single event is referred to by the two agreeing verbs. I elaborate on this approach in the following sections.

3. See further Koller (2015) for a different view.

4. Note in any case that the Hittite construction shows all features listed in the definition of serial verb constructions as defined in Aikhenvald (2006: 4):

A serial verb construction (SVC) is a sequence of verbs which act together as a single predicate, without any overt marker of coordination, subordination, or syntactic dependency of any other sort. Serial verb constructions describe what is conceptualized as a single event. They are monoclausal; their intonational properties are the same as those of a monoverbal clause, and they have just one tense, aspect, and polarity value. SVCs may also share core and other arguments. Each component of an SVC must be able to occur on its own. Within an SVC, the individual verbs may have same, or different, transitivity values.

A more detailed version of this definition can be found in Aikhenvald (2018: 3–4).

2.1 Grammaticalization and constructionalization

Rieken (2010) neatly describes the grammaticalization process undergone by Hittite motion verbs, and shows that available occurrences attest to different levels of grammaticalization throughout the history of Hittite. This is not surprising: indeed, both verbs retain their lexical meaning in various other constructions (Section 2.3), and the fact that more or less grammaticalized occurrences surface at the same time is only to be expected, and well-known developments of motion verbs in other languages offer possible parallels. As an example, one can mention the English *be going to*, a construction that often indicates future, but can also indicate concrete motion. I will return to this construction further on in this section. Thus, in Hittite texts one finds occurrences in which motion verbs cannot be taken as indicating motion, as in (1), others in which they do, and, in addition, many in-between occurrences, in which the motion component is not excluded.

Rieken (2010:222) compares (2) and (3). While in (2) *pai-* can indicate motion, but can also be taken semantically non-significant, in (3) the sentence boundary marked by the connective *ta* clearly shows that the latter analysis is not available. Indeed, while (2) must be analyzed as being monoclausal on account of the position on the P2 clitic =*za*, (3) clearly contains two separate clauses.

- (3) *nu= za panzi AŠAR- ŠUNU appanzi*
 CONN PTC go.PRS.3PL place their take.PRS.3PL
 ‘They (go) take their places.’ (KBo 4.9 v 45)
- (3) *DUMU^{MES}.É.GAL appa panzi ta= z AŠAR- ŠU[NU appanzi]*
 palace.servants back go.PRS.3PL CONN PTC place their take.PRS.3PL
 ‘The palace servants go back and take their places.’ (KBo 20.8 i 20’)

In Example (2), the clitic =*za* (so-called reflexive particle) has scope over the verb *appanzi* ‘they take’, even though its placement is dependent on *panzi* ‘they go’. Indeed, P2 clitics such as =*za*, personal pronouns, and local particles are placed after the first word in the sentence containing the verb over which they have scope (see Luraghi 1990:13–17; Hoffner & Melchert 2008:410–412, and Luraghi 2017:276–278). In its turn, example (3) contains the connective *ta* that marks a sentence boundary, and hosts the clitic =*za*. Note further that in (2) there is no overt subject for the verb *panzi* ‘they go’, and this is at odds with the fact that third person forms of intransitive verbs in Hittite require an overt subject, either an NPs as in (3) or a clitic pronoun (see Hoffner & Melchert 2008:280–283).

Up to now, I have used the word ‘construction’ in a loose sense. However, a better understanding of Hittite motion verbs can be gained by considering them parts of a construction in the technical sense (see Goldberg 1995), which I propose to call the *pai-/uwa-* plus agreeing verb construction(s) (abbreviated

pai-/uwa-AV). In this perspective, a construction is a holistic unit, a conventionalized pairing of form and meaning whose global meaning is not compositional, that is, it is not the sum of the meanings of its parts.

A number of studies have tackled the issue of the rise and development of constructions in the framework of diachronic construction grammar (Bergs & Diewald 2008, 2009; Hilpert 2013; Traugott & Trousdale 2013; Barðdal et al. 2015). Focusing on the dynamics of language change, Traugott & Trousdale (2013) distinguish between constructional change, that they view as affecting one internal dimension of a construction (2013: 26), from constructionalization, that is, the rise of a new construction. They describe the latter development as follows:

Constructionalization is the creation of form_{new} - $\text{meaning}_{\text{new}}$ (combinations of) signs. It forms new type nodes, which have new syntax or morphology and new coded meaning, in the linguistic network of a population of speakers. It is accompanied by changes in degree of schematicity, productivity, and compositionality. The constructionalization of schemas always results from a succession of micro-steps and is therefore gradual. (Traugott & Trousdale 2013: 22)

Traugott (2014: 8) further discusses the relation between an approach based on grammaticalization and the constructionalization perspective by discussing the English *be going to* construction. Traugott shows that while the former focuses on changes undergone by a specific morpheme (in this case the verb *go*), the latter describes the diachronic process as a change that encompasses the whole construction consisting of the verb *go*, the ending *-ing*, the occurrence of a verb immediately after *to*, associated with an “increase in the accessibility of the temporal implicature arising from the purposive *to*-clause” (Traugott 2014: 8). The implicature, based on a pragmatic inference that places a purpose in the future with respect to the time of utterance, becomes part of the semantics of the construction. This development must be kept in mind when analyzing the different distribution of Hittite *pai-/uwa-AV* constructions.

2.2 Function of the *pai-/uwa-AV* construction

In spite of the fact that the *pai-/uwa-AV* construction has been the object of numerous studies, its meaning and function remain somewhat puzzling. Neu (1995) describes the function of the construction with the present/future as indicating an emphatic future, as in (4) and (5).

- (4) *n= at= mu menahhanda uer nu= mu*
 CONN 3PL.NOM 1SG.OBL toward come.PRT.3PL CONN 1SG.OBL
memir paiueni= war= an= kan kuennumeni nu= wa= tta
 speak.PRT.3PL go.PRS.1PL QUOT 3SG.ACC PTC kill.PRS.1PL CONN QUOT 2SG.OBL
 SAG.DU-*an utumeni n= as UL tarahhun*
 head.ACC bring.PRS.1PL CONN 3PL.ACC not let.PRT.1SG
 ‘They came toward me and told me: “We shall (go) kill him and shall bring his
 head to you!” I did not allow them (and they did not kill him).’

