

THE CONSTRUCTION ‘Εἶναι + PARTICIPLE’ IN HOMERIC GREEK: PROTOTYPE ANALYSIS AND THE MORPHOSYNTAX-SEMANTICS INTERFACE*

EDOARDO NARDI
Università degli Studi di Palermo
edoardo.nardi@unipa.it
Università Guglielmo Marconi
e.nardi@unimarconi.it

ABSTRACT

Questo contributo tratta della perifrasi ‘εἶναι + participio’ in greco omerico all’interfaccia fra morfossintassi e semantica. I dati sono analizzati con riferimento al quadro teorico elaborato da Nardi e Romagno (cfr. NARDI - ROMAGNO 2022), che considerano la perifrasi con εἶναι in greco antico come una categoria prototipica: secondo questa prospettiva, la categoria sovraordinata ‘εἶναι + participio’ include due manifestazioni formalmente diverse ma funzionalmente equivalenti, un costrutto con una copula espressa, cioè una perifrasi vera e propria, e un costrutto senza copula espressa, cioè un participio predicativo (fondamentalmente, un participio che funziona come una forma finita). Questa indagine mira a valutare se si possano individuare fattori che determinano o soggiacciono all’uso di queste costruzioni participiali in greco omerico. L’analisi dei dati raccolti nei poemi omerici mostra che le costruzioni participiali codificano la funzione specifica di significare lo stato, inerente o acquisito, del soggetto del predicato, costituendo pertanto un’alternativa (più o meno libera) al perfetto originario (cfr. ROMAGNO 2005).

PAROLE CHIAVE

Greco omerico, perifrasi, participio predicativo, teoria dei prototipi, interfaccia morfossintassi-semantica

This contribution addresses the periphrasis ‘εἶναι + participle’ in Homeric Greek at the interface between morphosyntax and semantics. The data are examined with reference to the theoretical framework elaborated by Nardi and Romagno (2022), who regard the Ancient Greek εἶναι-periphrasis as a prototype category: according to this view, the superordinate category ‘εἶναι + participle’ includes two formally different, but functionally equivalent manifestations, a pattern with an expressed copula, *i.e.* a periphrasis *tout-court*, and a pattern with no overt copula, *i.e.* a predicative participle (basically, a participle functioning as a finite form). This investigation aims to assess if factors underlying or determining the usage of these participial constructions in Homeric Greek can be singled out. The analysis of the data individuated in the Homeric poems shows that the participial constructions encode the specific function of signifying the state, either inherent or attained, of the subject of the predicate, thus constituting a (more or less free) alternative to the original perfect (cfr. ROMAGNO 2005).

KEYWORDS

Homeric Greek, periphrasis, predicative participle, prototype theory, morphosyntax-semantics interface

1. INTRODUCTION

This contribution addresses the periphrasis made up of εἶναι “to be” plus participle, or εἶναι-periphrasis (example 1), and the predicative participle (example 2) in Homer’s *Iliad* and *Odyssey*;¹ the predicative participle is a syntactically independent participle, which represents the main predicate of the sentence and functions as a finite verbal form. Whenever a clearcut distinction is unnecessary, the εἶναι-periphrasis and the predicative participle will be conjointly referred to as the participial constructions. This conjoint reference is justified by the fact that, despite the evident formal difference (presence vs. absence of an overt εἶναι form), these constructions constitute two manifestations of the same (superordinate) predicative construction, as is fully discussed in §2.1.

* The results of this study were first presented in a lecture at La Statale University of Milan, for which I heartily thank Francesco Dedè and Domenica Romagno. I would also like to thank Luca Alfieri and Sara Virgili for their insightful comments, and Giulia Greco, with whom I fruitfully discussed a few issues concerning the future perfect in Homeric Greek. Of course, the responsibility for the contribution remains exclusively mine.

¹ The Greek text follows the editions by Thomas W. Allen (ALLEN 1917-1919, ALLEN - MONRO 1920); the English translation is that by Augustus T. Murray (MURRAY - DIMOCK 1995, MURRAY - WYATT 1999).

