STATE OF THE ART

Verbal Periphrasis in Ancient Greek

Abstract: The term 'verbal periphrasis' is commonly used to denote constructions consisting of a finite and a non-finite verb. This state of the art focuses on Ancient Greek periphrastic constructions, more specifically those formed with a participle. The first part of the article gives a broad outline of research conducted so far in this field of grammar, and offers an overview of exactly which constructions have been considered periphrastic. In the second and third part of the article, I discuss recent and less recent advancements with regard to two general issues, the definition of verbal periphrasis and the debate about language contact, and two more specific issues, the syntax and pragmatics of the most frequently occurring periphrases, which take εἰμί as finite verb. I conclude with some suggestions for further research.

INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of 'verbal periphrasis' (henceforth VPE) is well-known from various modern European languages, where this grammatical term is commonly used to denote constructions of the type "I am writing" (Engl.), "Je vais chanter" (Fr.) or "sono arrivato" (It.). In such examples a finite ('auxiliary') and a non-finite ('auxiliate') verb are combined (forming a so-called 'periphrastic' or 'analytic' construction) instead of a single ('synthetic' or 'monolectic') verb form (compare with "I write" (Engl.), "je chanterai" (Fr.), "arrivavo" (It.)). Much less well-known, even among classicists, is the fact that Ancient Greek as well had at its disposal a large array of such constructions. As Gildersleeve (1980[1900]:122) already recognized, "the Greek language has ample facilities for a large number of periphrastic tenses. With its many participles and its various auxiliaries, the possible combinations are almost inexhaustible … ".

In the past two decades, the subject of periphrasis has come under renewed attention, and it has been studied from both synchronic (Porter 1989; Fanning 1990; Evans 2001; Bentein 2011) and diachronic (Amenta 2001, 2003; Drinka 2003a, 2003b, 2007) angles. At the same time, however, it is clear that a general consensus on many key aspects (to start with the definition of the phenomenon) is still far from being reached (cf. recently Campbell 2008:32: "verbal periphrasis in Ancient Greek is a problematic issue"), as a result of which there is a lot of what Adrados (1992:451) calls 'confusionismo' in the secondary literature. This state of the art aims at offering an exhaustive overview of recent and less recent advancements in the field (which at present is still lacking), and thus to stimulate further research. I concentrate on so-called participial periphrastic constructions, and leave aside the Byzantine period (for which there are only very few grammatical studies available, cf. Wahlgren 2002). The article

is organized in three parts: The first part of the article gives a broad outline of research conducted so far in this field of grammar (§1), and offers an overview of exactly which participial constructions have been considered periphrastic (§2). In the second and third part of the article, I discuss recent and less recent advancements with regard to two general issues, the definition of verbal periphrasis (§3) and the debate about language contact (§4), and two more specific issues, the syntax and pragmatics of the most frequently occurring periphrases, which take εἰμί as finite verb (§5 and §6). To conclude, I give some suggestions for further research (§7).

1. RESEARCH ON VERBAL PERIPHRASIS[1]

Let me start this state of the art by giving a broad outline of research conducted up until the present. Broadly speaking, one can distinguish between three periods. The first, foundational, period, is characterized by a preoccupation with the εἰμί-VPE, mostly in combination with the present participle.[2] The first in-depth study was that of Alexander (1885), discussing a large amount of examples from Classical Greek. While previous scholarship had mentioned VPEs, the phenomenon was not studied in great detail, and considered a 'deterioration' of the classical norm. Other early works, which were heavily influenced by Alexander's study, are those of Barbelenet (1913) and Regard (1918), both of whom treat *la tournure périphrastique* as part of their research on nominal phrases. Particular attention to the New-Testamentic evidence was paid by Björck, who compared VPEs of the type ἦν διδάσκων "he was teaching" to the English progressive. One last 'foundational' study worth mentioning is that of Rosén (1957), who analyzes the discourse-properties of the VPE with εἰμί in greater detail (note that Rosén's analysis was critically reviewed and partially modified by Gonda 1959 and Rydbeck 1969).

The next major period in research on participial periphrasis is characterized by an interest in a larger number of constructions, studied from a diachronic point of view. Aerts (1965) dedicated his doctoral thesis to a full-scale diachronic research "from Homer up to the present day" of both εἰμί and ἔχω (including those constructions with the perfect participle, which were rather neglected). As such he was the first to take into account the Medieval and Modern Greek periods (including Modern Greek dialects such as Tsakonian), though precisely these findings have been criticized (Trapp 1967:93-94). The doctoral thesis of Dietrich (1973a) also took a diachronic perspective, and further expanded the number of constructions under

---

[1] Cf. also Aerts (1965:5-7/12-17); Dietrich (1973a:169-187) and Porter (1989:447-448).
[2] With the exception of Thielmann (1891, 1898), who takes into account a larger number of VPEs.

investigation: here, VPEs with βαίνω, γίγνομαι, διαγίγνομαι, διάγω, διαμένω, διατελέω, εἰμί, εἶμι, ἐπιμένω, ἔρχομαι, ἔστηκα, ἔχω, ἥκω, κυρέω, πέλομαι and τυγχάνω are studied. Dietrich's work was heavily influenced[3] by that of his teacher, Eugenio Coseriu. As we will see, both of them took great interest in (the relationship between) VPEs from different European languages.

Dietrich was the first to delimit the term 'verbal periphrasis' on the basis of semantic and formal criteria related to the concept of grammaticalization. More recent research has continued this combined interest in the diachrony and definition/delimitation of VPEs. As for the latter, different approaches have been taken in order to come to a more rigorous definition of verbal periphrasis. Kahn (1973), for example, takes a syntactic point of view, employing Harris' transformational grammar. Létoublon (1982, 1984), on the other hand, argues for a semantic distinction between 'périphrases à valeur concrète/métaphorique' and 'périphrases à valeur aspectuelle' (being very skeptical about the presence of the latter category in Ancient Greek). Another, controversial, contribution has been made by Porter (1988, 1989, 1999), who deals with periphrastic constructions in his work on verbal aspect in the New Testament (henceforth NT). Porter proposes a radical definition for VPEs, excluding all constructions other than that of εἰμί with participle. As for the diachronic perspective, it is worth mentioning the recent work of Amenta (2003), which consists of a diachronic and typological confrontation of aspectual VPEs with verbs of state and movement in Greek and Latin. Amenta's research is carried out within the framework of grammaticalization, focusing on parameters such as 'desemanticization' and 'decategorization' (Hopper & Traugott 2003).

Another element which has been on the research agenda, especially after Dietrich's work, is language contact. Both Verboomen (1992) and Evans (2001) focus on Semitic influences on the use of Greek VPEs in the Septuagint (henceforth LXX) and the NT. Most recently, Drinka has dedicated a number of important articles (2003a, 2003b, 2007) to the development of the periphrastic perfect in the European languages, with particular interest for Ancient Greek and its influence on Latin.

2. OVERVIEW OF PERIPHRASTIC CONSTRUCTIONS

In this second part of my paper I give a broad overview of the (diachronic) semantics of those participial constructions which have been called 'periphrastic' by one or more scholars. My overview distinguishes between three main groups, on the basis of the lexical value of the

---

[3] As H. & R. Kahane (1978:644) astutely remark: "the study features two heroes, a synchronic and a diachronic – both being, of course, the same person, Eugenio Coseriu".

finite verb: periphrastic constructions with verbs of state (εἰμί, ἔχω, τυγχάνω, γίγνομαι, ὑπάρχω, φαίνομαι, κυρέω), with verbs of movement (ἔρχομαι/εἶμι, ἥκω, βαίνω, πέλομαι, ἕστηκα) and with phasal verbs (διαγίγνομαι, διατελέω, διάγω, ἐπιμένω, παύομαι). As for the diachrony of these participial constructions, it is very important to realize the difference between Classical and Post-classical Greek. To be more specific, many of the constructions discussed below only occur in Classical Greek, where they can be considered 'exploratory expressions' (cf. Bentein 2011 for the criterion of 'restricted paradigmatic variability' and its application to Classical Greek). As Dietrich (1973a:279) notes, however, the number of variants seriously diminishes in Post-classical Greek, which can be taken as a sign of the further grammaticalization of the remaining constructions.

2.1. Verbs of state

2.1.1. Εἰμί

With perfect participle[4]

The VPE εἰμί + part.perf. has been treated with varying interest. According to Björck (1940:99) it occurs infrequently,[5] and most likely did not exert any influence on the forms with present and aorist participle. Remarkably, Aerts (1965:51) believes the opposite to be true: in his opinion periphrasis first occurred in the perfect and pluperfect indicative (cf. Robertson 1934:374; Kahn 1973:131; Karleen 1980:113 and Drinka 2003a:109), especially in the third person singular. He believes it had an exemplary role for the VPE εἰμί + part.pres.

Aerts (1965:51) is quite right in noting that this particular VPE is the oldest. It already occurs in Homer, and develops throughout the history of the language. According to Drinka (2003b:12), it has become completely productive by the time of the NT.[6] The construction occurs most frequently with medio-passive endings (Fanning 1990:319), while its occurrence with an active participle is much rarer (Robertson 1934:375; Palm 1955:93; Blass & Debrunner 1979:285; Adrados 1992:455; Rijksbaron 2006:129). An example from Classical Greek is (1), where we have the active ἀπολωλεκὼς εἴη. That this construction has a particular affinity with the medio-passive voice can be attributed to its overall stative character. Gildersleeve (1980[1900]:122), referring to Alexander (1885:307-308), writes that the perfect construction emphasizes "the maintenance of the result": the author wants to

---

[4] A collection of these forms in Classical and Post-classical Greek can be found in LaRoche (1893), Kontos (1898) and Harry (1905,1906: subjunctive, optative and imperative mood).

[5] Contrast with Chantraine (1927:246), Kahn (1973:137) and Porter (1989:467).

[6] In Early Medieval Greek, when the inflected participles of the third declension disappear, this type of VPE becomes even more prominent (Horrocks 1997:77).

indicate that a state is given or realized (cf. Regard 1918:112). Mostly this concerns the result of a previous action with regard to the present (periphrastic perfect) or the past (periphrastic pluperfect) (Gonda 1959:109-110; Goodwin 1966[1875]:14; Browning 1983:39; Smyth 1984:182). Fanning (1990:320), however, indicates that an implication of an antecedent is not always present, as in (2) which displays "purely present meaning" (cf. also Antoniadis 1930:151).

(1) … λέγων τήν τε προτέρην ἑωυτοῦ συμφορήν, καὶ ὡς ἐπ' ἐκείνῃ τὸν καθήραντα ἀπολωλεκὼς εἴη, οὐδέ οἱ εἴη βιώσιμον. (Her., *Hist.* 1.45.1).

(2) ἑστὼς ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος Καίσαρός εἰμι (*Acts* 25.10).

Adrados (1992:455) notes that the VPE εἰμί + part.perf. originally had an emphatic meaning, stressing that a state really has been accomplished (Chantraine 1927:249). This emphasis seems to have weakened (cf. Regard 1918:140; Chantraine 1927:249; Palm 1955:94), especially in those cases where the periphrastic form is suppletive, viz. the third person (plural, but often also singular) of the medio-passive indicative perfect and pluperfect of verbs with occlusive (later also vocalic) stem, and the medio-passive subjunctive and optative perfect (cf. Jannaris 1897:197). Fanning (1990:319,321) observes with regard to the NT that the construction could even be used to highlight the actual occurrence of an event in the present or past, but that this is much less common. Note, however, that this 'eventive' use is already well-attested in Classical Greek (though this is backgrounded in most of the grammars), especially in those cases where the participle takes active endings and an object (as in example (1)).

With the finite verb used in the future tense, this VPE could be used as a pluperfect (cf. Jannaris 1897:444; Stahl 1907:144; Goodwin 1966[1875]:21; Kühner & Gerth 1976[1898]:39; Smyth 1984[1920]:179; Adrados 1992:455; Duhoux 2000:462-463). In early antiquity, the active voice in particular was circumscribed by means of the periphrastic construction (with the exception of ἑστήξω "I shall be standing", τεθνήξω "I shall be dead" and κεχάρησω "I shall have rejoiced", cf. Jannaris 1897:442; Goodwin 1966[1875]:21). The passive voice was usually synthetic, but could also be expressed periphrastically. Both active and passive VPEs of this type can be found in the NT. As an example of the former, consider (3). Moulton (1978:226) indicates that this type of VPE is well kept up in the papyri.

(3) ἐγὼ ἔσομαι πεποιθὼς ἐπ' αὐτῷ (*Heb.* 2.13).

With present participle

The VPE εἰμί + part.pres. has received more scholarly attention than any other periphrasis. It first occurs, according to Aerts, in the tragedians, as in (4). Aerts (1965:17) describes this VPE as "predominantly situation-fixing, situation-describing and intransitive" (cf. Cobb 1973:83). Many scholars have pointed attention to the fact that the participle can have an adjectival character, as in πρέπον ἐστίν "it is fitting" (a.o. Regard 1918:113; Schywzer 1934:813; Björck 1940:17-40; Aerts 1965:12-15; Dietrich 1973a:190; Ceglia 1998:26; Duhoux 2000:296; Evans 2001:230-231).[7] According to Björck (1940:26-27), constructions of this type indicate a characteristic feature of a subject or a permanent situation (cf. Alexander 1885:291 ff.; Kühner & Gerth 1976[1898]:39): their focus is on a state rather than an action (compare with the perfect periphrasis mentioned above).

> (4) εἴ τις γυναῖκας τῶν πρὶν εἴρηκεν κακῶς/ ἢ νῦν λέγων ἔστιν τις ἢ μέλλει λέγειν
> (Eur. *Hec.* 1178-9).

It would seem that this VPE underwent a semantic extension by the time of the NT. Regard (1918:117-118) notes the expressiveness of the construction in this period: it expresses "la durée, la continuité, la permanence et aussi les nuances de caractère propre", whereby he notes the similarity with the English progressive. The latter observation was elaborated upon by Björck (1940), who named his doctoral study after the type of periphrasis found in (5), commonly occurring in the imperfect tense (cf. Robertson 1934:376; Fanning 1990:313; Amenta 2003:80-81). Aerts considers this to be a Koine-extension, with the earlier situation-fixing type remaining in use (cf. Aerts 1956:52). He furthermore stresses the fact that the progressive VPE only occurs in what might be called 'the Christian vulgar speech' and that there are clear reminiscences of the Biblical model in all these writings (cf. *infra*).

> (5) ἦν δὲ διδάσκων ἐν μιᾷ τῶν συναγωγῶν… (*Lc.* 13.10).

Whether the construction could express progressive aspect in Classical Greek is still under debate. Smyth (1984:414) and Gildersleeve (1980[1900]:81) remark that Classical Greek had no equivalent to the English progressive (cf. also Cobb 1973:83),[8] and Fanning (1990:312)

---

[7] An overview of the most frequently occurring participles with adjectival function (so-called 'Daueradjektivierungen') is given by both Björck (1940:18-20) and Aerts (1965:14-15). They list participles such as ἀρέσκων, δέων, καθήκων, πρέπων, προσήκων, συμφέρων and ὑπάρχων. Note that Goodwin (1966[1875]:332), Gildersleeve (1980[1900]:81) and Smyth (1984[1920]:414) do not distinguish adjectival from verbal periphrasis.

[8] Cobb refers to Aerts (1965) with regard to the emergence of the progressive VPE. He argues, however, that the progressive VPE was introduced "for the first time in the Greek language" (1973:85) in the works of Aristotle,

agrees that εἰμί + part.pres., which in Classical Greek only had "a static, adjective-like meaning" similar to that of perfect VPEs, developed a progressive sense in Biblical Greek. Other authors disagree with Aerts' conviction that the progressive VPE is non-existent in Classical Greek (cf. a.o. Gonda 1959:105-106; Rydbeck 1969:200; Karleen 1980:124; Porter 1989:455; Adrados 1992:452; Ceglia 1998:28; Evans 2001:230; Amenta 2003:69). Stahl (1907:145), for example, notes that this VPE can mean "daran sein, in etwas begriffen sein". Accordingly, he translates εἶ πορευόμενος in (6), with "du bist auf dem Wege". Björck (1940:71) similarly indicates that there are cases of εἰμί + part.pres. with a progressive function in Classical Greek, as for example μεταπεμπόμενοι ἦσαν in (7) (cf. also Stahl 1907:145; Rydbeck 1969:199; Porter 1989:458). Aerts admits that this is one of the few VPEs in Ancient Greek with emphasis on the course of action: "they were engaged in fetching". In view of the rarity of the construction, however, he doubts the authenticity of the passage. Björck (1940:72), on the other hand, concludes that the classical examples are not numerous, but agrees with Schwyzer (1934:813) that "sie volles Gewicht beanspruchen".

(6) οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι οὐ μόνον ἐρᾷς, ἀλλὰ καὶ πόρρω ἤδη εἶ πορευόμενος τοῦ ἔρωτος (Pl. *Lys.* 204b).

