

HOMERIC Βῆ δ'ἴμεν(αι): A DIACHRONIC APPROACH

by

ANTHONY D. YATES

(Under the Direction of Jared S. Klein)

ABSTRACT

The Homeric collocation βῆ δ'ἴμεναι and its related variants βῆ δ'ἴμεν and βῆ δ'ἴμεναι present a syntactic problem, failing to respond to standard treatments of infinitival syntax set forth in synchronic grammar handbooks of ancient Greek. I propose a new approach to the collocation, analyzing it as a serial verb construction. I further argue for a historical relationship with the asyndetic imperatival sequence βάσκει ἴθι, which also shows serial verb syntax and which ultimately provides the impetus for the creation of the collocation in the context of a face-to-face, verbal exchange between speaker and addressee. This derivation crucially accounts for a number of otherwise inexplicable syntactic, semantic, and poetic properties of the collocation in Homeric epic.

INDEX WORDS: Ancient Greek, Oral poetry, Homeric poetry, Homeric linguistics, Indo-European linguistics, Serial Verb Constructions, Deixis, Prototype Theory, Diachronic syntax, Diachronic semantics.

HOMERIC Βῆτι(Μ)ΕΝ(ΑΙ): A DIACHRONIC APPROACH

by

ANTHONY D. YATES

B.A., The University of California-Berkeley, 2008

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2011

© 2011

Anthony D. Yates

All Rights Reserved

HOMERIC Βῆτις (M)EN(AI): A DIACHRONIC APPROACH

by

ANTHONY D. YATES

Major Professor

Jared Klein

Committee

Charles Platter
Nicholas Rynearson

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2011

Acknowledgements

I could not have completed this project without the patience and support of the University of Georgia Classics Department, above all the members of my advising committee, Charles Platter and Nicholas Rynearson. I am deeply indebted for valuable suggestions, critical comments, and—at times—encouragement from fellow graduate students, in particular, David Driscoll, Alex Hanson, and Sam Zukoff, who forced me to clarify a number of important points. A special thanks goes to Craig Melchert, for useful bibliography and comments, and to Nancy Felson, for guidance in the early stages of this project. That which is good of me as a linguist and a classicist I owe, above all, to Jared Klein and Lowell Edmunds, who will forever be “my teachers.”

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements.....	iv
CHAPTER	
1 A New Approach to the Collocation βῆ δ'ἰ(μ)εν(αι).....	1
2 Semantics of the Collocation.....	14
3 Syntax of the Collocation.....	58
4 The Evolution of the Collocation.....	102
Appendix.....	135
Bibliography.....	139

Chapter 1:
A New Approach to the Collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι)

1.1. Preliminaries

The Homeric collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι)—that is, the set of relatively fixed expressions βῆ δ'ἴμεναι, βῆ δ'ἴμεν, and βῆ δ'ιέναι, which vary in person and number (1st s. βῆν, 3rd pl. βάν)—and the closely related expressions with other infinitives of motion (θέειν ‘to run,’ ἐλάαν ‘to drive’ and, perhaps, νέεσθαι ‘to go [home]’) present a syntactic problem unique in ancient Greek.¹ The collocation itself will be familiar to all readers of Homeric Greek. It appears throughout the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* more than seventy times in its variant forms, with an approximately equal distribution in each poem, e.g. *Od.*

22.108-9:

- (1.1) ὧς φάτο, Τηλέμαχος δὲ φίλῳ ἐπεπείθετο πατρί,
βῆ δ' ἴμεναι θάλαμόνδ', ὅθι οἱ κλυτὰ τεύχεα κείτο.

So [Odysseus] spoke, and Telemachus obeyed his dear father,
and **he set out** toward the chamber, where the famous weapons lay.

¹ The notation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) will henceforth be used to refer inclusively to the three variant types of the collocation with the Aeolic infinitives ἴμεναι, ἴμεν and (Attic-) Ionic ιέναι. The occurrence of the other infinitives of motion (θέειν, ἐλάαν and *νέεσθαι) will be discussed in Chapter 4 (§4.3.2). Standard Teubner editions of the text are used throughout this study, for the *Iliad*, West (1998, 2000), and for the *Odyssey*, Ludwich (1998).

and *Il.* 15.482-3:

- (1.2) εἶλετο δ' ἄλκιμον ἔγχος ἀκαχμένον ὀξεί χαλκῷ,
βῆ δ' ἰέναι, μάλα δ' ὄκα θεῶν Αἴαντι παρέστη.

And [Teukros] took up the mighty spear, sharp-edged with keen bronze,
 and **set out**, and running very swiftly, stood beside Aias.

Since the two verbal constituents of the collocation are verbs of motion, its interpretation is, from a literary perspective, relatively straightforward. The translations of (1.1-2) reflect the basic sense of the collocation as a whole: it indicates a movement, often, as in (1.1), a departure of one person away from another at the conclusion of a verbal exchange. The semantic non-problem thus contributes to the continued neglect of the syntactic problem, namely, that the relationship between the finite verb and infinitive is atypical in Greek.

1.2. Synchronic Grammar and the Syntax of βῆ δ' ἰ(μ)εν(αι)

The various functions of the Greek infinitive have been extensively documented, and a full synchronic description of its syntax can be found in any standard grammar of ancient Greek.² These grammars offer two possible descriptions of the function of the infinitive in the collocation βῆ δ' ἰ(μ)εν(αι):

² See *GG* (II: 357-383), *KG* (II, ii: 1-43 [§471-79]); cf. Smyth (1920: 437-454 [§1966-2038]). For Homeric Greek specifically, see *GH* (I: 485-93).

- 1) An infinitive expressing purpose
- 2) A verbal complement

Neither, however, is a sufficient explanation for the collocation. In the case of the former, the occurrence of a verb of motion expressing purpose after another verb of motion seems pleonastic, particularly in those instances where the collocation is not followed by a direction, destination, or subsequent action that the subject might “accomplish,” as in (1.2) above, or in (1.3) (=Il. 14.133-34):

- (1.3) ἽΩς ἔφαθ', οἳ δ' ἄρα τοῦ μάλα μὲν κλύον ἠδὲ πίθοντο·
βᾶν δ' ἴμεν, ἦρχε δ' ἄρα σφιν ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων

So [Diomedes] spoke, and they listened well and obeyed him.
They set out, and Agamemnon lord of men was first among them.

Although it may be contended, then, that an infinitive of purpose describes the syntax of some instances of βῆ δ' ἴ(μ)εν(αι), it very clearly does not apply to many other occurrences of the collocation.

No less problematic is the second possible synchronic explanation. In every instance of the collocation, the subject of the infinitive ἴ(μ)εν(αι) is manifestly the same as that of the finite verb βῆ. This type of complementation, where the subject of the infinitive is identical to the subject of the verb to which it is subordinate—in terms of generative grammar, subject controlled equivalent noun phrase deletion—occurs only

with a limited set of verbs in Greek and, as is likely, in Indo-European.³ These verbs tend to express volition (e.g. ἐθέλω), capability (δύναμαι), intention (διανοέομαι), inclination (σπεύδω), knowledge (ἐπίσταμαι), and their opposites (φοβέομαι, αἰσχῦνομαι), i.e. verbs which tend to have *modal* value. The verb of motion βαίνω (βῆ/βάν) has little in common with verbs of this type.

1.3. History of the Collocation

Wackernagel was first to call attention to the collocation. Taking special note of its archaic character, he observes in the infinitive ἵμεναι/ἰέναι the preservation of a prehistoric nominal case-form, specifically, an ancient dative with purposive force; he therefore translates this infinitive “zum Gehen,” discounting the semantic pleonasm which follows from this syntactic analysis.⁴ Later commentators were content to follow Wackernagel’s interest in the collocation, if not necessarily his conclusion as to the original nominal case of the infinitive: Kühner-Gerth maintains a purposive interpretation, translating the βῆ δ’ἰέναι “er schritt aus zu gehen;”⁵ Schwyzer-Debrunner argues for an original distinction between βῆ δ’ἵμεν “er schritt aus im Gehen” with locative infinitive and—following Kühner-Gerth—βῆ δ’ἰέναι “er schritt aus zu gehen”

³ Numerous Greek examples of infinitive complementation are compiled by Smyth (1920: 443-45 [§1991-4, 1999-2000]), although they are not organized according to the type of verbal complementation (subject equivalent noun phrase deletion, independent subject, object equivalent noun phrase deletion) as classified by Disterheft (1980). According to Disterheft, of these three types only subject equivalent noun phrase deletion can be reconstructed for late Proto-Indo-European; the verbs which employ this type of complementation most commonly mean wish, desire, know, think, be able, succeed, start, finish, dare, endure, refuse, avoid, neglect, i.e., verbs which often have modal value (*op. cit.* 184).

⁴ Wackernagel (1928: 261-62 [= 2009: 328-29])

⁵ *KG* (I.ii: 16-17)

with dative infinitive which collapsed during the later Homeric period;⁶ Vanséveren identifies the possibility of establishing a relative chronology of the three variant forms (βῆ δ'ιέναι, βῆ δ'ἴμεν, βῆ δ'ἴμεναι) of the collocation and, thereby, its potential to shed light on the evolution of the Greek infinitive, the original nominal case of which remains an open question.⁷

The collocation itself has received significant attention only in the two studies of Letoublon.⁸ Yet while her analysis is rigorous in identifying certain distinctive features of these two verbs and of the collocation as a whole, she nevertheless contends that the traditional view of the collocation, i.e. with a subordinate infinitive of purpose is correct, and attempts to resolve the semantic issues that emerge from this analysis. Although she maintains that a literal reading is always possible (“il se mit en marche pour aller”),⁹ she also notes the semantic pleonasm, and suggests that βῆ/βάν has been partially semantically bleached within the collocation.¹⁰ This explanation is inadequate for two reasons. First, a literal reading fails to account for the single instance of βῆ δ'έλααν, where it yields a nonsensical meaning.¹¹ More importantly, her explanation also fails to provide a viable interpretation for the *original* structure from which such a diachronic development could take place. Because she seems to perceive only the semantics, and not

⁶ GG (II: 359-60)

⁷ Vanséveren (2000: 76-78); her study is an attempt to answer this question.

⁸ Letoublon (1982, 1985)

⁹ Letoublon (1982: 192-3)

¹⁰ Letoublon (1985: 136): “On a l’impression que la formule s’est figée, que l’évolution linguistique s’est arrêtée au moment où βῆ commençait à se vider de sens concret du verbe de mouvement pour devenir un verbe auxiliaire ou un opérateur aspectuel, avec le sens ‘commencer de.’ ”

¹¹ *‘He began marching to drive’; it should be noted that in arguing for the viability of a literal translation, Letoublon (1982: 193) omits a translation of βῆ δ'έλααν, while rendering the collocation and its other variants (βῆ δ'ἴ[μ]εν[αι], *βῆ δὲ νεέσθαι, βῆ δὲ θέειν = “il se mit en marche pour aller, retourner, courir”). Having included βῆ δ'έλααν as a variant of the collocation two sentences prior (*op. cit.* 192), no reason is offered for the conspicuous absence of a translation.

the syntax of the collocation as problematic, she makes no attempt to investigate this original structure; rather, she proceeds to identify a set of expressions as the syntactic equivalents of βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι), i.e., an infinitive dependent on a finite verb of motion:¹²

Od. 7.14 ὄρτο πόλινδ' ἴμεν; *Il.* 24.2 ἐσκίδναντ' ἰέναι; 2.84 ἦρχε νέεσθαι; 13.329 ἦρχ' ἴμεν.

Yet upon closer examination, it quickly becomes clear that these expressions differ in critical ways from the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι). Already in the Homeric poems, the verb ἄρχω (ἦρχε), if it can properly be considered a verb of motion, regularly takes a complementary infinitive that need not be a verb of motion, e.g., *Od.* 16.345 ἦρχ' ἀγορεύειν,¹³ *Il.* 7.324 ὑφαίνειν ἦρχετο μῆτιν.¹⁴ The absence of constraints on the infinitive complement to this verb therefore differentiates it from the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι), which admits only infinitives of verbs of motion (ἴ[μ]εν[αι], θέειν, ἐλάαν). The productivity of the syntactic structure ἄρχω + infinitive is reflected, moreover, in its continued use in the language of the classical period (e.g. *Thuc. Hist.* 1.107.1: ἦρξαντο...οικοδομεῖν). It is therefore clear that ἄρχω belongs among the verbs in Greek that normally take a complementary infinitive which is properly subordinate to the verb and heads its subordinate clause—a typical example of subject equivalent noun phrase deletion. Unlike the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι), the relationship between finite verb and

¹² Letoublon (1985: 127): “un indicatif d’un verbe de mouvement avec un infinitif de dépendance”

¹³ The expression ἦρχ' ἀγορεύειν formulaically recurs in line-final position in group dialogue scenes in the *Odyssey*; cf. *Od.* 18.349, 20.359, 22.46.

¹⁴ Letoublon (1985) offers no further explanation for the inclusion of ἄρχω among verbs of motion. It should be noted, however, that Letoublon (1982 :192-39) seems to be more careful in distinguishing it from the verbs of motion which occur in the collocation and its related variants. It is possible, perhaps, that there is some confusion with ἔρχομαι; but while a form such as ἦρχετο is ambiguous, the form ἦρχε can only be from ἄρχω. It has been suggested, even, that these ambiguous forms are the result of two similar, yet distinct PIE roots: ἄρχω < *h₂er- ; ἔρχομαι < *h₁er- (see *EDG*, s.vv.).

infinitive of motion is in no way irregular.¹⁵

The other expressions in this set show greater affinity with βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι). Although ὄρνυμι (ὄρτο) differs from ἄρχω insofar as it manifestly can function independently as a verb of motion,¹⁶ it shares the property of appearing with a wide range of infinitives, e.g., *Il.* 12.279-80 ὄρετο...νιφέμεν, *Od.* 3.297 εὔδειν ὄρνυντο. In these expressions, the infinitive quite clearly conveys the notion of *purpose*, e.g. *Il.* 14.297:

(1.4) οὔτε πυρὸς τόσσός γε ποτὶ βρόμος αἰθομένοιο
οὔρεος ἐν βήσσης, ὅτε τ' **ὄρετο καιέμεν** ὕλην

Nor so great as the roaring of blazing fire
in a mountain glen, when it **rises to burn** the forest.

There is every reason to believe that the infinitive has the same value in the syntactically parallel ὄρτο...ἴμεν. The verb ὄρνυμι occurs only twice with the infinitive ἴ(μ)εναι (*Od.* 6.255, 7.14), both instances in the formulaic expression πόλινδ' ἴμεν. The complement of a destination (πόλινδε) makes viable the synchronic explanation of the infinitive ἴμεν as an infinitive of purpose, in this way differentiating it from the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι).

The same explanation can be applied to *Il.* 24.1-2:

(1.5) Λῦτο δ' ἀγών, λαοὶ δὲ θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας ἕκαστοι
ἔσκιδναντ' ἰέναι...

The assembly was dissolved, and the peoples to the swift ships
scattered, each **to go** to their own...

¹⁵ See *LSJ*, s.v. ἄρχω

¹⁶ e.g. *Il.* 15.124: ὄρτο διὰ προθύρου, λίπε δὲ θρόνον ἔνθα θάασσε (“[Athena] rushed out through the doorway, and left behind the throne where she was sitting.”)

It is the only example of an infinitive with the verb σκίδναμι,¹⁷ and appears with the complement of destination (θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας), a fact which emphasizes the necessity of occurrences *without* a direction, destination, or subsequent action to demonstrate the invalidity of purpose as a syntactic explanation for the infinitive, as in the case of βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι).

These expressions, which may be analyzed straightforwardly in terms of synchronic grammar, and the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι), which is impenetrable to synchronic analysis, suggest that there is no independent syntactic category verb of motion + infinitive of verb of motion and, consequently, that it cannot be used to justify the collocation's syntax. Yet this conclusion does not preclude the possibility that, from a diachronic perspective, some of these constructions reflect the same underlying syntactic phenomenon; it should be noted, in fact, that already in antiquity, a connection was perceived between βῆ δ'ιέναι and ὄρτ'ιέναι, attested in Hes. [*Sc.*] 43 in the same line-initial position characteristic of βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) and exhibiting the same contiguity of verbal constituents.¹⁸

¹⁷ The original form of the verb was σκίδναμι; in the Homeric poems, it has collateral forms, σκίδνημι/σκίδναμαι, σκεδάω, and σκεδάννυμι, which form prevails in classical Greek; see *LSJ*, s.vv.; cf. *EDG*, s.v. σκεδάννυμι

¹⁸ Schol. in Hesiodi *Scutum*, *ad loc.*: Ὀμηρικός ἐστὶν ὁ ζῆλος· ἐκεῖνος γὰρ συνεχῶς “βῆ δ'ιέναι” καὶ “ὄρτ'ιέναι” φησὶν· ὅθεν παρακεκίνηται καὶ Ἡσίοδος. Λαμβάνεται γοῦν καὶ ὅδε κάκει τὸ ὄρτο καὶ τὸ βῆ, ἀντὶ τοῦ ὄρμητο καὶ παρεκινήθη; cf. Hsch. s.v. βῆ ῥ'ἴμεναι: ὄρμησενιέναι. For the possibility of a relationship between these expressions and the collocation, see Chapter 3 n. 128, below.

1.4. The Collocation βῆ δ'ῖ(μ)εν(αι): A Diachronic and Comparative Approach

It is clear, then, that despite the inadequacy of the traditional explanation of the infinitive in the collocation and its variants, the syntactic problem has generally been neglected; it therefore demands a new approach which, in accordance with the very archaic character of the collocation---a feature identified by Wackernagel, repeatedly emphasized by Letoublon, and essential to those who would use it as evidence for the case origin of the Greek infinitive¹⁹—must be diachronic and, ultimately, comparative. The question of the syntax of the collocation cannot be divorced from that of its semantic function, yet it is only the *original* semantics of the collocation which offer the potential to shed light on its syntax. Since it is likely that the collocation attained the status of a fixed formula early in the Homeric tradition—so early, even, that it ceased to be well-understood by speakers *within* the Homeric period²⁰—its distribution in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* may be colored by semantic change, as it came to be used differently in the later stages of the Homeric tradition.²¹ It is thus necessary to take a diachronic approach to the collocation, so as to control for the effects of its diachronic development and determine its original semantic function. In view of its extreme archaism, moreover, it is reasonable to consider the further possibility that the collocation βῆ δ'ῖ(μ)εν(αι) reflects a once productive syntactic formation in very early Greek, which disappeared from spoken

¹⁹ Wackernagel (1928: 261-62 [= 2009: 328-29]), Vanséveren (2000: 76-78), Letoublon (136-38, 140-43); cf. §1.3, above

²⁰ cf. Letoublon 1985: 127; “Ce caractère archaïque explique que le sens de la formule ne soit plus très bien compris des Grecs, peut-être dès l’époque homérique.”

²¹ See Chapter 2 (§2.2.1-2)

language before the advent of writing, and is thus preserved only in the poetic language of Homeric epic as an isolated syntactic type. An analysis of its syntax therefore calls for a comparative approach, which examines similar structures in other languages, both related and unrelated to Greek.

These methods will be utilized in the ensuing three chapters with the aim of determining the original syntactic and semantic function of the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) in ancient Greek, its admittance to and productivity in Homeric epic, its evolution within the Homeric period, and its ultimate disappearance from the language. Chapter 2 will attempt to establish the unique semantic value of the collocation, with close attention to the lexical, aspectual, and deictic properties which distinguish it from other verbs of motion in Homeric epic. The collocation necessarily will be examined both as a whole and in its constituent parts, viz., the syntactic and semantic properties of βαίνω and the suppletive paradigm εἶμι—ἤλθον must be understood individually; these elementary verbs of motion not only factor significantly in the semantic value of the collocation, but are themselves semantically closest to the collocation, set apart only by their deictic and aspectual properties. Letoublon's study of Homeric verbs of motion will prove instrumental to this end, allowing for the semantic differentiation of its constituent verbs and, in turn, the collocation from the numerous other verbs of motion appearing in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.²²

The collocation will thereupon be more closely scrutinized, applying diachronic analysis to the semantic function of βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) in the Homeric poems. Having

²² Letoublon (1985)

discussed in greater detail the diachronic dimension of the Homeric tradition and its implications for a study of the collocation, I will utilize the possibility, identified by Vanséveren, to establish a relative chronology of the three forms of the collocation (βῆ δ'ῖμεναι, βῆ δ'ῖμεν, βῆ δ'ἰέναι). An attempt will be made, then, to determine the prototypical semantic value of the collocation in the very oldest layer of Homeric epic, where it is more likely to approximate the *original* semantic function of the collocation.

Chapter 3 will focus on the syntax of the collocation. The analysis carried out in Chapter 2 of the collocation's semantic value in the Homeric epic, specifically, the deictic and aspectual properties of each verb of motion will be used to evaluate the possibility that the collocation originally had serial verb syntax. Recent comparative surveys of verb-serializing languages have identified certain syntactic and semantic properties common to serial verb constructions (SVCs), several of which are significantly present in the collocation βῆ δ'ἰ(μ)εν(αι). This possibility is further recommended by the fact that motion serialization, i.e. SVCs in which at least one verb is a verb of motion, is the cross-linguistically most frequent type of verb serialization.²³ Although evidence for serial verb constructions in Indo-European languages is sparse,²⁴ Kiparsky has compared certain Indo-European verb sequences to SVCs found in some West African languages, where they are a fundamental part of the grammar. In recent years, moreover,

²³ Aikhenvald 2006: 47-50; Givón 1991: 139; Staden and Reesink 2008: 36-39. for examples of two verb SVCs in which both are verbs of motion, see Baird (2008: 64-66).

²⁴ In recent years, numerous studies have emerged demonstrating that serial verb constructions appear in a far greater number of languages than scholars have previously acknowledged; cf. van Staden and Reesink: "First reported in the nineteenth century for African languages, such as Ewe, now there seem to be only very few language families where serial verb constructions are *not* found in some form or another" (2008: 21).

constructions similar to the collocation in Hittite and English have been profitably treated as SVCs.²⁵

Hence, after reviewing the general cross-linguistic properties of serial verb syntax, $\beta\tilde{\eta} \delta' \tilde{\iota}(\mu)\epsilon\nu(\alpha)$ will be approached as a possible serial verb construction. I will argue, first, for a historical connection between the collocation and the asyndetic imperatival sequence $\beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa' \tilde{\iota}\theta\iota$, the latter providing the impetus for the creation of $\beta\tilde{\eta} \delta' \tilde{\iota}(\mu)\epsilon\nu(\alpha)$ in the context of a face-to-face, dialogic exchange between a speaker and an addressee. Serial verb analysis will be applied to $\beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa' \tilde{\iota}\theta\iota$, the serial verb properties of which are more transparent than those of the collocation, and for which this type of analysis has precedent, with analogous sequences in Vedic Sanskrit, Hittite, and even elsewhere in Homeric Greek having been treated as such.²⁶ I will then propose to extend serial verb analysis to $\beta\tilde{\eta} \delta' \tilde{\iota}(\mu)\epsilon\nu(\alpha)$, demonstrating that the ambiguous and potentially problematic status of the infinitive in the collocation does not preclude its treatment as a serial verb construction.

In Chapter 4, the focus of this study will return to the Homeric poems, where evidence will be adduced for the original dialogic exchange that led, ultimately, to the formation of $\beta\tilde{\eta} \delta' \tilde{\iota}(\mu)\epsilon\nu(\alpha)$. I will thereupon attempt to synthesize the results of Chapters 2 and 3 into a coherent narrative of the diachronic development of the collocation from its origin in $\beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa' \tilde{\iota}\theta\iota$ to its eventual loss in post-Homeric Greek, reconstructing the process by which it was admitted into the Homeric epics, became a productive part of the poetic diction, and evolved, semantically, within the Homeric period. Having attained

²⁵ cf. Chapter 3 (§3.1.3), below

²⁶ As proposed by Hock (2002); see discussion in Chapter 3 (§3.3.1 and nn. 23, 56)

formulaic status, its unique semantic value may have allowed it to flourish in the early stages of the Homeric tradition; Letoublon's analysis suggests, perhaps crucially, the absence of a centrifugally-oriented aorist expressing basic movement in Homeric Greek;²⁷ a role which the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι), in its spatial deictic and aspectual properties, would have been well-suited to fill. Its disappearance, moreover, may be traced to the gradual loss of this semantic value. Having evaluated these possibilities, I will proceed to offer some final remarks on the linguistic and poetic implications of this analysis of the collocation for ancient Greek and, more generally, for Indo-European languages.

²⁷ See (in table) Letoublon (1985: 109): "L'aoriste centrifuge n'existe pas en principe."

Chapter 2: Semantics of the Collocation

2.1. Preliminaries

The primary goal of this chapter will be to determine the semantic function of the collocation βῆ δ'ῖ(μ)εν(αι). Having defined the parameters of this investigation (§2.1.1), I will begin with a brief overview of the features of the collocation (§2.1.2). A methodological discussion will follow, in which I address the special challenges presented by a study of Homeric epic, in particular, the necessity of distinguishing between synchrony and diachrony (§2.2.1-2), which terms, as per Saussure, designate respectively the state of a language at a given point, and a phase in its evolution.¹ The analysis in this chapter will be, primarily, synchronic; however, a diachronic approach to the Homeric text will prove expedient in developing and refining hypotheses suggested by the synchronic data. I will also introduce the theoretical approach to semantic analysis employed in this study, namely, prototype semantics (§2.2.3). Finally, I will turn to the data itself (§2.3), and attempt to determine the prototypical properties of the collocation.

¹ Saussure (1916: 117): “De même *synchronie* et *diachronie* désigneront respectivement un état de langue et une phase d'évolution.”

2.1.1. Parameters

The corpus for this investigation will consist of the two Homeric epics, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, where the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) is well attested. In limiting it to these two poems, only four examples of the collocation found in the Homeric Hymns are excluded, all of which show the infinitival form ἴμεν: *HHDem.* 303, 485; *HHAp.* 515; *HHAphr.* 220. The reason for this exclusion is clear: if, as I will argue below (§2.2.2.3), the original function of the collocation ceased to be well understood relatively early in the Homeric period, its usage in the Hymns will, at best, recapitulate the data of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* or, less optimally, further skew it in the direction of ‘recent’ usage.

The collocation is not attested elsewhere in archaic Greek poetry, nor in the literature of the Attic period, by which point even the simplex form of the root aorist of the verb βαίνω (ἔβη-/ἔβα-) has ceased to be productive and disappeared from the language. The collocation was eventually revived in the 4th c. BCE by Apollonius of Rhodes in his *Argonautica*; in this work, numerous examples can be found with the forms of the infinitive ἴμεν and ἴμεναι, though the collocation βῆ δ'ἴέναι, so common in Homer, is conspicuously absent. While Apollonius’ use of the collocation in imitation of the Homeric style may be instructive insofar as it seems to reflect his perception of the relative archaism of the non-(Attic-) Ionic infinitives, its use can have little bearing on the ultimate aim of this study, namely, to determine the original syntactic and semantic value of the collocation, and has therefore been omitted.²

² On the implications of this archaism—perceived even in antiquity—see Chapter 4 (§4.4), below.

2.1.2. Features of the Collocation

The subject of this study is the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) and its variants, the set of related expressions having as their underlying structure an unaugmented root aorist of the verb βαίνω + the particles δὲ (60x) or ῥα (23x)³ + a present infinitive of a verb of movement.⁴ This infinitive is typically one of three infinitival forms of the verb 'to go' (*h₁ei-), the (Attic-) Ionic form ἰέναι (24x) or its Homeric variants, the Aeolic forms ἴμεν (34x) and ἴμεναι (15x). Other infinitives of verbs of movement appear as well, θέειν 'to run' (9x) and ἐλάαν 'to drive' (1x).⁵ It should be emphasized that only present infinitives are admitted in the collocation; the infinitive ἐλθεῖν, for example, of the suppletive aorist for the verb 'to go', does not occur (*βῆ δ'ἐλθεῖν).

The inflected verb of the collocation is, by contrast, aorist, though always unaugmented. The collocation uses only indicative forms of the original root aorist (<*g^weh₂-), excluding entirely analogic s-aorist forms (ἔβησ-) which can be found elsewhere in Homer. The verb appears only in the 3rd person, with the single exception of *Od.* 10.407 βῆν δ' ἰέναι, where the 1st

³ The manuscript tradition shows some variation as to which of these two particles occurs in a given instance; cf. Letoublon (1985: 127). On these particles, see Denniston (1954: 32-51, 162-87).

⁴ Etymologically, of course, (ἔ)βη (<*g^weh₂-) is not the root aorist to βαίνω (<*g^wem-) but to *βιβᾶμι (see n. 103, below). There is no evidence to suggest that *g^wem- and *g^weh₂- functioned as distinct lexical roots at any point in Greek. The strongest case for distinguishing the pair in Proto-Indo-European comes from Sanskrit, where they form separate root aorists (*agan; agāt*; see Table 2.4, below) with corresponding secondary presents (suffixed thematic *gacchati*; reduplicated *jigāti*). Yet it must be weighed against, e.g., the evidence of Classical Armenian, where both *g^wem- and *g^weh₂- manifest as root aorists within the same paradigm (see n. 109, below). In Greek, some formations are ambiguous, with possible derivations from either root: βᾶτην could be from zero-grade *g^wḡ-*teh₂*- beside βῆτην from *g^weh₂-*teh₂*- (see Hardarson [1993: 150-52]), though the latter is traditionally regarded as an analogic formation based on the former (see §2.3.1.2, below); more relevant to this study is βᾶσσω, which may reflect an original *g^wḡ-*sk^l/o-* or alternatively, *g^wh₂-*sk^l/o-*. While the former is usually assumed on the strength of comparison to Sanskrit *gacchati*, with which it would make exact equation (and for which *g^wh₂-*sk^l/o-* is untenable), the latter is also *lautgesetzlich* in Greek (cf. n. 101, below). Because there is no compelling evidence to treat them as distinct lexical roots in Greek, following a long tradition in Indo-European linguistics (*IGW, AHD* s.v. *gwā-*; cf. *LIV*, svv.) I will treat them as a unitary pair in this study.

⁵ The problematic lines *Il.* 23.229 and *Od.* 14.87 ἔβαν οἰκόνδε νέεσθαι will be discussed separately; see Chapter 4 (§4.3.2), below.

person occurs.⁶ Within the 3rd person, the verb is predominantly singular (βῆ, 65x), though the plural is also well represented (βᾶν, 17x). While dual forms of the aorist are common in Homer, (archaic zero-grade βάτην, 8x; analogic [ἐ]βήτην, 14x), they do not occur within the collocation itself, where the plural is used with unambiguously dual subjects, e.g. *Il.* 10.272-73:

(2.1) Τὼ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ὄπλοισιν ἔνι δεινοῖσιν ἐδύτην
βᾶν ῥ' ἰέναι, λιπέτην δὲ κατ' αὐτόθι πάντας ἀρίστους

And when **the pair** had donned their fearful arms,
they set out, and left behind the best men in that place.

A notable feature of the collocation βῆ δ' ἴ(μ)εν(αι) is its consistent occurrence in verse-initial position. The regularity—the persistence, in fact ($83/86 = 96.5\%$)⁷—with which it occupies this position cannot be fully explained by metrical requirements since it can occupy other slots as well, and does so in three exceptional cases (*Il.* 10.73, 20.484, 21.205). In these instances, it appears to be displaced by particle αὐτάρ, which strongly tends toward verse-initial position ($491/770 = 63.7\%$),⁸ e.g. *Il.* 21.205:

(2.2) αὐτάρ ὁ βῆ ῥ' ἰέναι μετὰ Παίονας ἵπποκορυστάς

H e set out in pursuit of the horse-hair crested Paionians.

⁶ A possible second instance of the first person can be found at *Od.* 12.367 βῆν δ' ἰέναι, but this line occurs in a passage of doubtful authenticity.

⁷ This figure includes the variants of the collocation with other infinitives of motion (θέειν, ἐλάαν). The collocation itself, i.e. the forms with (Attic-) Ionic infinitive ἰέναι and Aeolic ἴμεν and ἴμεναι, are line-initial in 70 of 73 total instances (95.9%).

⁸ Besides verse-initial position, this particle can appear at the beginning of the second or fifth foot; these two alternatives are illustrated in exx. 2.4-5.

The collocation in fact occurs quite frequently in conjunction with *αὐτὰρ*, embedded in larger discourse contexts initiated by this particle; a typical example is found at *Od.* 8.276-77:

- (2.3) **αὐτὰρ** ἐπεὶ δὴ τεῦξε δόλον κεχολωμένος Ἄρει,
βῆ ῥ' ἴμεν ἐςθάλαμον, ὅθι οἱ φίλα δέμνια κείτο

And when he had wrought the trap, enraged at Ares,
He went into the chamber, where his own bed lay.

Occasionally—less frequently, but with significant implications for its localization status in the hexameter—it seems even to displace the particle, e.g. *Il.* 16.219-22:

- (2.4) πάντων δὲ προπάροιθε δὺ' ἀνέρε θωρήσσοντο
Πάτροκλός τε καὶ Αὐτομέδων ἓνα θυμὸν ἔχοντες
πρόσθεν Μυρμιδόνων πολεμιζέμεν. **αὐτὰρ** Ἀχιλλεὺς
βῆ ῥ' ἴμεν ἐς κλισίην, χηλοῦ δ' ἀπὸ πῶμ' ἀνέωγε

In front of everyone, the two men were armed,
Patroklos and Automedon, having a single fighting spirit
to do battle at the head of the Myrmidons. **But** Achilles
went off into his shelter, and opened the lid of his chest.

or *Od.* 22.400:

- (2.5) ὣς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν, τῆ δ' ἄπτερος ἔπλετο μῦθος,
ᾧῖξεν δὲ θύρας μεγάρων ἐὺ ναιεταόντων,
βῆ δ' ἴμεν **αὐτὰρ** Τηλέμαχος πρόσθ' ἠγεμόνευεν

So she spoke, but her speech was without wings,
and she opened the doors of well-inhabited great hall.
She **went on**, and Telemachus led the way in front.

The relationship between the collocation and the particle $\alpha\upsilon\tau\grave{\alpha}\rho$ will be further discussed in Chapter 4.⁹

2.2. Issues and Methodology

What is the semantic function of the collocation $\beta\tilde{\eta} \delta' \tilde{\iota}(\mu)\epsilon\nu(\alpha)$? A complete and careful study of the usage of the collocation will allow for its synchronic description; however, owing to the special nature of the composition of the Homeric poems, it is not strictly necessary—nor perhaps even very likely—that the answer to this question, posed from a synchronic perspective, is the same as that to the diachronic question: What is the *original* function of the collocation $\beta\tilde{\eta} \delta' \tilde{\iota}(\mu)\epsilon\nu(\alpha)$? To answer this question is, of course, the ultimate aim of this investigation, but it cannot be addressed without first addressing the properties inherent to the Homeric text that demand an approach which distinguishes synchronic and diachronic analysis.

