Caterina Mauri and Andrea Sansò

Go and *come* as sources of directive constructions[1]

1 Introduction: motion deixis and directive speech acts

Being crucial to the management of interpersonal relationships, directive speech acts (orders, suggestions, exhortations) are very frequent in everyday conversation. Directive forms (imperatives, hortatives, jussives, etc.)[2] are often among the simplest verbal forms of a language, and this is especially true in the case of 2nd person (singular) directives, which in most languages correspond to the verbal root (or to a minimally marked form of the verb). Frequency and simplicity are among the reasons why such forms are particularly subject to processes of diachronic renewal. Moreover, ordinary requirements of politeness usually make the use of flat imperatives inappropriate in normal conversation and speakers are therefore prone to find indirect means to reach their illocutionary goals: highly frequent indirect speech acts may become conventionalized and thus become systematically associated with a directive illocutionary force.

The patterns by which various morphosyntactic strategies are exploited to convey orders are known from a considerable amount of mostly language-specific pragmatic analyses (see, for instance, the survey in Aikhenvald 2010:

---

1 This paper is the result of joint work by the two authors. However, for academic purposes, Caterina Mauri is responsible for Sections 2 and 4 and Andrea Sansò is responsible for Sections 1 and 3. We wish to thank two anonymous referees for their insightful comments on a previous draft of the article. The usual disclaimers apply.

2 The term "imperative" is normally reserved for directive forms in which the intended performer of the action is the addressee (*go!*), whereas the labels "hortative" and "jussive" are generally used in grammars to indicate 1st person plural directives (*let's go!*), and 3rd person directives (*let him/her/them go!*) respectively. This terminological variety reflects the fact that forms encoding directive speech acts addressed to different performers are seldom formally homogeneous within a given language. In this paper, however, we will adopt the label *directive(s)* to refer to the set of forms that encode positive directive situations in a language (i.e. to the exclusion of so-called prohibitives), because there are both cases in which a given directive strategy extends non-randomly from one person to another (see, for instance, Mauri & Sansò 2011: 3504, 3506, and *passim*), and languages in which a formally homogeneous directive paradigm for all the persons exists (van der Auwera et al., 2003: 50). These facts are suggestive of the existence of a semantic/conceptual core common to all directive situations, independently of the performer, which might be concealed by the plethora of terms used to refer to forms encoding them.

346–350). In Mauri and Sansò (2011) we have presented a detailed account of the recurrent processes leading to the emergence and conventionalization of directive strategies based on a large language sample and on the available cross-linguistic evidence. These processes include:

(i) the *cooptation* of strategies originally attested in indirect speech acts through conventionalization of pragmatic implicatures; the source strategies in these cases are primarily devoted to the expression of futurity/imminence (e.g. future constructions), or to the expression of the speaker's wish (e.g. optative constructions);

(ii) cases of *insubordination*, i.e. processes in which syntactically embedded directives (e.g. complement clauses after manipulative or desiderative predicates) become syntactically independent directive clauses; and

(iii) cases of *grammaticalization*, i.e. processes in which various source constructions involving a limited number of lexical sources develop directive functions. The source constructions share a twofold internal structure consisting of two events (preliminary action and ordered event), and the directive form referring to the preliminary action grammaticalizes into a general directive marker.

Along with permissive verbs (*let/allow*) and verbs of saying (*tell*), directive forms of deictic motion verbs are by and large one of the most frequent lexical sources in the processes of grammaticalization of directives (Mauri and Sansò 2011: 3496–3502) alluded to in (iii). As will be discussed below, this fact may be either interpreted as a piece of evidence in favour of the versatility of these two verbs, which are involved as lexical sources in plenty of grammaticalization processes, or may be suggestive of a closer connection between deictic motion and directive speech acts.

The literature on directive speech acts has not failed to acknowledge that motion deixis is relevant for this type of speech acts. It is well-known, for instance, that in many languages there are directional affixes denoting, among other meanings, motion away from or towards the speaker that are incompatible with forms other than directives (Aikhenvald 2010: 136–138; cf. (1)), and that it is cross-linguistically very frequent to find suppletive directive forms for the two verbs 'go' and 'come' (Veselinova 2007: 139; Aikhenvald 2010: 33–37; cf. (2)–(3)):

(1) Tariana (Arawak)

    a. *pi-ñha-si*
       2SG-eat-PROXIMAL.IMP
       'Eat here!'
       (Aikhenvald 2010: 136)

    b. *pi-ñha-kada*
       2SG-eat-DISTAL.IMP
       'Eat over there!'
       (Aikhenvald 2010: 136)

(2)   Modern Greek (Indo-European, Hellenic)

    'come'

    erx-ese   come-PRS.IND.2SG

    erx-ete   come- PRS.IND.2PL

    ela   come:IMP.2SG

    ela-te   come:IMP-IMP.2PL   (Veselinova 2007: 137)

(3)   Yucatec (Mayan)

    a. root *b'in* 'go' → imperative   *xen* 'go!'

                             hortative   *ko'ox* 'let's go (you and I)';

                                          ko'on-e'ex 'let's go (you all and I)'

                                          (Hofling and Ojeda 1994: 279)

    b. root *tal* 'come' → imperative   *ko'oten* 'come!'

