Review article: Luisa Amenta. *Perifrasi aspettuali in greco e in latino, Origini e grammaticalizzazioni*. Milano: Franco Angeli, 2003 (Materiali Linguistici. Universita di Pavia 38). 170 pages.

Klaas Bentein

Ghent University

I present here a detailed appraisal of Luisa Amenta's *Perifrasi aspettuali in greco e in latino, Origini e grammaticalizzazioni* (2003). Amenta's study on verbal periphrases is a revised version of her Ph.D. thesis (1999), completed at the *Università degli Studi di Roma Tre* under the supervision of Prof. dr. Marco Mancini. It offers a diachronic and typological confrontation of periphrastic constructions in both Greek and Latin.

I briefly describe the term 'verbal periphrasis' (§1), sketch the main points of previous research (§2) and outline the different chapters of Amenta's book (§3). Then I give some critical remarks (§4) and suggestions for further research (§5), concentrating on periphrases in Greek. I conclude with a list of typos and errors (§6).

Keywords: diachrony, Greek, Latin, typology, verbal periphrasis

1. Verbal periphrasis

The term 'verbal periphrasis'[1] (henceforth VP) is generally used to denote analytic constructions consisting of a finite ('auxiliary') and a non-finite ('auxiliate': gerund, participle or infinitive) verb form, which are an alternative for synthetic or monolectic verb forms, as in French *je vais aller* (analytic) versus *j' irai* (synthetic).

With regard to the classification of VPs, several proposals have been made.[2] Scholars (a.o. Amenta) often distinguish between 'temporal', 'aspectual' and 'modal' VPs,[3] based on the assumption that tense, aspect and mood (TAM) are the central categories of the verbal system. Others, however, focusing on the different non-finite verb forms, prefer the terms 'participial', 'gerundial' and 'infinitival' VPs.[4]

2. Research

Periphrastic verb constructions have been studied extensively, especially in Germanic, Romance and Slavic languages (cf. Robert Binnick's *Project on Annotated Bibliography of Contemporary Research in Tense, Grammatical Aspect, Aktionsart, and Related Areas* at <http://www.scar.utoronto.ca/~binnick/TENSE/> (accessed January 29, 2010)). With regard to Greek and Latin, the stage was set in the twentieth century with the pioneering dissertations of Marouzeau (1910) and Björck (1940), and those of Aerts (1965) and Eklund (1970).

Because of structural analogies in modern languages (e.g. Fr. *je vais dire*, Sp. *voy a decir*, Port. *vou dizer*, cf. Coseriu 1996:28), scholars have been particularly interested in the origins of periphrastic constructions. Starting in the nineteenth century with Thielmann (1885), extensive research was conducted on the development of Latin auxiliaries (mainly *habere* and *esse*) in Romance languages (e.g. Coleman 1971, Vincent 1982, Pinkster 1985, Loporcaro 1995). In the past decade scholars such as Nocentini (2001), La Fauci (2006) and Cennamo (2008) have continued this line of research.

In considering Greek influences on Latin and the Romance languages, Bonfante (1960:174) noted the Greek VP *ekʰō gegrammenon* (Lat. *habeo scriptum*, It. *ò scritto*, Fr. *j'ai écrit*...). Coseriu (1968, 1972) and his disciple Dietrich (1983, orginally 1973b) further researched these similarities with regard to 'aspectual' periphrases (with lexical verbs such as *to be* (*exist*), *to come*, *to go*, *to take*...). They concluded that Greek contained the antecedents of Romance periphrases, which were transmitted through early-Christian Latin (cf. Eklund 1970). Recent work of Drinka (2003a, 2003b, 2007) presents similar findings with regard to the periphrastic *have*-perfect. The hypothesis of the Greek origins of Latin and Romance VPs remains controversial, however, and is not commonly accepted.[5]

The relatively high frequency of periphrastic constructions in the Septuagint and the New Testament (esp. the type *ēn didaskōn*, cf. Björck 1940) has generally been interpreted in terms of Semitic influence (Wilcox 1984:1017). Scholars such as Schmid (1893:114), Moulton (1963:87), Zerwick (1966:124) and Ceglia (1998:30-31) have argued for a direct Aramaic or Hebrew influence. Verboomen (1992), on the other hand, stressed an indirect influence on the New Testament through the Greek of the Septuagint (cf. also Tabachovitz 1956:42, Aerts 1965:62-68).

Others such as Björck (1940:59-62), who believed the appearance of the *eimi*-periphrasis in the New Testament to be related to the vernacular/popular character of these writings (cf. Caragounis 2004:177), have discarded the importance of such Semitic influence. Dietrich (1973b) took a somewhat more moderate position, in stating that there 'may have been' a direct or indirect influence on the VP with *einai*, but that this question is "nicht von entscheidender Bedeutung für die Feststellung ihrer Existenz und ihrer Kontinuität in der grieschischen Sprachgeschichte" (p. 187). Amenta (2003:65-66) is of a similar opinion, based on evidence from the papyri and other vernacular material. Semitic languages may have 'activated' a construction which already belonged to the expressive possibilities of Greek, as attested in earlier literature. Evans (2001) has recently shown that even in the case of the

Septuagint we should take into account independent usage of VPs, next to the imitation of Hebrew models.