- (1) Ζεὺς μέν που τό γε οἶδε καὶ ἄθνατοι θεοὶ
 Zeus.NOM PTCL somehow DEM.ACC.SG PTCL know.PRF.3SG and immortal.NOM.PL god.NOM.PL
 ἄλλοι | ὅπποτέρῳ θανάτιο τέλος πεπρωμένον ἐστίν.
 other.NOM.PL which.of.two.DAT.SG death.GEN.SG end.ACC.SG grant.PTCP.PRF.PASS be.PRS.3SG
 But this, I ween, Zeus knoweth, and the other immortal gods, for which of the twain the doom of death *is ordained*. (Γ 308-309)
- (2) Ὁ μὲν τόξων ἐὺ εἰδῶς | Πάνδαρος, υἱὸς δ’ αὖτε
 DEM.NOM.SG PTCL bow.GEN.PL well know.PTCP.PRF Pandarus.NOM son.NOM.SG PTCL again
 Λυκάονος εὐχεται εἶναι | Αἰνεΐας δ’ υἱὸς μὲν ἀμύμονος
 Lycaon.GEN boast.PRS.3SG be.INF Aeneas.NOM PTCL son.NOM.SG PTCL excellent.GEN.SG
 Ἀγχίσαιο | εὐχεται ἐκγεγάμεν, μήτηρ δέ οἱ ἐστ’ Ἀφροδίτη.
 Anchises.GEN boast.PRS.3SG be.born.INF mother.NOM.SG PTCL 3SG.DAT be.PRS.3SG Aphrodite.NOM
 The one *is well skilled* with the bow, even Pandarus, and moreover avoweth him to be the son of Lycaon; while Aeneas avoweth himself to be born of peerless Anchises, and his mother is Aphrodite. (E 245-248)

While the construction in (1) does not appear to require any special remark, it is worth highlighting that the participle in (2) does not encode the subordinating function typical of the Ancient Greek circumstantial (or adverbial) participle:² εἰδῶς seems fully equivalent to the indicative οἶδε, and if the latter form were replaced with the former, no substantial change in the meaning of the sentence would be produced.

A preliminary question deserving some attention concerns the syntactic interpretation of the constructions and the ambiguity that may originate from it. The assessment of what combinations of εἶναι plus participle truly constitute periphrases is a long-standing and central issue in the literature: while earlier studies used to assume that a construction had to comply with specific features in order to be considered periphrastic,³ in more recent years scholars adopted a less rigid approach and began to view periphrasticity in scalar terms (see §2.1).⁴ Even though the recent approach permits to overcome many problems, a few instances of interpretative ambiguity still persist: a paradigmatic case of this issue in Homeric Greek occurs in Δ 211, and is effectively discussed by Bentein and Janse (cfr. BENTEIN - JANSE 2017), to whom I refer for more details. As for predicative participles, the interpretative difficulty consists in establishing if the participle is really syntactically independent, and if any circumstantial/adverbial usage can be reasonably ruled out. This question is often discussed with reference to Post-Classical Greek,⁵ but a few ambiguous cases can as well be found in Homer:

- (3) Οὗτος δ’ αὖ Λαερτιάδης πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς, | ὃς
 DEM.NOM.SG PTCL again Laertiades.NOM.SG many.wile.NOM.SG Odysseus.NOM REL.NOM.SG
 τράφη ἐν δῆμῳ Ἰθάκης κρναῆς περ εἰδῶς | εἰδῶς
 rear.AOR.PASS.3SG in land.DAT.SG Ithaca.GEN rugged.GEN.SG though be.PTCP.PRS know.PTCP.PRF
 παντοίους τε δόλους καὶ μῆδεα πυκνά.
 various.ACC.PL and deceit.ACC.PL and thought.ACC.PL cunning.ACC.PL
 This again is Laertes’ son, Odysseus of many wiles, that was reared in the land of Ithaca, rugged though it be, and he *knoweth* all manner of craft and cunning devices. (Γ 200-202)

The participle εἰδῶς is considered syntactically independent by Murray, and rendered as a predicative participle equivalent to the indicative οἶδα, but it may as well be understood adverbially as ‘Odysseus of many wiles, that was reared in the land of Ithaca, rugged though it be, *who knows* all manner of

² On the circumstantial / adverbial participle, among many others, cfr. SMYTH 1920, p. 456 and ff., SCHWYZER 1950, p. 385 and ff., CRESPO - CONTI - MAQUIEIRA 2003, p. 306 and ff.

³ Among others, cfr. BJÖRCK 1940, AERTS 1965, DIETRICH 1973, PORTER 1989, p. 452 and ff., CEGLIA 1998; for a useful historical overview, cfr. BENTEIN 2012.