                                          (Hofling and Ojeda 1994: 284)

Suppletive directives for verbs of motion outnumber suppletive directives for other verbs, representing 70% of suppletive imperatives across languages (Veselinova 2006: 139). As suppletive (and, more generally, irregular) forms tend to correlate with high frequency of occurrence, this fact may be suggestive of a great frequency of orders involving motion away from or towards the speaker in everyday conversation, or, at least, of their *saliency* as directive speech acts.[3]

In grammaticalization studies too, the existence of pathways of change in which deictic motion verbs are involved as lexical sources of directive forms is widely recognized. Heine and Kuteva (2002), for instance, acknowledge the existence of two paths of semantic change that lead to the development of what they call 'hortative' strategies. In both paths a deictic motion verb is involved as the

---

3 Note, however, that the frequency of suppletive imperatives of 'go' and 'come' may have more complex motivations than the frequency of the corresponding speech acts or their saliency in conversation. Veselinova (2006: 141–146) correctly observes that suppletive imperatives of motion verbs can be the result of the inclusion of exhortative particles (often of unclear origin) into a verbal paradigm: in these cases, it is the ellipsis of the morphological imperative that leads to the reinterpretation of the former particle as an imperative form, and to its integration into the paradigm. Suppletive imperatives may also arise in situations of intense discourse contact ("from a language with greater prestige and whose speakers have more power to the speakers who have less", Veselinova 2006: 147): cf. Bulgarian *ela*, come.IMP.2SG, from Greek *ela*. Still, it is a fact that only with motion verbs (and with the verb 'look') such phenomena (borrowing, integration of particles into the paradigm) are robustly attested, so that in the end these suppletive imperatives can be considered as "lexical expressions for a category that is *highly relevant* to the sense of verbs which express motion, and are obviously *very often used* in the imperative" (Veselinova 2006: 146, [our emphasis]).

lexical source of the construction: *come > hortative* (Heine & Kuteva 2002: 69) and *go > hortative* (Heine and Kuteva 2002: 159). According to Aikhenvald (2010: 346–351), deictic motion verbs have the potential for developing into imperative markers by virtue of their "purposeful overtones" (Aikhenvald 2010: 349), and because "semantics of motion is intrinsically linked to a change of state or creating a new situation" (Aikhenvald 2010: 349). Neither Heine and Kuteva nor Aikhenvald, however, seem to draw any distinction between (i) the development of 'go'/'come' into general directive markers and (ii) the more widespread pattern by which imperatives of motion verbs develop into expressive/emphatic markers with an exhortative meaning (see also Bravo, this volume). The latter path leads to non-obligatory encouragement, exhortative or emphatic devices acting at the discourse level (e.g. as discourse markers) and frequently (but not exclusively) occurring in directive contexts. The former instead is a *bona fide* instance of a grammaticalization process ending up in a new grammatical strategy (e.g. a bound imperative morpheme, a new imperative construction, etc.). Consider the example from Baure in (4): the free particle *pa* (< 'go'), directly preceding the verb, has an emphatic function and can be used to reinforce either an assertion (the two clauses in (4a) are both answers to a question such as "Who will eat it?") or a command (as in (4b)). However, it cannot be argued that *pa* has grammaticalized into a general directive marker, rather its function is similar to that of English *come on* or German *komm* (see exx. (5) and (6)).

(4) Baure (Arawak)

a. *pa nti' nikier! pa nti'-niš!*
    pa   nti'   nik=ro   /   pa   nti'=niš
    EMPH 1SG 1SG.eat=3SG.M   EMPH 1SG=EXCLAM
    'I will eat it!' 'Well, I will!'   (Danielsen 2007: 292)

b. *to pa pihirikašan nan siy-ye*
    to   pa   pi=hirik-a-ša-no   nan   siy-ye
    ART EMPH 2SG=sit-LK-IRR-IMP here chair-LOC
    'Go, sit here on the chair!'   (Danielsen 2007: 292)

(5 German

a. *Komm, denk darüber nach!*   b. *Komm, geh jetzt!*
    come   think about:it after   come   go   now
    'Come on, think about it!'   'Come on, go now!'

(6) English

Come on, finish your essay!

In Mauri & Sansò (2011: 3496–3497), we have argued that the motivation behind these grammaticalization processes cannot simply boil down to the fact that 'go' and 'come', which are said to imply telicity and change of state, have a high potential for grammaticalization as directive markers: such an explanation is simplistic and does not account for a number of facts. For instance, as will become clear in the following discussion, 'go' verbs grammaticalize into directive markers for 2nd person performers and, to a lesser extent, for 1st person plural performers, whereas 'come' verbs develop into directive markers for 1st person plural performers exclusively, i.e. there are some performers that seem to act as bridgeheads for these grammaticalization paths. How can this be explained by simply taking into account the change-of-state semantics of the two verbs?

The aim of this paper is to answer this question by addressing the complex net of factors at play in the development of directive values out of deictic motion verbs. To do this, we will first discuss data from a number of unrelated languages showing how motion verbs may acquire a general (non-motion) directive function, and secondly we will complete the picture by comparing these paths with other diachronic scenarios involving motion verbs as sources of grammatical meanings.

The paper is based on a convenience sample of 200 languages, chosen with a view to maximizing genealogical diversity but with little or no statistical concerns, as we have decided to focus on grammars of languages for which enough data on imperatives and related constructions were available, and we have included grammars of closely related languages whenever it appeared useful to compare diachronic developments in such languages. Directive strategies based on motion verbs are attested in 20 languages of the sample (10%) and are more or less evenly distributed between 'go' and 'come' verbs. We generally followed our primary sources in the evaluation of a given directive form as historically derived from (or synchronically related to) a certain motion construction (mainly cases in which there is a marker which is synchronically polysemous or there is sufficient resemblance between the source construction and the target construction). This allows us to take the source–target relationship for granted. When the grammar is not explicit or simply by-passes the question of the possible lexical origins of a directive marker, insights into the possible diachronic source of a given marker could come from reconstructions within a given language family or from cross-linguistic comparison.

This paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 we examine the grammaticalization paths in which there is a source construction involving some form of 'go' verbs. These paths are compared with other grammaticalization paths involving 'go' as a source meaning. In Section 3 we discuss the grammaticalization of 'come' as a directive marker: it turns out that this verb (or, more pre-

cisely, complex constructions formed with a directive form of this verb) gives rise to directive constructions addressed to 1st person plural performers. Some conclusions about these processes are presented in Section 4, where we also try to answer some more general questions concerning the role of the deictic motion semantics of 'go' and 'come' verbs in their reinterpretation as directive markers.

2 "Go" > directive

2.1 Go > itive directive

In some languages, the verb meaning 'go' may give rise to *specialized itive directive markers*, thus maintaining its source motion value. For instance, in Jingulu it is possible to encode directive speech acts addressed to 2nd persons by means of a construction in which the imperative of motion */-yirri/* (lit. 'go.IMP') is suffixed to the verb stem, resulting in directives that involve motion away from the site of commanding ('go and do X!').

(7)   Jingulu (Australian, West Barkly)

   ngunu   buba miji-yirri
   DEM(N) fire   get-go.IMP
   'Go get some firewood!'   (Pensalfini 2003: 230–231)

A similar situation is attested in Sipakapense Maya and in Toqabaqita. In Sipakapense Maya there is a special deictic imperative formed by means of the prefix j-, related to the irregular imperative of the verb 'go' (*jat*). This special imperative is possible with all persons:

(8)   Sipakapense Maya (Mayan)

   a. *jo', ji'cha'n k'chi' ruk' Liy tla'.*
       jo',   j+iY+cha'+n   k'a+chi'   r+uk'   Liy tla'
       go:1PL.IMP MOT.IMP+3.ABS+talk+AAP then+well 3SG-with Liy over.there
       'Let's go, let's go talk with Liy over there, then'   (Barrett 1999: 89–90)

   b. *jilq'o'!*
       j+∅+i+loq'+V'
       MOT.IMP+3SG.ABS+2.ERG+buy+MOD
       'Go buy it!'   (Barrett 1999: 89–90)

In Toqabaqita, the verb *lae* 'go' combines with other verbs to form itive directives for 2nd person and 1st person plural performers:

(9)   Toqabaqita (Austronesian, Eastern Malayo-Polynesian, Oceanic)

    a. *lae moro   fanga naqa*
       go 2DU.NFUT eat   PFV
       'Go eat now (you two)!'   (Lichtenberk 2008: 857)

    b. *lae kulu   qili nguda*
       go PL.INCL.NFUT dig crab
       'Let's go digging for crabs!'   (Lichtenberk 2008: 857)

2.2 Go > simple (non-motion) directive

In a number of languages, 'go' develops into a directive marker *tout court*, without any reference to motion. In Tetun, *bá* 'go' is used after other verbs in commands or invitations for the addressee to do something without the speaker, even in those contexts in which no motion is implied, as in (10):

(10)   Tetun (Austronesian, Central Malayo-Polynesian)

    imi hán bá
    2PL eat go
    'You (plural) eat up!'   (Williams-van Klinken *et al.* 2002: 68)

In Vietnamese the motion verb *đi* 'go, go ahead' combines with other verbs (including *đi* itself) to form a directive construction in which the motion component is not necessarily there:

(11)   Vietnamese (Austro-Asiatic, Mon-Khmer, Viet-Nuong)

    a. *mẹ   đi ngủ đi, khuya rồi!*
       mother go sleep IMP late   PFV
       'Go to bed, mother, it is late'   (Nguyễn 1997: 242)

    b. *ăn đi, ăn cho hết   bát canh, con ạ!*
       eat IMP eat for exhaust bowl soup child IMP
       'Eat, sonny, eat the whole bowl of soup'
                   (Bystrov & Stankevič 2001: 465–466)

A similar construction is also attested in Cambodian (Spatar 1997), another Mon-Khmer language, where the verb 'go' is the plausible source of a general (non-itive) imperative marker. In Cambodian, orders addressed to 2nd persons may be realized either by means of the bare verb form (identical to the indicative) or by means of the verb form accompanied by dedicated imperative markers (preposed or postposed, Spatar 1997: 119–121). One of these postposed imperative markers, *daw*, is a homonym of the motion verb 'go'. Although no clear diachronic arguments are provided, Spatar (1997: 122) suggests that the directive verb form *daw* 'go!' (exemplified in (12a), followed by the imperative marker *cuh*) and the directive marker *daw* (exemplified in (12b), where the motion component is absent) may be etymologically related. Diachronic evidence from other genetically close languages (e.g. Vietnamese above) makes Spatar's hypothesis highly plausible.

(12)   Cambodian (Austro-Asiatic, Mon-Khmer, Khmer)

    a. *daw phsa:r   ja:muay pangsri: aeng cuh*
       go   market with   sister   you   IMP
       'Go to the market with your sister.'   (Spatar 1997: 120)

    b. *an su:m a:n   pantic -p:anheiy a:n   daw*
       I beg read a little okay   read IMP
       'May I read? Okay, read!'   (Spatar 1997: 121)

Directive forms of 'go' may develop into non-motion directive markers also with *1st person plural performers*. In Yucatec there is a rather complex system for 1st person plural directives, involving two suppletive directive forms of 'go' for 1st person plural (*ko'ox* 'let's go [you.and.I]' and *ko'on-e'ex* 'let's go [you.all.and.I]'). In directive situations addressed to the speaker + the addressee, the two suppletive forms are followed by a subordinate clause introduced by the subordinator *j*, forming a general (non-deictic) directive strategy (see (13a,b)). When the verb in the subordinate clause is transitive, as in (13c,d), the picture is slightly more complicated, because two constructions may be used which differ in patient marking suffixes. When the subordinate verb is marked by *-ik* (as in (13c)), the construction only encodes the directive situation, without any reference to motion. On the other hand, when the subordinate patient marker *-e* occurs (as in (13d)), the dislocative semantics is retained and the construction encodes a directive situation in which the realization of the desired SoA requires motion away from the place where the order is uttered.