(KBo 6.29 ii 24–26)

- (5) *man= za I URU= ma kuinki assasti nu= kan kasma*
 IRR PTC one city CONN INDEF.ACC establish.PRS.2SG CONN PTC behold
 NIŠ DINGIR^{LIM} *sarratti n= an= kan uwami* LÚKÚR-*as*
 oath gods break.PRS.3SG CONN 3SG.ACC PTC come.PRS.1SG enemy.D/L
iwar GUL-ahmi
 as fight.PRS.1SG
 ‘If you found any (new) town, then pay attention: you will break the oath, I
 will (come) fight against it as an enemy.’

(KBo 5.13 i 34–35)

Similarly, van den Hout (2003) argues that the two verbs highlight the sequence of the events, often in cases in which a consecutive shading is also inferable from the context, and proposes the translation ‘thereupon.’ Van den Hout then describes the use of *uwa-* in occurrences such as (1) as ‘impersonal’, corresponding to English ‘it happened then’ (2003: 199–200). He explains the apparent difference between the meaning of the *uwa-* construction in (1) and (5) as due to an extension, whereby “the impersonal use derives from the normal usage outlined above”, possibly through a partial bleaching of the meaning ‘thereupon’, that he considers original and that might apply to both (4) and (5).

The difference in the meaning of the *pai-AV* and the *uwa-AV* construction has been further investigated in Rieken (2010), and I will return to this issue in the next section. There is in any case a general agreement in the literature on a common core. In all occurrences the construction indicates an event which is sequentially ordered following the event in the preceding clause, or in the preceding context in cases in which it occurs at the beginning of a new narrative unit, as in (1). Thus the *pai-/uwa-AV* construction indicates forward movement in the action. Note, however that the construction occurs in sentences that are either paratactically (hence iconically, i.e. reflecting the course of the events) arranged, as in (4) and (5), or at the beginning of new narrative units, as in (1), so the structure of discourse itself points to forward motion in the action, even without the intervention of *pai-/uwa-AV* construction. The additional contribution of the

construction, then, is to highlight some events, marking them as especially relevant, and causing them to stand out on the background of other events in the text.

How does the construction achieve this effect? As Traugott (2014) points out discussing the English *be going to* construction, one should consider both verbs involved in the construction (see Section 2.1). Motion verbs in the Hittite *pai-/uwa-AV* construction have lost their normal semantics, in much the same way as the form *be going to* in the English construction. As argued by Traugott, the semantic contribution of *be going to* is constituted by the temporal implicature arising from its purposive meaning. In its turn, the Hittite construction originated from a paratactic structure, in which two separate events are encoded in sentences that are iconically ordered and reflect the course of the events (see Sections 2.3 and 3). The two motion verbs however no longer refer to a separate event, and this is shown by the fact that the construction is monoclausal, so the effect of constructionalization is that we have a single event that is encoded by two verbs, constituting a unit in which the semantic contribution of the first verb remains in the implicature brought about by motion that I will discuss in Section 2.3 in the framework of the constructionalization process that favored the rise of the construction.

The property of the *pai-/uwa-AV* construction of referring to a single event by means of two verbs that share the same TAM and agreement categories still needs to be emphasized. By being referred to through a heavier construction, the event is perspectivized and highlighted as new and focal. In this way, through constructionalization, the two verbs acquire the function of New Event Markers (NEM; see Kuteva et al. 2019: 94–95). Notably, in the *pai-/uwa-AV* construction the two motion verbs functioning as NEMs have undergone de-categorialization, as they no longer function independently as verbs, in spite of showing full verbal morphology. As extensively argued in the literature, they cannot take spatial complements, and do not trigger the occurrence of third person clitic subjects independently of the second verb. I will return to this point in Section 3.

Parallels to the Hittite construction have been described in several African languages. König et al. (2015: 109–110) show that in Akie, an endangered Nilotic language spoken in Tanzania, “the suppletive verbs for ‘go’ and ‘come’ serve most of all... in narrative texts to highlight an event expressed by the following verb phrase or clause”. Examples are (6) and (7) (glosses are by the authors).

- (6) *ko to pwa ko ééch-it(u) ar-ko ye muréénee*
 until go.PL.P NAR big-INC P-3.PL become.P warriors

‘They (the twins) (went and) grew up and became warriors.’

(König et al. 2015: 109–110)

- (7) *tomá a kas si ko nyô kóó pun oll- í*
 not.yet 1.SG hear.P PURP 3.PL come.P 3.MP.S PAS LOC.REL- D.PR
 ‘I haven’t heard yet where he’s (come and) passed by.’
 (König et al. 2015: 109–110)

In much the same way as in Hittite, in the Akie Example (6) the verb *pwa* ‘go’ “perspectivize[s] what follows – that is, it functions as part of a fully grammaticalized new-event marking construction” (König et al. 2015: 109–110). Similar to the Hittite construction, the Akie construction may also occur in contexts in which a motion meaning is not completely ruled out: compare *uwami* in (5) and *nyô* in (7). This last example also shows that, again as in Hittite, the construction is not limited to main clauses but can also occur in subordinate clauses, as in (1). Even in such occurrences, notably, the motion verbs involved do not take complements (NPs or adverbs) that indicate direction (see Section 2.3).

A similar construction occurring in Kera, a Chadic (Afro-Asiatic) language, is described in Ebert (1987). In Kera, the two deictic motion verbs *bì* ‘come’ and *dé* ‘go’ also occur in sentences in which they do not indicate motion, do not take directional complements, but highlight the new event as being relevant in discourse. Ebert further shows that similar constructions occur with deictic motion verbs in neighboring languages, to the extent that the Tupuri (Niger-Congo) verb *raw* ‘go’ has been borrowed into Kera as a connective meaning ‘then.’ More discussion on similar developments can be found in Aikhenvald (2018: 178).

Perspectivization of an event as new and focal is easily visible in Example (1), which occurs at the beginning of a paragraph. This passage is from a treaty of king Mursili II. The king, addressing his vassal Manapa-Tarhunta, describes some events that preceded the present agreement and provide some background for the conditions that were being stipulated with it. The sentence in (1) starts a new paragraph, and refers to a turning point marked by the connective =*ma* (see below), introducing events that happened after the Mursili became king, following his older brother Arnuwandas. Notably, the preceding paragraph also features a sentence with the *uwa*-AV construction, refers to a focal event, and a further occurrence of this construction introduces the action taken by Mursili after his brother’s death in favor of his vassal. See Examples (8) and (9).