2.2.1. Synchrony and Diachrony in Homeric Epic

In engaging with the Homeric text, we must confront the issue of immanent diachrony: the Homeric poems were composed over a period of several centuries, and the language does not belong to a single time or place. While Ionic forms constitute the core of the poem, they coexist, side by side at every level of structural composition—line, sentence, etc.—with linguistic material that is archaic, dialectal (especially Aeolic), or even artificial as metrical necessity requires; we therefore speak of the Homeric *Kunstsprache*, the poetic language of the Homeric

⁹ See Chapter 4 (§4.2.2.2), below.

bards, the composite, artificial nature of which—as M. Parry has significantly demonstrated¹⁰—can only be explained as the product of generations of oral poets and their composition and performance of the same heroic themes. These themes were inseparable from the language used to relate them which was, at once, *traditional*—learned from bards of the previous generation—and *innovatory*, shaped by the vernacular language of the performing bard and thus, subject to geographical and temporal variation.¹¹

This evolutionary model of the Homeric *Kunstsprache* accounts for its non-Ionic elements as retentions from an earlier stage of the Homeric oral tradition, preserved, above all, in the formulaic language that is characteristic of all oral narrative poetry, being fundamental to its composition and performance.¹² The Homeric “formula,” defined by Parry as “a group of words which is regularly employed under the same metrical conditions to express a given essential idea,”¹³ is bound by the relatively rigid constraints of its metrical shape, on which its utility for the bard depends; this rigidity causes the formula to be the principal mechanism of linguistic conservatism in the epic, “a fixed element in a fluid medium” that “has lost the ability to evolve in step with linguistic and cultural change.”¹⁴ Yet the formula is not absolutely conservative; rather, like the poetic language itself, it evolves in step with the vernacular except where linguistic change would compromise its metrical structure, and so disrupt the system of oral

¹⁰Parry (1971: 325-61)

¹¹ cf. Janko (1992: 12): “[P]oets always drew on their changing vernacular as they recreated and adapted old tales, and their more striking or useful phrases entered the tradition, ultimately to become curious archaisms on the lips of singers hundreds of years younger.” Lord (2003) thus draws attention to the impact of the individual poet and even the individual performance: “[I]n a real sense every performance is a separate song; for every performance is unique, and every performance bears the signature of its poet singer. He may have learned his song and the technique of its construction from others, but good or bad, the song produced in performance is his own... The singer of tales is at once the tradition and an individual creator” (*op. cit.* 4).

¹² The central role of the formula in Homeric diction is properly emphasized in the conception of Davidson (1994: 62), who describes it as “the building-block of a system of traditional oral poetic expression;” cf. Bakker (1988: 186). On the cross-cultural properties of oral traditions, see Lord (2003).

¹³ Parry (1971: 272). This definition has been extensively examined, reevaluated and reformulated by Hoekstra (1964), Hainsworth (1968), Nagler (1974), Kiparsky (1976), Nagy (1976), and Miller (1982), among others; for a summary and assessment of this literature, see Edwards (1986: 19-22).

¹⁴ Hainsworth (1993: 28-29)

formulaic composition: “as the spoken language changes, the traditional diction of oral poetry likewise changes so long as there is no need of giving up any of the formulas.”¹⁵ Even within the formula, then, the *Kunstsprache* freely admits new linguistic forms which are metrically equivalent to their corresponding older, original forms.

Based on these principles, and building on the observation—first articulated by Witte, subsequently developed by Meiser¹⁶—that the *Kunstsprache* consists primarily of Ionic forms except where the corresponding Aeolic forms are not metrically equivalent, Parry showed that this linguistic fusion is consistent with an original Aeolic oral tradition which also incorporated features of Arcado-Cypriot, thereupon reworked by Ionic bards. These bards preserved metrically distinct Aeolicisms, the loss of which would impoverish the formulaic system.¹⁷ Parry’s view has been upheld, with only slight modifications, by recent scholarship.¹⁸ The effects of the diachronic development of the Homeric epics are thus evident wherever we encounter the co-presence of Ionic and Aeolic forms. This inevitable reality has implications for a study of the collocation βῆ δ’ἴ(μ)εν(αι), where the dialectically distinct infinitives Aeolic ἴμεν(αι) and (Attic-) Ionic ἰέναι appear; their somewhat uneasy coexistence will be further discussed below (§2.2.2.3).

¹⁵ Parry (1971: 331)

¹⁶ See the discussion of Parry (1971: 328, 328 n.1). Witte’s articles, published from 1908 to 1912, have been reprinted in Witte (1972); his results are synopsised by Hainsworth (1988: 24): “The principle that governed the creation of this special dialect...was to produce, for a given sense, the maximum metrical diversity from the least infusion of ‘foreign’ material.”

¹⁷ Parry (1971: 325-64, esp. 331-33)

¹⁸ See, especially, Janko (1982). The Mycenaean influence on the epic tradition could only be detected after the decipherment of the Linear B in 1953, subsequent to Parry’s pioneering studies (and untimely death, in 1935). Janko’s findings suggest an early stage of the epic in a Mycenaean culture area that travelled to Aeolic communities, where it developed significantly during the Dark Ages, and was later taken over, in large, by Ionic-speaking poets; for a brief summary of these results, see Janko (1992: 15-19), Edwards (1986: 47-48).

2.2.2. Form(ula) and Function: Semantics and the Oral Tradition

It is clear, then, that the synchronic morpho-phonological variation manifest in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*—and, more specifically, in the relationship between the infinitives ἴμεν(αι) and ἰέναι—is the result of the diachronic development of an oral tradition. Less clear, however, is how and to what extent this process affects the usage of a word or expression, which need not be consistent throughout the tradition nor can be assumed to be independent of its function in oral versification. Nevertheless, our approach must account for these effects, especially in the examination of a Homeric formula, which is, above all, subject to pressure stemming from the rigorous demands of oral performance and which, owing to its fixed status and metrical utility, may be used despite an imperfect understanding of its original meaning.¹⁹ The synchronic distribution of the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) therefore cannot be analyzed without taking into consideration its formulaic character.

2.2.2.1. The Formulaic Status of βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι)

The three most common forms of the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι)—βῆ δ'ἴμεναι, βῆ δ'ἴμεν, βῆ δ'ἰέναι—as well as βῆ δὲ θέειν have independent claim to the status of “formula” according to Parry’s strict definition.²⁰ Although other issues have been raised in defining as formulae expressions containing forms of the infinitive by Vanseveren,²¹ who censures the uncritical extension of the term to syntagms of the type, e.g., ἐθέλω + infinitive, she approves of its

¹⁹ Further discussed below in §2.2.2.1-2; See Parry (1971: 240-50); cf. Hainsworth (1993: 28-29)

²⁰ Parry (1971: 13-14) in fact recognized βῆ δ'ἴμεν as a formula.

²¹ Vanséveren (2000: 76-77)

application in certain cases, specifically citing the collocation βῆ δ'ῖ(μ)εν(αι) as an example of a “système formulaire”.

To regard the collocation as a collective unity in this way necessitates only the elimination of Parry’s requirement “under the same metrical conditions,” which has been widely criticized and, after Hainsworth pointed out that it fails to account for the persistence of word-groups despite inflection and other factors that alter their metrical shape,²² generally excluded from later scholars’ criteria for determining formulaic status.²³ By dispensing with this stipulation, then, the terms “formula” and “formular system” are properly applied to the collocation βῆ δ'ῖ(μ)εν(αι) in the same way as they are used to refer, respectively, to inflectional variants of the same word group individually and collectively.²⁴

2.2.2.1.1. Orality and the Formula

A study of this formular system must not neglect the definitive statement of Lord: “An oral poem is composed not *for* but *in* performance.”²⁵ The formula facilitates this mode of composition, making oral composition-in-performance possible even within the complexity of the Greek dactylic hexameter;²⁶ yet even so, the formula does not entirely ease the strain of the performance on the Homeric bard, as evidenced by certain poetic imperfections. In some cases, phonotactic or metrical regularity is compromised by the semantic appropriateness of a formula

²² Hainsworth (1968: 30)

²³ e.g. Nagy (1996: 18): “[T]he formula is a fixed phrase conditioned by the traditional themes of oral poetry;” cf. n.13, above.

²⁴ cf. Parry (1971: 18-19)

²⁵ Lord (2003: 13)

²⁶ The complexity of the hexameter, as the culmination of an evolutionary development from Greek lyric meters and, ultimately, Indo-European meters, is discussed by Nagy (1974: *passim*, esp. 6-8); cf. Bakker (1997: 146-48).

to its context; hiatus and *brevis in longo* may be explained, as Parry showed,²⁷ by the modification and juxtaposition of existing formulae developed to convey a particular idea.²⁸ In other cases, the metrical utility of a formula is prioritized at the expense of its specific meaning: “[Formulae] are the right phrase in one context, but override a precise choice of language in another, so as to give a sense that is approximate or even inappropriate.”²⁹ These two opposite phenomena are reconciled in the useful designation of Bakker, who describes them in terms of “integration.”³⁰

Relevant here is the latter case, which Bakker terms “imperfect semantic integration.”³¹ There can be no doubt that the synchronic distribution of the collocation βῆ δ’ῖ(μ)εν(αι) reflects, to some degree, such “imperfect” formular usage; yet these “imperfect” uses cause special complications in the analysis of the collocation. Because the exact meaning of βῆ δ’ῖ(μ)εν(αι) is not entirely clear, it is necessary to rely on its context as an interpretative tool, a guide to a more nuanced understanding of the collocation itself. Yet the possibility of imperfect semantic integration implies that the context is unreliable. If it is impossible to determine whether or not a given instance of a formula is semantically appropriate to its context, equal emphasis must be placed on its usage in each and every context in ascertaining its meaning: in short, imperfect usages afflict the data set with statistical noise, obscuring any correlation between context and meaning, and impeding our attempt to establish the original function of the collocation.

²⁷ Parry (1971: 197-222); cf. Bakker (1988: 187)

²⁸ Concerning hiatus, Bakker (1988: 187-88) speaks of a disruption of the “phonetic continuity (‘synhaphea’)” of the verse, referring to its occurrence as “imperfect phonetic integration;” for usage of formulae in this way, cf. Janko (1992: 12): “[I]f a bard needs to create phrases in so demanding a verse-form, he will more readily reuse or adapt pre-existing formulae than improvise from his vernacular.”

²⁹ Hainsworth (1993: 18); cf. Bakker (1988: 190): “The usefulness of a given phrase as a standard building-block in the versification may imply its being used under semantically less than optimal circumstances.”

³⁰ Bakker (1988: 186-90)

³¹ Bakker (1988: 19): “A given phrase, which has a function as a formula in the diction, may at times be used by a poet, under formular pressure in oral performance, under semantic and syntactic circumstances for which it was not devised originally.” For exx. and analyses, see *op. cit.* 189, 192

2.2.2.1.2. Diachrony and the Formula

Additional complexity is introduced to this analysis by the diachronic dimension of the Homeric poems, as it entails the possibility of semantic change. The potential for semantic change is inherent to any evolving language system, since myriad factors may condition a shift in speakers' understanding of a lexical item so that, for two speakers of a language separated by space and time, its meaning may vary considerably, and its usage change accordingly. Hence, in the context of the Homeric poems, two bards composing at different stages of the epic tradition may use a word or formula in different ways or in different contexts. It is not clear *a priori*, then, to what extent the distribution of a formula in these poems reflects its original semantic value, and to what extent it is the product of semantic change *within* the Homeric tradition.

Evidence for semantic inconsistency in the Homeric poems can be found in a number of archaic forms, whose meaning in their context can only be explained as reinterpretations on the part of the poet, e.g., at *Il.* 20.247 ἄχθος ἄροιστο 'would bear the burden': the aorist ἄροιστο (< /ἄρνομαι 'I gain, win') has obviously been reanalyzed and employed with the semantic value of a lexically distinct verb (ἄροιστο ← ἀείρομαι 'I bear').³² On certain occasions, when Homeric usage jars strikingly with an etymology generated by comparative philology, the conscious effort of the bard to analyze an ancient, poorly understood form is evident;³³ these instances typically—but not exclusively—fall into a category called by Parry the “ornamental gloss”

³² Edwards (1991: 247, *ad Il.* 20.247); cf. Hainsworth (1993: 29)

³³ Some examples are discussed by Parry (1971: 248-49) and Hainsworth (1993: 29-30); on the Homeric poet's reanalyses, Parry (1971: 248) comments: “For Homer, if we are to assign him to a point of time anywhere near the historical period of Greek literature, can only have explained the words in question by associations, however far-fetched, with words of which he knew the signification. His etymological science, for such it may be called, must have been dominated at every point by the principle of analogy.”

which consists principally of the archaic, esoteric epithets of heroes and gods, the obscurity of which the poet tolerates due to their metrical utility and distinctive poetic quality.³⁴

The radical reanalyses undergone by some of these forms are of little relevance to the semantic development of the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι). Since the collocation consists of two lexically basic verbs of movement, each a part of the poet's everyday language, it admits only a very limited range of viable interpretations, with little variability from the "essential idea" which Parry noted in passing: "he went."³⁵ More problematic, however, are the broad implications of such reanalyses, namely, that archaic forms—especially formulae—were not always well understood by Homeric bards, who used them despite a partial or even poor conception of their original meaning. In view of the evident archaism of the collocation and the unparalleled syntactic relationship between its verbal constituents, we may hypothesize that it too was at some point disconnected from its original semantic domain.³⁶ Its subsequent usage by bards with incomplete knowledge poses interpretational problems similar to those caused by imperfect semantic integration, clouding a clear perception of the original locus to which the collocation is strictly semantically appropriate.

Unlike imperfect semantic integration, the effects of diachronic semantic change may be mitigated provided we consider only 'older' usages in the Homeric period. To control the Homeric data in this way is, of course, usually problematic; in a text characterized by immanent diachrony, it is seldom possible to distinguish between 'older' and 'recent' usages of an individual word or formula.³⁷ However, the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι), which shows variation

³⁴ Parry (1971: 240-50, esp. 247-48)

³⁵ Parry (1971: 13-14)

³⁶ See below, §2.2.2.3; cf. Chapter 4 (§4.3.2-3), below.

³⁷ Nor can these usages be distinguished using broad chronological diagnostics, e.g., the fact that the *Odyssey* is a younger poem than the *Iliad* (see Janko [1982]). Such instruments are too crude and imprecise, for it remains the case that, with respect to any single feature, the *Odyssey* may, in fact, show greater archaism.

between the metrically equivalent infinitival forms Aeolic ἴμεναι and (Attic-) Ionic ἰέναι, may offer the rare possibility to penetrate the immanent diachrony of the Homeric text, and glimpse the evolutionary processes at work within the Homeric period which result in the synchronic distribution of the collocation.

2.2.2.2. The Principle of Economy and the Formular System

The system of oral formulaic composition was extremely efficient, maximizing the metrical utility of each formula, and therefore minimizing the number of formulae necessary for composition and easing the cognitive burden of the bard in performance. The preservation of metrically distinct—and so, useful—Aeolic forms was part of this efficient system, the development of which was governed by what Parry termed the principle of “economy.”³⁸ According to this principle, a system should be “free of phrases which, having the same metrical value and expressing the same idea, could replace one another.”³⁹ But while economy explains many of the features of the traditional diction, including the nature of the *Kunstsprache* and the system of nominative noun-epithet formulas for the gods and major heroes of the epics,⁴⁰ it appears to be flouted by the collocation βῆ δ’ἴ(μ)εν(αι).

Economy will tolerate, within the formular system, the metrical alternation between the variant Aeolic infinitive forms ἴμεναι and ἴμεν or, alternatively, between the (Attic-) Ionic infinitive ἰέναι and Aeolic ἴμεν because each form of the collocation has, with respect to the

³⁸ cf. Hainsworth (1993: 24): “Economy is pervasive...Dialect, archaic, and artificial forms enter the *Kunstsprache* only where they differ from the corresponding Ionic form.”

³⁹ Parry (1971: 276); the concise formulation of Page (1959: 224) captures some refinements made to Parry’s original work, taking into account an improved understanding of localization: “Generally speaking, for a given idea within a given place in the line, there will be found in the vast treasury of phrases one formula and one only”

⁴⁰ Parry (1971: 276-9; 7)

other, a unique metrical value, i.e. choriambic (— u u —) beside dactylic (— u u) shape.

However, the coexistence of Aeolic ἴμεναι and (Attic-) Ionic ἰέναι, having identical prosodic structure, is problematic. The expected replacement of the Aeolic infinitive ἴμεναι—in keeping with the general evolution of the *Kunstsprache* (as sketched above in §2.2.1), and the principle of economy⁴¹—by (Attic-) Ionic ἰέναι, the form of the infinitive predominant in epic and productive into the Attic period, has occurred only incompletely. Significantly, the Aeolic infinitive ἴμεναι is confined, nearly exclusively, to the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι). The distribution of these three variant forms of the infinitive is shown below in Table 2.1:⁴²

Table 2.1	<i>Total</i>	<i># in Collocation</i>	<i>% in Collocation</i>
ἰέναι	58	24	41.4%
ἴμεν	53	34	64.2%
ἴμεναι	16	15	93.75%

Economy is not exceptionless, yet the high frequency with which Aeolic ἴμεναι has been preserved in a single locus in the Homeric epics makes it untenable to simply assume an uncharacteristically superfluous retention in the traditional diction;⁴³ rather, the survival of these

⁴¹ The issues inherent to formular remaking—i.e. the substitution of a more recent form for a corresponding dialectal or archaic form in a formulaic context—specific to the infinitive in Homeric epic are discussed by Vanseveren (2000: 77-78); see also below, §2.2.2.3

⁴² A similar table appears in Letoublon's study (1985: 61). Her exact figures do not match my own (which can be found in the Appendix), but because she does not publish her data set, the precise differences cannot be reconciled. For my part, I have omitted *Il.* 20.65 φάτο δ' ἴμεναι ἄντ' Ἀχιλλῆος, on which see Edwards (1991: 330-31, *ad loc.*) and *GH* (I: 486); the scansion of this line is overly problematic, necessitating ἴμεναι to be read, in this instance alone, as ἴμεναι with geminate nasal (printed by Allen 1920, II: *ad loc.*), or with initial long ἴ̄ (West 1998, *ad loc.*). Letoublon (1985: 247 n. 9) explicitly includes it in her data, but notes its exceptionality; it can be inferred, then, on the basis of her analysis, that she does not include *Od.* 22.146 βῆ δ' ἴμεναι in her data-set. I have also accepted the suggested emendation at *Od.* 8.303 of Ludwich (1998, I: *ad loc.*).

⁴³ cf. *GH* (486), who is followed by, e.g. Edwards (1991: 330-31, *ad Il.* 20.365). Only Letoublon (1985: 61) appears to have observed the relationship between the infinitive ἴμεναι and the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι).

forms should be regarded as *motivated*, as Parry maintained: “A foreign or older form may be kept in the poetic language even when the poet’s own language has a form which could take its place, but such a keeping, apart from metrical reasons, will be due to the regular use of the form along with other words which are always used as a group and which the poet feels as such, or to the poetic character of the word, or to some other such special reason.”⁴⁴

The possibility that these retentions are semantically motivated is suggested by the non-replacement at *Il.* 6.393 of the Aeolic infinitive διεξιμεναι—i.e. the corresponding complex verb (δια + ἐξι + ἴμεναι)—by (Attic-) Ionic διεξιέναι, which Chantraine has proposed “a peut-être été conservé parce que διεξιέναι prend déjà en ionien le sens de ‘raconter’.”⁴⁵ His hypothesis calls attention to the possibility of semantic change *within* the Homeric tradition, and raises the question of the relationship between form and function in the collocation: Does semantic change underlie the coexistence of the formulae βῆ δ’ἴμεναι and βῆ δ’ιέναι?

2.2.2.3. The Evolution of the Collocation: A Working Hypothesis

Treating the collocation in conjunction with the simplex root aorist (ἐ)βῆ/(ἐ)βαν, Letoublon concludes:

*.L’emploi statistiquement prépondérant de l’infinitif archaïque ἴμεναι, le fait que les forms de ἐβῆν attestés dans la formule sont toujours les forms anciennes avec alternance vocalique (βῆ/ἐβαν) excluant les forms récentes analogiques (comme ἐβῆσαν) suffisent pour garantir l’appartenance de ce type formulaire au fonds le plus ancien de l’épopée. Ce caractère archaïque explique que le sens de la formule ne soit plus très bien compris des Grecs, peut-être dès l’époque homérique.*⁴⁶

⁴⁴ Parry (1971: 341)

⁴⁵ *GH* (486)

⁴⁶ Letoublon (1985: 127 [emphasis mine]); cf. Letoublon (1985: 61; 1982: 192-93, 193 n. 22), who cites the similar conclusions of Hoekstra (1964: 147-49)

Letoublon's conclusions support the hypothesis, proposed above (§2.2.2.1.2), that 'later' bards did not fully command the original meaning of the collocation. She also hints at a connection between their fading understanding and the preservation of the Aeolic infinitive ἴμεναι; though no further explanation is offered, her final statement seems to suggest that Aeolic ἴμεναι was not replaced by (Attic-) Ionic ἰέναι precisely because the collocation had ceased to be wholly understood by the poet.

Following Letoublon's intuition, then, we may tentatively conjecture a scenario in which, at a liminal stage of the epic tradition when Ionic-speaking bards began to rework a principally Aeolic poem, the poet in composition, though lacking a full and nuanced understanding of the archaic, formulaic expressions βῆ δ'ἴμεναι and βῆ δ'ἴμεν, nevertheless would retain a vague sense that they were singularly appropriate and would leave them intact, fixed in these contexts;⁴⁷ but because of the metrical utility of the collocation—the flexible, synonymous alternatives βῆ δ'ἴμεν (— u u) and βῆ δ'ἴμεναι (— u u —)—and its poetic quality—prominent and audibly distinctive in Homeric poetry—the collocation would remain an important part of the traditional diction. Consequently, the formula βῆ δ'ἴμεναι would be renewed with the productive form of the infinitive, Ionic ἰέναι, and subsequently utilized in composition alongside original Aeolic βῆ δ'ἴμεν, for which the poet had no corresponding metrical substitute in his vernacular; 'older' usages of βῆ δ'ἴμεναι thereby stand beside 'recent' usages of βῆ δ'ἰέναι, which would owe their impetus to—and hence would be used in accordance with—a changed understanding of the meaning of the collocation. Since its semantic evolution could only occur

⁴⁷ The exact nature of the mechanism of preservation for Aeolic ἴμεναι is treated more extensively in Chapter 4 (§4.3.3).

within the fairly narrow constraints imposed by its lexical component parts, usage of the ‘recent’ forms would differ from ‘older’ usage in subtle, but critical details.⁴⁸

This scenario, admittedly speculative, offers a possible semantic explanation for the coexistence of the formulae βῆ δ’ἴμεναι and βῆ δ’ιέναι. This explanation is, moreover, in accordance with general principles of semantic change and the special conditions of the Homeric tradition and oral formulaic composition. It will be useful to adopt it as a working hypothesis, from which two propositions highly relevant to a semantic analysis of the collocation arise:

- 1) Usage of the collocation βῆ δ’ἴμεναι will differ markedly from that of βῆ δ’ιέναι.⁴⁹
- 2) Usage of the collocation βῆ δ’ἴμεναι will better reflect the original function of the collocation βῆ δ’ἴ(μ)εναι.

The first proposition, which may be corroborated by a synchronic examination of the data, will guide the analysis carried out in the remainder of this chapter. Should differences between the usage of βῆ δ’ἴμεναι and βῆ δ’ιέναι prove demonstrable, it is possible that they are original to the collocation. This possibility will be explored in Chapter 4, where our working hypothesis will be reevaluated and further developed as a concrete theory.

This working hypothesis therefore introduces a second, deeper level of analysis to the study of the collocation in this chapter. In addition to determining how the collocation βῆ δ’ἴ(μ)εν(αι) functions in relation to the other verbs of movement attested in the Homeric poems, it will be necessary to observe how the three variant forms of the collocation function with respect to one another and to the formulaic system as a whole.

⁴⁸ In this study, the terms ‘older’ and ‘recent’ used throughout refer to the relative chronology of the collocation, the former corresponding to the period in which the βῆ δ’ἴμεναι was productive, and the latter to the period after βῆ δ’ιέναι became the productive variant. The collocation’s limited potential for semantic reanalysis is discussed above in §2.2.2.1.2.

⁴⁹ And, perhaps to a lesser extent, βῆ δ’ἴμεν, which, according to this hypothesis, remained productive after the replacement of βῆ δ’ἴμεναι by βῆ δ’ιέναι; see further discussion in Chapter 4 (§4.3.2-3)

2.2.3. Prototypicality and the Collocation βῆ δ'ἴμεναι

Explaining these interrelationships will be the aim of the remainder of this chapter. To this end, I will adopt the concept of *prototypicality* to distinguish between usages that are more characteristic (*prototypical*) and less characteristic (*peripheral*) of the original semantic value of the collocation. In terms of Prototype Theory,⁵⁰ the set of expressions represented in this study by the notation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι)—rigidly defined by the lexical and morphological means described in §2.1.2⁵¹—constitutes a cognitive category. The best example of this category,⁵² the *semantic prototype*, expresses the full semantic content of the collocation in its original function.⁵³ The approach to prototypicality undertaken here seeks to represent this semantic content as a set of characteristic—or *prototypical*—semantic properties, all of which are realized in the semantic prototype. If the semantic prototype is appropriately delimited—with all its prototypical properties described, and without the inclusion of extraneous or arbitrary complexities⁵⁴—then every member of this category, i.e. every use of the collocation βῆ

⁵⁰ These terms are drawn from Prototype Theory, which has its origin in cognitive psychology and the seminal work of Eleanor Rosch (e.g. 1973, 1978) on natural human category formation, whence its development and application to lexical semantics by, especially, Fillmore (1982: 31-35) and Geeraerts (1997). This study draws substantially on the discussion and insights of Bakker (1988) and Clarke (2005, 2010), who have demonstrated its usefulness for ancient Greek; for an updated bibliography on prototype theory and its use in cognitive linguistics, see Clarke (2010: 125).

⁵¹ Bakker (1988: 17) points out that, in contrast to the frequent overlapping of perceived cognitive categories in the real world, linguistic categories are clearly bounded, marked by lexical and morphosyntactic features: “As to their *form* all instances of linguistic categories are similar...in lexical semantics, the most peripheral instance of a given lexeme is *as to its form* identical to the prototypical instances” [emphasis his]. His example of the perceived cognitive category ‘chair,’ originally used by Rosch (1978), is discussed in greater detail by Lakoff (1987: 50-54).

⁵² On the difference between the classical theory of the category and Prototype Theory of categorization, see Lakoff (1987: 1-57), with a survey of important contributions to the development of prototype theory.

⁵³ It is important to be mindful of the caveat of Clarke (2005: 125), that “proto-” in prototype studies does not necessarily refer “to priority in time but to primacy in structural configuration.” For the purpose of this study, however, these two coincide: the relevant semantic prototype is the prototype of the *original* semantic value of the collocation.

⁵⁴ The importance of ‘Occam’s Razor’ for evaluating the semantic prototype is properly emphasized by Clarke (122-23, 125-26).

δ'ῖ(μ)εναι, will exhibit one or more of these properties, which justify its application by the poet in that specific instance.

Relevant to this approach are the notions of *gradience* and *neutralization*, as discussed by Bakker.⁵⁵ It is a fundamental insight of prototype theory that categories are graded. In a category that is clearly bounded, as is the case with the collocation βῆ δ'ῖ(μ)εν(αι), the notion of gradience refers to the fact that not all members of the category are equally good representatives of the category. The category is better represented by prototypical members, and best of all by the semantic prototype itself. In a graded category, a continuum of prototypicality may be envisioned along which a member may be ordered by the degree to which it possesses the properties of the semantic prototype.⁵⁶ more properties correlate with prototypicality, less with peripherality. Each instance of the expression βῆ δ'ῖμεναι, βῆ δ'ῖμεν, or βῆ δ'ῖέναι belongs to the graded category signified by βῆ δ'ῖ(μ)εν(αι), and may be ordered in proportion to its prototypicality in this way.

The concept of neutralization applies to the relationship between two distinct categories. A category X which has members that possess some of the same or similar properties as the members of category Y may be referred to as a “neighboring” category of category Y.⁵⁷ When dealing with peripheral members of neighboring categories, it can be difficult, though not impossible, to distinguish between them; in such cases, the difference between the prototypical instances of these categories has been neutralized.⁵⁸ For the collocation βῆ δ'ῖ(μ)εναι, obvious neighboring categories are represented by the verb βαίνω and the suppletive paradigm εἶμι—

⁵⁵ Bakker (1988: 15-18). It should be noted that, in his later work (e.g. [2005: *passim*]), Bakker has adopted the term “nuclear” in place of “prototypical” with the same meaning; on this term and its history in prototype semantics, see Lakoff (1987: 17-21).

⁵⁶ cf. Bakker (1988: 15); Fillmore (1982: 32)

⁵⁷ The term “neighboring,” used by Bakker (1988: 17), is apropos; it suggests the notion of a quantifiable distance from the center of a category in the same way as the term “peripheral” does, while clearly establishing that category as distinct.

⁵⁸ cf. Bakker (1988: 17-18)

ἤλθον. The difference between peripheral instances of the collocation and these verbs will be described in terms of neutralization.

This approach has a number of advantages. While it explains how all usage stems from one basic meaning, it does not necessarily require an attempt to specifically render this meaning; the prototype may, in fact, elude strict, concise definition,⁵⁹ being conceived at a more abstract level, the “pre-verbal essence of meaning that underlies and motivates the appropriateness of each act of naming.”⁶⁰ Rather, it will be defined in terms of its prototypical properties, any of which may be realized in a given usage of the collocation, though it may be the case that in no single usage are all prototypical properties realized.⁶¹ This approach therefore does not require—and indeed, argues against—identifying one particular instance of the collocation as a representation of the semantic prototype itself.

Moreover, prototype theory provides the means to account for, under just one label, the two factors discussed above (§2.2.2.1.1-2) which complicate analysis of Homeric epic, imperfect semantic integration and diachronic semantic change. Usage colored by either of these factors diverges from the original semantic domain of the collocation, occurring in contexts in which it is not wholly appropriate. Prototype theory treats such instances as peripheral. Bakker has profitably embraced this notion, treating imperfect semantic integration in conjunction with peripheral uses of formulae;⁶² so too has Clarke argued for “collapsing the distinction between

⁵⁹ And in all but the most specifically technical usages, it certainly cannot be defined by a one-size-fits-all translation into the interpretative metalanguage (English, French, etc.) of the translator; on the relationship between reading and translating a Greek text, see Clarke (2010: 120-23).

⁶⁰ Clarke (2005: 23)

⁶¹ cf. Clarke (2005: 23-24): “[It is possible] that the prototype does not lie among the category’s members at all, but takes shape at a more abstract conceptual level, such that it is never openly articulated on the surface of expressed thought. Lest this should seem merely obscurantist, it can be restated in this way: the prototype need not be a thing, whether abstract or concrete, but can be a process which is realised or *instantiated* in each of the members of the lexical category. In essence, then, the prototype approach invites us to look for a verbal rather than a nominal idea to motivate our definition.”

⁶² Bakker (1988: 19, 188-195, 239-265)

semantic change and polysemy,” which accords with the statement of Fillmore: “It is characteristic of the prototype notion in semantics that in the analysis of departures from and approximations to given semantic prototypes it is not always necessary to decide whether an account is to be taken as synchronic or diachronic in effect.”⁶³

These practical considerations recommend approaching semantic analysis in terms of prototypicality, as will others to be considered later.⁶⁴ What remains, then, is to determine what are the prototypical properties of the collocation βῆ δ’ῖ(μ)εναι.

2.3. The Collocation βῆ δ’ῖ(μ)εν(αι) and the Verbal System

A likely starting-point may be the collocation’s inherent properties—lexical, aspectual, and deictic, i.e. locating the action in time and space—by which it stands in relation to, yet is distinct from other verbs of movement in Homeric epic. Of special interest are the verb βαίνω and the suppletive paradigm εἶμι—ἤλθον, the categories neighboring the collocation. It is easy to identify semantic differences between other, lexically distinct verbs of movement and the collocation βῆ δ’ῖ(μ)εν(αι), but to distinguish semantically between the two verbs of which the collocation is a composite and the collocation itself will require a more subtle analysis and may, in the end, be expressed only in terms of the prototypical properties of the collocation βῆ δ’ῖ(μ)εν(αι).⁶⁵ What place, then, does the collocation βῆ δ’ῖ(μ)εν(αι) occupy in the system of verbs of movement in Homeric epic?

⁶³ Clarke (2005: 26); Fillmore (1982: 32)

⁶⁴ I refer here, in particular, to the notions of *salience* and *entrenchment* as discussed by Clarke (2010: 127-29) and Sweetser (1990: 1-19). These concepts, grounded in Prototype Theory, will prove instrumental in explaining the historical development of the collocation in Chapter 4; see, especially, §4.3.4, below.

⁶⁵ cf. Bakker (1988: 18): “[P]eripheral instances of neighboring categories may be substituted for one another without essential differences in meaning, at least to a far higher degree than their prototypical counterparts. This is reflected in speakers’ varying opinions as to whether ‘A’ or ‘B’ is the right expression in a given context.”

2.3.1. Lexical Value

The collocation belongs to a category “verbs of movement,” which may be defined as verbs referring to the autonomous *locomotion*, i.e. the change of location through time, of the subject.⁶⁶ This definition specifically excludes those verbs which result in a change of location not of the verb’s subject, but of its object (e.g. ἵημι ‘I set in motion’), as well as passive forms of such verbs which entail a change in location of the subject as the result of an external agent (*viz.* not autonomous). Further omitted from this category are verbs which refer to a movement in a static position (e.g. ἵσταμαι ‘I stand’). Yet it is, nonetheless, a large and rich category, with the means to express vividly a wide range of distinct movements: τρέχω, θέω—ἔδραμον ‘I run;’ πέτομαι ‘I fly;’ ἐλαύνω ‘I drive;’ φέρω ‘I take/bring, bear;’ αἴσσω ‘I dart;’ λείπω ‘I leave, depart;’ ἴκω/ἰκάνω ‘I arrive, reach;’ and many others. In this section, I will draw extensively on the findings of Letoublon, whose systematic study of verbal movement in Homeric epic addresses each of these verbs, with special emphasis on the suppletive paradigm εἶμι—ἦλθον and the verb βαίνω.⁶⁷

The lexical value of the collocation βῆ δ’ἴ(μ)εν(αι) is fundamentally bound to its constituent elements, the verb βαίνω and the suppletive paradigm εἶμι—ἦλθον. These verbs are distinguished from the majority of verbs of movement by their relatively basic lexical semantics, which can be expressed, in translation, by English ‘come/go.’ Other verbs of movement may also convey the meaning ‘come/go,’ while bearing a distinctive, additional *seme* qualifying the nature of the movement, e.g.: θέειν may be understood as ‘to come/go quickly, to come/go by

⁶⁶ Letoublon (1985: 14) similarly defines this category as consisting of those verbs which express “un mouvement autonome du sujet, avec déplacement;” cf. Fillmore (1992: 40-41)

⁶⁷ Chapters I and II of Letoublon (1985), the bulk of her study, is dedicated to these verbs. In general, the collocation βῆ δ’ἴ(μ)εν(αι) is treated only insofar as it bears upon the function of these two verbs in Homeric epic.

running;⁶⁸ φέρειν as ‘to come/go carrying X, to make X come/go to;’⁶⁹ etc. This additional seme—whether it indicates the manner of the subject’s displacement (e.g. θέω, πέτομαι), or denotes an additional object displaced as a result of the movement (ἄγω, φέρω)⁷⁰—semantically marks these verbs relative to the lexically basic verbs which constitute the collocation (βαίνω and εἶμι), and a few select others: ἔρχομαι, βλώσχω—ἔμολον, κίον, ἔρω/ἐρπύζω. These basic verbs function as the minimal representatives of the category itself, referring only to the movement of the verb’s subject resulting in its displacement.⁷¹

2.3.1.1. The Suppletive Paradigm εἶμι—ἦλθον

Though verbs like βλώσχω—ἔμολον, κίον, ἔρω/ἐρπύζω function, essentially, as semantic equivalents to the suppletive paradigm εἶμι—ἦλθον in the *Kunstsprache*, they are, as Letoublon demonstrates, peripheral to the system of verbs of movement in Homeric epic which has at its very core the suppletive paradigm as the basic ‘come/go’ verb.⁷² The case of ἔρχομαι is more interesting, since it is integrated into this paradigm as traditionally presented in grammar handbooks of ancient Greek.⁷³ However, Letoublon’s study presents convincing evidence for the unity of the paradigm εἶμι—ἦλθον in Homer epic, as distinct from the paradigm for this verb in the classical language (see Table 2.2, below):

⁶⁸ cf. Letoublon (1985: 199): “[S]emantiquement, θέω—ἔδραμον semble signifier ‘aller vite’ (avec sens nettement effectif à l’aoriste, ‘accourir’) plutôt que ‘courir.’”