The identification and delimitation of the concept 'verbal periphrasis' has been one of the most important theoretical issues in research on both Latin and Greek VPs. Attempts to establish criteria for identification have been undertaken by a.o. Zawadowksi (1959/60), Aerts (1965), Dietrich (1973), Létoublon (1982, 1983), De la Villa Polo (1989) and Porter (1989). A number of recent studies have tried to determine properties of individual VPs within the framework of grammaticalization theory. Relevant examples of such studies (others than those mentioned above) are Piras (1989/90: *sum* with participle), Cennamo (2005: *fieri, venire* and *devenire* with participle), Wakker (2006: *mellō* with infinitive/participle), Napoli (2007: *habeo* with participle) and Markopoulos (2009: *mellō, ek^hō* and *t^helō* with infinitive).

3. Outline of *Perifrasi aspettuali*

Perifrasi aspettuali is organized as follows. The introduction offers a brief status quaestionis and presentation of the corpus (pp. 11-19). Chapters 1-3 contain the theoretical framework (pp. 20-63), while chapters 4-6 consist of a diachronic and typological confrontation of Greek and Latin VPs (pp. 64-145). The seventh chapter sums up the conclusions (pp. 146-155). The book is rounded off by an extensive bibliography (pp. 157-170). There is a useful table of contents (pp. 5-7), but no keyword index.

The first chapter discusses the concept of grammaticalization, which is crucial to the analysis of the auxiliarization of the VP's finite verb form. Close attention is being paid to two parameters singled out by Heine (1993) and Hopper & Traugott (1993), viz. desemantization (p. 22 ff.) and decategorization (p. 25 ff.). Phonological reduction, a third parameter, is not considered relevant for the analysis of Greek and Latin VPs.

In the second chapter the author treats (developments in) the function of the participle as a non-finite verb form. If the participle is fully adjectivised, as in (1) there is no VP. In other cases, however, the function of the participle accompanying *esse/einai* shifted from being nominal to verbal, which lead to periphrasis (p. 30 ff.). The circumstantial participle (or *participium coniunctum*) (p. 35 ff.) is at the basis of VPs with verbs of movement in Greek, as in (2). This development does not seem to have a Latin equivalent.

(1)   *...quod erat Iugurtha manu promptus et adpetens gloriae militaris* (Sallust. *Bell.Iug.* 7.1)[6]

"...since Iugurtha was disposed to take action and eager for military glory"

(2) *Kai ēlt^hen kērussōn eis tas sunagōgas autōn* (Mk. 1.39)

  "And he came preaching in their synagogues"

Chapter three focuses on the notions tense (p. 46ff.), aspect (p. 48 ff.) and Aktionsart (p. 51 ff.). The contributions of Reichenbach (1947), Lo Cascio (1986), Comrie (1976), Bertinetto (1986) and Vendler (1967) are briefly summarized. In differentiating the Greek and Latin verbal systems (p. 54 ff.), the importance of the aspectual category in Greek is stressed. The author distinguishes between perfective and imperfective aspect, arguing that VPs "intervengono nella specificazione di significati aspettuali del comparto imperfettivo, e, in particolare progressivo e continuo" (p. 49). The specification of temporal relations is typical for Latin, with a major application in the elaboration of the *consecutio temporum*.

The fourth chapter contains the actual analysis of the grammaticalization of Greek VPs with verbs of state or movement. After a brief consideration of the possibility of Semitic influences (p. 64 ff.), the author concentrates on *einai* with participle. The semantic analysis shows that the finite verb is desemantized to a large extent, and that the VP is characterized by a "plurispecializzazione nel dominio dell'imperfettività" (p. 74). It can express progressive, habitual and continuative aspect. Syntactic factors indicative of grammaticalization are (p. 78 ff.): "collocazione obbligatoria dei costituenti", "tendenza alla contiguità sintattica" and "restrizioni di compatibilità con avverbiali di tipo locativo". The occurrence of other verbs of state such as *stēkō* and *kat^hizō* is infrequent (p. 84 ff.). The construction with *erk^homai* (p. 86 ff.) is central to the analysis of VPs with verbs of movement. Combined with a future participle this verb forms a "perifrasi imminenziale", with a shift from "direzionalità spaziale" to "direzionalità temporale" (p. 90). More frequent is its combination with a present participle (p. 92 ff.), but it is difficult to determine the degree of desemantization. It can express continuative aspect.