- (8) *mahh[an= ma= k]an uit* ^m *Ura-^D Tarhuntas NIS̄* DING[IR-LIM
 when CONN PTC come.PRT.3SG Ura-Tarhunta.NOM oath gods
sarrait]
 break.PRT.3SG
 ‘When Ura-Tarhunta broke the oath.’ (KUB 19.49 i 14)

- (9) [D^U]TU-ŠI= ma= za= kan ANA G^{IŠ}ŠÚ.A [ABĪ- YA *eshahat*] [n]u=
 My.Majesty CONN PTC PTC ON throne father my sit.PRT.MID.1SG CONN
tta uwanun D^UT[U-ŠI EGIR-*an tiyanun*]
 2SG.OBL come.PRT.1SG My.Majesty back put.PRT.1SG
 ‘(When my brother Arnuwanda died), I, My Majesty, seated myself on my
 father’s throne. Then I, My Majesty, started backing you.’ (KUB 19.49 i 19–21)

The occurrence of different connectives =*ma* and *nu* in (1), (8) and (9) is important for the organization of discourse. The sentences in (1) and (8), which occur at the beginning of new paragraphs, are temporal clauses, feature the adversative connective =*ma*, whose function is to indicate “discontinuity, either on the text level, or on the level of the events narrated in the text” (Luraghi 1990: 50; see further Kloekhorst 2008: 537, Widmer 2009: 328 and Luraghi & Inglese 2018: 267–268). In (1) and (9) the information contained in =*ma* clauses offers some background information for the events that follow, including the information that Mursili became king (‘I seated myself on my father’s throne’). The next sentence (‘then I started backing you’) is introduced by the connective *nu*, an additive marker which signals a return to the main the course of the events. The *uwa*-AV construction combines with both connectives, contributing its own meaning: it calls special attention on some of the events, which, by being encoded in this heavier construction, stand out as new and especially relevant. I provide the translation of the whole passage, in order to make my point clear.

§ 1... Your father left you, Manapa-Tarhunta [...], and you were a child. Your brothers [...] and Ura-Tarhunta, repeatedly tried to kill [you]. [They] would (indeed) have killed you, [but you] escaped. They drove you out of [the land of the Seha-]river. You then [went] over to the people of the town Karkisa. They (sc. your brothers) [took away] from you the land and the house of your father: they took them for themselves. [I, His Majesty, had recommended you, Manapa-Tarhunta] to the people of the town Karkisa. My brother (sc. Arnuwanda) also had repeatedly sent [them] gifts in your favor, and people of the town Karkisa protected you upon [our] word.

§ 2 When NEM Ura-Tarhunta broke the oath, the oath gods seized him. The people of the land of the Seha-river expelled him, and let you go back, and protected you [under our] word.

§ 3 (I. 19–33) When NEM my brother [Arnuwanda became a god] I, My Majesty, [seated myself] on [my father’s] throne. Then NEM I, My Majesty, started backing you. I [protected] the people of the land of the Seha-river because of you, [and they protected] you under my [word].

(For the Hittite text and different translations, see Friedrich 1930: 4–7; Beckman 1996: 77–78; Wilhem & Fuscagni 2020: CTH 69 (INTR 2014-02-17).)

Three events are encoded with the *uwa-AV* construction: Ura-Tarhunta's breaking of the oath that enabled Manapa-Tarhunta to return to his homeland, the death of king Arnuwanda, who had backed Manapa-Tarhunta during his exile, and the support offered by Mursili in continuity with his brother's actions. Notably, the construction is never obligatory: it constitutes an addition to Hittite's numerous devices, most importantly sentence connective, that contribute to make explicit the discourse status of specific pieces of information.

2.3 Constructions of Hittite motion verbs and constructionalization

The process of constructionalization, and the rise of the *pai-/uwa-AV* construction can be outlined based on different types of constructions in which motion verbs can occur. In the first place, one must consider that, when motion verbs express their proper meaning and indicate concrete motion, one may find two different types of occurrence, either with or without a spatial complement that specifies the direction or the source of motion. The *pai-/uwa-AV* construction takes its origin from the second type of occurrence. The passage in (10) contains several different occurrences of *pai-* and *uwa-*, and can serve as an example.

- (10) a. MU-*anni* =*ma* INA KUR ^{URU} *ziharriya paun*
 year.D/L CONN in country Z. go.PRT.1SG
- b. *nu*= *za* ANA PANI ABI ABI- YA *kuis* ^{URU} *gasgas*
 CONN PTC to face father father my REL.NOM city Kaskaean.NOM
^{HUR.SAG} *tarikarimun GEŠPUN-az esat*
 T.mountain fist.ABL occupy.PRT.3SG
- c. *namma*= *as*= *za* ^{URU} KÛ.BABBAR-*si* *hargas*
 furthermore 3SG.NOM PTC H.-D/L danger.NOM
kisat
 become.PRT.3SG
- d. *nu uer* ^{URU} KÛ.BABBAR-*san* GUL-*hir*
 CONN come.PRT.3PL H.-ACC make.war.PRT.3PL
- e. *n*= *an mekki dammeshair*
 CONN 3SG.ACC much damage.PRT.3PL
- f. *nu* ^DUTU-Ši *paun*
 CONN My.Majesty go.PRT.3SG
- g. *nu*= *za* ^{HUR.SAG} *tarikarimun* *kuis* ^{URU} *gasgan*
 CONN PTC T.-mountain REL.NOM city Kaskaean.ACC
esan harta
 occupy.PTCP have.PRT.3SG

- h. *n= an GUL-un*
 CONN 3SG.ACC conquer.PRT.1SG
 ...
- i. *namma EGIR-pa^{URU}KÛ.BABBAR-si uwanun*
 furthermore back H.D/L come.PRT.1SG
- j. *nu ki INA MU 1.KAM DÛ-nun*
 CONN DEM.ACC.PL in year one do.PRT.1SG

‘(a) The following year I went to the land of Ziharriya. (b) Certain groups of Kaskaean who at the time my grandfather had occupied the mountains of Tarikarimu by force, – (c) then there was calamity for Hattusa – (d) attacked Hattusa, (e) and greatly pressured it. (f) Then I, His Majesty, went; (h) and I attacked those (g) Kaskaean who had occupied the mountains of Tarikarimu.... (i) Then I came back to Hattusa. (j) This I did in one year.’

(KBo 3.4 iii 57–66; translation adapted from Younger 1990:157; note that in the translation the clause in (h) precedes the clause in (g), contrary to the order in the Hittite text; see further Goetze 1933: 80–81).