(7) … καὶ νεῶν ποίησιν ἐπέμενον τελεσθῆναι, καὶ ὅσα ἐκ τοῦ Πόντου ἔδει ἀφικέσθαι, τοξότας τε καὶ σῖτον, καὶ ἃ μεταπεμπόμενοι ἦσαν. (Thuc. *Hist.* 3.2.2.).

Dietrich (1973a, 1973b) describes the aspectual value of the VPE of εἰμί with present participle in terms of 'Winkelschau',[9] which is similar to progressive aspect.[10] In his opinion this category can be found as early as Homer (cf. Kühner & Gerth 1976[1898]:38-39; Porter 1989:455), as in (8). He finds more examples in Herodotus, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Thucydides, Plato, Xenophon, Lysias and Demosthenes. He concludes that this type of VPE is "überall lebendig und jederzeit möglich" (1973b:203). In Classical Greek, it's frequency was probably influenced by the functionally parallel VPE τυγχάνω + part.pres.

"which represent to some extent the state of the language at the end of the Classical period with foreshadowings of the Koine to come".

[9] Cf. Dietrich (1973b:195) on the aspectual category Winkelschau: "Sie bedeutet im Gegensatz zum faktischen Nennen der Verbalhandlung (ich singe, canto) die (aspektuelle) Betrachtung zwischen zwei Punkten A, B, die einen Ausschnitt aus der Handlung insgesamt darstellen. Die Punkte A und B können auch im Sprechpunkt C zusammenfallen".

[10] Coseriu (1975:15), however, notes the difference between progressive aspect and the category of *Winkelschau*. While the former is thought of as a "temporal frame encompassing something else", the latter considers the verbal action between two points of its development. Coseriu finds the progressive "unzureichend" to render the nuance of εἰμί with present participle.

(8) ἡμῖν δ' εἴνατός ἐστι περιτροπέων ἐνιαυτός/ ἐνθάδε μιμνότεσσι (Hom. *Il.* 2.295).[11]

In her recent study, Amenta (2003:69) also recognizes the existence of progressive VPEs in Classical Greek. She does consider it useful, however, to make a distinction between this type of construction and those that express a more general state, as in (9). Amenta (2003:73-4) mentions another meaning extension in the NT, which has largely escaped scholarly attention: in an example such as (10), the construction takes up habitual aspect (cf. also Fanning 1990:315: 'customary meaning'), which was traditionally expressed by the imperfect (cf. also Turner 1927:351; Pryke 1978:104; Browning 1983:38). She concludes that there is a "plurispecializzazione nel dominio dell'imperfettività" (Amenta 2003:74). A similar observation is made by Ceglia (1998:30): VPEs with εἰμί not only express the "typically Greek" progressive aspect, but also habitual/durative and even ingressive aspect,[12] which according to Ceglia (1998:33) is typical for Hebrew VPEs.

(9) ἦσαν δὲ Πηδασέες οἰκέοντες ὑπὲρ Ἁλικαρνησσοῦ μεσόγαιαν (Her. *Hist.* 1.175).

(10) καὶ ἦν διδάσκων τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ (*Lc.* 19.47).

As with the VPE εἰμί + part.perf, the finite verb could be used in the future tense[13] (cf. Jannaris 1897:444; Robertson 1934:375; Blass & Debrunner 1979:287; Evans 2001:239). Various instances can be found in the LXX and the NT (cf. Porter 1999:47), both with active and passive participle, as for example (11). Aerts (1965:59) can find only one (disputed) example from Classical Greek: (12). This leads him to conclude that this type of VPE did not originate from Classical Greek, but should be considered a Semitism (cf. also Ceglia 1998:37), mainly restricted to the LXX and the NT[14] (cf. Fanning 1990:317). This claim is contradicted by Porter (1989:465), who lists several examples from Ancient Greek (cf. Evans 2001:249). Others think this construction should be considered a natural development of the Greek language (cf. Voelz 1984:952-953). According to Robertson (1934:889) "the very failure of the future to express durative action clearly led to the use of the present participle

---

[11] Björck (1940:127) also mentions this example, though he remains rather vague with regard to its aspectual value ("Wer nach progressiven Wendungen in der vorattischen Poesie Umschau hält, wird zur Interpretation von Versen wie folgenden Stellung zu nehmen haben: Hom. B. 295…").

[12] Ceglia (1998:36) finds it striking that the ingressive aspect is expressed by the present participle, and not by the expected aorist participle: "dimostra in un certo senso l'estraneità di questa espressione al sistema verbale greco e il suo carattere imitativo di un modello straniero".

[13] Note that combinations of εἰμί with future participle are as good as non-existent (Regard 1918:112).

[14] Aerts (1965:59-60) mentions that there is hardly any question of a later expansion of the type. However, examples can be found in the Post-classical literature (Björck 1940:87; Aerts 1965:60; Trapp 1967:93).

with ἔσομαι" (cf. Jannaris 1897:444). Various scholars mention the potential of the construction to indicate the imperfective-durative character of a future action (cf. Regard 1918:134; Robertson 1934:887; Björck 1940:86; Dana & Mantey 1957:232; Mussies 1971:307; Coseriu 1975:12; Blass & Debrunner 1979:285; Amenta 2003:81; Campbell 2008:34).

(11) καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες ἔσονται ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πίπτοντες (*Mc.* 13.25).

(12) εὖ ἔσῃ νικῶν (Xen. *Hier.* 2.7).

With aorist participle

Early scholarly work (e.g. Buttmann 1859:265; Barbelenet 1913:87; Regard 1918:151; Smyth 1984[1920]:437) explicitly excludes the VPE εἰμί + part.aor. from the expressive possibilities of the Greek language, because of the apparent contradiction between the perfective aspect of the participle and the imperfective aspect of εἰμί.[15] Others, however, mention examples of this VPE in Classical Greek, although it is rare,[16] especially when the auxiliary has the present tense (Stahl 1907:145-146; Aerts 1965:27-35).[17] An example cited by Stahl (1907:145) is (13), which Aerts (1965:34) considers a (remarkable) case of adjectival periphrasis. According to Aerts (1965:35), in most cases there is no question of real periphrasis. Where it appears to be so, 'exceptional circumstances' are at the basis of its use. In this context, it is worth mentioning that Rutherford (1903:249) detects an emphatic value in Classical Greek (cf. Moulton 1978:227; Blass & Debrunner 1979:285); to render this emphasis he translates with "actually", "positively", "effectively", as in (14): "Some proposals were even actually made to Nikias".

(13) οὔτ' οὖν προδείσας εἰμὶ τῷ γε νῦν λόγῳ (Soph. *OT* 90).

(14) ἦσαν δέ τινες καὶ γενόμενοι τῷ Νικίᾳ λόγοι πρότερον πρός τινας τῶν Κυθηρίων (Thuc. *Hist.* 4.54.3).

The frequency of the construction (with εἰμί in the imperfect) increases dramatically in the non-Atticizing and early Christian literature of the first centuries AD (cf. Björck 1940:74-77; Zilliacus 1956:165; Adrados 1992:454).[18] Aerts holds the opinion (1965:76 ff.) that this

---

[15] Recently, Evans (2001:223) and Campbell (2008:33) have argued against such an aspectual conflict, cf. also Duhoux (2000:295).

[16] According to Porter (1989:477), Greek speakers probably did not often need a marked periphrastic construction of the least heavily marked verbal aspect (viz. aorist aspect).

[17] For an explanation of the more frequent use of the VPE ποιήσας ἦν compared to ποιήσας εἰμί, I refer to Aerts (1965:79-81).

[18] It should be noted that the construction is not very frequent in the NT. Porter (1999:49) finds only three examples 'worth considering'. According to Campbell (2008:32) there are no periphrastic constructions with

particular construction (ἦν + part.aor.) did not evolve from Ancient Greek usage, but seems to be a Koine-creation, dated to the first or second century AD. Zilliacus (1956:165), on the other hand, believes that ancient epic and tragic speech contained the prototype of the construction.

In general, the construction with aorist participle is taken to be an equivalent of the perfect and pluperfect (cf. Tiemann 1889:557; Stahl 1907:144-145; Wolf 1912:55; Psaltes 1913:230; Kapsomenakis 1938:44; Björck 1940:74; Schwyzer 1950:255; Blass & Debrunner 1979:288; Gildersleeve 1980[1900]:125; Karleen 1980:133; Browning 1983:39; Piñero & Pelaez 2003:161; Drinka 2007:112). Porter (1989:476), doubting the validity of this insight, makes the following critical remarks: (1) this would leave the aorist without any VPEs and the perfect with a double set of periphrastics, (2) the perfect did not need any other forms to fill supposed gaps, and (3) this formulation seems to be constructed along translational lines. He agrees with Aerts (1965:27), who writes that "in view of the aspect of the aorist it is evident that, in principle, VPEs with its participle have a different function than those with the present and perfect participles".[19] Adrados (1992:454) uses the term 'prepretérito aorístico' to characterize the construction with ἦν as auxiliary: it is used to create relative time in the past (with aoristic value), which is not possible with the synthetic forms.

According to Rosén (1957:139), perfective presents such as εἰμι ποιήσας in (15) express futurity (Rosén 1957:139; 1962:190-191), rather than that they should be considered 'second aorists' (cf. *infra* on so-called 'zweite Tempora').[20] Aerts, who also mentions this example, does not agree with Rosén's analysis (Aerts 1965:27). In his opinion, "the point in question here is an explanation of Idanthyrsus' behavior, not the ascertainment of what he is, or of the circumstances in which he finds himself. … The νῦν makes it clear that the point in question is not what Idanthyrsus has done, but what he is now doing. The present participle cannot express this shade of meaning, nor, obviously, can the perfect participle" (cf. also Rijksbaron 2006:128).

> (15) οὐδέ τι νεώτερόν εἰμι ποιήσας νῦν ἢ καὶ ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἐώθεα ποιέειν (Her. *Hist.* 4.127.1).

As already mentioned, the VPE ἔσομαι + part.pres. could be used to emphasize the durative character of a future action. Gildersleeve (1980[1900]:125) notes that there seems to be an

---

aorist participle in the NT. Cf. also Regard (1918:151-152); Björck (1940:74-85); Aerts (1965:76-90); Fanning (1990:310).

[19] Things seem to change in Koine-greek, however. Cf. Aerts (1965:90): "the far-reaching syncretising of aorist and perfect forms also includes the participles". Cf. also Björck (1940:79).

[20] According to Rosén (1957:139), this function is expressed by the VPE with ἔχω.

effort to develop a more exact aoristic future as well, as for example in (16) (an example also cited by Robertson 1934:889). Jannaris (1897:443) mentions that what he calls 'the effective future' (denoting that something will take place at a time to come) is sometimes periphrased by means of ἔσομαι with aorist participle. He considers it an extension of 'the durative future' with present participle (note, however, that ἔσομαι occurs less often with present than with aorist participle in Classical Greek). Björck (1940:87), on the other hand, believes the synthetic future rendered the aoristic aspect of a future action.[21] In his opinion, we should not consider the VPE ἔσομαι ποιήσας to be the counterpart of ἔσομαι ποιῶν (an extra element is that, according to Björck, it has a "stark hervortretende Vergangenheitsbedeutung"). In the rare cases it does occur, it has the value of a future perfect (cf. Stahl 1907:146; Schwyzer 1950:255; Goodwin 1966[1875]:21), as in (17) (but see Moorhouse 1982:205 for a critique).

(16) οὐκ εἰδότες ὁποῖοί τινες ἄνδρες ἔσονται γενόμενοι (Lys. *Epit.* 13).

(17) νέκυν νεκρῶν ἀμοιβὸν ἀντιδοὺς ἔσῃ (Soph. *Ant.* 1067).

2.1.2. ἔχω

With aorist participle

As an early example of this VPE, Schwyzer (1934:812) cites the Homeric (18), which is rejected by most scholars (e.g. Pouilloux 1953:118). Thielmann (1891:294ff.) argues that in cases like these there is still a strong sense of possession. In fifth-century Classical Greek, however, the construction (generally known as σχῆμα Ἀττικόν or Σοφόκλειον, cf. Keil 1963:46; Piñero & Pelaez 2003:162; Rijksbaron 2006:130) was fully grammaticalized (Drinka 2007:102). The participle accompanying the VPE with ἔχω is mostly active. Middle and passive participles are possible, though less frequent (as an example of the latter, cf. ἐρασθεὶς ἔχειν in Pl. *Crat.* 404C).

(18) ἑλὼν γὰρ ἔχει γέρας (Hom. *Il.* 1.356).

Aerts relates the development of this construction to the history of the synthetic perfect (1965:160): in his opinion, it "can be looked upon as a phenomenon concomitant to the development of the monolectic resultative perfect active in –ka" (cf. Drinka 2003a:111). Drinka (2003a:111) notes that the construction is especially used with verbs which did not have a perfect before (cf. Thielmann 1891:302-303; Dietrich 1973b:217), although this certainly cannot be generalized (cf. Thielmann 1891:303; Rijksbaron 2006:130). Keil (1963:49) argues against Chantraine's (1927:251) claim that "le Grec cherchait à renouveler

---

[21] Cf. Panzer (1964:59,64).

l'expression de l'idée du parfait". The construction should be considered suppletive for not yet existing synthetic perfects. It disappears in the early fourth century, which Keil (1963:47) relates to the appearance of the synthetic perfect. It is not found in the LXX (Evans 2001:224).

Stahl (1907:146), Smyth (1984[1920]:437), Gildersleeve (1980[1900]:126-127) and Adrados (1992:454) write that the construction emphasizes the maintenance of a result, and as such is analogous to the synthetic perfect (cf. Thielmann 1891:299-300;[22] Kühner & Gerth 1976[1904]:61; Moorhouse 1982:206; Browning 1983:39; Kurzová 1997:124). Aerts (1965:159) specifies that this VPE has the meaning of a resultative transitive perfect ('resultative' in the sense of Wackernagel and Chantraine). The situation-fixation is applied to the object rather than the subject, as in (19), where, according to Aerts (1965:131), the point at issue is the state of the objects as a result of Creon's action. The construction is only rarely used with intransitive verbs[23] (cf. Gildersleeve 1980[1900]:127; Kühner & Gerth 1976[1904]:61; Drinka 2003b:13). Goodwin (1966[1875]:15) writes that this VPE could also form a periphrastic pluperfect, with εἶχον or ἔσχον, as in (20).

(19) οὐ γὰρ τάφου νῷν τὼ κασιγνήτω Κρέων/ τὸν μὲν προτίσας, τὸν δ' ἀτιμάσας ἔχει (Soph. *Ant.* 21-22).

(20) τοὺς ἄλλους πάντας ὑπ' ἑωυτῷ εἶχε καταστρεψάμενος ὁ Κροῖσος (Her. *Hist.* 1.28.1).

Porter (1989:489), on the other hand, does not think there is a connection with the resultative synthetic perfect: he refers to McKay (1981:310), who argues against Chantraine's claim that –ka perfects are resultative (cf. Kurzová 1997:124). In Porter's opinion (1989:490), ἔχω was not used periphrastically in Classical Greek. He heavily criticizes Aerts' 'subjective' approach: in his opinion Aerts does not sufficiently consider the lexical ambiguity of ἔχω, which has a variety of meanings in both transitive and intransitive contexts.

In Rosén's (1957:139) opinion, VPEs of ἔχω with an aorist participle form a 'second aorist'. The author points at (21), where the VPE is co-ordinated with an aoristic synthetic verb. Keil (1963:47), however, does not think Rosén's argument is valid: he argues that the perfect κεκάθαρκα did not yet exist at this time, and that there are also instances where a VPE is co-ordinated with a synthetic perfect (e.g. Her. *Hist.* 1.83.1).

---

[22] Thielmann (1891:299) specifies that the aorist participle expresses the beginning of the action, and the verb ἔχω its continuation. Moorhouse (1982:206) similarly notes that that the "aor. part. here seems to add a past notion to the continuing effect of ἔχω" (cf. Rijksbaron 2006:130).

[23] Smyth (1984:182) notes that the construction of ἔχω with aorist participle can be used when a perfect active form with transitive meaning is lacking: στήσας ἔχω means "I have placed", whereas ἕστηκα means "I stand".

(21) ἐκάθηρα καὶ οἰκίοισι ὑποδεξάμενος ἔχω (Her. *Hist.* 1.41.1).

With perfect participle

Although Classical Greek has some examples of ἔχω + part.perf. (cf. Gildersleeve 1980[1900]:127; Moorhouse 1982:207; Rijksbaron 2006:131), its use is quite uncommon. As an example, consider (22). Aerts (1965:136) believes that in this particular case we should consider the participle a variant which enhances the perfect resultative meaning (cf. Thielmann 1891:301, who calls it a "pleonastische Ausdrucksweise", a contamination of the synthetic perfect and the periphrastic construction with aorist participle, which may have occurred more often in vulgar speech).

(22) κρέοντος, οἷά μοι βεβουλευκὼς ἔχει (Soph. *OT* 701).