Parallel to the treatment of Greek VPs, a discussion of alloglottic influences (p. 96) opens the fifth chapter, which analyzes Latin VPs. After a brief consideration of the more common VPs of *esse* with future participle (p. 98 ff.) and gerundive (p. 100 ff.), attention is paid to the VP of *esse* with present participle (only occurring in Christian texts). This construction follows the Greek New-Testamentical archetype, both from a formal and a semantic point of view (p. 109). The finite verb *esse*, however, seems to be grammaticalized to a lesser degree. This is reflected by the "maggiore libertà di posizione del verbo di stato" (p. 114) and the "minori restrizioni nella possibilità di essere coniugato in tutti i tempi e modi" (p. 123). In Latin, there are hardly any other VPs with verbs of state than the construction with *esse*. *Stare*

sometimes occurs with present participle as an equivalent of the Greek *stēkō* (p. 123 ff.). VPs with verbs of movement are non-existent, except for the passive future infinitive type *amatum iri*.[7]

In the sixth chapter the relationship between synthetic and analytic forms is discussed. In her theoretical *premessa* (p. 132 ff.) the author describes how a reorganization of the verbal system can lead to so-called categorial periphrasis (Haspelmath 2000). These categorial VPs are used to complement/specify the verbal system with regard to temporal and aspectual meanings. Synthetic forms will adopt a generic meaning, thus forming the non-marked element of the opposition synthetic vs. analytic.

Then follows an analysis of the use of Greek synthetic and analytic forms in a narrative context (p. 136 ff.). The latter can be used in the New Testament at the beginning (description of a present situation), middle (multiple levels of background) and end of a paragraph (prolonging the validity of an enunciation). The VPs in the Latin versions of the New Testament, however, do not present these expressive possibilities: they are not used to articulate the background in multiple narrative levels. There does seem to be a difference between Latin analytic and synthetic forms in the work of Lucifero of Cagliari (cf. Piras 1989/90), reflecting 'action actuelle' (analytic) and 'action habituelle' (synthetic).

In the last chapter the author summarizes her main findings with regard to origins and grammaticalizations. The role of alloglottic influences was, both in Greek and in Latin, that of a "potenziamento di una risorsa endogena" (p. 147). Greek and Latin aspectual VPs have reached different levels of grammaticalization (both with verbs of movement and of state), due to the centrality of Greek aspect. A discussion of Romance constructions of VPs with verbs of movement (e.g. Fr. *aller* + inf., *venir de* + inf.) rounds off the book (p. 151 ff.). The hypothesis of a Greek origin seems possible, since this type of construction does not occur in Latin. Its use in Greek was mainly restricted to *erkʰomai*, however, and did not present the same specifications as in Romance languages.[8]

4. Critical remarks

Amenta has made an important contribution to research of Greek and Latin VPs. She has brought the subject under renewed attention and has demonstrated how it can be approached in a 'modern' way, by means of the theoretical concept of grammaticalization (following major studies in Romance languages such as Squartini 1998). As such her work is a good starting-point for much-needed further research (cf. §5). In what follows I would like to make some critical remarks concerning the present study.

Adrados' (1992:451) complaint about the 'confusionismo' surrounding Greek VPs is by no means resolved in *Perifrasi aspettuali*. It seems strange that a study which puts considerable effort in clarifying well-known notions such as tense, aspect and Aktionsart does not bother to give a coherent outline of the problems concerning the definition of VPs. Neither do we get much explanation of what aspectual periphrases are ("perifrasi … che integrano i sistemi verbali … nell'espressione di significati aspettuali", p. 11), and what differentiates them from other types of VP (as a matter of fact Adrados uses the term 'perífrasis aspecto-temporales'). Especially the controversial contribution of Porter (1989), who considers *eimi* to be the only 'genuine' auxiliary, and does not accept the distinction between the nominal and verbal function of the participle as a basis of delimitation, would have deserved a response.

Amenta changed the subtitle of her Ph.D. thesis, *Un confronto diacronico-tipologico*, to *Origini e grammaticalizzazioni*, but in my opinion the former is more appropriate. Throughout the work she comments on external influences on Greek VPs and their internal development. Neither of these two elements is studied in great detail, however. The determination of external influences is entirely based on secondary literature. Regretfully, the author ignores the major recent treatment of Hebrew influences on Greek VPs, viz. Evans' *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch* (2001). As for the internal developments, Amenta advances the hypothesis that the participle in the VP with verbs of state has developed from a nominal to a verbal function ("un slittamento del participio da una funzione nominale … ad una funzione verbale", p. 30). This hypothesis certainly makes sense[9] but is never really substantiated from a diachronic point of view.

