JGL

BRILL

Pseudo-coordination and serial verbs in Hellenistic Greek?

Some insights from the New Testament and the Septuagint

Felicia Logozzo | ORCID: 0000-0002-4504-087X
University for Foreigners of Siena, Siena, Italy
logozzo@unistrasi.it

Liana Tronci | ORCID: 0000-0003-0924-934X
University for Foreigners of Siena, Siena, Italy
tronci@unistrasi.it

Abstract

This paper deals with Biblical Greek multiverb constructions in which two verbs, inflected in the same mood, person and number, are either coordinated by καί or asyndetically juxtaposed and relate to a single event. The first verb is semantically constrained (verb of motion), and does not govern any complement. In typological studies, these constructions are known as pseudo-coordinated and serialised constructions, depending on the presence of the coordinator or not. We suggest here a unified view of the two patterns, called Pseudo-Coordinated Constructions (PCCs) *lato sensu*. Data for this research were collected from the Septuagint and the New Testament, which, despite the several differences concerning the times of composition and the type of text, are both characterised by a conspicuous number of PCCs. It was found that serialisation occurred exclusively with imperatives, which is in line with some serialised occurrences of motion verbs in previous stages of Greek, as well as with typological evidence. Conversely, pseudo-coordination occurred with both imperatives and other moods; in the latter case, and especially with past indicatives in narrative contexts, it is not easily distinguishable from plain coordination. Two results emerge from our analysis. First, the greater incidence of PCCs in the Septuagint than in the New Testament can be explained as a direct influence of Biblical Hebrew. Second, the data of the New Testament appear to be relevant for Greek diachrony since the verb ὑπάγω 'go', which behaves as the unmarked verb in the PCCs of the New Testament, developed into Modern Greek πηγαίνω 'go', which occurs in both serialised and pseudo-coordinated constructions.

Keywords

Biblical Greek – serialisation – pseudo-coordination – imperative – contact with
Biblical Hebrew

1   Introduction[1]

The goal of this paper is to investigate two types of constructions in which two
verbs are either juxtaposed by asyndeton or coordinated by the conjunction
'and' and refer to a single event. These two configurations are known in the
literature as serialisation and pseudo-coordination respectively (cf. Section 2
for discussion). We propose an analysis here of these constructions in Biblical
Greek and we take into account data coming from both the Septuagint (LXX)
and the New Testament (NT). One example for each configuration, taken from
the Gospels, is given below.[2]

(1)   ἐὰν δὲ   ἁμαρτήσῃ   ὁ   ἀδελφός   σου,
      if   PTCL sin:SBJV.AOR.ACT.3SG ART.NOM brother:NOM 2SG.GEN
      ὕπαγε   ἔλεγξον   αὐτὸν   μεταξὺ
      go:IMP.PRS.ACT.2SG blame:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG 3SG.ACC between
      σοῦ   καὶ αὐτοῦ   μόνου
      2SG.GEN and 3SG.GEN only:GEN
      'If your brother sins, **go point out** their fault, just between the two of you'
      (Mt. 18.15).

---

2   Data were collected from the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (TLG, available at https://stephanus
    .tlg.uci.edu/). English translations reproduce, for the Bible, the New American Standard Bible
    or the New Revised Standard Version, with adjustments (https://www.biblestudytools.com/).
    English translations of other Greek texts are taken from the Perseus Digital Library (www
    .perseus.tufts.edu), if available, or provided by the authors. Ancient Greek texts are glossed
    according to the Leipzig Glossing rules (https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/pdf/Glossing-Rules
    .pdf). Additionally, the following glosses have been adopted: ACT = active; AOR = aorist; MID
    = middle; PTCL = particle. The verbs in the indicative are not glossed for mood. The examples
    from languages other than Ancient Greek are given with a word-for-word translation. Ancient
    Greek authors and works are quoted according to Liddell, Scott & Jones (1996 [1843]), except

(2) καὶ εἶπεν,   ποῦ   τεθείκατε   αὐτόν;   λέγουσιν
     and say:AOR.ACT.3SG where lay:PF.ACT.2PL 3SG.ACC say:PRS.ACT.3PL
     αὐτῷ,   κύριε,   ἔρχου   καὶ ἴδε
     3SG.DAT Lord:VOC come:IMP.PRS.MID.2SG and see:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG
     'And He said, "Where have you laid him?" They said to Him, "Lord, **come
     and see**"' (Jh. 11.34).

In both examples, the verbs are inflected in the imperative. The first verb of
each couple (henceforth V1) is a motion verb (ὕπαγε 'go' and ἔρχου 'come'),
while the second one (V2) is an open class, with very little semantic restriction,
e.g. action verbs as opposed to stative verbs. The two verbs of each couple are
inflected in the same mood (imperative) and the same person/number. They
are usually inflected in the same tense-aspect, but this is not necessarily the
case, as the present and the aorist in (1)–(2) show; see also the discussion later
in Section 3.2.2.

Turning to the semantic properties, we have claimed that the two verbs
relate to a single event. The reference to a single event is intended to mean that
the two actions, that of going/coming (V1) and that of doing something (V2),
cannot be separated from one another. This means that the action expressed
by V2 implies the motion expressed by V1. We argue that the "core" action of
the clause is that expressed by V2 and that V1 functions as a modifier of V2.
Evidence for single eventhood is also given by the syntactic features of the
construction, such as the lack of complements (e.g. complements of place) gov-
erned by V1. Besides verbs of movement, other verbs, e.g. body motion verbs,
verbs of posture, verbs of manner and verbs of taking, may occur in V1 position
crosslinguistically. See Section 2 for a review of studies and Sections 3 and 4 for
a discussion of our data concerning this topic.

As regards verbal moods, the imperative may occur in both pseudo-
coordination and serialisation in Biblical Greek, while the other moods occur
in pseudo-coordination, but not in serialisation; see the indicative in (3) with
V1 ὑπάγω and the infinitive in (4) with V1 ἔρχομαι.

(3) καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς   χαρᾶς   αὐτοῦ   ὑπάγει   καὶ
     and from ART.GEN joy:GEN 3SG.GEN go:PRS.ACT.3SG and
     πωλεῖ   πάντα   ὅσα   ἔχει   καὶ
     sell:PRS.ACT.3SG all.things:ACC that:ACC.PL have:PRS.ACT.3SG and

---

for the Gospels, for which we use Mt., Mk., Lk., and Jh. for the Gospels of Matthew, Mark,
Luke, and John, respectively.

ἀγοράζει   τὸν   ἀγρὸν   ἐκεῖνον
buy:PRS.ACT.3SG ART.ACC field:ACC DEM:ACC
'[The kingdom of heaven is like a treasure hidden in the field, which a man found and hid again;] and from joy over it **he goes and sells** all that he has and buys that field' (Mt. 13.44).

(4)   Ἰησοῦς   οὖν γνοὺς   ὅτι   μέλλουσιν
Jesus:NOM so perceive:PTCP that intend:PRS.ACT.3PL
ἔρχεσθαι   καὶ ἁρπάζειν   αὐτὸν   ἵνα
come:INF.PRS.MID and take:INF.PRS.ACT 3SG.ACC in.order.to
ποιήσωσιν   βασιλέα ἀνεχώρησεν   πάλιν εἰς
make:SBJV.AOR.ACT.3PL king:ACC withdraw:AOR.ACT.3SG again to
τὸ   ὄρος   αὐτὸς   μόνος
ART.ACC mountain:ACC 3SG.NOM alone:NOM
'So Jesus, perceiving that they were intending **to come and take** Him by force to make Him king, withdrew again to the mountain by Himself alone' (Jh. 6.15).

The first aim of this study is to give a detailed account of pseudo-coordination and serial verbs in Biblical Greek through a corpus-based investigation of the NT and the LXX. As is well known, these texts are very different as regards both the historical stage of Greek and the relationship with Biblical Hebrew (BH). As a translation of the Hebrew Bible, started in the 3rd century BCE and continued in later centuries, the LXX exhibits a language strongly influenced by Biblical Hebrew (BH). Conversely, the language of the NT was the Greek of the 1st century CE, even though Hebrew (and Aramaic) were present in the linguistic repertoire of the evangelists as well as BH. Despite these differences, we propose to investigate both texts jointly, since they are illustrative of two successive stages of Post-Classical Greek and represent a testing ground for analysing the influence of Hebrew on Biblical Greek.

The second aim of this study is to describe how pseudo-coordination and serial verbs behave in Biblical Greek, with respect to the state of affairs of previous stages of Greek, which has not received much attention so far (cf. Section 2). In particular, we are interested in exploring the syntactic and semantic properties of these constructions as well as their textual distribution. We also intend to contribute to the general discussion on pseudo-coordination and serial verbs.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 a survey of the literature is provided. Sections 3 and 4 are devoted to the analysis of data from the NT and the LXX, respectively. Finally, some conclusions are drawn in Section 5. A list of

all occurrences, together with relevant grammatical information, is given as an appendix at the end of the paper.

2 A survey of the literature

2.1 *Pseudo-coordination and serial verbs in typological research*

Pseudo-coordination and serial verbs have received considerable attention in typological studies. Scholars usually deal with them separately because of their difference in form and their being distributed crosslinguistically in a nearly complementary way. Here, we investigate them jointly, since they have a different form but similar functions.

Pseudo-coordination and serial verbs are defined as a sequence of two (or more) verbs which function as a single predicate in the clause and describe a single event (cf., among others, Aikhenvald 2006: 1; Ross 2016a: 228).[3] An example of a prototypical serial verb construction is provided by Sranan, a Dutch-based Creole spoken in Surinam, where serialisation is frequent and may include more than two verbs.

(5) ***Lon go teki*** *a buku* ***tyari go gi*** *a leriman*
    run go take the book carry go give the teacher
    'Run (and) fetch the book (and) take it to the teacher' (from Sebba 1987: 40, emphasis added).

The main difference between pseudo-coordination and serialisation concerns how the two verbs are linked, i.e. by an overt coordinator and by asyndetic juxtaposition respectively. This difference is not trivial and points to the origin of the two constructions, which presumably arose from sequences of imperatives (serial verbs) and from asymmetric coordination (pseudo-coordination).

In both constructions there is a "major" component or main verb, usually in V2 position, and a "minor" component, or modifier verb, usually in V1 position. The minor components are a closed class and vary from one language to another. They are mostly verbs of "direction—coming or going, ascending or descending, moving across, etc.—or posture and stance such as sitting or standing" (Aikhenvald 2018: 6).[4]

---

3 Concerning serial verbs, see also the studies collected in Aikhenvald & Dixon (2006); Ross et al. (2015) and Lovestrand (2018: 1–69) for an overview, and Aikhenvald (2018) for a typological account of serial verbs.

4 For the sake of completeness, "major" and "minor" components occur in asymmetric serial

Serial verbs are widespread in languages outside the Indo-European family, while pseudo-coordination is well-attested in Indo-European languages too (cf. Ross 2016a for an overview). In fact, sequences of juxtaposed verbs also occur in Indo-European languages, e.g. (American) English *go get*, *come play*, but they are not unanimously considered to be serial verbs. Aikhenvald (2018: 124–125) excludes these cases since juxtaposition occurs only with certain forms of the paradigm, e.g. the imperative, but is not allowed when the verbs are inflected for tense or person and number, as in American English *go get* and *go eat*, but **we went ate* or **he goes eats*.[5] Such restrictions are uncommon in languages where serialisation is a frequent strategy. Other scholars suggest a more nuanced stance, arguing that serialisation is not a monolithic notion and can be viewed, rather, as a continuum including different types and stages (see discussion in Bisang 2009).

Another aspect worthy of mention is the function of the modifier verb, which may aspectually influence the full verb, as is shown by the continuative meaning conveyed by 'to sit' in Swedish (6) and the perfective meaning conveyed by 'to take' in Norwegian (7). Aspectual modification is crosslinguistically recurrent in languages having pseudo-coordination (cf. Ross 2016a among others).

(6) *Han **satt o** **skrev** dikter*
     he   sat and wrote poem:PL
     'He was writing poems (in a sitting position)' (from Wiklund 2007: 1).

(7) *Han **tok og skrev** et dikt*
     he   took and wrote a poem
     'He wrote a poem' (from Lødrup 2002: 121).

Let us turn now to the syntactic properties of pseudo-coordination. Compared with other coordinated structures (de Vos 2005: 1–9), pseudo-coordination violates the generalisations about extraction that are governed by the Coordinate Structure Constraint (Ross 1967: 168). This constraint prevents unbalanced extraction in plain coordination, e.g. (8), but it does not work in pseudo-

---

verbs. In symmetric serial verbs, "[n]one of the components can be considered the 'head'" and it is possible to combine verbs of any semantic type, with the only restriction being the "semantic plausibility of the whole" (Aikhenvald 2018: 6).

5   This restriction does not work in (British and Australian) English pseudo-coordination, e.g. *go and get*, *come and play* (Aikhenvald 2018: 124), which resemble the corresponding serial verbs *go get*, *come play*, but allow inflection for tense, e.g. *He went and got a book*.

coordination, e.g. (9), where unbalanced extraction is allowed (both examples (8) and (9) are taken from Ross 1967: 168).

(8)   *Here's the whiskey which I went to the store and Mike bought.

(9)   Here's the whiskey which **I went** (to the store) **and bought**.

In his work on pseudo-coordination in Afrikaans, de Vos (2005: 136) stressed that extraction of low manner adjuncts is also a good test for pseudo-coordination. With respect to the question in (10a), the only possible answer is (10b); this shows that the scope of the WH-phrase is the main verb and not the modifier.

(10) a. *Hoe **loop** Jan die rekening **en**   betaal?*
          how walk Jan the bill   and pay
          'How does Jan go and pay the bill?'

      b. *Hy **betaal** met sy kreditkaart*
          he pay   with his credit card
          'He pays it with his credit card' (from de Vos 2005: 136).

The two properties are the syntactic counterpart of the semantic conceptualisation of the two verbs as being related to a single event. The notion of single eventhood is admittedly difficult to define (see Bruce 1988: 28–30 and Aikhenvald 2018: 36–39).

Besides pseudo-coordination and serialisation, the research topic of Associated Motion (AM) is worthy of consideration for our investigation. Guillaume & Koch (2021: 3) define AM as a "verbal grammatical category, separate from tense, aspect, mood and direction, whose function is to associate, in different ways, different kinds of translational motion (spatial displacement / change of location) to a (generally non-motion) verb event". AM is a morphological category; languages may have different systems for encoding AM, e.g. affixes, clitics, particles or auxiliaries. Some languages have dedicated markers for AM, while other languages make use of markers that are not typically AM markers. In the Amazonian language Cavineña, there are seven AM affixes, as (11) shows (examples taken from Guillaume & Koch 2021: 4).

(11) *ba-*   'see O[bject]'
     *ba-**ti**-*   'go and see O'
     *ba-**na**-*   'come and see O'

ba-aje-	'see O while going'
ba-be-	'see O while coming'
ba-kena-	'see O and go'
ba-dadi-	'see O while O is moving away'
ba-tsa-	'see O while O is approaching'

AM markers give information about several notions concerning motion, such as the path of motion (e.g. 'go' vs. 'come'), the temporal relation between the motion (prior, concurrent, subsequent) and the verb event, the argument role of the moving figure (subject or non-subject), and, finally, aspectual information on the verb event (Guillaume & Koch 2021: 6).

What is interesting for our investigation is that serialisation and pseudo-coordination have more or less the same functions as AM markers, as Lovestrand & Ross (2021: 87) suggest. They remark that languages displaying AM markers do not display serialisation and pseudo-coordination and vice versa, and this supports the idea that the two strategies, i.e. the morphological and the syntactical ones, are functionally equivalent and have a complementary distribution crosslinguistically, although they affect different language levels.

2.2 *The viewpoint of Indo-European studies: Quasi-Serial Verbs (QSV)*

Recently, during the last two decades, researchers have looked again at Indo-European languages in response to the findings of typological research. Instances of serial verbs have been found in several ancient traditions, namely Latin, Vedic Sanskrit, Homeric Greek, Classical Armenian, and Hittite (cf. Yates 2014a and references therein for an overview). In (12)–(16), we reproduce the examples from these languages, respectively, as provided by Yates (2014a: 238).[6]

(12) ***age abduce*** *hasce intro quas mecum adduxi, Stiche* (Pl. *St.* 418)
  '**Go take** these (women) I've brought with me indoors, Stichus.'

(13) *idáṃ te ánnaṃ yújiyam sámukṣitam*
  *tásyéhi **prá dravā píba*** (RV VIII.4.12cd)
  'Here is your food, ready for yoking, fully sprinkled: **come run drink** of it.'

(14) *ἀλλ᾽ ἴθι οἱ νέκταρ τε καὶ ἀμβροσίην ἐρατεινὴν*
  στάξον ἐνὶ στήθεσσ᾽, ἵνα μή μιν λιμὸς ἵκηται (*Il.* 19.347–348).

---

6 To the Indo-European languages discussed by Yates (2014a), one can add Tocharian (cf. Pinault 2005).

'But **go pour** nectar and lovely ambrosia <u>into him</u>, in (his) breast, so that
hunger will not reach him.'

(15) *ertʿcʿoycʿ zanjn kʿo kʿahanayin* (Lk. 5.14)
'**Go show** yourself to priest.'

(16) *īt=war ašta pargamuš* ḪUR.SAG.DIDLI.ḪI.A-*ašaš šāḫ* (KUB 17.10 i 24–25)
'**Go search** the high mountains.'

Since in Latin, Vedic and Greek, these constructions are confined to the imper-
ative with a motion verb as V1, Yates (2014a: 249) suggests that serialisation was
not an extended strategy in Proto-Indo-European and, because of the restric-
tion to the imperative, he labels these constructions "Quasi-Serial Verbs". In his
opinion, Latin, Vedic, and Greek are "a reflection of the original PIE situation,
where it [=serialisation] functioned as a peripheral syntactic strategy in much
the same way as QSV in modern English" (Yates 2014a: 254). The state of affairs of
Classical Armenian and Hittite, where serial verbs are much more widespread
and may also occur with verbs in the indicative, is probably the result of later
and *einzelsprachlich* changes (see van den Hout 2003, 2010 for Hittite; Meil-
let 1962: 110–120; Kölligan Forthcoming for Classical Armenian). The case of
Classical Armenian is very interesting, since multiverb constructions are very
pervasive, occur with indicatives more than with imperatives, and may have
spread by contact with the neighbouring Syriac, where both serial verbs and
pseudo-coordination appear to be productive (cf. Muraoka 1997: 80; Zimbardi
2021: 184–185). We do not look into this topic further and limit ourselves to
discussing some crucial aspects of serial verbs in ancient Indo-European lan-
guages and especially in Greek.

The first remark concerns the contiguity of V1 and V2. In some languages,
they are not contiguous, but in others, e.g. Latin and Classical Armenian, con-
tiguity appears to be a mandatory feature (cf. Yates 2014a: 246–247). The second
remark concerns the formal features of serial verbs in those Indo-European lan-
guages that do not display full serialisation, namely Latin, Vedic, and Greek. As
regards Latin, scholars noticed close prosodic cohesion in Plautus' serial verbs,
which cannot be explained without a monoclausal analysis (Fortson 2008: 37–
41). In Vedic and Greek, the observation that the clitics governed by V2 are
hosted by V1 provides evidence for serial verbs (see Hock 2002, 2014). One
example for Homeric Greek is given in (14) above, where the clitic οἱ is hosted
by the V1 ἴθι, even though its governing verb is V2 στάξον. Instances of clitic
climbing and argument fronting also occur in Classical Greek, see (17) and (18)
respectively (examples are from Yates 2014a: 246).

(17) ἴθι   <u>μοι</u>   ἔξευρε   καὶ τὰ

go:IMP.PRS.ACT.2SG 1SG.DAT find:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG and ART.ACC

τοῦ   μάντεώς τε καὶ μαντικῆς

ART.GEN seer:GEN and and seer's.art:GEN

'**Go find out** <u>for me</u> also those (which) are of the seer and of the seer's art'
(Pl. *Ap.* 538e).

(18) <u>τὸν</u>   <u>δὲ</u>   <u>δὴ</u>   <u>βελτίους</u>   <u>ποιοῦντα</u>   ἴθι

ART.ACC PTCL PTCL better.ones:ACC make:PTCP go:IMP.PRS.ACT.2SG

εἰπὲ   καὶ μήνυσον   αὐτοῖς τίς

say:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG and reveal:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG 3PL.DAT who:NOM

ἐστιν

be:PRS.ACT.3SG

'**Go proclaim** <u>their improver</u> and reveal to them who he is' (lit. 'go say […]
and reveal') (Pl. *Ap.* 24d).

However, the analysis of the imperatives in V1 position in (17)–(18) is not unan-
imously accepted. Some scholars have suggested that these verbs are mostly
lexicalised into interjections/discourse markers, as shown by the sequences in
which one imperative singular, e.g. ἄγε 'drive', φέρε 'bear', ἴθι 'go', is followed by
one imperative plural, which is the main verb of the clause (cf. Biraud 2010:
160–169; Denizot 2011: 207–213; see also Létoublon 1982: 180). The degree of lex-
icalisation is variable, of course, and depends on several factors, e.g. the type of
text, the author, etc. In some cases e.g. (19)–(20), it is not at all easy to decide
between serial verbs and lexicalised imperatives (examples from Denizot 2011:
208, 212; glosses and English translations added).

(19) ἴθι   ἐξηγέο

go:IMP.PRS.ACT.2SG disclose:IMP.PRS.MID.2SG

'**Come, disclose** that to me' (Hdt. 7.234).

(20) μηδενός   σοι,   ἔφη,   μελέτω,

no.one:GEN 2SG.DAT say:IPFV.ACT.3SG take.heed:IMP.PRS.ACT.3SG

ὦ Σώκρατες,   ἀλλ᾽ ἴθι   διαλέγου

Socrates:VOC just go:IMP.PRS.ACT.2SG speak:IMP.PRS.MID.2SG

αὐτῷ

3SG.DAT

'Take no heed of anyone, Socrates, he said; just **go have a talk** with him'
(Pl. *Lys.* 211c).