(13)   Yucatec (Hofling & Ojeda 1994: 284, 285)

    a. *ko'ox j   k'ay (túun)*   b. *ko'one'ex j   k'ay!*
       HORT SUBORD sing then   HORT   SUBORD sing
       'Let's sing (then)'   'Let's all sing'

    c. *ko'ox j   il-ik!*   d. *ko'ox j   il-e!*
       HORT SUBORD see-PPM   HORT SUBORD see-SPM
       'Let's see (about) it!'   'Let's go see it!'

The cross-linguistic data discussed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 provide evidence for a number of paths involving 'go' as a source of directive markers:

(14)   a. GO[DIRECTIVE.2PERSON] DO X > 2ND PERSON <u>DEICTIC</u> DIRECTIVE   [e.g. Jingulu]

      b. GO[DIRECTIVE.2PERSON] DO X > <u>DEICTIC</u> DIRECTIVE FOR ALL PERSONS
                                          [e.g. Sipakapense Maya]

      c. GO[DIRECTIVE.2PERSON] DO X > 2ND PERSON <u>NON-DEICTIC</u> DIRECTIVE
                                [e.g. Tetun, Vietnamese, Cambodian]

      d. GO[DIRECTIVE.1ST.PLURAL] (AND/IN ORDER TO) DO X
         > 1ST PERSON PLURAL <u>DEICTIC</u> DIRECTIVE   [e.g. Yucatec]

      e. GO[DIRECTIVE.1ST.PLURAL] (AND/IN ORDER TO) DO X
         > 1ST PERSON PLURAL <u>NON-DEICTIC</u> DIRECTIVE   [e.g. Yucatec]

In our sample there is no clear evidence to establish whether at least some of the paths in (14) can be conflated together. For instance, it is not clear whether the use of 'go' as an itive directive marker can be considered as an obligatory preliminary stage for the use of 'go' as a general, non-deictic directive marker: if this was the case, (14a) and (14c) could be thought of as two subsequent stages along the same path. Similarly, it is not clear whether the development of a deictic imperative out of a form originally meaning 'go' necessarily starts from 2nd person directives, and then extends to other performers: in this case, (14b) would represent the second step of the path in (14a).

    A number of further questions arise as to the nature and motivations of the development of 'go' into a directive marker. Firstly, it is debatable whether the grammaticalization of 'go' into a directive marker is an independent one or it is connected to the well-known pattern by which 'go' grammaticalizes into an aspectual prospective marker. A connection between the two paths has been explicitly postulated by Craig (1991) in Rama, where the verb 'go' is said to be involved in a case of "polygrammaticalization", i.e. as a set of grammaticaliza-

tion chains originating from the same particular lexical morpheme. The morpheme in question is *ba(ng)*, a suppletive form of the verb *taak* 'go' (which nowadays only survives in the 1st + 2nd person directive form *bang* 'let's go'). *Bang* undergoes grammaticalization as a prospective marker and as a marker of 1st person plural directives in which the meaning of motion is still retrievable, as in (15b).

(15)   Rama (Chibchan)

    a. *tiiskama ni-tanang-bang*
       baby   I-look_at-ASP
       'I'm going to look at the baby'   (Craig 1991: 457)

    b. *mwaing   yairi   s-tuk-bang*
       we   soup   1PL-drink-IMP
       'Let's (go) drink our soup!'   (Craig 1991: 485)

According to Craig, although various analyses of the relative timing of the two grammaticalization paths are possible, the two paths are interconnected, and the fact that the motion meaning is still preserved in 1st person plural directives formed with *-bang* suggests that "the use of *bang* in first person imperative … is the closest link between the free lexical motion verb *bang* and a bound aspect/mood marker *-bang*" (Craig 1991: 485). In the languages of our sample in which a 'go' > directive path is attested, however, there are no cases in which the same verb is also the source of prospective and future markers. Therefore, the existence of a path "'go' > directive" in a language does not entail the existence of a path "'go' > future/prospective" in the same language, and the two paths are only very loosely related. Whether this is due to the inherent goal-orientation of verbs meaning 'go', i.e. to the fact that such verbs, representing the most basic encoding of the cognitive schema SOURCE-PATH-GOAL happen to be good candidates for grammaticalization in functional domains (such as futurity and commands) in which the achievement of a goal is a salient component, as Kuteva (2001: 22) observes for the grammaticalization path "'go' > future", cannot be established without considering any single grammaticalization process in its own respect.

It is also tempting to think of the grammaticalization paths involving 'go' as a source as cases of serial verb constructions (henceforth SVCs), i.e. as sequences of verbs "which act together as a single predicate, without any overt marker of coordination, subordination, or syntactic dependency of any other sort" (Aikhenvald 2006: 1), especially given the fact that some of the languages discussed in this section (e.g. Vietnamese, Tetun) have SVCs. Directional motion

verbs are frequently involved in SVCs, and these constructions may grammaticalize into aspectual constructions: in other words, it cannot be excluded that the SVC verb + 'go' grammaticalizes first into an aspectual construction with a prospective/future meaning (much in the same way as "be going to" grammaticalizes into a future/prospective marker in English), and then, due to its inherent future-projection, the construction is used to encode directive situations.