The corpus is currently quite unbalanced: while the later Latin production is studied until the sixth century, with representatives such as the *Acts and Passions of the Martyrs* (2nd c. AC), the *Itinerarium Egeriae* (4th c. AC), the *Letters of Lucifer of Cagliari* (4th c. AC), the *Mulomedicina Chironis* (4th/5th c. AC), the *Getica* (6th c. AC), the *Romana* (6th c. AC) and the *Historia Francorum* (6th c. AC), the Greek part of the corpus is mainly limited to the New Testament and some earlier examples mentioned by Dietrich (1973b). As far as the Greek language is concerned, this approach compromises diachronic conclusions or at the least renders them problematic. The process of grammaticalization of *einai* with participle apparently is considered to be at "il suo punto più alto" in the New Testament (p. 83). This may well be, but there is no reference to the later production whatsoever. It would certainly have been advisable to consider the examples collected by Aerts (1965) and Dietrich (1973b).

Extending the corpus would be of particular relevance to the diachronic analysis of the VP with *erk^{h}omai*, which may have influenced the Romance languages (p. 151 ff.). Did the

diffusion of *einai* with participle really 'block' the consolidation of this VP, as the author suggests, or did the emergence of other verbs of movement at the time of the New Testament have an influence? The latter seems to be suggested by Létoublon (1982:193-194), who noticed that "poreuomai tende à empiéter sur le champ d'emploi de erkhomai, dont le paradigme supplétif présentait des difficultés".

Amenta really makes an effort to illustrate her treatment with examples. Regrettably, she does not contextualize them, which makes it difficult for the reader to assess the specific value of an example, in particular concerning the semantic analysis (such a contextualization was of great importance to Aerts). At page 69, for example, example (3) should illustrate that some VPs "descrivono una situazione come si presenta in un dato momento, quindi in stretto rapporto con il momento di riferimento che ne delimita la durata". Why not outline the context, and clarify the reference time? It seems as though the author has forgotten the context herself in (4) (p. 67), which she translates with "quando esistevano gli dei non esistevano ancora le razze mortali", while the main clause (not reproduced in *Perifrasi aspettuali*) actually is *ēn gar pote k^{h}ronos* "For there once was a time…".

(3)   *En de to deipnon poieumenon en Thēbēisi* (Herodotus *Hist.* 9.15)
      "The dinner was (being) held at Thebes"

(4)   …^{h}ote t^{h}eoi men ēsan, t^{h}nēta de genē ouk ēn (Plato *Prot.* 320)
      "...when there were gods, but (there were) no mortal creatures"

5. Suggestions for further research

There is much need for research on the use of VPs in Post-Classical and Medieval Greek. The following elements particularly deserve further attention:

(a) Definition and typology of VPs, based on semantic and morphosyntactic criteria. We need to establish clearly which type of construction counts as being periphrastic. As Evans noticed (2001:221), use of the term 'verbal periphrasis' has tended to lack precision.[10] While scholars such as Porter reserve it strictly for the construction with *einai*, others use the term to describe a wide variety of constructions with verbs such as *gignomai, ek^{h}ō, mellō, p^{h}ainomai, tugk^{h}anō* and *^{h}upark^{h}ō* (consider for example Jannaris 1897:180 and Smyth 1980:436-437; these are called 'catenative constructions' by Porter 1989:487-492).

It can be very difficult to determine whether a VP is involved, and it often goes hand in hand with a considerable degree of subjectivity (Fanning 1990:311; Porter 1989:454). I can illustrate this point with example (5) (cf. Rijksbaron 2006:127-128). Should we interpret the

sentence as "where an army of the Athenians was continuing the siege" or as "where an army of the Athenians was, which continued the siege"?

(5)   *^{h}ou ēn strateuma tōn At^{h}ēnaiōn poliorkoun* (Thucydides *Hist.* 2.67.1)

As I already mentioned, the typology of VPs has been previously embedded in the theory of grammaticalization,[11] which offers specific criteria for auxiliarization[12] such as desemantization, defectiveness, syntactic contiguity of the finite and infinite verb form, placement of elements such as adverbials, clitics and the negation... . Since individual VPs are expected to have reached different degrees of grammaticalization, a 'scalar approach'[13] of these constructions does not seem out of place. Pusch & Wesch (2003:4), however, indicate that such an approach may entail "das Risiko eines inflationären Gebrauchs des Periphrasenbegriffs, gekoppelt mit dessen deskriptiv-terminologischer Entwertung".

(b) The position of VPs in the verbal system, based on semantic criteria. Since VPs are known to express more complex and subtle meanings than synthetic verb forms,[14] attention should be paid to the specific TAM-distribution between finite and non-finite verb.[15] The *communis opinio* that VPs can be reduced to the macro-category of imperfectivity is over-simplified (this does not apply, for example, to the analytic future[16]) and deserves detailed research.