As remarked, the two verbs can take a spatial complement and/or a spatial adverb, as in the case of *INA KUR^{URU} ziharriya paun* ‘I went to the country of Z.’ in (10a) and *EGIR-pa^{URU}KÛ.BABBAR-si uwanun* ‘I went back to Hattusa’ in (10j). In such cases, the sentence that contains the motion verb can be the first of a series of new events, but this is not necessarily the case. In (10), the two sentences rather serve the function of setting a frame for the deeds accomplished by the king in a certain year, which start with an expedition in a foreign country, and end with his return to the Hittite capital. The sentences (10b) and (10c) offer some background information for the action taken by the king. They contain a relative clause and a main clause, whose subject is different from the subject of the motion verb in (10a). Sentence (10f), which resumes the narration of the king’s action, contains the second possible construction of motion verbs, that is, without a spatial complement (notably the direction of motion in this specific case is already known from sentence 10a). Here, the sentence is followed by another sentence that indicates what has been done immediately after the motion event. We find again a relative clause (10g) and the main clause (10f). Remarkably, the subject of the main clause is the same as the subject of the motion verb in (10f).

In fact, this is typical of occurrences in which a motion verb does not take a spatial complement, but is followed by another clause that also denotes an action: it is expected that if one moves and the focus is not on the spatial location to which s/he moves, then it is the mover’s participation in the following event that is focused. This is the pragmatic inference in the case that the motion verb still preserves its concrete meaning. Through constructionalization, it becomes part of

the semantics of the construction through different degrees of abstraction, from ‘someone proceeds to bring about/undergo an event’ to the final meaning ‘someone does indeed bring about/undergo and event’. Notably, this ensuing meaning is captured by the translations proposed for this construction in the literature, including ‘thereupon’ or ‘it happened that’.

This development is made clear in sentence (10d), which features an occurrence of the *pai-/uwa-AV* construction. Even though the indication of motion is still possible here, the verb *uer* cannot be considered as standing in an independent clause: the structure is monoclausal, as it does not contain any subject clitics, which, as remarked in Section 2.1, are obligatory with motion verbs (as with other intransitive verbs) in case a third person subject is not overtly expressed. Thus, *uer* must better be taken as a NEM in this sentence.

It needs to be remarked that, as noted by Traugott (2014) in her discussion of the *be going to* construction, in case a of constructionalization involving two verbs it is not only one that undergoes a semantic/functional change. Rather, it is the complex built up by the two verbs that acquires a new meaning. Recall that, in the case of the *be going to* construction, it is the occurrence of a verb immediately after *to* that supports the temporal implicature (see Section 2.1). With the *pai-/uwa-AV* construction, it is the behavior of clitics that, by pointing toward a monoclausal structure in which an event is referred to by a heavy construction that includes two verbs, gives a special status to the event and triggers the extension of the pragmatic inference. Hence, the meaning ‘someone does indeed bring about/undergo and event’ is integrated into the meaning of the construction.

2.4 Differences between the *pai-AV* and the *uwa-AV* construction

Thus far, I have spoken of the *pai-/uwa-AV* construction as a single unit of meaning. However, it is likely better to keep two sub-constructions distinct based on the specific motion verb. Indeed, differences between the two have been pointed out by van den Hout (2003, 2010) and by Rieken (2010), as I will discuss in this section.

As motion verbs indicate displacement, they are likely to highlight temporal sequence: motion in space is understood as reflecting the passing of time, so a development of motion verbs to NEM is not unpredictable, as shown by the typological parallels discussed in Section 2.2. Spatial metaphors are pervasive in our conceptualization of time. Two common metaphors by which humans understand time involve motion are the ‘Moving EGO’ and the ‘Moving Time’ metaphors (see Evans 2003: Chapters 5 and 17 for an exhaustive discussion). They are instantiated by English occurrences such as (11) and (12).

(11) *We are approaching Christmas.*

(12) *Christmas is approaching.*

In (11), the speaker is conceived as moving toward a new event, while in (12) it is the event which is conceived as coming close to the speaker. In what follows, I will argue that this type of metaphor lies at the foundation of the distinction between the *pai*-AV and the *uwa*-AV construction.

Van den Hout (2003) contains a full list of verbs occurring in the construction. Notably, as he remarks, not only is *uwa*- more frequent than *pai*-, but it also has a different distribution, as it can occur with all types of verb. In its turn, *pai*- never occurs with verbs that indicate states or spontaneous events: rather, as Rieken (2010) correctly points out, it occurs only with verbs that indicate controlled events, with few exceptions (see the discussion in Rieken 2010: 233–234). Rieken further argues that the distribution of the two verbs is partly different across verbal tenses and moods. Based on her findings, Rieken shows that while *uwa*- is more frequent than *pai*- with the preterite, *pai*- is more frequent with the imperative and in cases in which the present/future must be understood as having future reference. In addition, according to Rieken, only *uwa*- occurs with adverbs that point toward distance in time, such as *namma* ‘besides’, *appa*, *appanda* ‘later’.

This also happens with occurrences in which the *uwa*-AV construction has future reference, which may contain the adverbs *zilatya*, *ziladuwa* ‘in the future’ (2010: 224–226). In this way, the *uwa*-AV construction indicates events that are located at some distance in time from the moment of utterance. The *pai*-AV construction does not co-occur with such adverbs, but rather it appears in contexts in which it indicates immediate transition to the following event.

Different degrees of distance in time can be illustrated with some of the passages discussed thus far. With the present/future, for example, we find the verb *pai*- in (4), which refers to an action that the speaker pledges to carry out immediately. In turn, example (5) is taken from a treaty, and the speaker is telling his vassal about possible actions he might undertake in case the vassal breaks the oaths. Concerning the past, one can compare (1) and (10), which contain the *uwa*-AV construction and refer to events far removed in time from the following ones, with (13), in which the *pai*-AV construction indicates an immediate reaction in the past.

- (13) *n= as* URU *Almina andan pait* *nu= ssi* LÚKÚR *zahhiya*
 CONN 3SG.NOM A. into go.PRS.3SG CONN 3SG.DAT enemy battle.D/L
menahhanda namma UL kuiski mazzasta nu= za pait
 against besides not INDEF.NOM resist.PRT.3SG CONN PTC go.PRT.3SG
 URU *Alminan uetummanzi IŞBAT*
 A.-ACC fortify.INF he.took
 ‘He went into (the town of) Almina and the enemy no longer resisted him in
 battle. So thereupon he started to fortify Almina.’ (KBo 5,6 i 6–9)

Thus, both the *pai*-AV and the *uwa*-AV construction are NEM, but while the former indicates that the new event immediately follows the preceding one, and is brought about intentionally by an agent, the latter encodes an event that is most often distant in time, and that can, but need not necessarily be controlled by an agent, as it can also occur spontaneously: a typical example of this is (1). Rieken leaves open the question why the two verbs specialized in exactly these two functions.