One last remark on Ancient Greek concerns the relationship with the infinitival construction, which has been discussed in depth by Yates (2011, 2014b) and García Ramón (2021). They relate the imperatival construction βάσκ' ἴθι 'go forth / up, go; lit. make a step, go' to the infinitival construction βῆ δ' ἴμεναι 'he set out, he started to go; lit. he made a step to go', both of which are attested in Homeric Greek and disappear later. Both scholars consider that the imperatival sequence is a serial verb construction, but they explain the relationship with the infinitival construction in different ways. According to García Ramón (2021: 81–83), the imperatival construction was created on the model of the infinitival construction, which is, in his view, a syntactic calque from Anatolian into Ionic Greek. Conversely, Yates (2014b: 4) argues that the imperatival construction reflects the PIE QSV and is older than the infinitival construction. The relationship between βάσκ' ἴθι and βῆ δ' ἴμεναι is similar to that of English *go get* (serialisation, present tense) vs. *he went to get* (infinitival construction, past tense).

2.3   *Studies on Modern Greek*

In his crosslinguistic survey on pseudo-coordination, Ross (2016a: 218) claimed: "pseudo-coordination is found in both Ancient Greek and Modern Greek". This is true, but the properties of pseudo-coordination (and serial verbs) in Modern Greek and the differences with Ancient Greek remain to be explored in detail.

The first study dealing with pseudo-coordination in Greek is Coseriu's (1977 [1966]) paper on constructions such as Spanish *tomo y me voy* 'I take and go', which he investigated in several European languages (see pp. 79–115). Although the label of pseudo-coordination did not yet exist, the observations of Coseriu perfectly match the findings of later typological research on pseudo-coordination. The relevance of Coseriu's paper for our research is twofold. First, he mentions a great number of PCCs with motion verbs, e.g. πάω 'go' and ἔρχομαι 'come', and verbs of posture, e.g. κάθομαι 'sit' in Modern Greek, arguing that they are old and go back to the New Testament and the apocryphal Gospels (Coseriu 1977 [1966]: 97–98). Second, he observes that some participial constructions with the so-called "pleonastic" participles of λαμβάνω 'take', ἔρχομαι 'come', and in later stages of the language, ἵστημι 'stand up', can be replaced by pseudo-coordination (Coseriu 1977 [1966]: 143–147). We strongly agree with Coseriu's remark that the two structures, the participial one and the coordinated one, are functionally similar (cf. Logozzo & Tronci Forthcoming). They are not similar, though, in syntactic form, in that the participial construction is a subordinating strategy and the pseudo-coordination is a peculiar type of coordination.[7] Coseriu himself acknowledges that pseudo-

---

7   One anonymous reviewer brought our attention to the fact that Coseriu makes a leap from

coordination spread at the expense of the participial construction in later stages of Ancient Greek and definitely prevailed in Modern Greek (cf. Logozzo & Tronci 2020a).

Later studies were conducted from the perspective of serial verbs, on the one hand, and of clausal syntax (coordination, subordination, etc.), on the other hand. In his study on serialisation, Joseph (1990) examined different types of clauses and concluded that a good candidate for serial verbs are constructions such as (21), where the imperative of ἔρχομαι 'come' is followed by another imperative (example taken from Joseph 1990: 83).[8] The limitation to imperatives and to a very few verbs as V1 requires caution: "the Greek construction could just as easily be an eccentric and idiomatic type of verb complementation as an isolated different type of construction" (Joseph 1990: 87).

(21) **ela   pes   mu**
come:SG.IMP tell:SG.IMP me:GEN
'C'mon tell me!'

Concerning pseudo-coordination, we refer to Roussou (2006: 19–20), who identified several types of pseudo-coordination in Modern Greek, and Svorou's (2018a, 2018b) papers, which investigated the constructions with V1 πηγαίνω 'go' and κάθομαι 'sit' respectively, arguing that they exhibit all the syntactic and semantic properties of pseudo-coordination, but do not have the grammatical generality as in languages with prototypical pseudo-coordination (Svorou 2018a: 295). An interesting remark comes from Grammenidis' (1994: 197) comparison of the constructions with πηγαίνω/ἔρχομαι + the coordinating και 'and' and πηγαίνω/ἔρχομαι + the subordinating να 'to'. The author remarks that it is only in the first case that "the process introduced by the second verb is validated and the whole utterance is considered as an assertion".

Further evidence for Modern Greek multiverb constructions is provided by Bonnot & Vassilaki (2018), who analysed in particular the distribution of πηγαίνω 'go' and ἔρχομαι 'come', showing that both of them occur in pseudo-coordination, but that only the former occurs in imperatival serial verbs. This

---

the transitive use of λαμβάνω, be it a participle or a verb coordinated with another verb of the clause, and its intransitive use in the PCC. Distinguishing the two uses of λαμβάνω is not difficult when the second verb is intransitive and no direct object occurs in the clause: in this case, the construction is a PCC. Conversely, when the second verb is transitive and a direct object occurs in the clause, both analyses are possible and the choice of one or another is a matter of interpretation.

8   In examples quoted from other studies, the text is given in Greek alphabet or transliterated according to the source.

TABLE 1   Types of PCC

PCC (*lato sensu*)	
SYNDETIC TYPE (= pseudo-coordination)	ASYNDETIC TYPE (= serialisation)
V1 'and' V2	V1 Ø V2

observation is significant for our study, since the ancestors of πηγαίνω 'go' and ἔρχομαι 'come', i.e. ὑπάγω 'go' and ἔρχομαι 'come', have the same distribution in the NT with respect to the multiverb constructions at issue here. We return to this issue in Section 5.4.

2.4   *A unified view of serial verbs and pseudo-coordination*

In this paper, we adopt the research perspective suggested by Ross (2016a: 229), according to which pseudo-coordination and serial verbs are very closely related phenomena and "[t]he emphasis on form in both pseudocoordination and serialisation may be exaggerated, as both form multi-verb complex predicates with similar properties". Pseudo-coordination and serial verbs are two syntactic realisations of the same functional pattern, in which two verbs, asyndetically juxtaposed or coordinated by "and", relate to a single event. Henceforth, we use PCC (= Pseudo-Coordinated Construction) to refer to both serial verbs and pseudo-coordination and we distinguish them by adding *asyndetic* vs. *syndetic*. So, PCC is used as a hypernym for both asyndetic PCC (= serialisation) and syndetic PCC (= pseudo-coordination). Table 1 provides a summary of our proposal (V1 = light or modifier verb; V2 = main or full verb).

The idea of investigating syndetic and asyndetic constructions jointly is also supported by the results of Orlandini & Poccetti (2008). In their investigation of coordinated constructions in Latin, they observed that, besides asyndeton, serial verbs can be linked by *ac* and *atque*, which are "non-canonical" coordinators, in that they usually connect the parts of a whole.[9] The following examples show that both asyndetic and syndetic PCCs occur with imperatives and indicatives (from Orlandini & Poccetti 2008: 102–103, English translations added).

---

9   "Un lien de coordination non canonique, relevant de la "coordination collective" qui renvoie aux propriétés d'un ensemble, se retrouve avec les "serial verbs", qui, en latin, sont eux aussi, le plus souvent conjoints par *ac, atque*" (Orlandini & Poccetti 2008: 101).

(22) a. ***abi, nuntia*** (Liv. 1.16.7)
'**Go, tell** [the Romans].'

b. ***ibo, adloquar*** (Ter. *Haut.* 426)
'**I'll go accost** him.'

c. TOX. ***exi atque educe*** *uirginem* (Plaut. *Pers.* 459)
'**Come out and bring along** the young lady.'

d. DE. *si sapias,* ***eas ac decumbas*** *domi* (Plaut. *Merc.* 373)
'If you were prudent, **you'd go and lie down** at home.'

In order to investigate PCCs in Biblical Greek, we retain the following general criteria: (a) V1 and V2 share the same subject; (b) V1 usually does not govern any complement; if a complement of place occurs in the clause, it relates to the entire verbal complex, as is shown by its position after V2; (c) the two verbs are usually contiguous; if some complement intervenes, it is an argument governed by V2 or an adjunct related to the entire construction (cf. Section 3.2.1).

These syntactic constraints are the counterpart of the semantic property of the two verbs, i.e. the fact that they relate to a single event, the core meaning of which is expressed by V2, while V1 provides some modification to it. When V1 is a motion verb or a change of posture verb, which are the most frequent cases, the motion it denotes is part of the action meant by V2 and modifies it in some way.

One important property of the constructions investigated here is that they have a correspondence with multiverb constructions where a participle occurs as V1 before the main verb of the clause (= V2). In these constructions, the participle functions as the V1 of a PCC and is to be distinguished from the well-known use of participles as clause-combining (cf. Logozzo & Tronci 2020a, Forthcoming). The correspondence can be observed not only in Biblical Greek, by comparing passages such as (23a) and (23b) that are semantically similar, but also in translations of the Bible, e.g. from Biblical Hebrew to Septuagint Greek, e.g. (24a)–(24b), and from Biblical Greek to the Latin Vulgate, e.g. (25a)–(25b).

(23) a. καὶ ταχὺ *πορευθεῖσαι εἴπατε* τοῖς
and quickly go:PTCP say:IMP.AOR.ACT.2PL ART.DAT
μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ὅτι ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν
disciples:DAT 3SG.GEN that raise:AOR.PASS.3SG from ART.GEN
νεκρῶν, καὶ ἰδοὺ προάγει ὑμᾶς εἰς
dead:GEN.PL and behold precede:PRS.ACT.3SG 2PL.ACC to

τὴν   Γαλιλαίαν
ART.ACC Galilee:ACC
'**Go** quickly **tell** His disciples that He has risen from the dead; and
behold, He is going ahead of you into Galilee' (Mt. 28.7).

b. ὑπάγετε   εἴπατε   τοῖς   ἀδελφοῖς
go: IMP.PRS.ACT.2PL say:IMP.AOR.ACT.2PL ART.DAT brethren:DAT
μου   ἵνα   ἀπέλθωσιν   εἰς τὴν   Γαλιλαίαν, καὶ
1SG.GEN that leave:SBJV.AOR.ACT.3PL to ART.ACC Galilee:ACC and
ἐκεῖ με   ὄψονται
there 1SG.ACC see:FUT.MID.3PL
'**Go take word** to My brethren to leave for Galilee, and there they will
see Me' (Mt. 28.10).

(24) a. ἀναστὰς   λαβὲ   τὴν   γυναῖκά σου
get.up:PTCP take:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG ART.ACC wife:ACC 2SG.GEN
καὶ   δύο   θυγατέρας   σου,   ἃς   ἔχεις,
that two:ACC daughters:ACC 2SG.GEN REL.ACC have:PRS.ACT.2SG
καὶ ἔξελθε
and go.away:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG
'**Up, take** your wife and your two daughters who are here, and go away'
(Ge. 19.15).

b. _qūm qaḥ ʾet- ʾištəka wəʾet- šətê ḇ̱ənōṯekā hannimṣāʾ ōṯ_
arise take   your wife and two daughters who are here

(25) a. καὶ καταλιπὼν τὴν   Ναζαρὰ   ἐλθὼν   κατῴκησεν
and leave:PTCP ART.ACC Nazareth:ACC go:PTCP live:AOR.ACT.3SG
εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ   τὴν   παραθαλασσίαν
to Capernaum:ACC ART.ACC beside.the.sea:ACC
'He left Nazareth and made his home in Capernaum by the sea' (lit.
'came and lived') (Mt. 4.13).

b. _et relicta civitate Nazareth   **venit et habitavit**_
and leaving the city of Nazareth came and lived
in Capharnaum maritimam
in Capharnaum by the sea

According to Logozzo & Tronci (2020a, Forthcoming), Ancient Greek found
in this type of participial construction the unmarked strategy for expressing

multiverb combinations that in other languages, e.g. Biblical Hebrew and Latin, were expressed instead by PCC. Logozzo & Tronci (2019) provide evidence for this, by comparing the corpus of all sequences formed by the participle of ἔρχομαι + a finite verb in the Gospels with their Latin translations into the Vulgate. The instances where the participle and the finite verb were contiguous never correspond to Latin constructions with *cum* + subjunctive, which is one of the most usual translation strategies for Greek conjunct participles, but are translated in many cases by Latin PCCs.

3   PCCs in the NT

3.1   *Collection of data*

Data were collected by searching for sequences of [V(erb) + V(erb)] and [V(erb) + καί + V(erb)] in the digitised text of the NT available on the website of the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (TLG). The following search criteria were used: (1) no lexical restriction for the two verbs; (2) inflectional agreement of the two verbs for mood and, regarding the finite forms, for person/number. We obtained four different types of juxtaposed [V + V] and coordinated [V + καί + V] sequences, which are listed hereafter in (a)–(d). Every bullet of the list is followed by some examples extracted from the corpus.

a.   Plain coordinated structures, in which the two (or more) verbal lexemes denote successive or simultaneous actions/events, related to the same subject, as in (26) for the asyndetic type and in (27) for the syndetic one:

(26) καὶ ἐρῶ   τῇ   ψυχῇ   μου,   ψυχή,
      and say:FUT.ACT.1SG ART.DAT soul:DAT 1SG.GEN soul:VOC
      ἔχεις   πολλὰ   ἀγαθὰ   κείμενα   εἰς
      have:PRS.ACT.2SG many:ACC.PL good:ACC.PL lie.up:PTCP for
      ἔτη   πολλά   ἀναπαύου,
      year:ACC.PL many:ACC.PL take.rest:IMP.PRS.MID.2SG
      φάγε,   πίε,
      eat:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG drink:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG
      εὐφραίνου
      be.merry:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG
      'And I will say to my soul, "Soul, you have many goods laid up for many years to come; **take your ease, eat, drink, be merry**"' (Lk. 12.19).

(27) διὰ   τί   μετὰ τῶν   τελωνῶν   καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν
      because what with ART.GEN tax.collectors:GEN and sinners:GEN
      ἐσθίετε   καὶ πίνετε;
      eat:PRS.ACT.2PL and drink:PRS.ACT.2PL
      'Why do **you eat and drink** with the tax collectors and sinners?' (Lk. 5.30).

b.   Coordinated structures formed by two synonymous verbs which co-occur
      with an intensive function, e.g. (28) for the asyndetic type and (29) for the
      syndetic one:

(28) βλέπετε   ἀγρυπνεῖτε·   οὐκ
      take.heed:IMP.PRS.ACT.2PL be.watchful:IMP.PRS.ACT.2PL not
      οἴδατε   γὰρ   πότε ὁ   καιρός   ἐστιν
      know:PF.ACT.2PL actually   when ART.NOM time:NOM be:PRS.ACT.3SG
      'Take heed, keep on the alert; for you do not know when the appointed
      time will come' (Mk. 13.33).

(29) διὰ   τοῦτο λέγω   ὑμῖν,   πάντα   ὅσα
      because of DEM.ACC say:PRS.ACT.1SG 2PL.DAT all:ACC.PL REL.ACC
      προσεύχεσθε   καὶ αἰτεῖσθε   πιστεύετε   ὅτι
      pray:PRS.MID.2PL and ask:PRS.MID.2PL believe:IMP.PRS.ACT.2PL that
      ἐλάβετε,   καὶ ἔσται   ὑμῖν
      ask:AOR.ACT.2PL and be:FUT.MID.3SG 2PL.DAT
      'Therefore I say to you, "all things for which **you pray and ask**, believe that
      you have received them, and they will be granted you"' (Mk. 11.24).

c.   Coordinated structures in which both verbs are verbs of saying; they are
      used to introduce a direct speech and are known to be calqued on Hebrew,
      e.g. (30) (only the syndetic type is attested):[10]

(30) ἀπεκρίθησαν   καὶ εἶπαν   αὐτῷ,   ὁ
      answer:AOR.PASS.3PL and say:AOR.ACT.3PL 3SG.DAT ART.NOM
      πατὴρ   ἡμῶν   Ἀβραάμ   ἐστιν
      father:NOM 1PL.GEN Abraham be:PRS.ACT.3SG
      'They answered and said to Him, "Abraham is our father"' (Jh. 8.39).

---

10   The sequence of two coordinated verbs of saying is very rare in the NT; the sequences
      ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν (e.g. Mt. 12.39) and ἀπεκρίθησαν λέγοντες (e.g. Mt. 12.38), where one of the
      two verbs is in the participle, are more frequent.

d.   Coordinated structures in which the first verb (V1) is usually a motion verb and is followed in second position (V2) by a verb that denotes an action; the two verbs mean a single event and may be coordinated by καί 'and' or juxtaposed, e.g. (31) and (32) respectively:

(31) *καὶ   ἦσαν   οἱ   μαθηταὶ   Ἰωάννου   καὶ*
     and be:IPFV.ACT.3PL ART.NOM disciples:NOM John:GEN and
     *οἱ   Φαρισαῖοι   νηστεύοντες. καὶ **ἔρχονται**   καὶ*
     ART.NOM Pharisees:NOM fast:PTCP   and come:PRS.MID.3PL and
     λέγουσιν   αὐτῷ
     say:PRS.ACT.3PL 3SG.DAT
     'And there were John's disciples and the Pharisees that were fasting; and **they came and said** to Him' (Mk. 2.18).

(32) *λέγει   αὐτῇ,   ὕπαγε   φώνησον*
     say:PRS.ACT.3SG 3SG.DAT go:IMP.PRS.ACT.2SG call:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG
     τὸν   ἄνδρα   σου   καὶ ἐλθὲ   ἐνθάδε
     ART.ACC husband:ACC 2SG.GEN and come:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG here
     'He said to her, "**Go call** your husband and come here"' (Jh. 4.16).

Types (a)–(c) are not within the scope of this study, which focuses on the type (d).[11] As already stated, PCCs are characterised by syndetic or asyndetic coordination of the two verbs that refer to a single event. In (31) the action of coming (ἔρχονται) is directed at saying (λέγουσιν), and similarly in (32) the action of going (ὕπαγε) is directed at calling (φώνησον). In both occurrences, the motion verb does not govern any complement of place and this is evidence of its syntactic unity with V2.

Before starting with the analysis, we checked the data already collected by searching for every lexical item attested in PCCs, precisely ἀνίστημι 'arise', ἀπέρχομαι 'go away', ἐγείρω 'get up', ἐξέρχομαι 'go out', ἔρχομαι 'go, come', ἵστημι 'stand up', καταβαίνω 'go down', λαμβάνω 'take', πορεύομαι 'go', σπεύδω 'hurry', τρέχω 'run', ὑπάγω 'go'. Besides occurrences in which the two verbs are contiguous, we also found five occurrences of the verb ὑπάγω + V2, in which the two

---

11   Types (b) and (c) are worthy of further investigation, as one anonymous reviewer pointed out. Type (b) resembles nominal hendiadys, so it would be interesting to investigate which properties paired synonymous verbs display with respect to synonymous nouns. Type (c) seems to be a specific type of multiverb construction, specialised with the verbs of saying. Crosslinguistically, these combinations may give rise to quotatives by grammaticalisation of the verb of saying into a complementiser (e.g. in Tetun Dili, cf. Hajek 2006: 250).

TABLE 2   Instances of PCCs in the NT

	Asyndetic PCC	Syndetic PCC	TOTAL
Imperatives	ἐγείρω (2), λαμβάνω (1), ὑπάγω (14)	ἀνίστημι (4), ἐγείρω (6), ἐξέρχομαι (1), ἔρχομαι (3), καταβαίνω (1) πορεύομαι (1), σπεύδω (1), ὑπάγω (1)	
	17	18	35
Other moods	×	ἀνίστημι (1), ἀπέρχομαι (4), ἐγείρω (1), ἐξέρχομαι (3), ἔρχομαι (12), ἵστημι (6), καταβαίνω (1), πορεύομαι (3), τρέχω (2), ὑπάγω (2)	
		35	35
TOTAL	17	53	70

verbs are not contiguous. We included these occurrences in the corpus, because all of them display the verb ὑπάγω as V1 and show some common properties with the occurrences in which the two verbs are contiguous (for further details see Section 3.2.1).

Table 2 gives the list of the lexical items that occur in V1 position in PCCs. They are divided according to the syndetic vs. asyndetic type (in columns) and to the moods (in rows). As regards the moods, we separated the imperative from the others, since the imperative turns out to hold a special place in PCC. The verbs are listed in alphabetical order and are followed, in parenthesis, by the number of occurrences in PCCs.

Table 2 emphasises two aspects concerning PCCs in NT Greek. From a lexical point of view, the verbs occurring in V1 position are verbs of going and coming (ὑπάγω, ἔρχομαι, πορεύομαι), verbs of exit, leaving and approaching (ἐξέρχομαι, ἀπέρχομαι, προσέρχομαι), verbs of going up and going down (ἐγείρω, ἀνίστημι, καταβαίνω), and the verb of taking λαμβάνω. The only two verbs that occur in both the syndetic and the asyndetic types and are inflected in both the imperative and the other moods are ὑπάγω and ἐγείρω (in bold in Table 2). From a grammatical point of view, the unmarkedness of the imperative emerges. The imperative is the only verbal mood that occurs in both the syndetic and the asyndetic type. PCCs inflected in other moods than the imperative display only the syndetic pattern and do not have a large number of occurrences.

In what follows, we provide an analysis of PCCs attested in the NT. We begin with the occurrences in the imperative.

3.2   *PCC with imperatives*

3.2.1   The verb ὑπάγω

As Table 2 above clearly shows, the verb ὑπάγω is the most frequently attested verb in PCCs. Together with ἐγείρω, it is attested in both the syndetic and the asyndetic type, and in both the imperative and other moods. The verb ὑπάγω occurs in the imperative 14 times in asyndetic PCCs and once in the syndetic type. PCCs with ὑπάγω are attested in the Gospels of Matthew (7 occ.), Mark (4 occ.) and John (2 occ.), but they are not attested in that of Luke; two further occurrences are found in the Book of Revelation.