In studying VPs, we should pay attention to the 'interaction' between synthetic and analytic forms from a diachronic point of view.[17] Which VPs replace forms that are no longer used, which compete with other forms, and which occupy an 'open place' in the verbal system (cf. Mussies 1971:302)? As far as Post-Classical Greek is concerned, the appearance of VPs has to be seen in relation to major evolutions of the verbal system as a whole (cf. Browning 1983:36 ff.). Due attention should go to the role of phonology in these changes (Horrocks 1997:76).

(c) The pragmatics of VPs. Dietrich (1973a:209) suggested that the *eimi*-periphrasis possibly occurs more frequently in Christian than in profane literature because of a difference in narrative style ('Ehrzählhaltung'), but this hypothesis has never been thoroughly investigated.[18] There are virtually no studies that deal with the discursive function of VPs (cf. Amenta 2003:134). Suggestions on the use of the *eimi*-periphrasis in the work of Herodotus were made by Rosén (1957) and Gonda (1959) half a century ago. Recent research by Wakker deals with the pragmatics of VPs with *mellō* and *erk^{h}omai*, but it does not take into account Post-Classical Greek (Wakker 2006, 2007).

Another element is the role of social prestige in the diffusion of VPs. Sociolinguistic factors can be essential for the development of a specific construction: Drinka (2007:112) recently pointed at differences in the usage of the periphrastic perfect by a "sophist group" and a "non-sophist group" of authors, depending on the adoption or non-adoption of the elaborate, Atticistic style. Similar research has been carried out for the use of synthetic pluperfectforms by Hinterberger (2007).

(d) Expansion of the corpus. VPs develop an explosive productivity in the Post-Classical period, which is in part determined by the restructuring of the verbal system[19] (as for example the desystematization of the synthetic future). While I certainly do not underestimate the importance of early examples in classical authors such as Herodotus, Plato and Sophocles I believe that Post-Classical texts (with the exception of the New Testament) have not yet received the attention they deserve. We should concentrate on texts written in a low, vernacular style such as the *acta*, *vitae* and chronicles; these texts are particularly suited as they generally do not adhere to Sophistic tendencies.

6. Typos and errors

I noted the following typos and errors: "οἰκοδομεῖν" for "οἰκοδομεῖν" (p. 34), "ἐκ" for "ἐκ" (p. 34), "ἦσαν" for "ἦσαν" (p. 67), "προσκυνήσωσι ἐν" for "προσκυνήσωσιν ἐν" (p. 67), "οἰ βάρβαροι" for "οἱ βάρβαροι" (p. 69), "costitisce" for "costituisce" (p. 71), "poliesemia" for "polisemia" (p. 74), "espriemere" for "esprimere" (p. 74), "τρώγοντες καὶ πίνοντες γαμοῦντες καὶ γαμίζοντες" for "τρώγοντες καὶ πίνοντες, γαμοῦντες καὶ γαμίζοντες" (p. 74), "αὐτόν" for "αὐτὸν" (p. 76 & 113), "discepoli di Gesù" for "discepoli di Giovanni" (p. 78), "argormenti" for "argomenti" (p. 80), "μισηθήσεσθη" for "μισηθήσεσθε" (p. 82), "εἶμι" for "εἰμι" (p.86), "εἰσέρχομαι" for "εἰσέρχομαι" (p. 88), "τής αἰτίας" for "τῆς αἰτίας" (p. 93), "εὗρεν" for "εὗρεν" (p. 93), "ἀφ᾽ οὖ" for "ἀφ᾽ οὖ" (p. 93), "ὑπτασίαν" for "ὀπτασίαν" (p. 93), "l'infinito perfetto passivo" (*lectum iri*) for "l'infinito futuro passivo" (p. 98), "οὖτος" for "οὖτος" (p. 100), "citta" for "città" (p. 108), "θυμιᾶματος" for "θυμιάματος" (p. 120), "θέλει ἵνα" for "θέλει ἵνα" (p. 157), "Transactions and proceeding..." for "Transactions and proceedings..." (p. 157), "Noms d'agent e noms d'action..." for "Noms d'agent et noms d'action..." (p. 158), "Geburstag" for "Geburtstag" (p. 160), "Le verb grec ancien..." for "Le verbe grec ancien..." (p. 161), "Almqvist & Wiksells" for "Almqvist & Wiksell" (p. 161), "Goezler" for "Goelzer" (p. 162), "siécle" for "siècle" (p. 164), "...quelques aramaïsmes sous-jacent..." for "...quelques aramaïsmes sous-jacents..." (p.