⁴ AMENTA 2003, BENTEIN 2011, 2016, NARDI - ROMAGNO 2022.

⁵ MOULTON 1906, p. 222 and ff., among others.

craft [...]’. In this paper, the instances of interpretatively ambiguous participial constructions, such as that in (3) and in Δ 211, have not been taken into account.⁶

1.1. State of the art and research objective

Homeric Greek is among the most addressed varieties of Ancient Greek, and certainly the one with the oldest tradition of study, dating back at least to the Alexandrine philologists. However, both participial constructions at issue, especially the predicative participle, received relatively scarce attention.

The predicative participle in Homeric Greek, as well as in Classical Greek, usually goes unnoticed in grammars:⁷ the only exceptions appear to be Schwyzer (1950, p. 408), who briefly observes that a participle can be found without a governing copula in a nominal clause, and Chantraine (1953, p. 323), who regards this usage as an anacoluthon. In the same vein, some attention is paid to the construction in studies dedicated to nominal clauses, but in a fairly limited fashion. Besides Rodríguez Monescillo’s article on Aristophanes,⁸ the most noteworthy work in this regard is Guiraud’s investigation:⁹ the scholar addresses Homer (including the Hymns), Hesiod, Pindar, Theognis, Herodotus and the Attic tragedians, and goes through a number of instances of copular and non-copular nominal clauses (*i.e.*, respectively, periphrases and predicative participles; see §2.1), providing various comments mostly concerning the pattern usage in each author.¹⁰

Even though scholars focus on the εἶναι-periphrasis far more frequently than the predicative participle, discussions on the pattern in Homer are not particularly diffused, and most often centered on the combination “εἶναι + perfect participle”, that is, the periphrastic perfect.¹¹ In his seminal study on the Greek perfect, Chantraine¹² discusses the periphrastic perfect in the subjunctive and optative moods, as well as in the indicative, but the data are limited to Classical and Hellenistic Greek (two other important investigations into the diachronic development of the periphrastic perfect, not limited to the εἶναι-periphrasis, are provided by Moser and Drinka.¹³

Besides Guiraud,¹⁴ a significant contribution to the study of εἶναι-periphrases in Ancient Greek is represented by Aerts,¹⁵ whose main concern, as briefly observed above, is establishing in which cases the constructions can be regarded as periphrastic in relation to various diagnostic criteria, such as whether the copula has an existential meaning, the adjectival status of the participle, etc.¹⁶ Aerts acknowledges the occurrence of the εἶναι-periphrasis in Homer, although a few claims appear questionable,¹⁷ but he does not dedicate a specific discussion to it: in the section on Ancient Greek (according to a threefold distinction between Ancient, Koinè and Modern Greek), in fact, Aerts mostly focuses on Classical Greek.

More recently, Amenta published a study¹⁸ on the diachronic development of Greek periphrases with reference to grammaticalization, but little room is given to Homeric Greek, as most data are collected from the

⁶ The instances of interpretatively problematic periphrases occur in the following passages: Δ 211 (cfr. BENTEIN - JANSE 2017), E 177 (cfr. BENTEIN 2016, p. 294), E 191 (the participial character itself of κορτήεις in this case is questionable: it may as well be an adjective), N 681-682, N 764 (2 instances), Δ 22 = Θ 459 (cfr. *ivi*, p. 211), κ 156 = μ 368 and, similarly, π 472 (cfr. *ivi*, pp. 208-210; the ambiguity of the constructions in these three *Odyssey* passages is not acknowledged by AMENTA 2003, pp. 75-76, who regards them as fully periphrastic). Besides example (3), the only other case of ambiguous predicative participle occurs in E 831. Actually, also the participle κεκακωμένον in δ 754 raises some problems in terms of syntactic-functional interpretation, but its syntactic independence and, thus, its character of predicative participle appears to be beyond doubt (as such, it is included in the data).

⁷ BRUGMANN 1900, SMYTH 1920, CRESPO - CONTI - MAQUIEIRA 2003, among others.

⁸ RODRÍGUEZ MONESCILLO 1972.

⁹ GUIRAUD 1962, p. 145 and ff.; although I suspect that the scrutiny of the texts is not exhaustive, as I found several instances in Homer that Guiraud does not mention.