In order to find an answer, one needs to start from the different semantics of the two verbs when they are used with their concrete meaning. As I showed in Section 1, this difference is based on deixis. The verb *pai*- ‘go’ indicates motion originating from the place of the speaker, whereas the origin of motion with *uwa*- ‘come’ is primarily away from the speaker.⁵ Here, the pragmatic inference is that motion starting from the speaker is controlled by the speaker, while motion starting away from the speaker does not necessarily involve the speaker’s control. Also, while with ‘go’ the origin of motion is the deictic center identified with the speaker, there is no distance between the two. On the other hand, the origin of motion with ‘come’ is removed from the speaker. We have then two different pragmatic inferences: (a) *pai*-: ‘if motion originates from the speaker, then the following event starts immediately’, and (b) *uwa*-: ‘if motion starts away from the speaker, then the following event is removed in time’. As a result of constructionalization, they are semanticized as part of the two separate sub-constructions, and the speaker is understood as the subject.

We can relate the *pai*-AV construction with the ‘moving EGO’ model of time: the speaker goes on to the new event. The *uwa*-AV construction on the other

5. In fact, the situation with ‘come’ is more complicated than with ‘go’, as has frequently been observed in languages that feature such pairs of deictic motion verbs, as the reference point may identify with the speaker, but it can also include the hearer or a third person, depending on language specific factors (Goddard 1997; see also Fillmore 1966, 1983, among others). However, the generalization that lies at the foundation of the deictic opposition between the two motion verbs, and accounts for schematization of the construction (in terms of Langacker 2008: 17) relies on the opposite relation between the origo and the speaker.

hand, can most often be related with the ‘moving time’ model: the new event comes from afar toward the speaker. Because of their different deictic component, the two constructions mark the event denoted by the second verb as new, and sequentially following the events referred to in the preceding context, but they do so in different ways. This difference is reflected in the possible translation equivalent one uses when turning the Hittite text into English. Van den Hout (2003, 2010) shows that both the *pai*-AV and the *uwa*-AV construction can be translated as ‘and thereupon V’, but that this holds more frequently for the former (see also Rieken 2010). Conversely, only the *uwa*-AV construction can be used as equivalent of the English expression ‘it then happened then V’. This can again be exemplified by (1).

Van den Hout (2010: 199–200) refers to such constructions as ‘impersonal’: and in fact, their meaning and discourse function match those of English ‘it happened then’, even though the motion verb is inflected. Notably, however, its inflection is not independently motivated by agreement with the subject, but rather it seems to be motivated by agreement with the second verb. As motion verbs in the *pai*-/*uwa*-AV construction have lost semantic and syntactic features of predicates, and can no longer convey meaning, take clitics or govern arguments, their behavior is completely dependent on the second verb. Indeed, as argued in Section 2.2, they should better be regarded as NEMs, that is, as discourse markers: through transcategorization they have acquired a new categorial status in the construction.

Remarkably, inflectional categories of motion verbs are still realized in the *pai*-/*uwa*-AV construction. This makes them morphologically different from other discourse markers. In fact, however, this must be viewed as a manifestation of the ‘behavior before coding’ principle, as stated in Haspelmath (2010: 554): “When a grammatical construction grammaticalizes, as a rule the behavioural properties change before the coding properties of the construction”. Following Haspelmath, behavioral properties are understood as including the syntactic behavior of the item which is undergoing change, while coding properties refer to its morphological realization. This applies perfectly to motion verbs in the *pai*-/*uwa*-AV constructions, as they have no syntactic properties of verbs, but still display verbal morphology.⁶

6. Hoffner & Melchert (2008: 325–326) flatly state that “[w]hat is clearly false and to be avoided is the frequently encountered interpretation of the phrasal verb as an impersonal ‘it will happen/happened that ...’. As the agreement of the phrasal verb with the main verb shows, there is nothing impersonal about the construction”. This claim rests on a misunderstanding: none of the authors who propose the translation ‘it happened then’ has ever argued that the motion verb is not inflected. However, in discourse terms, the function of the *uwa*-AV construction in several occurrences is exactly the same as the function of the impersonal expression ‘it happened then’ in English.

Van den Hout (2003:200, 2010) also mentions the occurrence in (14), in which the verb *uwa-* seems to be really used impersonally, as there is no subject to agree with it.

- (14) [*kuis*]_s= *an* *UL=ma* *uwatezzi* *nu* *uizzi* *apedani*
 REL.NOM 3SG.ACC NEG CONN bring.back.PRS.3SG CONN come.PRS.3SG DEM.D/L
 UN-*si*= *pat idalauesz*
 person.D/L PTC become.bad.PRS.3SG
 ‘[Whoev]er does not bring him, for that same person it will tum out badly.’
 (KUB 11.1+ IV (33/)25’-26’)

In (14), the verb *uizzi* bears the third person singular ending, and agrees with *idalauesz* ‘go bad, become evil’, but agreement in the latter verb is not triggered by a nominative subject. Rather, the verb is used impersonally, and the third person singular functions here as default form. Note however that the impersonal construction in this passage is not connected with the occurrence of the *uwa*-AV construction, and does not provide any evidence concerning its possible development. In fact, this is one of a number of occurrences of third person singular verb forms used impersonally with dative experiencers, in this case *apedani*, or, depending on one’s approach, an occurrence of a non-canonical dative subject (see Luraghi 2010 for a discussion of this type of construction).

3. Diachrony

Within the course of the attested history of Hittite, the *pai-/uwa*-AV construction becomes increasingly frequent, with only a handful of Old Hittite occurrences that cannot be taken as containing two asyndetically coordinated clauses. An example is (15).

- (15) *n= as uizzi DAM LÚGUDU₁₂ -as katt[(a tiezzi)]*
 CONN 3SG.NOM come.PRS.3SG spouse priest.GEN beside stand.PRS.3SG
 ‘He comes stands beside the priest’s spouse.’ (KBo 17.15 Vo 18’)

This occurrence is discussed by Rieken (2010:118), who points out that the verb *tiezzi* should normally occur with the clitic subject *-as*, which here only appears once, before *uizzi*, and has scope over the two verbs. Thus, this must be taken as an instance of a mono-clausal construction (another occurrence is described in van den Hout 2010:198).