164), "The Syntax of the Participle in the Greek of New Testament" for "The syntax of the Participle in the Greek New Testament" (p. 164), "Mechanism of Syntactic Change" for "Mechanisms of Syntactic Change" (p. 165), "A Grammar of the New Testament Greek" for "A Grammar of New Testament Greek" (p. 167), "...costructions participales..." for "...constructions participales..." (p. 167), "La Koiné del Nuovo Testamento e la trasmissione del testo sacro" for "La Koiné del Nuovo Testamento e la trasmissione del sacro testo" (p. 168), "Analicity and Syntheticity: a Dichronic Perspective with Spatial Reference..." for "Analyticity and Syntheticity: a Diachronic Perspective with Special Reference..." (p. 168). Coseriu 1971 (main text p. 105) and Schwegler 1997 (main text p. 147) are not listed in the bibliography.

Notes

[1] For an overview of the history and usage of the term 'periphrasis', see Haspelmath (2000) and Hoffmann (1993)

[2] For a more comprehensive overview, see Pusch & Wesch (2003).

[3] A recent study making use of this classification is Gavarró & Laca (2002).

[4] A recent study making use of this classification is Olbertz (1998).

[5] Drinka's findings were recently criticised by Giacalone Ramat (2008:140). See also Horrocks (1997:77-78).

[6] In this case the co-ordinated adjective *promptus* suggests nominal (non-periphrastic) interpretation of the participle.

[7] Greek constructions such as *kai ēlthen kērussōn eis tas sunagōgas* (Mk. 1.39) are translated in Latin with a form of *esse*: *et erat praedicans in synagogis*.

[8] There is, for example, no VP that reflects the retrospective view of *je viens de…* .

[9] Compare, for example, with the findings of Cennamo (2006) concerning VPs with *facere* and *fieri*.

[10] For a similar critique, see Dietrich (1973b:21): "Die meisten älteren Arbeiten, die periphrastische Konstruktionen behandeln, haben gerade deswegen zu widersprüchlichen Ergebnissen geführt, weil dieser Terminus (Periphrase, KB) nicht eindeutig abgegrenzt war und deshalb oft für verschiedene Phänomene gebraucht wurde".

[11] See Haspelmath (2000: 661) for the importance of grammaticalization with regard to verbal periphrasis.

[12] Literature on this topic is extensive. Representative examples are Giacalone Ramat (2001), Létoublon (1984) and Wakker (2006).

[13] Recent studies making use of such an approach are, among others, Giacalone Ramat (2001) and Schwegler (1990).

[14] Consider the following example (brought to my attention by prof. Mark Janse): *emelle ou to deuteron diap^hugōn esest^hai* (Herodotus *Hist.* 7.194), [Sandoces, who was set free before and had escaped from being put to death] "was destined not to be escaping for the second time". The (imperfective) modal auxiliary *emelle* implies an expectation, which is expressed by a VP consisting of a modal future infinitive (*esest^hai*) and a perfective aorist participle (*diap^hugōn*)!

[15] See Campbell (2008:34), Evans (2001:224) and Renault & François (2005).

[16] For more details, see Horrocks (1997:76).

[17] The article written by Benveniste (1968) on this topic is still worth reading.

[18] Verboomen (1992:7) does not think this hypothesis is viable, because it only involves the *eimi*-periphrasis.

[19] Browning (1983:29-36), Evans (2005:112-113) and Horrocks (1997:66, 75-76) deal with this restructuring.

References

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

Aerts, Willem J. 1965. *Periphrastica. An investigation into the use of* εἶναι *and* ἔχειν *as auxiliaries or pseudo-auxiliaries in Greek from Homer up to the present day*. Amsterdam: Hakkert (diss. Amsterdam).

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

Benveniste, Émile. 1968. "Mutations of linguistic categories". *Directions for historical linguistics* ed. by Winfred P. Lehmann and Yakov Malkiel, 85–94. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bertinetto, Pier Marco. 1986. *Tempo, Aspetto e Azione nel verbo italiano: Il sistema dell'indicativo*. Firenze: Preso dall'Accademia Della Crusca.

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

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

Browning, Robert. 1983. *Medieval and modern Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Second edition.

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

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

Ceglia, Luca. 1998. "L'evoluzione della costruzione perifrastica verbale nel greco del Nuovo Testamento". *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 83.20–44.

Cennamo, Michela. 2005. "Passive auxiliaries in late Latin". *Latin et langues Romanes. Etudes de linguistique offertes à Jozsef Herman à l'occasion de son 80ème anniversaire* ed. by Sándor Kiss, Luca Mondin and Giampaolo Salvi, 177–194. Niemeyer: Tübingen.

Cennamo, Michela. 2006. "The rise and grammaticalization paths of Latin fieri and facere as passive auxiliaries". *Passivization and typology. Form and function* ed. by Werner Ambraham and Larisa Leisiö, 311–336. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Cennamo, Michela. 2008. "The rise and development of analytic perfects in Italo-Romance". *Grammatical change and linguistic theory: The Rosendal papers* ed. by Thórhallur Eythorsson, 115–142. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Coleman, Robert. 1971. "The origin and development of Latin habeo + infinitive". *Classical Quarterly* 21.215–232.

Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coseriu, Eugenio. 1968. "El aspecto verbal perifrástico en griego antiquo". *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, Eugenio. 1972. "Das Problem des griechischen Einflusses auf das Vulgärlatein". *Griechisch und Romanisch* ed. by Gunter Narr, 1–15. Tübingen: Fotodruck Präzis.

Coseriu, Eugenio. 1996. "Latin et grec dans le latin dit 'vulgaire'". *Aspects of Latin. Papers from the 7th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics* ed. by Hannah Rosén, 27–37. Innsbruck: Universität Innsbruck. Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.

De la Villa Polo, Jesús. 1989. "La identificación de la auxiliaridad verbal en Griego". *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica* 22.195–208.

Dietrich, Wolf. 1973a. "Der Periphrastische Verbalaspekt im Griechischen und Lateinischen". *Glotta* 51.188–228.

Dietrich, Wolf. 1973b. *Der periphrastische Verbalaspekt in den romanischen Sprachen. Untersuchungen zum heutigen romanischen Verbalsystem und zum Problem der Herkunft des periphrastischen Verbalaspekts*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Dietrich, Wolf. 1983. *El aspecto verbal perifrástico en las lenguas románicas. Estudios sobre el actual sistema verbal de las lenguas románicas y sobre el problema del origen del aspecto verbal perifrástico*. Madrid: Gredos.

Drinka, Bridget. 2003a. "The formation of periphrastic perfects and passives in Europe: An areal approach". *Historical Linguistics 2001* ed. by Barry J. Blake and Kate Burridge, 105–128. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Drinka, Bridget. 2003b. "Areal factors in the development of the European periphrastic perfect". *Word* 54.1–38.

Drinka, Bridget. 2007. "The development of the HAVE perfect: Mutual influences of Greek and Latin". *Split auxiliary systems: A cross-linguistic perspective* ed. by Raúl Aranovich, 101–121. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Eklund, Sten. 1970. *The periphrastic, completive and finite use of the present participle in Latin. With special regard to translations of Christian texts in Greek up to 600 A.D*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell (diss. Uppsala).

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

Evans, Trevor. 2005. "Periphrastic tense forms in the Greek Tobit". *Interpreting translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in honour of Johan Lust* ed. by Florentino García Martínez and Marc Vervenne, 109–119. Leuven: Peeters.

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

Gavarró, Anna & Brenda Laca. 2002. "Les perífrasis temporals, aspectuals i modals". *Gramàtica del català contemporani Vol. 3* ed. by Joan Solà, 2663–2726. Barcelona: Empúries.

Giacalone Ramat, Anna. 2001. "Emergent auxiliaries and the theory of grammaticalization". *Naturally! Linguistic studies in honour of Wolfgang Dressler presented on the occasion of his 60th birthday* ed. by Chris Schaner Wolles, John R. Rennison and Friedrich Neubarth, 121–131. Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier.

Giacalone Ramat, Anna. 2008. "Areal convergence in grammaticalization processes". *Rethinking grammaticalization: New perspectives* ed. by María José López-Couso and Elena Seoane, 129-167. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Gonda, Jan. 1959. "A remark on 'periphrastic' constructions in Greek". *Mnemosyne* IV, 12.97–112.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2000. "Periphrasis". *Morphologie. Morphology. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Flexion und Wortbildung. An international handbook on inflection and word formation. Vol. 1* ed. by Geert Booij, 654–664. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Heine, Bernd. 1993. *Auxiliaries. Cognitive forces and grammaticalization*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hinterberger, Martin. 2007. "Die Sprache der byzantinischen Literatur: Der Gebrauch der synthetischen Plusquamperfektformen". *Byzantinische Sprachkunst. Studien zur byzantinischen Literatur, gewidmet Wolfram Hörandner zum 65. Geburtstag* ed. by Martin Hinterberger and Elisabeth Schiffer, 107–142. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hoffmann, Roland. 1993. "Periphrase (periphrastisch). Zu Herkunft und Geschichte eines sprachwissenschaftlichen Begriffs". *Glotta* 71.223–242.

Hopper, Paul & Elisabeth C. Traugott. 1993. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Horrocks, Geoffrey. 1997. *Greek: A history of the language and its speakers*. London & New York: Longman.

Jannaris, Antonius. 1897. *An historical Greek grammar chiefly of the Attic dialect: As written and spoken from classical antiquity down to the present time*. Hildesheim: Olms.

La Fauci, Nunzio. 2006. "Dinamiche sistematiche. Perifrasi perfettive e futuro sintetico: Dal latino al romanzo". *Atti della Giornata di Linguistica Latina, Venezia, 7 maggio 2004* ed. by Renato Oniga and Luigi Zennaro, 101–131. Venezia: Cafoscarina.

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

Létoublon, Françoise. 1983. "Les verbes de mouvement et l'auxiliarité en latin". *Glotta* 61.218–228.