⁶⁹ Fillmore (1992: 82-102) equates the deictic properties of Eng. come/go with Eng. bring/take, allowing for an analysis of this kind. It remains an open question if there is, in ancient Greek, any analogous spatial deictic oppositions for lexemes expressing the notion of “bearing X” (perhaps, even realized within a suppletive paradigm, as in εἶμι—ἦλθον?).

⁷⁰ In the latter case, such verbs—lexical factitives—are also syntactically marked with respect to the others; see Letoublon (1985: 14-15), who describes the syntactic difference as ‘l’addition d’un actant.’

⁷¹ For the term “elementary” to describe these verbs, see *OED*, s.v. *come*; cf. Fillmore 1997: 78

⁷² According to Letoublon (1985: 110-120), ἔρω/ἐρπύζω and βλώσχω—ἔμολον serve as “doublets” for the suppletive paradigm. For κίον, see *op. cit.* 88, 231-34

⁷³ For a comparison of εἶμι and ἔρχομαι, see Letoublon (1985: 59-73)

<u>Table 2.2</u>	<u>Homeric Greek</u>	<u>Classical Greek</u>
Present	εἶμι	ἔρχομαι
Future	ἐλεύσομαι/εἰσομαι	εἶμι
Aorist	ἦλθον	ἦλθον
Perfect	εἰλήλουθα	εἰλήλουθα

The suppletive paradigm εἶμι—ἦλθον will serve as a vehicle to introduce the properties, some specific to verbs of movement, which must be understood in order to determine the prototypical features of the collocation.

When attempting to describe the semantic function of the suppletive paradigm, it is important to consider, above all, its *deictic* properties.⁷⁴ Like non-motion verbs, it is characterized by verbal tense, whose linguistic function is, along with aspect, to locate—to point out (Gk. δεῖξις ‘pointing out’)—in time the event expressed by the verb relative to its utterance. In ordinary, face-to-face conversation between two persons, the speaker of the the utterance—the (first person) self or *ego*—generally occupies the deictic zero-point—Buhler’s *origo*—the center of a system of reference with respect to which the event time is prior, subsequent, or simultaneous, as indicated by the temporal-aspectual properties of the verb;⁷⁵ it is typically his ‘now,’ shared with a (second-person) addressee,⁷⁶ that serves as the reference time for the event.⁷⁷

⁷⁴ Deixis has been defined by Lyons (1977: 637) as “the location and identification of persons, objects, events, processes and activities being talked about, or referred to, in relation to the spatio-temporal context created and sustained by the act of utterance and the participation in it.” For a historical survey of the scholarship on deixis and, especially, its use in Greek and Latin literature, see Edmunds (2008).

⁷⁵ For Buhler’s notion of the *origo*, the ego-centric zero point of the *Zeigfeld*—the deictic field—see Bühler (1990: 10); cf. Lenz (2003: vii-ix)

⁷⁶ Lyons (1977: 637) has termed this deictic context the “canonical situation.”

⁷⁷ The terms “reference time” and “event time” are used by Fillmore (1992: 57). He refers, also, to the moment of the utterance as the “coding time” of expression (*op. cit.* 67-68), further distinguishing between the time of “encoding,”

Yet the *origo* functions, too, as the point of reference for expressions of spatial deixis, uniting the speaker’s ‘here’ with his ‘now’ and, thereby, the two dimensions of human cognition, time and space.⁷⁸ The spatial deictic operators most familiar to students of ancient Greek—as of Latin and Classical Armenian, where similar tripartite systems exist—are the deictic (or demonstrative) pronouns ὄδε, οὗτος, and (ἐ)κεῖνος, which locate persons or objects at increasing distance in space relative to the speaker at the *origo* (as shown in Table 2.3).⁷⁹

Table 2.3 ⁸⁰	<u>1st Person / Proximal</u>	<u>2nd Person / Medial</u>	<u>3rd Person / Distal</u>
Greek	ὄδε	οὗτος	(ἐ)κεῖνος
Latin	<i>hic</i>	<i>iste</i>	<i>ille</i>
Cl. Armenian	<i>ays</i>	<i>ayd</i>	<i>ayn</i>

Because of this relationship to the speaker, these pronouns are conventionally aligned with the three grammatical persons: the proximal deictic (ὄδε) with the first person speaker, the medial (οὗτος) with the second-person addressee, and the distal ([ἐ]κεῖνος) with the third person, who is a non-participant in the discourse context (the “audience”).⁸¹ Less familiar, however, may be the spatial deictic notions lexically embedded in certain verbs of movement, including the suppletive

i.e. when the speaker “sends” the message to the addressee(s), and the time of “decoding,” i.e. when the message is received. This distinction is especially relevant to the study of written texts; unlike everyday conversation, where “encoding” and “decoding” take place almost simultaneously, the “encoding” function, writing, may be quite separate from the “decoding” function, reading or performance. For the discussion and application of this distinction to Greek poetics, see Felson (2004, esp. 257) and in the same volume, D’Alessio (2004, esp. 269 n.7 with further bibliography), who demonstrates its special relevance for choral lyric poetry and performance.

⁷⁸ See Felson (2004: 256). As Fillmore observes (1966: 222), the sentences “I am there” and “I am not here” are semantically contradictory—specifically, false on every occasion of utterance (*ibid.* n. 8).

⁷⁹ See Bakker (2010: 153); cf. Felson (2004: 256-57), Edmunds (2008: 79-80)

⁸⁰ This table is modeled on the one presented by Edmunds (2008: 80). On the system of deixis in Greek, see Bakker (2010); on the systems in Latin and Classical Armenian, see Klein (1999, 1996) respectively.

⁸¹ Fillmore (1992: 62) designates these three grammatical persons as “speaker,” “addressee,” and “audience” respectively; see, also, on the relationship between grammatical persons and proximity in space, Bakker (2010: 153) and Felson (2004: 256-57).

paradigm εἶμι—ἦλθον. The motion expressed by such verbs is deictically oriented in space, either toward the *origo* or away from it: the direction of these movements will be referred to, respectively, as *centripetal* and *centrifugal*.⁸²

The suppletive paradigm εἶμι—ἦλθον is thus deictically oriented in both time and space; its range of spatio-temporal deictic properties—as well as some of the natural ambiguities of the Greek language—may be illustrated with a single, significant example from the first book of the *Iliad*, namely, the famous speech of Achilles to Agamemnon in which he rebukes the commander and pronounces his intention to withdraw from the Achaian war effort (*Il.* 1.152-53, 169-70):

(2.6) οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ Τρώων ἔνεκ' ἦλυθον αἰχμητάων
 δεῦρο μαχησόμενος...
 ...
 νῦν δ' εἶμι Φθίην δ', ἐπεὶ ἦ πολὺ φέρτερόν ἐστιν
 οἴκαδ' ἵμεν σὺν νηυσὶ κορωνίσιν...

For I did not come for the sake of spear-armed Trojans
 hither to do battle...

...
 Now I am going to Phthia, since it is better by far
 to go homeward with the curved ships...

The 'here' of the speaker, inferred from the context, is the Achaian camp outside the walls of Troy; the directional adverb δεῦρο 'hither' points to this 'here' and, as such, functions as an explicit marker of the centripetal deictic orientation of ἦλ(υ)θον.⁸³ Letoublon's study confirms

⁸² The same terminology is employed by Letoublon (1985: 46-47), whose study is by far the most comprehensive work on the deictic properties of motion verbs in Greek; cf. Felson (2004: 257)

⁸³ Letoublon (1985: 47) lists the spatial adverbs δεῦρο and ἐνθάδε as explicit markers of centripetal deixis; of centrifugal deixis, κεῖσε and πόσε.

that centripetal deixis is, in fact, a prototypical feature of the verb ἦλθον.⁸⁴ In contrast, the destination of the movement expressed by the verb εἶμι, and restated in the infinitival clause οἴκαδ' ἵμεν with the same verb in the following line, is Achilles' homeland, Phthia; in the context of the utterance, the movement is therefore unambiguously centrifugal—a prototypical property of the verb. Although the spatial deictic properties of both εἶμι and ἦλθον may generally be neutralized⁸⁵—i.e. lack deictic orientation or have their usual deictic orientation reversed—the emergence of a semantic opposition between the two verbs is nevertheless clear.

The integration of semantic opposites into a single paradigm is, as Letoublon contends, the result of the tense-aspect system of Greek: the perfective *Aktionsart* of the verbal root of ἦλθον⁸⁶ yields only the stem for the Greek aorist tense, which is aspectually punctual and completive; the imperfective root of εἶμι (**h₁lei-* 'go'), conversely, provides a tense stem only for verbs expressing actions that are durative and incompletive, the present.⁸⁷ These temporal-aspectual properties can be observed in ex. (2.6). The aorist tense of the verb ἦλ(υ)θον places the initial movement in the past, prior to the verb's utterance and removed from Achilles' 'now,' just as the centripetally-oriented allative adverb δεῦρο locates the source of the movement in space at a point similarly distant from his 'here,' Phthia. Yet the verb is also aspectually completive, its

⁸⁴ The spatial deictic properties of εἶμι and ἦλθον are analyzed by Letoublon (1985: 42-54); their opposition is summarized in table on page 109. She does not use the term "prototypical," but refers, equivalently, to a "sème distinctif;" a concise list of these "sèmes distinctifs" for each of the verbs included in her study appears in her conclusion (*op. cit.* 235-36). She does, however, use the term "neutralization," with a sense approximately equivalent to that described in §2.2.3. Moreover, the operating principle of her study—and especially applied to the collocation βῆ δ' ἵ(μ)εν(αι)—seems to respond to the challenge of prototype semantics, as per Clarke (2010: 125), to "work backward by trial and error to a hypothetical prototype, arriving finally at the candidate which best explains the motivation of the attested uses and best harmonizes with the overall patterning of lexical semantics in the language." The results of her study can therefore quite naturally be assimilated to the terminology of Prototype Theory.

⁸⁵ In the special case of the first-person of εἶμι, neutralization does not occur; cf. Letoublon (1985: 65-71, 77).

⁸⁶ The aorist ἦλθον is generally derived from PIE **h₁leudh*, (cf. OIr. *luid* 'went' via syncope from ἦλυθον, which is less common in Homer and absent from the classical language; see *DELG* and *EDG* (2010, I) s.v. ἐλεύσομαι).

⁸⁷ Letoublon (1985: 54-58, esp. 56), who argues that there is no lexical opposition within the paradigm (as in Eng. come/go, Fr. venir/aller, Germ. kommen/gehen), only a semantic one, and should not be strictly translated by opposing lexemes in these languages (*op. cit.* 57).

action realized in Achilles' present location, Troy, and time, the moment of the utterance explicitly marked by the temporal adverb $\nu\tilde{\nu}\nu$ 'now' as the temporal deictic center.⁸⁸

The present tense of the verb $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\mu\iota$, on the contrary, indicates the simultaneity of the movement—or the imminent movement⁸⁹—with the speaker's present. The same Phthia, previously the source of movement expressed by $\eta\lambda(\nu)\theta\omicron\nu$, has become the destination of a centrifugal movement. So too is its aspectual imperfectivity clear; an action that is imperfective can hypothetically be interrupted,⁹⁰ and in the case of Achilles' intended journey home to Phthia, it is prevented in embryo by the timely intervention of Athena (*Il.* 1.188ff.), who persuades Achilles to withdraw from the fighting, but remain at Troy.

Before proceeding, it should be noted that this example is drawn from the dialogue of a character in the narrative, i.e. direct speech, where the *origo* is situated on the speaker in virtual space and time in the same way as it would be on a speaker in reality. In third-person narrative, however, the situation of the *origo* becomes more complex. The text establishes a deictic space displaced—or *shifted*⁹¹—from the first person speaker; in the elegant formulation of Felson:⁹²

⁸⁸ Bakker (2005: 170-71) argues for a performative interpretation of 1.152-3, in which the aspectual value of the verb $\eta\lambda(\nu)\theta\omicron\nu$ functions as an indicator of proximal temporal deixis: "This is a statement of Achilles' present 'here and now,' not about the past, and the aorist is not a report on Achilles' coming, but a statement, a declaration, of its results. When or how he came is less important than his being here... What counts is that these past actions have created conditions that make their utterance in the present a meaningful thing to do."

⁸⁹ cf. Letoublon (1985: 65): "A la première personne, les exemples de $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\mu\iota$ impliquent tous, non pas un mouvement un cours, mais une décision de se mouvoir." It is not, however, a proper future, a sense which is provided in the Homeric epics by $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota/\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ (on which verbs, see *op. cit.* 73-81). Letoublon discusses the special modal value of $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\mu\iota$ in the 1st person singular, which is a product, she argues, of the pragmatic conditions of its utterance, suggesting it is used with semi-performative value (*op. cit.* 65, 71, 79-80). This orientation towards the future ultimately results in its role as the true future in the suppletive paradigm in the language of the classical period.

⁹⁰ cf. Boas and Huitink (2010: 140): "[A]s a rule, imperfective actions may be interrupted."

⁹¹ On the terms "shifter" and "shift," and their foundational significance for the study of deixis, see Edmunds (2008: 69-74, 78-79, 81).

⁹² Felson (2004: 260); for Bühler's imagination-oriented deixis (*Deixis am Phantasma*), see Bühler (1990: 137-57)

[A]n author—whether an oral storyteller, a character, narrator, or a literate composer—may create a universe of discourse outside him- or herself and purposely yield his or her position in the slot *ego/nunc* to imagined events and characters. In this type of imaginary displacement—Bühler’s imagination oriented deixis—time and space are not to be understood concretely within the lifetime and before the eyes of the speaker/composer as in ocular deixis. Instead, that figure has created a new *origo* as the place on the grid where “I,” “here,” and “now” intersect: at it he situates not only himself but the listener/reader, and from it he orients all subsequent activities—in front of, in back of, or alongside it; going from or coming to it, etc.

The *origo* specifically relevant to an analysis of the collocation βῆ δ’ἴ(μ)εν(αι), which occurs almost without exception in the third person singular and plural, is the ‘here’ and ‘now’ of the verbal subject; the centripetal ‘comings’ and centrifugal ‘goings’ of the subject are deictically oriented with respect to this *origo*, as are the tense-aspect of the verbs expressing these movements.

2.3.1.2. The Verb βαίνω

The semantic properties of the root aorist (ἔ)βῆ/(ἔ)βάν and the present βαίνω are essentially consistent, except insofar as they are integrated in the Greek tense-aspect system. The verb shows a unique range of usage, which Letoublon argues can be explained as the product of an original sense in Greek ‘to take a step.’ This sense would explain a number of attested usages reflecting the sense of movement on foot—often idiomatic, e.g. *Il.* 5.745 ποσὶ βήσετο, *Il.* 6.65 λὰξ...βὰς⁹³—or the notion of a discontinuity in the movement, specifically, the crossing of a limit, the most obvious examples of which are its verbal compounds, e.g. ἀναβαίνω/ἀποβαίνω ‘to

⁹³ On these idiomatic expressions, see Letoublon (1985: 128-29); it is evident too, in verbal nouns, e.g. βάσις ‘step, stepping’ (<*g^wḡ-ti-; cf. Skt. *gáti-* ‘id.’).

embark/disembark (a ship),’ διαβαίνω ‘to cross over (a river, a sea).’⁹⁴ Both properties appear to be prototypical of this verb.⁹⁵

The spatial deictic orientation of βαίνω in Homeric epic is, without exception, centrifugal. Even in the absence of any indicator of direction, such as a prepositional phrase or deictic adverb, its sense is unambiguous, e.g. *Il.* 4.384-86:

(2.7) ἔνθ' αὖτ' ἀγγελίην ἐπὶ Τυδῆ στεῖλαν Ἀχαιοί.
αὐτὰρ ὁ **βῆ**, πολέας δὲ κυχῆσατο Καδμείωνας
δαινυμένους κατὰ δῶμα βίης Ἴτεοκληείης.

From there, then, the Achaians dispatched Tydeus as a messenger.
And he **went off**, and arrived among the manifold Kadmeians,
feasting around the house of mighty Eteokles.

Its observed centrifugality in Homeric Greek is confirmed by its relationship with the antonymous pair of verbs λείπω ‘I leave (behind)’ and μένω ‘I remain,’ being used only in syntactic and semantic apposition to the former, while opposed to the latter, e.g. *Il.* 22.136-39:⁹⁶

(2.8) Ἴκτορα δ', ὡς ἐνόησεν, ἔλε τρόμος· οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔτ' ἔτλη
αὐθι **μένειν**, ὀπίσω δὲ πύλας **λίπε**, **βῆ** δὲ φοβηθείς·
Πηλεΐδης δ' ἐπόρουσε ποσὶ κραιπνοῖσι πεποιθώς.

But when he saw [Achilles], a tremor of fear seized Hektor, and no longer did he dare
to remain there, but **left behind** the gates, and **went off**, terror-struck.
And the son of Peleus rushed after [him], trusting in his swift feet.

⁹⁴ According to Letoublon (1985: 41-42), the specialized usages of these compound verbs allow this verb to survive beyond Homeric Greek, unlike the simplex forms which, as a result of their semantic similarity to the suppletive paradigm εἶμι—ἦλθον, becomes superfluous and disappear except in stylistically marked poetry.

⁹⁵ Letoublon (1985: 235-36)

⁹⁶ cf. Letoublon (1985:137)

The centrifugal deixis of βαίνω is a striking feature, on the basis of which Bloch constructed two elementary movement verb paradigms in Homeric Greek corresponding to the centripetal/centrifugal distinction, the former with present ἔρχομαι—aorist ἦλθον, the latter with present εἶμι—aorist ἔβην.⁹⁷ Letoublon, however, who convincingly refutes Bloch’s proposal, contends that this deictic value is not a fundamental constituent of the sense of the verbal root(s) of βαίνω—ἔβην (*g^wem-/g^weh₂-) as it is for εἶμι (*h₁ei), but rather a natural development of its usage from an original non-deictically oriented meaning;⁹⁸ in this way, she seeks to reconcile the fact that this orientation is, from an Indo-European perspective, anomalous.⁹⁹ The spatial deictic orientation for the roots *g^wem-/g^weh₂- and *h₁ei- in several language branches of Indo-European are depicted in Table 2.4 (below):

⁹⁷ The proposal of Bloch (1940) appears to be the impetus for the study of Letoublon (1985). A native speaker of German, Bloch (1940) framed the centripetal/centrifugal distinction in terms of Germ. *kommen/gehen*; cf. Eng. *come/go*, Fr. *venir/aller*. For a summary of Bloch’s argument, see Letoublon (1985: 30-31), as well as for its (convincing) refutation (*op. cit.* 54-48, esp. 57). Letoublon’s study has, nevertheless, been neglected in certain recent scholarship; see, e.g. *EDG*, s.v. βαίνω, where the authority of Bloch is cited.

⁹⁸ Letoublon (1985: 137): “Le sens ‘s’en aller’ n’est pas le sens premier de l’aoriste, mais il s’explique tout naturellement comme un effet de sens à partir de ‘faire un pas,’ quand on est ‘ici,’ lieu de référence de l’énonciation, ‘faire un pas,’ c’est commencer à s’éloigner, à partir.”

⁹⁹ Letoublon (1985: 142-43), who suggests that “[i]l ne serait pas impossible que le sens ‘faire un pas’ donne une orientation déictique centripète dans un système autre que le grec... Dans ce cas, on pourrait dire que le système grec, avec les différentes évolutions sémantiques possibles réalisées en fait à partir d’une valeur sémantique originelle unique, et la naissance d’une orientation déictique centrifuge, donnerait l’exemple d’un processus qui a pu avoir lieu en indo-européen au moment de la division dialectale: on partirait d’un verbe non orienté dans l’espace de l’énonciation, qui a actualisé diversement les virtualités sémantiques et déictiques dans les dialectes hérités.”

Table 2.4¹⁰⁰				
	<u>Root</u>	<u>Centripetal</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Centrifugal</u>
Greek	* <i>h₁ei-</i> * <i>g^wem-</i> * <i>g^weh₂-</i>		βάσκει ¹⁰¹	εἶσι βαίνει ¹⁰² *βίβᾱσι/ἔβη ¹⁰³
Latin	* <i>h₁ei-</i> * <i>g^wem-</i>	<i>venit/vēnit</i>		<i>it/iit</i>
Sanskrit	* <i>h₁ei-</i> * <i>g^wem-</i> * <i>g^weh₂-</i>		<i>gacchati/agan</i> (?) ¹⁰⁴ <i>jigāti/agāt</i> (?)	<i>eti</i>
Hittite	* <i>h₁ei-</i>	<i>uiazi</i> ¹⁰⁵	<i>iyattari</i>	<i>paizzi</i>
Gothic	* <i>h₁ei-</i> * <i>g^wem-</i>	<i>qimiþ/qam</i> ¹⁰⁷		<i>iddja</i> ¹⁰⁶
Cl. Armenian	* <i>g^wem-</i> * <i>g^weh₂-</i>	<i>ekn</i> ¹⁰⁸ (<i>eki</i>) ¹⁰⁹		
Tocharian B	* <i>h₁ei-</i> * <i>g^wem-</i>	<i>śem(o)</i>		<i>yaṃ</i>

¹⁰⁰ Unless otherwise noted, all forms are 3rd person singular. In languages which have both present and aorist formations to the same root, they notation present/aorist (e.g. Skt. *gacchati/agan*) is employed. For the derivation of these forms see, in general, *LIV*, s.vv. **h₁ei-*, **g^wem-*, **g^weh₂-*.

¹⁰¹ It is assumed in this study that Gk. -βάσκει (found in 3rd s. only in compounds, e.g. Ar. Av. 486 διάβασκει, though in the imperative elsewhere, e.g. A. *Pers.* 663, 671) is correctly derived from the zero-grade of **g^wem-* (**g^wm̄-ské-ti*; see *LIV*, s.v. **g^wem-*, cf. *IEW* **g^wā/*g^wem-*, Weiss [2010: 93])—therefore making exact equation with Skt. *gacchati*—though a derivation from **g^weh₂-* (e.g. Letoublon (1985: 143) is also plausible (cf. n. 4, above). If this alternative were correct, an etymological relationship would obtain between the first element of βάσκ’ ἴθι and that of the collocation βῆ δ’ἴ(μ)εν(αι), thus strengthening the historical connection between the two expressions as proposed in Chapter 3 (§3.4.2). If indeed βάσκω is from **g^wem-*, this study may be taken as further evidence for the unity of **g^wem-* and **g^weh₂-* in Greek and, perhaps, in Proto-Indo-European.

¹⁰² Gk. βαίνει has an etymological match in Lat. *venit* (**g^wm̄-je-ti*); *LIV*, s.v. *g^wem-*; cf. *EDL*, s.v. *veniō*

¹⁰³ *βίβᾱσι is not attested, but can be inferred from 3rd pl. Dor. βίβαντι. Both Gk. ἔβη and Skt. *agāt* derive from **e-g^weh₂-t*.

¹⁰⁴ The deictic orientation of these roots in Sanskrit is not precisely clear; see Letoublon (1985: 142-43, 258 n. 85)

¹⁰⁵ Both *uiazi* ‘comes’ (which has a suppletive imperative *ehu* with full-grade of **h₁ei-*; cf. Lat. *ī* ‘go’) and *paizzi* ‘goes’ (which has a suppletive imperative *it* ‘go’ (< **i-dhi*; cf. Gk. ἴθι, Ved. Skt. *ihī*) are derived from **h₁ei-* ‘go’ with additional post and pre-verbal elements respectively (cf. Dunkel [1985: 58], van den Hout [2010: 196-97]). The deictically-neutral verb *iyattari* ‘comes, goes’ is deponent.

¹⁰⁶ It is generally agreed that the Goth. preterite form *iddja* ‘went’ comes from **h₁ei-*; on its problematic derivation, see Cowgill (1960).

¹⁰⁷ cf. Eng. *come* < OE *cumin* < **g^wem-*. See *AHD*, *IGW* s.v. **g^wā-*; cf. *OED* s.v. *come*. The preterite Goth. *qam* continues the IE perfect.

¹⁰⁸ Cl. Arm. *ekn*, a root aorist, is cognate with Skt. *agan* (< **e-g^wem-t*), showing the augment characteristic of the past tense in this language, Sanskrit, and Greek; see *LIV*, s.v. **g^wem-*.

¹⁰⁹ Occurring within the same paradigm as *ekn* ‘came’ (< **e-g^wem-t*), 1st s. *eki* ‘I came’ nevertheless cannot be derived from the same root; it is to be taken, rather, from **g^weh₂-* (see *LIV*, s.v. *g^weh₂-*), thus providing further evidence for the functional unity of these two roots (cf. n. 4, above).

In support of her proposal, Letoublon adduces evidence for the secondary development of directional complements,¹¹⁰ comparing the dual form of the root aorist in archaic zero-grade (βάτην) with its corresponding ‘recent,’ analogic form (βήτην). The zero-grade form shows a directional complement in only two of eight (= 25%) instances (*Il.* 23.710; *Od.* 24.361), while it occurs seven out of twelve times (= 58.3%) with the analogic form (*Il.* 6.40, 8.115, 12.330, 16.327, 23.685; *Od.* 13.49, 22.202).¹¹¹ Whether or not this argument can be accepted, in part or in whole,¹¹² it is nevertheless the case that the spatial deictic orientation of the verb βάλνω is always centrifugal in Homeric Greek, with respect to which feature it is semantically nearer to the verb εἶμι than to the aorist ἤλθον.

Aspectually, the event pertinent to (ἔ)βῆ/(ἔ)βάν is the initial movement of the subject, viewed punctually and holistically without regard for the duration of movement, similar to Eng. ‘set out.’ Citing, again, instances of the archaic root aorist, Letoublon further observes the frequent use of the descriptive appositive, a usage she finds typically associated with the imperfect of εἶμι (ἦϊα, ἦϊον), e.g. *Il.* 1.326-30:¹¹³

¹¹⁰ Letoublon (1985) is not always clear as to the precise criteria for determining which expressions constitute a directional complement; for expressions considered as directional (or, more precisely, destinal) in this study, see below, n. 118.

¹¹¹ Letoublon (1985: 137), who does advise some caution, due to the small size of the sample; it may be of interest that only the archaic, zero-grade form βάτην appears in the famous “Embassy Scene” in Book 9 of the *Iliad* (9.182, 192), on which see Nagy (1999: 49-56) and Page (1959: 324-25), with bibliography.

¹¹² On the verity of this hypothesis, see Chapters 3 and 4 (§3.3.2; 3.4; 4.3.2-3), below.

¹¹³ cf. *Il.* 11.557 ἦϊε πόλλ’ ἀέκων (= *Il.* 17.666); for Letoublon’s study of the imperfect of εἶμι, see Letoublon (1985: 81-84, esp. 81).

- (2.9) Ὡς εἰπὼν προΐει, κρατερὸν δ' ἐπὶ μῦθον ἔτελλε·
 τὼ δ' **ἀέκοντε βήτην** παρὰ θῖν' ἀλὸς ἀτρυγέτοιο,
 Μυρμιδόνων δ' ἐπὶ τε κλισίας καὶ νῆας ἰκέσθην,
 τὸν δ' εὔρον παρὰ τε κλισίῃ καὶ νηὶ μελαίνῃ
 ἦμενον· οὐδ' ἄρα τὼ γε ἰδὼν γήθησεν Ἀχιλλεύς.

Having spoken thus, he sent them forth, and put upon them a mighty command,
 and they **went off unwillingly** beside the shore of the barren salt sea.
 They reached the shelters and ships of the Myrmidons,
 and found him beside the shelter and the black ship,
 sitting. But when he saw them, Achilles did not rejoice.

On the basis of such usages, Letoublon concludes:

[L]e sens 'se mettre en route,' qui convient particulièrement à l'aspect d'aoriste, n'est nullement incompatible avec un 'ordre de procès non-effectif' [viz. 'imperfective Aktionsart']; la durée n'est pas pertinente, ce qui justifie l'emploi de l'aoriste, et le terme initial, ce qui justifie la présence d'une apposition de type descriptif, sans complément de direction exprimé."¹¹⁴

It is thus the moment of departure that is captured by the root aorist for (ἔ)βῆ/(ἔ)βάν. The duration of the movement is left open, and may be described, modified, or emphasized by a present participle or similar adverbial expression. The eventual realization (or non-realization) of the journey is left unexpressed.

The perfectivity of the aorist, manifest in this way for (ἔ)βῆ/(ἔ)βάν, contrasts it with ἦλθον, which indicates not the beginning of a movement, but rather, its completion, as in ex. (2.6). This distinction is evident in certain examples which show an apparent spatio-temporal gap separating the moment of the departure, as indicated by the verb (ἔ)βῆ/(ἔ)βάν, and the terminus

¹¹⁴ Letoublon (1985: 137)

of the movement, which may be marked by a verb in *ικ-* ‘arrive, reach’ (pres. *ἴκω, ἰκάνω, ἰκνέομαι*—aor. *ἰκόμην, ἴξον*),¹¹⁵ as in ex. (2.9) and elsewhere, e.g. *Il.* 10.469-70:

(2.10) τὼ δὲ **βότην** προτέρω διὰ τ' ἔντεα καὶ μέλαν αἶμα,
αἶψα δ' ἐπὶ Θρηκῶν ἀνδρῶν τέλος **ἴξον** ἰόντες

The two men **set off**, onward through the armaments and black blood,
and suddenly coming upon the Thracians, they **reached** their goal.

or *Od.* 17.255:

(2.11) αὐτὰρ ὁ βῆ, μάλα δ' ὤκα δόμους **ἴκωνεν** ἄνακτος

He **set out**, and very swiftly he **reached** the halls of the lord.

Aspectually, then, the root aorist (ἔ)βῆ/(ἔ)βάν appears to have inchoative or ingressive force, emphasizing the incipient movement.

The prototypical properties of the lexical constituents of the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) have thus been described; it is now possible to determine which of these properties the collocation manifests, and in what significant ways it diverges from each of its individual constituents.

2.3.2. Time and Aspect

The tense and aspect of the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) are determined, essentially, by the inflected verb form βῆ/βάν. The aorist tense of this verb temporally locates the action in the past.

¹¹⁵ On this set of verbs, which alone of motion verbs in Greek govern a direct (non-prepositional) accusative of destination—thus preserving an element of Indo-European syntax, to which Vedic Sanskrit bears witness—see Letoublon (1985: 144-165).

This temporal value opposes the collocation to the present εἶμι, while aligning it with the aorists ἦλθον and ἔβην. Aspectually, it functions too like the root aorist, with ingressive value. The descriptive appositive, if less common than with the simplex verb, still occurs, e.g. *Il.* 4.198-200:

- (2.12) ὧς ἔφατ', οὐδ' ἄρα οἱ κῆρυξ ἀπίθησεν ἀκούσας,
βῆ δ' ἰέναι κατὰ λαὸν Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων
παπταίνων ἦρωα Μαχάονα...

So [Agamemnon] spoke, and the herald listened and did not disobey him,
and set out through the host of bronze-plated Achaians,
seeking the hero Machaon.

or *Od.* 8.285-88:

- (2.13) οὐδ' ἀλαδὸς σκοπιὴν εἶχε χρυσήνιος Ἄρης,
 ὧς ἶδεν Ἥφαιστον κλυτοτέχνην νόσφι κίοντα·
βῆ δ' ἴμεναι πρὸς δῶμα περικλυτοῦ Ἥφαιστοιο,
ἰχανόων φιλότιτος εὖστεφάνου Κυθρείης.

But gold-reined Ares did not keep a blind man's watch.
 When he saw Hephaistos, famed for his craft, going away,
He set out for the house of far-famed Hephaistos,
craving the embrace of fair-garlanded Kytheria.

Moreover, examples of a spatio-temporal gap between departure and arrival may still be adduced, such as *Il.* 20.329:

- (2.14) Αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τό γ' ἄκουσε Ποσειδάων ἐνοσίχθων,
βῆ ῥ' ἴμεν ἄν τε μάχην καὶ ἀνὰ κλόνον ἐγγειάων,
 ἔξε δ' ὄθ' Αἰνείας ἠδ' ὁ κλυτὸς ἦεν Ἀχιλλεύς.

But when earth-shaking Poseidon heard it,
He set out through the battle and the tumult of spears,
 and **arrived** where Aeneas and famous Achilles were.

and *Od.* 6.48-51:

(2.15) αὐτίκα δ' Ἡὼς ἦλθεν εὐθρονος, ἥ μιν ἔγειρε
 Ναυσικάαν εὐπεπλον· ἄφαρ δ' ἀπεθαύμασ' ὄνειρον,
βῆ δ' ἵμεναι διὰ δώμαθ', ἵν' ἀγγείλειε τοκεῦσι,
 πατρὶ φίλῳ καὶ μητρὶ· **κινήσατο** δ' ἔνδον ἐόντας.

And presently came fair-throned Dawn, who awoke
 lovely-robed Nausikaa. Straightaway she marveled at the dream,
 and **set out** through the halls, so as to bring news to her parents,
 her dear father and mother. And she **encountered** them within.

In general, the increased frequency of a terminal directional complement in the collocation relative to the simplex verb (ἔ)βῆ/(ἔ)βάν makes it more difficult to distinguish between the collocation and the aorist ἦλθον with regard to verbal aspect;¹¹⁶ nevertheless, on the basis of the above cited similarities with (ἔ)βῆ/(ἔ)βάν, and in the absence of firm evidence to the contrary, it seems appropriate to accept, at least in part, the assessment of Letoublon, who concludes that the collocation functions, aspectually, as an “aorist inchoatif renvoyant à l’instant du départ; l’infinif present du verbe ‘aller’ évoque au contraire le mouvement qui suit le départ, dans sa durée indéterminée.”¹¹⁷

2.3.3. Spatial Deixis

Just as centrifugality is a prototypical property of both its lexical constituents, it also characterizes the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι). Unlike the present εἶμι, however, this spatial deictic orientation is never neutralized, a feature it shares with the simplex root aorist (ἔ)βῆ/(ἔ)βάν. Within the aorist, its centrifugal orientation opposes it to ἦλθον, for which verb centripetal

¹¹⁶ These frequency statistics are shown in Table 2.5, and discussed in the next section (§2.3.3).

¹¹⁷ Letoublon (1985: 136); the latter point, however, will be challenged, in Chapter 3 (§3.4.1), where an alternative function for the infinitive will be proposed.

spatial deixis is prototypical. It is clear, then, how the collocation is distinct from the suppletive paradigm εἶμι—ἤλθον, namely, that it is opposed, in every instance, by its temporal-aspectual properties to the present εἶμι, and in most instances, by its spatial deictic properties to the aorist ἤλθον. It is less clear, however, how it differs from the simplex verb (ἔ)βῆ/(ἔ)βάν, with which verb, in fact, the collocation shows significant semantic overlap, and in a number of peripheral instances of each, can only be described in terms of neutralization.

Yet the collocation shares a semantic property with the suppletive paradigm which the simplex verb does not possess. Like εἶμι—ἤλθον, the collocation is frequently oriented in space towards a definite goal, which may be encoded either by an explicit expression of purpose—generally a future tense participle (e.g. *Od.* 4.24 ἀγγελέων), but also subordinate clauses of purpose (ἵνα, ὥς)—or by certain directional complements which, by metaphorical re-interpretation, denote the subject’s *intent* to reach a fixed point or destination.¹¹⁸ The former type is marginally attested for (ἔ)βῆ/(ἔ)βάν, which could have developed directional complements only secondarily;¹¹⁹ the latter type, however, is conspicuous for its rarity.¹²⁰ A comparison

¹¹⁸ cf. Luraghi (2003: 326): “A number of expressions that express Direction can also encode Purpose: εἰς, ἐπί with the accusative, and πρὸς with the accusative. Direction expressions can be metaphorically re-interpreted as denoting Purpose, on account of a metaphorical equation of human intention with directional motion. Occasionally, and only in Homeric Greek, μετὰ with the accusative, ‘after,’ also expresses Purpose.” In this study, all four of these prepositions have been taken as goal-oriented expressions of direction, henceforth to be referred to as expressions of *destination*, to contrast them with other, non-goal-oriented expressions of direction (e.g. διά + acc. ‘through;’ cf. Luraghi [2003: 168-69], and with potentially ambiguous expressions, above all, παρά + acc. ‘along’ which may be directional or non-directional (see Luraghi [2003: 135-37], who notes that direction is much more common with animate landmarks, e.g. *Il.* 18.143 εἶμι παρ’ Ἡφαίστων κλυτοτέχνην [‘I will go to Hephaistos, famed for his art.’]), and which, in its non-directional use, Letoublon (1985: 44, 245 n. 47) refers to as a “complement scenique.” Further excluded are idiomatic usages, e.g. ἐς ἄρματα/δίφρους βαίνω ‘I mount a chariot’ (*Il.* 8.115, 23.352, etc.), and a few instances in which ἐπί functions to express not destination, but “Location on the surface of an extended landmark” (Luraghi 2003: 306-7), as in *Il.* 2.655 βῆ φεύγων ἐπὶ πόντον (“He went off, fleeing, over the sea;” cf. Luraghi [2003: 307 ex. 32]). The only other expressions of destination included are those with the lative particle -δὲ, on which see Gonda (1957), Hooker (1966), *DELG*, s.v., and Letoublon (1985: 32-33). The intent of including only this set of directional expressions in this data-set is to limit authorial bias in the interpretation of the data.