Browning (1983:69) writes that in the early middle ages the periphrastic perfect ἔχω + passive perfect participle and its passive equivalent εἰμί + passive perfect participle become firmly established. He does not provide his reader with any examples, however. As far as the Koine is concerned, Aerts (1965:161) could only find a few.[24] These belong to the type ἔχω + object + perfect participle[25] (cf. Drinka 2003a:110; Drinka 2003b:12-13), which in the majority of the cases is not periphrastic (Aerts 1959:161; Fanning 1990:310; Drinka 2003b:13; Drinka 2007:111 counts 16 'credible' examples in the NT). Some cases, such as (23), seem more periphrastic in character (Turner 1927:358), but here again the participle is appositive (Porter 1989:490). Drinka (2007:111), however, notes that "the category turns out to be more significant than its numbers imply".

(23) συκῆν εἶχέν τις πεφυτευμένην ἐν τῷ ἀμπελῶνι αὐτοῦ (*Lc.* 13.6).

With present participle

According to Aerts (1965:128), VPEs with ἔχω as finite verb only occur in combination with aorist and perfect participles. Dietrich (1973b:210), however, mentions some examples with present participle, which in his opinion express the category 'Winkelschau + Dauer'. (24) is the only attested example from Classical Greek.

(24) ἐπεὶ σύ, μᾶτερ, ἐπὶ δάκρυσι καὶ/ γόοισι τὸν θανόντα πατέρα πατρίδα τε/
φίλαν καταστένουσ' ἔχεις (Eur. *Tr.* 315-317).

---

[24] Contrast with Vendryes 1937:86 "en grec, il y a des exemples très nets de l'auxiliaire 'avoir' dans la prose de l'époque hellénistique".

[25] According to Evans (2001:225) the VPEs in Classical Greek are unrelated to these later occurrences.

Other, Post-classical, examples belong to the type ἔχω + adjunct of time + participle (present/aorist), as in (25). Scholars such as Jannaris (1897:435), Wolf (1912:56), Psaltes (1913:231), Hesseling (1916:50), Schwyzer (1934:812) and more recently Drinka (2007:114) consider the construction to be periphrastic, but Aerts (1965:164) does not (cf. also Porter 1989:490-491). He refers to Tabachowitz (1926:52; 1943:24), who argues that the adjunct of time is the object of ἔχω and that the participle has an explicative function. Tabachowitz, has to admit, however that there are some examples where the adjunct of time is not expressed in the accusative case, as in (26). In such cases there may have been 'confusion' between ἔχω and εἰμί.

   (25) ἡμέρας ἔχω τριάκοντα ὁδεύων (Cyr. *De Ador.* 10.32).

   (26) ἐξ ἧς ἔχω κανονίζουσα αὐτόν (Leont. *Vit. Sym.* 1709B).

2.1.3. τυγχάνω[26]

With present participle

As Wheeler's (1891) data quite clearly show, VPEs with τυγχάνω as finite verb occur very frequently in Classical Greek (especially Classical prose, cf. Adrados 1992:452), though they diminish greatly in Post-classical Greek (cf. Jannaris 1897:493, who indicates that τυγχάνω seems to have lost its participial construction in the early Greco-Roman period).[27] In general, this participial construction is not considered periphrastic: in most grammars, the participle is classified as supplementary (e.g. Rijksbaron 2006:120). Dietrich (1973a, 1973b), on the other hand, does consider the construction with present participle to be periphrastic: it expresses a combination of the values 'Winkelschau' and 'Zufall', as illustrated by example (27).

   (27) ὁ δὲ Θρασυδαῖος ἔτι καθεύδων ἐτύγχανεν (Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.28).

Some scholars believe that in Classical Greek the VPE τυγχάνω + part.pres. stood in opposition to εἰμί + part.pres with regard to the expression of progressive aspect, or *Winkelschau* as Dietrich would say (Dietrich 1973a:234, 1973b:209 indicates that the construction was grammaticalized to a larger extent than the VPE with εἰμί). Björck (1940:64) agrees that there are some similarities between the constructions with εἰμί and τυγχάνω, but at the same time notes that "…zu einem reinen Ausdruck der Progressivität ist τυγχάνειν mit

---

[26] Note that the verb τυγχάνω (together with κυρέω, cf. *infra*) diverges from the other verbs listed under §2.1 in that it is not stative when used lexically (in which case it has the meaning of "to hit").

[27] The construction occurs in the papyri but not at all in the NT. According to Moulton (1978:228) NT writers would instinctively avoid a phrase as "I happen to be". Rydbeck (1969:193) thinks that other VPEs may have made the construction redundant (he considers εἰμί ποιήσας a potential candidate, but admits this VPE is infrequent; cf. also Aerts 1965:88 ff.).

Partizip nie geworden". In his opinion, the construction could not be used when something was not a coincidence, but to the contrary was to be expected. We could not say of Cornelius in *Acts* 10.24 ἐτύγχανεν προσδοκῶν αὐτούς. Coseriu (1975:14), on the other hand, writes that it is doubtful whether the construction encompassed more than *to be* with an aspectual determination of momentaneity.

Rydbeck (1969:193) is of the opinion that the VPE τυγχάνω + part.pres. gives aoristic aspect to the present tense. He also suggests that, from a diachronic point of view, the verb "kann in seiner Nuance recht verblaβt sein" (Rydbeck 1969:193). This is explicitly indicated by Ljungvik (1926:45) in his study of the aprocryphal Gospels: "τυγχάνειν hat, wie es scheint, die Bedeutung der Zufälligkeit u. dgl. ganz eingebüsst und wurde wohl fast nur als ein volleres 'sein' empfunden". Ljungvik does not give any examples, however, of participial constructions.

With aorist and perfect participle

According to Rosén (1957:140; 1962:191-192) the occurrences of τυγχάνω with an aorist and perfect participle in Herodotus should be considered periphrastic: they build a second aorist and a second perfect, as in (28). Dietrich (1973a:234) considers the occurrences with perfect participle adjectival. Aerts (1965:83) points attention to some Post-classical examples, more specifically from Procopius' *Anecdota* (with the sense of a pluperfect).

(28) τοῦτο τὸ μὴ τυγχάνοι ἄλλῳ ἐξευρημένον (Her. *Hist.* 2.135.3).

2.1.4. γίγνομαι

With present and perfect participle

Periphrasis with γίγνομαι is largely accepted (cf. Schodde 1885:76; Jannaris 1897:490; Radermacher 1911:83; Dana & Mantey 1957:231; Moulton 1963:89; Aerts 1965:33; Goodwin 1966[1875]:332; Blass & Debrunner 1979:287; Karleen 1980:134; Smyth 1984[1920]:437; Thompson 1985:52; Adrados 1992:452-453; Conybeare & Stock 1995[1905]:70; Fanning 1990:310; Evans 2001:224 ff.; Caragounis 2004:176), but only few authors distinguish between the various types of participle. Boyer (1984:172) explicitly rejects it as being periphrastic. Porter classifies it as a 'catenative' construction (cf. *infra*), as he considers γίγνομαι to be aspectually marked (1989:491).

The semantic similarity between εἰμί and γίνομαι has often been pointed at (e.g. Evans 2001:225). According to some scholars, the two verbs can substitute for each other. This would be the case in (29), where εἰμί with perfect participle is replaced by γίγνομαι (Adrados

1992:455; cf. also Harry 1906:69; Bonaccorsi 1933:30; Schwyzer 1934:812; Conybeare & Stock 1995[1905]:70).

> (29) πεποιθὼς ἐγένου ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ, … (*Is.* 30.12).

VPEs with γίγνομαι do not seem to be used frequently in Post-classical Greek. Evans (2001:225) indicates that there are only a few examples in the LXX (contra Thompson 1985:52). According to Winer (1870:440) there are no examples of the construction in the NT (contrast, however, with a.o. Dietrich 1973a:236 and Adrados 1992:453). Dietrich (1973b:210) indicates that this VPE only occurs in Biblical texts, or texts which are close to it (cf. Mussies 1971:304). Wolf (1912:56) notes some occurrences in Malalas.

Most scholars point at the ingressive aspect of the construction (Coseriu 1975:18;[28] Fanning 1990:310), for which both the present and the perfect participle can be used (Blass & Debrunner 1979:287). Dietrich (1973a:236) accords γίγνομαι + part.pres. the combined value 'Winkelschau + Situierung'. Next to the progressive aspect it signals "eine Betonung des bisher im Kontext unbeachteten Handlungsstranges", as in (30).

> (30) ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ καὶ κηρύσσων (*Mc.* 1.4).

With aorist participle

Stahl (1907:146) notes that the above mentioned ingressive aspect also occurs with the aorist participle (cf. Wolf 1912:56). Here, however, there seems to be a weakening of the ingressive value "zur bloβen Umschreibung", as in (31). Aerts (1965:33) remarks that this VPE is often used for the imperative or prohibitive (cf. Madvig 1853:165; Moorhouse 1982:205). The nuance of the expression is that of an urgent desire.

> (31) μὴ τοίνυν, ὦ ξένε, …ἀπαρνηθεὶς γένῃ (Pl. *Soph.* 217c).

2.1.5. ὑπάρχω

With present and perfect participle

Most scholars referring to the construction with γίγνομαι mention this VPE in the same breath. Again, Boyer (1984:172) explicitly rejects its periphrasticity. Stahl (1907:146) notes that ὑπάρχω could be used both with the present and perfect participle (in the NT only with perfect participle, according to Blass & Debrunner 1979:287), "im Sinne der betonten Wirklichkeit", as in (32). Robertson (1934:375) cites the New-Testamentic example (33) (cf.

---

[28] According to Coseriu (1975:18) this VPE can express the category of 'Grad der Handlung', more specifically the 'ingressive Grade' (in his view γίγνομαι = "εἰμί + ingressiv"). For the difference between *Grad* and *Schau*, cf. Coseriu (1966:41) and Dietrich (1973b:194-197).

also Blass & Debrunner 1979:287; Conybeare & Stock 1995[1905]:71). McKay (1981:292) calls the use of ὑπάρχω instead of εἰμί in this example "more pretentious".

(32) ὑπῆρχον Ὀλύνθιοι δύναμίν τινα κεκτημένοι (Dem. *Ol.* 3.7).

(33) μόνον δὲ βεβαπτισμένοι ὑπῆρχον εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ (*Acts* 8.16).

Blass & Debrunner (1979:287) indicate that the classical meaning of ὑπάρχω got weakened towards that of εἰμί in later times (i.c. the NT, cf. Antoniadis 1930:156 for Luke). According to Jannaris (1897:491) the more regular ὑπάρχω often replaced εἰμί in Post-classical transitional Greek (300-600 n. C.) (cf. Bauer 1988:1670; Porter 1989:443). Meecham (1935:117) cites (47), occurring in the letter of Aristeas (second century BC), as an example of the periphrastic perfect with ὑπάρχω.

(34) ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Εἰ μὴ πεποιθὼς ὑπάρχοι τοῖς ὄχλοις μηδὲ ταῖς δυνάμεσιν, ἀλλὰ τὸν θεὸν ἐπικαλοῖτο διὰ πάντων … (*Ep. Arist.* 193)

2.1.6. Φαίνομαι and κυρέω[29]

Constructions with the finite verbs φαίνομαι and κυρέω are arguably least often mentioned in treatments of Ancient Greek verbal periphrasis. They are not normally considered periphrastic: the participle is commonly classified as supplementary (e.g. Rijksbaron 2006:117). Gildersleeve (1980[1900]:126) and Smyth (1984:437) do mention the construction with φαίνομαι – Gildersleeve even notes that it is "especially worthy of note as a valuable periphrasis" – , but this view does not seem to be shared by many scholars. According to Gildersleeve (1980[1900]:126) this VPE is often used for the future ascertainment of a past action, as in (48) "it will appear that I have put no one in the catalogue".

(35) οὐ τοίνυν οὐδ᾽ εἰς τὸν κατάλογον Ἀθηναίων καταλέξας οὐδένα φανήσομαι (Lys. *Δήμ. καταλ. ἀπ.* 16).

As for the VPE with κυρέω, according to Dietrich (1973a:234) it has the same aspectual value as the construction with τυγχάνω ('Winkelschau + Zufall'). It is typically used in tragedy, as in (36). There do not seem to be any examples from Post-classical Greek.

(36) εἰ μὴ κυρῶ λεύσσων μάταια (Soph. *Trach.* 406-407).

---

[29] For a collection of examples with κυρέω in the earlier Greek writers, I refer to Wheeler (1891).

2.2. Verbs of movement

2.2.1. ἔρχομαι/εἶμι

With future participle

According to Thielmann (1898:55) the VPE ἔρχομαι + part.fut. can already be found in Homer, where the finite verb still retains its lexical value (cf. Adrados 1992:453). Thielmann finds the first 'real' VPEs in the work of Herodotus and the tragedians, as in (37).

> (37) ἐγὼ δὲ περὶ μὲν τούτων οὐκ ἔρχομαι ἐρέων ὡς οὕτως ἢ ἄλλως κως ταῦτα ἐγένετο (Her. *Hist.* 1.5.3).

Schwyzer (1950a:255) interprets the construction of ἔρχομαι with a future participle, e.g. ἔρχομαι φράσων, as "einen schärferen Ausdruck des Futurums". Elsewhere, he writes that this construction is equivalent to *je vais dire* in French (Schwyzer 1934:813, referring to Thielmann 1898:55). Dietrich describes the construction ἔρχομαι/εἶμι + part. Fut. as expressing 'sekundäre parallel-prospektive Perspektive'.[30] Adrados (1992:453-454) writes that the VPE indicates intention (cf. Moorhouse 1982:207) and has imperfective aspect (the action starts in the present and continuous towards the future). Adrados (1992:455) also mentions the possibility of a 'pretérito-futuro' with the construction ἦα λέξων, but this is infrequent.

Létoublon (1982:184) agrees that it is very tempting to consider cases such as (37) aspectual VPEs, since several criteria of auxiliarity are present (e.g. desemanticization of the finite verb). She notes, however, that the finite verb always occurs in the first person, and that the non-finite verb is always a verb of saying (restrictions which were first noticed by Thielmann 1885:56; according to Amenta 2003:90 the construction is used as "formula di passaggio per introdurre nuovi argomenti", cf. also Wakker 2007:178-179). If we were really dealing with aspectual VPEs we would not expect such constraints (cf. Létoublon 1984:31-32). Consequently, we should consider Herodotus' use to be 'metaphorical', rather than truly periphrastic (cf. Stahl 1907:686; Wakker 2007:179). Plato, on the other hand, does seem to expand the finite verb to other forms of the verbal paradigm and the non-finite verb to other lexical types (cf. Thielmann 1898:57: "völlige Freiheit herrscht aber erst bei Plato"; Létoublon 1982:187), as for example (38): "c'est donc en tant que sophiste qui nous allons le

---

[30] Dietrich (1973a:134) distinguishes three perspectives the speaker can take with regard to the verbal action: the action can occur parallel with the moment of speaking ('parallele Perspektive', regarding the present), it can occur before the moment of speaking ('retrospektive Perspektive', regarding the past), or after the moment of speaking ('prospektive Perspektive', regarding the future). This constitutes the primary perspective or 'primäre perspektive'. It is possible, however, within each space of time delimited by the primary perspective to take on each of the three perspectives, forming a secondary perspective or 'sekundäre Perspektive'. In the French present (*je fais*), for example, there is a retrospective (*j'ai fait*) and a prospective (*je vais faire*) secondary perspective.

payer?" (Létoublon 1982:187). Here we witness an expansion from metaphorical to auxiliary use (cf. also Wakker 2006:253).

(38) ὡς σοφιστῇ ἄρα ἐρχόμεθα τελοῦντες τὰ χρήματα (Pl. *Prt.* 311e).

With present participle[31]

In his treatment of this VPE, Dietriech (1973b:211) notes that in some cases the lexical value of the finite verb is still apparent, as for example in (39), which he translates, however, with durative aspectual value: "der auch immer am besten dabei ist, das Licht der frühgeborenen Eos anzukündigen" (Adrados 1992:453 agrees with this aspectual interpretation). Létoublon (1982:180), on the other hand, who takes a more strict position, prefers a non-periphrastic interpretation: "lorsque l'astre…qui s'avance, annonçant la lumière à la terre…" (cf. Amenta 2001:178). In another example, (40), she specifies that we are dealing with a metaphorical movement (cf. *supra*): the narrative itself constitutes the space in which the subject advances by praising his stepmother.

(39) εὖτ' ἀστὴρ ὑπερέσχε φαάντατος, ὅς τε μάλιστα ἔρχεται ἀγγέλλων φάος Ἠοῦς ἠριγενείης (Hom. *Od.* 13.93-4).

(40) τραφῆναι δὲ ἔλεγε ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ βουκόλου γυναικός, ἤιέ τε ταύτην αἰνέων διὰ παντός (Her. *Hist.* 1.122.3).