An analysis of the patterns exemplified in this section as resulting from the grammaticalization of SVCs into aspectual constructions, however, is problematic. Take, for instance, Tetun. The motion verb *bá* in Tetun forms SVCs in which it follows other motion verbs indicating direction, as in (16a). Moreover, *bá* participates in another type of SVC, exemplified in (16b); in this type of construction it precedes another verb forming with it a non-contiguous structure, as demonstrated by the fact that postverbal adverbs can be optionally placed after either the first or the second verb:

(16)   Tetun

    a. *nia   sae   fali   bá*
       3SG ascend again go
       'He went up again.'   (Hajek 2006: 243)

    b. *sira [bá (fali) hariis] (fali) iha tasi*
       3PL go   again bathe   again LOC sea
       'They went to swim in the sea again.'   (Hajek 2006: 243)

The directive construction with *bá* differs from both these types of SVCs: on the one hand, *bá* appears after the other verb, as in (16a) and unlike (16b), but unlike the serial verb construction in (16a) directive *bá* combines with all verbs and is not limited to motion verbs; on the other hand, adverbs in the directive construction (such as, e.g., *lai* 'first', and *dei* 'only') appear after *bá* (Lumien van Klinken 1999: 244), thus showing that this verb forms a tighter syntactic unit with the other verb than it does in SVCs such as those exemplified in (16b).

To sum up, there are no reasons to think of the grammaticalization path "'go > directive" as being necessarily related to other grammaticalization paths involving 'go' as source meaning. A tentative explanation of the process(es) of grammaticalization described in this section should instead consider a simple fact: in directive speech acts the addressee often needs to move away from the place where the speaker utters his/her order as a preliminary action necessary to bring about the desired SoA. In most cases, the directive strategies employed by the speaker leave this need for dislocation unexpressed and implicit: when it is explicit, however, i.e. when a sequence of two verbs is used (*go and do x/go do x*),

the verb expressing dislocation can be easily reinterpreted as a general directive marker. In other words, the frequency with which in directive situations the realization of the order implies a dislocation of the performer may be speculatively considered as a prerequisite for the construction [go do X] to be processed as a single unit and, subsequently, for the verb meaning 'go' to be reanalyzed as having a general (i.e. non-dislocative) directive function.

This conclusion is corroborated by the existence of similar processes of weakening of motion verbs. In English there is a construction (called the *go get* construction or the "double verb construction") which encodes a single event made up of a main predicate with associated motion ('go' and the main verb in this construction behave syntactically as a single unit, see Nicolle 2007: 54–58):

(17)   English

  a. *We go watch a match every week.*
  b. *Did she go buy apples?*

It has been convincingly shown that this construction has its most likely source in imperatives (Nicolle 2007: 54), and has then extended to declarative clauses. Nicolle (2007) explains the kind of semantic development of *go get* constructions as involving "a subjectified construal of both the action of moving and the other event [in which] the perspective of the conceptualizer becomes incorporated into the description of the event described by the main verb, whilst less prominence is given to the act of physical movement" (Nicolle 2007: 58, adapted). In other words, it is the salience of the deictic dimension in directive situations that is responsible for the reinterpretation of a motion verb in a chain of verbs as marking the point of view of the speaker rather than motion proper. 'Go eat' (and its counterpart 'come eat') no longer expresses motion + another action, but simply the fact that the eating must be done somewhere else (or where the speaker is situated in the case of 'come eat'): the "function of the deictic movement verb has changed whilst its semantic content remains unchanged" (Nicolle 2007: 58). If the analysis of *go get* as deriving from "go and get" through conjunction elision is correct (but see the discussion in Nicolle 2007), the semantic change is accompanied by a structural change resulting in a tighter construction. A similar weakening of the motion component can be hypothesized for 'go' verbs that undergo grammaticalization as directive markers: by using 'go' + another verb in a command the speaker not only orders a motion action to the performer, but also casts her-/himself as the deictic centre of the order. In the course of time, the motion component may become secondary and the simple deictic anchoring connected to the verb 'go' may become central, giving rise to dislocative direc-

tives such as those exemplified by Sipakapense Maya (*do x somewhere else*). In their turn, dislocative directives can loose their deictic meaning and be reanalyzed as plain directives. Overtones of anger and disapproval, correlated with the 'subjective' construal of distance between the speaker and the addressee, may also arise at this stage and take over the original motion meaning. Although there is no conclusive evidence that this process has taken place in the cases discussed in this section, the process of weakening of meaning involved in this process is the same as in other grammaticalization paths involving 'go' as a source, and could tentatively be assumed to characterize the grammaticalization path 'go' > directive as well.

3 "Come" > directive

The 2nd person directive form of a verb meaning 'come' (strictly intended as 'motion towards the speaker') develops into a marker of directive situations with 1st person plural performers in which no motion towards the speaker is implied. The source constructions in this path are a family of complex constructions in which the addressee is invited to move towards the speaker, in order to undertake the desired action together with her/him ('come [and] (we will) do X', 'come in order to do X', 'come do X', etc.).

Let us consider Tetun again: besides the grammaticalization of *bá* as a directive marker for 2nd persons (example (10) in the preceding section), in this language there is also a directive strategy addressed to the speaker + the addressee that derives from the grammaticalization of the 2nd person directive form of 'come', *mai* (18a-b). The situation in (18a), in which *mai* is followed by the verb *bá* used in its lexical value of 'go', virtually implies a displacement by the addressee, i.e. this sentence can be used if the addressee is asked to join the speaker in performing the desired action, consisting in a displacement away from the speaker's place together with her/him (although this is not a necessary implication). In (18b), instead, the situation does not presuppose any motion towards the speaker, and *mai* is simply employed as a general directive marker for 1st person plural performers.