¹⁰ It is worth noting that in Post-Classical and especially Biblical Greek the predicative participle becomes more frequent and develops innovative usages: it is probably this quantitative and qualitative enhancement that causes the construction to draw wider scholarly attention (cfr. NARDI 2023, and the bibliography mentioned there).

¹¹ As for grammars, cfr. SMYTH 1920, pp. 179, 182-183, SCHWYZER 1939, p. 812; 1950, pp. 407-408.

¹² CHANTRAINE 1926, p. 246 and ff.

¹³ MOSER 1988 and DRINKA 2017, p. 94 and ff.

¹⁴ GUIRAUD 1962.

¹⁵ AERTS 1965.

¹⁶ Cfr. AERTS 1965, p. 5 and ff.

¹⁷ For example, Aerts (AERTS 1965, p. 14) refers to 22 instances of “εἶναι / πέλομαι + perfect participle” (20 middle and 2 active) occurring in the Homeric poems and the Hymns (also cited by DRINKA 2017, pp. 94-95), but the instances of “εἶναι + perfect participle” are more than twice as many according to my scrutiny, and in *Iliad* and *Odyssey* only (see §3). Furthermore, Aerts (AERTS 1965, p. 18) denies the presence of “εἶναι + present participle” periphrases in Homer: this claim is proven wrong both by my analysis (see §3) and previous studies (cfr. AMENTA 2003, p. 68, BENTEIN 2016, p. 208 and ff.).

¹⁸ AMENTA 2003.

New Testament. As far as I know, Bentein’s study¹⁹ is to date the most insightful and detailed investigation into the εἶναι-periphrasis, thanks to its diachronic approach and its attention to many aspects of the question. Since – quite remarkably – basically all the observations and comments made by Bentein find confirmation in the present analysis, I refer to §3 for a detailed discussion.

In this contribution, I carry out an investigation into the participial constructions in Homeric Greek at the interface between morphosyntax and semantics, with particular reference to the category of actionality and related issues, in order to single out any potential factors that may underlie or determine the usage of the constructions: as seen, this type of analysis seems to be lacking in the literature, and this study represents an attempt to fill this gap. The paper is structured as follows: in section §2, the theoretical background and the methodological tools employed in the analysis are fully made explicit; section §3 includes the analysis and the discussion of the data, with reference to the morphological, morphosyntactic and semantic features of the constructions, as well as their paradigmatic function (in §3.1); in §4, I point out the results of the analysis, and make some concluding remarks.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGICAL TOOLS

2.1. The construction ‘εἶναι + participle’ as a prototype category

In the wake of studies such as Amenta²⁰ and, in particular, Bentein,²¹ Nardi e Romagno²² have recently elaborated a theoretical framework in which the εἶναι-periphrasis is regarded as a prototype category, in the sense of Rosch:²³ according to this view, the category members are collocated at a different conceptual distance from the prototype on the basis of a similarity relationship, and the category, as well as the sub-categories it may feature, are not distinguished in a clearcut fashion, but have fuzzy boundaries, typically resulting in some sorts of reciprocal merging of the peripheral (*i.e.* non prototypical) members of the contiguous (sub-) categories.

With reference to this framework, Nardi e Romagno²⁴ divided the superordinate category “εἶναι + participle” into three sub-categories: existential constructions,²⁵ predicative participles (example 2) and “true” periphrases (example 1). At this point, it is opportune to clarify why the predicative participle and the periphrasis are considered together in this paper:

Aristotle observes that any [Greek] finite verb is functionally equivalent to a participle plus a copula,²⁶ that is, to an εἶναι-periphrasis: e.g., διδάσκει = διδάσκων ἐστί “he teaches” (*Metaph.* 1017a28; *Anal. Pr.* 51b12). Since the participle is a nominal form, and nominal clauses are perfectly acceptable in Greek, a participle by itself can function as a full predicate (e.g., διδάσκει = διδάσκων “he teaches”; cf. also Aristotle *Poet.* 1457a27, Schwyzer 1950: 407-408) [...]. The predicative participle (e.g., διδάσκων), then, and its copular counterpart (*i.e.*, εἶναι-periphrasis: e.g., διδάσκων ἐστί) are two formally-different ways to express predication.²⁷

Therefore, although the periphrasis and the predicative participle are usually considered as distinct constructions²⁸ because of the formal difference that characterizes them (presence vs. absence of an overt copula), these constructions happen to be two formally different manifestations of the same predicative superordinate construction “εἶναι + participle” (what is more, the distinction between periphrasis and

¹⁹ BENTEIN 2016.