Létoublon, Françoise. 1984. "Il vient de pleuvoir, il va faire beau. Verbes de mouvement et auxiliaires". *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur* 9.25–41.

Lo Cascio, Vincenzo. 1986. "Temporal deixis and anaphor in sentence and text: Finding a reference time". *Temporal structure in sentence and discourse* ed. by Vincenzo Lo Cascio and Co Vet, 191–228. Dordrecht: Foris.

Loporcaro, Michele. 1995. "Grammaticalizzazione delle perifrasi verbali perfettive romanze e accordo del participio passato". *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 80.144–167.

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

Marouzeau, Jules. 1910. *L'emploi du participe présent latin à l'époque républicaine*. Paris: Champion (diss. Paris).

Moulton, James & Nigel Turner. 1963. *A grammar of New Testament Greek. Vol. III: Syntax*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

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

Napoli, Maria. 2007. "Latino habeo più participio perfetto passivo. Riflessioni su grammatica e lessico". *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 92.3–50.

Nocentini, Alberto. 2001. "La genesi del futuro e del condizionale sintetico romanzo". *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 117.367–401.

Olbertz, Hella. 1998. *Verbal periphrases in a functional grammar of Spanish*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Pinkster, Harm. 1985. "The development of future tense auxiliaries in Latin". *Glotta* 63.186–208.

Piras, Antonio. 1989/90. "Criteri e limiti di accertabilità della perifrasi con sum e il participio presente: Dalle origini a Lucifero di Cagliari". *Sandalion: Quaderni di Cultura Classica, Cristiana e Medievale* 12-13.63–97.

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

Pusch, Claus D. & Andreas Wesch. 2003. "Verbalperiphrasen zwischen Grammatik, Lexikon und Pragmatik". *Verbalperiphrasen in den (ibero)romanischen Sprachen. Perífrasis verbals en les llengües (ibero)romàniques* ed. by Claus D. Pusch and Andreas Wesch, 1–10. Hamburg: Buske.

Reichenbach, Hans. 1947. *Elements of symbolic logic*. New York: Collier-Mac Millan.

Renault, Richard & Jacques François. 2005. "L'expression des TAM et la place des périphrases verbales dans trois langues". *Les Périphrases Verbales* ed. by Hava Bat-Zeev Shyldkrot and Nicole le Querler, 27–45. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Rijksbaron, Albert. 2006. *The syntax and semantics of the verb in Classical Greek*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. Third edition.

Rosén, Haim. 1957. "Die 'zweiten' Tempora des Griechischen: zum Prädikatsausdruck beim griechischen Verbum". *Museum Helveticum* 14.133–154.

Schmid, Wilhelm. 1893. *Der Atticismus in seiner Hauptvertreten: Von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus. Vol. III*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Schwegler, Armin. 1990. *Analyticity and syntheticity: A diachronic perspective with special reference to Romance languages*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Smyth, Herbert W. 1984. *Greek grammar*. Rev. G.M. Messing. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard university press.

Squartini, Mario. 1998. *Verbal periphrases in Romance: Aspect, actionality, and grammaticalization*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Tabachovitz, David. 1956. *Die Septuaginta und das Neue Testament: Stilstudien*. Lund: Gleerup.

Thielmann, Philipp. 1885. "Habere mit dem Part. Perf. Pass.". *Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie* 2.372–423, 509–549.

Vendler, Zeno. 1967. "Verbs and time". *Philosophical Review* 66.143–160.

Verboomen, Alain. 1992. *L'imparfait périphrastique dans l'Évangile de Luc et dans la Septante. Contribution à l'étude du système verbal du grec néotestamentaire.* Louvain & Paris: Peeters.

Vincent, Nigel. 1982. "The development of the auxiliaries *habere* and *esse* in Romance". *Studies in the Romance verb: Essays offered to Joe Cremona on the occasion of his 60th birthday* ed. by Nigel Vincent & Martin Harris, 71–96. London: Croom Helm.

Wakker, Gerry. 2006. "Future auxiliaries or not?" *Word classes and related topics in Ancient Greek. Proceedings of the Conference on 'Greek Syntax and Word Classes' held in Madrid on 18-21 June 2003* ed. by Emilio Crespo, Jésus de la Villa and Antonio R. Revuelta, 237–255. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.

Wakker, Gerry. 2007. "Intentions and future realisations in Herodotus". *The language of literature. Linguistic approaches to classical texts* ed. by Rutger J. Allan and Michel Buijs, 168–187. Leiden: Brill.

Wilcox, Max. 1984. "Semitisms in the New Testament". *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II, 25.2. ed. by Wolfgang Haase, 978–1029. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Zawadowski, Leo. 1959/60. "Criteria of Latin periphrastic forms". *Eos* 50.213–222.

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