The origin of the Hittite construction has been sought in the framework of imperative constructions involving motion verbs, attested in many ancient IE languages, in which motion verbs often lose their concrete meaning (see especially

Dunkel 1985). However, such constructions typically involve verbs deriving from the root **i-*, rather than deictic verbs, and, crucially, they also occur in Hittite. Hence, van den Hout (2010) suggests that the origin of the construction must better be sought within Hittite, not limited to imperatives, but as a result of frequent occurrence of motion verbs in sentences in contexts in which they precede a subsequent clause with an agreeing verb. Such contexts favor constructionalization, as I have argued in Section 2.3.

An issue that I have not focused on up to now concerns the position of motion verbs in the *pai-/uwa-AV* construction. Notably, the two motion verbs can occur in two different positions:

- a. after a connective, less frequently a subordinating conjunction as in (1), and possible clitics,
- b. in initial position, in which case they host possible clitics.

Most examples given in this paper contain occurrences of pattern (a); pattern (b) is shown in (4) and in (16).

- (16) *kissan memista* *ÚL= war= smas= at ammuk hannahhi*
 so speak.PRT.3SG NEG QUOT 2PL.DAT 3SG.ACC 1SG.NOM decide.PRS.3SG
DI-essar paiddu= wa= smas= at ^DIŠTAR-is^{URU} *ninuwas*
 lawsuit.ACC go.IMP.3SG PTC 2PL.DAT 3SG.ACC I-NOM N.-GEN
MUNUS.LUGAL-as hannau
 queen.NOM decide.IMP.3SG
 ‘He spoke as follows: I will not decide it for you, the lawsuit; let Ishtar, queen
 of Niniveh, decide it for you.’ (ABoT48.7–9)

In (4) we find a present-future with future reference, *paiuweni*, while (16) features the imperative form *paiddu*. In both cases, fronted motion verbs serve as hosts for clitics that are in the scope of the second verb: in particular, both *kuennumeni* ‘we will kill’ in (4), and *hannau* ‘let (her) decide’ in (16) are transitive, and object clitics appear on the motion verb (=an in ex.4 and =at in ex.16). Verbal imperatives are the most frequent forms when motion verbs are in sentence initial position: this has often been a reason for resorting to imperatives to explain the origin of the construction.

Van den Hout (2010:200–201) argues that there are other sentences in Hittite with initial verbs, including motion verbs, that do not involve imperatives, and might explain how motion verbs may have ended up possibly being in initial position. However, it seems better not to separate verb initial sentences (pattern (a)) from the others (pattern (b)) when trying to find the origin of the *pai-/uwa-AV* construction. Rather, it is more insightful to focus on similarities. In the first place, the position of clitics is a common feature of both patterns. In fact, even outside

this construction Hittite features a number of verb initial sentences which only contain the verb and one or more clitics. In such cases, clitics are hosted by the initial verb but crucially, and contrary to the *pai-/uwa-AV* construction, they have scope over the initial verb itself (see Luraghi 1990: 18–21; 94–99), as in (17).

- (17) *pianazzi= (y)a= tta LÚ asiwandan siet datti*
 give.PRS.3SG and 2SG.OBL poor.GEN property.ACC take.PRS.2SG
 ‘(You go to the house of the poor, eat, drink) and he gives you. You take the
 property of the poor.’ (KBo 22 i 29’-30’)

In (17) the verb *pianazzi* ‘he gives’ is in sentence initial position, as *paiuweni* in (4), and *paiddu* (16), and in the same way as these two verbs it hosts clitics. Crucially, however, the clitic =*ta* in (17) is an argument of *pianazzi*, whereas third person object clitics =*an* and =*at* in (4) and (16) are arguments of the second verb in the sentence. In addition, when the verb in the *pai-/uwa-AV* construction is not sentence initial it can only be preceded by a connective and possible clitics that have scope over the second verb.

In fact, it turns out that the two word order patterns in (a) and (b) are only superficially different: in Hittite, P₂ clitics such as pronouns, local particles and the reflexive particle, mark the left sentence boundary, and have scope over the sentence predicate. In the case of the *pai-/uwa-AV* construction, they have the second verb in their scope, showing, with either order, that the motion verb does not function as an independent predicate. Interestingly, Luraghi (1993) suggested that the position of both motion verbs in pattern (a) (non-initial) is better described as being ‘post-Wackernagel’: motion verbs follow immediately P₂ clitics hosted by a sentence connective (occasionally a conjunction). In case no sentence connective occurs, motion verbs remain the only available host for clitics. Following this view, it can further be pointed out that this behavior is partly remindful of the behavior of the modal particle *man*. This particle can stand in sentence initial position and host clitics when no other host is available, in much the same way as *pai-* and *uwa-*. Differently from motion verbs, when *man* is not initial, it features a clitic variant in P₂.⁷

Remarkably, cliticization is the expected result of a grammaticalization cline that leads an autonomous lexical item to be reanalyzed into a grammatical item.

7. An anonymous reviewer points out that “The syntax of the irrealis/optative marker is much more complex... The particle may be syntactically independent and then it does occur in the first or initial position. Or it is enclitic and then it occurs in the second position within the complex of the enclitics”. While I do not see big differences between this description and my own account, I follow the reviewer’s suggestion and refer the interested reader to Sideltsev (2017) for more fine-grained details on the behavior of *man*.

In constructional terms, the construction has been reanalyzed as denoting an event which is being perspectivized as new and focal. The semantic information about the event is encoded by the second verb, and motion verbs have the function of NEMs, that is, they have become discourse markers. Hence, a further, and highly predictable, development of motion verbs in the *pai-/uwa-AV* construction would have been to lose inflection and cliticize to P2: in this way, transcategorization would have been completed.⁸

A parallel to this possible further development is offered by Kxoe (Central Khoisan). According to Heine (2000) in this language the motion verbs *cíí* ‘reach, proceed’ and *lää* ‘come’ can occur either inflected, in which case they carry their lexical meaning, or uninflected. In the latter case, they are usually devoid of their lexical meaning, and function as NEMs. Notably, in both cases they are immediately followed by another verb: this shows that co-occurrence of a motion verb with another verb provides the context for reanalysis in this language similar to what happens in Hittite. Contrary to Hittite, the new status of the transcategorized verb forms is reflected in their morphological form through loss of agreement markers.