Moorhouse indicates that the construction emphasizes the continuance of an act, which he illustrates with (41) "proceeds with my destruction by fire". In similar vein, Dietrich (1973a:237) mentions that the construction with ἔρχομαι/εἶμι generally is indifferent to the distinction between 'prospektive' and 'retrospektive Schau' (cf. Adrados 1992:453; Amenta 2001:171; Amenta 2003:87).

(41) μ' εἶσι φλογίζων (Soph. *Phil.* 1199).

In the NT we find more grammaticalized examples, such as (42) (cf. Amenta 2001:178, 2003:36). Amenta (2003:95) remarks that it is difficult to determine the periphrasticity of this and other constructions: the finite verb is never desemanticized to the same extent as in the more familiar constructions with εἰμί (Amenta 2003:93). Dietrich (1973a:239) mentions some additional Post-classical examples.

---

[31] The VPE ἔρχομαι + part.pres. is better preserved than that with εἶμι, which does not occur frequently in the Koine (Dietrich 1973a:237). When in the later Koine the verb ἔρχομαι started to mean "to come" it could no longer be used in this way (Dietrich 1973b:217). A periphrastic construction with the verb ὑπάγω (Modern Greek πάω) probably took over its function. According to Dietrich there are no instances found in texts of the first centuries AD. Tabachowitz (1943:1), however, cites several (very interesting) paratactic examples, such as Palladius *Hist.Laus.* 70.6: ἐγὼ γὰρ ὑπάγω γίνομαι μοναχός.

(42) καὶ ἦλθεν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλων (*Mc.* 1.39).

With perfect participle

Dietrich (1973a:242) briefly mentions example (43) as precursory to the Romance construction with the verb "to go" (e.g. Sp. "ir, andar, seguir") and a perfect participle or adjective. As to its aspectual value, it is similar to the previously mentioned construction with present participle. Again, the finite verb retains part of its lexical value.

(43) δοίη δ᾽ ᾧ κ᾽ ἐθέλοι καί οἱ κεχαρισμένος ἔλθοι (Hom. *Od.* 2.54).

2.2.2. ἥκω

With future participle

In Dietrich's (1973a:241-3) opinion, this VPE expresses 'sekundäre parallell-prospektive Perspektive', similarly to the construction with ἔρχομαι (cf. also Liddell & Scott 1968:767). Thielmann (1898:58) doubts, however, whether examples such as (44) prove the existence of a periphrastic construction with this verb in Classical Greek: "allerdings kommt in allen diesen Fällen ἥκω nicht über die ursprüngliche Bedeutung hinaus".

(44) τῆς μητρὸς ἥκω τῆς ἐμῆς φράσων ἐν οἷς/ νῦν ἔστ᾽ ἐν οἷς θ᾽ ἥμαρτεν οὐχ ἑκουσία (Soph. *Trach.* 1122-23).

With present participle

According to Thielmann (1898:58) the construction is used "von einer zum zweitenmal oder öfter eintretenden Handlung". This meaning seems to be recognized by Liddell & Scott (1968:767) as well, as they translate (45) with "which commonly happens even now" (cf. Coseriu 1975:15). This goes well with Dietrich's (1973b:211) observation that, while the VPEs ἔρχομαι/εἶμι + part.pres. are indifferent towards the distinction between 'prospektive' and 'retrospektive' Schau, the construction with ἥκω is more inclined towards the latter and that with βαίνω more towards the former. Amenta (2003:87) rightly remarks that ἥκω always maintains a strong spatial sense, so that there are only a few truly periphrastic constructions with this verb.

(45) ὃ καὶ νῦν ἥκει γινόμενον (Pol. *Hist.* 24.9.11).

With perfect and aorist participle

While the VPEs of ἥκω + part.fut./pres. occur relatively frequent in Classical Greek (though not in Post-classical Greek, cf. Dietrich 1973a:264-5) those of ἥκω + part.perf./aor. do not. Some scholars do mention these constructions, because of the fact that they resemble modern Romance constructions. Similarly to the construction with ἔρχομαι, Dietrich (1973a:242)

mentions (46) as precursory to the Romance construction with the verb "to come" and a perfect participle or adjective. With regard to (47), Thielmann (1898:58) notes the similarity between the construction with aorist participle and modern French "je viens de…". In both cases, ἥκω retains much of its semantic force.

(46) καὶ δεῖ με, περὶ ὧν οὗτος ἐπιβεβουλευκὼς ἥκει, … . (Lys. *Areop.* 3).

(47) ἐν δ' ἄντρου μυχοῖς/ κρύψας γυναῖκα τὴν κακῶν πάντων ἐμοὶ ἄρξασαν ἥκω (Eur. *Hel.* 424-426).

2.2.3. βαίνω, πέλομαι[32]

I treat the VPEs with βαίνω and πέλομαι under one and the same heading, because both are both rather peripheral. For βαίνω there are some well-known Homeric instances, such as (48) (Coseriu 1975:14). In Classical Greek, however, more examples are hard to find (Dietrich 1973a:240 found another example in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*: ἀμπτάμενος ἔβα (*Lys.* 106)). Liddell & Scott (1968:302) mention an interesting example from the papyri, our (49), which they interpret as 'Periphrase für das Futur' (cf. Coseriu 1975:14). Dietrich indicates that in general the construction shows a low degree of grammaticalization and that the finite verb most often retains its lexical meaning.

(48) πολὺν δ' ὅ γε λαὸν ἀγείρας βῆ φεύγων ἐπὶ πόντον (Hom. *Il.* 2.664-5).

(49) βαίνω καταγγέλλων (*PMag.Par.*1.2474).

Dietrich (1973a:237-238) shows that the construction with πέλομαι is essentially limited to early poetry. He can find only one example of a VPE of πέλομαι with present participle in Homer, our example (50). It is not clear, however, whether we are really dealing with a periphrastic construction. An alternative interpretation, indicated by Dietrich (1973a:237), would be "sie ging hin als Helfende". Goodwin (1966[1875]:332) also mentions (51), where πέλομαι is accompanied by a perfect participle.

(50) ἦ γάρ ῥα πέλεν Δαναοῖσιν ἀρηγών (Hom. *Il.* 5.511).

(51) αὐτὰρ ἐμεῖο λελασμένος ἔπλευ Ἀχιλλεῦ (Hom. *Il.* 23.69).

---

[32] It is not entirely clear whether πέλομαι should in fact be considered a verb of movement (Liddell & Scott 1968:1358 list this verb with the meaning "come into existence, become, be"). Beekes & van Beek (2010:1169), however, discussing the etymology of πέλομαι, cite Sanskrit *cárati* "to move around, wander, drive (on the meadow), graze" and Albanian *siell* "to turn around, turn, bring".

2.2.4. ἕστηκα[33]

With present participle

The VPE with ἕστηκα constitutes an interesting Post-classical development. According to Dietrich this construction expresses *Winkelschau*. Amenta (2001:176-177, 2003:85) similarly mentions the possibility of postural verbs such as στήκω to express progressive aspect. The construction occurs several times in the NT, as for example in (52). In some cases the lexical value of the finite verb *to stand* may be implied, because the construction is grammaticalized to a small degree.

> (52) ἄνδρες Γαλιλαῖοι, τί ἑστήκατε βλέποντες εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν; (*Acts* 1:11).

With perfect and aorist participle

Interestingly, there are also a few examples of ἕστηκα with perfect and aorist participle. This type of VPE is mentioned by Björck (1940:118), who refers to an article of Cameron (1939:178-179). Cameron discusses an example found in an inscription, printed here as (53). In that same article, he presents some additional examples, both with aorist and perfect participle.

> (53) στήκω κολαθέσα ἐπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ (Steinleitner, Die Beicht, p. 47, No. 22 = S.E.G. 6.252).

2.3. Phasal verbs

2.3.1. διαγίγνομαι, διάγω, διατελέω and ἐπιμένω

Constructions with the verbs διαγίγνομαι, διάγω, διατελέω and ἐπιμένω generally are not considered periphrastic, primarily because of the fact that – even in combination with a participle – they always retain their lexical value of "to continue" (Bentein 2011). Rijksbaron (2006:120) classifies this type of participle as 'supplementary'.

   Next to Dietrich (1973a, 1973b), Jannaris (1897:490-491) and Adrados (1992:453) also consider these constructions to be periphrastic. Mateos (1977:33) only mentions ἐπιμένω. According to Dietrich (1973b:213), the Ancient Greek verbal system had a division between 'kontinuative' and 'extensive Schau', similar to the modern Romance languages, especially Spanish.[34] More particularly, the finite verbs διατελέω and ἐπιμένω are mainly used to

---

[33] This finite verb generally occurs in the perfect (cf. also Bauer 1988:1532). According to Dietrich (1973b:210), in some cases we can interpret ἵσταμαι + part.pres. in terms of *Winkelschau*. An example is *Trans. Beat. Mar.* 35: ὁ δὲ ἡγεμὼν ἵστατο θεωρῶν ἀπὸ μακρόθεν τὴν θέαν.

[34] An example of 'kontinuative Schau' in the Romance languages is Fr. "je continue à chanter", and an example of 'extensive Schau' Sp. "quedo cantando". The difference between these two categories lies "im ununterbrochenen Andauern der Handlung in festen Grenzen" in case of the extensive Schau (1973b:196). Dietrich translates the second example with "ich singe bis zum Ende weiter".

22

express *kontinuative Schau*, as in (54). The finite verbs διάγω and διαγίγνομαι, on the other hand, are used to express *extensive Schau*, as in (55). Dietrich indicates, however, that this distinction is not entirely similar to what is found in the Romance languages, and that further research is needed to distinguish the constructions more accurately.[35]

(54) εἶτα τὸν λοιπὸν βίον καθεύδοντες διατελοῖτε ἄν (Pl. *Ap.* 31a5).

(55) ἡ ψυχή μου διὰ τὸ ὑβρίσθαι καὶ ὀργίζεσθαι οὐ τὸ ἀσφαλέστατον σκοποῦσα διῆγεν (Xen. *Cyr.* 5.4.35).

2.3.2. παύομαι

To the best of my knowledge, Mateos (1977:33) is the only scholar who mentions παύομαι with present participle as a periphrastic construction. In his opinion, it expresses 'interruptive aspect', as in the New-Testamentic (56). The negative construction οὐ παύομαι with present participle, which occurs more often, has continuative aspect. This construction is of course well-known from Classical Greek (cf. e.g. Rijksbaron 2006:120).

(56) ὡς δὲ ἐπαύσατο λαλῶν (*Lc.* 5.4).

3. THE DEFINITION OF VERBAL PERIPHRASIS[36]

There has been, and still is, considerable disagreement among scholars about use and definition of the term 'verbal periphrasis' (Kahn 1973:126-127; Porter 1989:452), which, as (Dietrich 1973a:21) notes, may lead to contradictory results. Purely syntactically, for example, some people reserve the term 'verbal periphrasis' for constructions with a participle (e.g. Kahn 1973:126; Cobb 1973:81), while others also consider expressions with an infinitive and some also with a verbal adjective (e.g. Thielmann 1891:298; Regard 1918:111; Moulton 1963:89; Conybeare & Stock 1995[1905]:70; cf. also Kahn 1973:148 and Drinka 2009). Jannaris (1897:435), Blass & Debrunner (1979:261, 297-98), Coseriu (1966:54) and Dietrich (1973a:246-63) also mention constructions where the 'auxiliary' is non-finite, and the 'lexical verb' finite (cf. Black 1967:125), e.g. ἐλθών + finite verb. Thielmann (1898:57) even discusses paratactic constructions such as εἶμι καὶ πειράσομαι (Aesch. *PV* 325) (cf. Coseriu 1966:23). Some scholars, such as Zilliacus (1956:164), also take into account expressions of the type φροντίδα ἔχειν, ἐν φροντίδα εἶναι and φροντίδα τιθέναι to be *periphrastische Konstruktionen* (cf. also Rosenkranz 1930:162; Schwyzer 1934:812; Aerts 1965:150 ('nominal periphrases')).

---

[35] Jannaris (1897:491) indicates that these verbs develop a different meaning in Post-classical Greek: in the LXX διάγω means διακομίζω, and it does not appear in the NT. Διαγίγνομαι does appear in the NT, but with the meaning of παρέρχομαι.

[36] Cf. Porter (1989:447-449) and Dietrich (1973a:21-64) for a historical overview.

With regard to participial VPEs, there is no agreement which constructions should be considered periphrastic. While scholars such as Porter reserve the term strictly for the construction with εἰμί, others describe a wide variety of constructions with verbs such as γίγνομαι, ἕστηκα, ἔχω, κυρῶ, φαίνομαι, τυγχάνω and ὑπάρχω (e.g. Jannaris 1897:180, Smyth 1980:436-437 and Adrados 1992:452-453; these are called 'catenative constructions' by Porter 1989:487-492).

As already mentioned, the early studies of Alexander (1885), Barbelenet (1913) and Regard (1918) focus almost exclusively on the construction of εἰμί + part. In an attempt to determine when this construction is 'truly' periphrastic, they propose to subdivide the occurrences. Regard (1918:113-114) for example, distinguishes between three groups, while recognizing that such a distinction is *un peu flottante*: (1) "des exemples de combinaison étroite" (2) "exemples… où le participe est plus ou moins assimilable à un adjectif ordinaire" (3) "des combinaisons lâches entre diverses formes de être et le participe". The second point, concerning the adjectival character of the participle, was further elaborated by Björck (1940), who argues for a distinction between 'verbal' 'adjectival' periphrasis,[37] in which he was followed by most of the grammarians.[38] Björck furthermore distinguishes between 'Daueradjektivierung' and 'Gelegenheitsadjektivierung',[39] based on frequency of occurrence.

As we have seen above, the landmark studies of Aerts (1965) and Dietrich (1973a, 1973b) adopt a broader perspective: they take into account a larger number of constructions, and as such attempt to offer a more precise definition of verbal periphrasis. For Aerts (1965:2) one can only have periphrasis "when εἶναι and ἔχειν together with a participle express an elementary verbal conception, e.g. Koine ἦν διδάσκων = ἐδίδασκεν, AGR γεγραμμένον ἐστί = γέγραπται…".[40] VPEs are thus considered to form an alternative to synthetic forms,

---

[37] Amenta (2003:70) clarifies the distinction between εἰμί with an adjective and adjectival periphrasis: while the former construction indicates a quality or a condition of a subject without any temporal delimitation with regard to the validity of the statement, the latter construction assumes validity starting from a certain point of time.

[38] Others do not make the distinction, and consider the participle accompanying εἰμί to be adjectival in all cases (cf. Stahl 1907:145; Gildersleeve 1980[1900]:81; Smyth 1984:414). Especially passive perfect participles are considered adjectival (cf. Harry 1905:350; Gonda 1959:111; Aerts 1965:13-14; Gildersleeve 1980[1900]:122, 124; Karleen 1980:132; McKay 1981:291; Adrados 1992:455; Wallace 1996:647; Duhoux 2000:296). Harry (1905:350-351) notes that, as far as the passive periphrastic perfect is concerned, when the participle is removed to a distance from the finite verb, its verbal nature "reasserts itself".

[39] Cf. Hilhorst ("participes devenus stéréotypés … participes incidemment adjectivés", 1976:71) and Karleen ("frozen and non-frozen adjectival participles", 1980:118). Ceglia (1998:26) remarks that, strictly speaking, we should not call this type of construction adjectival 'periphrasis', as it is not periphrastic.

[40] Contrast this definition, however, with what Aerts writes on p.150 (on VPEs in the work of Herodotus): "we find all sorts of nominal and verbal periphrases, for example with εἶναι, γίγνεσθαι, ποιεῖν, ποιεῖσθαι, μέλλειν, ἔρχεσθαι, ἰέναι etc. and so it it is not strange that periphrases with ἔχειν also occur in his prose". This rather "loose definition of periphrasis" has been criticized by Porter (1989:489).

expressing more or less the same meaning but in a periphrastic way (cf. Stahl 1907:144; Björck 1940:9; Fanning 1990:310; Rosén 1992:11-12; Rijkbsaron 2006:126-127; Markopoulos 2009:11). Aerts (1965:3) specifies this relationship by positing three types of periphrasis: (1) 'substitute periphrasis', when the VPE replaces a monolectic form with little to no difference in meaning (2) 'suppletive periphrasis', when the VPE replaces a no-longer existent monolectic form (3) 'expressive periphrasis', when the VPE is used 'with a special purport' (cf. Mussies 1971:302; Fanning 1990:310). Dietrich (1973a:56; 1973b:192) proposes a definition of verbal periphrasis which integrates several of the above mentioned elements. He recognizes a syntactic, semantic and paradigmatic criterion to delimit and identify periphrastic constructions: (1) the construction forms a syntactic unit, (2) its meaning cannot be deduced from the separate parts, and (3) it stands in functional opposition to a synthetic verb form. Note that in their standard work on grammaticalization, Hopper & Traugott (2003:124) still follow Dietrich's definition of periphrasis.