The verb ὑπάγω is interesting from several points of view in the NT. Firstly, it provides evidence for semantic bleaching and morphosyntactic tightening with respect to Classical Greek. In Classical Greek, ὑπάγω is used both transitively 'lead, bring under' and intransitively 'go away, withdraw, retire', while in the NT it is used only intransitively 'go'.[12] In this intransitive use, it can be a full verb and accordingly can be combined with an adverbial of place, as in (33), or used absolutely, as in (34), to mean a generic departure/leaving.

(33) καὶ   ἐκείνοις   εἶπεν,   ὑπάγετε   καὶ   ὑμεῖς   εἰς
and DEM.DAT say:AOR.ACT.3SG go:IMP.PRS.ACT.2PL and   2PL.NOM   to
τὸν   ἀμπελῶνα,   καὶ   ὃ   ἐὰν   ᾖ
ART.ACC vineyard:ACC and   REL.ACC if   be:SBJV.PRS.ACT.3SG
δίκαιον   δώσω   ὑμῖν
right:NOM   give:FUT.ACT.1SG 2PL.DAT
'And to those he said, "You also **go into the vineyard**, and whatever is right I will give you"' (Mt. 20.4).

(34) καὶ   εἶπεν   αὐτοῖς,   ὑπάγετε.   οἱ   δὲ
and say:AOR.ACT.3SG 3PL.DAT   go:IMP.PRS.ACT.2PL ART.NOM   PTCL
ἐξελθόντες   ἀπῆλθον   εἰς   τοὺς   χοίρους
come.out:PTCP go.out:AOR.ACT.3PL to   ART.ACC   swine:ACC
'And He said to them, "**Go!** And they came out and went **into the swine**"' (Mt. 8.32).

---

12   According to Liddell, Scott & Jones (1996 [1843] s.u. ὑπάγω): "Later, in pres., simply *go*, opp. ἔρχομαι 'come'" (with examples from the NT). The phenomenon of the "intransitivisation" of some transitive verbs is remarked on by scholars (cf. Turner 1963: 52 and, more recently, Tronci 2018). We return to this issue in Section 3.2.2.

In both examples, the verb ὑπάγω indicates a movement towards a place, which is expressed by εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα in (33) and εἰς τοὺς χοίρους in (34). Even though the verb ὑπάγω does not govern the adverbial of place in (34), which is governed by the verb ἀπῆλθον, it cannot be questioned that ὑπάγω denotes a real movement towards that place. Note that the swine had already been mentioned in the previous context: εἰ ἐκβάλλεις ἡμᾶς, ἀπόστειλον ἡμᾶς **εἰς τὴν ἀγέλην τῶν χοίρων** (Mt. 8.31) 'If You are going to cast us out, send us **into the herd of swine**'.

Let us turn now to constructions such as (35) and (36), which represent PCCs. They are clearly different from the occurrences just discussed, since ὑπάγω is not combined here with adverbials of place and is immediately followed by another verb inflected in the same mood and person/number of ὑπάγω. The motion expressed by ὑπάγω does not happen independently from the action expressed by the second verb.

(35=1)   ἐὰν   δὲ   ἁμαρτήσῃ   [εἰς σὲ]   ὁ
           and   PTCL   sin:SBJV.AOR.ACT.3SG to 2SG.ACC ART.NOM
           ἀδελφός   σου,   ὕπαγε
           brother:NOM 2SG.GEN go:IMPV.PRS.ACT.2SG
           ἔλεγξον   αὐτὸν   μεταξὺ   σοῦ   καὶ
           question:IMPV.AOR.ACT.2SG 3SG.ACC between 2SG.GEN and
           αὐτοῦ   μόνου
           3SG.GEN alone:GEN
           'If your brother sins against you, **go point out** the fault when the two of you are alone' (Mt. 18.15).

(36)   ἀλλὰ ὑπάγετε   εἴπατε   τοῖς
           but   go:IMP.PRS.ACT.2PL say:IMP.AOR.ACT.2PL ART.DAT
           μαθηταῖς   αὐτοῦ   καὶ τῷ   Πέτρῳ   ὅτι
           disciples:DAT 3SG.GEN and ART.DAT Peter:DAT that
           προάγει   ὑμᾶς   εἰς τὴν   Γαλιλαίαν
           go.ahead:PRS.ACT.3SG 2PL.ACC to ART.ACC Galilee:ACC
           'But **go tell** his disciples and Peter that he is going ahead of you to Galilee' (Mk. 16.7).

In both cases, the sequences ὕπαγε ἔλεγξον and ὑπάγετε εἴπατε describe a single event, whose core meaning is that of the verbs in V2 position (ἔλεγξον and εἴπατε, respectively). The latter govern the arguments of the clause, while ὑπάγω does not govern any complement of place. It seems to be not relevant for the syntactic construction of the clause, even though it is not so from the

semantic viewpoint. In (36), for instance, the action of telling something to the disciples and Peter, expressed by the V2 εἴπατε, necessarily implies that of leaving or going somewhere, since the disciples and Peter are not present in the speech situation. In (35), instead, the physical movement is not necessarily implied; however, by pointing to the semantic idea of leaving, ὑπάγω gives a nuance of immediacy to the action of the V2 ἔλεγξον.

Regardless, our concern is not whether the movement is real or not. What is crucial for our analysis is the functional value of the motion verb in V1 position. Even though its removal does not affect the syntactic, i.e. argumental, structure and the general meaning of the clause, some semantic nuances are lost. Let us compare examples (37) and (38) below with (36) above. In (37), the two actions of going and saying relate to two events, as is shown by the argument governed by ὑπάγω. In (38), instead, the imperative εἴπατε relates to a more general directive, which is not required to be performed immediately; rather, its performance depends on the conditional clause ὅπου ἐὰν 'wherever'.

(37) ὁ   δὲ   εἶπεν·   ὑπάγετε   εἰς τὴν
      3SG.NOM PTCL say:AOR.ACT.3SG go:IMP.PRS.ACT.2PL to ART.ACC
      πόλιν   πρὸς τὸν δεῖνα   καὶ εἴπατε
      city:ACC to   ART.ACC such.an.one:ACC and say:IMP.AOR.ACT.2PL
      αὐτῷ
      3SG.DAT
      'And He said, "Go into the city to a certain man, and **say** to him"' (Mt. 26.18).

(38) ἀκολουθήσατε   αὐτῷ,   καὶ ὅπου ἐὰν
      follow:IMP.AOR.ACT.2PL 3SG.DAT and where if
      εἰσέλθῃ   εἴπατε   τῷ
      enter:SBJV.AOR.ACT.3SG say:IMP.AOR.ACT.2PL ART.DAT
      οἰκοδεσπότῃ   ὅτι ὁ   διδάσκαλος λέγει
      owner.of.the.house:DAT that ART.NOM teacher:NOM say:PRS.ACT.3SG
      'Follow him; and wherever he enters, **say** to the owner of the house that the Teacher says' (Mk. 14.13–14).

Another syntactic strategy can be used to convey the immediacy of the action, namely the participial construction. Let us compare (36) above and (39=23a) below, where the same event is recounted. While Mark makes use of a PCC, Matthew prefers the participial construction.

(39=23a) *καὶ ταχὺ   πορευθεῖσαι εἴπατε   τοῖς*
       and quickly go:PTCP   say:IMP.AOR.ACT.2PL ART.DAT
       μαθηταῖς   αὐτοῦ   ὅτι ἠγέρθη   ἀπὸ τῶν
       disciples:DAT 3SG.GEN that raise:AOR.PASS.3SG from ART.GEN
       νεκρῶν,   καὶ ἰδοὺ   προάγει   ὑμᾶς   εἰς
       deads:GEN and indeed precede:PRS.ACT.3SG 2PL.ACC to
       τὴν   Γαλιλαίαν
       ART.ACC Galilee:ACC
       '**Go** quickly **tell** His disciples that He has risen from the dead; and
       behold, He is going ahead of you into Galilee' (Mt. 28.7).

The comparison between (39) and (36) clearly shows that the participial con-
struction is an alternative to PCC, as Logozzo & Tronci (2020a, Forthcoming)
point out. This does not mean that the two constructions are identical to one
another. For instance, the adverb ταχύ 'quickly' is added to the participial con-
struction in order to stress the semantic nuance of immediacy. Besides, it is
noteworthy that the motion verb is not the same in the two constructions. The
verb ὑπάγω only occurs in PCCs and it is never attested in the participial con-
struction, even though it exists as a participle; on the contrary, πορεύομαι is
found in both constructions, as we will discuss later.

Let us now turn to the issue of contiguity of the two verbs in PCCs. As already
discussed in Section 2, scholars have different views on this issue and the dis-
tinction between asyndetic and syndetic PCC turns out to be relevant here. As
regards asyndetic PCC, Aikhenvald (2018: 92) explicitly states that contiguity is
not a mandatory feature and that languages behave differently with respect to
the contiguity of the two verbs. We also refer to Aikhenvald (2006: 37–39), who
relates contiguity and wordhood, providing examples from several languages.
It cannot be denied, however, that "the more contiguous the components of an
SVC [= serial verb construction] are in their surface realisation, the more bound
together they are, and the closer the whole construction comes to a prototyp-
ical SVC" (Aikhenvald 2006: 4).[13] As far as syndetic PCC is concerned, the topic
of contiguity of the two verbs has not been much discussed. Several studies
have shown that insertion of lexical elements between the two verbs is not
allowed, since the first verb in PCCs is syntactically "frozen", cannot govern any
argument/complement and is not combined with any adjunct (see discussion
in de Vos 2005: ch. 2). Therefore, the contiguity of the two verbs appears to be
the result of this syntactic constraint.

---

13   This is in accordance with the *proximity* principle which asserts that "[t]he closer two lin-
    guistic entities are functionally, the more contiguously they will be coded" (Givón 2001:
    64). For a similar discussion of serialisation, see also Givón (1991).

In our corpus, there are 15 occurrences of PCCs formed by the imperative of ὑπάγω + the imperative of another verb; in 5 of them ὑπάγω is not contiguous to the V2. All of them are of the asyndetic type. When the two verbs are not contiguous, they are separated by (a) adverbials of time, precisely πρῶτον in (40) and σήμερον in (41); (b) the direct object governed by V2, which is the reflexive pronoun σεαυτόν in (42) and the relative clause without antecedent ὅσα ἔχεις in (43).

(40) ἄφες   ἐκεῖ   τὸ   δῶρόν   σου
     leave:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG there ART.ACC offering:ACC 2SG.GEN
     ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ   θυσιαστηρίου καὶ ὕπαγε   *πρῶτον*
     before   ART.GEN altar:GEN   and go:IMP.PRS.ACT.2SG firstly
     διαλλάγηθι   τῷ   ἀδελφῷ   σου,   καὶ
     make.peace:IMP.AOR.PASS.2SG ART.DAT brother:DAT 2SG.GEN and
     τότε   ἐλθὼν   πρόσφερε   τὸ   δῶρόν
     then come:PTCP offer:IMP.PRS.ACT.2SG ART.ACC offering:ACC
     σου
     2SG.GEN
     'Leave your offering there before the altar, and firstly **go make peace** with your brother, and then come and present your offering' (Mt. 5.24).

(41) ἄνθρωπος εἶχεν   τέκνα   δύο.   καὶ προσελθὼν
     man:NOM have:IPFV.ACT.3SG sons:ACC two:ACC and come:PTCP
     τῷ   πρώτῳ   εἶπεν,   τέκνον, ὕπαγε
     ART.DAT first:DAT say:AOR.ACT.3SG son:VOC go:IMP.PRS.ACT.2SG
     σήμερον   *ἐργάζου*   ἐν τῷ   ἀμπελῶνι
     tomorrow work:IMP.PRS.MID.2SG in ART.DAT vineyard:DAT
     'A man had two sons, and he came to the first and said, "Son, **go work today** in the vineyard"' (Mt. 21.28).

(42) καὶ λέγει   αὐτῷ   ὁ   Ἰησοῦς,
     and say:PRS.ACT.3SG 3SG.DAT ART.NOM Jesus:NOM
     ὅρα   μηδενὶ   εἴπῃς,   ἀλλὰ
     see:IMP.PRS.ACT.2SG no.one-DAT say:SBJV.AOR.ACT.2SG but
     ὕπαγε   σεαυτὸν   δεῖξον   τῷ
     go:IMP.PRS.ACT.2G yourself:ACC show:IMP.AOR.ACT.2G ART.DAT
     ἱερεῖ
     priest:DAT
     'Then Jesus said to him, "See that you say nothing to anyone; but **go show yourself** to the priest"' (Mt. 8.4 ≈ Mk. 1.44).

(43) ὁ   δὲ   Ἰησοῦς   ἐμβλέψας   αὐτῷ   ἠγάπησεν
ART.NOM PTCL Jesus:NOM look:PTCP 3SG.DAT love:AOR.ACT.3SG
αὐτὸν   καὶ εἶπεν   αὐτῷ,   ἕν   σε
3SG.ACC and say:AOR.ACT.3SG 3SG.DAT one.thing:NOM 2SG.ACC
ὑστερεῖ·   ὕπαγε   ὅσα   ἔχεις
lack:PRS.ACT.3SG go:IMP.PRS.ACT.2SG REL.ACC have:PRS.ACT.2SG
πώλησον   καὶ δὸς   [τοῖς]   πτωχοῖς
sell:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG and give:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG ART.DAT poors:DAT
'Jesus, looking at him, loved him and said, "You lack one thing; **go sell what
you own**, and give the money to the poor"' (Mk. 10.21).

By most traditional definitions, a lack of contiguity is not disqualifying for clas-
sification as PCC. What is crucial is that there is no complement of the motion
verb between the two verbs. However, it is important to note that the elements
that can occur between the two verbs are not arbitrary. The adverbials of time
in (40) and (41) can be easily understood: they are related to the event in its
entirety and this is iconically coded by their position between the two verbs.
The position of the reflexive pronoun σεαυτόν in (42) is more surprising, since
here it does not follow the verb that governs it, as is the rule. This apparent vio-
lation of the rule can be explained iconically, as well. As regards the position
of the reflexive pronoun, it is interesting to compare the same scene as it is
depicted in Luke's Gospel:

(44) καὶ αὐτὸς   παρήγγειλεν   αὐτῷ   μηδενὶ
and 3SG.NOM order:AOR.ACT.3SG 3SG.DAT no.one:DAT
εἰπεῖν,   ἀλλὰ ἀπελθὼν δεῖξον   σεαυτὸν
say:INF.AOR.ACT but   go:PTCP show:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG yourself:ACC
τῷ   ἱερεῖ
ART.DAT priest:DAT
'And he ordered him to tell no one but [he said], "**Go show yourself** to the
priest"' (Lk. 5.14).

Here, the reflexive pronoun follows the verb that governs it, as is the rule. Other
features, such as the participial structure instead of the PCC and the choice of
the Classical Greek verb ἀπέρχομαι 'go away' instead of the Post-Classical ὑπάγω
'go', point to the model of Classical Greek. The language of Luke's Gospel is
highly influenced by Classical Greek, therefore it is not surprising that the par-
ticipial structure is attested in Luke's Gospel and not in the others and that
the verb ὑπάγω, which is attested in the Gospel of Luke, never occurs there in
PCCs.

Finally, as regards the occurrence in (43) above, let us compare the same passage in the synoptic Gospel of Matthew, where the same two imperatives are contiguous and the direct object, as expected, follows the second verb.

(45) ἔφη   αὐτῷ   ὁ   Ἰησοῦς,   εἰ θέλεις
say:IPFV.ACT.3SG 3SG.DAT ART.NOM Jesus:NOM if want:PRS.ACT.2SG
τέλειος   εἶναι,   ὕπαγε
perfect:NOM be:INF.PRS.ACT go:IMP.PRS.ACT.2SG
πώλησόν   σου   τὰ   ὑπάρχοντα   καὶ
sell:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG 2SG.GEN ART.ACC possessions:ACC to
δὸς   τοῖς   πτωχοῖς
give:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG ART.DAT poors:DAT
'Jesus said to him, "If you wish to be perfect, **go sell your possessions**, and give the money to the poor"' (Mt. 19.21).

Interestingly, no PCC is attested in Luke's Gospel for reporting the same scene. As (46) shows, the motion verb ὑπάγω is lacking and only the main verb of the sequence πώλησον occurs in the clause. The comparison between (43) above and (46) below is interesting for two reasons. Firstly, the direct object comes before its governing verb in both cases. Secondly, the lack of the motion verb ὑπάγω in (46) is consistent with the idea that it functions as a modifier, without any change in the syntactic structure of the clause.

(46) ἀκούσας   δὲ   ὁ   Ἰησοῦς   εἶπεν   αὐτῷ,   ἔτι
hear.PTCP PTCL ART.NOM Jesus:NOM say:AOR.ACT.3SG 3SG.DAT still
ἕν   σοι   λείπει·   πάντα   ὅσα
one.thing:NOM 2SG.DAT lack:PRS.ACT.3SG all:ACC.PL REL.ACC
ἔχεις   πώλησον   καὶ
have:PRS.ACT.2SG sell:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG and
διάδος   πτωχοῖς
distribute:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG poors:DAT
'When Jesus heard this, He said to him, "One thing you still lack; **sell all that you possess** and distribute it to the poor"' (Lk. 18.22).

In the case of sequences of imperatives, the formal difference between (asyndetic) juxtaposition and (syndetic) coordination can be used to code the distinction between serialisation and asymmetric coordination. In (45) above, for example, the two juxtaposed imperatives ὕπαγε πώλησον code PCC as opposed to the coordinated imperatives πώλησον [...] καὶ δός which mark a sequence of two events. It goes without saying that the fact that two imperatives occur in a

PCC does not imply that the same verbs cannot occur as two independent verbs in a plain coordination, as in (47) and (48):

(47) *καὶ εἶπεν   αὐτῷ,   ὕπαγε*
     and say:AOR.ACT.3SG 3SG.DAT go:IMP.PRS.ACT.2SG
     νίψαι   εἰς τὴν   κολυμβήθραν τοῦ   Σιλωάμ
     wash:IMP.AOR.MID.2SG to ART.ACC pool:ACC   ART.GEN Siloam
     (ὃ   ἑρμηνεύεται   ἀπεσταλμένος). ἀπῆλθεν   οὖν καὶ
     REL.NOM mean:PRS.MID.3SG send:PTCP   go:AOR.ACT.3SG then and
     ἐνίψατο,   καὶ ἦλθεν   βλέπων
     wash:AOR.MID.3SG and come:AOR.ACT.3SG see:PTCP
     'And he said to him, "**Go wash in the pool of Siloam**" (which means Sent). Then he went and washed and came back able to see' (Jh. 9.7).

(48) *ὁ   ἄνθρωπος ὁ   λεγόμενος Ἰησοῦς   πηλὸν*
     ART.NOM man:NOM ART.NOM call:PTCP Jesus:NOM clay:ACC
     ἐποίησεν   καὶ ἐπέχρισέν   μου   τοὺς
     make:AOR.ACT.3SG and anoint:AOR.ACT.3SG 1SG.GEN ART.ACC
     ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ εἶπέν   μοι   ὅτι   ὕπαγε   εἰς
     eyes:ACC   and say:AOR.ACT.3SG 1SG.DAT that go:IMP.PRS.ACT.2SG to
     τὸν   Σιλωάμ καὶ νίψαι·   ἀπελθὼν οὖν καὶ
     ART.ACC Siloam and wash:IMP.AOR.MID.2SG go:PTCP then and
     νιψάμενος ἀνέβλεψα
     wash:PTCP see:AOR.ACT.1SG
     'The man who is called Jesus made clay, and anointed my eyes, and said to me, "**Go to Siloam and wash**". So, I went away and washed, and I received sight' (Jh. 9.11).

Examples (47) and (48) depict more or less the same scene, but from two different points of view. In both of them, the addressee of the directive is asked to go and wash in the pool of Siloam; however, in (47) the two juxtaposed imperatives refer to a single event, while in (48) the two verbs refer to two events in a sequence. Evidence for this is given by the position of the adverbial of place, which is likely to be governed by the motion verb, but follows the two verbs in (47) and is put just after its governing verb in (48). This means that the verb ὑπάγω is a full verb in (48), while in (47) it does not govern its argument syntactically, which becomes an argument of the PCC.

We argue that the two ways of representing the scene depend on the speaker's perspective. In (47) the direct speech of Jesus is reported, while in (48) it is the addressee of the injunction who reports the sequence of the actions he

performed according to Jesus' speech. In other words, (47) is a true injunction, while (48) is an account of the events, which are told after their accomplishment. By this different perspective, the choice of a PCC in (47) vs. an asymmetric coordination in (48) can be explained.

3.2.2   The verb ἐγείρω

The second verb that occurs in both syndetic and asyndetic PCCs is the body motion verb ἐγείρω 'get up', which refers to a change in posture.[14] In our corpus, the imperative of ἐγείρω occurs 8 times in PCCs. In 6 of them, the scene is that of the healed paralytic, which is told according to these three different configurations.

a.   Three imperatives occur, namely ἔγειρε 'rise', ἆρον [τὸν κράβαττόν σου] 'take your mat', ὕπαγε 'go'; the first two of them are asyndetically juxtaposed and the third is coordinated by καί, e.g. (49):

(49) σοὶ   λέγω,   ἔγειρε
      2SG.DAT say:PRS.ACT.1SG stand.up:IMP.PRS.ACT.2SG
      ἆρον   τὸν   κράβαττόν σου   καὶ
      take:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG ART.ACC mat:ACC   2SG.GEN and
      ὕπαγε   εἰς τὸν   οἶκόν   σου
      go:IMP.PRS.ACT.2SG to ART.ACC home:ACC 2SG.GEN
      'I say to you, "**Stand up, take** your mat and go to your home"' (Mk. 2.11 ≈ Jh. 5.8).

b.   Two imperatives occur, namely ἔγειρε 'rise' and περιπάτει 'walk'; they are linked syndetically by καί, e.g. (50):

---

14   Differently from Modern Greek (cf. Svorou 2018b), Ancient Greek appears to display a few occurrences of PCCs with posture verbs (see examples (75), (76) and (115) with V1 ἵστημι 'stand up'), with respect to the verbs of change of posture, e.g. ἐγείρω in the NT and ἀνίστημι in the LXX (see Section 4.3.1 below). In response to one anonymous reviewer, who invited us to reflect on this aspect, we would like to mention two facts. First, concerning the verbs of sitting, there are a few instances of the "pleonastic" participial construction with καθίζω 'sit' + another verb in the NT (Mk. 9.35, Lk. 14.28, 14.31, 16.6, Jh. 8.2), which seem to point to the progressive-like meaning, expressed by PCCs with posture verbs. Second, there is another construction that may express a similar progressive-like meaning, i.e. the so-called periphrases with εἰμί + present participle (cf. Logozzo & Tronci 2020b: 233–235).