¹¹⁹ As contended by Letoublon (1985: 137); see discussion above, §2.3.1.2 and nn. 98-99.

¹²⁰ cf. Letoublon (1985: 39)

between the collocation and the simplex verb with respect to this feature is presented in Table 2.5 (below):

	<i>Destination</i>		<i>Purpose</i>		<i>Goal</i>		<i>Total</i>
	#	%T	#	%T	#	%T	
(ἔ)βῆ/(ε)βάν	97	46.9%	10	4.8%	98	47%	207
βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι)	36	49.3%	10	13.7%	44	60.3%	73
βῆ δ'ίεναι	8	33.3%	2	8.3%	10	41.7%	24
βῆ δ'ἴμεν	17	50%	5	14.7%	21	70.6%	34
βῆ δ'ἴμεναι	11	73.3%	3	20%	13	86.7%	15

A superficial look at this data-set therefore supports, if weakly, the claim that the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) is more frequently deictically oriented towards a goal than (ἔ)βῆ/(ε)βάν (60% ~ 47%). The evidence for this claim becomes stronger when the data is more closely scrutinized. First, from a synchronic perspective, we may observe that a single fixed formula, κακκείοντες ἔβαν οἶκον δὲ ἕκαστος (*Il.* 1.606, *Od.* 1.424, 3.396, 7.229, 13.17 with a close variant, *Il.* 23.58 κλισίην δὲ), account for six of the ten examples of expressions of purpose for the simplex verb;¹²¹ considering only unique expressions of this type, there are nine examples (9/73 = 12.3%) of βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι), while only four of (ἔ)βῆ/(ε)βάν (4/207 = 1.9%).¹²² The most convincing evidence, however, emerges from a diachronic approach.

¹²¹ The simplex form of the verb κακκείοντες (< κατάκειμαι) occurs with βῆ δ'ἴμεναι at *Od.* 14.532 and 18.428 (ex. [2.16], below). Whether these forms are, in fact, archaic desideratives or true futures is of little relevance to the analysis at hand since, in either case, they denote with a motion verb the intent of the subject to attain a definite end or goal, i.e. express *purpose*; on the morphological question, see *GH* (I: 453). I am inclined to view them as archaic desideratives, which status could be viewed as further evidence for the archaism of the collocation and, in particular, the βῆ δ'ἴμεναι variant.

¹²² Another repeated expression of purpose occurs at *Od.* 14.327-28 τὸν δ' ἐς Δωδώνην φάτο βήμεναι, ὄφρα θεοῖο / ἐκ δρυὸς ὑψικόμοιο Διὸς βουλὴν ἐπακούσῃ (“He said that [Odysseus] had gone to Dodona, so as to hear from the divine / lofty-leaved oak the will of Zeus;” = *Od.* 19.296). The collocation, *Od.* 4.24 βῆ δ' ἴμεν ἀγγελέων (“He set out to announce;” = *Od.* 4.528, 4.679) is not unique.

Each of these three categories shows a clear diachronic trend in accordance with the working hypothesis proposed in §2.2.2.3. Goal-oriented deixis, with complements of both destination and purpose, is clearly prototypical (13/15= 86.7%) of the collocation βῆ δ'ἴμεναι, the form most likely to be archaic. In other forms of the collocation, βῆ δ'ἴμεν and βῆ δ'ιέναι, this feature is increasingly absent: βῆ δ'ἴμεν, likely to have been productive beside both Aeolic and Ionic types as a metrical variant, is less frequently goal-oriented (21/34= 70.6%); and with βῆ δ'ιέναι, expressions of a goal are the least frequent (10/24= 41.7%), even less so than the simplex root aorist (98/207= 47%). Of the two types of goal-orientation, expressions of purpose, while observing this trend, are more conservative; even in the recent form of the collocation, with (Attic-) Ionic infinitive ιέναι, this feature occurs more often than with(ἔ)βῆ/(ἔ)βάν (8.3% ~ 4.8%). With expressions of destination, however, a striking reversal can be observed: βῆ δ'ιέναι occurs far less frequently with the complement of destination than with the simplex verb (33.3% ~ 46.9%) and even occurs quite commonly with no directional complement whatsoever (9/24= 37.5%; cf. βῆ δ'ἴμεναι 1/15 = 6.66%), e.g. *Il.* 24.346-48:

(2.16) αἶψα δ' ἄρα Τροίην τε καὶ Ἑλλήσποντον ἵκανε,
βῆ δ' ιέναι κούρω αἰσυμνητῆρι ἐοικῶς
 πρῶτον ὑπηγήτη, τοῦ περ χαριστάτη ἦβη.

And he suddenly arrived at Troy and the Hellespont,
 and **set out**, looking like a princely young man,
 newly bearded, his most beautiful prime of youth.

This reversal, as evidence of a significant semantic change between the variant forms of the collocation βῆ δ'ἴμεναι and βῆ δ'ιέναι, supports the first proposition of this working hypothesis, and suggests that we look to examples of the collocation βῆ δ'ἴμεναι as near approximants of the semantic prototype, such as *Od.* 18.427-28:

(2.17) αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σπεῖσάν τε πῖον θ' ὅσον ἤθελε θυμός,
βάν ῥ' ἵμεναι κείοντες ἐὰ πρὸς δῶμαθ' ἕκαστος.

And when they had poured libations and drank as much as the heart desired,
They set off to lie down, each man to his own home.

and *Il.* 20.31-32:

(2.18) Ἦς ἔφατο Κρονίδης, πόλεμον δ' ἀλῖαστον ἔγειρε.
βάν δ' ἵμεναι πόλεμον δὲ θεοὶ δίχα θυμὸν ἔχοντες

So spoke the son of Kronos, and awakened unabating battle,
and the gods set out for war, with heart(s) divided.

These two examples illustrate the spatial deictic properties of a prototypical instance of the collocation, enacting, with their utterance, a movement centrifugally-oriented from the deictic zero-point towards a definite goal.

2.3.4. The Semantic Prototype of the Collocation

In the above sections, the semantic prototype for the collocation βῆ δ' ἵ(μ)εν(αι) has been outlined: temporally past, aspectually ingressive, and spatially centrifugal with an aim towards accomplishing a purpose or reaching a specific destination. In its possession of these prototypical properties, the collocation occupies a unique place in the rich and vivid system of verbs of movement in Homeric epic. With respect to any single property, it is aligned most closely with one or more of its constituent verbs, sharing, with εἶμι and (ἔ)βῆ/(ἔ)βάν, centrifugal deixis; with ἦλθον and (ἔ)βῆ/(ἔ)βάν, the past tense of the aorist; with the root aorist (ἔ)βῆ/(ἔ)βάν, ingressive

aspect; and, crucially, with both εἶμι and ἤλθον—but not with (ἔ)βῆ/(ἔ)βάν—orientation towards a goal.

To demonstrate the prototypicality of this final property of the collocation requires a diachronic approach to an analysis of the data, relying on the working hypothesis put forward in §2.2.2.3 to establish a relative chronology of the variant forms of the collocation. Yet due caution is in order. While this hypothesis is justified in its own right, being logically consistent with the general diachronic development of the Homeric poems, and its initial prediction, a semantic divergence between the variants of the collocation with Aeolic and Ionic metrically equivalent forms of the infinitive, borne out by the data, it does not strictly follow that the hypothesis is correct—specifically, the second, diachronic proposition. While it seems to be a less likely development, an opposite diachrony of usage in the Homeric tradition—from βῆ δ'ίέναι to βῆ δ'ἴμεναι—would yield this same divergence.¹²³

To verify this working hypothesis, and the correctness of the interpretation in §2.3.3, I will turn, in Chapter 3, to the syntax of the collocation, arguing that the syntactic relationship between finite verb and infinitive in the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) is closely linked to—and even ultimately derived from—the asyndetic imperatival sequence βάσκ'ἴθι.¹²⁴ An understanding of this relationship will confirm goal-oriented spatial deictic orientation as a prototypical property of the collocation, as well as resolve any remaining ambiguity in its aspectual function and explain a number of hitherto inadequately treated or otherwise neglected features of the collocation.¹²⁵ Finally, in Chapter 4, I will show how the semantic divergence of βῆ δ'ἴμεναι and

¹²³ There is some danger of circularity, then, in positing either interpretation of the collocation's evolution: by defining the possession of goal-oriented spatial deixis as prototypical of the collocation's original semantic function, the vector of diachronic development confirms our initial analysis; but if we were to define its absence as original, the diachronic vector points in the exact opposite direction.

¹²⁴ See Chapter 3 (§3.4.2), below

¹²⁵ e.g. the verse-initial position of the collocation; see Chapter 4 (§4.2.2-3), below.

βῆ δ'ιέναι is symptomatic of the diachronic evolution of the semantic prototype of the collocation as it originally functioned in ancient Greek.¹²⁶

¹²⁶ See Chapter 4 (§4.3.2-3), below.

Chapter 3: Syntax of the Collocation

3.1. Preliminaries

In Chapter 1, I argued that the relationship between inflected verb and infinitive in the collocation βῆ δ'ῖ(μ)εν(αι) is syntactically problematic, demonstrating that it does not respond to standard treatments of infinitival syntax as set forth in traditional grammar handbooks of ancient Greek. In this chapter, I will propose a new approach to the syntax of the collocation, namely, that the collocation should be treated as a serial verb construction. Having reviewed the general cross-linguistic properties of serial verb constructions (§3.1), with a brief discussion of closely related construction in modern English (§3.2), I will approach, first, the asyndetic imperatival sequence βάσκ' ἴθι (§3.3) as a possible example of a serial verb construction, taking into account its formal properties as well as its apparent semantic function in Homeric epic, and thereupon propose a historical origin for the construction. I will then extend serial verb analysis to βῆ δ'ῖ(μ)εν(αι) (§3.4), advocating a historical relatedness between βάσκ' ἴθι and the collocation which is in accordance with similar developments in other Indo-European languages.

3.1.1. Defining the Serial Verb Construction

The term serial verb construction (SVC) is conventionally applied to two or more sequential verbs appearing in a single clause without intervening conjunction which share grammatical features—voice, tense-aspect, and mood—and which together express a single event or aspects of a single overall event.¹ This definition is not unproblematic, however, in particular, the “single event” criterion; as Givón observes:

On the structural side, single clause is a notion that retains a high potential for circularity. One can easily define *clause* as *a construction with a single verb at its core*. On the cognitive side, *single event* is just as susceptible to the very same circular definition, and linguists are notoriously prone to letting grammatical structure determine what is a “single event.”²

The issue of eventhood has been addressed by modern linguists in field studies by approaching clauses as intonational units³—as defined by pauses in speech, or other intonational breaks, e.g., a raising or lowering of intonation—and, more generally, relying on the intuition of native speakers.⁴ In historical linguistics, such methods are often mostly or entirely inaccessible.⁵ Mindful, then, of Givón’s caveat that grammatical structure is not an absolute indicator of a SVC, the formal properties of serial verbs will function as the most important indicators of serial verb syntax.

¹ van Staden and Reesink (2008: 21-22, 28-29); cf. Lightfoot (1979: 213), Givón (1991: 137), Aikhenvald (2006: 1, 4-21), van den Hout (2010: 192-93)

² Givón (1991: 140 [emphasis his]), with bibliography.

³ Or “intonational contours;” see Givón (1991: 142), Baird (2008: 58-59).

⁴ Givón (1991: 140ff.), Aikhenvald (2006: 5, 7-8)

⁵ Prosodic status in metrical texts may provide evidence for intonational units; for discussion, and an approach to βᾶσκ’ἴθι and βῆ δ’ἴ(μ)εν(αι) from this perspective, see below (§3.3.1.3, 3.4). For a study of the prosodic status of (quasi-)serial verbs in English-language poetry of the 16th-20th century, see Shih (2009); cf. n. 64, below.

Formally, serial verb constructions are defined by monoclausality and syntactic independence; no overt markers of coordination or subordination occur between serial verbs. A characteristic feature of SVCs is argument sharing; in almost every case, serial verbs share at least one argument.⁶ In same-subject (SS) serial verb constructions, serial verbs will share person and number, in addition to voice, tense-aspect, and mood.⁷ The shared grammatical features of these verbs are morphosyntactically marked generally in one of two ways:

- 1) Every component verb of the SVC receives identical morphosyntactic marking
- 2) One verb is marked for all features, while all other verbs receive limited or no marking.⁸

These two principal types may be referred to, respectively, as concordant-marking and single-marking serialization.⁹ While individual languages admit some further variation as to which features may be grammatically marked in a SVC and in what way marking is distributed over its constituent verbs,¹⁰ a basic recognition of these two types of formal marking will be sufficient for the proposed treatment of the asyndetic imperatival sequence βάσκ' ἴθι and the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι).

3.1.2. Semantics of Serial Verb Constructions

⁶ Aikhenvald (2006: 12-13)

⁷ In contrast to different-subject (DS) SVCs; see Givón (1995: 274-76).

⁸ cf. van Staden and Reesink (2008: 24): “[Coordinate-marking] serialization is defined as a construction in which only one of the verbs carries all the inflections, while the others are given either in their bare stem form or in a stripped-down form, possibly with an affix indicating, for instance, that the word is a predicate (despite not being inflected for subject, tense, etc.).”

⁹ These terms are used by Aikhenvald (2006: 39-40); van Staden and Reesink (2008: 23-24) refer to “dependent” and “independent” serialization, respectively.

¹⁰ See Aikhenvald (2006: 37-44)

The semantic component of the definition of a SVC is, as noted above, the conceptualization of the verbs as expressing a single event. This single-eventhood differentiates SVCs from the similarly marked, but semantically distinct *consecutive* construction, in which verbs express separate events following closely upon one another in time and space.¹¹ The semantic range of SVCs is quite wide, as they may encode a number of different sentential relationships including, quite commonly, notions expressed by case-roles, prepositions or other adverbial means in non-serializing languages. Frequent types include: dative/benefactive, instrumental, manner, perfect aspect, comparative, associative, and deictic-directional.¹² This last type, specifically relevant to a study of the collocation, may be illustrated with two examples from Tok Pisin:¹³

- (3.1) *i-wokabaut i-go*
 PRED-move PRED-go

He went away (from a reference point)

- (3.2) *i-wokabaut i-kam*
 PRED-move PRED-come

She moved toward (a reference point)

¹¹ See Lightfoot (1979: 216-220), van den Hout (2010: 192-93)

¹² See Givón (1995: 227-28), with examples from Akan, a Niger-Congo language, and Givón (2001, I: 269), with examples from Saramaccan, a creole language spoken in Suriname and French Guiana.

¹³ Tok Pisin is an English-based creole spoken in Papua New Guinea. Directional-deictic SVCs are discussed, from a cross-linguistic perspective, by Givón (1991: 139), Aikhenvald (2006: 22-23), and most extensively, by van Staden and Reesink (2008: 36-40), who further distinguish between motion and direction SVCs. Examples (3.1-2) are reproduced from Givón (1991: 146) and (3.3-4) from Givón (1995: 227-28).

and two examples from Akan:¹⁴

- (3.3) *Ebo so-a adaka no kɔ-ɔ skuul*
 Ebo carry-PAST box the go-PAST school

Ebo carried the box to school.

- (3.4) *Kofi yi-i tam no fi-i pon no do*
 Kofi take-PAST cloth DEF leave-PAST table DEF on

Kofi took the cloth off the table.

As these translations show, the semantics of SVCs are commonly such that an event encoded by a SVC in a productively verb-serializing language is often best rendered by a simple, single verb predicate in non-serializing languages. In examples (3.1-2), the elementary verb of motion imparts its spatial deictic value (centrifugal/centripetal) to a motion verb otherwise neutral with respect to deictic orientation. In examples (3-3-4), however, the verb of motion functions in a related, but different capacity, namely, to mark a case-role: ‘come’ and ‘go’ operate equivalently to the allative and ablative prepositions Eng. ‘to’ and ‘off/from’ respectively. In these functions, serial verbs show a cross-linguistically frequent tendency toward *grammaticalization*;¹⁵ this process may result in a complete loss of semantic value such that the grammaticalized verb can no longer function synchronically as an independent predicate, at which point, no longer a serial verb, it assumes a new role in the language as a grammatical marker. Grammaticalized serial

¹⁴ Of (3.1-4), only (3.4) is an example of a different-subject (DS) SVC, i.e. an SVC in which the subject of a serial verb is different from the subject of at least one other serial verb. In this case, the subject of *yi-i* ‘took’ (Kofi) is different from the subject of *fi-i* ‘left’ (the cloth). The others are all same-subject (SS) SVCs, which have the same subject for all serial verbs. For example, in (3.3) the subject of *so-a* ‘carried’ (Ebo) is also the subject of *kɔ-ɔ* ‘went.’

¹⁵ cf. Givón (1991: 139): “In...Tok Pisin, Oceanic, Amerindian, and Tibeto-Burman languages, verbs with deictic values, such as ‘come’ and ‘go,’ are grammaticalized to impart those deictic values to other motion or transfer verbs.

verbs frequently become tense-aspect or modal markers, which may further develop into affixes or particles with the same function.¹⁶

3.1.3. Distribution of Serial Verb Constructions

Serial verb constructions are pervasive in many languages of West Africa, Amazonia, Oceania, New Guinea, and Southeast Asia and, more generally, in Creole languages, which have limited verbal morphology and strongly tend towards analytic, as opposed to synthetic, syntax.¹⁷ While these languages are the principal loci for SVCs, a better understanding of these constructions has led to the recognition of SVCs and similar syntactic structures in other languages; accordingly, van Staden and Reesink remark: “First reported in the nineteenth century for African languages, such as Ewe, now there seem to be only very few language families where serial verb constructions are *not* found in some form or another.”¹⁸

The earliest evidence for SVC-like structures in Indo-European languages was adduced by Kiparsky¹⁹—who compared SVCs to certain syntactic structures found in Indo-European languages in which, when two or more verbs appear in conjunction, only one of these verbs (almost always the first) is fully marked for mood and tense, the rest receiving limited or no marking—a feature which he argues belonged to Proto-Indo-European, and explains the origin of

¹⁶ See Aikhenvald (2006: 30-31); cf. van den Hout (2010: 193)

¹⁷ van Staden and Reesink (2008: 1); cf. Pullum (1990: 235)

¹⁸ van Staden and Reesink (2008: 21 [emphasis theirs]).

¹⁹ I know of no study before Kiparsky (1968) to draw an explicit parallel between SVCs and any syntactic structure in an Indo-European language; cf. Zwicky (1990: 8). This statement is certainly true for English and Hittite. Pullum (1990), surveying the history of scholarship of Eng. *go get* and similar structures which he himself compares to SVCs, notes no such comparison before his own (cf. Zwicky [1990]); for Hittite, the connection between the “phraseological” construction and SVCs appears first in Disterheft (1986). Many of the arguments of Kiparsky (1968), though not specifically the comparison to SVCs, are resumed in Kiparsky (2005).

the Vedic injunctive.²⁰ In recent years, more direct evidence for SVCs in Indo-European languages has emerged. Zwicky has proposed extending serial verb treatment to the “*go get*” construction in modern English.²¹ Moreover, in a series of articles by Disterheft, Luraghi, Hock, and van den Hout, serial verb analysis has been applied also to the so-called “phraseological” construction in Hittite, in which two verbs—one a form of *pai-* ‘to go’ or *uḫa-* ‘to come’—sharing person, number, tense and mood are embedded in the same clause.²² Hock has even suggested applying the term SVC to certain imperatival sequences in Vedic Sanskrit and ancient Greek of a type similar to $\beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa' \text{ } \acute{\iota}\theta\iota$.²³

As I will argue below (§3.3-4), $\beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa' \text{ } \acute{\iota}\theta\iota$ and the collocation $\beta\eta \delta' \acute{\iota}(\mu)\epsilon\nu(\alpha\iota)$, like these constructions in English and Hittite, exhibit certain formal properties of SVCs which recommend approaching them as possible instances of serial verb syntax. Nevertheless, the serial verb status of these constructions has often been challenged, with objections that apply to $\beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa' \text{ } \acute{\iota}\theta\iota$ and $\beta\eta \delta' \acute{\iota}(\mu)\epsilon\nu(\alpha\iota)$ as well.

3.1.4. A Potential Objection: The Productivity of Verb Serialization in Greek

The disputed status of these constructions is made evident by the assertion of Aikhenvald: “A few familiar European languages have a restricted set of contiguous sequences of verbs with a mono-predicative meaning. At first sight, these appear to have some of the

²⁰ Kiparsky (1968: 33-34), (2005: 9); in the earlier work, this optional specification of secondary verbs is referred to as “tense and mood reduction” (1968: 34 §2). The refinements to his theory added in Kiparsky (2005 [esp. §3-4]) suggest that the rule in question does not involve “reduction,” but rather, “optional specification” of verbs in conjunction. This theory will be referred to henceforth by the formulation “optional verb specification.”

²¹ Zwicky (1990), be discussed further below (§3.2). He uses *go get* as a generic label for all come/go-initial expressions of this syntactic type (*op. cit.* 218), to be distinguished, especially from seemingly similar constructions with conjunction, which he calls “*go & get*.”

²² Disterheft (1986), Luraghi (1993), Hock (2002), and van den Hout (2003, 2010), to be discussed further below (§3.4.1).

²³ Hock (2002); the

definitional properties of SVCs...These constructions cannot be considered on par with SVCs.”²⁴

Aikhenvald goes on to list several reasons for objecting to the serial verb status of these constructions, including limitations on the set of lexemes involved and their inflection for mood or tense, restriction to certain colloquial dialect registers, and the possibility of inserting a conjunction or dependency marker between constituent verbs without change in meaning.²⁵

Several of the objections on this list, which rather comprehensively sums up and reiterates statements found in the linguistics literature on SVCs, would call into question the existence of SVCs in ancient Greek. The relative isolation of βάζκ' ἴθι and almost complete isolation of βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) as syntactic items, and the limited range of tense and mood—*inter alia*, a complete lack of present indicative forms—attested for these two expressions would be, for Aikhenvald and others, a strong argument against their serial verb status. These same objections, however, have also been applied to the Eng. *go get* construction, the serial verb status of which is convincingly supported by the analysis of Pullum.²⁶ An examination of the *go get* construction will therefore serve to illustrate the viability of approaching serial verb-like structures in non-productively verb serializing languages as SVCs.

²⁴ Aikhenvald (2006: 46)

²⁵ Aikhenvald (2006: 46-47)

²⁶ Pullum (1990)

3.2. (Quasi-) Verb Serialization and Eng. *go get*

Simonides' famous epitaph for the Spartan warriors who perished at Thermopylae, quoted by Herodotus (*Hist.* 7.228.9-10), was translated by the English poet W.L. Bowles as follows:²⁷

(3.5) ἽΩ ξεῖν', ἀγγέλλειν Λακεδαιμονίοις ὅτι τῆδε
κείμεθα, τοῖς κείνων ρήμασι πειθόμενοι.

Go tell the Spartans, thou that passest by,
That here, obedient to their laws, we lie.

The imperative infinitive ἀγγέλλειν has been rendered by a form of the *go get* construction, a bare infinitive verb phrase following an imperative or similarly bare infinitive form of *come*, *go*, and for some speakers, *run* or *hurry*; it therefore occurs in the imperative, the 1st and 2nd person singular and 3rd person plural of the simple present, in constructions with *do* or with modals, and in present subjunctive constructions.²⁸ Though the construction is, according to the OED, now restricted to colloquial registers and to American English,²⁹ its place in United States' everyday

²⁷ Bowles' translation is variously reported, the most frequent alternation being between the version in (3.5), and that cited by Pullum (1990: 218) "thou who passest by;" The opening phrase "Go tell the Spartans" has served as the title of both a film (1978) and a novel (1991).

²⁸ For examples, see Zwicky (1969: 430-31), who first identified the bare infinitive constraint: "The generalization apparently is that the construction is only possible when the required form of *go/come* is identical to the infinitival form of *go/come*...the verbal form following *come/go* must also be identical to its infinitival form;" cf. Pullum (1990: 218-19), who uses V1 and V2 to refer to the positions of *go* and *get* respectively. With regard to quasi-serial verbs with *run* and *hurry*, the former, but not the latter, is in the dialect of the author of this study. Shopen (1971: 255) cites other examples, including *sit* and *stay*, none of which I judge grammatical, nor are endorsed in the study of Pullum (1990).

²⁹ OED, s.v. *go*, v. (§32a); its restriction to modern American—and not British—English seems to be upheld by a search of the 2011 archives for the NY Times and the Guardian (UK). An interesting example is *go see*, which is appears regularly in such contexts as "Go see a movie/play/show" in the NY Times; it is entirely absent in the Guardian, where "go and see" or "go to see" instead occurs.

discourse and popular culture marks the culmination of a rich history in English prose and poetry, as (3.6-11) show:³⁰

- (3.6) I must *go seek* some dew-drops here.
- (3.7) Kill then, and bliss me / But first *come kiss* me...
- (3.8) *Ga purches* land quhar euir he may.
- (3.9) *Come fly* with me.
- (3.10) *Go put* on your best tonight / It's you and me and one spotlight.
- (3.11) It's do or die / Gotta *go put* it overtime.

These quotations exemplify the grammaticality of both the imperative- and modal-initial types, with *come* and *go* in V1, and a range of subsequent verbs in their bare infinitive forms in V2. In this way, they illustrate a fundamental linguistic property of the *go get* constructions—termed by Pullum the “inflection condition”—namely, that any overt sign of inflection on either verb makes the construction ungrammatical for most speakers:³¹

- (3.12) *Go get* the paper.
- (3.13) I told you to *go get* the paper.
- (3.14) Every day I *go get* the paper.
- (3.15) *Every day my son *goes get* the paper.
- (3.16) *I *went get* the paper.
- (3.17) **Going get* the paper is not my job.
- (3.18) *My dog *has gone get* the paper.

³⁰ The quotations in this list are from the following sources: (3.6), cited by Shih (2009: 1), is from William Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (c. 1590), Act II, Scene I, line 14; (3.7), cited by Pullum (1990: 218), is by an anonymous author collected in Thomas Morley's *First Book of Ballets* (1595); (3.8), which shows that the construction goes back to Middle English, is the oldest attestation cited by OED (cf. Shih 2009: 1), a quote from John Barbour in 1386; (3.9), cited by Pullum (1990: 218) is the name of the title track of Frank Sinatra's 1958 album; (3.10-11)—the most contemporary, and from two very different musical genres—are from the refrain of, respectively, “You and Me and One Spotlight” by Yellowcard (2006) and “Overtime” by Ace Hood (feat. Akon and T-Pain; 2009).

³¹ The following list is from Pullum (1990: 219; for his methodology in eliciting grammaticality judgments, and an analysis of their implications, see *op. cit.* 230-34).

The verb *come* yields the same pattern of grammaticality. The inflection condition is thus consistent with the morphosyntactic marking constraints of SVCs; only (3.15-18), in which one verb is marked for features that the other is not, are ungrammatical. In all other cases, both *go* and *get* are identically marked for the tense, voice, and mood, as well as their shared argument, the subject.³²

A potential problem, however, is that the *go & get* construction, the superficially similar sequence of two verbs with overt conjunction, also shows the same grammaticality pattern seen in (3.15-18). The supposed identity of this construction with *go get* is specifically cited by as grounds for rejecting the serial verb status of the latter by Aikhenvald, who asserts the equivalence of the following pair in American English:³³

(3.19) Go get your jumper.

(3.20) Go and get your jumper.

Pullum, however, has adduced syntactic and semantic evidence for several distinctions between these two constructions. He identifies, first, a crucial morphosyntactic difference between *go get* and *go & get* when the second verb, *get*, is inflected in the same tense as the *go* verb. The previously ungrammatical examples (3.17-3.20) remain ungrammatical for *go get* (3.21-3.24), but become grammatical for *go & get* (3.25-29):³⁴

(3.21) *Every day my son *goes gets* the paper.

(3.22) *I went got the paper.

(3.23) *Going getting the paper is not my job.

(3.24) *My dog *has gone gotten* the paper.

³² The nature of this marking is different in the imperative forms of *go get* than in all other types. The implications of these marking strategies will be engaged in the discussion of the diachrony of *go get* in §3.4.2.2, below.

³³ Aikhenvald (2006: 46-47)

³⁴ Pullum (1990: 221-22)

- (3.25) Every day my son *goes & gets* the paper.
 (3.26) I *went & got* the paper.
 (3.27) *Going & getting* the paper is not my job.
 (3.28) My dog has *gone & gotten* the paper.

The *go & get* construction therefore does not adhere to the inflection condition, requiring only normal tense agreement in coordinate clauses. Yet there are other differences as well.

Syntactically, the *go get* construction allows stacking and extraction from the complement of V2, and is typically non-interventional, i.e. it does not admit adverbial or prepositional complements to V1;³⁵ the *go & get* construction behaves exactly oppositely, thus:³⁶

- (3.29) *Come go eat* with us.
 (3.30) **Come & go & eat* with us.
 (3.31) What would you like to *go eat*?
 (3.32) ?What would you like to *go & eat*?
 (3.33) **Go away* read something.
 (3.34) *Go away and* read something.

These additional syntactic properties are, again, consistent with serial verb syntax. Pullum points out that extraction is possible in SVCs in productively verb serializing languages, but that it is not possible in coordinate structures in those same languages.³⁷ Contiguity, too, is associated with serial verbs, especially in constructions with intransitive verbs, which assign only one

³⁵ Zwicky (2003) refers to this property as the “intervention condition.”

³⁶ Pullum (1990: 226-27), who cites Shopen (1971) for the first two observations. On (3.29-3.32), see the analysis of Shih (2009: 10); because Pullum’s corresponding examples are, as Shih observes, problematic, I cite here Shih’s modified versions for (3.31-32).

³⁷ Pullum (1990: 224-25), who cites the argument of Sebba (1987) for this property in Sranan, a verb serializing creole spoken in Suriname.

thematic role, the subject, and therefore do not take an object that, in SVCs, would usually occur adjacent to the controlling verb.³⁸

Semantically, *go get* is distinguished from *go & get* by two properties. First, *go get*, but not *go & get*, has an obligatory volitional quality; a sentence such as (3.35) is ungrammatical because the action is “involuntary or accidental.”³⁹

(3.35) *Sometimes driftwood may *come wash* upon on the beach.

(3.36) Sometimes driftwood may *come & wash* up on the beach.

Second, a single-event constraint, just as in SVCs, appears to apply only to the *go get* construction. This property is shown by the grammaticality of (3.37), but the ungrammaticality of (3.38):⁴⁰

(3.37) *I hope they don't *go come back* to the house while we're in bed.

(3.38) I hope they don't go and come back to the house while we're in bed.

³⁸ Aikhenvald (2006: 37-39); the non-contiguity of transitive verbs is illustrated by (3.3-4), but is easy to see that, as in (3.1-2), the absence of an intervening object results in contiguity.

³⁹ Shih (2003: 10) on the example of Pullum (1990: 226); Shopen (1971: 259) refers to this quality, with equal vagueness, as “agential:” “*Go* and *come* ordinarily allow either an agential or a non-agential interpretation, but in quasi-modal (*viz.* in the *go get* construction) the interpretation must be agential.”

⁴⁰ Pullum (1990: 226), whom Shih (2009: 10-11) follows, cites these examples to show that *go get*, in contrast to *go & get*, implies “a movement away from the viewpoint location” i.e. a centrifugal deictic orientation but I believe this analysis is incorrect. Though I agree with Pullum and Shih (though Pullum does not clearly specify that he is referring with *go get* exclusively to construction with *go*—and not *come*—in V1) that Eng. *go get* has a strong centrifugal orientation, and would suggest that a corresponding centripetal orientation is implicit for *come get* in most cases (see [3.40-41], below), I think these same deictic properties are operative in most cases of the *go & get* construction (cf. Zwicky [1969: 432-33], who makes no distinction in this respect between *go get* and *go & get*). Moreover, not only is Pullum's example better explained by a single-event constraint, this constraint also allows for an explanation in the normal framework of spatial deixis as to why (3.29) is grammatical, but “**Go come eat* with us” is ungrammatical. The former is grammatical only because *come* operates there in the non-deictic, comitative—or “tag along”—sense identified by Fillmore (1997: 98): “‘come’ and ‘bring’ also indicate motion at reference time which is *in company of* either the speaker or the addressee” (on which property, see *op. cit.* 94-100).

The reversal of the direction of movement implied by **go come* constitutes separate events, and so renders the sentence ungrammatical but is allowed for **go & come* because, like normal coordination, it can represent two distinct events.

The ungrammaticality of (3.37) therefore shows the importance of deictic orientation in the *go get* construction. These deictic values are evident in the very clear semantic distinctions among (3.39-41):

(3.39) Put the hat on the shelf.

(3.40) *Go put* the hat on the shelf.

(3.41) *Come put* the hat on the shelf.

In (3.39), the location of the shelf is not specified in any way. In (3.40), however, the sense strongly suggests that the shelf is located away from the speaker, and in (3.41), that it is located proximally to the speaker. An example such as (3.42), moreover, is confusing or ungrammatical:

(3.42) *?Go put* the hat on my head

Though there are cases, as Zwicky argues, in which no motion or direction is indicated,⁴¹ (3.39-42) suggest rather that *go* and *come* in the *go get* construction can generally be interpreted in terms of the normal spatial deictic properties of these verbs.⁴² The V1 verbs *come* and *go* impart their deictic values—centripetal and centrifugal, respectively—onto the construction as a whole in the same way as analogous deictic verbs function in SVCs.

⁴¹ Zwicky (1969: 432-33): “[T]he absence of true motion in ‘I’ll *go solve* a problem is mirrored in ‘I’ll *go and solve* the problem;’ similarly, ‘Did you have to *go (and) wreck* my ideas?’” Though in these two examples and in particular, the latter, I am inclined to agree with Zwicky, it is worth questioning what semantically distinguishes ‘I’ll *go (and) solve* the problem’ and ‘I’ll *come (and) solve* the problem.’

⁴² As outlined by Fillmore (1997: 77-102); cf. §2.3.1.1, above

Pullum therefore succeeds in distinguishing the *go get* construction from *go & get* and, simultaneously, demonstrates that *go get* is consistent, with respect to a number of important syntactic and semantic properties, with serial verb syntax. He argues, then, that *go get* should be syntactically analyzed in the same way as SVCs in productively verb serializing languages, namely, with multiple verbal heads.⁴³ Though Pullum does not prioritize the “terminological” question—‘Is the *go get* construction a SVC?’—thus referring to it as “quasi-verb serialization, his study therefore shows that *go get* may profitably be analyzed as a SVC.

More generally, the possibility of analyzing the *go get* construction as a SVC can be taken as further evidence against the objection of Aikhenvald, by which she would deny serial verb status to constructions in languages which serialize with only a limited set of verbs. As Pullum points out, the situation in English is not without parallel; he lists a number of languages with constructions that have been treated as serial verbs, which employ only a small set of verbs, including several with only motion verbs.⁴⁴ The case of Eng. *go get*, a serial verb-like structure in an otherwise non-verb serializing language, therefore suggests that the relative isolation of βάσκ’ ἴθι and βῆ δ’ἴ(μ)εν(αι) as syntactic items in their language should not preclude their analysis as SVCs, and supports an attempt to approach them as such.