More recent studies have explicitly criticized the 'subjectivity' found in the early proposals of Björck (1940), Aerts (1965) and Dietrich (1973a, 1973b). Kahn (1973:127) criticizes an approach which "hesitates between two characterizations, one of them lexico-semantic and stylistic, the other properly syntactical". In his opinion periphrasis should be defined in syntactic terms, without reference to the meaning of the verb. In order to achieve this, he makes use of Harris' transformational syntax: "the occurrence of εἰμί + participle in a given sentence is periphrastic whenever there is only one kernel sentence underlying both forms in the transformational source of the given sentence".[41] This definition permits us to categorize an example such as (57) (cf. Rijksbaron 2006:127-128) as non-periphrastic, because it is made up out of two kernel sentences: "the army was there" and "the army continued the siege".[42] Kahn (1973) furthermore recognizes the adjectival use of the participle but he rejects it as a basis for the grammatical classification of different types of VPE. In every case the underlying structure, the transformational source, is Noun + Verb.[43] Moreover, it is not clear

---

[41] As Kahn (1973:127) notes, this definition coincides in most cases with Aerts' criterion of an 'elementary verbal conception'.

[42] Porter (1989:448) criticizes Kahn's approach of transformational decomposition, because it heavily relies on meaning. Kahn (1973:130) is aware of this weakness: "this definition cannot produce mechanical agreement, since the kernels which a reader is willing to recognize in transformational decomposition will depend upon his understanding of the sentence in the first place". He is, however, convinced that his syntactic formulation of the problem – replacing the former vague notions of 'strong' and 'weak sense', 'independent meaning' and so on – will lead to a substantial reduction of disagreement about particular cases.

[43] Kahn illustrates this with Sophocles *OT* 747: δεινῶς ἀθυμῶ μὴ βλέπων ὁ μάντις ᾖ "I fear the prophet may not be blind after all". In this case the VPE could be interpreted as adjectival because it is used opposed to τυφλός (cf. Aerts 1965:18; Rijksbaron 2006:127). However, μὴ βλέπων ᾖ, remains roughly synonymous with μὴ βλέπῃ.

to Kahn what criterion we can use to define 'complete adjectivization' of a participle. It would seem that, as long as it is recognizably connected with finite verb forms from the same stem, it does not lose its verbal nature completely.

(57) … οὗ ἦν στράτευμα τῶν Ἀθηναίων πολιορκοῦν (Thuc. *Hist.* 2.67.1)

Similarly to Kahn (1973), Porter (1989) does not accept the delimitation of VPEs on the basis of adjectivization of the participle. In Porter's definition (Porter 1988:158; Porter 1989:452-453; Porter 1999:45) a periphrastic construction must contain an 'aspectually vague' auxiliary verb and a participle in agreement with its referent. These two components must form a single grammatical unit both from a semantic and a syntactic point of view (the two components should be adjacent). The only construction which meets these criteria is εἰμί with participle (cf. Porter 1988:158; Porter 1999:45). Porter (1989:487) considers constructions with verbs such as δύναμαι, μέλλω, θέλω, ἔχω and γίνομαι to be catenative and not periphrastic, "since the auxiliary inherently maintains its integrity as an independent contributor to the semantics of the clause".

Evans (2001:221) also criticizes Aerts' proposal, more specifically the category of 'expressive periphrasis', for being "over-subjective". He does not dismiss it entirely, however, and in general takes a much more positive stance than Kahn and Porter. In fact, Evans (2001:221) makes use of Aerts' first two categories (suppletive and substitute periphrasis, cf. *supra*) to define verbal periphrasis: "verbal periphrasis is defined here as the combination of an auxiliary verb plus participle or infinitive as equivalent to (substitute) or replacement for (suppletive periphrasis) a synthetic tense form". Evans also offers a forcecul critique of Porter's work, both for his use and understanding of the term 'aspectually vague auxiliary verb', which "lacks diachronic scope and yields an artificially narrow definition of periphrasis" (Evans 2001:222) and his dismissal of the distinction between adjectival and verbal periphrasis. Evans (2001) recognizes VPEs with various finite verbs, such as ἔχω, θέλω, μέλλω and ὀφείλω.

Most recently, Bentein (2011) has proposed a more flexible approach: he argues that the category of 'verbal periphrasis' is prototypically organized. Bentein opposes two different models: the 'criterial-attribute model' and the 'prototype model'. While with the former, members are identified by means of a list of defining features (as in Porter 1989) and the category has fixed boundaries, the latter model recognizes that a category can have both central and more peripheral members, and that there are not always clear-cut boundaries. From the second perspective, we may consider the various criteria proposed for identification

of verbal periphrasis (both with regard to Ancient Greek and cross-linguistically), "semantic, morphological, syntactic and paradigmatic dimensions along which prototypical periphrastic constructions are identified" (Bentein 2011). Bentein thus recognizes four groups of periphrastic constructions in Classical Greek, from prototypical (εἰμί with perfect participle, ἔχω with aorist participle) to more peripheral.

4. LANGUAGE CONTACT

4.1. Ancient Greek and the Semitic languages[44]

Many works discussing verbal periphrasis in Ancient Greek refer to Semitic influences. This especially concerns the VPE εἰμί + part.pres., the frequency of which increases remarkably in the LXX and the NT (cf. Moulton 1978:226; Blass & Debrunner 1979:285-286; Thompson 1985:50). Scholars of Biblical Greek generally attribute this increased frequency to the influence of the Semitic languages (*Hebrew*: Milroy 1892:18-19; Schmid 1893:3.114; Boyer 1984:171; Conybeare & Stock 1995[1905]:68;[45] Ceglia 1998:30/ *Aramaic*:[46] Winer 1870:439; Chantraine 1927:250; Schwyzer 1934:813; Sparks 1943:131, 1950:25; Dana & Mantey 1957:232; Moulton 1963:87; Rosén 1962:xxiii, 1979:64; Creed 1965:lxxx/ *Both*: Abel 1927:267; Robertson 1934:888; Mussies 1971:306;[47] Thompson 1985:50-52; Voelz 1984:962/ *Unspecified* ('the Semitic languages'):[48] Schodde 1885:77-78; Blass & Debrunner 1979:285-286; Fanning 1990:317), although the existence of the construction in Classical Greek is generally recognized (e.g. Moulton 1978:226: "no one denies that periphrasis is thoroughly Greek") and free use of the construction in Biblical Greek admitted (e.g. Thompson 1985:51: "not every periphrastic construction in the LXX of course is the result of the underlying Hebrew or Aramaic").

In his doctoral dissertation, Aerts (1965) basically agrees with such Semitic influence, but argues that it is primarily indirect. He follows Tabachowitz (1956:41-47), who was one of the first scholars to stress the stylistic influence of the LXX on the NT. Aerts (1965:57) bases his argumentation primarily on the Gospel of Luke, who uses the construction most often. He observes that, although Luke was not Jewish by birth and had a good knowledge of Greek, his

---

[44] Regrettably the article by Gil Arrondo (1989) was not available to me at the time of writing.

[45] Conybeare & Stock (1995[1905]:68) note that, next to the Hebrew influence, there also was "a strong tendency towards the employment of such forms within the Greek language itself".

[46] The reader will notice the large number of scholars adhering to an Aramaic influence. According to Verboomen (1992:73) it forms the *communis opinio* in the scientific literature.

[47] According to Mussies (1971:306), it is difficult to attribute the Semitic origin of the periphrastic construction in the gospels to either Hebrew or Aramaic influence without the support of further data.

[48] Criticized by Björck (1940:124) and Verboomen (1992:17).

gospel contains several Semitic expressions. He concludes that Luke must have drawn on sources translated into Greek, i.c. the LXX[49] (cf. Antoniadis 1930:151; Hartman 1963:25; Pryke 1978:103; cf. Sparks 1943:134 for Luke as "a habitual, conscious, and deliberate Septuagintalizer"). Verboomen (1992:19-22) also dismisses a direct (Aramaic) influence. Based on a comparison of the use of the periphrastic imperfect in the LXX and Luke's Gospel, he confirms that Luke's use of the construction should be considered a conscious stylistic imitation or 'Septuagintism'.

Fisher (1989), on the other hand, explicitly argues against Aerts' observation concerning the connection between the frequency of the progressive VPE in the LXX and the NT, as his statistics show that the Pentateuch actually contains fewer instances than 'normal' Greek literature, e.g. the work of Demosthenes (Fisher 1989:87-88, 270). He does agree, however, that "some kind of Semitic influence" (Fisher 1989:271) should be posited, since these VPEs only occur in Biblical Greek.

In his 1965 thesis, Aerts (1965:67) had called for an investigation of the methods of translation in the LXX with regard to periphrastic constructions "to reach greater certainty as to its emotional value". Recently, such a translation-technical study was conducted by Evans (2001), who divides his examples in three groups: (1) "literal renderings of somewhat similar Hebrew constructions" (2) "examples displaying comparative structural freedom but still formally motivated" (3) "examples displaying freedom of formal motivation" (Evans 2001:250). While most examples belong to the first category (57%),[50] Evans also demonstrates the independent usage of all types of VPEs. Evans (2001:256) thinks Aerts' claim about the influence of the LXX on the NT has 'potential validity', but he does not consider the progressive (and future) VPEs to be Semitisms.

Some scholars discard the importance of Semitic influences altogether. Björck (1940:59-62, 66-69), for example, stresses the fact that the construction is also found in non-Biblical writings. In his view, the progressive periphrasis cannot be a 'translation-semitism', because then it would be found in all four Gospels (Björck 1940:68).[51] He argues that the construction is found more often in the synopticists because of the 'special character' of their writings as 'Volkserzählung' (Björck 1940:67; cf. Caragounis 2004:177).

---

[49] Mussies (1971:305-306) agrees that influence through the LXX-version would be more probable if Luke did not have a Semitic background. He notes, on the other hand, that such an influence would only hold for Luke (not for Matthew and Mark), and that scholars are not absolutely certain about Luke's non-Jewish origins.
[50] Fisher's study (1989:163) shows similar results (59%).
[51] Cf. Aerts (1965:56-57) for a critique.

Others take a more moderate position than Björck, in that they acknowledge the existence of the construction in Classical Greek, but recognize the fact that Semitic influences may have 'actualised' a possibility of the Greek language (cf. Palm 1955:95; Rydbeck 1969:197; Blass & Debrunner 1979:285-286). Dietrich (1973b:187), for example, states that there "may have been" direct or indirect influence on the VPE with εἰμί, but that this question is "nicht von entscheidender Bedeutung für die Feststellung ihrer Existenz und ihrer Kontinuität in der griechischen Sprachgeschichte". Amenta (2003:65-66) accords particular importance to the testimony of the papyri, private letters and other documents of daily life, which show the proximity of the NT-language with the spoken Koine (she refers to the work of Mandilaras 1973:50). As εἰμί + part.pres. also occurs in these documents (cf. Amenta 2003:34), she stresses its endogenous origin, though she does recognize the possibility of an indirect Semitic influence 'activating' a construction which already belonged to the expressive possibilities of the Greek language (Amenta 2001:180-181). Giannaris (2009) treats the question along the same line as Dietrich and Amenta: he considers language contact, both with Hebrew and Aramaic, a relevant factor in the development of the VPE εἰμι with present participle, but stresses the existence of the construction in Classical and Post-classical non-biblical Greek.

4.2. Ancient Greek and the Romance languages

In considering the Greek influences on Latin and the Romance languages, Bonfante (1960:174) had noted the existence of the Greek VPE ἔχω γεγραμμένον (Lat. *habeo scriptum*, It. *ò scritto*, Fr. *j'ai écrit* ...).[52] Coseriu (1962, 1966, 1968, 1971, 1975, 1977, 1996) and his student Dietrich (1973a, 1973b, 1983, 1995, 1998) further studied such aspectual VPEs, as part of a larger research programme aiming to determine the contribution of Greek to vulgar Latin and by extension the Romance languages. Their conclusion is that the functional similarities between the Romance languages can only be explained through Ancient Greek (Coseriu 1975:22), which had at its disposal a large variety of periphrastic expressions with lexical verbs such as *to be*, *to come*, *to go*, *to take* ... (cf. Dietrich 1973a:16) to render the categories of 'partialisierende' and 'globalisierende Schau'.[53] Comparing Ancient Greek with the Romance languages, Coseriu (1966:54; 1975) observes the following tendency: when the participle in Ancient Greek functions as a lexical verb (e.g. εἰμι γράφων expressing *partialisierende Schau*) the construction remained hypotactic (e.g. Span. *estar escribiendo*),

---

[52] Earlier scholars had already made similar observations. Cf. for example Vendryes (1937).

[53] Dietrich's (1973b:195) offers the following definition of the concept 'Schau': "Diese typische romanische Kategorie ermöglicht eine Betrachtung der Verbalhandlung entweder 'partialisierend' (zwischen zwei Punkten) oder 'globalisierend', d.h. als ausdrücklich unteilbar".

but when the participle functions as an auxiliary verb (e.g. λαβὼν γράφω expressing *globalisierende Schau*) the construction became paratactic (e.g. Span. *cojo y escribo*).[54] The antecedents of the Romance periphrases where transmitted in the first centuries AD through early-Christian (vulgar) Latin[55] (Dietrich 1973b:198).

According to Poppe (2003:82), in the years following the publication of Dietrich's doctoral thesis (1973a), most reviewers accepted to a lesser or greater extent his general thesis of the Greek origins of Latin and Romance VPEs (e.g. Dominicy 1977; but see Wunderli 1975 for a more critical view). In her recent book, Amenta similarly considers the Greek VPEs with verbs of state "probabili archetipi delle perifrasi romanze aventi verbi di stato come modificatori" (Amenta 2003:64) and the Latin biblical language "un veicolo privilegiato per la trasmissione del costrutto" (Amenta 2003:147).[56] She does point, however, to the similarity between the hypothesis of Semitic influence on Greek VPEs, and Greek influence on Latin VPEs (which appear quite frequently in the Latin versions of the Gospels) (Amenta 2003:146). She stresses that Latin VPEs already existed in Pre-Christian times, so that Greek probably stimulated the use of a construction which was already known in Latin but was not often used (Amenta 2003:96). The work of Drinka (2003a, 2003b, 2007) presents similar findings with regard to the periphrastic *have*-perfect. She claims that this periphrastic perfect "sprang ultimately from a Greek innovation which was adopted and reanalyzed by Latin, and which spread from there into the languages of Europe" (Drinka 2003a:106). Next to formal factors, Drinka also pays attention to sociolinguistic elements stimulating these borrowings, namely the social prestige of Greek in Roman society (Drinka 2003b:11, 2007). Giacalone Ramat (2008:140) argues against Drinka's findings with regard to the periphrastic have-perfect: "although some calquing cannot be excluded, especially in the translations of Christian literature, there is no evidence of any direct influence of Greek upon the development of the Latin and Romance perfect". Giacalone Ramat (referring to Horrocks

---

[54] Modern Greek has generalized the paratactic copulative construction for both 'partialisierende' and 'globalisierende Schau' (Coseriu 1966:54-55; 1975:22). Cf. the examples mentioned by Seiler (1952:158-162) (also mentioned by Coseriu 1966:23).

[55] This hypothesis of a Greek influence on vulgar-Latin VPEs was not entirely new. As Dietrich (1973a:16) notes, several other scholars had adopted this hypothesis, but strictly limited to to the expression *sum* + part.pres. (Milroy 1892:18; Blaise 1955:133; Eklund 1970:66). In general these works did not pay any attention to similarities between Greek and the Romance languages.

[56] One type of construction which cannot have been transmitted to the Romance languages is that with verbs of movement, which is translated in Latin with a verb of state (*Mc.* 1.39, for example, καὶ ἦλθεν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν is translated with *Et erat praedicans in synagogis eorum et in omni Galilaea* in the Vulgata) (Amenta 2003:151).

1997:77-78) does think Latin may have influenced Greek with regard to the construction of have (ἔχω) with past passive participle.

5. SYNTAX OF VPEs WITH εἰμί

5.1. The position of the finite and non-finite verb

One of the first syntactic elements on the research agenda was the position of the finite verb vis-à-vis the infinite verb. Alexander (1885) related the position of εἰμί to degree of periphrasticity: when εἰμί is used in an emphatic position, i.e. when it comes before the participle (cf. Gildersleeve 1980[1900]:81), we cannot speak of 'true' periphrasis (as the finite verb, due to its emphatic position, takes its lexical value of "to be", "to exist"). Along similar lines, Barbelenet (1913:88) noted that, when the participle does not immediately precede the finite verb, it is difficult to determine the 'unity' of the VPE. Regard (1918), on the other hand, came to a different conclusion: in most cases the copula precedes the participle as second element of the VPE (cf. Bonaccorsi 1933:30; Boyer 1984:172 with regard to the NT).[57]

More recent work largely agrees with Regard. Ceglia (1998:29), for example, observes that in the work of Herodotus[58] the participle generally follows the copula.[59] He also points attention to the fact that the finite verb is often located at the beginning of the sentence, as in (58). Most recently, Amenta (2001:174, 2003:78) has determined that the word order *finite verb – participle* is obligatory in the NT, which she interprets in terms of grammaticalization. Amenta (2001:174) also notes that 'adjectival' VPEs in the NT tend to have the same syntactic structure as 'verbal' VPEs (cf. *supra* for adjectival periphrasis).[60]

(58) ἦν δὲ τὸ δεῖπνον ποιεύμενον ἐν Θήβῃσι (Her. *Hist.* 9.15.4).