(18)   Tetun (Austronesian, Central Malayo-Polynesian)

    a. *ema   tene   ita   r-ak   "mai   ita   bá   nebá"*
       person invite 1PL.INCL 3PL-say come   1PL.INCL go   there
       'People invite us saying "Let's go over there."' (motion implied)
                              (Lumien van Klinken 1999: 208)

b. *mai   ita   hamulak*
   come 1PL.INCL pray
   'Let's pray.' (no motion implied)   (Lumien van Klinken 1999: 208)

Such complex constructions are still transparent in some cases, as in (19) and (20). In Leti, directives addressed to 1st person plural performers consist of two clauses conjoined by *=po* 'and then', the first of which shows the directive form of the verb 'come' inflected for person (2nd singular or plural), while the second one has a verb inflected for 1st person plural inclusive. In fast speech, the verb 'come' may occur uninflected, that is, without 2nd person singular or plural agreement markers.

(19)   Leti (Austronesian, Central Malayo-Polynesian)
     mmüapo tamtïètano
     mu-ma=po   *ta-mtïètna=o*
     2SG-come=then   1PL.INCL-sit=IND
     'Let's sit down.'   (van Engelenhoven and Williams-van Klinken 2005: 753)

In Ewe, the imperative of the verb 'come' is followed by an optional linker and by a verb inflected for 1st person plural imperative or subjunctive. This biclausal structure still expresses a complex situation made up of two distinct events. Yet, this structure is systematically used to encode orders to 1st + 2nd person performers.

(20)   Ewe (Niger-Congo, Kwa)

     vă/mi-vá   *(né)* *mí-ɖu/mí-a-ɖu-i*   *nú*
     come.IMP.2SG/2PL-come LK   1PL-eat/1PL-SBJV-eat-3SG thing
     'Let's eat something/Come, let's eat!'[4]
               (Ameka 2008: 155; see also Agbodjo and Litvinov 2001: 395)

---

4 Ewe SVCs with *va* followed by another verb may "either express concrete motion or the fact that something eventually happened" (Essegbey 2004: 474), as in the following example:

(i)   *Kofi   va   kpɔnɔvi-a*
   K.   come   see sibling-def
   'Kofi came and saw his sibling/Kofi eventually saw his sibling.'

Although Ameka (2008: 156) does not attach any significance to the lack of the overt linker in structures such as (20), it must be remarked that the structure without the linker cannot be equated with a SVC, since in this case the second verb in the chain would remain uninflected. Therefore, it must be excluded that *va* has an aspectual meaning also when used in combination with other verbs in 1st + 2nd person directives.

In some languages, the construction derived from the 2nd person imperative of 'come' may co-exist with another strategy, and in such cases it is frequently typical of colloquial speech. A case in point is Modern Hebrew. In Modern Hebrew the future is normally used to convey orders to 1st person plural performers (21a). In the colloquial language, the future can be used in combination with the imperative form of the verb *ba'* 'come' (21b,c). This form can distinguish number and gender in the singular (*bo'* 'come:IMP.2SG.M'; *bo'i* 'come:IMP.2SG.F'; *bo'u* 'come:IMP.PL'), the choice depending on the number/gender of the addressee as in the following examples:

(21)   Modern Hebrew (Afro-Asiatic, Semitic)

   a. *"n-ikanes   po"   ...ve-'arba't-am   nixns-u   le-mis'ad-a*
       FUT.1PL-enter here ...and-four-they enter-PST.3PL DIR-restaurant-F
       '"Let's drop in here" ... and the four of them entered the restaurant'
       (future verb form)   (Glinert 1989: 123; see also Malygina 2001: 271)

   b. *bo'   n-ešev   ba-mxonit, xom gehinom baxuc*
       come:IMP.2SG.M FUT.1PL-sit in-car   hot hell   outside
       'Let's sit in the car, it's hot like hell in the street'
                                     (Glinert 1989: 123; see also Malygina 2001: 271)

   c. *'im ken, bo'   n-itxalef   ba-tafkid-im*
       if   yes come:IMP.2SG.M FUT.1PL-exchange INSTR-role-PL.M
       'If so, let's swap our roles'
                                     (Glinert 1989: 123; see also Malygina 2001: 271)

The various manifestations of the grammaticalization path 'come' > directive all involve *a biclausal construction grammaticalizing into a monoclausal construction*: in all these processes, the verb originally meaning 'come' is reanalyzed as a marker of 1st + 2nd person directive, so that it is the whole configuration 'come + 1st person plural verb' that eventually conveys the directive meaning.

(22)   COME[DIRECTIVE.2PERSON] (AND/IN ORDER TO) DO(1PL) X

         > 1ST + 2ND PERSON DIRECTIVE

The path schematized in (22) is fostered by the fact that situations in which the addressee is invited to join the speaker (i.e. to move towards her/him) in order to bring about the desired SoA together and orders addressed to the speaker + the addressee are functionally similar. Both situations indeed entail that the speaker and the addressee join one another before undertaking the requested

action together. Such functional similarity motivates the processing of [*come* do$_{[1PL]}$ X] as a single unit, thus preparing the ground for the reanalysis of the verb meaning 'come' as a 1st person plural directive marker. As in the case of 'go' described above, the motion component becomes secondary in this grammaticalization path, and phenomena of loss of categorial status of the imperative of 'come' (e.g. loss of inflection, as in Leti fast speech) may accompany its reinterpretation as a directive marker.