One more observation concerns changes in discourse setting that may have favored the rise of a new construction. As I remarked above, the construction was still on the rise in Old Hittite, but became increasingly frequent afterwards. The development is parallel to another change undergone by Hittite discourse markers in the passage from Old Hittite to later stages of the language. This other change is semantic bleaching and consequent generalization of the connective particle *nu*, originally a discourse particle which highlighted the sequence of events (Luraghi 1990; Widmer 2009; Luraghi & Inglese 2018). Still in Old Hittite, this connective could be translated with ‘then’, ‘and then’, similar especially to the meaning of the *pai-AV* construction. There are of course notable differences between the old and the new construction. Among other things, the *pai-AV* construction can co-occur with the adversative particle *=ma*, while the connective *nu* normally does not. Most frequently this happens when *pai-* is in sentence initial position. When *pai-* occurs after the connective and possible clitics, its discourse function is indeed close to the original discourse function of *nu* in Old Hittite.⁹ I will not elaborate

8. An anonymous reviewer points out that “motion verbs are never demonstrably enclitic... we cannot speak about cliticization in case of motion verbs.” I fully agree with the reviewer: motion verbs in the *pai-/uwa-AV* construction bear an accent, and do not show any signs of being clitic at the stage of the written sources. Here, I am speculating on a possible development. As no written sources are available to attest to any further developments of the construction, it is obvious that my hypothesis remains speculative.

9. A further difference between the *pai-AV* construction and the connective *nu* is that the latter can also occasionally occur in sentences in which it highlights some additional focal informa-

further on the relation between the *pai-/uwa-AV* construction and other sentence connectives. It might however be worth considering in further research the development of a new construction in the light of other discourse strategies to highlight the sequence of events in Hittite.

4. Conclusion

In this paper, I have once again addressed the issue of the function of ‘phraseological’ *pai-* and *uwa-*, taking as a starting point the descriptions by van den Hout (2003, 2010) and Rieken (2010). I have argued that, rather than focusing on the development undergone by the two verbs, one can achieve a better understanding by considering this peculiar use as instantiation of a construction, which I have called the *pai-/uwa-* **plus agreeing verb construction**. This construction has arisen through constructionalization, when the implicature based on the pragmatic inference ‘if one moves and the focus is not on the spatial location to which s/he moves, then it is the mover’s participation in the following event that is focused’ became part of the semantics of the construction. This development led the two verbs to acquire the function of New Event Markers. Similar developments of deictic motion verbs are known from other genetically unrelated languages.

Based on findings concerning the different distribution of *pai-* and *uwa-* in van den Hout (2003) and Rieken (2010), I have argued that the *pai-/uwa-AV* construction must be regarded as consisting of two sub-constructions, semantically distinct through the opposite deictic meaning of either motion verb. In particular, the fact that the verb *pai-* ‘go’ indicates motion away from the deictic center identified by the speaker accounts for its tendency to indicate events that will take place in the immediate future, or that have taken place in a near past. On the other hand, the verb *uwa-* ‘come’ indicates motion direct toward the speaker and originating from an external point. This is reflected in its tendency to occur in cases in which the event referred to is far removed in time from the time of utterance, either in the past or, less frequently, in the future. In addition, I have argued that the different origin of motion also accounts for the co-occurrence of the *uwa-AV* construction with any types of verb, and the limitation of the *pai-AV* construction to verbs that denote control. I explained this based on the inference that motion originating from the speaker is controllable, while motion originating elsewhere is less readily controllable.

tion not necessarily following the information of the preceding sentence on the temporal level (see Luraghi & Inglese 2018).

I have also argued that both verbs have undergone transcategorialization, as shown by their semantics and their syntactic behavior, and still preserve verbal morphology as a manifestation of the behavior before coding principle. In the last part of the paper, I discussed the position of the two verbs in the clause when they occur in the *pai-/uwa-AV* construction. I have argued that their tendency to occur either after a connective and possible clitics or in sentence initial position hosting possible clitics is partly remindful of the position of the modal particle *man*, and have suggested that cliticization would have been a possible further development of the two verbs as NEM. Finally, I tentatively proposed that a reason for the rise and extension of the *pai-/uwa-AV* construction after the Old Hittite particle could be the loss of pragmatic force of the particle *nu*.

Acknowledgements

This paper was written as part of the Basic Research Program at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE University, Moscow) and in the framework of the project *Dipartimenti di Eccellenza 2018–2022* (Ministry of University and Research). I wish to thank two anonymous reviewers for comments on an earlier version of this paper.

Abbreviations

1	first person	NEG	negation
2	second person	NEM	New Event Marker
3	third person	NOM	nominative
ABL	ablative	OBL	oblique
ACC	accusative	P	perfective
CONN	connective	P2	second position
D	demonstrative	PAS	passive
D/L	dative/locative	PL	plural
DAT	dative	PR	proximal
DEM	demonstrative	PRS	present/future
GEN	genitive	PRT	preterite
IMP	imperative	PTC	particle
INC	inceptive	PTC	particle
INDEF	indefinite pronoun	PTCP	participle
INF	infinitive	PURP	purpose
IRR	<i>irrealis</i> modality	QUOT	quotative
LOC	locative	REL	relative pronouns, relative clause marker
MID	middle voice		
MP	middle past	S	subjunctive
NAR	narrative	SG	singular