Similarly to some of the older works, Aerts (1965:11-12) points attention to the fact that the position of εἰμί may suggest emphasis. This is particularly true for those cases where the forms ἦν or ἦσαν are at the beginning of a sentence, and are accompanied by the particle γάρ

---

[57] Apparently, VPEs consisting of the perfect participle and εἰμί in the present tense, constitute a small exception to the rule (Regard 1918:165-166). It is also possible that word order is changed to give the sentence a more expressive force, e.g. *Apoc.* 1.18: ζῶν εἰμι.

[58] Aerts (1965·25-26) notes this is clearly different in the Orators and Plato, where instances of *participle – finite verb* are in the majority. In his opinion, the gradual loss of expressiveness in use reduced the need for an emphatic εἰμί.

[59] The same seems to hold true for the construction with verbs of movement in the work of Herodotus and the tragedians, where the auxiliary verb almost always precedes the participle (Thielmann 1898:56-57).

[60] According to Amenta (2001:174), the standard word order for adjectival periphrasis in pre-neotestamentarian Greek was *participle – finite verb*.

or δέ (e.g. ἦν γὰρ: "there was namely…") (Amenta 2003:67). This is the case in example (59), which is commonly not considered to be periphrastic (cf. e.g. Hartman 1963:9).

(59) ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ πρὸς τῷ ὄρει ἀγέλη χοίρων…βοσκομένη (*Mc.* 5.11).

Other scholars assign much less importance to word order. Björck (1940), for example, thinks it is mostly a question of individual style. He thus formulates a 'rule' for Luke, who normally adopts the following word order in case of the progressive VPE: *finite verb – participle – adverbial adjunct of place* (cf. also Verboomen 1992:20). There are, however, many factors influencing word order, as for example a tendency to separate adjuncts. Consequently, Björck (1940:52) translates (60) periphrastically: "and we were passing some days in this city". According to Rosén (1957:137), word-order is random when we are dealing with so-called *zweite Tempora*. In Kahn's (1973:139) opinion as well, word order is a stylistic feature. The initial position of the verb does not form an obstacle to periphrastic interpretation.

(60) ἦμεν δὲ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ πόλει διατρίβοντες ἡμέρας τινάς (*Acta* 16:12).

5.2. Adjacency of finite and non-finite verb form

A second element often discussed is the adjacency of the finite and non-finite verb. Which elements, if any, can come in between them? Most scholars note that both parts of a periphrastic construction generally keep close to each other (cf. Thielmann 1898:56 (with regard to verbs of movement); Mantey 1939:248; Keil 1963:46; Moulton 1963:89; Ceglia 1998:34), especially when we are dealing with suppletive constructions (Rosén 1957:136/1962:190 notes that in such cases the construction can only be separated by clitics; cf. also Keil 1963:41).[61] Syntactic contiguity is interpreted by Amenta (2001:172, 2003:78) in terms of grammaticalization: the more grammaticalized a verbal group, the more its component parts are contiguous.

The importance of syntactic contiguity has been stressed most emphatically by Porter (1999:45-6), who formulates the following 'rule': "no elements may intervene between the auxiliary verb and the participle except for those which complete or directly modify the participle" (cf. Porter 1989:453). Following this rule, (61) would not be periphrastic, as the subject comes in between the two verb forms. Porter's rule has been criticized, however, by various scholars. Amenta (2003:78), for example, points attention to the fact that the subject can come in between the finite and the non-finite verb, which she takes as a sign of

---

[61] Rosén also notes (1957:137) that in the case of *zweite Tempora* (cf. *infra*) there is no need for syntactic contiguity. Apparently this syntactic distinction between suppletive periphrastic forms and 'zweite Tempora' dissappears "in späteren Sprachzuständen" (Rosén 1957:151; cf. also Rydbeck 1967:190).

'coreference'. Evans (2001:232) also explicitly criticizes Porter's rule: he finds it entirely artificial, ignoring the natural flexibility of Greek word order (cf. Schmidt 1994:534-5 for counterexamples). In the same vein, Bentein (2011) stresses the fact that we need to be aware of the fact that Ancient Greek word order is influenced by complex pragmatic factors.

(61) καὶ ἦν ὁ λαὸς προσδοκῶν τὸν Ζαχαρίαν (*Lc.* 1.21).

5.3. Other elements that influence periphrastic interpretation

On various occasions it has been noted that some elements can seriously complicate the interpretation of periphrastic constructions. Spatial and temporal adjuncts, for example, can be interpreted both with the auxiliary and the participle (cf. Dover 1968:87; Porter 1989:453; Porter 1999:46; Rijksbaron 2006:127-128). Porter (1999:46) illustrates this point with (62), which can mean either "Christ is at the right hand of God, seated" or "Christ is seated at the right hand of god". It would seem that difficulty of interpretation mainly arises when the adverb occurs in between the finite and the non-finite verb. As Amenta (2003:79, 94) notes, cases such as (63) are unproblematic.

(62) Χριστός ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ καθήμενος (*Col.* 3.1).

(63) ἦν δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων ἐν Αἰνὼν (*Jhn.* 3.23).

We have already seen that Björck (1940:50) attaches great importance to individual word-order (cf. *supra* with regard to Luke). Aerts (1965:9), on the other hand, takes a much more generalizing position (criticized by Karleen 1980:121-123): with adjuncts of place (and less obvious with adjuncts of time) we generally have an independently used εἰμί with a conjunct participle (cf. Amenta 2001:172-173, 2003:66-67, 78-79; cf. Amenta 2003:94 for ἔρχομαι). Dietrich (1973b:207) objects to Aerts' 'rule': he argues for the liveliness of the VPE εἰμί + part.pres., and believes it would be contradictory to the grammatical character of this construction that it cannot be used with such adjuncts.

Aerts mentions some more elements which render periphrastic interpretation more difficult: the negation (Aerts 1965:65), co-ordinated adjectives (Aerts 1965:17) and the dative of interest or possession (Aerts 1965:9). From an alternative point of view, Karleen (1980:126) argues that speakers must have had "some means of disambiguating" between periphrastic and non-periphrastic interpretation. As such, he gives a list of elements which can co-occur with the progressive VPE: adverbs of duration, time, degree and manner; monolectic and sentential objects; conjunctions such as ἕως and ὡς.

6. Pragmatics of VPEs with εἰμί

6.1. Synthetic versus periphrastic

One of the central pragmatic questions concerns the difference between synthetic and periphrastic (analytic) verb forms. Those who see no difference whatsoever (e.g. Abel 1927:266) sometimes refer to the Aristotelian passage printed under (64). Both Alexander (1885:292) and Cobb (1973) point out, however, that this passage hardly proves anything. As Alexander (1885:292) writes, Aristotle's words do not "militate against the existence of a different force and tone in the two forms of expression". Aristotle's main concern here is that of formal logic.

> (64) οὐθὲν γὰρ διαφέρει τὸ ἄνθρωπος ὑγιαίνων ἐστὶν ἢ τὸ ἄνθρωπος ὑγιαίνει οὐδὲ τὸ ἄνθρωπος βαδίζων ἐστὶν ἢ τέμνων τοῦ ἄνθρωπος βαδίζει ἢ τέμνει, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων (Arist. *Metaph.* 1017a27).

It seems necessary to distinguish between those VPEs that occur alongside synthetic forms ('substitute periphrasis') and those VPEs that replace synthetic forms ('suppletive periphrasis) (cf. Keil 1963:41; Aerts 1965:3; Mussies 1971:302-303; Porter 1989:453; Duhoux 2000:295; Evans 2001:221). In the latter case, VPEs generally assume the meaning of their synthetic counterpart (for example the medio-passive perfect and pluperfect, cf. *supra*). VPEs that occur alongside synthetic forms are more problematic, however. What makes an author choose ἦν διδάσκων rather than ἐδίδασκεν?

Synthetic and periphrastic forms are often considered to be roughly equivalent, in case both are available (cf. Buttmann 1859:264; Stahl 1907:145; Aerts 1965:2-3; Blass & Debrunner 1979:286; Boyer 1984:172; Fanning 1990:309, 314; Campbell 2008:32).[62] Porter (1989:454) and Ceglia (1998:21) argue that it is better not to consider synthetic and periphrastic forms complete synonyms. They often have the same meaning, but there may be (small) semantic and stylistic differences (cf. also McKay 1981:292). Porter (1989:462), for example, argues that the VPE in (65) is used "to affirm that God is/was in world-reconciling activity, rather than referring to the simple fact that God reconciles/ed the world".

> (65) ὡς ὅτι θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ (*2Cor.* 5.19).

Various scholars indicate that VPEs can be more expressive[63] or emphatic[64] (e.g. Regard 1918:112; Zwaan 1922:62; Abel 1927:266; Antoniadis 1930:152; Schwyzer 1934:812;

---

[62] One construction which is generally considered to be non-equivalent to a synthetic verb form and as such belongs to Aerts' category of 'expressive periphrasis' is the construction ἔσομαι + part.pres.

[63] Both Regard (1918:141) and Björck (1940:27) write that VPEs can be used as a means of variation.

Doudna 1961:42; Kühner & Gerth 1976[1898]:38; Pryke 1978:103; Piñero & Pelaez 2003:161), as the two component parts of the construction draw attention to the verbal action (cf. Madvig 1853:165; Winer 1870:438; Hesseling 1928:16; Hilhorst 1976:72). Coseriu (1975:11), however, heavily criticizes the notion of emphasis: "er muß darauf hingewiesen werden, daß der Rückgriff auf 'Emphase' ein beliebtes Mittel ist, wenn die genaue Bestimmung einer besser definierten Funktion nicht gelingen will".

Such a precise description of the function of periphrasis with εἰμί has been offered by Rosén (1957). Rosén (1957:152) believes it is "ziemlich verkehrt" to say that periphrastic constructions emphasize verbal action (cf. Verboomen 1992:2). Concentrating on Herodotus, he distinguishes between suppletive periphrastic constructions (Rosén 1957:135; 1962:189, 1967:xxii; 1992:34) and so-called *zweite Tempora* (both with εἰμί and ἔχω; following Polotsky 1944:57-68 for Coptic; cf. Rosén 1957:133-135 for a short overview of Polotsky's theory). With the latter type of construction the verbal content of the participle has 'nichtrhematische Status', which means that the focus is not on the verbal action itself but on the complementary parts of speech accompanying the action. In illustration, consider (66), where the fact that an event is taking place constitutes the theme, and the fact that this is at Milete the rheme (Rosén 1957:146; cf. Gonda 1959:97-98). As such, we should translate this example with "It was at Miletus that these events took place" (rather than "these events were taking place at Miletus"). Rosén discerns seven main syntactical types in which these forms occur (Rosén 1957:141-150, 1962:189, cf. Keil 1963:42-44).

(66) ταῦτα δὲ ἦν γινόμενα ἐν Μιλήτῳ (Her. Hist. 1.146.3).

In his 1957 publication, Rosén had to admit, however, that in case of non-predicativity *zweite Tempora* are not always used, and that he was not able to find out which conditions determine the choice for this construction (Rosén 1957:150). The issue was resolved roughly twenty years later: *zweite Tempora* are used in those cases "in denen der Satzordnungsmechanismus versagen muß" (1975:35). In this 1975 publication, Rosén discusses the 'normal' Greek sentence structure, and distinguishes five main types where *zweite Tempora* appear (1975:35-36).

Gonda agrees with Rosén that it is wrong to say that periphrastic constructions emphasize verbal action: "it is not the idea expressed by the verb which is thrown into relief but the

---

[64] This seems to be especially the case in an early stadium (which is consistent with findings in grammaticalization theory, cf. for example Croft 2000:159). Hesseling (1916:50), for example, argues that the VPE with εἰμί is emphatic in Classical Greek, but no longer in Post-classical Greek. Cf. also Zwaan (1922:62), Meecham (1935:117) and Wallace (1996:647).

complements added to it" (Gonda 1959:99; cf. Porter 1989:453). Gonda himself focuses on the difference between verbal and nominal or semi-nominal (i.c. periphrastic) style: while the former is primarily narrative the latter is more descriptive. As such, the semi-nominal style is suited to bring forward other sentential elements (cf. Moorhouse 1982:204). Gonda (1959:109) criticizes Rosén, however, for not paying due attention to Björck's progressive periphrasis, which is attested in Herodotus (Gonda 1959:105). Moreover, he believes that Rosén tries too hard to fit all the examples to his theory (Gonda 1959:107).

Rydbeck (1969:188 ff.) similarly criticizes Rosén for his 'Totalitätsanspruch'. He remarks that there is not always a special emphasis on an adverbial complement, that Rosén's seven syntactic types include almost all possible types of Greek sentences, that we do not always have *zweite Tempora* where we would expect them (but see Rosén 1975) and that it is sometimes inevitable that another element than the participle gets emphasized. Rydbeck (1969:194) does think Rosén's theory is applicable to Herodotus, "in modifizierter Form und ohne Anspruch auf Totalität".

6.2. Discourse function

As already mentioned above, Björck (1940) considers the VPE εἰμί + part.pres. to be an equivalent of the English progressive. In his doctoral thesis, Björck also takes into account the discourse function of the construction. He concludes that the Ancient Greek progressive construction has 'Rahmenfunktion' or 'Hintergrundsfunktion' (Björck 1940:42,62; followed by Tabachowitz 1956:41ff.; cf. also Alexander 1885:300), explicitly referring to Jespersen (1931:180): "… the action or state denoted by the expanded tense is thought of as a temporal frame encompassing something else". Applied to a narrative text (i.c. the NT), this particular VPE can be used at the beginning of a pericope to sketch the situation, while simple tenses are used for narrative progress (cf. Björck 1940:44), as illustrated in (67). Periphrasis can also be used at the middle of the narration, to sketch the background, or at its end, to indicate the situation or continuing activity resulting from the end of the facts (Björck 1940:46-47).

> (67) ἦν τε ὑποστρέφων καὶ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ ἅρματος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀνεγίνωσκεν τὸν προφήτην Ἠσαΐαν. εἶπεν δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τῷ Φιλίππῳ… (*Acts* 8.28-29).

Björck's 'Gleichschaltung'[65] of the Greek periphrastic imperfect and the English progressive was criticized by several scholars (e.g. Gonda 1959:105; Coseriu 1975:15). According to

---

[65] For a similar observation, cf. Turner (1927:349): "The past tense of the substantive verb ἦν-ἦσαν with present active, present or perfect passive, participle as auxiliary; *exactly* [my emphasis, KB] equivalent to our English "was" "were" with present and past participle".

Verboomen (1992:1), Björck's 'Hintergrundsfunktion' does not hold because the Greek synthetic imperfect already has this function (cf. Mussies 1996:234).[66] The issue was clarified by Amenta (2003). In stating that VPEs can be used in the NT at the beginning, middle or end of a paragraph, Amenta (2003:136-139) explicitly resumes Björcks findings. She also specifies, however, the difference between the VPE εἰμί + part.pres. and the synthetic imperfect, by assuming multiple levels of background. In (68), where the VPE is used in the middle of the paragraph, the event denoted by the synthetic imperfect forms the background for that denoted by the periphrastic construction (Amenta 2003:137). According to Amenta the use of VPEs is related to "precise scelte di carattere stilistico da parte degli evangelisti che possono orientare in tal modo il racconto" (Amenta 2003:139).

> (68) καὶ ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ, ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς (*Mc.* 1.22).

6.3. Stylistic motivation

As we have seen, Rosén (a.o. 1957) concentrated on the work of Herodotus in his analysis of the VPE with εἰμί, suggesting that the construction was fully developed by this fifth-century writer. In his groundbreaking 1957 study, Rosén had already suggested that Herodotus' distinction between suppletive periphrasis and *zweite Tempora* was much more obscure "in späteren Sprachzustanden" (Rosén 1957:151). Some further suggestions about the use of the Herodotean type of periphrasis in later Greek were made by Rydbeck (1969). In summary, Rydbeck characterizes the Ionic VPE found in the work of Herodotus as "echtgriechisch" (1969:198), but notes that after a few generations the feeling for such a sharp distinction was lost. The Attic writers show only little interest for "ein so wildgewachsenes und schwieriges Produkt wie die herodotische Periphrase", with the exception of Plato[67] and Thucydides (Rydbeck 1969:198-199; cf. Keil 1963:45). In general, only adjectival periphrasis was frequently employed. As for Post-classical Greek, Rydbeck (1969:194-195) finds some examples of the 'classical' type in the *Corpus Hippocraticum* (Epidemics, 300 v. Chr. at the earliest) and Rosén (1962:xxiii) in Luke's writings.