(50) τί   γάρ   ἐστιν   εὐκοπώτερον, εἰπεῖν,
     what:Q PTCL be:PRS.ACT.3SG   easier:NOM say:INF.AOR.ACT
     ἀφίενταί   σου   αἱ   ἁμαρτίαι, ἢ εἰπεῖν,
     forgive:PRS.MID.3PL 2SG.GEN ART.NOM sins:NOM or say:INF.AOR.ACT
     ἔγειρε   καὶ περιπάτει;
     stand.up:IMP.PRS.ACT.2SG and walk:IMP.PRS.ACT.2SG
     'For which is easier, to say, "Your sins are forgiven", or to say, **Stand up and
     walk**"?' (Mt. 9.5–6 ≈ Lk. 5.23).

c.   Two imperatives occur, namely ἔγειρε 'rise' and πορεύου 'go'; they are
      linked syndetically by καί; before the second verb, the participial clause
      ἄρας [τὸ κλινίδιόν σου] codes the third action of the scene, e.g. (51):

(51) εἶπεν   τῷ   παραλελυμένῳ, σοὶ   λέγω,
     say:AOR.ACT.3SG ART.DAT paralyse:PTCP 2SG.DAT say:PRS.ACT.1SG
     ἔγειρε   καὶ ἄρας   τὸ   κλινίδιόν σου
     stand.up:IMP.PRS.ACT.2SG and take:PTCP ART.ACC bed:ACC 2SG.GEN
     πορεύου   εἰς τὸν   οἶκόν   σου
     go:IMP.PRS.ACT.2SG to   ART.ACC home:ACC 2SG.GEN
     'He said to the one who was paralysed, "I say to you, **stand up and take
     your bed and go** to your home"' (Lk. 5.24).

The three verbs ἐγείρω 'get up', αἴρω 'take' and ὑπάγω 'go' that occur in (49) are
attested in another syntactic configuration in Matthew's Gospel: the first verb
occurs as a participle and the other two verbs as imperatives, coordinated by
καί. Despite the difference in form, the constructions in (49) and (52) turn out
to be functionally similar.

(52) τότε λέγει   τῷ   παραλυτικῷ, ἐγερθεὶς
     then say:PRS.ACT.3SG ART.DAT paralytic:DAT stand.up:PTCP
     ἆρόν   σου   τὴν   κλίνην καὶ
     take:IMP.AOR.ACT.2G 2SG.GEN ART.ACC bed:ACC and
     ὕπαγε   εἰς τὸν   οἶκόν   σου
     go:IMP.PRS.ACT.2SG to   ART.ACC home:ACC 2SG.GEN
     'He then said to the paralytic, "**Stand up take** your bed and go to your
     home"' (Mt. 9.6).

The fact that the difference between serialisation and pseudo-coordination is
not relevant for Ancient Greek PCCs clearly appears by comparing (49) above
and (53) below. The first two imperatives that occur in an asyndetic form in (49)
are linked by καί in (53). Both (49) and (53) are taken from Mark's Gospel.

(53) τί   ἐστιν   εὐκοπώτερον, εἰπεῖν   τῷ
      what:Q be:PRS.ACT.3SG easier:NOM say:INF.AOR.ACT ART.DAT
      παραλυτικῷ, ἀφίενταί   σου   αἱ   ἁμαρτίαι, ἢ
      paralytic:DAT forgive:PRS.MID.3PL 2SG.GEN ART.NOM sins:NOM or
      εἰπεῖν,   ἔγειρε   καὶ ἆρον
      say:INF.AOR.ACT stand.up:IMP.PRS.ACT.2SG and take:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG
      τὸν   κράβαττόν σου   καὶ περιπάτει;
      ART.ACC mat:ACC 2SG.GEN and walk:IMP.PRS.ACT.2SG
      'Which is easier, to say to the paralytic, "Your sins are forgiven", or to say,
      "Stand up and take your mat and walk"?' (Mk. 2.9).

As already remarked in Section 3.2.1, the choice of the syndetic vs. asyndetic
PCC can be explained according to the narrative situation. With respect to (49),
where the imperatives code a direct injunction, the imperatives in (53) do not
code a direct injunction (εἰπεῖν […] ἢ εἰπεῖν […]), as they depend on the dis-
junctive question that Jesus asked his interlocutors (τί ἐστιν εὐκοπώτερον […]?).
It is possible that the choice of asyndetic vs. syndetic PCC depends on this dif-
ference.

   We would also highlight another aspect concerning the behavior of ἐγείρω
in the NT. In all PCCs where it occurs, ἐγείρω is inflected in the active form.
This is peculiar, since its meaning is intransitive (cf. the English translation
'stand up') and this verb is regularly inflected in the active voice, when it is used
transitively, and in the middle voice, when it is used intransitively (cf. McKay
1985: 210, fn. 26). The following examples, taken from the NT, illustrate the voice
opposition:

(54) καὶ προσελθὼν ἤγειρεν   αὐτὴν κρατήσας τῆς
      and come:PTCP raise:AOR.ACT.3SG 3SG.ACC take:PTCP ART.GEN
      χειρός
      hand:GEN
      'He came and took her by the hand and **lifted her up**' (Mk. 1.31).

(55) ἐκείνη   ὡς ἤκουσεν,   ἐγείρεται   ταχὺ καὶ
      DEM.NOM when hear:AOR.ACT.3SG arise:PRS.MID.3SG quickly and
      ἔρχεται   πρὸς αὐτόν
      go:PRS.MID.3SG to 3SG.ACC
      'And when she heard it, **she got up** quickly and went to him' (Jh. 11.29).

Concerning imperatives in intransitive clauses, inflection is not consistent: in
the aorist they are inflected in the passive stem (with the affix -θη-), cf. (56),

while in the present, they are active in the 2nd person singular, cf. (57),[15] and middle in the plural, cf. (58).

(56) οἱ   δὲ   βαστάζοντες ἔστησαν,   καὶ εἶπεν·
ART.NOM PTCL bear:PTCP stay:AOR.ACT.3PL and say:AOR.ACT.3SG
νεανίσκε,   σοὶ   λέγω,   ἐγέρϑητι
young:VOC 2SG.DAT say:PRS.ACT.1SG arise:IMP.AOR.PASS.2SG
'The bearers came to a halt. And He said, "Young man, I say to you, **arise!**"'
(Lk. 7.14).

(57) αὐτὸς   δὲ   κρατήσας τῆς   χειρὸς   αὐτῆς
3SG.NOM PTCL take:PTCP ART.GEN hand:GEN 3SG.GEN
ἐφώνησεν   λέγων· ἡ   παῖς,   ἔγειρε
call:AOR.ACT.3SG say:PTCP ART.NOM child:VOC arise:IMP.PRS.MID.2SG
'He, however, took her by the hand and called, saying, "Child, **arise!**"' (Lk.
8.54).

(58) ἐγείρεσϑε,   ἄγωμεν·   ἰδοὺ ἤγγικεν
arise:IMP.PRS.MID.2PL go:SBJV.PRS.ACT.1PL see approach:PF.ACT.3SG
ὁ   παραδιδούς   με
ART.NOM betray:PTCP 1SG.ACC
'**Rise**, let us be going; see, my betrayer is approaching' (Mt. 26.46).

In summary, ἐγείρω shows an irregular behavior in PCCs with respect to voice inflection. A possible explanation of this is the general tendency of Hellenistic Greek, which "extensively gives to trans.[itive] verbs an intrans.[itive] sense and substitutes a reflexive idea for the object" (Turner 1963: 51). Nevertheless, a general reference to intransitivisation does not account for the voice distribution of ἐγείρω, which behaves irregularly only in PCCs and in the 2nd person singular of the imperative. In our opinion, another explanation is possible. It is based on the notion of inflectional attrition, i.e. the weakening of some verbal features, when the verb is used as a modifier in PCCs. In the case of ἐγείρω, attrition might have focused on the category of voice. This phenomenon has been acknowledged in other languages where PCCs are attested, e.g. in some

---

15   In the manuscript tradition of Lk. 8.54, both active and middle imperatives occur. We pre-
fer the reading with the active imperative given in the Nestle et al. (2014) edition instead
of that with the middle imperative ἐγείρου, given in the edition by von Tischendorf (1869–
1872).

dialects of South Italy. In his study on PCCs with the verbs STAND and GO in the dialects of Apulia, Ledgeway (2016: 181) states that "any attrition in the inflectional paradigms of STAND and GO can be taken to represent a weakening in their defining verbal characteristics and, at the same time, to signal a concomitant change in their category from lexical verb (V) to functional predicate (Aux)".

For space reasons, we do not look into this topic further. However, we think that inflectional attrition must be investigated in detail with respect to PCCs in NT Greek. Here, we only point out that some kind of inflectional weakening also concerns the verb ὑπάγω, which is only attested in the present stem in the NT, even though grammarians stress that its meaning is "aoristic": "[i]n ὕπαγε νίψαι (John 9:7) the present is itself aoristic (cf. ἔγειρε ἆρον in 5:8)" (Robertson 1919: 855).

3.2.3   The verb λαμβάνω

The imperative of λαμβάνω 'take' occurs only once in asyndetic combination with a second imperative, precisely in the scene of the Last Supper:

(59) *καὶ   δοὺς   τοῖς   μαθηταῖς   εἶπεν,*
      and give:PTCP ART.DAT disciples: DAT say:AOR.ACT.3SG
      λάβετε   φάγετε,   τοῦτό
      take:IMP.AOR.ACT.2PL eat: IMP.AOR.ACT.2PL DEM.NOM
      ἐστιν   τὸ   σῶμά   μου
      be:PRS.ACT.3SG ART.NOM body:NOM 1SG.GEN
      'And He gave [the bread] to the disciples, and said, "**Take, eat**; this is My body"' (Mt. 26.26).

The passage is somewhat problematic with respect to our topic, especially from the semantic point of view. The first imperative may be analysed as both a full verb 'take (one piece of bread)' and a modifier of the V2, conveying a meaning of immediacy to the action of eating (as in Spanish *tomo y me voy* discussed by Coseriu 1977 [1966]). The Synoptic Gospels do not help us, since in Luke's Gospel the two verbs do not occur and in Mark's Gospel only λάβετε occurs, cf. (60).

(60) *καὶ   ἔδωκεν   αὐτοῖς   καὶ   εἶπεν,*
      and give:AOR.ACT.3SG 3PL.DAT and say:AOR.ACT.3SG
      λάβετε   τοῦτό   ἐστιν   τὸ   σῶμά
      take:IMP.AOR.ACT.2PL DEM.NOM be:PRS.ACT.3SG ART.NOM body:NOM

μου
1SG.GEN
'And He gave [the bread] to them, and said, "**Take** it; this is My body" ' (Mk. 14.22).

Although the occurrence (59) is problematic, we decided to include it in our corpus for two reasons. First, there is crosslinguistic evidence for verbs of taking occurring in PCCs (cf. discussion in Section 2.3, especially Coseriu 1977 [1966]).[16] Second, the participle of λάμβανω is not rare in the NT as a modifier of the main verb of the clause. This is illustrated by the following two examples, the first one with an indicative as the main verb and the second one with an imperative as the main verb:

(61)   *ὁμοία*   *ἐστὶν*   *ἡ*   *βασιλεία*   *τῶν*
     like:NOM be:PRS.ACT.3SG ART. NOM kingdom:NOM ART.GEN
     οὐρανῶν   *κόκκῳ*   *σινάπεως,*   *ὃν*   **λαβὼν**   *ἄνθρωπος*
     heaven:GEN seed:DAT mustard:GEN REL.ACC take:PTCP man:NOM
     ἔσπειρεν   *ἐν τῷ*   *ἀγρῷ*   *αὐτοῦ*
     sow:AOR.ACT.3SG in ART.DAT field:DAT 3SG.GEN
     'The kingdom of heaven is like a mustard seed, which a man **took** and **sowed** in his field' (Mt. 13.31).

(62)   *ἐκεῖνον*   **λαβὼν**   **δὸς**   *αὐτοῖς*   *ἀντὶ ἐμοῦ*   *καὶ*
     DEM.ACC take:PTCP give:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG 3PL.DAT for   1SG.GEN and
     σοῦ
     2SG.GEN
     '**Take** that and **give** it to them for me and for yourself' (Mt. 17.27).

A final remark on λαμβάνω concerns the fact that it is the only transitive verb in the group of modifier verbs of our corpus. This means that its full desemantisation may be checked in intransitive PCCs, which is not the case of (59) above.

3.2.4   Other imperatives in PCCs

As Table 2 in Section 3.1 shows, the only verbs that occur in asyndetic PCCs in the imperative are ὑπάγω, ἐγείρω, and λαμβάνω. All other verbs occur in syndetic PCCs. Lexically, they are mostly motion verbs, both simple verbs such as

16   Note that Coseriu does not mention the occurrence in (59), which is the only PCC with λαμβάνω attested in the NT, but only the participial constructions.

πορεύομαι 'go' and ἔρχομαι 'come',[17] and prefixed verbs such as ἐξέρχομαι 'exit' and καταβαίνω 'go down'. In addition to motion verbs, there is the verb of change in posture ἀνίστημι 'get up' and the verb of manner σπεύδω 'hurry'.

The verb ἀνίστημι occurs 4 times in syndetic PCCs, all of them in the Acts of Apostles. In (63) we give the most interesting occurrence of this verb in a PCC. In this example, the combination of the two verbs ἀνίστημι and πορεύομαι occurs two times in two different speech levels. The first time, it is a matter of a directive speech act: both verbs are inflected in the imperative and syntactically are a PCC. The second occurrence, instead, is an account of what happened. The relationship between the two actions of getting up (ἀνίστημι) and going (πορεύομαι) is syntactically expressed by the participial construction.

(63) ἄγγελος   δὲ   κυρίου   ἐλάλησεν   πρὸς Φίλιππον λέγων,
     angel:NOM PTCL Lord:GEN say:AOR.ACT.3SG to   Philip:ACC say:PTCP
     ἀνάστηθι   καὶ πορεύου   κατὰ   μεσημβρίαν
     get.up:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG and go:IMP.PRS.MID.3SG toward south:ACC
     ἐπὶ τὴν   ὁδὸν   τὴν   καταβαίνουσαν ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλὴμ εἰς
     to   ART.ACC road:ACC ART.ACC go.down:PTCP from Jerusalem to
     Γάζαν.   αὕτη   ἐστὶν   ἔρημος.   καὶ ἀναστὰς
     Gaza:ACC DEM.NOM be:PRS.ACT.3SG solitary:NOM and get.up:PTCP
     ἐπορεύθη
     go:AOR.PASS.3SG
     'Then an angel of the Lord said to Philip, "**Get up and go** toward the south
     to the road that goes down from Jerusalem to Gaza". This is a wilderness
     road. So **he got up and went**' (Act.Ap. 8.26–27).

According to Turner (1963: 57), there is no difference in terms of voice between the aorists ἠγέρθη and ἀνέστη: ἠγέρθη "is passive only in form and is used of the resurrection with a very active nuance", like ἀνέστη. This comparison is also interesting for our investigation, since the two verbs seem to alternate in V1 position in PCCs that have a similar meaning (see Section 3.3).

Finally, we mention the use of the manner verb σπεύδω 'hurry', which is attested only once in a PCC in our corpus, see (64) below. This example clearly

---

17   We exclude the case of Jh. 1.39: ἔρχεσθε καὶ ὄψεσθε 'come and see' (lit. 'come and you will
      see'), since the two verbs are not inflected in the same mood. Daniel Ross (p.c.) suggests
      that this can be a case of unbalanced PCC. This is extremely rare, but some languages dis-
      play PCCs where the two verbs do not necessarily match. Further investigation is needed
      to explain the relationship between ἔρχεσθε καὶ ὄψεσθε and ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε 'come and see',
      attested in Jh. 1.46, 11.34.

shows the modifier function of the verb in V1 position: the action of hurrying is not independent from that of getting out; it denotes the manner in which the action signified by the second verb is to be carried out, which is also emphasised by the adverbial ἐν τάχει 'quickly'.

(64) ἐγένετο […]   γενέσθαι   με   ἐν ἐκστάσει
      happen:AOR.MID.3SG happen:INF.AOR.MID 1SG.ACC in trance:DAT
      καὶ ἰδεῖν   αὐτὸν   λέγοντά μοι,
      and see:INF.AOR.ACT 3SG.ACC say:PTCP 1SG.DAT
      σπεῦσον   καὶ ἔξελθε   ἐν τάχει
      hurry:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG and go.out:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG in speed:DAT
      ἐξ   Ἰερουσαλήμ
      out Jerusalem
      'I fell into a trance and saw Jesus saying to me, "**Hurry and get out** of Jerusalem quickly"' (Act.Ap. 22.17–18).

The combination of σπεύδω with verbs of movement is also attested in other types of construction in NT Greek, especially participial constructions, e.g. ἦλθαν σπεύσαντες (Lk. 2.16) 'they came in a hurry' (lit. 'they went by hurrying'), σπεύσας κατάβηθι (Lk. 19.5) 'hurry and come down' (lit. 'by hurrying come down'), and σπεύσας κατέβη (Lk. 19.6) 'he hurried and came down' (lit. 'by hurrying he came down').

3.3   *PCCs with other moods than the imperative*
PCCs with other moods than the imperative are exclusively of the syndetic type. As already summarised in Table 2 in Section 3.1, the verbs attested in this configuration are (a) motion verbs, namely ἀπέρχομαι 'go out', ἐξέρχομαι 'go out, come out', ἔρχομαι 'come', καταβαίνω 'go down', πορεύομαι 'go', ὑπάγω 'go', and (b) verbs of change of posture, namely ἀνίστημι 'get up', ἐγείρω 'get up', and verbs of posture, such as ἵστημι 'stand up'. In most occurrences, the verbs are inflected in a finite mood, especially the indicative. In Table 3 we give the distribution of the verbs according to the moods, with the exclusion of the imperatives.

Let us begin with the occurrences of ἔρχομαι, which is the most frequent verb in PCCs in the indicative. With the exception of Mt. 17.11, where the two coordinated verbs are not inflected in the same tense-aspectual stem (V1 is present and V2 is future), in all occurrences the two verbs are inflected in the same tense-aspectual stem, namely the present, e.g. (65), or the aorist, e.g. (66).

TABLE 3   PCCs in other moods than the imperative in the NT

	indicative	subjunctive	infinitive	participle	TOTAL
ἀνίστημι	1				1
ἀπέρχομαι	3		1		4
ἐγείρω	1				1
ἐξέρχομαι	3				3
ἔρχομαι	11		1		12
ἵστημι			1	5	6
καταβαίνω		1			1
πορεύομαι	1	1	1		3
τρέχω	2				2
ὑπάγω	1	1			2
TOTAL	23	3	4	5	35

(65=31) καὶ   ἦσαν   οἱ   μαθηταὶ   Ἰωάννου καὶ
and be:IPFV.ACT.3PL ART.NOM disciples:NOM John:GEN and
οἱ   Φαρισαῖοι   νηστεύοντες. καὶ ἔρχονται
ART.NOM Pharisees:NOM fast:PTCP   and come:PRS.MID.3PL
καὶ λέγουσιν   αὐτῷ
and say:PRS.ACT.3PL 3SG.DAT
'Now John's disciples and the Pharisees were fasting; and people
came and said to him' (Mk. 2.18).

(66)   καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ   μαθηταὶ   αὐτοῦ
and hear:PTCP ART.NOM disciples:NOM 3SG.GEN
ἦλθον   καὶ ἦραν   τὸ   πτῶμα
come:AOR.ACT.3PL and take:AOR.ACT.3PL ART.ACC body:ACC
αὐτοῦ   καὶ ἔθηκαν   αὐτὸ ἐν μνημείῳ
3SG.GEN and lay:AOR.ACT.3PL 3SG.ACC in tomb:DAT
'When his disciples heard about it, **they came and took** his body,
and laid it in a tomb' (Mk. 6.29).

The lack of correspondence in the tense-aspect inflection of the two verbs can be observed in (67), where ἠγέρθη is in the aorist and διηκόνει in the imperfect. The aorist of V1 marks here the immediacy of the first action and its accomplishment at the moment of V2.

(67) καὶ ἀφῆκεν   αὐτὴν   ὁ   πυρετός·   καὶ
     and leave:AOR.ACT.3SG 3SG.ACC ART.NOM fever:NOM and
     ἠγέρθη   καὶ διηκόνει   αὐτῷ
     get.up:AOR.PASS.3SG and serve:IPFV.ACT.3SG 3SG.DAT
     'And the fever left her, and **she got up and began to serve** him' (Mt. 8.15).

This occurrence is also interesting for two further reasons. First, comparing (67) with the same event told in Mark's Gospel in (68), we observe that the PCC of (67) corresponds to the simple verb διηκόνει 'she served' in (68).

(68) καὶ ἀφῆκεν   αὐτὴν   ὁ   πυρετός,   **καὶ**
     and leave:AOR.ACT.3SG 3SG.ACC ART.NOM fever:NOM and
     διηκόνει   αὐτοῖς
     serve:IPFV.ACT.3SG 3PL.DAT
     'And the fever left her, and **she served** them' (Mk. 1.31).

Second, the same scene is depicted in Luke's Gospel by the participial construction with the verb ἀνίστημι 'get up' instead of ἐγείρω 'get up'.