References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2006. Serial verb constructions in typological perspective. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Serial verb constructions*, 1–68. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2018. *Serial verbs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198791263.001.0001>
- Barðdal, Jóhanna, Elena Smirnova, Lotte Sommerer & Spike Gildea (eds.). 2015. *Diachronic construction grammar*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/cal.18>
- Beckman, Gary M. 1996. *Hittite diplomatic texts*. Atlanta (GA): Scholars Press.
- Bergs, Alexander & Gabriele Diewald (eds.). 2008. *Constructions and language change*. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110211757>
- Bergs, Alexander & Gabriele Diewald (eds.). 2009. *Contexts and constructions*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/cal.9>
- Dunkel, George. 1985. IE horatory *ey, *eyte, Ved. ēta ... stavama, Hitt. ehu+wa it, Horn. εἰ δ'ἄγε. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 46. 47–79.
- Ebert, Karen H. 1987. Discourse function of motion verbs in Chadic. *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 10. 53–71.
- Evans, Vyvyan. 2003. *The structure of time*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Fillmore, Charles. 1966. Deictic categories in the semantics of 'come'. *Foundations of Language* 2. 219–227.
- Fillmore, Charles. 1983. How to know whether you are coming or going. In Gisa Rauh (ed.), *Essays on deixis*, 219–221. Tübingen: Narr.
- Friedrich, Johannes. 1930. *Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache*. 2. Teil. Leipzig: Hinrich.
- Friedrich, Johannes. 1960. *Hethitisches Elementarbuch*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Garrett, Andrew. 1990. The syntax of Anatolian pronominal clitics. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University PhD dissertation.
- Goddard, Cliff. 1997. The semantics of coming and going. *Pragmatics* 1(2). 147–162.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.7.2.02god>
- Goetze, Albrecht. 1933. *Die Annalen des Mursilis*. *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft*, 38 Band, Heft VI 23.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 1995. *Constructions: A construction grammar approach to argument structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2010. The behaviour-before-coding principle in syntactic change. In Franck Floricic (ed.), *Essais de typologie et de linguistique générale: Mélanges offerts à Denis Creissels*, 541–554. Lyon: Presses Universitaires de l'École Normale Supérieure.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2016. The serial verb construction: Comparative concept and cross-linguistic generalizations. *Language and Linguistics* 17(3). 291–319.
- Heine, Bernd. 2000. On the rise of new-event markers in Kxoe. In Rainer Vossen, Angelika Mietzner & Antje Meifiner (eds.) *Mehr als nur Worte ...: Afrikanistische Beiträge zum 65. Geburtstag von Franz Rottland*, 269–284. Köln: Köppe.
- Hilpert, Martin. 2013. Corpus-based approaches to constructional change. In Thomas Hoffmann & Graeme Trousdale (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of construction grammar*, 458–477. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Hoffner, Harry A. & H. Craig Melchert. 2008. *A grammar of the Hittite language*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin. 2008. *Etymological dictionary of the Hittite inherited lexicon*. Leiden: Brill.
- Koller, Bernhard. 2015. Hittite *pai-* 'go' and *uwa-* 'come' as restructuring verbs. In Leonid Kulikov & Nikolaos Lavidas (eds.), *Proto-Indo-European syntax and its development*, 79–99. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/bct.75.05kol>
- König, Christa, Bernd Heine & Karsten Legère. 2015. *The Akie language of Tanzania: A sketch of discourse grammar*. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.
- Kuteva, Tanya, Bernd Heine, Bo Hong, Haiping Long, Heiko Narrog & Seongha Rhee. 2019. *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316479704>
- Langacker, Ronald W. 2008. *Cognitive grammar: A basic introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195331967.001.0001>
- Luraghi, Silvia. 1990. *Old Hittite sentence structure*. London-New York: Routledge.
- Luraghi, Silvia. 1993. Verb serialization and word order. Evidence from Hittite. In: Henning Aertsen & Robert J. Jeffers (eds.), *Historical linguistics 1989*, 267–281. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Luraghi, Silvia. 1996. Processi di grammaticalizzazione in ittita. *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 81(1). 45–47.
- Luraghi, Silvia. 1998. I verbi ausiliari in ittita. In: Giuliano Bernini, Pierluigi Cuzzolin & Piera Molinelli (eds.), *Ars Linguistica. Studi in onore di Paolo Ramat*, 299–322. Roma: Bulzoni.
- Luraghi, Silvia. 2010. Experiencer predicates in Hittite. In Ronald. I. Kim, Elisabeth Rieken, Norbert Oettinger & Michael J. Weiss (eds.), *Ex Anatolia lux*, 249–264. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press.
- Luraghi, Silvia. 2017. The syntax of Anatolian. In J. Klein, Brian Joseph & Matthias Fritz (eds.), *Handbook of comparative and historical Indo-European linguistics*, 274–291. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110261288-022>
- Luraghi, Silvia & Guglielmo Inglese. 2018. Subordination and sentence connectives in Old Hittite: A quantitative analysis. In: Elisabeth Rieken, Teresa Roth & Ulrich Geupel (eds.), *100 Jahre Entzifferung des Hethitischen. Morphosyntaktische Kategorien in Sprachgeschichte und Forschung*, 259–274. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Neu, Erich. 1995. Futur im Hethitischen? In Heinrich Hettrich, Wolfgang Hock, Peter-Arnold Mumm & Norbert Oettinger (eds.), *Verba et Structurae: Festschrift für Klaus Strunk zum 65. Geburtstag*, 195–202. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Rieken, Elisabeth. 2010. Die periphrastischen Konstruktionen mit *pai-* 'gehen' und *uwa-* 'kommen' im Hethitischen. In Christel Ruster, Jean Catsanicos & René Lebrun (eds.), *la-a-ma-an-te-et-na-ak-ki-i: Studia anatolica in memoriam Erich Neu scripta*, 217–239. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.
- Sideltsev, Andrei. 2017. Accented clitics in Hittite? *Transactions of the Philological Society* 115(2). 176–211. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-968X.12097>
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs & Graeme Trousdale. 2013. *Constructionalization and constructional changes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199679898.001.0001>

- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2014. Toward a constructional framework for research on language change. *Cognitive Linguistic Studies* 1(1). 3–21. <https://doi.org/10.1075/cogls.1.1.01tra>
- van den Hout, Theo. 2003. Studies in the Hittite phraseological construction. I. Its syntactic and semantic properties. In Gary Beckman, Richard H. Beal & Gregory McMahon (eds.), *Hittite studies in honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the occasion of his 65th birthday*, 177–204. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- van den Hout, Theo. 2010. Studies in the Hittite phraseological construction, II: Its origin. *Hethitica* 16. 191–204.
- Widmer, Paul. 2009. Hethitisch nu als Mittel der informationsstrukturellen und syntaktischen Verknüpfung. In Elisabeth Rieken & Paul Widmer (eds.) *Pragmatische Kategorien. Form, Funktion und Diachronie. Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft*, 321–333. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Wilhelm, Gernoth & Francesco Fuscagni (eds.). 2020. *Hethitologie Portal Mainz*. Available at: <http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/HPM/index.php> (last access 22 July 2020).
- Yates, Anthony D. 2014. On the PIE ‘quasi-serial verb’ construction: Origin and development. In: Stephanie W. Jamison, H. Craig Melchert & Brent Vine (eds.), *Proceedings of the 25th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*, 237–55. Bremen: Hempen.
- Younger, K. Lawson. 1990. *Ancient conquest accounts*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Address for correspondence

Silvia Luraghi
 Department of Humanities, Section of Linguistics
 University of Pavia
 Corso di Strada Nuova 65
 I-27100 Pavia
 Italy
 silvia.luraghi@unipv.it
 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0584-1007>

Publication history

Date received: 14 January 2020
 Date accepted: 12 May 2020
 Published online: 25 August 2020