3.3. Verb Serialization and βάσκ’ ἴθι

The asyndetic imperatival sequence βάσκ’ ἴθι occurs six times in Homeric epic, exclusively in the *Iliad* (*Il.* 2.8, 8.399, 11.186, 15.158, 24.144, 24.336). All six instances are spoken by Zeus, four of which are addressed to Iris, one to Hermes, and one to the destructive

⁴³ Pullum (1990: 227-29); on the syntactic analysis of SVCs, see Givón (2001, I: 230); cf. Givón (1995: 267-76, 300), Baker (1989).

⁴⁴ Pullum (1990: 235)

dream (οὔλε ὄνειρε) sent to Agamemnon in Book 2.⁴⁵ As a representative sample, then, we may examine *Il.* 24.143-6, 2.7-10, and 24.334-38:

(3.43) Ἴριον δ' ὄτρυνε Κρονίδης εἰς Ἴλιον ἱρήν·
 βάσκ' ἴθι Ἴρι ταχεῖα λιποῦσ' ἔδος Οὐλύμποιο
 ἄγγελιον Πριάμῳ μεγαλήτορι Ἴλιον εἴσω
 λύσασθαι φίλον υἷον...

But the son of Kronos urged on Iris to sacred Ilion:
 “**Go forth**, swift Iris, leaving behind your Olympian seat!
 Bring word to great-hearted Priam within Ilion
 to ransom his dear son...

(3.44) καί μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα·
βάσκ' ἴθι οὔλε ὄνειρε θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν·
 ἐλθὼν ἐς κλισίην Ἀγαμέμνονος Ἀτρεΐδαο
 πάντα μάλ' ἀτρεκέως ἀγορευέμεν ὡς ἐπιτέλλω

And addressing it (i.e. the Dream), [Zeus] spoke winged words:
 “**Go forth**, destructive Dream, to the swift ships of the Achaians!
 Coming to the shelter of Agamemnon son of Atreus,
 speak everything precisely as I command.”

(3.45) Ἑρμεία, σοὶ γάρ τε μάλιστά γε φίλτατόν ἐστιν⁴⁶
 ἀνδρὶ ἐταιρίσσαι, καὶ τ' ἔκλυες ᾧ κ' ἐθέλησθα,
βάσκ' ἴθι καὶ Πριάμον κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν
 ὡς ἄγαγ', ὡς μήτ' ἄρ τις ἴδη μήτ' ἄρ τε νοήσῃ
 τῶν ἄλλων Δαναῶν, πρὶν Πηλεΐωνα δ' ἰκέσθαι.

Hermes, for you it is dearest of all
 to be a companion to man, and you listen to whomever you like.

⁴⁵ The address to Iris—in contrast, especially, to the address to Hermes (cf. n.46, below)—appears to be formulaic, occupying the first half of the line up to the trochaic caesura. The absence of this archaic formula in the *Odyssey* may be explained, perhaps, by Hermes usurpation of Iris’ original role as messenger of the gods. Iris is never mentioned in the *Odyssey*, though obliquely referred to via the begger Iros (*Od.* 18.6-7); cf. Gantz (1993: 17, 106).

⁴⁶ The exceptionality of the address to Hermes is also noted by Richardson (1993: 308, *ad loc.*): “elsewhere, [βάσκ' ἴθι] always comes at the beginning of a speech by Zeus, with a vocative. Here it is displaced by the explanatory clause in 334-5: Zeus treats Hermes with more elaborate courtesy than either the Dream or Iris, and in any case, a reason for the choice of Hermes is necessary here.”

Go forth, and to the hollow ships of the Achaians
lead Priam in such a way that none of the other Danaans see or perceive him,
until he reaches the son of Peleus.

These few examples are sufficient to illustrate some intriguing features of βάσκ' ἴθι. In each of these three, Zeus' command sends his messenger off on an errand away from the shared space of the interlocutors. The movement implicit in the messenger's errand is therefore centrifugal; this semantic property—appropriately regarded as *prototypical* of the imperatival sequence—is, of course, shared with the collocation βῆ δ' ἴ(μ)εν(αι).⁴⁷ This spatial deictic orientation cannot be understood as a function of βάσκω alone; even more so than (ἔ)βῆ/(ἔ)βάν—which, at least from a synchronic perspective, is centrifugal in Homeric epic⁴⁸—βάσκω is deictically neutral.⁴⁹ While the force of βάσκ' ἴθι—the only locus of this verb in Homer—is centrifugal, and a centrifugal sense is also apparent when it is paired in a similar imperative sequence with deictically-neutral ἐπίγω 'I press on, make haste' in Ar. *Th.* 783 βάσκει', ἐπίγετε ('Get going, press on!'),⁵⁰ βάσκω has a very clear centripetal value in a rare independent occurrence at A. *Pers.* 663. (=671), in which scene the chorus is summoning the ghost of Darius to appear (A. *Pers.* 663-67):⁵¹

⁴⁷ See above, §2.3.3

⁴⁸ Though (ἔ)βῆ/(ἔ)βάν is always centrifugal in Homeric Greek, Letoublon (1985: 137, 142-43) has argued for an original, deictically-neutral value. See discussion in §2.3.1.2, above; for an evaluation of her hypothesis, cf. n. 85, below.

⁴⁹ With Sihler (1995: 505); cf. n. 57, below. ““Get going”” can only apply to the centrifugal case; for the equivalent centripetal situation, I would suggest ‘come on.’

⁵⁰ It might be possible to treat these sequential imperatives in the same way as βάσκ' ἴθι; just as easily, however, they could fail tests for monoclausality, as the editorial punctuation suggests (though elision may be a small point in favor of monoclausal status); see below, §3.2.1.3.

⁵¹ For these lines, I follow the text of West (1991).

(3.46) **βάσκε** πάτερ ἄκακε Δαριάν, οἶ.
 ὅπως αἰνά τε κλύης νέα τ' ἄχη,
 δέσποτα δέσποτ', ὦ φάνηθι.

Ah! **Come [forth]** blameless father Darius!
 So that you may hear the terrible new griefs,
 Master, O Master, appear!

The deictic value of the βάσκ' ἴθι would seem, then, to be determined by the second verb, the prototypically centrifugal imperative of εἶμι.⁵²

A second recurrent feature is not strictly specific to βάσκ' ἴθι, but has pragmatic implications for its interpretation, bearing significantly on the context of its utterance: in every instance, the nature of the errand initiated by βάσκ' ἴθι is specified in a subsequent imperatival clause.⁵³ The formal characteristics of these imperatival clauses show some slight variation. The subsequent imperative occurs in overt coordination with βάσκ' ἴθι in (3.45), but in all other instances without apparent conjunction, just as in (3.43-44).⁵⁴ In two of these six instances, (3.44) and again, in *Il.* 15.158, the role of the imperative is filled by a predicative infinitive in imperative function.⁵⁵ The task required of the messenger is, with the single exception of *Il.* 24.336, to perform a speech delivering the instructions of Zeus to a recipient; only Hermes is issued a more complex mission, namely, to lead (*Il.* 24.337 ἄγαγ') Priam clandestinely through the camps of Achaians to retrieve the body of Hector from Achilles' tent. Though the sample size is small, a mere six total occurrences of βάσκ' ἴθι in Homer (and so, in Greek), the fact that a

⁵² The deictic value of εἶμι in the imperative is principally centrifugal, though it can be neutralized by a deictic adverb like δεῦρο (e.g. *Il.* 3.130); cf. Letoublon (1985: 51): “ἴθι employé absolument et sans adverbe de lieu donne toujours un ordre de départ...δεῦρ' ἴθι est attesté toutefois, ce qui prouve que la valeur déictique du verbe est neutralisable.” See also above, §2.3.1.1

⁵³ For the importance of this subsequent imperative, see Chapter 4 (§4.2.1.2), below.

⁵⁴ *Il.* 8.199 βάσκ' ἴθι Ἴρι ταχεῖα, πάλιν τρέπε μηδ' ἔα ἄντην / ἔργεσθ'. (“Go forth, swift Iris! Turn them back again and do not allow them to come opposite [me]!) shows conjunction between the subsequent pair of infinitives, but not between the pair and βάσκ' ἴθι.

⁵⁵ For a study of the infinitive in imperative function in Greek and Indo-European, see Vanséveren (2000: 85-103). Disterheft (1980: 191-92) reconstructs the imperative infinitive in late stage Proto-Indo-European.

subsequent imperative appears in every instance, and in several cases, multiple imperatives in succession, justifies regarding its presence as obligatory.

These initial observations will be further discussed in the ensuing sections (§3.3.2, 3.4.2).

I turn now to the syntactic configuration of *βάσκ' ἴθι* which, I will argue, meets formal criteria for determining serial verb syntax.

3.3.1. *βάσκ' ἴθι* as a Serial Verb Construction

Approaching *βάσκ' ἴθι* as a SVC is not without precedent. Hock has contended that certain imperatival sequences with similarities to *βάσκ' ἴθι* merit serial verb status, e.g., *Il.* 3.192:⁵⁶

(3.47) *εἶπ' ἄγε μοι καὶ τόνδε φίλον τέκος ὅς τις ὄδ' ἐστί*

Come tell me of this man, too, dear child, who he is...

and *Il.* 19.34748:

(3.48) *ἀλλ' ἴθι οἱ νέκταρ τε καὶ ἀμβροσίην ἐρατεινὴν
σταῖζον ἐνὶ στήθεσσ', ἵνα μή μιν λιμὸς ἴκηται.*

But go pour nectar and lovely ambrosia
in his breast, so that hunger does not come upon him.

In this section, I will discuss four formal properties of *βάσκ' ἴθι* that support its status, along with the structures (3.47-48), as serial verb constructions: feature sharing (§3.3.1.1), syntactic

⁵⁶ Hock (2002); cf. n. 23, above

independence (§3.3.1.2), monoclausality (§3.3.1.3), and single-eventhood (§3.3.1.4). These four properties, if they can be demonstrated, constitute a strong case for treating βάσκ' ἴθι as a SVC.

3.3.1.1. Feature Sharing: Morphosyntactic Marking of βάσκ' ἴθι

The two sequential imperatives βάσκε and ἴθι are spoken by Zeus to a single addressee. They share person, number, voice, and mood, i.e. 2nd person singular active imperative, with each verb independently bearing morphosyntactic marking as such: ἴθι (< **h₁i-dhi*; cf. Skt. *ihī*), by the athematic 2nd sing. pres. impv. ending –θι (< **-dhi*); βάσκε (< **g^wm-ské-φ*) by the zero-ending of the thematic 2nd sing. pres. impv. While the imperative in Greek does not convey tense, the present imperative is specified for imperfective aspect; the presence of the imperfective marker –σκε- (< **-ské-*)⁵⁷ in the verbal morphology therefore does not mark it in contrast to the present ἴθι.⁵⁸

The shared subject of these imperatives fulfills the argument-sharing requirement of SVCs. Morphosyntactically, the identical, separate marking of each verb is strikingly similar to the concordant-marking SVCs found in productively verb-serializing languages. With respect to these formal features, βάσκ' ἴθι is consistent with serial verb syntax.

⁵⁷ The origin and function of this suffix are discussed by Sihler (1995: 505-507): “PIE **sk^é/δ-*... is built to the zero grade of the root, with accent on the thematic vowel... The various functions in the IE languages might be traced to an iterative/durative origin. The tendency for iteratives to coalesce into past-habitual has been noticed above (for certain Greek forms, especially of the imperfect, in Homer and Herodotus [*op. cit.* 506]). Even some of the oldest forms of Latin and Greek, in which no semantic color is evident, can be understood in this light: **g^wneh₃-sk^é/δ-* ‘come to know, come to understand;’ **g^wm-sk^é/δ-* ‘come to being on the way, set out;’” cf. Fortson (2010: 99): “PIE possessed an accented thematic suffix **sk^é/δ-*, added to the zero-grade of the root. The productive descendants of this formation differ in meaning from branch to branch...the habitual or durative sense is also found in Homeric Greek (e.g. φεύγεσκον ‘they would (habitually) flee’).

⁵⁸ The situation in Greek thereby differs from Hittite, in which the **-ské* suffix cannot appear on the initial (motion) verb in SVCs (*GrHL* [325]), though it may appear on subsequent verbs. In Greek, however, as I will argue below (§3.3.2; 3.4; 3.4.2.3), the semantically minor verb, equivalent in role to the Hittite verb of motion, is in βάσκ' ἴθι and βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) the second verb, the form of εἶμι. The Hittite ordering constraint on the occurrence of this suffix therefore does not apply in Greek.

3.3.1.2. Syntactic Independence: βάσκω, εἶμι, and βάσκ' ἴθι

Neither conjunction nor subordination is apparent in βάσκ' ἴθι. The two imperatives stand in asyndetic sequence,⁵⁹ with no formal marker of subordination appearing on either verb. The absence of either is *prima facie* evidence for the syntactic independence of these two verbs. Their separate occurrence, functioning independently as predicates in similar clauses, confirms their syntactic status: for βάσκω, cf. the imperative βάσκε in (3.46); for εἶμι, cf. the recurring Homeric formulae ἀλλ' ἴθι (*Il.* 10x, *Od.* 4x) and δεῦρ' ἴθι (*Il.* 3.130, 390; 7.75).⁶⁰ Their ability to function independently as predicates shows that grammaticalization, so frequent in SVCs, has not occurred.

3.3.1.3. Monoclausality: the Intonational Status of βάσκ' ἴθι

The syntactic independence of the verbs βάσκε and ἴθι is a precondition for monoclausality, yet not an absolute indicator of serial verb status. SVCs are further distinguished from superficially similar clause-chaining structures found in some of the same language families in which SVCs commonly occur, and from covertly (i.e. conjunctionless) coordinated consecutive clauses, by their intonational status: “A serial verb construction has the intonation properties of a monoverbal clause, and not of a sequence of clauses.”⁶¹

Though the scientific phonological analysis utilized in modern field studies is obviously out of the question for dead languages, it is possible to approach this problem in other ways. A

⁵⁹ Viewed as such by Watkins (1975: 96-97), Letoublon (1985: 135), Dunkel (1985:65), et al.; *pace* Georgiev (1984), whose suggested emendation βάσκιθι has not been adopted (see, e.g., *EDG*, s.v. βαίνω).

⁶⁰ On these two formulae, see Dunkel (1985: 65-66, 76-77 nn. 101,112).

⁶¹ Aikhenvald (2006: 6-8)

method utilized in studies of Hittite serialization,⁶² and by Hock for Vedic and Greek, is to examine the distribution of clitics and sentential particles; the monoclausality of, e.g., (3.47) is shown by the attachment of the enclitic 1st person pronoun μοι, functionally associated with the verb εἶπ(ε), to the second verb ἄγε, and likewise in (3.48) by οἱ to ἴθι, though it properly belongs with the object of στάζον.⁶³ Yet this method too is inaccessible for βάσκ' ἴθι, which offers no examples of such clitics or particles. An alternative possibility, however, is to return to the question of the intonational status of βάσκ' ἴθι, which may be approached on the basis of prosodic evidence adduced from the metrical text.⁶⁴

Bakker has approached Homeric poetry in terms of intonational units, arguing that Homeric hexameter lines can be divided into shorter, intonational units.⁶⁵ His analysis suggests that intonation units typically “coincide either with the end of the hexameter line or with the middle caesura (penthimemeral or trochaic caesura).”⁶⁶ Though the limited data-set, again, calls for due caution, we may observe that βάσκ' ἴθι never runs over this central, major caesura. On the contrary, the four instances of the formulaic address to Iris (βάσκ' ἴθι Ἰρι ταχεῖα), as well as to the Dream at *Il.* 2.8, occupy precisely the first half of the verse-line up to the trochaic caesura.

Even within these formulaic phrases, there is evidence for an additional intonational break after verse-initial βάσκ' ἴθι. The extra-sentential vocative name-epithet formula Ἰρι ταχεῖα is likely to be an intonational unit in its own right, its syntactic autonomy reflected by a slight pause in speech. The intonational independence of βάσκ' ἴθι is further reinforced by the

⁶² See n. 22, above; further discussed in §3.4.1, below

⁶³ Hock (2002: 67)

⁶⁴ Shih (2009: 29-31) shows that quasi-serial verbs in English tend strongly to coincide with “major syntactic or metrical breaks” (*op. cit.* 30). Note that (3.48) is not an SVC on the level of intonation, but may still be serial on the level of constituency.

⁶⁵ Bakker (1997: 47ff.)

⁶⁶ Bakker (1997: 50), where he concludes: “The coincidence of intonation with metrical units is a universal of performed oral poetry, and in the study of Homer it seems justified to use the latter as evidence for the former.” For relevant bibliography, see *ibid.* n.33.

exceptional address at 24.336, where the conjunction καὶ occupies the normal position of the vocative name-epithet formula and clearly marks the boundary of the clause.⁶⁷

The only remaining question, then, is whether yet another intonational break falls between βάσκε and ἴθι. The elided final syllable of βάσκε (βάσκ') suggests a fluid pronunciation, as does its dactylic rhythmic structure. The unlikelihood of such a break gains further support from Bakker's analysis of Homeric formulae as "stylized intonation units."⁶⁸ The formulaic status of βάσκ' ἴθι in Homeric epic is unobjectionable:⁶⁹ it is repeated; it occurs under the same metrical conditions and even in the same position in the verse; and since the archaic imperative βάσκε is, as noted, preserved only within the bounds of this bipartite phrase, its utterance in Homeric poetry absolutely entails the subsequent occurrence of ἴθι, thus completing the formula.⁷⁰ Following Bakker's schema,⁷¹ then, I suggest a tripartite intonational analysis of, e.g., *Il.* 24.144, as shown in Figure 4.1 (below):

Figure 4.1		
a)	βάσκ' ἴθι	Go forth,
b)	Ἴρι ταχεῖα,	swift Iris,
c)	λιποῦσ' ἔδος Οὐλύμπιο	leaving behind your Olympian seat!

⁶⁷ In addition to these arguments, I also note Bakker's division (1997: 151) of *Il.* 9.167, in which he brackets verse-initial εἶ (εἶ?) δ' ἄγε as an intonational unit; on the relationship between this phrase and βάσκ' ἴθι, see Dunkel (1985: 63-66, esp. 65).

⁶⁸ Bakker (1997: 53): "In fact, formulas are stylized intonation units, and the cognitive approach to Homeric narrative is incomplete without some idea of how it might serve as a step toward a psychology of the Homeric formula."

⁶⁹ See, e.g., *DELG*, s.v. βαίνω: "βάσκω, presque uniquement attesté dans la formule hom. et archaïque βάσκ' ἴθι; the potential problems with treating the collocation βῆ δ' ἴ(μ)εν(αι) as a formula (or rather, formular system) were dealt with in §2.2.2.1), where the definition of a Homeric formula was discussed.

⁷⁰ A relationship of this type between the constituents of Homeric formulae is emphasized in the definition of Hainsworth (1968: 35-36): "repeated word-group" in which "the use of one word created a strong presumption that the other would follow. This degree of mutual expectancy I choose as the best differentia of the formulaic word-group."

⁷¹ The following notation for clause division is used throughout by Bakker (1997).

The best evidence of the metrical text thus upholds regarding βάσκ' ἴθι as occurring in a single intonational unit, thereby supporting its monoclausality and, in turn, its status as a possible SVC.

3.3.1.4. Single-Eventhood:

The significant semantic overlap of the sequential imperatives βάσκε ‘get going, go’ and ἴθι ‘go’ has often been interpreted as “redundancy,” in which respect it has been equated to the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι).⁷² Like the collocation, this interpretation does not do justice to important semantic nuances of these verbs, such as their spatial deictic orientation, yet at the same time underscores the fact that they seem to refer to one event, a single action to be performed by the addressee (i.e. one departure, not two). Letoublon contends that in the imperative sequence βάσκ' ἴθι the value of ἴθι as a motion verb has been semantically bleached, with the result that it functions as an exhortative, similar to the more familiar Greek interjection ἄγε found so frequently in Attic prose.⁷³ Her suggested translation “Allons, marche!” in fact is not irreconcilable with the synchronic facts, as I will show below (§3.3.2), but her reasoning is, quite probably, ahistorical, and in any event, does not predict a consistently centrifugal orientation.⁷⁴ Once again, however, this interpretation does not distinguish two distinct events corresponding to the two imperatives.

⁷² Hainsworth (1993: 245-46, *ad. Il.* 11.186. “Redundancy,” in general, should not be regarded as an explanation, but rather, an indicator of the *need* for an explanation; I find myself very much in sympathy with the remark of Dunkel (1985: 62): “I reject ‘überflüssig’ as a linguistic analysis.”

⁷³ Letoublon (1985: 135): “Si ἴθι se rapproche probablement d’un sens vide d’exhortation, parce qu’autrement les deux impératifs feraient double-emploi, βάσκ’ doit avoir le sens d’un itératif, une des valeurs probables de la formation in *-sk-*. Le syntagme idiomatique conserve une forme archaïque qui a disparu de la langue vivante.”

⁷⁴ It should be recalled that in Letoublon’s attempt to explain the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι), she is obliged to take the exact opposite stance, with semantic bleaching of βῆ/βάν (cf. Chapter 1, n. 10, above). If a historical connection between βάσκ' ἴθι and βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) can be accepted (§3.4.2), this double reasoning becomes very unlikely.

These two uniquely problematic interpretations point to the same conclusion: the difficulty of rendering βάσκ' ἴθι by two predicates and, conversely, the ease with which it is expressed by a monoverbal predicate with adverbial, prepositional, or interjectional complement is explained most naturally by the fact that βάσκ' ἴθι refers to a single event, the departure of Zeus' messenger to accomplish his errand. With regard to single-eventhood, then, βάσκ' ἴθι is yet again consistent with the cross-linguistic properties of SVCs. By treating it as such, its synchronic syntax is explained, and work may begin towards establishing, first, its synchronic semantic function and, thereupon, a diachronic explanation for its syntactic structure.

3.3.2. Serial Verb Semantics of βάσκ' ἴθι

In contrast to interpreting the double imperative sequence as an example of asyndetic conjunction, which is problematic and tends to produce non-explanations such as “redundancy,” approaching βάσκ' ἴθι as a SVC readily yields a functional interpretation. Because its constituents are two verbs of motion, βάσκ' ἴθι has clear parallels in the deictic-directional SVCs in (3.1-2) and, so too, in the Eng. *go get* construction. In these examples, a deictic motion verb functions to impart its deictic orientation to the construction as a whole. It was noted above that the spatial deictic orientation of βάσκ' ἴθι is always centrifugal, but since the initial verb, βάσκω, is deictically neutral, it would seem to owe its spatial deictic orientation, principally, to the second imperative ἴθι.⁷⁵ This hypothesis is substantiated by its typological correspondence with cross-linguistically frequent deictic-directional SVCs; like the SVCs in (3.1-2) and the Eng. *go get* construction, the centrifugality associated with a form of the verb εἶμι is projected onto βάσκ' ἴθι.

⁷⁵ cf. §3.3, above

This interpretation is much preferable not only to “redundancy,” but also to any other proposed alternatives. To assign a purely exhortative force to ἴθι, as does Letoublon,⁷⁶ is to deny βάσκ’ ἴθι this centrifugal deictic value, thus leaving the spatial deictic orientation of βάσκ’ ἴθι unaccounted for. The exhortative sense of the expression, (over)emphasized in her translation, in fact arises quite naturally from the imperative mood. By treating βάσκ’ ἴθι, instead, as a serial verb construction in ancient Greek, it is possible to understand its full, synchronic semantic value in Homeric epic.

3.3.3. Evolution of βάσκ’ ἴθι

The diachronic source of serial verb constructions is, in many languages, unclear, and in those languages in which SVCs have a generally accepted origin, they often do not synchronically recapitulate their diachronic development either syntactically or semantically.⁷⁷ The greatest complications, however, tend to arise in SVCs with one or more transitive serial verbs, which consequently have multiple objects condensed into a single clause. This problem is less relevant for intransitive SVCs, and so it is appropriate to seek an original structure that more closely approximates the synchronic syntax and semantics of βάσκ’ ἴθι.

One such possibility is that βάσκ’ ἴθι simply reflects an original sequence of two separate clauses in asyndetic coordination, with one imperative as the predicate of each. The original structure of, for example, (3.44) above could have been as in (3.49), with punctuation marking the clausal break:

⁷⁶ cf. n.73 and §3.3.1.4, above

⁷⁷ Givón (1995: 274-276), who criticizes, from both a syntactic and semantic perspective, the attempts of Byrne (1987, 1992) to apply embedded clause analysis to SVCs in Saramaccan. The traditional historical explanation—stated by Givón (2001, I: 230), but by no means universally accepted for SVCs—is a development from original, simple coordinate structures in sequence; see also §3.4.2, below.

(3.49) **βάσκ'(ε)!** Ἴθι οὐλε ὄνειρε θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν!

Get going! (And) go, destructive Dream, unto the ships of the Achaians!

This sequence would not be anomalous in ancient Greek. The verb βάσκ'(ε) is sufficient to constitute an independent predicate. It has already been observed, moreover, that imperatives need not be separated by any sentence-connective, either conjunctive or contrastive; the apparently obligatory imperatives occurring in the lines following each instance of βάσκ' ἴθι suggest, even, that asyndetic coordination is the more common type. In this example, the surface form would even preserve integrity of clause structure, with ἴθι, the deictically-oriented verb of the pair, taking a prepositional object as expected.

The only major historical development would be clause union, with the adjacent imperatives reinterpreted as a single, monoclausal predicate. It cannot be ignored, however, that the very plausibility of a biclausal analysis with asyndetic coordination casts renewed doubt on the necessity of insisting on a serial verb analysis. This point has been emphasized by Joseph in his treatment of a construction analogous to βάσκ' ἴθι in modern Greek.⁷⁸ He evaluates the sequential imperatives of the type seen in (3.50):

(3.50) ἔλα πές μὲν
 IMPV-SG-come IMPV-SG-say GEN-me

C'mon tell me!

The sequence, which morphosyntactically parallels βάσκ' ἴθι, consists of the imperative ἔλα (< Cl. Gk. ἔλαυνω 'drive'), the suppletive imperative to Mod. Gk. ἐρχομαι, and the imperative πές,

⁷⁸ Joseph (1990: 83), from which work (3.50), with translation, is drawn.

which is the suppletive aorist (< Cl. Gk. εἶπον) to modern Greek λέγω. Joseph argues that they are monoclausal, occurring in the same intonational contour with no break or pause, refer to a single event, and are syntactically independent, being marked neither by subordination nor conjunction.⁷⁹ Though έλα occurs in this serial-like relationship with a number of other verbs, no other verb of motion—and probably no other verb⁸⁰—initiates such a sequence. It can be used independently, with the sense ‘Come (here)!’, though Joseph’s translation is in keeping with his judgment of its function as primarily exhortative.⁸¹

As in English, this construction is productive insofar as it occurs with other verbs than ‘to tell,’ yet it does not have corresponding forms outside of the imperative mood.⁸² In this respect, serial verb syntax would be significantly less productive in modern Greek than even in English, which serializes in a range of persons, numbers, and moods, provided only the inflection condition is met.⁸³ The isolation of the έλα construction in the grammar of modern Greek, and the possibility of interpreting it as two sequential imperatives are thus sufficient grounds, for Joseph, to dismiss it as a potential SVC and, more broadly, to reject serial verbs in modern Greek as a whole.⁸⁴

The strongest argument in support of the serial verb status of βάσκ’ ἴθι and the similar imperative sequences adduced by Hock against such objections would therefore be evidence for its spread outside of the imperative. Though no corresponding present indicative forms are attested (*βάσκω εἶμι), I will argue below (§3.4) that the lexical pair in βάσκ’ ἴθι has aorist forms supplied by the collocation βῆ δ’ἴ(μ)εν(αι). If a historical relationship between βάσκ’ ἴθι and βῆ

⁷⁹ Joseph (1990: 84); though no specific evidence is cited, his first two claims are presumably supported by native speaker judgment.

⁸⁰ Joseph (1990: 85-86) tentatively offers only one other construction which could be treated as a SVC, and even it presents several obstacles to serial analysis.

⁸¹ Joseph (1990: 84-85)

⁸² It does, however, occur in the imperative plural too: έλατε πέστε μν

⁸³ See §3.2, above.

⁸⁴ Joseph (1990: 85-87)

δ'ῖ(μ)εν(αι) can be confirmed, the productivity objection ceases to be sufficient reason to dismiss these construction as SVCs.

3.4. Verb Serialization and the Collocation βῆ δ'ῖ(μ)εν(αι)

The prototypical semantic properties of the collocation βῆ δ'ῖ(μ)εν(αι) have been treated at length, in Chapter 2. It is immediately possible to see that approaching the collocation as a SVC can explain most of these semantic properties in much the same way as for βάσκ' ἴθι, which shares these same properties: the second verbal element, a form of εἶμι, imparts its centrifugal orientation onto βῆ/βάν—originally neutral with respect to spatial deixis⁸⁵—with the result that the collocation as a whole—the SVC—is therefore prototypically centrifugally oriented; the person, number, tense-aspect (aorist, punctual), voice, and mood of the SVC are marked by the inflected form of the verb βῆ/βάν. This analysis predicts the terminal directional complements which frequently occur with the collocation—especially with the Aeolic variant βῆ δ'ῖμεναι—but does not demand them, as does the standard view of the infinitive in the collocation, which regards it as an infinitive of purpose.⁸⁶ However, it is necessary first to consider the formal properties of βῆ δ'ῖ(μ)εν(αι) which justify this approach, and to resolve certain complications which arise in the process.

⁸⁵ In this way, a historical connection between βάσκ' ἴθι and βῆ δ'ῖ(μ)εν(αι) would seem to confirm the intuition and analysis of Letoublon (1985: 137), who argues for a deictically-neutral origin for βῆ/βάν.cf. Chapter 2 (§2.3.1.2), above.

⁸⁶ The semantics of motion serial verb constructions leaves one important property unexplained, namely, the collocation's orientation *towards a purpose or goal*; this crucial exception is addressed in Chapter 4 (§4.2.3.3), below.

3.4.1. βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) as a Serial Verb Construction

Several of the formal arguments which apply to βάσκ' ἴθι also apply to the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι). With regard to single-eventhood, it was noted above (§3.3.1.4) that βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι), along with βάσκ' ἴθι, has been interpreted as “redundancy,”⁸⁷ a label which is useful only insofar as it supports a single-event conceptualization of both. There is no overt sign of coordination between the two verbal forms; the value of the particle δὲ is discourse-connective. The intonational arguments for monoclausality are mostly the same as well. The collocation never runs over the major caesura, standing either in initial position or, in the three exceptional cases (*Il.* 10.73, 20.484, 21.205) noted above (§2.1.2), occupying the first half of the hexameter up to the penthemimeral caesura. In its shorter, dactylic variant form βῆ δ'ἴμεν, it is prosodically equivalent to βάσκ' ἴθι, and so essentially the same metrical arguments apply; in its longer forms, βῆ δ'ἴμεναι and βῆ δ'ἴέναι, its choriambic rhythm at the beginning of the line coincides with the most common major sense-break before the main caesura in the hexameter.⁸⁸ Neither intonational tests for monoclausality nor single-eventhood criteria offer any real grounds for challenging the serial verb status of the collocation.

The apparent obstacle to approaching βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) as a serial verb construction is posed by the grammatical category of ἴ(μ)εν(αι) in ancient Greek. The Greek infinitive typically functions as the predicate of a subordinate clause, being dependent on the main verb which governs it. The morphosyntactic marking of ἴ(μ)εν(αι) as an infinitive seems, then, to signal its participation in a subordinate relationship with βῆ/βᾶν—which has the full inflectional morphology expected of a main verb—of the same sort which infinitives generally participate in

⁸⁷ cf. n. 72, above

⁸⁸ See Edwards (1986: 176-77), who points to, *inter alia*, the emphasis placed by Kirk (1990: 18-24) on the “rising threefolder,” which typically exhibits this sense-break after the third element (# — u u — |).

with modal verbs. Hence, the collocation $\beta\tilde{\eta} \delta'\tilde{\iota}(\mu)\epsilon\nu(\alpha\iota)$ would fail the test for syntactic independence and, thereby, the definitional requirements of a SVC.

It has already been shown in Chapter 1, however, that standard views of infinitival syntax fail to account for the collocation $\beta\tilde{\eta} \delta'\tilde{\iota}(\mu)\epsilon\nu(\alpha\iota)$;⁸⁹ the would-be subordinate relationship of $\tilde{\iota}(\mu)\epsilon\nu(\alpha\iota)$ to $\beta\tilde{\eta}/\beta\grave{\alpha}\nu$ therefore demands a closer look. An alternative possibility would be to view $\beta\tilde{\eta} \delta'\tilde{\iota}(\mu)\epsilon\nu(\alpha\iota)$ as a single-marking type SVC which, as Zwicky notes, may “look subordinate, since there is one verbal constituent that is evidently the morphosyntactic locus, plus one or more others that appear to be in some non-finite governed category also used in subordination.”⁹⁰ The finite verb $\beta\tilde{\eta}/\beta\grave{\alpha}\nu$ is apt to function in the former capacity, marking the collocation for all its grammatical features: person, number, tense-aspect, voice, and mood. Yet Zwicky’s observation bears more significantly on $\tilde{\iota}(\mu)\epsilon\nu(\alpha\iota)$, suggesting that formal identity of the infinitive in the collocation to its use elsewhere with inflected verb in subordination need not be taken as functional identity; the infinitive may instead function in the collocation $\beta\tilde{\eta} \delta'\tilde{\iota}(\mu)\epsilon\nu(\alpha\iota)$ as a minimally marked verbal form of the sort expected in single-marking type SVCs, sharing its single-argument, the subject, with the finite verb, as well as all its grammatical features, while itself marked for few or none.

A reconsideration of the infinitive in Homeric Greek, with special attention to its morphosyntactic features, in fact recommends adopting this nontraditional view of the infinitive in the collocation $\beta\tilde{\eta} \delta'\tilde{\iota}(\mu)\epsilon\nu(\alpha\iota)$. The infinitive in Homeric Greek, like the Indo-European infinitive,⁹¹ has its origin in the nominal domain. In Greek, however, it is almost wholly integrated into the verbal system, in which respect it contrasts with, e.g., Vedic Sanskrit, where it

⁸⁹ cf. §1.2, above

⁹⁰ Zwicky (1990: 8)

⁹¹ On the infinitive in late stage Proto-Indo-European and its form and function in the ancient Indo-European languages, see Jeffers (1972, 1975) and Disterheft (1980).

regularly functions as a normal noun, and still semantically reflects its nominal case function. The infinitive fulfills diverse roles in the Greek verbal system, three of the most important—and most archaic, having been reconstructed for late stage Proto-Indo-European⁹²—being its use as the complement to same-subject modal or modal-like verbs, i.e. subject equivalent noun phrase deletion,⁹³ as the subject of a complement (usually purpose) clause, and in imperative function. This diversity of syntactic function, and the non-correspondence between morphological type of infinitive (-μεν, -μεναι, -ειν, -ναι) and any particular function,⁹⁴ lead Vanséveren to conclude that the Greek infinitive was never specified for case, but was, rather, a “forme casuelle non marquée,” with a particle -αι optionally added with no change in function.⁹⁵ This minimal morphological marking would allow for flexibility, allowing it to be interpretable implicitly in various syntactic contexts, including as an imperative, in which capacity it operates as an independent predicate in a main clause.

In this imperative function, above all, two important properties of the infinitive emerge. First, it becomes evident that the infinitive can be syntactically independent in Greek; its status in the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) cannot, then, be assumed as dependent. The second property—which in fact holds for all three functions, yet is seen most clearly in its imperative function—is the extent to which its meaning is determined by its context. As a verbal form, it is minimally specified for grammatical function, expressing neither person, number, nor tense, which property is unremarkable when occurring in syntactic dependency relationships, but striking for an

⁹² Disterheft (1980: 191-92); following Disterheft, Vanséveren (2000) investigates these types in Homeric Greek.

⁹³ Verbs of this type have been discussed, from both a Greek and an Indo-European perspective, in Chapter 1 (§1.2), above.