The structure "come$_{IMP}$ + 1st person plural verb" is attested as a non-conventionalized way to convey orders to 1st person plural performers also in conversational data from some European languages. In spoken English, for instance, 1st person plural directives with *let's* are sometimes reinforced by the imperative of 'come', as in (23), whereas in some vernacular varieties of English (e.g. in Jamaican English) "come + 1st person plural indicative" is used as a strategy to convey orders to the speaker + the addressee (exx. (24)–(25)):

(23) *I'm naturally Scottish so that's erm **Come let's** hear your Scottish accent. No Why not? Hannah does that a lot, right, she goes to America and she comes back with an American accent, she goes to Scotland, she comes back with a Scottish accent* (British National Corpus; Chris, student, 15 years old, North-west Midlands)

(24) *If skin is to cut with lash, then **come we lash** the skin till water come down and wet the land* (lyrics from a sacrifice chant of Pocomania rituals, St. Thomas, Jamaica; http://www.fromjamaica.com/planet/blog/post/4949/)

(25) ***Come we go** down a Unity* (lyrics from a folk song; Cassidy 2007: 144)

Similarly, in colloquial French, the sequence *viens + on va faire x* ("come$_{IMP.2SG}$ + we are going to do x") is used as an expressive command strategy for 1st person plural performers, not necessarily in contexts in which the addressee is requested to move to the speaker's site:

(26) *"Ohlala, un tremblement de terre !!", "**Viens on va mettre à jour** notre statut sur Facebook !!"* (title of a Facebook fan page)
      'Huh, an earthquake! Let's update our Facebook status!'

(27) *C'est facile à faire pour elle. Elle est l'adulte, elle a un grand pouvoir. Elle va créer des activités communes où elle va demander à l'enfant de participer innocemment : « **viens on va faire** des confitures ensemble », « **viens on va faire** la cuisine ensemble », « **viens on va faire** de la couture ensemble », « **viens on va faire** le ménage ensemble ».* (http://le-zinc-du-matin.over-blog.com/article-petite-fable-educative-45683810.html)

'It's easy for her to do it. She's the adult, she's got a special power. She's going to plan some common activities and she's going to innocently ask the baby to take part in them: "let's make some preserves together!", "let's cook together!", "let's sew together!", "let's do the housework together!"'

4 Conclusions

Data discussed in Sections 2 and 3 show that the development of directive strategies from 'come' and 'go' verbs is plausibly triggered by specific, recurrent conditions of directive speech acts, closely connected to the appeal conveyed to the hearer and to the identity of the performer. We are however left with a more general question: to what extent are the diachronic paths described determined and/or constrained by the original meaning of 'come' or 'go'? Can we account for the various developments by reference to their persistent original lexical semantics?

In the paths analyzed in this paper, 'come' and 'go' become the source of directives by virtue of the frequent connection between directive situations and some motion requested to the performer, thus suggesting that it is the 'displacement' component of these verbs that is crucially associated with directives. The logic underlying such recurrent association can be described as follows. In every directive situation, the speaker conveys an *appeal* to the addressee(s) to help make the desired SoA true and *expects* the desired SoA to be brought about right away. The source constructions discussed here contain themselves an *appeal to the addressee* to do something in order for the desired SoA to be brought about. The appeal refers to a preparatory condition (in the sense of Searle 1969: Ch. 3) through which the addressee favours the realization of the order, namely a *displacement*: 'go in order to realize the order', 'come in order to realize the order'. Motion occurs very frequently as a preliminary action in directive situations, and this is probably the motivation underlying the reanalysis of 'come' and 'go' as general directive markers.

The original lexical semantics of 'go' and 'come' is still observable in the first stage of their grammaticalization path, when the complex constructions [COME and/in order to DO X] and [GO (and/in order to) DO X] are systematically employed to convey ventive and itive/dislocative directive situations. Yet, their original lexical semantics is completely lost once they grammaticalize into general (non-motion) directive markers, nor is the directive function itself inherently connected to some notion of motion.

A provisional answer to the question of whether the various developments can be explained by reference to the persistent original lexical semantics of

'come' and 'go' could therefore be negative. The paths described are not *per se* determined by the original meaning of 'go' and 'come', but these verbs rather enter the process of grammaticalization because they imply some displacement, and displacement is *frequently necessary* in directive situations in order to realize the order. Clearly, the inherent semantics of the verbs makes their occurrence in directive situations frequent, but it is such *frequent co-occurrence* that triggers their reanalysis as directive markers.

However, the picture gets more complex if we consider whether and how the semantics of 'come' and 'go' may *constrain* the paths described. As widely argued throughout the paper, there appear to be a clear specialization of 'come' verbs for directives addressed to 1st person plural performers, and 'go' verbs for directives addressed to 2nd person performers and 1st person plural performers. In other words, the two lexical sources are not simply reanalyzed as directive markers *tout court*, but are reanalyzed as directive markers mostly when the performer coincides with one (or both) *speech act participant(s)*, and they do not extend to orders addressed to 3rd parties. This restriction is not attested in other paths from other lexical verbs, such as for instance *let* and other causative/manipulative stems, which may evolve into directive markers available for all persons (Mauri & Sansò 2011: 3502ff; see also Mauri & Sansò 2012).