(69) καὶ ἐπιστὰς   ἐπάνω αὐτῆς   ἐπετίμησεν   τῷ
     and stand:PTCP over   3SG.GEN rebuke:AOR.ACT.3SG ART.DAT
     πυρετῷ,   καὶ ἀφῆκεν   αὐτήν·   παραχρῆμα   δὲ
     fever:DAT and leave:AOR.ACT.3SG 3SG.ACC immediately PTCL
     ἀναστᾶσα   διηκόνει   αὐτοῖς
     get.up:PTCP serve:IPFV.ACT.3SG 3PL.DAT
     'And standing over her, He rebuked the fever, and it left her; and she immediately **got up and waited** on them' (Lk. 4.39).

Unlike PCCs with the indicative, PCCs with the subjunctive are very rare and are attested only in John's Gospel. They occur in subordinate clauses governed by ἵνα, e.g. (70) and ἐάν, e.g. (71).

(70) καὶ ἔθηκα   ὑμᾶς   ἵνα   ὑμεῖς
     and appoint:AOR.ACT.1SG 2PL.ACC in.order.to 2PL.NOM
     ὑπάγητε   καὶ καρπὸν φέρητε   καὶ
     go:SBJV.PRS.ACT.2PL and fruit:ACC bear:SBJV.PRS.ACT.2PL and
     ὁ   καρπὸς ὑμῶν   μένῃ
     ART.NOM fruit:NOM 2PL.GEN remain:SBJV.PRS.ACT.3SG
     'And I appointed you that **you would go and bear fruit**, and that your fruit would remain' (Jh. 15.16).

(71) ὅτι **πορεύομαι** **ἑτοιμάσαι** τόπον ὑμῖν· καὶ ἐὰν
that go:PRS.MID.1SG prepare:INF.AOR.ACT place:ACC 2PL.DAT and if
πορευθῶ **καὶ ἑτοιμάσω** τόπον
go:SBJV.AOR.PASS.1SG and prepare:SBJV.AOR.ACT.1SG place:ACC
ὑμῖν, πάλιν ἔρχομαι καὶ παραλήμψομαι ὑμᾶς
2PL.DAT again come:PRS.MID.1SG and take:FUT.MID.1SG 2PL.ACC
πρὸς ἐμαυτόν
to myself:ACC
'[If it were not so, would I have told you] that **I go to prepare** a place for
you? And if **I go and prepare** a place for you, I will come again and will
take you to myself' (Jh. 14.2–3).

Example (71) is interesting since the pair of verbs in the PCC (πορευθῶ καὶ
ἑτοιμάσω) also occurs in an infinitival clause (πορεύομαι ἑτοιμάσαι). This is not
an isolated case: in our corpus, motion verbs and verbs of change of posture
are frequently combined with infinitival clauses, e.g. ἐξήλθατε […] συλλαβεῖν με
(Mt. 26.55) 'Have you come out to arrest me?', κατέβην ἐξελέσθαι αὐτούς (Act.Ap.
7.34) 'I have come down to rescue them', ἀνέστη ἀναγνῶναι (Lk. 4.16) 'He stood
up to read'. However, even though the two constructions seem to be similar,
this is not the case. In the infinitival structure, the motion verb is the verbal
core of the clause and the infinitive expresses purposive semantics. In the PCC,
instead, both verbs are asserted, without any purposive semantics. The two con-
structions may be related to the same situation, but they view and describe it
in a different way (Daniel Ross, p.c.).

Let us turn now to PCCs with verbs inflected in non-finite moods, namely
infinitive and participle. PCCs with infinitives can depend on both subject
control verbs, such as μέλλω 'intend to' and ἄρχομαι 'begin' in (72=4) and (73)
respectively, and object control verbs, such as ἐπιτρέπω 'let' in (74).

(72=4) Ἰησοῦς οὖν γνοὺς ὅτι μέλλουσιν
Jesus:NOM so perceive:PTCP that intend:PRS.ACT.3PL
ἔρχεσθαι **καὶ ἁρπάζειν** αὐτὸν ἵνα
come:INF.PRS.MID and take:INF.PRS.ACT 3SG.ACC in.order.to
ποιήσωσιν βασιλέα ἀνεχώρησεν πάλιν εἰς
make:SBJV.AOR.ACT.3PL king:ACC withdraw:AOR.ACT.3SG again to
τὸ ὄρος αὐτὸς μόνος
ART.ACC mountain:ACC 3SG.NOM alone:NOM
'So Jesus, perceiving that they were intending **to come and take** Him
by force to make Him king, withdrew again to the mountain by Himself
alone' (Jh. 6.15).

(73) ἀφ’   οὗ   ἂν   ἐγερθῇ   ὁ
     since REL.GEN PTCL get.up:SBJV.AOR.PASS.3SG ART.NOM
     οἰκοδεσπότης   καὶ   ἀποκλείσῃ   τὴν
     owner.of.the.house:NOM and shut:SBJV.AOR.ACT.3SG ART.ACC
     θύραν,   καὶ   ἄρξησθε   ἔξω   ἑστάναι   καὶ
     door:ACC and begin: SBJV.AOR.MID.2PL outside stand:INF.PF.ACT and
     κρούειν   τὴν   θύραν   λέγοντες
     knock:INF.PRS.ACT ART.ACC door:ACC say:PTCP
     'When once the owner of the house has got up and shut the door, and **you
     begin to stand outside and to knock** at the door, saying […]' (Lk. 13.25).

(74) ἕτερος   δὲ   τῶν   μαθητῶν   [αὐτοῦ] εἶπεν
     another:NOM PTCL ART.GEN disciples:GEN 3SG.GEN say:AOR.ACT.3SG
     αὐτῷ,   Κύριε,   ἐπίτρεψόν   μοι   πρῶτον
     3SG.DAT Lord:VOC let:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG 1SG.DAT first
     ἀπελθεῖν   καὶ   θάψαι   τὸν   πατέρα   μου
     go:INF.AOR.ACT and bury:INF.AOR.ACT ART.ACC father:ACC 1SG.GEN
     'Another of his disciples said to him, "Lord, first **let me go and bury** my
     father"' (Mt. 8.21).

As regards PCCs with participles, we have only 5 occurrences (Jh. 3.29, 12.29,
18.25, Act.Ap. 11.13, 16.9), in which the participle of ἵστημι is combined with the
participle of another verb. Let us see a couple of examples:

(75) ὁ   δὲ   φίλος   τοῦ   νυμφίου,   ὁ
     ART.NOM PTCL friend:NOM ART.GEN bridegroom:GEN ART.NOM
     ἑστηκὼς   καὶ ἀκούων   αὐτοῦ,   χαρᾷ   χαίρει
     stand:PTCP and hear:PTCP 3SG.GEN joy:DAT rejoice:PRS.ACT.3SG
     διὰ   τὴν   φωνὴν   τοῦ   νυμφίου
     because.of ART.ACC voice:ACC ART.GEN bridegroom:GEN
     'But the friend of the bridegroom, **who stands and hears** him, rejoices
     greatly because of the bridegroom's voice' (Jh. 3.29).

(76) ἦν   δὲ   Σίμων   Πέτρος   ἑστὼς   καὶ
     be:IPFV.ACT.3SG PTCL Simon:NOM Peter:NOM stand:PTCP and
     θερμαινόμενος
     warm:PTCP
     'Now Simon Peter **was standing and warming himself**' (Jh. 18.25).

3.4   *Summary*

At the end of this corpus-based analysis, we may claim that PCCs are productive in the NT, in both the syndetic and the asyndetic types. The asyndetic type is only attested with imperatives; conversely, the syndetic type is admitted with imperatives and other moods, both finite (indicative and subjunctive) and non-finite moods (infinitive and participle). In V1 position, there are verbs of motion, e.g. ἔρχομαι 'come', πορεύομαι 'go', τρέχω 'run', ὑπάγω 'go', verbs of change of posture, e.g. ἐγείρω 'get up', ἀνίστημι 'stand up', and verbs of posture, e.g. ἵστημι 'stand up'; moreover, we found one occurrence of the verb of manner σπεύδω 'hurry' and one of the verb λαμβάνω 'take'.

Syndetic PCCs are more frequently attested than asyndetic ones (53 vs. 17 occurrences); they are less marked and tend to blend into asymmetric coordination, i.e. coordination of two verbs that cannot be reversed, e.g. *John went to Rome and visited its monuments*. The boundaries between syndetic PCC and asymmetric coordination are quite blurred in many cases.

Among the criteria used for identifying PCCs, the most important one is the lack of complements depending on V1, which correlates with the semantic bleaching of V1. The contiguity of the two verbs, even though not mandatory, has been taken into account. Several constructions of our corpus are paralleled by the so-called "pleonastic" participle, i.e. constructions in which V1 is a participle and V2 the main verb of the clause. The relationship with these constructions indirectly corroborates our analysis.

One last remark concerns the use of the asyndeton in NT Greek. As Blass, Debrunner & Funk (1961 [1896]: 241) pointed out, asyndetic structures spread in NT Greek. Juxtaposition is found not only in PCCs, but also in complex clauses that display one imperative in the main clause and another verb in the subordinate. Some examples are given below in (77)–(79): the subordinate is a completive clause in (77) and a final clause in (78) and (79); the two verbs of each example are not inflected in the same person and in the same mood, excepting (79) where both verbs are imperatives.

(77) ἀδελφέ,   ἄφες   ἐκβάλω   τὸ
     friend:VOC let:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG take.out:SBJV.AOR.ACT.1SG ART.ACC
     κάρφος   τὸ   ἐν τῷ   ὀφθαλμῷ σου
     speck:ACC ART.ACC in ART.DAT eye:DAT 2SG.GEN
     'Friend, **let me take out** the speck in your eye' (Lk. 6.42 ≈ Mt. 7.4).

(78) ἦλθεν   ἡ   ὥρα,   ἰδοὺ   παραδίδοται
come:AOR.ACT.3SG ART.NOM hour:NOM behold betray:PRS.MID.3SG
ὁ   υἱὸς   τοῦ   ἀνθρώπου εἰς τὰς   χεῖρας
ART.NOM son:NOM ART.GEN man:GEN to ART.ACC hands:ACC
τῶν   ἁμαρτωλῶν. ἐγείρεσθε   ἄγωμεν
ART.GEN sinners:GEN get.up:IMP.PRS.MID.2PL let.go:SBJV.PRS.ACT.1PL
'The hour has come; the Son of Man is betrayed into the hands of sinners.
Get up, let us be going' (Mk. 14.41–42).

(79) καὶ ἐνεβριμήθη   αὐτοῖς ὁ   Ἰησοῦς   λέγων·
and order:AOR.PASS.3SG 3PL.DAT ART.NOM Jesus:NOM say:PTCP
ὁρᾶτε   μηδεὶς   γινωσκέτω
see:IMP.PRS.ACT.2PL no.one:NOM know:IMP.PRS.ACT.3SG
'Then Jesus sternly ordered them, "**See that no one knows** of this"' (lit.
'See no one knows […]') (Mt. 9.30).

4   PCCs in the LXX

4.1   *Collection of data*

As far as the LXX is concerned, we queried the TLG for the sequences listed in
Table 4.

    We analysed each result of the queries according to the following criteria:
– no lexical restriction for the second verb;
– regarding the finite forms, inflectional agreement of the two verbs in person
   and number.
Then, we discarded:
– juxtaposition and coordination of a finite + a non-finite verb form (for
   instance, participle + indicative; indicative + infinitive);
– accidental juxtaposition, devoid of syntactic value;[18]
– emphatic coordination with double καί in the configuration 'καί + lemma +
   καί + VERB' (see below Section 4.3.3);
– coordinated structures that cannot be considered PCCs for reasons that we
   explain later.

---

18   See, for instance, the following example:
      (i) […] ἐν τῇ   ὁδῷ   ᾗ   ἂν   πορεύησθε,   καὶ
          in   ART.DAT journey:DAT REL.DAT PTCL go:SBJV.PRS.MID.2PL and
          κατάξετέ […]
          bring down:FUT.ACT.2PL
          '[If harm should happen to him] on the journey that you are to make, you would bring
          down [my gray hairs with sorrow to Sheol]' (Ge. 42.38).

TABLE 4   Queries for PCC in the LXX

For asyndetic PCCs	For syndetic PCCs
ἀνίστημι (lemma) + VERB	ἀνίστημι (lemma) + καί + VERB
βαδίζω (lemma) + VERB	βαδίζω (lemma) + καί + VERB
πορεύομαι (lemma) + VERB	πορεύομαι (lemma) + καί + VERB

TABLE 5   PCCs in the LXX (only the 3 most frequent verbs)

	Asyndetic PCCs		Syndetic PCCs		TOTAL
Imperatives	ἀνίστημι	16	ἀνίστημι	32 + 3 sbjv	135
(or exhort. sbjv.)	βαδίζω	16	βαδίζω	9 + 1 sbjv	
	πορεύομαι	15 + 1 sbjv	πορεύομαι	34 + 3 imp&fut + 5 sbjv	
Other moods	×	×	ἀνίστημι	11	39
			βαδίζω	1	
			πορεύομαι	27	
TOTAL		48		126	174

The corpus obtained is reported in the appendix. In Table 5 we give the number of occurrences for each verb distributed according to the syndetic vs. asyndetic type in the columns and the imperative vs. other moods in the rows.

With respect to the data of the NT, many more occurrences of PCCs are attested in the LXX. The first point to highlight in the LXX occurrences is the absence of ὑπάγω 'go' in PCCs, whereas it is the most frequent verb in the NT. Actually, ὑπάγω is quite rare in the LXX; we found only 6 occurrences altogether.[19] However, several other verbs occur in PCCs. Given that LXX occurrences are very numerous we dealt only with data concerning the three most frequent verbs, which are ἀνίστημι 'stand up', βαδίζω 'go' and πορεύομαι 'go'.

In the following two sections, we discuss internal evidence for PCCs (Section 4.2) and external evidence coming from the comparison with the Hebrew source text (Section 4.3).

---

19   Ex. 14.21; To. 8.21, 10.11, 10.12, 12.5; 4 Ma. 4.13.

4.2   *Internal evidence for PCCs*

4.2.1   Asyndetic PCCs

Asyndetic PCCs in the LXX seem to be restricted to the imperative form, similarly to previous stages of Greek (cf. Muraoka 2016: 701–702, who also gives examples with other verbs).

(80) *καὶ   ἐκάλεσεν   Φαραω   Μωυσῆν   καὶ Ααρων λέγων*
      and call:AOR.ACT.3SG Pharaoh Moses:ACC and Aaron say:PTCP
      βαδίζετε,   λατρεύσατε   κυρίῳ   τῷ
      go:IMP.PRS.ACT.2PL serve:IMP.AOR.ACT.2PL Lord:DAT ART.DAT
      θεῷ   ὑμῶν
      God:DAT 2PL.GEN
      'Then Pharaoh called to Moses and Aaron, and said, "**Go serve** the Lord, your God"' (Ex. 10.24).

(81) *καὶ   εἶπεν   Κύριος   πρός με   ἀνάστηθι*
      and say: AOR.ACT.3SG Lord: NOM to   1SG.ACC arise:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG
      βάδισον   ἐπὶ τὸν   Εὐφράτην
      go:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG to ART.ACC Euphrates:ACC
      'The Lord said to me, "**Arise, go** to the Euphrates"' (Je. 13.6).

(82) *καὶ   ἐνετείλαντο   τοῖς   υἱοῖς   Βενιαμιν λέγοντες*
      and command:AOR.MID.3PL ART.DAT sons:DAT Benjamin say:PTCP
      πορεύεσθε   ἐνεδρεύσατε   ἐν τοῖς   ἀμπελῶσιν
      go:IMP.PRS.MID.2PL lie:IMP.AOR.ACT.2PL in ART.DAT vineyards:DAT
      'And they commanded the sons of Benjamin, saying, "**Go, lie** in wait in the vineyards"' (Jd. 21.20).

Only one occurrence of the exhortative subjunctive is attested:

(83) *διὰ τοῦτο   λέγετε   πορευθῶμεν*
      for DEM.ACC say:PRES.ACT.2PL go:SBJV.AOR.PASS.1PL
      θύσωμεν   τῷ   θεῷ   ἡμῶν
      sacrifice:SBJV.AOR.ACT.1PL ART.DAT Lord:DAT 1PL.GEN
      'Therefore you say, "Let us **go** [and] **sacrifice** to the Lord"' (Ex. 5.17).

It should be pointed out that despite the relatively similar number of occurrences in PCCs, the frequency of the three verbs in the LXX is not comparable: while πορεύομαι is attested 1260 times, ἀνίστημι occurs 540 times and βαδίζω only 72 times, most in the imperative form. This means that the incidence of

βαδίζω in PCCs is higher than that of the other two verbs. Besides, βαδίζω is the most "serialised" verb, because it is the only one that occurs more frequently in asyndetic than syndetic coordination. It is also likely that βαδίζω was perceived as an archaic form, as also evidenced by its absence in the NT, and somewhat "specialised" in dialogical and directive contexts. In summary, despite its low frequency, it is the favourite motion verb in asyndetic PCCs.

As far as the juxtaposition of non-finite verbal forms is concerned, the only 3 sequences[20] of πορεύομαι in the infinitive + another infinitive, which mean 'go to do something' (e.g. 84), cannot be considered as asyndetic PCCs. The occurrence of two juxtaposed infinitives here is due to contextual constraints, i.e. the subordination of the regular infinitive construction of πορεύομαι to a main verb, as in Jd. (Alex.) 12.1 ἐπορεύθης πολεμεῖν; Jd. (Vat.) 14.3 πορεύῃ λαβεῖν; Ex. 32.6 ἀνέστησαν παίζειν.

(84) ἀνὴρ   ἢ   γυνὴ   ἢ   πατριὰ   ἢ   φυλή,   τίνος
      man:NOM or woman:NOM or family:NOM or tribe:NOM who:GEN
      ἡ   διάνοια   ἐξέκλινεν   ἀπὸ Κυρίου
      ART.NOM heart:NOM turn.away:IPFV.ACT.3SG from Lord:GEN
      τοῦ   θεοῦ   ὑμῶν   πορεύεσθαι   λατρεύειν
      ART.GEN God:GEN 2PL.GEN go:INF.PRS.MID serve:INF.PRS.ACT
      τοῖς   θεοῖς   τῶν   ἐθνῶν
      ART.DAT gods:DAT ART.GEN nations:GEN
      '[So that there will not be among you] a man or woman, or family or tribe,
      whose heart turns away from the Lord our God, **to go** [and] **serve** the gods
      of those nations' (De. 29.17).

Occurrences of V1(inf.) καί V2(inf.), such as (85) and (86) are a full-fledged syndetic PCCs:[21]

(85) μὴ   ἐξελθέτω   ἐκ   τῆς   πόλεως   διαπεφευγὼς
      not go:IMP.AOR.ACT.3SG from ART.GEN city:GEN escape:PTCP
      τοῦ   πορευθῆναι   καὶ ἀπαγγεῖλαι   ἐν Ιεζραελ
      ART.GEN go:INF.AOR.PASS and tell:INF.AOR.ACT in Jezreel
      'Let no one escape or leave the city **to go and tell** it in Jezreel' (2 Ki. 9.15).

---

20   In addition to (84), see 1 Ki. 9.9; Je. 48.17.

21   PCCs with two infinitives can be considered a way to avoid chained infinitives such as *I want to go to eat*, according to the principle of "horror aequi" (cf. Rohdenburg 2003: 240). See Hommerberg & Tottie (2007), e.g., regarding the verbal complementation of *try* in English (*try to* vs. *try and*).

(86) *καὶ ὅτε   οὐκ ὤκνησας   ἀναστῆναι   καὶ*
and when not hesitate:AOR.ACT.2SG get.up:INF.AOR.ACT and
καταλιπεῖν   τὸ   ἄριστόν   σου
leave:INF.AOR.ACT ART.ACC dinner:ACC 2SG.GEN
'And when you did not hesitate **to get up and leave** your dinner' (To. 12.13).

4.2.2   Syndetic PCCs

Syndetic PCCs with imperatives or exhortative subjunctives occur in very similar contexts to asyndetic PCCs, a fact which leads us to consider the two forms as alternatives and essentially equivalent to one another. The following examples show two syndetic PCCs, namely πορεύεσθε καὶ λατρεύσατε in (87) and βαδίζετε καὶ λατρεύσατε in (88), which can be compared with the asyndetic PCC βαδίζετε, λατρεύσατε in (80) above. All of them depict the same event:

(87) *καὶ ἀπέστρεψαν   τόν   τε Μωυσῆν   καὶ Ααρων*
and bring.back:AOR.ACT.3PL ART.ACC PTCL Moses:ACC and Aaron
πρὸς Φαραω, καὶ εἶπεν   αὐτοῖς   πορεύεσθε   καὶ
to   Pharaoh and say:AOR.ACT.3SG 3PL.DAT go:IMP.PRS.MID.2PL and
λατρεύσατε   τῷ   θεῷ   ἡμῶν
serve:IMP.AOR.ACT.2PL ART.DAT God:DAT 1PL.GEN
'So Moses and Aaron were brought back to Pharaoh, and he said to them, **"Go and serve** our God!"' (Ex. 10.8).

(88) *καὶ ἐκάλεσεν   Φαραω Μωυσῆν   καὶ Ααρων νυκτὸς   καὶ*
and call:AOR.ACT.3SG Pharaoh Moses:ACC and Aaron night:GEN and
εἶπεν   αὐτοῖς   ἀνάστητε   καὶ
say:AOR.ACT.3SG 3PL.DAT rise.up:IMP.AOR.ACT.2PL and
ἐξέλθατε   ἐκ   τοῦ   λαοῦ   μου   καὶ
get.out:IMP.AOR.ACT.2PL from ART.GEN people:GEN 1SG.GEN and
ὑμεῖς   καὶ οἱ   υἱοὶ   Ισραηλ· βαδίζετε   καὶ
2PL.NOM and ART.NOM sons:NOM Israel go:IMP.PRS.ACT.2PL and
λατρεύσατε   κυρίῳ τῷ   θεῷ   ὑμῶν
serve:IMP.AOR.ACT.2PL Lord:DAT ART.DAT God:DAT 2PL.GEN
'Then he called for Moses and Aaron at night and said, "Rise up, get out from among my people, both you and the sons of Israel; and **go and worship** the Lord, your God"' (Ex. 12.31).