⁹⁴ Again, the inevitable comparison is to Vedic, where the morphological type of an infinitive, i.e. its original nominal case often determines its semantic function; see Vanséveren (2000: 17-19, 134-36, 144-45).

⁹⁵ cf. Vanséveren (2000: 145-46), whose monograph systematically dismisses the numerous case hypotheses. Her view is not uncontested; a concise summary of the traditional case view can be found in Weiss (2010: 119).

independent predicate.⁹⁶ As an imperative, the infinitive can be understood to simply “name” the action, with the verbal subject assigned by the context of the utterance.⁹⁷ This subject is almost always the 2nd person—in direct discourse, the zero-person⁹⁸—and may be left unexpressed, as in (3.44), where it follows and continues the subject of βάσκ’ ἴθι. It is similarly left unspecified in a rare occurrence of the infinitive functioning as a third-person imperative at *Il.* 7.77-80, where it resumes the 3rd s. imperative φερέτω:⁹⁹

(3.51) εἰ μὲν κεν ἐμὲ κείνος ἔλη ταναήκει χαλκῶ,
 τεύχεα συλήσας φερέτω κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας,
 σῶμα δὲ οἴκαδ’ ἐμὸν **δόμηναι** πάλιν, ὄφρα πυρός με¹⁰⁰
 Τρῶες καὶ Τρώων ἄλοχοι λελάχωσι θανόντα.

If that man should take me with the long-edged bronze,
 having stripped my arms, let him bear them to the hollow ships,
 but my body, **let him give** it back (to be taken) home, so that the
 men of Troy and their wives allot me, in death, my share of fire.

Yet even when the imperative infinitive does not follow a finite imperative, a subject is not strictly required. In a verbal exchange between Menelaos (*Il.* 10.62-63) and Agamemnon (*Il.* 10.65-66), the latter responds to his brother’s inquiry (μένω) with the speech-initial imperative infinitive μένειν:

⁹⁶ While most finite verbal forms express person, number, tense-aspect, mood, and voice, the infinitive indicates only two of these features, voice and aspect.

⁹⁷ Disterheft (1980: 191-192); cf. Chantraine (*GH*, II: 316): “l’idée verbale pure et simple”; Vanséveren (2000: 91 n. 29), with bibliography.

⁹⁸ See Vanséveren (2000: 100, 145)

⁹⁹ For notes on both the translation, and the 3rd s. imperative infinitive, see Kirk (1990: 244, *ad loc.*).

¹⁰⁰ The use of the Aeolic infinitive variant δόμεναι (cf. Attic-Ionic δοῦναι) may be significant; the infinitive in 3rd person imperative function is doubtlessly archaic. Structures of this type might be profitably treated in conjunction with Kiparsky’s theory of optional verb specification (see n.20, above), though they will not be further engaged in this study.

- (3.52) αὐθι μένω μετὰ τοῖσι δεδεγμένος εἰς ὃ κεν ἔλθῃς,
ἦε θέω μετὰ σ' αὐτίς, ἐπὴν εὖ τοῖς ἐπιτείλω;
...
αὐθι **μένειν**, μή πως ἀβροτάξομεν ἀλλήλοισιν
ἐρχομένων· πολλαὶ γὰρ ἀνὰ στρατόν εἰσι κέλευθοι.

Should I remain here with them, awaiting such time as you come,
or run in pursuit of you, when I have properly issued command to them?

...
Remain there, lest somehow we should miss one another
as the two of us go. For there are many paths through the army.

Quite frequently, though, the subject is marked by a pronominal subject in the nominative case, either singular (σύ) or plural (ὕμεῖς). Infinitival forms of εἶμι are used as imperatives with a singular pronoun at *Il.* 21.296-97:

- (3.53) σὺ δ' Ἴκτορι θυμὸν ἀπούρας
ἄψ ἐπὶ νῆας **ἶμεν**· δίδομεν δέ τοι εὖχος ἀρέσθαι.

But you, when you have taken away Hektor's life,
go back to the ships. We grant it to you to gain glory.

or alternatively, with the subject unmarked, as at *Od.* 6.297-99:

- (3.54) αὐτὰρ ἐπὴν ἤμεας ἔλπι ποτὶ δώματ' ἀφῖχθαι,
καὶ τότε Φαιήκων **ἶμεν** ἐς πόλιν ἠδ' ἐρέεσθαι
δώματα πατρὸς ἐμοῦ μεγαλήτορος Ἄλκινόοιο.

And when you believe that I have reached the house,
Go, then, into the city of the Phaiakians and ask for
the halls of my father, great-hearted Alkinoos.

Though the imperative infinitive is relatively uncommon in Homeric Greek—according to Vanseveren, only 5.7% of total infinitives in the Homeric epics¹⁰¹— it is nevertheless a productive part of the language; these uses illustrate its distribution in several slightly different contexts. It takes an subject, either explicitly with a marked nominative subject, or implicitly, by the context of the utterance, i.e. the face-to-face verbal dialogue in which the addressee becomes the natural subject. The semantic value of the infinitive is thus specified almost completely by its context, having itself very few intrinsic verbal properties; its minimal morphological marking, and maximal syntactic range makes it an ideal candidate to participate in a relationship in which it shares the features specified by the finite verb βῆ/βάν in the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι).

The infinitive ἴ(μ)εν(αι) thus presents very few obstacles to a serial verb analysis of the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι). The unmarkedness of the infinitive from both a nominal and a verbal perspective allows it to function, in Greek, as the near equivalent of the “bare” verbal stem, or otherwise “stripped down” verbal form found in coordinate-marking SVCs in productively verb serializing languages.¹⁰² But it is nevertheless the case that the syntactic relationship observed in βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) is, in relative contrast to βάσκ' ἴθι, not a natural one in the grammar of Greek, as its extremely limited productivity—βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι), and a few βάσκ' ἴθι similar expressions with verbs of motion (βῆ δὲ θέειν, etc.)—makes clear. It is therefore difficult to posit an organic process in the language which would produce βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) and its related variants. In the next section, then, I will propose instead to account for the collocation as the result of a diachronic development from βάσκ' ἴθι.

¹⁰¹ Vanséveren (2000: 165), with a comprehensive list of usages.

¹⁰² cf. n. 8, above

3.4.2. The Evolution of the Collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι)

The theoretical basis for a connection between βᾶσκ' ἴθι and βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) was first established by Watkins,¹⁰³ who noted the syntactic similarity of βᾶσκ' ἴθι to βῆ δὲ θέειν, suggesting that they, along with the Hittite “phraseological” construction and the English *go get* construction,¹⁰⁴ are of the same syntactic type. He did not mention its relationship with βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι), although the exact correspondence of lexemes—*g^wem-/g^weh₂- > βᾶσκε, βῆ/βὰν; *h₁ei > ἴθι, ἴ(μ)εν(αι)—in the two expressions certainly suggests a closer affinity between these two. Though Watkins left the details of this syntactic relationship as an open question, he nevertheless identified βᾶσκ' ἴθι as representative of the underlying syntactic type from which βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) may then be derived; in this section, it will be shown that a serial verb approach to βᾶσκ' ἴθι and βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) will yield a diachronic vector pointing from the former, a more natural formation in ancient Greek, to the latter, which is better explained as a secondary development, and has significant parallels in other Indo-European languages.

A probable evolutionary path for βᾶσκ' ἴθι was proposed above (§3.3.3), by which independent clauses headed by imperatives in initial-position underwent clause union, resulting in a syntactic structure that can be analyzed, synchronically, as a serial verb construction—specifically, as an example of deictic-directional motion serialization. At this stage, the SVC would have been isolated in the grammar, yet did not remain so. The subsequent progression of βᾶσκ' ἴθι is suggested by the analogous developments of the very structures noted by Watkins in Hittite and English, both of which have since been analyzed as SVCs. In these languages, it has been contended that the source of motion verb-initial SVCs is an original imperative sequence

¹⁰³ Watkins (1975: 96-97)

¹⁰⁴ The archaic-sounding variant of the *go get* construction cited by Watkins (1975: 96) ‘go bail for someone,’ though not a part of dialect of the author of this study, can be found in the *OED*, s.v. *go*, v. 32f

with serial-like properties which has diachronically diffused through the grammar, spreading from the imperative to the indicative and elsewhere.¹⁰⁵ The history of these expressions in Hittite and English will therefore be surveyed below (§3.4.1-2) and, thereupon, considered as a possible mechanism for the same diachronic processes occurring within ancient Greek (§3.4.3).

3.4.2.1. The Origin of Motion Serialization in Hittite

The Hittite “phraseological” construction consists of two or more verbs embedded in a single clause,¹⁰⁶ the first being either the verb *pai-* ‘go’ or *uua-* ‘come,’ which occurs in clause-initial position or immediately subsequent to a conjunction in this position and any clitics attached thereto, and shares grammatical features with the other verb(s), agreeing in person, number, tense, and mood. That the phraseological construction is not, synchronically, a case of the simple asyndeton so common to Hittite, is shown, first, by the attachment of sentential particles or enclitic pronouns belonging to the main verb(s) to *pai-/uua-* or the clause-initial conjunction without a sentence-connective following the *pai-/uua-* verb; the lack of enclitic subject pronouns on the *pai-/uua-* verb in the phraseological construction, in contrast to their regular occurrence when they are used alone as main verbs, confirms the monoclausality of the constituent verbs.¹⁰⁷ The semantic interpretation of the phraseological construction is not entirely clear; it can be observed, however, that the verb of motion has, to varying degrees, lost its

¹⁰⁵ This diachronic process was first proposed by Dunkel (1985: 57-63) for Hittite, and by Zwicky (2003) for English.

¹⁰⁶ The term “phraseological” to describe this construction was coined by Friedrich (1926), and in the absence of a firm consensus on their semantic and syntactic interpretation (on which see van den Hout [2010: 192-94], who considers both “serial” and “consecutive”), it remains in use.

¹⁰⁷ *GrHL* (324-25); cf. van den Hout (2003, 2010), with examples.

semantic value as a main verb, as in (3.59-60) (= *HKM* 52: 17-18; *KUB* 11.1 + iv (33/25'-26'):¹⁰⁸

(3.59) *n=at uṽami INA É.GAL-lim memaḥḥi.*

I will come—tell it to the palace.

(3.60) [*kuis*]s=an UL=ma uṽatezzi nu uizii [(*apēdani* U)]N-ši=pat idalauēšzi

[Whoev]er does not bring him, for that same person it will come—turn out badly.

In the former example, the form of *uṽa-* still conveys the notion of movement, yet in the latter such an interpretation is precluded by the lexical semantics of the main verb, which renders it impossible.¹⁰⁹

As with its semantic function, the syntax of the phraseological construction is not fully understood, yet its synchronic syntactic properties, such as feature sharing and monoclausality, invites the analogy with serial verb constructions, made first by Disterheft.¹¹⁰ It has also been approached, quite independent of this observation,¹¹¹ from a diachronic perspective, with a convincing account put forward by Dunkel,¹¹² who, observing the elevated frequency of

¹⁰⁸ As noted by, e.g., Disterheft (1984): “Initial *pai-/uṽa-*...are semantically weak and often have a meaning which is difficult to pinpoint.” The bibliography on the phraseological construction, with various proposed interpretations, has been surveyed by van den Hout (2003: 178-80); cf. *GrHL* (325 n. 5). (3.59-60), with translation, are taken from van den Hout (2003), who, in the absence of a precise understanding of the construction’s semantics, has adopted the convention of translating the phraseological construction with a dash between the constituent lexemes.

¹⁰⁹ Other examples in which the semantic function of the motion has been mostly or entirely bleached have been compiled and analyzed by van den Hout (2003: 193-95).

¹¹⁰ Disterheft (1986)

¹¹¹ The constructions treated by Dunkel (1985) in Vedic, Hittite, and Greek were subsequently taken up by Hock (2002), who argues for their serial verb status.

¹¹² Dunkel (1985), who is followed in most respects by Luraghi (1989); his historical account has been challenged for Hittite more recently by van den Hout (2010). Some of van den Hout’s arguments, however, are less than persuasive. Though I believe he is correct insofar as he objects to a “PIE phraseological construction” with the verbal root **h₁ei* as suggested by Dunkel, it does not follow that the deictically neutral verb of motion *iya-* should occur in the phraseological construction, as per van den Hout (2010: 197). In fact, if the original sense of the motion

imperatives—approximately 1/3 of phraseological constructions, with the imperatives *it, itten*, and *eḥu*¹¹³—posits that the imperative was the original locus of the construction, whence it was extended to create corresponding indicative forms. The “canonical situation,” i.e. a face-to-face verbal exchange between speakers would serve as the mechanism of transmission for extension, under special circumstances in which one speaker is issuing a command to the other; in such situations, Dunkel argues that “the shifting between imperative and indicative modes often leads to new indicative formations based on the imperative. Commonly, the command is incorporated into the response...In this way, a command “go (and) do it” could bring forth a response in any tense, either in the first person: “I/we will go (and) do it, went (and) did it,” or in third person: He/they will go (and) do it, went (and) did it.”¹¹⁴

To support this claim, Dunkel identifies examples of imperatival sequences with corresponding constructions in the indicative. In the following examples, the imperative sequences in (3.61) (= *CTH* 67) would produce the analogous indicative sequences in (3.62) with *pai-* (= *CTH* 40) and in (3.63) with *uḡa-* (= *CTH* 147):

(3.61) *it=wa walḥ*

“Go strike.”

verb was not purely hortatory but rather, as in English (cf. §3.2, above), also directional—as it is in many instances of the phraseological construction (cf. *GrHL* [326-27])—it is expected that only directional motion verbs would occur in the phraseological construction; this point thus supports, not contradicts, an imperatival origin for the construction.

¹¹³ Dunkel (1985: 57) reports, for the corpus in question, 41/132 (= 31.1%) phraseological constructions with 2nd person imperatives. 2nd s. *eḥu* ‘come!’ and 2nd s. *it* / 2nd pl. *itten* ‘go!’ are suppletive imperatives to *uḡa-* ‘come’ and *pai-* ‘go’ respectively, which verbs are both derivatives of **h₁ei-* ‘go.’ Gk. ἴθι has an exact cognate in Hitt. *it*, both zero-grade athematic imperatives; the full-grade imperative seen in Lat. *ī* ‘go!’ is continued in Hitt. *eḥu* (with post-verbal particle).

¹¹⁴ Dunkel (1985: 61); cf. van den Hout (2010: 194-95). Dunkel points out, moreover, that from a morphological perspective, there are a number of indicative verb forms which are likely to be formed from original imperatives, e.g. Gk. **ἔσθι* (<**ed-dhi*; cf. Skt. *addhī*) ‘eat!’ → **ἔσθιω* ‘I eat’ (cf. *EDG*, s.v. ἔδω), Ved. *śrudhī* ‘listen!’ (< **klu-dhi*; cf. Gk. κλύθι) → **śrudhīyāmi* (ppl. *śrudhīyānt-*; RV 1x).

(3.62) *pair...GUL-ahhir*

They went...(and) struck.

(3.63) *uwami...walhmi*

I come...strike.

The spread of the SVCs through the indicative with forms generated for present, future, and past—in which tense the phraseological construction is quite frequent, in fact, in narrative contexts¹¹⁵—thus owes its impetus to the imperative, which like βᾶσκ' ἴθι, can be explained diachronically as the result of the reinterpretation of asyndetically conjoined paratactic clauses. Dunkel's account also explains a thorny issue, namely, the clause-initial position of the *pai-/uṣa-* verb. In Hittite, a rigid SOV language, a verb in initial position is aberrant, except in the case of the imperative, for which it was the unmarked position.¹¹⁶ The word order of imperative sentences, with clause-initial *pai-/uṣa-*, would thereupon have been generalized for the phraseological construction with indicative verbs.¹¹⁷

3.4.2.2. The Origin of Motion Serialization in English

The English *go get* construction, like SVCs in productively verb serializing languages,¹¹⁸ is traditionally derived from an original coordinate structure, i.e. *go & get*. This hypothesis was

¹¹⁵ *GrHL* (326 [=§24.35])

¹¹⁶ Or, as per Luraghi (1989: 275-77), in Wackernagel's position, being "preceded by pronouns governed by a verb which occurred later in the sentence" (*op. cit.* 277); Luraghi argues that this alternative position can be found in the Latin imperatival sequence in Pl. *Men.* 637 *eam ipsus i roga* 'Go ask her yourself!', though the text is problematic (on which, see van den Hout [2010: 197 n. 31]).

¹¹⁷ cf. van den Hout (2010: 196-198), with a critique of the views of Dunkel (1985) and Luraghi (1989).

¹¹⁸ cf. n. 77, above

first challenged by Pullum,¹¹⁹ who showed that *go get* and *go & get* function differently both syntactically and semantically, the former exhibiting sufficient similarities with SVCs so as to be properly analyzed as such. Pullum only hinted at an alternative diachronic path;¹²⁰ this theory, by which the *go get* construction begins in the imperative, with subsequent extension to the indicative and other moods, was developed only later in an unpublished paper abstract by Zwicky.

Following Pullum, Zwicky argues in his brief abstract that a derivation from *go & get* fails to account for certain unique properties of the *go get* construction, in particular, the inflection condition and the “intervention condition,”¹²¹ as well as its uneven distribution of usage, which is strongly skewed toward the imperative, while occurring much more rarely in the indicative, although the non-3rd person singular indicative forms—i.e. I/you/we/they go get; cf. **he/she/it goes gets*—meet the inflection condition and are grammatical for most speakers. These properties, he contends, are better explained by original sequential imperatives, with initial hortatory *come* or *go* “reanalyzed as forming prosodic, syntactic, and semantic units with them; the resulting construction was then extended from the imperative to other uses of the base form, and then to homophonous finite forms.”¹²² As in Hittite, moreover, Zwicky emphasizes the importance of face-to-face discourse in the process of the spread beyond the imperative.¹²³

¹¹⁹ Pullum (1990)

¹²⁰ Pullum (1990: 236 n.3)

¹²¹ cf. n. 35, above.

¹²² Zwicky (2003): 1; he contends that “hortatory” *come/go* is specialized as a single word, thus accounting for the intervention condition. I would note that for “hortatory” *come/go*, though exhortation is part of its function, it is still only a part, and that it is the deictic element—which may in some cases be neutralized—that distinguishes *go/come* in the *go get* construction from pure exhortatives such as ‘Come/go on,...’ which are *not* monoclausal with a subsequent verb, and cannot be analyzed as SVCs. In other words, a *prototypical* usage (see §2.2.3, above) of “hortatory” *come/go* is still a deictic expression (cf. §3.2 and esp. n. 40).

¹²³ Zwicky (2003)

Zwicky's proposal is substantiated by the study of Shih,¹²⁴ who draws on the prosodic evidence of English poetic texts to show that a quasi-serial verb, unlike conjoined verbs, functions in English as a "single morphological unit," thus concluding that "they do not arise and are entirely distinct from syntactically conjoined verbs. Hence, the situation in English resembles that of Hittite, with the major difference being only the means available in each language to effect the change from imperative to indicative. In English, the response formulated to a command by an addressee would tend to use modals, e.g.: 'Go do it!' → 'I will go do it'; this same response in Hittite, with its richer system of verbal morphology, accomplishes the transition, as expected, by inflection; the integrity of "unit," i.e. the monoclausal verbs, is preserved by the identical inflection of each verb. The reason why English, but not Hittite, is subject to the constraint of the inflection condition is thus also explained: the phonological identity of command and response in dialogic exchange led to a rule requiring that this formal equivalence be maintained.¹²⁵ In Hittite, on the other hand, verbal morphology was utilized immediately, with the result that serialization is not limited by the restrictions observed in English, and occurs freely in all persons, numbers, and tenses.

3.4.2.3. The Origin of βῆ δ'ῖ(μ)εν(αι)

The unique syntactic and semantic properties of βῆ δ'ῖ(μ)εν(αι) are best explained as the culmination of diachronic processes similar to those witnessed in other Indo-European languages, specifically Hittite and English. Given the imperative βάσκ' ἴθι—originally, an

¹²⁴ Shih (2009)

¹²⁵ Pullum (1990: 230-34) discusses the problems with dialectal variation and the inflection condition; this explanation does not engage some of Pullum's (exceedingly complex!) questions, but accounts, rather, for the pattern of usage widely accepted among speakers of colloquial American English. Zwicky (2003)—which has not, to my knowledge, been formalized into a paper—offers no reasoning in this direction.

imperative sequence in which the two verbs have been reanalyzed as a single unit and, synchronically, share a single clause—there arose, in the context of the canonical situation, a need for corresponding indicative forms which lead, eventually, to the creation of βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι). The formal connection between the two expressions is a very close one: the relationship between βάσκ' ἴθι and βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) would have processed both at the lexical level, between the derivatives of the verbal roots **g^wem-/g^weh₂-* ‘come, go’ and **h₁ei-* ‘go,’ and the syntactic level, with serial verb syntax evident in both expressions— a lexical and syntactic identity which is realized in the essential semantic equivalence of the pair. If the function of the verbal suffix -σκε- in βάσκω is to be understood as inchoative or ingressive,¹²⁶ an exact correspondence would emerge between the two expressions, as ingressive βάσκε is aligned, aspectually, with the punctual, ingressive aorist βῆ/βάν in the collocation: βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) functions, semantically, as the aorist indicative analogue to present imperative βάσκ' ἴθι

When aorist indicative forms corresponding to βάσκ' ἴθι were produced, the resulting expression was βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι), a coordinate-marking type SVC with inflected βῆ/βάν and minimally specified second verbal element ἴ(μ)εν(αι), and not, as might be expected, a single-marking type **βῆ...ῆλθε*. Yet the latter formation was, for a fundamental reason, blocked. In Greek, as in English and Hittite, it is clearly important that the response of the addressee to the speaker's command recapitulate the language in which was issued. The suppletive relationship between εἶμι and ῆλθον does not meet this identity requirement: the divergence between present εἶμι and its suppletive aorist ῆλθον— both with respect to lexical root (**h₁ei-* ~ **h₁ludh-*), and semantically, with prototypically centrifugal εἶμι, but centripetal ῆλθον¹²⁷—prevents it from fulfilling this role. The necessity of precisely replicating the phraseology and, thereby, the

¹²⁶ See n. 57, above

¹²⁷ See Chapter 2 (§2.2.3)

syntactic and semantic function of βάσκ' ἴθι would provide the impetus for βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι), a syntactic formation that was otherwise unproductive in the grammar of ancient Greek.¹²⁸

Of course, this historical explanation is not yet fully complete. The development from imperative to aorist indicative bypasses the direct response of the addressee, which would inevitably have been formulated in the present, future, or other modal form, none of which are attested. The task remains, moreover, to find support in the text itself for the face-to-face verbal exchange between speaker and addressee, from which non-imperative forms corresponding to βάσκ' ἴθι would be generated. These two points will be addressed in Chapter 4, in which I will substantiate the diachronic evolution of the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) proposed here through the evidence of the Homeric epics.

¹²⁸ Evidence against the complete isolation of the collocation as a syntactic item is extremely limited; besides βῆ δὲ θέειν, βῆ δ'έλλάαν, and *βῆ δε νεέσθαι (on which, see Chapter 4 [§4.2.2, 4.3.2]), the only potential analogues to βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) are *Il.* 24.2 ἐσκίδναντ' ἰέναι and a conjectural * ὄρτ' ἴμεν (*Od.* 6.255, 7.14 ὄρτο...ἴμεν; cf. *Hes. Sc.* 43 ὄρτ' ἰέναι), on which see Chapter 1 (§1.3), above. In none of these examples is a purposive, subordinate reading of the infinitive excluded, yet it is not impossible that they could have arisen in a way similar to the collocation or as analogic forms on the model of the collocation, with the infinitive having a deictic function as in βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι). In the absence of the evidence of a larger sample, however, such comparisons are principally speculative.

Chapter 4: The Evolution of the Collocation

4.1. Preliminaries

In Chapters 2 and 3, the semantic and syntactic function of the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) in Homeric epic was analyzed. At the conclusion of the latter, I attempted to synthesize the findings of those two chapters into a cohesive model of the evolution of the collocation. Yet although the proposed diachronic development of the collocation accounts for the unique syntactic relationship between its two verbal constituents and its distinctive semantic value, the hypothetical intermediate stage, a face-to-face verbal exchange between speaker and addressee, remains entirely theoretical. The first object of this chapter will be to determine how and to what extent the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* bear witness to this shared discourse context (§4.2). I will then trace its diachronic evolution within the Homeric period itself (§4.3), following its changing semantic function and, ultimately, justifying both its prominent status in the two epics, and its subsequent disappearance from ancient Greek. I will conclude with some general remarks on the implications of the findings of this study for ancient Greek and, more broadly, Proto-Indo-European and the other Indo-European languages (§4.4).

4.2. Command and Response: $\beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa' \acute{\iota}\theta\iota \rightarrow \beta\eta \delta' \acute{\iota}(\mu)\epsilon\nu(\alpha\iota)$ in Homeric Epic

In Chapter 3, I argued for a diachronic path of development that led, first, to $\beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa' \acute{\iota}\theta\iota$ and, thereupon, to the collocation $\beta\eta \delta' \acute{\iota}(\mu)\epsilon\nu(\alpha\iota)$, the key intermediate stage between the two expressions being a face-to-face verbal exchange between a speaker and an addressee, in which the former issues the latter a command (in the imperative) $\beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa' \acute{\iota}\theta\iota$. The addressee's formulaic response would echo the language of the command itself, the very purpose for which the new indicative forms based on $\beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa' \acute{\iota}\theta\iota$ were created.¹ In this section, I will show that Homeric epic attests a discourse relationship between $\beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa' \acute{\iota}\theta\iota$ and $\beta\eta \delta' \acute{\iota}(\mu)\epsilon\nu(\alpha\iota)$, presenting evidence, both direct and indirect, which ultimately supports the reconstruction of the ritualistic verbal exchange that gave rise to the collocation.

Yet before we proceed to consider this evidence, it is necessary to confront a problem : the immediate response engendered by $\beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa' \acute{\iota}\theta\iota$ could not be aorist indicative, but would be, instead, present ($*\beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\omega \epsilon\acute{\iota}\mu\iota$), future, or some other modality; none of these forms, however, are attested in the Homeric text. Hence, before proceeding to attempt a reconstruction of an original verbal exchange initiated by $\beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa' \acute{\iota}\theta\iota$, it will be necessary to address the problem of these missing forms.

4.2.1. The Discourse Problem: Spoken and Reported

The response of the addressee to a command is an integral stage of the process by which, as in Hittite and English, the indicative forms of serial verb-like structures corresponding to imperative forms are formed. That the Homeric text does not bear witness to this stage for

¹ cf. Chapter 3 (§3.4.2.3), above

βάσκ' ἴθι would be seriously problematic, if not for the fact that it is the nature of the Homeric text to gloss over exactly this stage in an exchange of this kind. (4.1-2) illustrate a common way in which the Homeric poet typically deals with imperatival commands issued in direct discourse.

In (4.1) (= *Il.* 4.193, 198-200), Agamemnon issues a command to his herald Talthybios:

(4.1) Ταλθύβι' ὄττι τάχιστα Μαχάονα δεῦρο κάλεσσον

...
 Ὡς ἔφατ', οὐδ' ἄρα οἱ κῆρυξ ἀπίθησεν ἀκούσας,
βῆ δ' ἰέναι κατὰ λαὸν Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων
 παπταίνων ἥρωα Μαχάονα·

“Talthybios, summon Machaon here as swiftly as possible...

...
 So he spoke, and the herald listened and did not disobey,
and set out through the army of the bronze-plated Achaians,
 seeking the hero Machaon.

In (4.2) (= *Il.* 611-12, 616-17), the speaker is Achilles:

(4.2) ἀλλ' ἴθι νῦν Πάτροκλε Διὶ φίλε Νέστορ' ἔρειο
 ὄν τινα τοῦτον ἄγει βεβλημένον ἐκ πολέμοιο

...
 Ὡς φάτο, Πάτροκλος δὲ φίλῳ ἐπεπείθεθ' ἑταίρῳ,
βῆ δὲ θέειν παρά τε κλισίας καὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν.

“But go now, Patroklos dear to Zeus, ask Nestor
 who is this wounded man, whom he brings in from the fighting.

...
 So he spoke, and Patroklos obeyed his dear companion.
He set out at a run beside the shelters and ships of the Achaians.

Having marked the conclusion of the speech, typically with the formulaic speech-closing ὡς φάτο, the poet may acknowledge a verbal response to a command; if so, it is incorporated, as in

(4.2), as an assertion of the addressee's compliance; the poet has several such formulae at his disposal to represent precisely this stage of a verbal exchanges, two of which are evident in (4.1-2): οὐ...ἀπίθησεν ἀκούσας; φίλω ἐπεπείθετο; κλύον ἦδ' ἐπίθοντο (e.g. *Il.* 14.133). Rather than reopen the narrative to direct discourse for a response, the addressee's compliance—or non-compliance—is *reported* by the narrator, as is his ensuing action.

This narrative approach does not allow for an affirmative response to a command βάσκ' ἴθι within the Homeric text. Its place is occupied by one of the above formulae, by which the Homeric narrator acknowledges only that such an exchange took place. The fact the Homeric text does not contain present, future, or any other appropriate utterance of the addressee is predictable; the preservation of the collocation through the conversion from command, to 1st person response, to the integration of this response into the Homeric narrative in the 3rd person indicative—and in the expected augmentless aorist of reported narration²—testifies to the significance of the precise, ritualistic phraseology of the response, which must have been such that, in reporting the action of the addressee, the exact language of the elided response was maintained in the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι).³

4.2.2. Direct Evidence for βάσκ' ἴθι → βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι)

The transition from the direct address of a speaker to a third-person narrative response in Homeric epic thus presupposes an original verbal exchange between speaker and addressee. However, there is no single instance in Homeric epic where βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) follows directly upon the direct discourse in which βάσκ' ἴθι is uttered with no intervening action on the part of the

² See Bakker (2005: 114-135); note the absence of the augment, too, in *Il.* 14.133 κλύον ἦδ' ἐπίθοντο, one of the formulae discussed above which report the compliance of (an) addressee(s) to a command.

³ The ritualistic quality of this type of repetition will be further discussed in §4.2.3.1, below.

addressee; the very closest example is the irregular exchange between Zeus and Hermes, and the ensuing action of the latter (= *Il.* 24.336-48):

- (4.3) **βάσκ' ἴθι** καὶ Πρίαμον κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν
 ὡς ἄγαγ', ὡς μήτ' ἄρ τις ἴδη μήτ' ἄρ τε νοήσῃ
 τῶν ἄλλων Δαναῶν, πρὶν Πηλεΐωνα δ' ἰκέσθαι.
 Ὅς ἔφατ', οὐδ' ἀπίθησε διάκτορος Ἀργειφόντης.
 αὐτίκ' ἔπειθ' ὑπὸ ποσσὶν ἐδήσατο καλὰ πέδιλα
 ἀμβρόσια χρύσεια, τὰ μιν φέρον ἡμὲν ἐφ' ὑγρῆν
 ἠδ' ἐπ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν ἅμα πνοιῆς ἀνέμοιο·
 εἶλετο δὲ ράβδον, τῇ τ' ἀνδρῶν ὄμματα θέλγει
 ὣν ἐθέλει, τοὺς δ' αὐτε καὶ ὑπνώοντας ἐγείρει·
 τὴν μετὰ χερσὶν ἔχων πέτετο κρατὺς Ἀργειφόντης.
 αἶψα δ' ἄρα Τροίην τε καὶ Ἑλλήσποντον ἴκανε,
βῆ δ' ἰέναι κούρω αἰσυμνητῆρι ἐοικῶς
 πρῶτον ὑπηγήτη, τοῦ περ χαριεστάτη ἦβη.

“**Go forth** and lead Priam to the hollow ships of the Achaians,
 so that none of the Danaans should see or perceive him,
 before he reaches the son of Peleus.”

So [Zeus] spoke, and his minister, the slayer of Argos, did not disobey.

Immediately he bound beneath his feet his lovely sandals—
 immortal, golden—which bore him over water and the wide earth.

He took hold of his rod, with which he enchants the eyes of whatever men
 he desires, and he wakes again those who are asleep.

Holding it in his hands, the might slayer of Argos took to flight,
 and rapidly he arrived at Troy and the Hellespont,
 and **set out**, looking like a princely young man,⁴
 newly-bearded, whose youth is most graceful.

Hermes' initial response is to arm himself and leap into flight; upon completion of his descent to earth, his movement, resumed on foot, is marked by the collocation. In this instance, and more generally, it is appropriate to consider certain mitigating factors. With a single exception, the collocation—like simplex βῆ/βὰν—is used only with movement on foot, and does not intrinsically address the vertical dimension inherent in a movement following an interactions on Mount Olympos/Ida with Zeus, to whose use βάσκ' ἴθι has been specialized. Accordingly, the

⁴ On the problematic form αἰσυμνητῆρι, see Richardson (1993: 309, *ad loc.*).

position in which the collocation would occur is occupied by a formula which is specific to a vertical descent (βῆ δ' ἐξ Ἰδαίων ὀρέων, 6x; βῆ δὲ κατ' Οὐλύμποιο καρῆνων, 7x), by a more generic response formula (e.g. *Il.* 2.409 ὄρτο δὲ Ἴρις ἀελλόπος ἀγγελέουσα), or a combination of the two.

There are, moreover, only six instances in Homeric epic of βάσκ' ἴθι. It is thus very possible that simple chance excludes the occurrence of both in a single locus. The probability of their direct correspondence is further reduced by the diachronic processes of Homeric re-performance; the eventual semantic assimilation of the collocation to simplex βῆ/βᾶν suggests that the latter may overlie an 'older' instance of βῆ δ' ἴ(μ)εν(αι) in (4.4) (= *Il.* 2.8, 16-17):⁵

(4.4) βάσκ' ἴθι οὐλε ὄνειρε θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν

...

Ὦς φάτο, βῆ δ' ἄρ' ὄνειρος ἐπεὶ τὸν μῦθον ἄκουσε·
καρπαλίμως δ' ἴκανε θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν,

“**Go forth**, destructive Dream, to the swift ships of the Achaians.”

...

So [Zeus] spoke, and when it heard the speech, the Dream **set out**,
and quickly it arrived at the swift ships of Achaians.

Some other near examples of direct correspondence of this kind are provided by the variant of the collocation βῆ δὲ θέειν. In most significant ways, βῆ δὲ θέειν parallels βῆ δ' ἴ(μ)εν(αι): syntactically, it can be analyzed as a serial verb construction; poetically, it occupies the same line-initial position as the collocation and similarly shows a strong tendency to recur in post-dialogic position (6/9= 66.67%);⁶ lexically, the root θε(F)- (< **dhey-* ‘run;’ cf. Skt. *dhavate*)

⁵ Of course, that is not to say that a direct replacement is possible, but rather, that the post-dialogic lines would be structured differently; on these diachronic processes, see §4.3.1-3, below.

⁶ cf. §4.2.3.1-2, below

shows the same defectivity as εἶμι, lacking an aorist stem.⁷ In view of these qualities and its apparent productivity, it would not be groundless to posit an expression *βάσκε θέε, excluded from Homeric epic for metrical reasons—in line-initial position, it would strictly demand a subsequent word beginning with a double consonant—or some other factor, which led to the creation of βῆ δὲ θέειν, in the same way as βάσκ' ἴθι provided the impetus for βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι). In view of Watkins' observation that expressions of the type ἴων...ἄνασσε (*Il.* 1.179-80) and βῆ δὲ θέειν are both syntactic derivative formations of a bipartite asyndetic type *ἴθι...ἄνασσε,⁸ it is possible to see a fairly close correlation between imperative and indicative sequence in, e.g., (4.5) (= *Il.* 12.343-45, 351-53):

(4.5) ἔργεο δῖε Θεῶτα, **θέων** Αἴαντα **κάλεσσον**,

ἀμφοτέρω μὲν μᾶλλον· ὃ γάρ κ' ὄχ' ἄριστον ἀπάντων
εἶη, ἐπεὶ τάχα τῆδε τετεύχεται αἰπὺς ὄλεθρος.