Given the fact that such restriction appears to be characteristic of directives derived from 'come' and 'go', it might be connected to the lexical semantics of the verbs, especially to their deictic component. Such a component only makes sense to performers who share the communicative situation with the speaker, since 3rd parties might already be distant from the place where the directive speech act is uttered and could therefore not be able to identify the deictic origo. Crucially, the fact that addressees must have direct access to the spatial deictic information of the speech act, at least in the source construction, could also constrain the successive diachronic developments of 'come' and 'go' as general directive markers, restricting the use of motion and non-motion directive markers derived from 'go' and 'come' to directive situations addressed to speech act participants, i.e. 1st and 2nd persons.

Therefore, we may provide a second, more complex answer to the question of whether the various developments can be explained by reference to the persistent original lexical semantics of 'come' and 'go', following our twofold analysis. First, a distinction has to be made between (i) the explanation of why 'come' and 'go' verbs are recurrent diachronic sources for directives and (ii) the explanation of why directives derived from 'come' and 'go' are restricted to orders addressed to speech act participants. Once such a distinction is made, we argue that the answer is negative in one case but positive in the other. In particular, the reason why 'come' and 'go' may be reanalyzed into directives is *not* connected to their

lexical semantics, but rather to their frequent occurrence in directive situations. However, their original deictic semantics plausibly *plays a role* in constraining the *possible extensions* of their reanalysis, restricting the use of directives derived from 'come' and 'go' to orders addressed to speech act participants.

Abbreviations

AAP	absolute antipassive
ASP	aspectual marker
EMPH	emphatic
EXCLAM	exclamative
HORT	hortative
INSTR	instrumental
LK	linker
MOD	modal suffix
MOT	motion
NFUT	non-future
PPM	proximal patient marker
PFV	perfective
SPM	subordinate patient marker
SUBORD	subordinator

References

Agbodjo, Kofi H. & Viktor P. Litvinov. 2001. Imperative sentences in Ewe. In Viktor S. Xrakovskij (ed.), *Typology of imperative constructions*, 390–403. Munich: Lincom Europa.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2006. Serial verb constructions in typological perspective. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & Robert M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Serial Verb Constructions. A Cross-linguistic Typology*, 1–68. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2010. *Imperatives and commands*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ameka, Felix K. 2008. Aspect and modality in Ewe: A survey. In Felix K. Ameka & Mary E. Kropp Dakubu (eds.), *Aspect and modality in Kwa languages*, 135–194. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Barrett, Edward R. 1999. *A grammar of Sipakapense Maya*. Austin: University of Texas at Austin dissertation.

Bystrov Igor S. & Nonna V. Stankevič. 2001. Imperative in Vietnamese. In Viktor S. Xrakovskij (ed.), *Typology of imperative constructions*, 461–474. Munich: Lincom Europa.

Cassidy, Frederic G. 2007. *Jamaica Talk. Three hundred years of the English language in Jamaica*. Kingston: University of West Indies Press.

Craig, Colette G. 1991. Ways to go in Rama: a case study in polygrammaticalization. In Elizabeth C. Traugott, & Bernd Heine (eds.), *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, 455–492. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Danielsen, Swintha. 2007. *Baure. An Arawak language of Bolivia*. Leiden: CNWS Publications.

Essegbey, James, 2004. Auxiliaries in serializing languages: on COME and GO verbs in Sranan and Ewe. *Lingua* 114: 473–494.

Glinert, Lewis. 1989. *The grammar of Modern Hebrew*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hajek, John. 2006. Serial verbs in Tetun Dili. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & Robert M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Serial Verb Constructions. A Cross-linguistic Typology*, 239–253. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hofling, Charles A. & Fernando L. Ojeda. 1994. Yucatec Maya imperatives and other manipulative language. *International Journal of American Linguistics*. 60 (3): 272–294.

Kuteva, Tania. 2001. *Auxiliation: An enquiry into the nature of grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lichtenberk, Frantisek. 2008. *A grammar of Toqabaqita*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Lumien van Klinken, Catherine. 1999. *A grammar of the Fehan dialect of Tetun*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Malygina, Ljudmila V. 2001. Imperative sentences in Modern Hebrew. In Viktor S. Xrakovskij (ed.), *Typology of imperative constructions*, 268–299. Munich: Lincom Europa.

Mauri, Caterina & Andrea Sansò. 2011. How directive constructions emerge: Grammaticalization, constructionalization, cooptation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43: 3489–3521.

Mauri, Caterina, & Andrea Sansò. 2012. The reality status of directives and its coding across languages. *Language Sciences* 34: 147–170.

Nguyễn, Đinh-Hoà. 1997. *Vietnamese*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Nicolle, Steve, 2007. The grammaticalization of tense markers: A pragmatic reanalysis. *Cahiers Chronos* 17: 47–65.

Pensalfini, Rob. 2003. *A grammar of Jingulu, An Aboriginal language of the Northern Territory*, Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Searle, John R., 1969. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Spatar, Natalja M. 1997. Imperative constructions in Cambodian. *Mon-Khmer Studies* 27: 119–127.

van der Auwera, Johan, Nina Dobrushina & Valentin Goussev. 2003. A semantic map for Imperative-Hortatives. In Dominique Willelms, Bart Defrancq, Timothy Colleman & Dirk Noel (eds.), *Contrastive Analysis in Language. Identifying Linguistic Units of Comparison*, 44–68. Palgrave, New York.

van Engelenhoven, Aone & Catherine Williams-van Klinken. 2005. Tetun and Leti. In Alexander Adelaar & Nikolaus P. Himmelmann (eds.), *The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar*, 735–768. London: Routledge.

Veselinova, Ljuba N. 2006. *Suppletion in verb paradigms. Bits and pieces of a puzzle*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Williams-van Klinken Catherine, John Hajek & Rachel Nordlinger. 2002. *Tetun Dili. A grammar of an East Timorese language*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.