Almost all imperatives in syndetic PCCs are inflected in the 2nd person; however, a few instances of 3rd person are found, e.g. (89) and (90):

(89) *ἀναστήτωσαν   καὶ βοηθησάτωσαν   ὑμῖν*
rise.up:IMP.AOR.ACT.3PL and help:IMP.AOR.ACT.3PL 2PL.DAT
'**Let them rise up and help** you!' (De. 32.38).

(90) *πορευέσθω   καὶ ἀποστραφήτω   εἰς τὴν*
depart:IMP.PRS.MID.3SG and return:IMP.AOR.PASS.3SG to ART.ACC
οἰκίαν   αὐτοῦ
house:ACC 3SG.GEN
'**Let him depart and return** to his house' (De. 20.5).

As expected, exhortative subjunctives are inflected only in the 1st person plural
in syndetic PCCs, as in (91):

(91) *ἐξῆλθον   ἐξ Ισραηλ υἱοὶ   παράνομοι   καὶ*
come.out:AOR.ACT.3PL from Israel sons:NOM repudiated:NOM and
ἀνέπεισαν   πολλοὺς   λέγοντες πορευθῶμεν   καὶ
mislead:AOR.ACT.3PL many:ACC say:PTCP go:SBJV.AOR.PASS.1PL and
διαθώμεθα   διαθήκην   μετὰ τῶν   ἐθνῶν
make:SBJV.AOR.MID.1PL covenant:ACC with ART.GEN nations:GEN
τῶν   κύκλῳ ἡμῶν
ART.GEN around 1PL.GEN
'Certain renegades came out from Israel and misled many, saying, "**Let us
go and make** a covenant with the Gentiles [= nations] around us"' (1Ma.
1.11).

The imperatives of ἀνίστημι and πορεύομαι are the most frequent in syndetic
PCCs. This is presumably due to the fact that coordination with an overt coor-
dinator is less marked in Ancient Greek than simple juxtaposition (but see
Section 4.2.1 for asyndetic PCCs with βαδίζω).

    According to the criteria stated in Section 4.1, we excluded from our corpus 9
occurrences of ἀνίστημι, e.g. (92a)–(92b),[22] in which V1 and V2 are not inflected
in the same mood and do not agree in person and/or number, according to the
pattern shown in Table 6.

───────────

22   In addition to (92), see Jd. (Alex.) 18.9.1, 18.9.5, 19.28; Jd. (Vat.) 18.9, 19.28; 2 Ki. 15.14; Ob. 1.3;
      Je. 6.4.

TABLE 6   Pattern excluded
            (V1 ἀνίστημι)

V1	καί	V2
IMP.2PL/SG		SBJV.1PL

(92) a. *παρασκευάσασθε*   *ἐπ'*   *αὐτὴν*   *εἰς πόλεμον,*
     prepare: IMP.AOR.MID.2PL against 3SG.ACC to war:ACC
     ἀνάστητε   *καὶ ἀναβῶμεν*   *ἐπ'*
     arise: IMP.AOR.ACT.2PL and get.in: SBJV.AOR.ACT.1PL against
     αὐτὴν   *μεσημβρίας*
     3SG.ACC at.noon
     'Prepare war against her; **arise, and let us attack** at noon' (Je. 6.4).

   b. *καὶ εἶπεν*   *πρὸς αὐτὴν*   *ἀνάστηθι*   *καὶ*
      and say:AOR.ACT.3SG to   3SG.ACC arise: IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG and
      ἀπέλθωμεν
      go:SBJV.AOR.ACT.1PL
      'He said to her, "**Get up and let us go**"' (Jd. 19.28).

Both multiverb constructions in (92) can be analysed as a plain coordination, in which the two verbs relate to two different subjects and the first verb keeps its full meaning. Another analysis is however possible: in this case, the imperative of ἀνίστημι could function as an interjection, like 'come on, let us attack!', 'come on, let us go!', on the model of Classical Greek ἄγε / ἴθι.[23] In both cases, though, they are not instances of PCC.

Finally, before moving to the analysis of other moods, we focus on 3 cases of coordination between the imperative of πορεύομαι and the indicative future of another verb, which are all attested in the First Book of Samuel[24] (= 1 Ki.):

(93) *καὶ εἶπεν*   *κύριος*   *πορεύου*   *καὶ*
     and say:AOR.ACT.3SG Lord:NOM go:IMP.PRS.MID.2SG and
     πατάξεις   *ἐν τοῖς*   *ἀλλοφύλοις*   *τούτοις*
     attack:FUT.ACT.2SG in ART.DAT foreigners:DAT DEM.DAT
     'And the Lord said [to David], "**Go and attack** the Philistines [=foreigners]"' (1 Ki. 23.2).

---

23   Cf., among others, Goodwin (1890: § 250–251); Biraud (2010: 160–169); Denizot (2011: 207–213).

24   In addition to (93), see 1 Ki. 15.3, 22.5.

The "volitive future" with an imperative value is very common in Biblical Greek (cf. Robertson 1919: 874; Turner 1963: 86) and also occurs in previous stages of Greek. As is well-known, the future is a very usual "opérateur TAM" (cf. Orlandini & Poccetti 2012 on Latin and Ancient Greek), since it is provided with many aspectual and modal functions (cf. Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca 1994: 258–259 for a typological survey).

No asyndetic juxtaposition of imperative and future forms is attested in the LXX; as far as the NT is concerned, Robertson (1919: 874) mentions the occurrence in (94), which is actually questionable since ὅρα and ποιήσεις are not contiguous.[25]

(94) ὅρα   γάρ φησιν,   ποιήσεις
      see:IMP.PRS.ACT.2SG PTCL tell:PRS.ACT.3SG make:FUT.ACT.2SG
      πάντα   κατὰ   τὸν   τύπον   τὸν   δειχθέντα
      everything.ACC according ART.ACC pattern:ACC ART.ACC show:PTCP
      σοι   ἐν τῷ   ὄρει
      2SG.DAT in ART.DAT mountain.DAT
      'He told: "**See** that you **make** everything according to the pattern that was shown you on the mountain"' (Ep.Hebr. 8.5).

Differently from the NT, many syndetic PCCs with futures are attested in the LXX. For ἀνίστημι the ratio is 6 out of 11 occurrences, while for πορεύομαι it is 9 out of 24. As is well known, the future is used to express the speaker's volition, intention or wish; it is not surprising, therefore, that many futures occur in dialogic contexts and relate to the 1st person, as in (95), while others are in the 3rd person, e.g. (96) and (97). As expected, there are no futures in the 2nd person in syndetic PCCs, since the imperative usually occurs in this case.

(95) πορεύσομαι   καὶ ἐπιστρέψω   εἰς τὸν   τόπον
      go:FUT.MID.1SG and return:FUT.ACT.1SG to ART.ACC place:ACC
      μου
      1SG.GEN
      'I **will go and return** to my place' (Ho. 5.15).

---

25   Concerning contiguity and PCCs, see Section 3.2.1.

(96)   ὁ   δοῦλός   σου   **πορεύσεται**   **καὶ**
       ART.NOM servant:NOM 2SG.GEN go:FUT.MID.3SG and
       πολεμήσει   μετὰ τοῦ   ἀλλοφύλου   τούτου
       fight:FUT.ACT.3SG with ART.GEN foreigner:GEN DEM.GEN
       'Your servant **will go and fight** with this Philistine' (1 Ki. 17.32).

(97)   δείξω   πρὸ   προσώπου αὐτοῦ ὁδὸν   καθ'
       show:FUT.ACT.1SG in.front.of face:GEN 3SG.GEN way:ACC by
       ἣν   **πορεύσεται**   **καὶ** κυριεύσει   πάσης τῆς
       REL.ACC go:FUT.MID.3SG and capture:FUT.ACT.3SG all:GEN ART.GEN
       ὀρεινῆς
       hill.country:GEN
       'I will show him a way by which he **can go and capture** all the hill country'
       (Ju. 10.13).

When multiverb constructions occur in narrative contexts, especially with
verbs in past tenses, it is more difficult to distinguish PCC from plain coor-
dination.[26] Some difficult instances are the following ones, where V1 may be
analysed as either a full verb or a modifier of V2:

(98)   αὐτὸς   **ἀνέστη**   **καὶ** **ἐπάταξεν**   ἐν τοῖς
       3SG.NOM arise:AOR.ACT.3SG and strike:AOR.ACT.3SG in ART.DAT
       ἀλλοφύλοις
       foreigners:DAT
       'He **arose and struck** the Philistines' (2 Ki. 23.10).

(99)   καὶ **ἐπορεύθη**   ἡ   παιδίσκη   καὶ
       and go:AOR.PASS.3SG ART.NOM maidservant:NOM and
       ἀνήγγειλεν   αὐτοῖς, καὶ αὐτοὶ   **πορεύονται**   **καὶ**
       tell:AOR.ACT.3SG 3PL.DAT and 3PL.NOM go:PRS.MID.3PL and
       ἀναγγέλλουσιν   τῷ   βασιλεῖ   Δαυιδ
       tell:PRS.ACT.3PL ART.DAT king:DAT David
       'And a maidservant went and told them, and they **go and tell** King David'
       (2 Ki. 17.17).

---

26   A similar difficulty is remarked by Ross (2013: 113–119) in his analysis of PCCs in English
     literary texts ranging from 1500 to 1600.

Some other occurrences, where V1 cannot be considered just a modifier of V2, were excluded from the corpus. Besides (100), where the motion verb governs a complement of place, we also excluded (101) and (102), where the combination of V1 and V2 constitutes, from a syntactic point of view, a plain symmetric coordination between two imperfective verbs with the same subject, in which an actual motion overlaps with the actions of crying or lowing.[27]

(100) καὶ τότε εἶδον   ἀσεβεῖς   εἰς τάφους   εἰσαχθέντας,
       and then see:AOR.ACT.1SG wicked:ACC in graves:ACC carry:PTCP
       <u>καὶ ἐκ   τόπου   ἁγίου   ἐπορεύθησαν   καὶ</u>
       and from place:GEN holy:GEN go:AOR.PASS.3PL and
       <u>ἐπῃνέθησαν   ἐν τῇ   πόλει</u>,   ὅτι   οὕτως
       pray:AOR.PASS.3PL in ART.DAT city:DAT since so
       ἐποίησαν
       do:AOR.ACT.3PL
       'Then I saw the wicked buried. They used to **go** <u>in and out of the holy
       place</u> and **were praised** <u>in the city</u> where they had done such things'
       (Ec. 8.10).

(101) ἐν τρίβῳ   ἑνὶ   ἐπορεύοντο   καὶ ἐκοπίων
       in highway:DAT one:DAT go:IPFV.MID.3PL and low:IPFV.ACT.3PL
       'They [= the cows] **went** along the highway, **lowing** as they went' (lit.
       'they went and lowed') (1Ki. 6.12).

(102) πορευόμενοι ἐπορεύοντο   καὶ ἔκλαιον   αἴροντες
       go:PTCP   go:IPFV.MID.3PL and weep:IPFV.ACT.3PL bear:PTCP
       τὰ   σπέρματα αὐτῶν   ἐρχόμενοι δὲ   ἥξουσιν
       art.ACC seeds:ACC 3PL.GEN come:PTCP PTCL come:FUT.ACT.3PL
       ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει αἴροντες   τὰ   δράγματα   αὐτῶν
       in joy:DAT   carry:PTCP ART.ACC sheaves:ACC 3PL.GEN
       'Those who **go out weeping**, bearing the seed, shall come home with
       shouts of joy, carrying their sheaves' (lit. 'they went out and wept')
       (Ps. 125.6).

The verb that follows ἐπορεύοντο in (102) can be analysed as a modifier of the motion verb. Some support for this analysis comes from the syntactic analysis

---

27   The verb of motion can also be coordinated with other verbs in this "overlapping" pattern,
      cf. 4 Ki. 2.11; Je. 48.6; Ez. 1.12.

of the two parallel clauses occurring in (102), which are introduced by the participles πορευόμενοι 'going' and ἐρχόμενοι 'coming back', respectively. We note that the verb ἔκλαιον of the first clause corresponds to the prepositional phrase ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει in the second one, which functions as a modification of the main verb ἥξουσιν. Then, we may claim that ἔκλαιον is a modifier of the main verb ἐπορεύοντο. Indirect evidence for our analysis comes from constructions such as ἐπορεύετο κλαίων (3 Ki. 20.27), where the modifier is expressed by a participle, as expected. With respect to the participial strategy, coordination emphasises the co-extension of both actions and gives them the same informative importance.

The overlapping of durative actions can be expressed by the juxtaposition between two participial forms as in (103).[28] As in (101) and (102), such a coordination is not considered an example of PCC.

(103) *οἱ   ἱερεῖς   οἱ   οὐραγοῦντες ὀπίσω τῆς*
       ART.NOM priests:NOM ART.NOM follow:PTCP behind ART.GEN
       κιβωτοῦ τῆς   διαθήκης   κυρίου   πορευόμενοι καὶ
       ark:GEN ART.GEN covenant:GEN Lord:GEN go:PTCP   and
       σαλπίζοντες
       sound.the.trumpet:PTCP
       'The priests who followed the ark of the covenant of the Lord [went],
       blowing the trumpets as they went' (lit. 'going and blowing the trumpets') (Jo. 6.9).

Among narrative syndetic PCCs, we observe a very interesting series of occurrences of πορεύομαι + V2 in which the function of modifier of V1 is unquestionable. Besides (104) and (105), we also refer to 2 Ki. 3.1.2, 3.1.3; Jn. 1.13.

(104) *καὶ τὸ   παιδάριον Σαμουηλ ἐπορεύετο   καὶ*
       and ART.NOM boy:NOM Samuel go:IPFV.MID.3SG and
       ἐμεγαλύνετο   καὶ ἀγαθὸν   καὶ μετὰ κυρίου   καὶ μετὰ
       grow:IPFV.MID.3SG and favour:ACC and with Lord:GEN and with
       ἀνθρώπων
       men:GEN
       'Now the boy Samuel **was growing** in stature and in favour both with
       the Lord and with men' (lit. 'he went and grew') (1 Ki. 2.26).

---

28   See also Je. 27.4; 2 Ki. 13.19, 16.13; Jd. (Alex.) 14.9.

(105) ἡ   θάλασσα ἐπορεύετο   καὶ ἐξήγειρεν   μᾶλλον
ART.NOM sea:NOM go:IPFV.MID.3SG and wake:IPFV.ACT.3SG more
κλύδωνα
wave:ACC
'The sea **was becoming** increasingly stormy' (lit. 'the sea was going and increasing more the wave') (Jn. 1.11).

In both cases, the V1 is desemantised and expresses the increase and the intensity of the action meant by V2. Desemantisation of V1 is much more evident in (105), where the subject is inanimate.[29]

In a few instances in our corpus, e.g. (106) and (107), the syndetic PCC formed by two participles (πορευομένη καὶ σκληρυνομένη, πορευόμενος καὶ μεγαλυνόμενος) with such an augmentative meaning is found in a sentence with πορεύομαι as the main verb of the clause.[30]

(106) καὶ ἐπορεύθη   χεὶρ   τῶν   υἱῶν   Ισραηλ
and go:AOR.PASS.3SG hand:NOM ART.GEN sons:GEN Israel
πορευομένη καὶ σκληρυνομένη   ἐπὶ   Ιαβιν   βασιλέα
go:PTCP   and become.stronger:PTCP against Jabin:ACC king:ACC
Χανααν
Canaan
'And the hand of the children of Israel **prevailed more and more** against Jabin the king of Canaan' (lit. 'and the hand [...] went going and becoming stronger') (Jd. 4.24).

(107) καὶ ἐπορεύετο   Δαυιδ *πορευόμενος καὶ μεγαλυνόμενος*
and go:IPFV.MID.3SG David go:PTCP   and grow:PTCP
'David **grew** increasingly powerful' (lit. 'David went going and growing') (2 Ki. 5.10).

---

29   According to typological studies, this type of "augmentative" meaning is usually expressed by another kind of coordination, namely "conjoined repetition" (cf. Hoarau 1997: 79 ff.; Lang 1984: 100 ff.); as Haspelmath (2007: 25) claims: "[a]nother special type of conjunction involves the combination of several identical elements to express intensity of an action or a high degree of a property, as in *She ran and ran, The city grew bigger and bigger*".

30   According to one anonymous reviewer, one should consider that ἐπορεύθη πορευομένη in (106) and ἐπορεύετο πορευόμενος in (107) belong together in what has been called "copy verb construction", a Hebraism in the LXX (cf. Goldenberg 1971, Muraoka 1985, Kim 2009).

4.3 *External evidence: the comparison with BH*

4.3.1 BH *QWM*

As is well known, LXX Greek is a translation language, which was strongly influenced by the language of the original Hebrew text (cf. among others, Bickerman 2007; Horrocks 2010 [1997]: 106–108). In Biblical Hebrew (henceforth BH), PCCs are very common. They are known in the literature as "verbal hendiadys", i.e. two verbs "simply coordinated, both having the form as required by the narrative sequence in which they occur, but in meaning the first serves to qualify the second and is best translated adverbially in English" (Lambdin 1971: 238; cf. also Chrzanowski 2011; Lillas 2012). Within this perspective, we compared Greek PCCs with their corresponding BH structures, in order to investigate if and how the syntactic structures of the original Hebrew Bible could have influenced the Greek translation.

Let us start with some remarks concerning PCCs with ἀνίστημι and their correspondences in the source text.[31] In the following example, the imperative of ἀνίστημι occurs in an asyndetic PCC, followed by the imperative of καταβαίνω:

(108) *καὶ εἶπεν   κύριος   πρός με*
       and say:AOR.ACT.3SG Lord:NOM to   1SG.ACC
       ἀνάστηθι   κατάβηθι   τὸ
       arise:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG go.down:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG ART.ACC
       τάχος   ἐντεῦθεν
       quick:ACC from.here
       'Then the Lord said to me, "**Arise go down** from here quickly"' (De. 9.12).

The original Hebrew text also displays an asyndetic PCC, which is called *qûm gram* by scholars (cf., among others, Andrason 2019). The Greek combination ἀνάστηθι κατάβηθι corresponds to BH *qûm* (*arise*.IMP) *rēd* (*go.down*.IMP), where two imperatives are juxtaposed. The first verb *qûm* 'rise up, stand up' (lit. 'arise') functions as a modifier of the second verb; it is partially or totally desemantised, as Andrason (2019: 115) clearly points out: *qûm* "alters the action expressed by V2 and adds an element of immediacy (or urgency and insistency), or it communicates an ingressive value".

---

31 See Section 3.2.2 for discussion on PCCs with ἐγείρω 'rise, get up' as a V1 in the NT. Despite the lexical difference in the V1 (ἐγείρω in the NT vs. ἀνίστημι in the LXX), the constructions are similar in the two texts.

TABLE 7   BH *qûm gram*

V1 (*qûm*) IMP   +   V2 IMP

The meaning of immediacy conveyed by V1 in (108) is also expressed by the adverbial phrase τὸ τάχος, which follows the two imperatives and relates to the whole verbal complex.

The analysis of *qûm*/ἀνίστημι as a modifier in multiverb constructions is confirmed by occurrences such as (109), in which the semantic value of V2 is opposite to that of V1 (cf. also Muraoka 2016: 702). The Greek ἀνάστηθι κάθισον translates BH *qûmî* (*arise*.IMP) *šəbî* (*sit*.IMP), which is a sequence of two imperatives meaning 'arise sit'. Asyndetic juxtaposition of imperatives is usual in BH (cf. Joüon & Muraoka 2018 [1991]: 611).

(109)   ἐκτίναξαι   τὸν   χοῦν   καὶ
shake.yourself:IMP.AOR.MID.2SG ART.ACC dust:ACC and
ἀνάστηθι   κάθισον,   Ιερουσαλημ
arise:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG sit:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG Jerusalem
'Shake thyself from the dust; **arise sit** [on your throne], O Jerusalem!' (Is. 52.2).

Example (109) is not the only case of juxtaposition of ἀνίστημι and a verb of sitting. For instance, in (110), ἀνίστημι occurs in participial form and is followed by two imperatives, the first of which is just κάθισον 'sit!'. The original Hebrew text includes a series of 3 imperatives: the first two verbs are juxtaposed without any overt coordinator, while the second and the third ones are linked by the letter *waw* standing for *wə* 'and'. The Greek ἀναστὰς κάθισον καὶ φάγε corresponds to BH *qûm* (*arise*.IMP) *nāʾ* (*please*) *šəbāh* (*sit*.IMP) *wə* (*and*) *ʾoklāh* (*eat*.IMP):

(110)   ἀναστὰς   κάθισον   καὶ   φάγε   τῆς
arise:PTCP sit:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG and eat:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG ART.GEN
θήρας   μου,   ὅπως   εὐλογήσῃ   με
venison:GEN 1SG.GEN so.that bless:SBJV.AOR.ACT.3SG 1SG.ACC
ἡ   ψυχή   σου
ART.NOM soul:NOM 2SG.GEN
'[I pray you] **arise, sit and eat** of my venison, that your soul may bless me' (Ge. 27.19).

It goes without saying that BH *qûm gram* is frequently translated into Greek by the participle of ἀνίστημι + the main verb. As already observed, the participial construction is definitely the strategy preferred by Greek translators of the Bible.

4.3.2   BH *LEK*

The imperative *lēk* 'go, walk' from the verb *HLK* 'go, walk' is the usual source for the serialised imperatives of βαδίζω and πορεύομαι occurring in our corpus. The imperative *lēk* is commonly used in asyndetic PCCs with a "preparatory sense", according to van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze (2017: 167). This is illustrated in (111) and (112), where the Greek imperatives βάδιζε ἄπελθε and πορεύου εἴσελθε translate BH serialised imperatives *lēk* (*go.*IMP) *šûḇ* (*come.back.*IMP) and *lēk* (*go.*IMP) *hāḇê'* (*bring.in.*IMP), respectively.