Various other authors refer to stylistic reasons for the employment of periphrasis, both in Herodotus and later writers. Some attribute the occurrence of VPEs to poetic style. Winer (1853:165), for example, writes very generally that the VPE εἰμί + part.pres./aor. constitutes "a poetical license of not very frequent occurrence". With regard to prose, Ruijgh (1970:76)

---

[66] Mussies (1996:234) specifies that, while in English "he was teaching" is only opposed to "he taught", in Greek the periphrastic construction is opposed to both a durative and a non-durative simple indicative.

[67] Cf. i.a. Tiemann (1889) for a collection of VPEs in Plato (εἰμί with present and aorist participle).

considers the occurrence of VPEs in the work of Herodotus a sign of "style abundant": sentence (69), for example, is well-formed without the participle ποιεύμενον (cf. also Kahn 1973:141). The latter is heavily criticized by Dietrich (1973a:193), who notes that we cannot judge a text by stating what an author could have said, and that we cannot consider one part of a sentence 'grammatical' and the other 'stylistic'.

(69) ἦν δὲ τὸ δεῖπνον ποιεύμενον ἐν Θήβῃσι (Her. *Hist.* 9.15)

Conybeare and Stock (1995[1905]:68) refer to Plato, who – in their opinion – made use of VPEs "for the sake of philosophical precision, and partly, it must be confessed because in his later style he preferred two words to one". Similarly, Björck (1940:36) writes that "grosse Stillkünstler" such as Isocrates, Demosthenes and Plato have used the expressive possibilities of VPEs "unbedenklich und in vollem Masse". As an application of the latter, it is worth mentioning the findings of Wifstrand (1934:41). He notes a frequent use of VPEs with εἰμί in references, "um darzulegen, wie die eine oder andere Person in der referierten Rede, Schrift, dem Gedicht, Brief, usw. auftritt oder sich äussert" (cf. Palm 1955:96). He mentions several examples, among others (70) (from a letter that is read aloud to the Athenians). Here, Philip excuses himself for the delay of the legation.

(70) καὶ πάντ' ἀναδεχόμενος καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ποιούμενος τὰ τούτων ἁμαρτήματ' ἐστίν (Dem. *De fals. leg.* 36).

With regard to Post-classical Greek, there is an ongoing debate about the pragmatic value of periphrastic constructions. One of the basic observations is that VPEs, with εἰμί in particular, mainly occur in biblical/Christian literature (the LXX and NT in particular). This has been variously explained. As we have already seen, Verboomen (1992) (among others) ascribes the high frequency of the VPE εἰμί + part.pres. in the NT to an indirect Hebrew influence, through the Greek of the LXX. In Verboomen's opinion, the periphrastic construction should be considered part of a 'judeo-christian Kunstsprache', which Luke (and Mark) consciously tried to imitate (cf. Tabachowitz 1956:47; Hilhorst 1976:72). He points attention to the fact that the periphrastic construction is often (though not always, cf. Verboomen 1927:85) accompanied by other septuagintisms such as καὶ ἐγένετο, ἐν τῷ, καὶ ἰδού and καὶ αὐτός (Verboomen 1992:77), as in (71). Ceglia (1998:32) similarly notes that it is not a particular aspectual choice which motivates the use of VPEs, but rather the desire to write in a style which is suited for the words of God, and similar to the Hebrew model.[68] As for the other

---

[68] Hartman (1963:26) agrees that there are some parallells between VPEs in the LXX and the NT, but he does not consider it likely that Mark and Luke would have used periphrasis "as occasion arose". To illustrate this he

Christian literature, Aerts (1965:55-56) points to the fact that reminiscences of the biblical model can clearly be discerned in later Christian writings using the progressive VPE, while it does not appear in common Koine-usage.

(71) Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν διδάσκων… καὶ ἰδοὺ… (*Lc.* 5.17).

One can wonder, however, to what degree the evangelists consciously tried to imitate the LXX. Dawsey (1986:30), for example, points at the fact that, as far as the gospel of Luke is concerned, the periphrastic construction with εἰμί almost always appears in narrative parts (thirty-eight out of forty occurrences). In his narration, Luke may have simply appropriated a Greek worship language that was influenced by Hebrew (cf. Black 1965; Horton 1978), rather than consciously try to imitate the LXX.

An alternative approach has been to associate the use of periphrastic constructions with register, more in particular the lower register (as is well-known, the existence of multiple registers characterizes Post-classical literature). According to Schmid (1887:1.117), for example, the VPE with εἰμί was already in Attic prose an element of vulgar speech, which continued in Polybius and the NT.[69] Similarly, Björck (1940:58) considers the VPE εἰμί + part.pres. to be "volkstümlich" (cf. Rundgren 1965:466; Caragounis 2004:177). Björck admits that the construction does not appear often in the papyri (in fact there are only few examples, cf. Mayser 1926:223, 1934:15; Mandilaras 1973:363; Gignac 1981:284), but he believes these documents are "unergiebig… schon weil sie naturgemäss nicht sehr oft eine ausführliche Schilderung von Episoden enthalten" (Björck 1940:66-67).

Björck's hypothesis was criticized from different corners. In a critical review of Björck's work, Dölger (1940:257) remarks that the construction of εἰμί with aorist participle seems much more 'volkstümlich' than that with present participle, as the latter can also be found in highly rhetorical texts. Rydbeck (1969) furthermore notes that the VPE εἰμί + part.pres. can hardly be found in non-biblical texts of Hellenistic-roman times, and therefore concludes that "wenn die Periphrase irgendeine spezielle stilistische Nuance hat, diese in jedem Fall a priori nicht volkstümlich oder vulgär ist" (Rydbeck 1969:169).

More recent research, however, does seem to be in line with Björck's suggestions (though it does not specifically concern the VPE εἰμί + part.pres.). Dietrich (1973a), for one, agrees

---

analyzes an example where Mark uses a VPE (*Mc.* 10.22: ἀπῆλθεν λυπούμενος, ἦν γὰρ ἔχων χρήματα πολλά…) and Luke consciously seems to avoid periphrasis (*Lc.* 18.23: περίλυπος ἐγενήθη, ἦν γὰρ πλούσιος σφόδρα…).

[69] In another passage, Schmid (1893:3.114) specifies that only adjectival periphrasis and periphrasis expressing a pluperfect were common. All other uses are to be considered "als Eleganz und nicht unrichtig als Atticismus".

with Björck with regard to the fact that aspectual VPEs in general (so not only that with εἰμί) are typical for a narrative 'Erzählungsmanier' (Dietrich 1973a:202-3, 1973b:203-4; cf. Amenta 2001:180, 2003:82). Similarly to Björck, Dietrich notes that the low frequency of VPEs in the papyri is due to the fact that these texts do not contain a lot of truly narrative passages (Dietrich 1973a:211, 1973b:204). Christian texts on the other hand, occupy a "Sonderstellung" in Hellenistic literature because of their new way of narrative, which favoured the use of aspectual VPEs (Dietrich 1973b:204,209). Accordingly, Dietrich (1973a:223-224) argues for the liveliness of VPEs in Post-classical literature. He finds confirmation in the fact that new combinations, which did not have a model, were formed (1973b:207).[70]

In this context, it is worth mentioning the recent research of Drinka (2007) concerning the perfect periphrases with εἰμί and ἔχω. Drinka (2007:112) concludes that "the frequency of periphrastic perfect usage among both Christian and non-Christian authors turns out to have been affected by a writer's adoption or non-adoption of elaborate, Atticistic style" (cf. also Dietrich 1973a:231). As such, Atticistic writers participating in the Second Sophistic started avoiding VPEs and using the synthetic perfect instead. The same tendency can be seen in early Byzantine works: while the histories, hymns and theological treatises tend to be more Atticistic, the chronicles tend to be written in a more vernacular style (which implies that periphrastic constructions are more frequently used).

Caution is needed, however, not to automatically associate all VPEs with the lower register. Horrocks (1997:77), for example, points at the construction of ἔχω with perfect passive participle, which seems to have been influenced by a parallel Roman construction (type: *hoc habeo factum*). This construction only appears in what Horrocks calls "the more polished 'literary' registers of the Koine in the Roman period", as for example in the work of the historian Diodorus Siculus. It is neither used by authors writing in a low register nor by those writing in an Atticizing register.

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

As I hope to have shown in the previous pages, research on verbal periphrasis has made substantial progress since the first major study by Alexander (1885). Especially the doctoral theses of Björck (1940), Aerts (1965) and Dietrich (1973a) can be considered groundbreaking works: Björck for his in-depth study of the εἰμί-VPE in the NT, Aerts for outlining the

---

[70] Verboomen (1992:7), however, finds it unlikely that the Christian literature 'favoured' the use of VPEs, as Dietrich argues, since this hypothesis only seems true for VPEs with εἰμί.

diachronic development of the εἰμί and ἔχω-VPEs, and Dietrich for considerably expanding the constructions under examination, and tackling the question of language contact. The more recent works of Porter (1989), Evans (2001), Amenta (2003) and Bentein (2011) have studied questions of definition, language contact and grammaticalization in greater detail. At the same time, however, much remains to be done. Let me briefly touch upon three issues which I consider to be particularly relevant (cf. Bentein 2010:134-6 for some additional elements).

a. <u>Individual constructions</u>. As my presentation in §2 may have made clear, Ancient (especially Classical) Greek had a large variety of periphrastic constructions at its disposal, many of which have only briefly been touched upon in Dietrich's work. At the same time, it has become clear to me that even more remains to be done with regard to Post-classical Greek, where many novel formations remain to be uncovered, e.g. supercomplex forms of the type ἑστὼς ἤμην Ἑνὼχ εὐλογῶν τῷ κυρίῳ (*Ap. Enoch.* 12.3), constructions with an infinitive instead of a participle, as in τυγχάνει ἔχειν ἐν μισθώσει (*P.Oxy.* 41.2974 r.9-10), constructions with postural verbs such as καθίζω and μένω, as in ἔμεινε γινόμενον ἕως τῆς τελευτῆς τοῦ γέροντος (Mosch., *Prat. Spir.* 69.2921.34), … . Obviously, a flexible approach towards the phenomenon of periphrasis (instead of a rigid definition as given by Porter) is needed here.

b. <u>Constructional networks</u>. In connection with what was noted under point a, I would like to stress the importance of analyzing the relationship between periphrastic constructions. Again I must mention Dietrich, who – as far as I can tell – was the only author to actually map out a system of constructions, and to explain from a diachronic point of view how the rise of one periphrasis (e.g. that with εἰμί) can entail the descent of another (e.g. that with τυγχάνω), using the grammaticalization-framework. Obviously, it would be very interesting to carry out a more in-depth study of Dietrich's first outline, and to include synthetic forms with a meaning similar to that of periphrastic constructions.

c. <u>Modern linguistic theory.</u> Thirdly and finally, I believe much is to be gained from using modern linguistic theory. An adequate theoretical framework can help the classical philologist in drawing up a constructional network, or to clarify the discourse function of particular tense-aspect categories (the latter of which is of great importance when dealing with the fundamental ambiguity surrounding many periphrastic constructions). I believe present-day research on register, genre and style could drastically improve our understanding of why particular periphrastic constructions occur in some but not in other texts. From a diachronic point of view, cross-linguistic research on tense and aspect can help us to describe the development of periphrastic constructions, or to determine which lexical verbs might in time acquire a more abstract, grammatical, meaning (e.g. when studying Post-classical Greek).

REFERENCES

Abel, F-M. 1927. *Grammaire du grec biblique: Suivi d'un choix de papyrus*. Paris: Gabalda.

Adrados, F.. 1992. *Nueva sintaxis del griego antiguo*. Madrid: Gredos.

Aerts, W.J. 1965. *Periphrastica.* Amsterdam: Hakkert (diss. Amsterdam).

Alexander, W.J. 1885. Participial periphrases in Attic prose. *American Journal of Philology* 6, 291-308.

Amenta, L. 2001. L'evoluzione semantica delle forme perifrastiche: Stare, andare, venire + gerundio. In: Z. Fabian & G. Salvi (eds.), *Semantica e lessicologia storiche*, 169-182. Roma: Bulzoni.

Amenta, L. 2003. *Perifrasi aspettuali in greco e in latino. Origini e grammaticalizzazioni*. Milano: Franco Angeli.

Antoniadis, S. 1930. *L'évangile de Luc: Esquisse de grammaire et de style*. Paris: Belles Lettres.

Barbelenet, D. 1913. *De la phrase à verbe être dans l'ionien d' Hérodote*. Paris: H. Champion.

Bauer, W. & K. Aland. 1988[6]. *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Beekes, R.S. & L. van Beek. 2010. *Etymological dictionary of Greek*. Leiden: Brill.

Bentein, K. 2010. Review article: L. Amenta, Perifrasi aspettuali in greco e in latino, Origini e grammaticalizzazioni. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 10, 127-141.

Bentein, K. 2011. Verbal periphrasis in Ancient Greek: A prototype analysis. *Acta Classica* (to appear).

Björck, G. 1940. Ἦν διδάσκων. *Die periphrastischen Konstruktionen im Griechischen*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell (diss. Uppsala).

Black, M. 1965. Second thoughts IX: The Semitic element in the New Testament. *Expository Times* 77, 20-23.

Black, M. 1967[3]. *An Aramaic approach to the gospels and acts*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Blaise, A. 1955. *Manuel du latin chrétien*. Strasbourg: Le Latin chrétien.

Blass, F. & A. Debrunner. 1979[15]. *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch. Bearbeitet van Friedrich Rehkopf*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Bonaccorsi, G. 1933. *Primi saggi di filologia neotestamentaria: Letture scelte dal Nuovo Testamento greco con introduzione e commento. Vol. 1. Introduzione. Vangeli. Atti degli Apostoli*. Torino: Società Editrice Internazionale.

Bonfante, G. 1960. Les rapports linguistiques entre la Grèce et l'Italie. In: *Hommages à Léon Herrmann*, 171-183. Bruxelles: Latomus.

Boyer, J.L. 1984. The classification of participles: A statistical study. *Grace Theological Journal* 5, 163-179.

Browning, R. 1983[2]. *Medieval and modern Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Buttmann, A. 1859. *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachgebrauchs*. Berlin: Ferd. Dümmlers Verlagsbuchhandlung.

Cameron, A. 1939. Inscriptions relating to sacral manumission and confession. *The Harvard Theological Review* 32, 143-179.

Campbell, C. 2008. *Verbal aspect and non-indicative verbs: Further soundings in the Greek of the New Testament*. New York: Lang.

Caragounis, C. 2004. *The development of Greek and the New Testament: Morphology, syntax, phonology, and textual transmission*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Ceglia, L. 1998. L'evoluzione della costruzione perifrastica verbale nel greco del Nuovo Testamento. *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 83, 20-44.

Chantraine, P. 1927. *L'histoire du parfait grec*. Paris: Champion.

Cobb, R.A. 1973. The present progressive periphrasis and the metaphysics of Aristotle. *Phronesis* 18, 80-90.

Conybeare, F.C. & S.G. Stock. 1995[1905]. *Grammar of Septuagint Greek*. Boston, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Coseriu, E. 1962. Sobre las llamadas "Construcciones con verbos de movimiento": Un problema hispánico. *Revista de la Facultad de humanidas y ciencias* 20, 121-126.

Coseriu, E. 1966. Tomo y me voy. Ein Problem vergleichender europäischer Syntax. *Vox Romanica* 25, 13-55.

Coseriu, E. 1968. El aspecto verbal perifrástico en griego antiquo. In: *Actas del III Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos (Madrid, 28 de marzo - 1 abril de 1966)*, 93-116. Madrid: Sociedad Española de Estudios Clásicos.

Coseriu, E. 1971. Das Problem des griechischen Einflusses auf das Vulgärlatein. In: G. Narr (ed.), *Griechisch und Romanisch*, 1-15. Tübingen: Fotodruck Präzis.

Coseri, E. 1975. Der periphrastische Verbalaspekt im Altgriechischen. *Glotta* 53, 1-25.

Coseriu, E. 1977. El aspecto verbal perifrástico en griego y sus reflejos románicos. In: *Estudios de Lingüística románica*, 231-263. Madrid: Credos.

Coseriu, E. 1996. Latin et grec dans le latin dit "vulgaire". In: H. Rosén (ed.), *Aspects of Latin. Papers from the 7th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics*, 27-37. Innsbruck : Universität Innsbruck. Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.

Creed, J.M. 1965. *The gospel according to St. Luke: The greek text with introduction, notes and indices*. London: Macmillan.

Croft, W. 2000. *Explaining language change. An evolutionary approach*. Harlow: Longman.

Dana, H. E. & J.R. Mantey. 1957. *A manual grammar of the Greek New Testament*. New York: MacMillan.

Dawsey, J.M.. 1986. *The Lukan voice: Confusion and irony in the Gospel of Luke*. Macon: Mercer University Press.