...

Ἦς ἔφατ', οὐδ' ἄρα οἱ κῆρυξ ἀπίθησεν ἀκούσας,
βῆ δὲ θέειν παρὰ τεῖχος Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων,
στῆ δὲ παρ' Αἰάντεσσι κιών, εἶθαρ δὲ προσηύδα

“Go godlike Thoös, **run summon** Aias,
or even better, both of them; for by far the best of all things
it would be, since sheer ruin will swiftly be readied here.”

...

So [Menestheus] spoke, and the herald listened and did not disobey,
and **he set out at a run** beside the wall of the bronze-plated Achaians,
and proceeding, he stood beside the Aiantes, and addressed them forthwith.

In this example, the unexpectedly pre-posed Αἴαντα, the object of κάλεσσον, even suggests a monoclausal reading; βῆ δὲ θέειν constitutes the proper response to a command of this type, yet

⁷ It should be noted, however, that according to Letoublon (1985:193-99, 235-36), both present θέω and suppletive aorist (ἐ)δράμων refer to an incipient, centrifugal movement (i.e. ‘run to’); it is not exactly clear, then, what role the collocation would play semantically.

⁸ Watkins (1975: 96-97)

it is not direct evidence for an original command and response structure of the kind hypothesized. It can, however, be added to the body of indirect evidence for this verbal exchange, which will be laid out in the next section.

4.2.3. Indirect Evidence for $\beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa' \acute{\iota}\theta\iota \rightarrow \beta\eta \delta' \acute{\iota}(\mu)\epsilon\nu(\alpha\iota)$

At least three idiosyncratic characteristics of the collocation $\beta\eta \delta' \acute{\iota}(\mu)\epsilon\nu(\alpha\iota)$ in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* cannot be explained in view of its serial verb status. The first two are poetic features, namely, its frequent occurrence in post-dialogic position, and its consistently line-initial metrical position in the hexameter.⁹ The third, perhaps even more significant property is its prototypically goal-oriented deictic orientation.¹⁰ These characteristics can, however, be justified by its diachronic development from $\beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa' \acute{\iota}\theta\iota$, as will be demonstrated in the next three sections.

4.2.3.1. The Discourse Role of $\beta\eta \delta' \acute{\iota}(\mu)\epsilon\nu(\alpha\iota)$

Although Homeric epic does not attest a sequence in which $\beta\eta \delta' \acute{\iota}(\mu)\epsilon\nu(\alpha\iota)$ in narrative responds directly to $\beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa' \acute{\iota}\theta\iota$ in direct discourse, its strong tendency—more than one-third of all instances of the collocation (28/73= 38.3%)—to occupy a position at or very near the intersection of these two discourse modes suggests that the collocation has generalized the discourse role expected in view of its historical connection to $\beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa' \acute{\iota}\theta\iota$. Its frequent, post-dialogic position is in fact a consistent feature of the collocation in its diachronic development,

⁹ On the latter, cf. Chapter 2 (§2.1.2), above.

¹⁰ cf. Chapter 3, n. 86

surviving even the loss of deictic function observed after the replacement of the Aeolic infinitive ἴμεναι by (Attic-) Ionic ἰέναι within the collocation.¹¹

The collocation may appear in the very first line after the end of a speech as in (4.1)—in which case, it also follows the narrator’s report of the addressee’s acknowledged compliance—or in the ensuing lines, before any other movement on the part of the addressee or before the action is displaced elsewhere.¹² The intervening action tends to be highly formulaic, and of a ritualistic nature; arming scenes are common, as are descriptions of feasting, such as that in (4.6) (= *Od.* 18.418-19, 421, 427-28):

(4.6) ἀλλ' ἄγετ', οἰνοχόος μὲν ἐπαρξάσθω δεπάεσσιν,
 ὄφρα σπείσαντες **κατακείμεν οἴκαδ' ἰόντες**.¹³
 ...
 ὣς φάτο, τοῖσι δὲ πᾶσιν ἐαδότα μῦθον ἔειπε.
 ...
 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σπεῖσάν τε πῖον θ' ὅσον ἤθελε θυμός,
βάν ῥ' ἴμεναι κείμεντες ἐὰ πρὸς δώμαθ' ἕκαστος.

“But **come**, let the cup-bearer pour the first drops in the goblets,
 so that, when we’ve made a libation, we might **go lie down at home**.”

...
 So [Amphinomos] spoke, and gave a speech which pleased them all.

...
 And when they had made a libation and drank as much as (each man’s) heart desired,
they set out to lie down, each man to his own home.

¹¹ cf. §4.3.4, below

¹² These criteria are admittedly somewhat arbitrary, and open to interpretation. It excludes, e.g., (4.3), since Hermes’ first response is to ‘fly’ (*Il.* 24.345 πέτετο). If a small, fixed number of lines were used instead, the numbers would not vary significantly, though a few instances would be lost. The variation in marginal instances tends only to be the length of description afforded to the process of putting on arms, or the ritual feasting/sacrifice, which may be more or less elaborate according to the poet’s inclination.

¹³ Hock (2002) has proposed extending serial verb treatment to sequences of this type (i.e. ἄγετ’...κατακείμεν), with parallels in Vedic Sanskrit and Hittite. I cannot address his argumentation here, but note only that, if Hock is correct, it would be a different type of SVC from the collocation (it has, *inter alia*, multiple subjects, separately marked), and would demand a different sort of analysis.

The occurrence of the collocation in such contexts may have an interesting parallel in Hittite, where analogous serial verb-like structures frequently occur in ritual contexts.¹⁴ If, as Dunkel contends,¹⁵ these constructions originated in the imperative and, secondarily, made the transition to the indicative, and the same development has taken place from βάσκ' ἴθι to βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι), it is possible that these structures in both languages reflect, pragmatically, their origin in ritualized verbal exchange where the necessity of exactly replicating the phraseology of a command conditioned this transition.

Evident, too, in (4.6) is the Homeric particle ἀντάρ which, as observed in Chapter 2 (§2.1.2), often occurs immediately prior to the collocation. It has been argued by Katz that Homeric ἀντάρ contains the particle τάρ, which often marks ritualized dining or sacrifice, citing the parallel use of its etymological cognate in Luvian.¹⁶ This particle participates in a relationship with the collocation similar to its relationship with direct discourse: ἀντάρ seems to prompt the poet's use of βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι), accounting for about one-fifth of all instances of the collocation (15/73= 20.5%). Though it has this function in combination with direct discourse in some cases, including (4.6), it also has an independent relationship with the collocation too significant to be regarded as circumstantial (9/73= 12.3%). In this respect too, then, the collocation would seem to find its natural locus in ritual contexts.

¹⁴ *GrHL* (327)

¹⁵ Dunkel (1985); cf. Chapter 3 (§3.4.2.1), above.

¹⁶ Katz (2007), who refers to τάρ as a “sacral particle.” A near exact parallel can be observed in *Il.* 1.8 τίς τάρ and Cuneiform Luvian *ku-(i-)iš=tar*, on which see *op. cit.* 6-8. The line is printed as such by West (1998: *ad loc.*), though others do not accept this reading; for a history of the problem, see Katz (2007).

4.2.3.2. Metrical Localization and βῆ δ'ῖ(μ)εν(αι)

A striking feature of the collocation βῆ δ'ῖ(μ)εν(αι) is the position it occupies in the Homeric hexameter, in all but a few instances appearing line-initially (70/73 = 95.8%).¹⁷ These three instances, however, are sufficient to show that the collocation *can* occupy other positions in the hexameter, but that it exhibits a very strong localization priority toward first position, to the extent, even, that it may displace other items which tend to occur in this position.¹⁸ Even in Homeric epic, where many metrical formulae are regularly deployed in the same metrical slots, the persistence with which βῆ δ'ῖ(μ)εν(αι) occurs in initial-position—irrespective, even of variation in metrical shape, i.e. choriambic βῆ δ'ῖ(μ)εναι or dactylic βῆ δ'ῖμεν—cannot be explained by chance alone.

A possible motivation for the localized status of the collocation in the hexameter is its historical relationship with βᾶσκ' ἴθι. Unlike the SOV word order characteristic of Vedic Sanskrit and rigidly adhered to in Hittite—and consequently, usually reconstructed for Proto-Indo-European—the ordering of sentence constituents in ancient Greek was generally free. An important exception to this relative freedom was the imperative which, like in Hittite, normally occurred first in its sentence.¹⁹ This phenomenon is apparent in βᾶσκ' ἴθι, which occupies sentence-initial—and line-initial—position in all six occurrences.²⁰ The importance of precise phraseology in the verbal exchange which served as impetus for the syntactically irregular βῆ δ'ῖ(μ)εν(αι) was emphasized in Chapter 3 (§3.4.2.3, above), on the basis, in part, of an analogous development in Hittite, which produced SVCs with indicative verbal forms corresponding to

¹⁷ cf. Chapter 2 (§2.1.2), above

¹⁸ On “priority” in localization, see Bakker (2005: 1-24), who cites Visser (1987, 1988). Bakker approaches localization priority in terms of peripherality (cf. §2.2.3, above). On the position of the collocation, cf. Chapter 2 (§2.1.2), above.

¹⁹ cf. Luraghi (1989: 273-75), Chapter 3 (§3.4.2.1), below.

²⁰ cf. Chapter 3 (§3.3, [3.43-45]). It is evident, too, in (3.47-48), and obviously elsewhere.

motion verb-initial imperatival SVCs on a much wider scale than ancient Greek. In the process, the word order of the imperatival type was generalized, with the result that in the indicative, despite the strict requirement in Hittite that non-imperative verbs appear in final position, the motion verb still occurs in clause-initial position.²¹

This same process, in which precise phraseology is paramount, would explain the metrical position of βῆ δ' ἴ(μ)εν(αι). If the ordering of sentence-constituents in imperatival sentences were preserved, the collocation would come to occupy the same position as βάσκ' ἴθι, topicalized in its sentence and metrically verse-initial; in this way, the issuance of a command in, e.g., (4.7) (= *Il.* 2.8) would generate, in due course, a corresponding expression such as in (4.8) (= *Il.* 10.336):

(4.7) **βάσκ' ἴθι** ... ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν

Go forth...to the ships of Achaians.

(4.8) **βῆ δ' ἴεναι** προτὶ νῆας...

He set out toward the ships...

The metrical status of βῆ δ' ἴ(μ)εν(αι) in Homeric epic thus provides further evidence for the historical relationship between the collocation and βάσκ' ἴθι proposed in Chapter 3 (§3.4.2).

²¹ cf. Chapter 3 (§3.4.2.1), below.

4.2.3.3. The Goal-Oriented Deixis of βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι)

The semantic analysis carried out in Chapter 1 allows for the prototypical spatial deictic orientation of the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) to be described, now, in terms of two features:²²

- 1) Centrifugally oriented with respect to the *origo*—in 3rd person narrative, the time and place of verbal subject at the moment of enunciation²³
- 2) Deictically oriented towards a *goal*, i.e. a purpose or destination.

The former can be explained, just as for βάσκ' ἴθι, by approaching the collocation as a deictic-directional SVC, a cross-linguistically common type of motion serialization in which one serial verb functions to impart its deictic orientation to the construction as a whole: the centrifugal orientation of βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) results from the projection of the prototypically centrifugal deixis of the infinitival form of εἶμι onto the neutrally-deictic βῆ/βάν and, thereby, the collocation as a whole.²⁴

The latter, however, remains to be addressed. It was observed in Chapter 2 that those instances of the collocation containing the Aeolic infinitive variant ἴμεναι (βῆ δ'ἴμεναι) —the type most likely to be archaic—are oriented in all but two instance towards a goal, either by the complement of an expression of purpose (future participle, finite subordinate clause) or destination (prepositional accusative, -δέ, adverbial).²⁵ These expressions of purpose, in particular, must be explained; for while the effect of deictic ἴθι in the SVC is to make it centrifugally deictic, so that a complement of destination is expected, this approach does not predict a subordinate expression of purpose, nor is any such expression to be found at all with

²² cf. Chapter 2 (§2.3.3), above.

²³ cf. Chapter 2 (§2.3.1.1), above.

²⁴ cf. Chapter 3 (§3.3.2; 3.4), above.

²⁵ The exact figure is 13/15 = 87% exhibiting goal-oriented deixis; cf. Chapter 2 (§2.3.3.), above.

βάσκ' ἴθι. Rather, the complementary expressions of purpose observed with the collocation follow directly from the context of the utterance of βάσκ' ἴθι which, as noted in Chapter 3 (§3.3), contains a subsequent imperative or imperatives, the presence of which is obligatory. These imperatives specify the nature of the errand on which the addressee is sent; the response of the addressee—or more accurately, the *report* of his response²⁶—would often incorporate these subsequent imperatives, encoding them, naturally, as expression of purpose, to accomplish the task commanded. Expressions of destination can be understood as the natural result of the centrifugal deixis of the expression, further reinforced by contexts in which it constitutes a simple response to βάσκ' ἴθι itself—i.e. to go to the place commanded.

In this scenario, it is possible, to view pairs such as (4.9-10) (= *Il.* 24.144-45, *Od.* 4.24) and (4.11-12) (= *Il.* 15.158, *Od.* 6.50-51) correlative types:

(4.9) **βάσκ' ἴθι** Ἴρι ταχεῖα λιποῦσ' ἔδος Οὐλύμπιοιο
ἄγγελον Πριάμῳ μεγαλήτορι Ἴλιον εἶσω

“**Go forth**, swift Iris, leaving behind your Olympian seat!
Bring word to great-hearted Priam within Ilion...”

(4.10) **βῆ δ' ἴμεν ἀγγελέων** πρὸς δώματα ποιμένι λαῶν.

He set out to the halls **to bring word** to the shepherd of the peoples.

(4.11) **βάσκ' ἴθι** Ἴρι ταχεῖα, Ποσειδάωνι ἄνακτι
πάντα τάδ' ἀγγεῖλαι, μὴ δὲ ψευδάγγελος εἶναι.

“**Go forth**, swift Iris! **Bring word** of all these things
to lord Poseidon, and be not a false messenger!

²⁶ See §4.2.1.1, below.

(4.12) **βῆ δ' ἵμεναι** διὰ δώμαθ', ἵν' ἀγγείλειε τοκεῦσι,
πατρὶ φίλῳ καὶ μητρὶ·

She set out through the halls **to bring word** to her parents,
her dear father and mother...

In these examples, the deictic orientation of the collocation towards an immediate purpose follows from the discourse conditions of a verbal exchange, with βῆ δ' ἵμεναι itself responding to the initial imperative βάσκ' ἴθι, and the purpose clause to the second imperative: in (4.10) the purposive future participle ἀγγελέων echoes ἀγγεῖλον in (4.9); in (4.12) the subordinate clause of purpose ἵν' ἀγγείλειε answers ἀγγεῖλαι in (4.11). In the same way, (4.7-8) could be viewed as a pair exemplifying the destination-oriented type. The frequent goal-oriented deictic orientation of the collocation stands, then, as another example of a phenomenon best explained by the same hypothesis which explains its own origin, namely, as the product of the transition of βάσκ' ἴθι from imperative to indicative.²⁷

4.3. The Development of the Collocation βῆ δ' ἵ(μ)εν(αι)

It is clear that the Homeric poems reflect multiple stages in the diachronic evolution of the collocation βῆ δ' ἵ(μ)εν(αι). Some of these developments are internal to Homeric epic. In Chapter 1, it was hypothesized that those instances of the collocation containing Aeolic forms of the infinitive ἵμεν and, especially, ἵμεναι are likely to be archaic, and better preserve the original function of the collocation; this hypothesis was corroborated by the derivation of the collocation

²⁷ It should not be ignored, however, that (4.9-12) are extracted from very different parts of the text, and in some cases, even from different texts; as noted above (§4.2.2), there is no evidence for a situation in which βῆ δ' ἵμεναι responds directly to βάσκ' ἴθι nor, *a fortiori*, a correspondence between an imperative subsequent to βάσκ' ἴθι and an expression of purpose following the collocation.

proposed in Chapter 3, the properties of the Aeolic-type collocations showing greater semantic consistency with those expected in a deictic-directional serial verb construction and, more specifically, with its development from βάσκ' ἴθι by way of a face-to-face verbal exchange between speaker and addressee. The substitution of the (Attic-) Ionic form of the infinitive ἰέναι, with the quite different semantic properties collocations containing this form exhibit, marks a new stage in its semantic evolution.

Other stages in the history of the collocation fall, either partially or entirely, outside the scope of Homeric poetry, yet the two epics—and more importantly, the diachronic trends which can be observed in these epics—nevertheless provide our only evidence of these stages. Just traces of an original verbal exchange are present in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, the dialogue itself having been lost in undocumented prehistory. Similarly, the absence of the collocation in post-Homeric Greek can only be explained in terms of the changing function of the collocation in the epics. In the next five sections, I will attempt to reconstruct a relative chronology of the diachronic development of the collocation from its pre-Homeric origins through the Homeric period and to its eventual disappearance in post-Homeric Greek.

4.3.1. The Homeric Prehistory of the Collocation

The evidence, both direct and indirect, for the original verbal exchange presupposed by the derivation βάσκ' ἴθι → βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) has been surveyed above (§4.2). The direct evidence is not, on its own, especially compelling, only weakly attesting the interaction between these two expressions; indirectly, however, the function of the collocation in Homeric epic continues to reflect this derivation in several significant ways. This situation suggests that, at some very early

stage, the Homeric tradition was conscious of the verbal exchange which produced indicative forms corresponding $\beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa'$ ἴθι, and that elements of this exchange were admitted into the Homeric *Kunstsprache* insofar as they were *functional*: the incorporation of the imperative $\beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa'$ ἴθι and $\beta\eta\delta'$ ἴ(μ)εν(αι), the 3rd person aorist characteristic of Homeric narrative,²⁸ allowed the poet to represent the exchange, which was itself independent of Homeric epic, a part of non-poetic language—if not every day language, but rather, a formal, ritualized register;²⁹ yet other elements—notably, the 1st person forms expected in an addressee's response—were not integrated, because they had no natural place in the epic language.³⁰

It is easy, then, to see how a connection between $\beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa'$ ἴθι and $\beta\eta\delta'$ ἴ(μ)εν(αι) could be subject to the pressures of diachronic language change. If the original verbal exchange ceased to be relevant, too far removed, perhaps, from the cultural experience of performing poets,³¹ the perception of a relationship between $\beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa'$ ἴθι and $\beta\eta\delta'$ ἴ(μ)εν(αι) would steadily fade. Even a small decrease in the use $\beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa'$ ἴθι and $\beta\eta\delta'$ ἴ(μ)εν(αι) as correlative types of the sort exemplified in (4.1-2; 3-4; 5-6) would, over time, lead to the loss of the connection, the process of oral composition and re-performance having the self-reinforcing effect of further distancing the two expressions. A possible factor in such a decrease could be the apparent specialization of $\beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa'$

²⁸ cf. §4.2.2 and n. 2, above; it was certainly an added bonus that the collocation may alternate freely between 3rd singular and 3rd plural without a change in metrical shape.

²⁹ cf. §4.2.3.1, above

³⁰ cf. §4.2.1, above

³¹ On the original context of the verbal exchange, only speculation is possible. In its formal, ritualized diction, and its apparent specialization to use in hierarchical relationships between superior and subordinate (cf. n. 32, above), $\beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa'$ ἴθι would seem to find a natural home in a royal court: a command issued by a king seems more likely to elicit a precise, echoic response than the muted expression of compliance (e.g. 'Okay') which might suffice for a more casual exchange. This sort of hierarchical relationship is not, however, the dominant type in the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*; the epic poems are populated, rather, by βασιλεῖς 'petty kings,' who rarely command such unchallenged obedience. Certain formulaic phrases, however, appear to preserve traces of a distinct courtly register, e.g. ἱερὸν μένος Ἀλκινόοιο, which some have attributed to the Mycaean element in Homeric epic (cf. Janko [1992: 11-12], with bibliography). In any case, such situations were in all probability outside the everyday experience of most Aeolic or Ionic-speaking Homeric poets.

ἴθι to commands issued by Zeus alone,³² thus permitting fewer opportunities for their correlative use. Eventually, the link between βᾶσκ' ἴθι and βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) would be almost entirely obscured,³³ leaving behind only the two expressions, fixed as Homeric formulae³⁴ whose usage indirectly bears the mark of their original relationship.³⁵

4.3.2. The Collocation in the Early Homeric Period

An early Homeric period may be defined, for the study of βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι), as that in which the 'older,' Aeolic form of the infinitive ἴμεναι is productive in the collocation prior to its replacement by (Attic-) Ionic ἰέναι.³⁶ Though its correlative discourse relationship with βᾶσκ' ἴθι was no longer operative, the role of the collocation in this stage of Homeric epic is strongly characterized by its historical relationship with βᾶσκ' ἴθι, which manifests itself in two ways. The first is in the goal-oriented deictic orientation of the collocation, which is, in part, explained as a prototypical—and not peripheral—semantic property via this historical relationship; the other is its regular occurrence in post-dialogic position.³⁷ Though the latter is important, it is the

³² One might speculate that this verbal exchange had a hierarchical element, with the speaker of the command holding a position of authority relative to the addressee. Certainly, this relationship is present in the *Iliad*, where Zeus uses the expression with subordinate entities, i.e. Iris and the Dream, and in the single instance with an Olympian, Hermes, Zeus employs “more elaborate courtesy” (Richardson 1993: 308, *ad Il.* 24.334ff.; cf. Chapter 3, n. 66) towards him, first offering a kind of apologetic explanation. More generally, its restriction to Zeus embeds the hierarchical relationship *par excellence*, since all beings are, to different extents, his subordinates.

³³ cf. Chapter 2 (§2.2.2.1.2), above.

³⁴ In this sense, the collocation is an example of a “bound phrase of ordinary language,” to which Kiparsky (1976) has compared the Homeric formula. A similar approach is taken by Bakker (1997) who, in arguing for treating the Homeric diction as “special speech,” remarks (*op. cit.* 126): “The boundary line between speech features and special speech features, however, cannot be drawn sharply: poetic features of Homeric style can be reduced to speech features precisely because speech features can easily become poetic.”

³⁵ Even the little direct evidence which can be adduced may owe as much to the frequency of the collocation in post-dialogic position—i.e. an indirect effect of its relationship with βᾶσκ' ἴθι—as to the original discourse relationship itself; cf. §4.2.3.1, above.

³⁶ cf. Chapter 2 (§2.2.2.3), above.

³⁷ As noted in Chapter 2, (§2. 3.3), goal-oriented deixis is a prototypical feature, characterizing a significant majority (13/15 = 86.7%) of instances of βῆ δ'ἴμεναι. Approximately half (7/15= 46.7%) of all instances occur in post-dialogic position.

former which distinguishes this phase in the evolution from its later, ‘recent’ usage, as shown in Chapter 2.

Within this period, then, a functional opposition was observed between the collocation and simplex βῆ/βἄν; while the former would occur with the complement of direction, the latter—having, as argued by Letoublon, an original, non-deictic value³⁸—did not. It was a relatively small step to generalize this opposition as deictic :: non-deictic. This reduction of semantic specificity would contribute toward the extension of the collocation to environments other than post-dialogic position; the Homeric poet could use the collocation simply to emphasize the intention of the subject to accomplish a goal, hence, coupled with a subordinate expression of purpose or a terminal directional complement. A possible transition between these two different usages can be observed in (4.13) (= *Od.* 14.72-3), where the collocation occurs in post-dialogic position, but without the shift between speaker and addressee; rather, the speaker Eumaeus is also the agent of the subsequent action:³⁹

(4.13) ὡς εἰπὼν ζῶστῆρι θοῶς συνέεργε χιτῶνα,
βῆ δ' ἴμεν ἐς συφεούς, ὅθι ἔθνεα ἔρχατο χοίρων.

So speaking, [Eumaeus] quickly fastened on his tunic with his belt,
And set out to the pigpens, where the herds of swine were enclosed.

The productivity of the collocation in this role significantly benefited, too, from its relationship with the suppletive paradigm εἶμι—ἦλθον. Within the aorist, the centrifugal deixis of the collocation set it in opposition to centripetally-deictic ἦλθον, while aligning it with the similarly centrifugal present εἶμι; aspectually, too, both the collocation and present εἶμι refer to

³⁸ Letoublon (1985: 137); see discussion in Chapter 2 (§2.3.1.2), above.

³⁹ The formulaic speech-closing in this scenario is not ὡς φάτο, but the participial phrase ὡς εἴπων.

the moment of departure, in which respect they are semantically nearer to one another than to ἤλθον, which indicates, rather, the arrival that is the movement's final realization.⁴⁰ These facts suggest, to Letoublon, that the Homeric language lacks a distinction in the aorist between centripetal and centrifugal elementary verbs of motion; her analysis thus leads her to conclude: "L'aoriste centrifuge n'existe pas in principe."⁴¹ The collocation, however, was well-suited to fill this void, functioning, essentially, as a centrifugally-oriented, aspectually ingressive *periphrastic* aorist to present εἶμι.

Evidence that the collocation participated in such a relationship with εἶμι is provided by its variant forms, βῆ δὲ θέειν, βῆ δ'έλάαν, and perhaps *βῆ δὲ νεέσθαι, the latter two of which, at least, are doubtlessly analogic creations.⁴² βῆ δ'έλάαν is a kind of *Augensblickbildung*, combining two formulaic types—on the one hand, βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι), and on the other, the line-initial Homeric formulae μάστιξεν δ'ἵππους 'he whipped the horses' and μάστιξεν δ'έλάαν 'he whipped [the horses] to go'—in its single occurrence at *Il.* 13.27. This blend can stand in the epic only because of the analogy to βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι), formed from the simplex verb βῆ/βάν in initial-position plus an infinitive of a verb of motion; semantically, it seems to operate as an intransitive aorist 'he drove,' being thus noteworthy as the single use of βαίνω in Homeric epic for motion in a chariot.⁴³

The other two verbs present even more interesting cases. Both θέω and νέομαι share with εἶμι one crucial property, namely, the lack of an aorist stem; the defective present θέω has a suppletive aorist ἔδραμον 'I ran' in Homeric epic,⁴⁴ while the missing forms in the paradigm of

⁴⁰ cf. Chapter 2 (§2.3.1.1, 2.3.2-4)

⁴¹ Letoublon (1985: 109 [see table]).

⁴² On βῆ δ'θέειν and the possibility of an unattested expression *βάσκε...θέε, see §4.3.1, above.

⁴³ A second such use occurs in the Homeric Hymns (*HHDem.* 423); cf. Janko (1992: 46, s.v.).

⁴⁴ For the suppletive relationship between θέω and ἔδραμον, see Letoublon 1985: 181-97. This relationship is distinct from, but does not exclude the traditionally recognized suppletive relationship between τρέχω (present) and

νέομαι are furnished by the denominative aorist (ἐ)νόστησα (< νόστος ‘safe return’).⁴⁵ This deficiency suggests that βῆ δ’έλααν, and perhaps *βῆ δὲ νεέσθαι may have been productive, as the collocation was for εἶμι, as an equivalent aorist form. Though *βῆ δὲ νεέσθαι is not found with contiguous constituents in the line-initial position characteristic of the collocation—only non-initial ἔβαν...νεέσθαι (*Il.* 23.229; *Od.* 14.87) is attested⁴⁶—it is nevertheless a compelling case. There is an important semantic difference between present νέομαι and suppletive aorist (ἐ)νόστησα which parallels the suppletive paradigm εἶμι—ἦλθον, namely, that present νέομαι ‘I return (home)’ enacts a movement aimed towards a goal that is separated from the speaker in time and space, while aorist (ἐ)νόστησα ‘I have returned (home)’ marks the culmination of this journey at its goal. The former, then, is centrifugal and atelic, while the latter is centripetal and telic.⁴⁷ The collocation *βῆ δὲ νεέσθαι was thus situated to provide the ingressive, atelic aorist corresponding to present νέομαι just as it did for εἶμι.

4.3.3. The Collocation in Transition: from Early Homeric to Late Homeric

At some point, however, the simplex verb βῆ/βάν began to develop terminal directional complements. Whether this development was influenced by the collocation, with the distinction between the collocation and simplex βῆ/βάν beginning to give way, or via some other independent process, the deictic :: non-deictic opposition between the two expressions which once contributed to the productivity of the collocation now paved the way for its disappearance.

ἔδραμον (aorist). Already in antiquity, θέω was recognized as the epic equivalent of τρέχω; Hesychius glosses θέειν (s.v.) as ‘τρέχειν, δραμεῖν;’ cf. *LSJ*, s.vv.

⁴⁵ cf. *DELG*, *EDG* s.v. νέομαι

⁴⁶ The appearance of this particular sequence is explained, perhaps, as a blend of two formulae, post-trochaic caesural ἔβαν οἶκον δὲ (7x) and line-final οἶκον δὲ νεέσθαι (10x), once again, allowed to stand because of an underlying *βῆ δὲ νεέσθαι, or else, because of the analogy to the collocation βῆ δ’ἴ(μ)εν(αι).

⁴⁷ cf. Letoublon (1985: 171-74)

With the collapse of this opposition, there ceased to be any semantic distinction between the collocation and simplex verb. The result for the collocation was the loss of its goal-oriented deictic orientation, as it was freely used in contexts where it afforded to the Homeric poet a metrically-useful alternative to simplex βῆ/βᾶν.

At this stage, once the discrete sense of the collocation was lost, the infinitive was reduced, in principle, to the status of ornamental epithet; provided the replacement of “noun” with “verb,” Parry’s formulation accurately describes the function of the infinitive in the collocation: “It is one with its noun, with which it has become fused by repeated use, and the resulting noun-epithet formula constitutes a thought unit differing from that of the simple noun only by an added quality of epic nobility.”⁴⁸ As was argued in Chapter 2, the continued use of the collocation after this point was owing primarily to poetic factors, namely, its metrical utility—the choriambic and dactylic variants βῆ δ’ἴμεναι and βῆ δ’ἴμεν—and its heroic quality, as an audibly distinctive, syntactically opaque archaism in the evolving Homeric diction.⁴⁹

When the principally Aeolic oral epic came to be reworked by Ionic bards, the collocation was, because of these poetic factors, sufficiently indispensable in the system of oral composition that it was renewed with the newly productive form of the infinitive ἰέναι: βῆ δ’ἴμεναι became βῆ δ’ἰέναι. Yet this replacement was only partial, although in general, Parry’s principle of economy would predict the complete replacement of ‘older’ Aeolic βῆ δ’ἴμεναι by ‘recent’ Ionic βῆ δ’ἰέναι. It was hypothesized, in Chapter 2, that the retention of the ‘older’ form was semantically motivated since the ‘recent’ forms show a very different pattern of usage, specifically, with respect to the goal-oriented deixis prototypical of the collocation; yet this theory is inadequately precise, since it does not address what semantic feature of βῆ δ’ἴμεναι the

⁴⁸ Parry (1971: 249)

⁴⁹ See Chapter 2 (§2.2.2.3), above.

poet recognized as incongruous with his understanding of the collocation. Having since confirmed the relative chronology there proposed, it is now possible to reengage this question.

Although they account for only about half ($7/15 = 46.7\%$) of the occurrences of βῆ δ'ῖμεναι, it seems likely that the preservation of ῖμεναι in the text is conditioned by two factors:

- 1) Subordinate purpose clauses (future participle, subordinating conjunction)
- 2) Terminal accusative in –δὲ

With the collocation shifting in the direction of the primarily non-deictic usage it exhibits in the later Homeric period, its formulaic use with complements of these two types would seem sufficiently inconsistent with the poet's conception of the semantic function that the archaic infinitive form would be retained rather than replaced. The latter, in particular, is an archaic syntactic element, a trace of the Proto-Indo-European terminal accusative which is well-represented in, e.g., Vedic Sanskrit⁵⁰ and appears in the only instance in which Aeolic ῖμεναι is maintained outside of the collocation at *Od.* 17.185-87:⁵¹

(4.14) ξεῖν', ἐπεὶ ἄρ' δὴ ἔπειτα πόλινδ' ῖμεναι μενεαίνεις
σήμερον, ὡς ἐπέτελλεν ἄναξ ἐμός· – ἦ σ' ἂν ἐγὼ γε
αὐτοῦ βουλοίμην σταθμῶν ῥυτῆρα λιπέσθαι·

“Stranger, since you are of a mind **to go to the city** today, as my lord ordered—although I, for my part, would prefer to leave you here as keeper of the farmhouses.”

⁵⁰ cf. Chapter 2, n. 115

⁵¹ The –δὲ suffix also occurs with διεξίμεναι at *Il.* 6.293 διεξίμεναι πεδίον δέ ; cf. Chapter 2 (§2.2.2.2), above. It may have had similar effect, too, at *Il.* 7.79, where it appears adjacent to the Aeolic infinitive δόμεναι, which functions, in this unusual case, as a 3rd person imperative infinitive. See discussion of this example (= 3. 51) in Chapter 3 (§3.4.1.1 and nn. 98-99), above.

These two features are almost entirely absent as complements to βῆ δ'ίεναι. The two instances of subordinate purpose clauses are not line-internal, as is always the case with βῆ δ'ῖμεναι and even βῆ δ'ῖμεν, but in the subsequent line, i.e. in “unperiodic” enjambment.⁵² The lative suffix –δὲ is limited to a single instance at *Od.* 16.413; yet it serves as directional complement to the only occurrence in the *Iliad* of βῆ δ'ῖμεναι at 20.32, the likely mechanism for the preservation of this isolated case.⁵³

4.3.4. The Collocation in the Later Homeric Period

The replacement of ‘older’ Aeolic βῆ δ'ῖμεναι by ‘recent’ Ionic βῆ δ'ίεναι as the productive form of the collocation initiates, as it has been designated for the purpose of this study, the later Homeric period. At this point in its development, the collocation’s diachronic trend towards non-deictic usage has reached its culmination, with terminal directional complements appearing in only one-third ($8/24 = 33.3\%$) of all occurrences of βῆ δ'ίεναι, a startling development from its use in nearly three-quarters ($11/15 = 73.3\%$) of instances of βῆ δ'ῖμεναι. By this time, moreover, the evolution of the collocation has crossed paths with βῆ/βάν, its percentage of deictic usage falling below the overall figure for the simplex verb in Homeric epic ($97/207 = 46.9\%$), which can be assumed to persist in its developing in the opposite direction, namely, towards deictic semantics.⁵⁴

⁵² The term “unperiodic” enjambment was used, by Parry (1971: 253), to describe the Homeric line which yields “a complete thought, although it goes on in the next verse, adding free ideas by new word groups.” He opposes “unperiodic” to “necessary” enjambment (*ibid.*), in which “the verse end can fall at the end of the word group where there is not yet a whole thought, or it can fall in the middle of the word group;” on this opposition, see *op. cit.* 251-65; the study of enjambment in Homeric scholarship, employing the same or related terminology, is discussed by Edwards (1986: 224-28).

⁵³ = (2.18); see discussion in Chapter 2 (§2.3.3).

⁵⁴ cf. Table 2.5 in Chapter 2 (§2.3.3), with discussion.

The loss of this semantic property, once prototypical of the collocation, constitutes a radical semantic development, which can be best described in terms of a shift in the semantic prototype. In this stage, the collocation can and does have deictic value, appearing with terminal directional complements; yet this type of usage is no longer primary—no longer prototypical—of the collocation. Rather, its non-deictic usage has become, in the terms of Clarke, *salient*, and over time—especially as simplex βῆ/βάν continues to develop deictic function, thus filling its former role—*entrenched* in the perception of the semantic function of βῆ δ'ἰέναι.⁵⁵ This entrenchment caused the establishment of a new prototype which had, at its center, the non-deictic usage of the collocation. From the perspective of this new prototype, deictic usages of the collocation, formerly prototypical, were now peripheral, while a once peripheral usage, e.g. the single independent occurrence of ‘older’ βῆ δ' ἴμεναι in (4.15) (= *Od.* 22.146), was now prototypical and, accordingly, constitutes the majority of its usage (16/24= 66.7%):

(4.15) ἔνθεν δώδεκα μὲν σάκε' ἔξελε, τόσσα δὲ δοῦρα
καὶ τόσσας κυνέας χαλκήρεας ἵπποδασειάς·
βῆ δ' ἴμεναι, μάλα δ' ὄκα φέρων μνηστῆρσιν ἔδωκε

From there he took out twelve shields and as many spears,
and as many bronze horse-haired helms,
and **he set out**, and bearing them very swiftly, he gave them to the suitors.