(111)   εἶπεν   δὲ   κύριος   πρὸς Μωυσῆν   ἐν Μαδιαμ
        say:AOR.ACT.3SG PTCL Lord:NOM to   Moses:ACC in Midian
        βάδιζε   ἄπελθε   εἰς Αἴγυπτον
        go:IMP.PRS.ACT.2SG go.back:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG to Egypt:ACC
        'Now the Lord said to Moses in Midian, "**Go back** to Egypt"' (lit. 'go, go
        back') (Ex. 4.19).

(112)   καὶ Ιωναθαν ἔδωκεν   τὰ   σκεύη   αὐτοῦ
        and Jonathan give:AOR.ACT.3SG ART.ACC weapons:ACC 3SG.GEN
        ἐπὶ τὸ   παιδάριον αὐτοῦ   καὶ εἶπεν   τῷ
        to   ART.ACC lad:ACC   3SG.GEN and say:AOR.ACT.3SG ART.DAT
        παιδαρίῳ αὐτοῦ   πορεύου   εἴσελθε   εἰς
        lad:DAT   3SG.GEN go:IMP.PRS.MID.2SG enter:IMP.AOR.ACT.2SG into
        τὴν   πόλιν
        ART.ACC city:ACC
        'Then Jonathan gave his weapons to his lad and said to him, "**Go enter**
        into the city"' (3Ki. 20.40).

According to van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze (2017: 167), *lēk* and a few other verbs, e.g. *qwm* 'arise', *bw'* 'come', *yhb* 'give' "lose their typical semantic values when they are used within the context of other main imperatives which they introduce".

Example (113) is very interesting for our purpose, since both *qûm*/ἀνίστημι and *lēk*/βαδίζω occur as imperatives in PCCs: ἀνάστητε καὶ ἐξέλθατε corresponds to BH *qûmû* (*arise.*IMP) *ṣə'û* (*go.out.*IMP) and βαδίζετε καὶ λατρεύσατε corresponds to BH *ləḵû* (*go.*IMP) *'iḇḏû* (*serve.*IMP).

(113=88) καὶ   ἐκάλεσεν   Φαραω Μωυσῆν   καὶ Ααρων νυκτὸς
and call:AOR.ACT.3SG Pharaoh Moses:ACC and Aaron night:GEN
καὶ   εἶπεν   αὐτοῖς ἀνάστητε   καὶ
and say:AOR.ACT.3SG 3PL.DAT rise.up:IMP.AOR.ACT.2PL and
ἐξέλθατε   ἐκ   τοῦ   λαοῦ   μου
get.out:IMP.AOR.ACT.2PL from ART.GEN people:GEN 1SG.GEN
καὶ   ὑμεῖς   καὶ οἱ   υἱοὶ   Ισραηλ
and 2sg.NOM and ART.NOM sons:NOM Israel
βαδίζετε   καὶ λατρεύσατε   κυρίῳ
go:IMP.PRS.ACT.2PL and serve:IMP.AOR.ACT.2PL Lord:DAT
τῷ   θεῷ   ὑμῶν, καθὰ λέγετε
ART.DAT God:DAT 2PL.GEN as say:PRS.ACT.2PL
'Then he called for Moses and Aaron at night and said, "**Rise up, get
out** from among my people, both you and the sons of Israel; and **go
and serve** your Lord, as you have said"' (Ex. 12.31).

The Hebrew source text and the Greek translation fail to match in just one
aspect: in both PCCs of (113) the coordinator καί is added to translate the origi-
nal asyndetic constructions. Although asyndetic PCCs are well attested in LXX
Greek, the choice of the syndetic PCC makes it evident that the syndetic type
is less marked than the asyndetic one.

4.3.3   Sources for Biblical Greek repeated coordinators
The search for the sequence [V1 καί V2] in the LXX returned several occurrences
in which καί also precedes V1, i.e. [καί V1 καί V2]. This type is known as "bisyn-
detic coordination" (cf. Haspelmath 2007: 10–11; Dik 1968: 42) and is illustrated
in (114):

(114) καὶ   ἦλθον   οἱ   παῖδες   Δαυιδ πρὸς
and go:AOR.ACT.3PL ART.NOM servants:NOM David to
Αβιγαιαν   εἰς Κάρμηλον   καὶ ἐλάλησαν   αὐτῇ
Abigail:ACC at Carmel:ACC and speak:AOR.ACT.3PL 3SG.DAT
λέγοντες Δαυιδ ἀπέστειλεν   ἡμᾶς   πρὸς σὲ
say:PTCP David send:AOR.ACT.3SG 1PL.ACC to 2SG.ACC
λαβεῖν   σε   αὐτῷ εἰς γυναῖκα. καὶ
take:INF.AOR.ACT 2SG.ACC 3SG.DAT to wife:ACC and
ἀνέστη   καὶ προσεκύνησεν   ἐπὶ τὴν
arise:AOR.ACT.3SG and bow:AOR.ACT.3SG to ART.ACC
γῆν   ἐπὶ πρόσωπον καὶ εἶπεν   ἰδοὺ ἡ
ground:ACC on face:ACC and say:AOR.ACT.3SG behold ART.NOM

δούλη   σου   εἰς παιδίσκην νίψαι
maidservant:NOM 2SG.GEN to maid:ACC wash:INF.AOR.ACT
πόδας   τῶν   παίδων   σου.   καὶ ἀνέστη
feet:ACC ART.GEN servants:GEN 2SG.GEN and arise:AOR.ACT.3SG
Αβιγαια   καὶ ἐπέβη   ἐπὶ τὴν   ὄνον
Abigail:NOM and ride:AOR.ACT.3SG on ART.ACC donkey:ACC

'And the servants of David came to Abigail at Carmel, they spoke to her, saying, "David has sent us to you to take you as his wife". **She arose and bowed** with her face to the ground and said, "Behold, your maidservant is a maid to wash the feet of your servants". Then Abigail quickly **arose**, and rode on a donkey' (1 Ki. 25.40–42).

The sequence καὶ ἀνέστη καὶ προσεκύνησεν translates BH *wattāqom wattištaḥû*, where we can identify the so-called double *wayyiqtol*, i.e. the double sequence of *waw* 'and' + past forms. Despite the small difference in form, the Greek sequence καὶ ἀνέστη καὶ προσεκύνησεν may be analysed as a PCC, likewise the occurrences of ἀνίστημι discussed in Sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.2. Even though an analysis as a plain coordination is possible, some support for the hypothesis that (114) is a PCC comes from the lexical meanings of the two verbs, which are antonyms.

Space is lacking here for an extensive discussion of these constructions. However, let us comment briefly on the following occurrence, where the verb ἵστημι 'stand up' occurs as V1 in a bisyndetic coordinated construction.

(115)   καὶ ἀνέστη   ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ   θυσιαστηρίου
        and arise:AOR.ACT.3SG from face:GEN ART.GEN altar:GEN
        κυρίου   ὀκλακὼς   ἐπὶ τὰ   γόνατα   αὐτοῦ   καὶ
        Lord:GEN kneel:PTCP on ART.ACC knees:ACC 3SG.GEN and
        αἱ   χεῖρες   αὐτοῦ   διαπεπετασμέναι εἰς τὸν
        ART.NOM hands:NOM 3SG.GEN spread:PTCP   to ART.ACC
        οὐρανόν. καὶ ἔστη   καὶ εὐλόγησεν   πᾶσαν
        sky:ACC and stand:AOR.ACT.3SG and bless:AOR.ACT.3SG all:ACC
        ἐκκλησίαν   Ισραηλ φωνῇ   μεγάλῃ
        assembly:ACC Israel voice:DAT loud:DAT
        'He **arose** from before the altar of the Lord, from kneeling on his knees with his hands spread toward heaven. And **he stood and blessed** all the assembly of Israel with a loud voice' (3 Ki. 8.54–55).

There is no doubt that the sequence καὶ ἔστη καὶ εὐλόγησεν, corresponding to BH *wayyaʿmōḏ wayəḇārek̲*, functions here as a PCC. The information that Salomon

(the subject of the clause) stood up is given at the beginning of the text, by the verb ἀνέστη 'he arose'. By the modifier καὶ ἔστη 'and he stood', the action meant by V2 καὶ εὐλόγησεν 'and he blessed' seems to acquire nuances of force and solemnity.

Even if we cannot discuss bisyndetic coordination in more detail, we would like to stress that in Greek this is only an effect of the word-for-word translation from BH. In BH, the *wayyiqtol* is not a plain sequence of *waw* 'and' + an imperfective verb, since this sequence gives rise to a "converted tense", i.e. a verb phrase that expresses several different meanings, among which is the narrative preterit (cf. Kawashima 2010, Andrason 2019). Two *wayyiqtols* can be combined into a sequence, as is the case in (114) and (115), regardless of whether the first verb is a full verb or a modifier of the second one. Joüon & Muraoka (2018 [1991]: 361) recall that in BH "a narrative begins with a *qatal* (historic present) and continues with a *wayyiqtol*, which is followed, if need be, by other *wayyiqtols*, the series of which is never broken without some particular reason". A literal translation of double *wayyiqtol* gives a double sequence of καί + verb in Greek, which is, again, an effect of the word-for-word translation. The presence of bisyndetic coordination should not prevent us from recognising a PCC in this type of construction, whenever the first verb of the sequence functions as a modifier of the second one.

5   Conclusion

5.1   *Summary and next steps of research*
To summarise, PCCs in Biblical Greek are multiverb constructions formed by two verbs which are either linked by the coordinator καί 'and' (pseudo-coordination *stricto sensu*) or asyndetically juxtaposed (serialisation). The first verb of the verbal complex (V1) is not a full verb and is lexically constrained, while the second verb (V2) is an open class, which usually expresses actions (not states). The verbs in first position are mostly motion verbs and verbs of change of posture; they appear to have partially or totally lost their lexical meaning and are unable to govern any complement or adjunct. The function of V1 is to modify the action expressed by V2: the motion and the change of posture denote the first step in order to perform the action expressed by V2. Nuances of immediacy and urgency emerge in many instances of our corpus with respect to the corresponding simple imperatives.[32]

---

32   Metaphorical extensions of PCCs with motion verbs to a pragmatic function of unexpect-

Asyndetic and syndetic PCCs have been considered here as two constructions that are different in form but similar in function. The difference also emerges in their distribution: the asyndetic type only occurs with imperatives, while the syndetic type is found with every mood. The former comes from a sequence of two imperatives, e.g. *go! get!*, while the latter originates from syndetic clause coordination and, because of this, may overlap in some cases with asymmetric coordination, especially in narrative contexts.

Our investigation also brings to light three relevant topics for further research:
1.   the relationship between the imperative and the PCCs;
2.   differences between the LXX and the NT, in relation to BH influence;
3.   continuity vs. discontinuity in the diachrony of Greek.
In the following sections, we briefly discuss these topics.

5.2   *The relationship between the imperative and the PCC*
First, the imperative turns out to be the unmarked verbal form in PCCs. It occurs in both syndetic and asyndetic types, unlike the other moods, which only occur in the syndetic type. Besides, it is more frequent than all the other moods together: in the LXX 135 PCCs display imperatives out of a total number of 171; in the NT imperatives occur in 35 out of 70 PCCs. As remarked in Section 2.2, the relationship of the imperative with PCCs was presumably inherited from Indo-European. As far as Homeric and Classical Greek are concerned, imperatives such as ἴθι 'go' or ἄγε 'up' + another imperative have been analysed as interjections or discourse markers, even though this analysis cannot account for some instances (Biraud 2010: 160–169; Denizot 2011: 207–213).

The unmarked status of the imperative in PCCs is likely to be connected with the main function of the imperative, i.e. its occurrence in directive speech acts, which are dialogic, since they necessarily imply an interlocutor, and are typical of spoken language and spoken-like written language. In directives, speakers want to urge the interlocutor to perform one action and they tend to use basic syntactic forms; syntactic complexity and especially subordination tend to be reduced to the minimum.

Another relevant aspect of directives is deixis. Directives relate to the *hic et nunc* of enunciation and are centered on the relationship between the speaker and the interlocutor. It is not surprising, then, that motion verbs are prototypi-

---

edness, disapproval, etc. are usual crosslinguistically; cf. Ross (2016b), who analyses some instances of English PCCs with *go* as V1 in terms of miratives (e.g. "Look at what he **went and did** this time!").

cally used in imperatival PCCs. As regards basic spatial meanings such as 'come' and 'go', they code proximity to the speaker and distance from the speaker, respectively. On investigating our PCCs, we observed that V1 does not express only spatial deixis; rather, it adds nuances of immediacy and urgency to the action meant by V2. In other words, PCCs may code temporal deixis, precisely the proximity to the moment of speech. This is particularly clear in pairs with and without the V1 (see discussion concerning examples (36)–(38) in Section 3.2.1).

As Logozzo & Tronci (Forthcoming) argue, the opposition between *discourse* and *story*, as introduced by Benveniste (1966), may account for the distribution of the PCCs with respect to the corresponding constructions with a "pleonastic" participle. While the latter are unmarked, being able to occur in both *discourse* and *story*, PCCs are frequent in the *discourse* and rarer in the *story*.

5.3   *Differences between the LXX and the NT, in relation to BH influence*
The comparison between the data of the NT and the LXX allows us to confirm that PCCs are well attested in both texts and show a certain vitality with respect to previous stages of Greek, where sequences of two imperatives are attested, but not unanimously classified by scholars (see discussion in Section 2.2). In both the NT and the LXX, PCCs occur in imperatival directives and in narrative contexts; with the imperatives, there are both asyndetic and syndetic constructions, while only the syndetic type is found in narrative contexts. Further evidence for the vitality of PCCs comes from the lexical variety of the verbs occurring as V1.

Besides common features, the NT and the LXX show some differences. First, PCCs are not as pervasive in the NT as in the LXX. From a quantitative point of view, we found 70 occurrences of PCCs in the NT by searching for all relevant sequences against 174 occurrences of PCCs in the LXX by searching for only three verbs, namely ἀνίστημι 'arise', βαδίζω 'go, walk', πορεύομαι 'go'. Secondly, PCCs attested in the LXX appear to closely follow the Hebrew source text, where PCCs are usual (cf. Section 4.3 and Chrzanowski 2011: 24–33 for a bibliographical survey). Often, it seems that the asyndetic PCCs of the LXX are a word-for-word translation of the original Hebrew constructions. In the cases in which the LXX shows a syndetic construction instead of a Hebrew asyndetic one, we can assume that Greek translators aimed at adapting Hebrew syntax as much as possible to the Greek one, which prefers overt syntactic linkers to juxtaposition. To explain this difference between the translation and the source text, we also recall that the books of the LXX were translated by different translators and at different periods, hence different strategies of translation may have been employed.

The influence of BH is not as direct on the NT, which was written in Greek by people who used "a reasonably close reflection of the everyday Greek of the majority of the literate population in the early centuries AD" (Horrocks 2010 [1997]: 147), although they were Jews and surely knew BH. Further investigation on contemporary texts is needed, however, in order to understand to what extent NT Greek was influenced by Hebrew and whether, conversely, its syntactic shape is typical of Post-Classical Greek.

The comparison between the NT and the LXX brings to light another fact, which especially concerns the asyndetic constructions. In the NT, ὑπάγω is the only motion verb that occurs in asyndetic PCCs, whereas in the LXX, both βαδίζω and πορεύομαι occur in asyndetic PCCs with more or less the same number of occurrences. However, the quantitative incidence of PCCs for βαδίζω and πορεύομαι is not even, if compared with the total number of occurrences of the two verbs in the LXX: there are 72 occurrences of βαδίζω in the LXX, of which 16 in asyndetic PCCs (22%), against 1260 occurrences of πορεύομαι in the LXX, of which 16 are asyndetic PCCs (1.2%). The rate of βαδίζω is parallel to that of ὑπάγω in the NT, which is attested 79 times, of which 14 in asyndetic PCCs (18%). Neither βαδίζω nor ὑπάγω are abundant in the two texts analysed, but many of the occurrences are found in asyndetic PCCs. There is a general tendency for modifier verbs to be fixed, especially in languages where PCC is not an extensive grammatical pattern. This tendency to repeat and fix the same verbs as modifiers may explain not only the "preference" for βαδίζω in the LXX and for ὑπάγω in the NT, but also the alleged pragmaticalisation of Homeric and Classical Greek imperatives ἴθι, ἄγε, φέρε etc. (see Denizot 2011: 207–213).

5.4   *Continuity vs. discontinuity in the diachrony of Greek*

We observed that, in the NT, ὑπάγω 'go' is the unmarked verb in PCCs. It is not only the most frequently attested verb, but also the verb that occurs in both syndetic and asyndetic constructions, in the imperative and in other moods. Other motion verbs such as ἔρχομαι 'come' and πορεύομαι 'go' are restricted to syndetic PCCs in the NT, even though they have many occurrences as full verbs. Compared with the distribution of ἔρχομαι in PCCs, ὑπάγω appears to be specialised in the asyndetic type in the NT; it occurs only twice in narrative contexts. Conversely, ἔρχομαι is clearly the favorite motion verb in narrative (syndetic) PCCs.

This distribution can be explained in sociolinguistic terms by the opposition between low/spoken language vs. high/written language. If we consider that there are many more occurrences of ἔρχομαι in the NT than of ὑπάγω (634 against 79), the instances of ὑπάγω in asyndetic PCCs as well as the absence of ἔρχομαι in these constructions acquire more relevance.

As a perspective for further research, let us comment on some data taken from Bonnot & Vassilaki (2018), who investigated the Modern Greek verb πηγαίνω 'go', i.e. the etymological descendant of ὑπάγω. This verb occurs not only in syndetic PCCs, as Svorou (2018a) also points out, but also in asyndetic PCCs with imperatives: both types are illustrated in (116). The distribution of πηγαίνω 'go' in PCCs is even more interesting if compared with other motion verbs, such as, for instance, ἔρχομαι 'come' (aorist ἦρθα), which does not occur in directives and is only used in the syndetic type, cf. (117) (examples are taken from Bonnot & Vassilaki 2018: 4–5; English translations added).

(116) **píjene Ø fére**   ta pçáta   / **píjene ke fére** ta pçáta
      go   bring the dishes   go   and bring the dishes
      '**Go bring** the dishes / **Go and bring** the dishes'.

(117) *ðe xtípisa tin pórta kanenós, to kanáli   írθe ke me*
      not knocked the door of.anyone the TV channel came and me
      vríke
      found
      'I did not knock on anyone's door; it is the TV channel that **came and found** me'.

The Modern Greek verbs πηγαίνω 'go' and ἔρχομαι 'come' are distributed in PCCs in the same way as the verbs ὑπάγω and ἔρχομαι in the NT. Further research is required in order to understand whether this distribution is specific to the NT or is usual in other contemporary and later texts. If the latter is the case, we should also investigate whether these texts were influenced by the NT or not.

Several studies have been devoted recently to the topic of PCCs in Modern Greek. They show that the construction, in both the syndetic and the asyndetic types, is well-established in spoken and written language. They also provide evidence that the verbs concerned are not only motion and change of posture verbs (Bonnot & Vassilaki 2018; Svorou 2018a), but also the posture verb κάθομαι 'sit' (Svorou 2018b; Bonnot & Vassilaki 2021) and the verb πιάνω 'take' (Bonnot & Vassilaki 2021).

If we look at the diachrony of Greek, the pivotal position of NT Greek emerges as regards multiverb constructions. We observed that both PCCs and "pleonastic" participles occur in NT Greek; their distribution is not comparable, in that imperatival directives are mostly expressed by PCCs, while "pleonastic" participles are more frequent in narrative contexts (cf. Logozzo & Tronci Forthcoming). Neither of these constructions appears to be usual in Classical

Greek. Our opinion is that both of them are the Greek response to Hebrew paratactic syntax. The difference is that the participle is a usual form in Greek to express several types of modification, so its use as verbal modifier presumably sounded Greek-like. Conversely, coordination and juxtaposition were not usual strategies for coding verbal modification in Greek, so we can assume that PCCs spread on the model of the corresponding constructions in BH.

To conclude, BH played an important role in the spread of PCCs in the LXX and the NT, even with appropriate caveats. Concerning the LXX, the influence of BH can be seen in the perfect match between the modifier verbs and in the word-for-word translation of BH occurrences with antonymic verbs, e.g. *arise and bow* in example (114). In the NT, by contrast, the picture is different. PCCs are not as pervasive as in the LXX and the fact that they appear especially in direct speech with imperatives suggests that they are typical of spoken Greek, as opposed to more formal narrative contexts. Besides, the unmarkedness of the modifier verb ὑπάγω in PCCs and the persistence in this function in its Modern Greek descendant *pijéno* suggest that the language of the NT presumably resembles the Greek spoken and written in the 1st century CE. By comparing the LXX and the NT, we can affirm that BH triggered some covert tendencies of the Greek language, concerning especially PCCs in narrative contexts, which were further established by the composers of the NT.

Acknowledgments

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2006. Serial verb constructions in typological perspective. In Aikhenvald & Dixon, 1–68.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2018. *Serial verbs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra & R.M.W. Dixon (eds.). 2006. *Serial verb constructions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Andrason, Alexander. 2019. Categorial gradience and fuzziness—The QWM gram (serial verb construction) in Biblical Hebrew. *Ancient texts and modern readers. Studies*

in ancient Hebrew linguistics and Bible translation, ed. by Gideon Kotzé, Christian S. Locatell & John A. Messarra, 100–126. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Benveniste, Émile. 1966. Les relations de temps dans le verbe français. *Problèmes de linguistique générale, 1*, 237–250. Paris: Gallimard.

Bickerman, Elias J. 2007. The Septuagint as a translation. *Studies in Jewish and Christian history*, ed. by Amram Tropper, 163–194. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Biraud, Michèle. 2010. *Les interjections du théâtre grec antique*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.

Bisang, Walter. 2009. Serial verb constructions. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 3.792–819.

Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner & Robert W. Funk. 1961 [1896]. *A Greek grammar of the New Testament and other early Christian literature*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Bonnot, Christine & Sophie Vassilaki. 2018. Syntagmes verbaux coordonnés désignant un seul procès en russe et en grec moderne. Paper presented at the TOPE, INALCO (4th May, 2018).