Dietrich, W. 1973a. *Der periphrastische Verbalaspekt in den romanischen Sprachen.* Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Dietrich, W. 1973b. Der Periphrastische Verbalaspekt im Griechischen und Lateinischen. *Glotta* 51, 188-228.

Dietrich, W. 1983. *El aspecto verbal perifrástico en las lenguas románicas*. Madrid: Gredos.

Dietrich, W. 1995. *Griechisch und Romanisch: Parallelen und Divergenzen in Entwicklung, Variation und Strukturen*. Münster: Nodus Publikationen.

Dietrich, W. 1998. Griechisch und Romanisch. In: G. Holtus, M. Metzeltin & C. Schmitt (eds.), *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik* 7, 121-134. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Dölger, F.J. 1940. Review: Ἦν διδάσκων. Die periphrastischen Konstruktionen im Griechischen. *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 57/58, 257-258.

Dominicy, M. 1977. Les périphrases verbales des langues Romanes. *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 55, 914-934.

Doudna, J.C. 1961. *The greek of the gospel of Mark*. Philadelphia (Pa.): Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis.

Dover, K. J. 1968. Review: W.J. Aerts, Periphrastica. *Gnomon* 40, 87-88.

Drinka, B. 2003a. The formation of periphrastic perfects and passives in Europe: An areal approach. In: B. Blake & K. Burridge (eds), *Historical Linguistics 2001*, 105-128. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Drinka, B. 2003b. Areal factors in the development of the European periphrastic perfect. *Word* 54, 1-38.

Drinka, B. 2007. The development of the HAVE perfect: Mutual influences of Greek and Latin. In: R. Aranovich (ed.), *Split auxiliary systems: A cross-linguistic perspective*, 101–121. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Drinka, B. 2009. The *-to-/-no- construction of Indo-European: Verbal adjective or past passive participle? In: V. Bubenik, J. Hewson & S. Rose (eds.), *Grammatical change in Indo-European languages*, 141–158. Amsterdam: Benjamins;

Duhoux, Y. 2000². *Le verbe grec ancien. Éléments de morphologie et de syntaxe historiques*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.

Eklund, S. 1970. *The periphrastic, completive and finite use of the present participle in Latin*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell (diss. Uppsala).

Evans, T. 2001. *Verbal syntax in the Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek usage and Hebrew interference*. Oxford: Oxford university Press.

Fanning, B. 1990. *Verbal aspect in New Testament Greek*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Fisher, W. F. 1989. *The Participle in the Greek Pentateuch: A descriptive analysis and comparison to New Testament usage*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Southwestern Baptist Theol. Seminary.

Giacalone Ramat, A. 2008. Areal convergence in grammaticalization processes. In: M.J. López-Couso, E. Seoane & T. Fanego (eds.), *Rethinking grammaticalization: New perspectives*, 129-67. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Giannaris, A. 2009. Περιφράσεις και γλωσσικές επαφές στην ελληνιστική κοινή. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 29, 269-80.

Gignac, F.T. 1981. *A grammar of the Greek papyri of the Roman and Byzantine periods*. Milano: Cisalpino.

Gil Arrondo, O.L. 1989. „EN DIDASKON": semitismo en koine?. In: *Actas del VII Congresso español de estudios clasicos, Madrid, 20-24 de abril 1987, I,* 169-172. Madrid: Editorial de la Universidad Complutense.

Gildersleeve, B.L. 1980[1900]. *Syntax of classical Greek.* Groningen: Bouma.

Gonda, J. 1959. A remark on "periphrastic" constructions in Greek. *Mnemosyne* IV, 12, 97-112.

Goodwin, W.W. 1966[1875]. *Syntax of the moods and tenses of the Greek verb.* London: MacMillan.

Harry, J. E. 1905. The perfect subjunctive, optative and imperative in Greek. *The Classical Review* 19, 347-354.

Harry, J.E. 1906. The perfect forms in later Greek from Aristotle to Justinian. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 37, 53-72.

Hartman, L. 1963. *Participial constructions in the synoptic gospels.* Lund: Gleerup.

Haspelmath, M. 2000. Periphrasis. In: G. Booij, C. Lehmann, & J. Mugdan (eds.), *Morphology. An international handbook on inflection and word formation.* Vol. 1, 654-64. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hesseling, D.C. 1916. *Bloemlezing uit het Pratum Spirituale van Johannes Moschos.* Utrecht : Ruys.

Hesseling, D.C. 1928. *Het perfectum in het postklassieke Grieks: Overblijfsels in de taal van heden.* Amsterdam: Koninklijke akademie van wetenschappen.

Hilhorst, A. 1976. *Sémitismes et latinismes dans le Pasteur d'Hermas.* Nijmegen: Dekker en van de Vegt.

Hopper, P. & E.C. Traugott. 2003[2]. *Grammaticalization.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Horrocks, G.C. 1997. *Greek: A history of the language and its speakers.* London: Longmann.

Horton, F.L. 1978. Reflections on the Semitisms of Luke-Acts. In: C.H. Talbert (ed.), *Perspectives on Luke-Acts,* 1-23. Danville: Association of baptist professors of religion.

Jannaris, A. 1897. *An historical Greek grammar chiefly of the Attic dialect.* Hildesheim: Olms.

Jespersen, O. 1931. *A modern English grammar on historical principles, vol. IV.* Heidelberg: Winter.

Kahane, H. & R. Kahane. 1978. Review: W. Dietrich, Der periphrastische Verbalaspekt in den romanischen Sprachen. *Romance Philology* 31, 644-648.

Kahn, C.H. 1973. *The verb Be and its synonyms: Philosophical and grammatical studies. 6 : The verb Be in ancient Greek.* Dordrecht: Reidel.

Kapsomenakis, S.G. 1938. *Voruntersuchungen zu einer Grammatik der Papyri der nachchristlichen Zeit: Beiträge zur Herstellung und Deutung einzelner Texte.* München: Beck.

Karleen, P.S. 1980. *The syntax of the participle in the Greek New Testament.* Ph.D. thesis, University of Pennsylvania.

Keil, F. 1963. Untersuchungen zum Perfektgebrauch Herodots. *Glotta* 41, 10-51.

Kontos, K.S. 1898. *Φιλολογικαὶ παρατηρήσεις.* Ἀθηνᾶ 10, 269-306; 307-324.

Kühner, R. & B. Gerth. 1976[1898-1904][3]. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Teil: Satzlehre.* Hannover: Verlag Hahnsche Buchhandlung.

Kurzová, H. 1997. Notes on Greek participial constructions. In: E. Banfi (ed.*), Studi di linguistica greca II*, 107-128. Milano: FrancoAngeli.

La Roche, J. 1893. *Beiträge zur griechischen Grammatik*. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.

Létoublon, F. 1982. Les verbes de mouvement en grec: De la métaphore à l'auxiliarité? *Glotta* 60, 178-96.

Létoublon, F. 1984. II vient de pleuvoir, il va faire beau. Verbes de mouvement et auxiliaires. *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur* 9, 25-41.

Liddell, H.G. & R. Scott. 1968[9]. *A Greek-English lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Ljungvik, H. 1926. *Studien zur Sprache der apokryphen Apostelgeschichten*. Uppsala: Lundequistska bokhandeln.

Madvig, J.N. 1853. *Syntax of the Greek language, especially of the Attic dialect*. Trans. H. Browne. Rev. T.K. Arnold. London: Rivingtons.

Mandilaras, B.G. 1973. *The verb in the Greek non-literary papyri*. Athens: Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sciences.

Mantey, J.R. 1939. The mistranslation of the perfect tense in John 20:23, Mt 16:19 and Mt 18:18. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 58, 243-249.

Markopoulos, T. 2009. *The future in Greek: From Ancient to Medieval*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mateos, J. 1977. *El aspecto verbal en el Nuevo Testamento*. Madrid: Ed. Cristianidad.

Mayser, E. 1926-1938. *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*. Berlin & Leipzig: Mouton de Gruyter.

McKay, K.L. 1981. On the perfect and other aspects in New Testament Greek. *Novum Testamentum* 23, 289-329.

Meecham, H.G. 1935. *The letter of Aristeas: A linguistic study with special reference to the Greek Bible*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Milroy, W.M. 1892. *The participle in the Vulgate New Testament*. Baltimore: Diss. Hopkins University.

Moorhouse, A.C. 1982. *The syntax of Sophocles*. Leiden: Brill.

Moulton, J.H. 1963[3]. *A grammar of New Testament Greek. Vol. III Syntax by Nigel Turner*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Moulton, J.H. 1978[3]. *A grammar of New Testament Greek. Vol. I Prolegomena*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Mussies, G. 1971. *The morphology of Koine Greek as used in the Apocalypse of St. John. A study in bilingualism*. Leiden: Brill.

Mussies, G. 1996. Review: A. Verboomen, L'imparfait périphrastique dans l'Évangile de Luc et dans la Septante. *Mnemosyne* 49, 234-236.

Palm, J. 1955. *Über Sprache und Stil des Diodoros von Sizilien: Ein Beitrag zur Beleuchtung der hellenistischen Prosa*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Lund.

Panzer, B. 1964. Das Futurum im Griechischen. Ein Beitrag zur Struktur und Entwicklung des griechischen Verbalsystems. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 16, 55-73.

Piñero, A. & J. Pelaez. 2003. *The study of the New Testament: A comprehensive introduction*. transl. by David E. Orton a.o. Leiden: Deo publishing.

Polotsky, H.J. 1944. *Études de syntaxe copte*. Le Caire: Société d'archéologie copte.

Poppe, E. 2003. Progress on the progressive? A report. In: H.L.C. Tristram (ed.): *The Celtic Englishes III*, 65-84. Heidelberg: Winter Universitätsverlag.

Porter, S. E. 1988. Vague Verbs, periphrastics, and Matt 16:19. *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 1, 155–73.

Porter, S. E. 1989. *Verbal aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with reference to tense and mood*. New York: Peter Lang (diss. Sheffield).

Porter, S.E. 1999[2]. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Pouilloux, J. 1953. Une particularité sophocléenne: La périphrase du participe aoriste et de ἔχω. In: *Mélanges offerts à Octave et Melpo Merlier à l'occasion du 25e anniversaire de leur arrivée en Grèce*, 117-135Athènes: Institut Français d'Athènes.

Pryke, Edgar J. 1978. *Redactional style in the Marcan Gospel: A study of syntax and vocabulary as guides to redaction in Mark*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Psaltes, S.B. 1913. *Grammatik der byzantinischen Chroniken*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

Radermacher, L. 1911. *Neutestamentliche Grammatik. Das Griechisch des NT im Zusammenhang mit der Volkssprache*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Regard, P.F. 1918. *La phrase nominale dans la langue du Nouveau Testament*. Paris: Leroux.

Rijksbaron, A. 2006[3]. *The syntax and semantics of the verb in Classical Greek*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.

Robertson, A. T. 1934. *A grammar of the Greek New Testament in the light of historical research*. Nashville (Ten.): Broadman Press.

Rosén, H.B. 1957. Die "zweiten" Tempora des Griechischen: Zum Prädikatsausdruck beim griechischen Verbum. *Museum Helveticum* 14, 133-154.

Rosén, H. B. 1962. *Eine Laut- und Formenlehre der herodotischen Sprachform*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Rosén, H.B. 1967. HN ΔΙΔΑΣΚΟΝ et questions apparentées. Mises au point sur les contacts linguistiques néotestamentaires. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*, xxi-xxvi.

Rosén, H.B. 1975. Gedanken zur Geschichte des griechischen Satzbaus. *Die Sprache* 21, 23-36.

Rosén, H.B. 1979. *L'hébreu et ses rapports avec le monde classique: Essai d'évaluation culturelle*. Paris: Geuthner.

Rosén, H.B. 1992. *Die Periphrase. Wesen und Entstehung*. Innsbruck 1992.

Rosenkranz, B. 1930. Der lokale Grundton und die persönliche Eigenart in der Sprache des Thukydides und der älteren attischen Redner. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 48, 129-179.

Ruijgh, C.J. 1970. Review: E. Coseriu, El aspecto verbal perifrástico. *Lingua* 25, 75-76.

Rundgren, F. 1965. The synoptic Gospels as language. *Biblica* 46, 465-469.

Rutherford, W.G. 1903. Aristophanes, *Knights* 414. A neglected idiom. *The Classical Review* 7, 249.

Rydbeck, L. 1969. Bemerkungen zu Periphrasen mit εἶναι + Präsens Partizip bei Herodot und in der Koine. *Glotta* 47, 186-200.

Schmid, W. 1887-1897. *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern: Von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus (5 Bande.)*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Schmidt, D.D. 1994. Review: S. Porter, Idioms of the Greek New Testament. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 113, 534-536.

Schodde, G.H. 1885. Εἰμί and γίνομαι with participles in the New Testament. *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis* 5, 76-78.

Schwyzer, E. 1934. *Griechische Grammatik. Erster Band: Allgemeiner Teil, Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion*. München: C.H. Beck.

Schwyzer, E. 1950. *Griechische Grammatik. Zweiter Band: Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik. Vervollständigt und herausgegeben von Albert Debrunner*. München: C.H. Beck.

Seiler, H. 1952. *L'aspect et le temps dans le verbe néo-grec*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Smyth, H.W. 1984[1920]. *Greek grammar. Revised by Gordon M. Messing*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Sparks, H. F. 1943. The semitisms of St. Luke's gospel. *The Journal of Theological Studies* 44, 129-138.

Sparks, H. F. 1950. The semitisms of the Acts. *The Journal of Theological Studies* 1 (n.s.), 16-28.

Spencer, A.. 2006. 'Periphrasis.' In K. Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*, second edition, 287-294. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Stahl, J.M. 1907. *Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums der klassischen Zeit*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Tabachowitz, D. 1926. *Sprachliche und textkritische Studien zur Chronik des Theophanes Confessor*. Uppsala: Almqvist.

Tabachowitz, D. 1943. *Études sur le grec de la basse époque*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Tabachowitz, D. 1956. *Die Septuaginta und das Neue Testament: Stilstudien*. Lund: Gleerup.

Thielmann, P. 1891. Ἔχω mit Particip. In: *Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiet der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft*, 294-306. München: Beck.

Thielmann, P. 1898. Über periphrastische Verba im Griechischen. *Blätter für das Gymnasialschulwesen* 34, 55-65.

Thompson, S. 1985. *The Apocalypse and Semitic syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tiemann, J. 1889. Zum Sprachgebrauch Platos. I, II, III. *Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie* 6, 248-53; 362-66; 556-59.

Trapp, E. 1967. Review: W.J. Aerts, Periphrastica. *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 60, 92-94.

Turner, C.H. 1927. Marcan usage: Notes, critical and exegetical, on the second gospel. *The Journal of Theological Studies* 28, 349-362.

Vendryes, J.. 1937. Sur l'emploi de l'auxiliaire 'avoir' pour marquer le passé. In: *Mélanges de linguistique et de philologie offerts à Jacq. Van Ginneken*, 85-92. Paris: C. Klincksieck.

Verboomen, A. 1992. *L'imparfait périphrastique dans l'Évangile de Luc et dans la Septante.* Louvain & Paris: Peeters.

Voelz, J. W. 1984. The language of the New Testament. *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II, 25.2, 894-977.

Wahlgren, S. 2002. Towards a grammar of Byzantine Greek. *Symbolae Osloenses* 77, 201-204.

Wakker, G. 2006. Future auxiliaries or not?. In: E. Crespo, J. de la Villa, A.R. Revuelta (eds), *Word classes and related topics in Ancient Greek.*, 237-255. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.

Wakker, G. 2007. Intentions and future realisations in Herodotus. In: R.J. Allan & M. Buijs (eds), *The language of literature*, 168-187. Leiden: Brill.

Wallace, D.B. 1996. *Greek grammar beyond the basics.* Grand Rapids (Mich.): Zondervan.

Wheeler, J. R. 1891.The participial constructions with τυγχάνειν and κυρεῖν. *Harvard Studies* 2, 143-157.

Wifstrand, A. 1934. Eine besondere Anwendung der Verbalumschreibung mit εἶναι + Präsenspartizip. *Vetenskaps-Societetens i Lund, Årsbok*, 41-44.

Winer, G.B. 1870. *A treatise on the grammar of New Testament Greek.* Edinburgh: Clark.

Wolf, K. 1912. *Studien zur Sprache des Malalas*. München: Straub.

Wunderli, P. 1975. Review: W. Dietrich, Der periphrastische Verbalaspekt in den romanischen Sprachen. *Vox Romanica* 34, 226-232.

Zerwick, M. 1966. *Graecitas biblica: Novi Testamenti exemplis illustratur*. Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico.

Zilliacus, H. 1956. Zur Umschreibung des Verbums in spätgriechischen Urkunden. *Eranos* 54, 160-166.

Zwaan, J. de. 1922. The use of the Greek language in Acts. In: F.J. Foakes Jackson & K. Lake, *The beginnings of christianity vol. 2*, 3-65. London: Macmillan.