This new prototype is manifest in an increased proportion of independent uses (9/24= 37.5%; cf. 1/15= 6.7% for βῆ δ' ἴμεναι), and in an innovation of this period, namely, its use in

⁵⁵ Clarke (2010: 128): “When a salient usage becomes entrenched, it is possible that [it] will achieve the status of a new prototype in its own right, ousting the original prototype from its position of dominance;” on semantic change from the perspective of Prototype Theory, see *op. cit.* 127-130).

introducing similes as in (4.3) (= *Il.* 24.347) and (4.16) (= *Il.* 17.665-67), a function which is unattested for βῆ δ' ἵμεναι:

(4.16) Ὡς ἔφατ', οὐδ' ἀπίθησε βοῆν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος,
βῆ δ' ἰέναι ὥς τις τε λέων ἀπὸ μεσσαύλοιο...

So he spoke, and Menelaos of the great war cry did not disobey him,
and **he set out** like a lion from a walled courtyard...

In these functions, the role of infinitive is purely poetic; the collocation does not differ in its “essential idea” from the simplex verb, but is, rather, used formulaically, i.e. under conditions of metrical necessity, the simile itself being the primary semantic material in the line.⁵⁶ In this sense, the collocation has completed the transition from an expression which became a formula because of what it *means*, to an expression which continues to be used because it *is a formula*.⁵⁷

In another respect, however, the collocation was conservative, revealing its historical connection, otherwise long forgotten by the performing poet, with βάσκ' ἴθι. It continued to be used commonly in post-dialogic position; Ionic βῆ δ' ἰέναι shows similar frequency statistics in this locus (10/24= 41.7%) to Aeolic βῆ δ' ἵμεναι (7/15= 46.7%). The diachronic stability of the collocation in this function speaks to its absolute integration into the information structure of Homeric epic, providing to the poet, at the threshold of direct discourse and narrative, a vehicle for transitioning between episodes, relocating the action of the poem to a different place where a new set of events can unfold. As such, it would be operative, too, in a pragmatic capacity,

⁵⁶ See Bakker (2005:

⁵⁷ cf. Bakker (1988: 157): “Parry was the first to discover the functional motivation for the presence of formulas in Homer. Yet he did not carry this discovery to its logical conclusion. In treating phrases as formulas because of what they *are* or *mean*, Parry...missed a chance to arrive at an account of the formulaic use of language which is plausible. Instead of being qualitatively different from ordinary language phrases, formulas are what they are because of how they *are used*.”

functioning as an audible cue to the audience that such a shift is taking place, and that the “visual” perspective of the listener is being reoriented.⁵⁸ The value of the collocation as a means to organize the Homeric narrative, thus facilitating both performance and reception, allowed it to continue to flourish in the poetic language in its post-dialogic role.

4.3.5. The Disappearance and Revival of the Collocation: After Homeric Epic

By the time of the earliest written records of Greek, the collocation had long since been dissociated from the ordinary, non-poetic language. From a synchronic, syntactic perspective, the collocation had become entirely impenetrable; semantically, it was perceived as merely redundant. Within the *Kunstsprache*, it had become a poetic equivalent to simplex βῆ/βᾶν, whose use was conditioned by the exigencies of the meter during oral composition-in-performance of the Homeric epics. As the Homeric poems came to be fixed as texts, the metrical flexibility of the collocation, with both choriambic and dactylic variant forms, which facilitated oral composition in the Homeric hexameter ceased to be relevant. Its value as an obscure archaism—its “epic quality”—was, apparently, not sufficiently to attract lyric or tragic poets who flourished after Homer, perhaps outweighed by its opacity. Its survival in prose was doubly improbable, and the complete loss of even simplex βαίνω/ἔβη in Attic prose ensured that the collocation would not assume a place in the non-poetic language.⁵⁹ It enjoyed a brief revival in the 3rd century, however, incorporated into Apollonius of Rhodes’ epic *Argonautica* (8x) as a curiosity of Homeric poetry; that Apollonius was deliberately striving for archaism is clear from the

⁵⁸ The importance of this “visual” aspect in Homeric is stressed by Bakker (1997: 61): “Path and space are realities in terms of which the presentation of the epic tale is viewed by performers and their audiences; the epic story involves not only a continuously shifting present moment, but also a given location, not only a now but also a here.” See also, *op. cit.* 54-85 and Bakker (2005: 56-70, 154-176).

⁵⁹ On the loss of simplex βαίνω, see Letoublon (1985: 141-43).

absence of βῆ δ'ιέναι, the poet making use of only the 'older' forms of the collocation with Aeolic infinitives ἴμεν and ἕμεναι.

4.4. The Collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι): Implications for Greek and Indo-European

This exhaustive analysis of βάσκ' ἴθι and the collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) points toward some broader conclusions for the syntax of the oldest stratum of ancient Greek and other Indo-European languages, as well as for the poetics of Homeric epic. In Hittite, Vedic, and ancient Greek, there are imperatival sequences which show syntactic and semantic features consistent with deictic-directional serial verb constructions.⁶⁰ Two of these languages, Hittite and Greek, as well as English,⁶¹ offer evidence for the secondary development of SVCs with verbs in the indicative or other, non-imperatival modalities. In view of such evidence, the question of Proto-Indo-European inheritance becomes inevitable: Did Proto-Indo-European have serial verb constructions?⁶²

The evidence considered in this study does not justify projecting SVCs of any type into Proto-Indo-European, though it does not necessarily preclude this possibility. Only the imperatival type of SVC presents any real possibility for an inherited formation. It does seem probable that Proto-Indo-European had imperative constructions with basic structural similarities to those in Vedic, Hittite, and Greek: an elementary verb of motion in the imperative, with hortatory (e.g. 'Come/go [on]!') or deictic function (e.g. 'Come/go [here/there]!'), followed closely by a second imperative. Yet the formal similarities between the Vedic, Hittite, and Greek

⁶⁰ cf. Chapter 3 (§3.1.3, 3.3.1)

⁶¹ At exactly what point in the history of English SVCs developed is unclear; they are first attested near the beginning of Early Modern English, as in (3.8).

⁶² Hock (2002: 96-100) has argued for the construction of imperatival-type SVCs in Proto-Indo-European on the basis of the Vedic, Greek, and Hittite constructions in question.

types are sufficient are inexact: *inter alia*, the Greek type does not show the strict ordering restrictions apparent in Hittite and Sanskrit, permitting the verb of motion in either initial or second position.⁶³ They therefore admit only a reconstruction of this very general syntactic type, which may in all likelihood represent a language universal. Absent, moreover, is a diachronic development characteristic of SVCs, namely, *grammaticalization*; if verb serialization were a part of the genetic inheritance of Vedic, Hittite, and Greek, it can be expected to see some sign of grammaticalization in these constructions.⁶⁴ Rather, the fact that the imperatival constructions exhibiting serial-verb syntax emerge in English at a period far removed from Indo-European unity suggests that the similar structures in Vedic, Greek, and Hittite are more likely to be separate developments than a common inheritance.⁶⁵

Yet the development of serial verb-like structures in Vedic Sanskrit, English, Hittite, and ancient Greek the Indo-European languages is no less extraordinary for being independent; the inheritance question is, after all, only one question, and in this case, not the most interesting one. The latter three languages, in particular, seem to demonstrate an avenue by which non-productively verb serializing languages may come to acquire SVCs in their synchronic grammar.

⁶³ Hittite and Sanskrit always have a verb of motion in initial position in SVCs. Both βᾶσκ' ἴθι and (3.47) offer evidence for the verb of motion in second position in Greek, though (3.48) shows the reverse is also possible. (3.47) also shows that Dunkel's argument that constructions of this type occur only with the root **h₁ei-* 'go' is untenable. In general, deictic-directional SVCs vary from language to language with regard to the order of the motion verb relative to other serial verbs (e.g. [40-41] in Van Staden and Reesink [2008: 39]), and even within a single language (cf. Baird [2008: 66-67, esp. (35, 42)]). While productively verb-serializing languages exhibit *tendencies* in certain types of SVCs toward a default orderings of constituents verbs (with iconicity as an important factor), it is rare that these preferred orders manifest as firm rules, as in Hittite. The otherwise very perceptive and useful discussions of Luraghi (1989) and van den Hout (2010) of serial verbs in wider perspective would benefit from describing SVCs without referring to the order of constituents.

⁶⁴ Grammaticalization is entirely absent in Vedic, where only the imperatival type expression is attested, and which presents no example in which reading sequential imperatives is semantically problematic. A case may be made for very limited progress towards grammaticalization in Greek, and perhaps to a slightly greater extent in Hittite (in which language, quite separate from the phraseological construction, Luraghi (1989) has argued for a serial verb origin for the quotative particle *-wa(-)/-war*). There thus does not appear to be any sign of grammaticalization which could be attributed to shared inheritance of an Indo-European imperatival-type SVC.

⁶⁵ As noted in Chapter 3 (§3.2 and n. 30), the oldest attestation of the English *go get* construction is (3.7) from 1386, i.e. the beginning of the Early Modern English period. Whether it can be projected back somewhat further, into Middle or Old English, is unclear; it does not appear to have analogues in any other Germanic language, and can safely be assumed to be an innovation of English, likely at a time near its first attestation.

This diachronic process begins with sequential imperatives in separate clauses, reanalyzed as a single clause under conditions of asyndetic parataxis. That such a reanalysis took place is clear when, in the canonical situation, a face-to-face verbal exchange between speaker and addressee, the imperatives are echoed verbatim with corresponding indicative forms of the same verbs. The constituent verbs of the speaker's response function semantically as the monoclausal unit definitive of serial verb syntax, its meaning more than the sum of its parts. In this way, a reading in accordance with the synchronic grammar of ancient Greek of βάσκα' ἴθι 'Get going, go!' and, to an even greater extent, βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) 'He went to go...' yield translations which are , redundant, and most importantly, which do not do justice to the syntactic relationship between the two constituent nor their unitary semantic function: 'Go forth!' and '[S]he set out to...', respectively.

This study also reaffirms the importance of the canonical situation in two significant ways. First, it provides another example of the speaker-addressee exchange serving as a mechanism for the extension of forms from imperative to indicative. Throughout the Homeric tradition, the collocation continuously reflects its origin in the dialogic context which provided the impetus for its creation—sufficient impetus, in fact, that the boundaries of syntax seem to stretch to accommodate the precise phraseology required in this ritualized verbal exchange.⁶⁶ The resultant expression βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι), an otherwise unprecedented syntactic formation in the Greek language, bears the distinctive mark of this historical development irrespective of its otherwise diachronically changing form and function in Homeric epic. It is entirely consistent in its discourse role, with both βῆ δ'ἴμεναι and βῆ δ'ἴέναι recurring in post-dialogic position, as

⁶⁶ The identity between βάσκα' ἴθι and βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) must have been realized at the level of their lexical roots the lexical roots *g^wem-/g^weh₂- 'come, go' and *h₁ei- 'go.' As such, the collocation provides further evidence for the fundamental unity of the roots *g^wem- 'come/go' and g^weh₂- 'come, go'—formally suppletive, yet functionally equivalent—in ancient Greek and, more broadly, in Proto-Indo-European; cf. Chapter 2, n. 4.

well as in its localization in the Homeric hexameter, almost without exception in line-initial position, as expected from its role as an immediate response to βάσκ' ἴθι. Even after the loss of a direct correspondence between these two expressions, the goal-oriented deixis which flows, quite naturally, from a command and response exchange allowed the collocation to thrive in the poetic language beside non-deictic simplex (ἔ)βη/(ἔ)βαν.

In the productivity of the collocation in this deictic function, too, it is fitting to see the canonical situation at work. As the center of the shared space of the interlocutors, it provides the 'here' and 'now' with respect to which events are located in space and time. In Homeric performance, when this deictic center is displaced from the poet and into the universe of the narrative he creates,⁶⁷ its importance becomes---perhaps paradoxically---not less, but *more important*. It has been suggested in this study that much of the early productivity of the collocation is owing to its use as a centrifugally-oriented deictic aorist corresponding semantically to defective present εἶμι.⁶⁸ If so, the collocation operates as the means for the Homeric poet to express a deictic distinction that did not exist in ordinary language. In order impart the vividness of the real world to Homeric narrative—to bring the world of Homeric epic to life in the imagination of his listeners—it would have been even more crucial for the poet to emphasize the virtual viewpoint and perspective of his audience; by distinguishing the comings and goings of the heroes and gods of epic in the dominant mode of Homeric narration, the poet's use of the collocation played a small, but vital role in imparting to Homeric epic its characteristic ἐνάργεια.⁶⁹

⁶⁷ cf. Chapter 2 (§2.3.1.1), above

⁶⁸ See §4.3.2, above

⁶⁹ The quality of ἐνάργεια 'vividness' was recognized already by scholiasts in antiquity; for discussion, see Bakker (2005: 82, 95-96).

βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) also raises some interesting diachronic questions about Homeric poetry. In view of the evident archaism of the collocation, above all, the form βῆ δ'ἴμεναι, it may be possible to use this form of the collocation as an index of archaism in the epic. While it is appropriate to use due caution in assigning archaism to the greater context of an archaic element, it is nevertheless possible that the preservation of forms of the collocation with Aeolic infinitive ἴμεναι took place not at the level of the metrical line, but at a higher level, with the complete fixation of its discourse context or even of its episode. An intriguing prospect is presented by one episode in particular, the Lay of Demodokos in *Od.* 8. In the blind bard's song, we find four instances of the collocation in close succession, with alternation between βῆ δ'ἴμεν (*Od.* 8.273, 277) and βῆ δ'ἴμεναι (*Od.* 8.287, 303). It is possible, then, that as in the famous Catalogue of Ships of *Il.* 2, the *Odyssey* has here preserved some very archaic poetic material, integrating it into the epic as a bardic performance within a performance. As a repository for such archaism, Demodokos' song would therefore stand beside the Song of the Red Sea and the Song of Deborah in the Hebrew Bible, the traditional songs of lament of Lithuanian, Caedmon's hymn in Old English and other songs which preserve some of the oldest linguistic material in their respective traditions.⁷⁰

A comparative and diachronic approach to the Homeric collocation βῆ δ'ἴ(μ)εν(αι) has thus made it possible to address the neglected syntactic problem, and to reconcile this new understanding of the relationship between the constituent verbal elements of the collocation with its semantic function in Homeric epic. If the resolution of a lingering, if somewhat minor problem in ancient Greek seems insufficient to justify a study of this magnitude from a literary perspective, it is my belief that it has yielded insights into Homeric poetry and poetics, into

⁷⁰ For this observation, I am indebted to Jared Klein.

ancient Greek, and into the syntax of Indo-European languages which are of interest to classicists and linguists alike.

Appendix

In the table on the following pages, the results of my analysis of the Homeric collocation βῆ δ'ῖ(μ)εν(αι) and its variants are summarized. In this study, I have focused on the syntactic and semantic environments in which the collocation occurs; the columns in this table represent features which frequently occur with the collocation or are essential to distinguishing it from other verbs of motion in the Homeric poems. If a feature is present in a given instance of the collocation, it is indicated by a 1 in the corresponding column. In this table, the following abbreviations have been used:

P =	Poem (Il. = Iliad, Od. = Odyssey)
Bk. #	Book number
Ln. #	Line number
S	Source (i.e. a spatial expression indicating the place from/out of which a movement occurs)
Goal	Goal (i.e. an expression of purpose and/or destination are present)
Dest (Prep/Adv)	Destination (i.e. terminal directional complement, as expressed by the prepositional accusative or, less commonly, an adverb [e.g. ὄθι] is present)
Dest (Acc)	Destination (i.e. terminal directional complement, as expressed by the terminal accusative with lative particle –δέ)
Purpose	Purpose (i.e. an expression of purpose, either a future participle or a subordinate clause of purpose)
PP	Present participle
PD	Post-dialogic
AUT	αὐτὰρ
IND	Independent (i.e. no expression of source, destination, or purpose is present)

βῆ ρ' ἴμεν	Il.	16	221	1	1					1		
βάν δ' ἴμεν	Il.	19	241	1	1			1				
βῆ ρ' ἴμεν	Il.	20	319					1		1		
βῆ ρ' ἴμεν	Od.	1	441	1								
βῆ δ' ἴμεν	Od.	2	5	1								
βῆ ρ' ἴμεν	Od.	2	10	1	1					1		
βῆ δ' ἴμεν	Od.	4	24	1			1					
βῆ δ' ἴμεν	Od.	4	310	1								
βῆ δ' ἴμεν	Od.	4	528	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>		<i>1</i>					
βῆ δ' ἴμεν	Od.	4	679	1			1					
βῆ ρ' ἴμεν	Od.	5	475	1	1			1				
βῆ δ' ἴμεν	Od.	6	15	1	1							
βῆ δ' ἴμεν	Od.	6	130					1		1		
βάν ρ' ἴμεν	Od.	8	56	1	1					1		
βάν δ' ἴμεν	Od.	8	109	1	1							
βῆ ρ' ἴμεν	Od.	8	273	1	1		1					
βῆ ρ' ἴμεν	Od.	8	277	1	1					1		
βῆ ρ' ἴμεν	Od.	13	160	1	1			1		1		
βῆ δ' ἴμεν	Od.	14	73	1	1			1				
βῆ δ' ἴμεν	Od.	17	365	1			1					
βάν ρ' ἴμεν	Od.	19	429	1	1							
βῆ δ' ἴμεν	Od.	20	146	1	1							
βάν δ' ἴμεν	Od.	22	179	1	1			1				
βῆ δ' ἴμεν	Od.	22	400					1		1		
34				4	21	17	0	5	1	11	8	8
				<i>0</i>	<i>0.618</i>	<i>0.5</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.1471</i>	<i>0.0294</i>	<i>0.3235</i>	<i>0.23529</i>	<i>0.235</i>
βάν δ' ἴμεναι	Il.	20	32	1			1		1	1		
βῆ δ' ἴμεναι	Od.	2	298	1	1				1			
βῆ ρ' ἴμεναι	Od.	2	394	1	1							
βῆ δ' ἴμεναι	Od.	6	50	1				1		1		
βῆ δ' ἴμεναι	Od.	8	287	1	1							
βῆ δ' ἴμεναι	Od.	8	303	1	1							
βῆ δ' ἴμεναι	Od.	14	532	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>		<i>1</i>					
βῆ ρ' ἴμεναι	Od.	16	341	1	1						1	
βῆ ρ' ἴμεναι	Od.	17	604	1	1				1			
βάν δ' ἴμεναι	Od.	18	341						1			
βάν ρ' ἴμεναι	Od.	18	428	1				1		1	1	
βῆ δ' ἴμεναι	Od.	21	8	1			1					
βῆ ρ' ἴμεναι	Od.	21	58	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>		<i>1</i>					
βῆ δ' ἴμεναι	Od.	22	109	1			1		1			

Bibliography

- AHD = 2000. *American Heritage Dictionary of Indo-European Roots*, 2nd ed., ed. Watkins, Calvert. Houghton Mifflin Company: Boston and New York.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2006. "Serial Verb Constructions in Typological Perspective;" in *Serial Verb Constructions: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, edd. Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. and Dixon, R.M.W: 1-68. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Baird, Louise. 2008. "Motion Serialization in Kéo;" in *Serial Verb Constructions in Austronesian and Papuan Languages*, ed. Senft, Gunter: 55-74. Australia.
- Baker, Mark. 1989. "Object sharing and project in serial-verb constructions." *Linguistic Inquiry*, 20: 513-53.
- Bakker, Egbert J. 1988. *Linguistics and Formulas in Homer: Scalarity and the Description of the Particle* per. John Benjamins Publishing Company: Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
1997. *Poetry in Speech: Orality and Homeric Discourse*. Cornell University Press: Ithaca and London.
- 2005. *Pointing at the Past: From Formula to Performance in Homeric Poetics*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA.
- 2010. "Pragmatics: Speech and Text" in *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, ed. Bakker, Egbert J.: 151-168. Wiley-Blackwell: Oxford.
- Bers, Victor. 1984. *Greek Poetic Syntax in the Classical Age*. Yale University Press: New Haven and London.
- Bloch, Alfred. 1940. *Zur Geschichte einiger suppletiven Verba in Griechischen*. Doctoral dissertation. Basel.
- Boas, Evert van Emde and Huitink, Luuk. "Syntax" in *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, ed. Bakker, Egbert J.: 134-50. Wiley-Blackwell: Oxford.
- Bühler, Karl. 1990. *Theory of Language: The Representational Function of Language*, trans. Goodwin, Donald Fraser. John Benjamins Publishing Company: Amsterdam and Philadelphia.

- Byrne, Francis. 1987. *Grammatical Relations in a Radical Creole*. John Benjamins Publishing Company: Amsterdam.
- 1992. “Tense, scope, and spreading in Saramaccan.” *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages*, 7.2.
- Clarke, Michael C. 2005. “Etymology in the Semantic Reconstruction of Early Greek Words.” *Hermathena*, 179: 13-38.
- 2010. “Semantics and Vocabulary” in *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, ed. Bakker, Egbert J.: 120-33. Wiley-Blackwell: Oxford.
- Cowgill, Warren. 1960. “Gothic *iddja* and Old English *ēode*.” *Language*, 36: 483-501.
- Davidson, O.M. 1994. *Poet and Hero in the Persian Book of Kings*. Ithaca, NY.
- D’Alessio, Giovan Battista. 2004. “Past Future and Present Past: Temporal Deixis in Greek Archaic Lyric.” *Arethusa*, 37.3: 267-294.
- DELG = Chantraine, Pierre. 1968. *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque: Histoire des Mots*, Vol I-II. Klincksieck: Paris.
- Delbrück, Berthold. 1893. *Vergleichende syntax der indogermanischen sprachen*, Vol. III. Karl J. Trübner: Strassburg.
- Denniston, John Dewar. 1934. *The Greek Particles*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Disterheft, Dorothy. 1980. *The Syntactic Development of the Indo-European Infinitive*. Slavica: Columbus, OH.
- 1984. “Non-final verbs in Hittite.” *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, 97: 221-227.
- 1985. “Purpose and Consecutive in Irish.” *Ériu*, 36: 107-23.
- 1986. “The structure and diachrony of consecutives.” *Diachronica*, 3: 1-14.
- Dover, Kenneth J. 1968. *Greek Word Order*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- Dunkel, George. 1985. “IE hortatory *ey, *eyte, Ved. *ēta...stavama*, Hitt. *ehu + wa it*, Hom. εἰ δ’ ἄγε.” *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*, 46: 47-79.
- 1998. “Back to the Future in Hittite.” *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*, 58: 51-56.

- EDG = Beekes, Robert. 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, Vol I-II. Brill: Leiden and Boston.
- EDL = de Vaan, Michael. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*. Brill: Leiden and Boston.
- Edmunds, Lowell. 2008. "Deixis in Ancient Greek and Latin Literature: Historical Introduction and the State of the Question." *Philologia Antiqua*, 1: 67-98.
- Edwards, Mark. W. 1986. "Homer and Oral Tradition: The Formula, Part I." *Oral Tradition*, 1.1-2: 171-230.
- 1988. "Homer and the Oral Tradition: The Formula, Part II." *Oral Tradition*, 3.1-2: 11-60.
- 1991. *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume V: Books 17-20*. Cambridge University Press: New York and Cambridge, UK.
- Felson, Nancy. 2004. "Introduction." *Arethusa*, 37.3: 253-266.
- Fillmore, Charles J. 1966. "Deictic Categories in the Semantics of 'Come.'" *Foundations of Language*, 2.3: 219-227.
- 1982. "Towards a Descriptive Framework for Spatial Deixis" in *Speech, Place, and Action: Studies in Deixis and Related Topics*, edd. Jarvella, Robert J. and Klein, Wolfgang. John Wiley & Sons: Chichester, UK.
- 1997. *Lectures on Deixis*. CSLI Publications: Stanford, CA.
- Fortson, Benjamin W. IV. 2010. *Indo-European Language and Culture: An Introduction*, 2nd ed. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Gantz, Timothy. 1993. *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*, Vol. I-II. John Hopkins University Press: Baltimore and London.
- Geeraerts, Dirk. 1997. *Diachronic Prototype Semantics*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Georgiev, V. I. 1984. "Homerisch βάσκιθι, nicht βὰσκι# ἴθι !". *ZVS*, 97: 233-235.
- Gippert, Jost. 1978. *Zur Syntax der infinitivischen Bildungen in den indogermanischen Sprache*. Peter Lang: Frankfurt.
- Givón, Talmy. 1991. "Some Substantive Issues Concerning Verb Serialization: Grammatical vs. Cognitive Packaging;" in *Serial Verbs: Grammatical, Comparative, and Cognitive Approaches*, ed. Lefebvre, Claire: 137-184. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

- 1995. *Functionalism and Grammar*. John Benjamins Publishing Company: Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
 - 2001. *Syntax*, Vol. I-II. John Benjamins Publishing Company: Amsterdam and Philadelphia.
- GG = Schwyzer, Eduard and Debrunner, Albert. 1953. *Griechische Grammatik*, Vol. I-II. C.H. Beck: Munich.
- GH = Chantraine, Pierre. 1958. *Grammaire Homérique*, Vol. I-II. Klincksieck: Paris.
- GrHL = Hoffner, Harry A. Jr. and Melchert, Craig. 2008. *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*, Part I. Eisenbrauns: Indiana.
- Hainsworth, J.B. 1968. *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula*. Clarendon Press: Oxford.
- 1988. “The Epic Dialect” in *A Commentary on Homer’s Odyssey, Volume I: Introduction and Books I-VIII*, edd. Heubeck, Alfred, West, Stephanie and Hainsworth, J.B.: 24-32. Clarendon Press: Oxford.
 - 1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume III: Books 9-12*. Cambridge University Press: New York and Cambridge, UK.
- Hardarson, Jón Axel. 1993. *Studien zum urindogermanischen Wurzelaorist und dessen Vertretung im Indoiranischen und Griechischen*. Innsbruck.
- Hock, Hans Henrich. 2002. “Vedic *éta...stavāma*: Subordinate, coordinate, or what?” in *Indo-European Perspectives*, ed. Southern, Mark R.V. (*JIES Monograph No. 43*). Institute for the Study of Man: Washington, D.C.
- Hoekstra, A. 1964. *Homeric Modification of Formulaic Prototypes*. North-Holland Publishing Company: Amsterdam and London.
- IEW = Pokorny, Julius. 1959. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern and München.
- Janko, Richard. 1992. *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume IV: Books 13-16*. Cambridge University Press: New York and Cambridge, UK.
- 1982. *Homer, Hesiod, and the Hymns: Diachronic Development in Epic Diction*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- Jeffers, Robert John. 1972. *The Infinitives of the Indo-European Languages*. Cornell University doctoral dissertation.
- 1975. “Remarks on the Indo-European infinitive.” *Language*, 51: 133-48.

- Joseph, Brian. 1990. "On Arguing for Serial Verbs (with Particular Reference to Modern Greek)." *Working Papers in Linguistics*, 39: 77-90.
- KG = Kühner, Raphael, Blass, F.W. and Gerth, Bernhard. 1834 — . *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, Vol. I-III. Hanover.
- Kirk, G.S. 1990. *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume II: Books 5-8*. Cambridge University Press: New York and Cambridge, UK.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1968. "Tense and Mood in Indo-European Syntax." *Foundations of Language*, 4: 30-57.
- 1976. "Oral Poetry: Some Linguistic and Typological Considerations" in *Oral Literature and the Formula*, edd. Stolz, Benjamin A. and Shannon, Richard S. III. Center for the Coordination of Ancient and Modern Studies: Ann Arbor, MI.
- 2005. "The Vedic Injunctive: Historical and Synchronic Implications." *The Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics*, ed. Singh, Rajendra. (online version: <http://www.stanford.edu/~kiparsky/Papers/injunctive.article.pdf>)
- Klein, Jared. 1996. *On Personal Deixis in Classical Armenian. A Study of the Syntax and Semantics of the n-, s-, and d- Demonstratives in Manuscripts E and M of the Old Armenian Gospel*. J.H. Röhl: Dettelbach.
- 2000. "Personal Deixis in Latin." *The Classical Outlook*, 77.3: 93-99.
- Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago and London.
- Lenz, Friedrich. 2003. "Introduction" in *Deictic Conceptualisation of Space, Time and Person*, ed. Lenz, Friedrich. John Benjamins Publishing Company: Amsterdam and Philadelphia.
- Letoublon, Françoise. 1982. "Les verbes de mouvement en grec: de la métaphore à l'auxiliarité?" *Glotta*, 60: 178-196.
- 1985. *Il allait, pareil à la nuit: Les verbes de mouvement en grec; suppletisme et aspect verbal*. Paris.
- 1992. "La deixis spatio-temporelle et le système verbal: le cas du grec ancien" in *La Deixis*, edd. Morel, Mary-Annick and Danon-Boileau, Laurent. Presses Universitaires de France: Paris.
- Lightfoot, David W. 1979. *Principles of Diachronic Syntax*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.

- LIV = Rix, Helmut et al. 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. Dr. Ludwig Reichert: Wiesbaden.
- Lord, Albert B. 2003. *The Singer of Tales*, 2nd ed., edd. Mitchell, Stephen and Nagy, Gregory. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA.
- LSJ = Liddell, H.G. and Scott, R. 1940 — . *A Greek English Lexicon*, with a Revised Supplement, 9th ed. Clarendon Press: Oxford.
- Ludwich, Arthur. 1998. *Homerus: Odyssea*, Vols. I, II. Teubner: Stuttgart and Leipzig.
- Luraghi, Silvia. 1989. “Verb Serialization and Word Order: Evidence from Hittite” in *Historical Linguistics 1989: Papers from the 9th International Conference on Historical Linguistics*. John Benjamins Publishing Company: Amsterdam and Philadelphia.
- 2003. *On the Meaning of Prepositions and Cases: The Expression of Semantic Roles in Ancient Greek*. John Benjamins Publishing Company: Amsterdam and Philadelphia.
- Lyons, John. 1977. *Semantics*, Vol. I-II. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- Meister, Karl. 1921. *Die homerische Kunstsprache*. Teubner: Leipzig.
- Miller, D. Gary. 1982. *Homer and Ionian Epic Tradition: Some Phonic and Phonological Evidence Against an ‘Aeolic’ Phrase*. Innsbruck.
- 1982. *Improvisation, Typology, Culture, and the New Orthodoxy: How ‘Oral’ is Homer?*. University Press of America: Washington, D.C.
- Nagler, M.N. 1974. *Spontaneity and Tradition: A Study in the Oral Art of Homer*. University of California Press: Berkeley.
- Nagy, Gregory. 1974. *Comparative Studies in Greek and Indic Meter*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA.
- 1976. “Formula and Meter” in *Oral Literature and the Formula*, edd. Stolz, B.A. and Shannon, R.S: 239-260. Center for the Coordination of Ancient and Modern Studies: Ann Arbor, MI.
- 1990. *Greek Mythology and Poetics*. Cornell University Press: Ithaca and London.
- 1996. *Homeric Questions*. University of Texas Press: Austin.
- 1999. *Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*, revised edition. John Hopkins University Press: Baltimore and London.
- 2003. *Homeric Responses*. University of Texas Press: Austin.

- OED* = *Oxford English Dictionary*. 1928 — . Online (<http://www.oed.com>). Oxford University Press.
- Page, Denys L. 1955. *The Homeric Odyssey*. Oxford.
- 1959. *History and the Homeric Iliad*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Parry, Millman. 1971. *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Millman Parry*. ed. Parry, Adam, Oxford University Press: Oxford and New York.
- Pullum, Geoffrey K. 1990. "Constraints on intransitive quasi-serial verb constructions in modern colloquial English." *Working Papers in Linguistics*, 39: 218-239.
- Richardson, Nicholas. 1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume VI: Books 21-24*. Cambridge University Press: New York and Cambridge, UK.
- Rosch, Eleanor H. 1973. "Natural Categories." *Cognitive Psychology*, 4: 328-50.
- 1978. "Principles of Categorization" in *Cognition and Categorization*, edd. Rosch, Eleanor H. and Lloyd, B. Erlbaum Associates: Hillsdale, NJ.
- Ruijgh, C.J. 1989. "Review: Françoise Letoublon, *Il allait pareil à la nuit*." *Mnemosyne*, 42: 146-153.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de. 1916. *Cour de linguistique générale*. ed. Mauro, T. Paris.
- Sebba, Mark. 1987. *The Syntax of Serial Verbs*. John Benjamins: Amsterdam.
- Sihler, Andrew L. 1995. *New Comparative Grammar of Latin and Greek*. Oxford University Press: Oxford and New York.
- Shih, Stephanie S. 2009. "Prosodic Evidence for the lexical status of quasi-serial verbs." Unpublished paper (online: <http://www.stanford.edu/~stephsus/Shih2009.pdf>).
- Shopen, Tim. 1971. "Caught in the act: An intermediate stage in a would-be historical process providing syntactic evidence for the psychological reality of paradigms" in *Papers from the Seventh Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*: 254-263. Chicago Linguistic Society: Chicago.
- Sihler, Andrew L. 1995. *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. Oxford University Press: New York and Oxford.
- Smyth, Herbert Weir. 1920. *Greek Grammar*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA.

- Steever, Sanford B. 1988. *The Serial Verb Formation in the Dravidian Languages*. Motilal Banarsidass: Delhi.
- Sweetser, Eve. 1990. *From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- van den Hout, Theo. 2003. "Studies in the Hittite Phraseological Construction I: Its Syntactic and Semantic Properties" in *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, edd. Beckman, Gary, Beal, Richard, and McMahon, Gregory: 177-203. Eisenbrauns: Indiana.
- 2010. "Studies in the Hittite Phraseological Construction II: Its Origin" in *Hethitica XVI: Studia Anatolica in memoriam Erich Neu dicata*, ed. Lebrun, René: 191-204. Peters: Louvain-la-Neuve.
- van Staden, Miriam and Reesink, Ger. 2008. "Serial Verb Constructions in a Linguistic Area;" in *Serial Verb Constructions in Austronesian and Papuan Languages*, ed. Senft, Gunter: 17-54. Australia.
- Vanséveren, Sylvie. 2000. *Prodige à voir: Recherches comparatives sur l'origine casuelle de l'infinitif en grec ancien*. Peeters: Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium.
- Visser, Edzard. 1987. *Homerische Versifikationstechnik: Versuch einer Rekonstruktion*. Peter Lang: Frankfurt.
- 1988. "Formulae or Single Words? Towards a New Theory on Homeric Verse-Making." *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft*, 14: 21-37.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1928. *Vorlesungen über Syntax*, Vol. I-II. Basel.
- 2009. *Lectures on Syntax*. Lanslow, David, ed. Oxford University Press: Oxford and New York.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1975. "Some Indo-European Verb Phrases and their Transformation." *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*, 38: 89-109.
- Weiss, Michael. 2009. *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*. Beech Stave Press: Ann Arbor, MI and New York.
- 2010. "Morphology and Word-Formation" in *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, ed. Bakker, Egbert J.: 104-19. Wiley-Blackwell: Oxford.
- West, M.L. 1991. *Aeschylus: Persae*. Teubner: Stuttgart and Leipzig.
- 1998. *Homerus: Ilias*, Vol. I. Teubner: Stuttgart and Leipzig.

— 2000. *Homerus: Ilias*, Vol. II. Teubner: Stuttgart and Leipzig.

Witte, Kurt. 1972. *Zur homerischen Sprache*. Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft: Darmstadt.

Zwicky, Arnold. 1969. "Phonological constraints in syntactic descriptions." *Papers in Linguistics*, 1: 411-463.

— 1990. "What are we talking about when we talk about serial verbs?" *Working Papers in Linguistics*, 39: 1-33.

— 2003. "Go look at the modern language to test hypotheses about the past." Abstract. (online version: <http://www.stanford.edu/~zwicky/lisaabst.qsv.pdf>).