Bonnot, Christine & Sophie Vassilaki. 2021. Entre phraséologie et conditionnement contextuel: le cas des constructions pseudo-coordonnées en russe et en grec moderne. *Lexique* 29.191–209 (special issue *Les phraséologismes pragmatiques. Préfabrication et lexiculture*, ed. by Gaétane Dostie & Dorota Sikora).

Bruce, Les. 1988. Serialization: From syntax to lexicon. *Studies in Language* 12.19–49.

Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins & William Pagliuca. 1994. *The evolution of grammar. Tense, aspect, and modality in the language of the world*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Chrzanowski, Jaroslaw. 2011. *Verbal hendiadys revisited: Grammaticalization and auxiliation in Biblical Hebrew verbs*. PhD dissertation, The Catholic University of America.

Coseriu, Eugenio. 1977 [1966]. "Tomo y me voy": Un problema de sintaxis comparada europea. *Estudios de lingüística románica*, 79–151. Madrid: Gredos ["Tomo y me voy". Ein Problem vergleichender europäischer Syntax. *Vox romanica* 25.13–55].

Denizot, Camille. 2011. *Donner des ordres en grec ancien*. Mont-Saint-Aignan: Publications des Universités de Rouen et du Havre.

Dik, Simon. 1968. *Coordination. Its implications for the theory of general linguistics*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.

Fortson, Benjamin W. 2008. *Language and rhythm in Plautus: Synchronic and diachronic studies*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

García Ramón, José Luis. 2021. Anatolian and Greek in contact: The initive periphrasis Hom. βῆ δ' ἴμεν, Hitt. *dai- /-tiįa- +* supine *-uįan*, HLuv. *ta- +* infinitive. *Linguistic and cultural interactions between Greece and Anatolia: In search of the Golden Fleece*, ed. by Michele Bianconi, 80–107. Leiden: Brill.

Givón, Talmy. 1991. Serial verbs and the mental reality of "event": Grammatical vs. cog-

nitive packaging. *Approaches to grammaticalization*, ed. by Elizabeth Closs Traugott & Bernd Heine, vol. 1, 81–127. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Givón, Talmy. 2001. *Syntax: An introduction*. Vol. 2. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Goldenberg, Gideon. 1971. Tautological infinitive. *Israel Oriental Studies* 1.36–85. Reprinted in Gideon Goldenberg. 1998. *Studies in Semitic linguistics: Selected writings*, 66–115. Jerusalem: Magnes Press.

Goodwin, William. 1890. *Syntax of the moods and tenses of the Greek verb*. Boston: Ginn & Company.

Grammenidis, Simos. 1994. The Verbs πηγαίνω and έρχομαι in Modern Greek. *Themes in Greek linguistics: Papers from the First International Conference on Greek Linguistics* (*Reading, September 1993*), ed. by Irene Philippaki-Warburton, Katerina Nicolaidis & Maria Sifianou, 193–199. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Guillaume, Antoine & Harold Koch. 2021. Introduction: Associated Motion as a grammatical category in linguistic typology. *Associated Motion*, ed. by Antoine Guillaume & Harold Koch, 3–29. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Hajek, John. 2006. Serial Verbs in Tetun Dili. In Aikhenvald & Dixon, 239–253.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2007. Coordination. *Language typology and syntactic description*, ed. by Timothy Shopen, 1–51. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hoarau, Lucie. 1997. *Étude contrastive de la coordination en français et en anglais*. Paris: Ophrys.

Hock, Hans H. 2002. Vedic éta … stávāma: Subordinate, coordinate, or what? *Indo-European perspectives*, ed. by Mark Southern, 89–102. Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man.

Hock, Hans H. 2014. Come and Get It: The Indo-European Background of the Vedic *éta … stávāma* Construction. *Proceedings of the 24th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*, ed. by Stephanie W. Jamison, H. Craig Melchert & Brent Vine, 47–66. Bremen: Hempen.

Hommerberg, Charlotte & Gunnel Tottie. 2007. Try to or try and? Verb complementation in British and American English. *ICAME Journal* 31.45–64.

Horrocks, Geoffrey. 2010 [1997]. *Greek: A history of the language and its speakers*. 2nd edn. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

van den Hout, Theo. 2003. Studies in the Hittite phraseological construction I: Its syntactic and semantic properties. *Hittite studies in honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the occasion of his 65th birthday*, ed. by Gary Beckman, Richard Beal & Gregory McMahon, 177–203. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

van den Hout, Theo. 2010. Studies in the Hittite phraseological construction II: Its origin. *Hethitica XVI: Studia Anatolica in memoriam Erich Neu dicata*, ed. by René Lebrun & Julien De Vos, 191–204. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.

Joseph, Brian. 1990. On arguing for serial verbs (with particular reference to Modern Greek). *When verbs collide: Papers from the* (*1990*) *Ohio State Mini-Conference on*

Serial Verbs, ed. by Brian Joseph & Arnold Zwicky. *Ohio State University Working Papers in Linguistics* 39.77–90.

Joüon, Paul & Takamitsu Muraoka. 2018 [1991]. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. 2nd edn. Roma: Gregorian and Biblical Press.

Kawashima, Robert S. 2010. 'Orphaned' Converted Tense Forms in Classical Biblical Hebrew Prose. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 55.1.11–35.

Kim, Yoo-Ko. 2009. *The function of the tautological infinitive in Classical Biblical Hebrew*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Kölligan, Daniel. Forthcoming. Multiverb constructions in Classical Armenian. *Festschrift Lucio Melazzo*, ed. by Annamaria Bartolotta. Palermo: Palermo University Press.

Lambdin, Thomas O. 1971. *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew*. New York: Scribner.

Lang, Ewald. 1984. *The semantics of coordination*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2016. From coordination to subordination: The grammaticalization of progressive and andative aspect in the dialects of Salento. *Coordination and subordination*, ed. by Fernanda Pratas, Sandra Pereira & Clara Pinto, 157–184. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Létoublon, Françoise. 1982. Les verbes de mouvement en grec: de la métaphore à l' auxiliarité? *Glotta* 60.178–196.

Liddell, Henry G., Robert Scott, Henry S. Jones. 1996 [1843]. *A Greek-English lexicon*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lillas, Rosmari. 2012. *Hendiadys in the Hebrew Bible. An investigation of the applications of the term*. PhD Dissertation, University of Gothenburg. http://hdl.handle.net/2077/29024

Lødrup, Helge. 2002. The syntactic structures of Norwegian pseudocoordinations. *Studia Linguistica* 56.2.121–143.

Logozzo, Felicia & Liana Tronci. 2019. Subordination vs coordination: la traduction latine des participes du verbe ἔρχομαι dans les Évangiles. *De Lingua Latina, revue de linguistique latine du Centre Alfred Ernout* 18.1–35. https://lettres.sorbonne-universite.fr/sites/default/files/media/2020-05/revlinglaternout_dll_18-logozzo_tronci.pdf

Logozzo, Felicia & Liana Tronci. 2020a. Nota sulle costruzioni "a participio pleonastico" in greco antico: il tipo ἐλθὼν κατῴκησεν. *Atti del Sodalizio Glottologico Milanese* 14.85–108.

Logozzo, Felicia & Liana Tronci. 2020b. Les constructions à verbe εἶναι 'être' et participe présent: *status quaestionis* et nouvelles propositions. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 115.191–239.

Logozzo, Felicia & Liana Tronci. Forthcoming. Motion and posture verbs in multiverb constructions: evidence from the New Testament. *Alloglōssoi. Multilingualism and minority languages in ancient Europe*, ed. by Albio Cesare Cassio & Sara Kaczko. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Lovestrand, Joseph. 2018. *Serial verb constructions in Barayin: Typology, description and Lexical-Functional Grammar*. PhD Dissertation, University of Oxford.

Lovestrand, Joseph & Daniel Ross. 2021. Serial verb constructions and motion semantics. *Associated Motion*, ed. by Antoine Guillaume & Harold Koch, 87–128. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

McKay, Kenneth L. 1985. Aspect in imperatival constructions in New Testament Greek. *Novum Testamentum* 27.3.201–226.

Meillet, Antoine. 1962. *Études de linguistique et de philologie arméniennes. 1.* Lissabon: Imprensa Nacional.

van der Merwe, Christo, Jacobus Naudé & Jan Kroeze. 2017. *A Biblical Hebrew reference grammar. Second Edition*. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.

Muraoka, Takamitsu. 1985. *Emphatic words and structures in Biblical Hebrew*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press.

Muraoka, Takamitsu. 1997. *Classical Syriac: A basic grammar with a chrestomathy*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Muraoka, Takamitsu. 2016. *A syntax of Septuagint Greek*. Leuven: Peeters.

Nestle, Eberhard, Erwin Nestle, Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini & Bruce M. Metzger. 2014. *Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine*. Munster: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Orlandini, Anna & Paolo Poccetti. 2008. Liens de coordination: une approche sémantique à travers les langues anciennes. *Revue de sémantique et pragmatique* 24.93–113.

Orlandini, Anna & Paolo Poccetti. 2012. Le futur dans les langues anciennes. *De Lingua Latina, revue de linguistique latine du Centre Alfred Ernout* 12.1–26. https://lettres.sorbonne-universite.fr/sites/default/files/media/2020-05/dll_12_a-orlandini-p-_poccetti_futur.pdf

Pinault, Georges-Jean. 2005. Impératif et exhortation en tokharien. *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel. Akten des XI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, 17.–23. September 2000, Halle an der Saale*, ed. by Gerhard Meiser & Olav Hackstein, 495–523. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Robertson, Archibald T. 1919. *A grammar of the Greek New Testament in the light of historical research*. New York: Hodder & Stoughton.

Rohdenburg, Günter. 2003. Cognitive complexity and *horror aequi* as factors determining the use of interrogative clause linkers in English. *Determinants of grammatical variation in English*, ed. by Günter Rohdenburg & Britta Mondorf, 205–249. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Ross, Daniel. 2013. *Verbal Pseudocoordination in English: A syntactic analysis with reference to diachronic, dialectal and cross-linguistic variation*. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Qualifying Exam Paper. http://hdl.handle.net/2142/42581

Ross, Daniel. 2016a. Between coordination and subordination: typological, structural

and diachronic perspectives on pseudocoordination. *Coordination and subordination*: *form and meaning*, ed. by Fernanda Pratas, Sandra Pereira & Clara Pinto, 209–243. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Ross, Daniel. 2016b. Going to surprise. The grammaticalization of itive as mirative. *Online proceedings of Cognitive Linguistics in Wrocław Web Conference 2016*. https:// sites.google.com/site/coglingwroc2/

Ross, Daniel, Ryan Grunow, Kelsey Lac, George Jabbour & Jack Dempsey. 2015. *Serial verb constructions: A distributional and typological perspective*. Paper presented at the *Illinois Language and Linguistics Society* (*ILLS*) 7 (17 April 2015). http://hdl.handle .net/2142/88844

Ross, John R. 1967. *Constraints on variables in syntax*. PhD Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Roussou, Anna. 2006. *Συμπληρωματικοί δείκτες*. Athens: Πατακης.

Sebba, Mark. 1987. *The syntax of serial verbs: an investigation into serialisation in Sranan and other languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Svorou, Soteria. 2018a. Motion verb integration and core cosubordination in Modern Greek. *Applying and expanding Role and Reference Grammar*, ed. by Rolf Kailuweit, Lisann Künkel & Eva Staudinger, 281–304. University of Freiburg. https://freidok.uni -freiburg.de/data/16830

Svorou, Soteria. 2018b. Constructional pressures on 'sit' in Modern Greek. *Functionalist and usage-based approaches to the study of language: In honor of Joan L. Bybee*, ed. by K. Aaron Smith & Dawn Nordquist, 17–58. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

von Tischendorf, Konstantin. 1869–1872. *Novum Testamentum graece, ed. VIII critica maior* (2 vol.). Lipsiae: Giesecke & Devrient.

Tronci, Liana. 2018. Aorist voice patterns in the diachrony of Greek. The New Testament as a sample of Koine. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 18.2.241–280.

Turner, Nigel. 1963. *A grammar of New Testament Greek—J.H. Moulton. Vol. III. Syntax*. London/New York: T&T Clark.

de Vos, Mark. 2005. *The syntax of verbal pseudo-coordination in English and Afrikaans*. Utrecht: LOT.

Yates, Anthony D. 2011. *Homeric ΒΗ Δ'ΙΕΝΑΙ: A Diachronic and Comparative Approach*. Master's thesis. University of Georgia. https://getd.libs.uga.edu/pdfs/yates_anthony _d_201108_ma.pdf

Yates, Anthony D. 2014a. On the PIE 'Quasi-Serial Verb' construction: Origin and development. *Proceedings of the 25th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*, ed. by Stephanie W. Jamison, H. Craig Melchert & Brent Vine, 237–255. Bremen: Hempen.

Yates, Anthony D. 2014b. Homeric ΒΗ Δ'ΙΕΝΑΙ: A Serial Verb Construction in Greek? Paper presented at the 145th Annual Meeting of the American Philological Association (3–5 January 2014), Chicago, IL.

Wiklund, Anna-Lena. 2007. *The syntax of tenselessness: Tense/mood/aspect-agreeing infinitivals.* Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Zimbardi, Emanuele. 2021. *La traduzione greca del sermone su Ninive e Giona di Efrem siro. Nuova edizione critica e studio sulla tecnica di traduzione.* Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.

A Appendix

A.1 *NT*

ἀνίστημι
SYNDETIC TYPE
   Jh. 11.31 (ind. aor.)
   Act.Ap. 8.26 (imp.)
   Act.Ap. 9.6 (imp.)
   Act.Ap. 9.34 (imp.)
   Act.Ap. 26.16 (imp.)

ἀπέρχομαι
SYNDETIC TYPE
   Mt. 8.21 (inf.)
   Mk. 5.20 (ind. aor.)
   Jh. 9.7 (ind. aor.)
   Jh. 11.28 (ind. aor.)

ἐγείρω
ASYNDETIC TYPE (only imp.):
   Mk. 2.11
   Jh. 5.8
SYNDETIC TYPE
   Mt. 8.15 (ind. aor. + ipfv.)
   Mt. 9.6 (imp.)
   Mk. 2.9 (imp.)
   Mk. 2.11 (imp.)
   Lk. 5.23 (imp.)
   Lk. 6.8 (imp.)
   Apoc. 11.1 (imp.)

ἐξέρχομαι
SYNDETIC TYPE
   Mk. 1.35 (ind. aor.)
   Lk. 13.31 (imp.)
   Jh. 18.4 (ind. aor. + prs.)
   Jh. 21.3 (ind. aor.)

ἔρχομαι
SYNDETIC TYPE
   Mt. 17.11 (ind. prs. + fut.)
   Mk. 2.18 (ind. prs.)
   Mk. 5.33 (ind. aor.)
   Mk. 6.29 (ind. aor.)
   Lk. 5.7 (ind. aor.)
   Lk. 12.38 (sbjv.)
   Lk. 20.16 (ind. fut.)
   Jh. 1.39 (imp.)
   Jh. 1.46 (imp.)
   Jh. 6.15 (inf.)
   Jh. 11.34 (imp.)
   Jh. 15.22 (ind. aor.)
   Jh. 19.38 (ind. aor.)
   Apoc. 5.7 (ind. aor. + pf.)
   Apoc. 8.3 (ind. aor.)

ἵστημι
SYNDETIC TYPE
   Lk. 13.25 (inf.)
   Jh. 3.29 (ptcp.)
   Jh. 12.29 (ptcp.)
   Jh. 18.25 (ptcp.)
   Act.Ap. 11.13 (ptcp.)
   Act.Ap. 16.9 (ptcp.)

καταβαίνω
SYNDETIC TYPE:
   Jh. 4.47 (sbjv.)
   Act.Ap. 10.20 (imp.)

λαμβάνω
ASYNDETIC TYPE (only imp.):
   Mt. 26.26 (imp.)

πορεύομαι
SYNDETIC TYPE:
    Mt. 12.45 (ind. prs.)
    Jh. 7.35 (inf.)
    Jh. 14.3 (sbjv.)
    Act.Ap. 5.19 (imp.)

σπεύδω
SYNDETIC TYPE:
    Act.Ap. 22.18 (imp.)

τρέχω
SYNDETIC TYPE:
    Mk. 5.6 (ind. aor.)
    Jh. 20.2 (ind. prs.)

ὑπάγω
ASYNDETIC TYPE (only imp.):

Mt. 5.24
Mt. 8.4
Mt. 18.15
Mt. 19.21
Mt. 21.28
Mt. 27.65
Mt. 28.10
Mk. 1.44
Mk. 6.38
Mk. 10.21
Mk. 16.7
Jh. 4.16
Jh. 9.7
Apoc. 10.8
SYNDETIC TYPE:
    Mt. 13.44 (ind. prs.)
    Jh. 15.16 (sbjv.)
    Apoc. 16.1 (imp.)

A.2   LXX

ἀνίστημι
ASYNDETIC TYPE (only imp.):
    Ge. 21.17
    De. 9.12
    Jd. (Alex.) 7.9
    3 Ki. 19.7; 20.7; 20.15
    2 Es. 9.5
    Ca. 2.10; 2.13
    Ec. 31.21
    Mi. 6.1
    Is. 52.2
    Je. 13.6
    La. 2.18
    Da. 7.5
    Da. (Theodotionis) 7.5
SYNDETIC TYPE
a. *Imperatives+Exhort. Sbjv.:*
    Ge. 19.14; 31.13
    Ex. 12.31; 32.1
    De. 2.13; 2.24; 32.38

1 Ki. 16.12; 23.4
2 Ki. 13.15; 17.21
3 Ki. 12.24g; 12.24h; 17.8; 19.5; 20.17
1 Ch. 22.16
2 Es. 10.3
2 Es. 12.18 (sbjv. 1pl)
1 Ma. 9.8 (sbjv. 1pl)
Odae 2.38
Mi. 2.9; 4.12
Jn. 1.1; 1.6; 3.1
Is. 32.9
Je. 2.27; 13.4; 18.1; 30.23; 30.25; 38.6
Je. 26.16 (sbjv. 1pl)
Ez. 3.22
b. *Other Moods:*
    2 Ki. 12.21 (ind. aor.)
    2 Ki. 23.9 (ind. aor.)
    4 Ki. 3.24 (ind. aor.)
    To. (Vat.+Alex.) 12.13 (inf.)
    Ps. 19.9 (ind. aor.)

Ho. 6.2 (ind. fut.)
Am. 9.11 (ind. fut.)
Is. 28.21 (ind. fut.)
Je. 2,28 (ind. fut.)
Je. 44.10 (ind. fut.)
Da. (Theodotionis) 11.31 (ind. fut.)

βαδίζω

ASYNDETIC TYPE (only imp.):
Ex. 4.19; 6.5; 10.24; 19.24; 32.34
De. 5.29; 10.11
2 Ki. 24.1
Ho. 1.2
Am. 7.12; 7.15
Je. 12.9; 43.19
Ez. 3.4; 3.11
Da. 12.13

SYNDETIC TYPE
a. *Imperatives+Exhort. Sbjv.:*
Ge. 42.19
Ex. 12.31
De. 13.7 (sbjv. 1pl)
Jd. 10.13
2 Ki. 7.3
To. 2.2
Je. 13.1; 17.19; 19.1; 35.12
b. *Other Moods:*
1 Es. (paocryphus) 4.4 (ind. prs.)

πορεύομαι

ASYNDETIC TYPE (only imp.):
Imperatives+Exhort. Sbjv.:
Ex. 5.17 (sbjv. 1pl)
Ex. 12.32; 33.1
Jd. (Vat.) 21.20
1 Ki. 20.40; 26.19
2 Ki. 3.16; 14.21
3 Ki. 18.8; 18.11; 18.14; 19.15
1 Ch. 21.2
2 Ch. 34.20

2 Es. 5.15
2 Es. 18.10

SYNDETIC TYPE
a. *Imperatives+Exhort. Sbjv.:*
Ex. 5.7; 10.8
Ex. 5.8 (sbjv.1pl)
De. 13.3; 13.14 (sbjv.1pl)
De. 20.5; 20.6; 20.7; 20.8
Jo. 18.8
Jd. (Alex.) 18.2; 21.10
Jd. (Vat.) 10.13; 18.2; 21.10
1 Ki. 15.18; 20.11
1 Ki. 15.3; 22.5; 23.2 (imp&fut)
2 Ki. 7.4; 14.30; 24.11
3 Ki. 2.29; 2.31; 18.1
1 Ch. 17.3; 21.9
Es. 4,13
To. (Sin.) 13.14
1 Ma. 1.11 (sbjv.1pl)
1 Ma. 5.17
Ho. 3.1
Ho. 5.15 (sbjv.1pl)
Za. 6.7
Is. 6.9; 20.2; 38.4
Je. 3.11; 22.1; 42.13; 46.15
b. *Other Moods:*
Ge. 22.3 (ind. aor.)
Ex. 4.18 (ind. fut.)
Nu. 32.41 (ind. aor.)
Nu. 32.42 (ind. aor.)
Jd. (Alex.) 4.24 (ptcp.)
Jd. (Vat.) 18.9 (inf.)
1 Ki. 2.26 (ind. ipfv.)
1 Ki. 17.32 (ind. fut.)
1 Ki. 17.36 (ind. fut.)
1 Ki. 23.2 (ind. fut.)
2 Ki. 3.1.2 (ind. ipfv.)
2 Ki. 3.1.3 (ind. ipfv.)
2 Ki. 5.10 (ptcp.)
2 Ki. 17.17 (ind. prs.)

4 Ki. 9.15 (inf.)   Ho. 5.14 (ind. fut.)
1 Ch. 11.8 (ptcp.)   Ho. 5.15 (ind. fut.)
Ju. 10.13 (ind. fut.)   Jn. 1.11 (ind. ipfv.)
To. (Vat.+Alex.) 8.10 (ind. aor.)   Jn. 1.13 (ind. ipfv.)
1 Ma. 12.17 (inf.)   Is. 28.13 (sbjv. aor.)
Ho. 1.2 (ind. aor.)   Je. 10.23 (ind. fut.)
Ho. 2.9 (ind. fut.)