²⁰ AMENTA 2003.

²¹ BENTEIN 2011, 2016.

²² NARDI - ROMAGNO 2022.

²³ ROSCH 1973, 1978

²⁴ NARDI - ROMAGNO 2022, p. 224 and ff.

²⁵ Existential constructions consist in combinations of εἶναι plus participle, in which εἶναι encodes an existential meaning, that is – essentially – it means “to exist” or “there is/are” (e.g. *Mark* 15:40). Since no such pattern seems to appear in the Homeric poems, existential constructions will not be further considered in this study.

²⁶ Following NARDI - ROMAGNO (2022), I will refer to εἶναι as “copula” rather than “auxiliary”, as it is most often the case in the literature about periphrases, not limited to Ancient Greek (among many others, cfr. AMENTA 2003, p. 20 and ff.): this choice is motivated by the fact that εἶναι in the constructions under examination resembles more closely a copula than an auxiliary (cfr. NARDI - ROMAGNO 2022, pp. 220-221).

²⁷ NARDI - ROMAGNO 2022, p. 228.

²⁸ The most blatant exception is GUIRAUD 1962; see §1.1.

predicative participle is better defined in a graded manner, rather than in discrete terms, with reference to a copularity continuum).²⁹

As for what specifically concerns “true” periphrases, the constructions belonging to this sub-category exhibit a higher or lower degree of periphrasticity (defined according to the trait [\pm PERIPHRAISIS]), depending on the level of desemanticization of the selected copula,³⁰ which is considered the really relevant parameter: the more desemanticized the copula is, the more periphrastic the construction.³¹ In its turn, the level of copula desemanticization depends on a number of morphological, morphosyntactic and semantic features taken by the participle (tense, voice, actional traits such as stativity and telicity, transitivity and, to a lesser extent, the lexical meaning), as well as on the criterion of “modal-aspectual relevance”,³² by which constructions that encode specific modal (e.g. conativity) or aspectual (e.g. progressivity) meanings exhibit a higher level of copula desemanticization and, thus, higher periphrasticity.

With reference to this framework, it is possible to identify specific patterns that correspond to the least periphrastic constructions ([$-$ PERIPHRAISIS], types A-D below), and specific patterns that correspond to the most periphrastic constructions ([$+$ PERIPHRAISIS], types E-F):³³

- (A) εἶναι + passive participle, typically (but not exclusively) in the perfect or aorist, and from telic predicates: e.g. ἐστὶν κεκαλυμμένον “it is covered” (*Matthew* 10:26).
- (B) εἶναι + “Homeric” active perfect participle:³⁴ e.g. ἦν πεπηγώς “it was fixed” (Flavius Josephus, *Bellum Iudaicum* VII:149).
- (C) εἶναι + active participle of verbs denoting psychological or physical conditions: e.g. ὑγιαίνων ἦν “he was sound in health” (*Testamentum Levi* 1:2).
- (D) εἶναι + perfect participle of unaccusative verbs with a clearly non-eventive (thus, stative) interpretation:³⁵ e.g. ἦν τεθνεῶσα “she was dead” (*Acta Pauli et Theclae* 28).
- (E) εἶναι + active perfect/aorist participle (including formally middle, but functionally active participles), typically from transitive and/or telic predicates: e.g. ἦν συντεταχώς “he had composed” (Flavius Josephus, *Antiquitates Iudaicae* X:93) or (ἡμῶν τις) ἦν θεασάμενοι “(some of us) had seen” (*Anaphora Pilati* A 10).
- (F) constructions that encode specific modal or aspectual values: e.g. ἦσαν ἀτενίζοντες ‘they were staring’ (*Luke* 4:20) or ἦν ἀποφορτιζόμενον “it was to unload” (*Acts* 21:3).

Furthermore, the dimension of periphrasticity happens to be interrelated with the dimension of eventivity/stativity,³⁶ which captures the traditional distinction between verbal and adjectival periphrases (on which cfr. BENTEIN 2016, p. 59 and ff., and the bibliography mentioned there) and is defined according to the trait [\pm VERBAL]: highly periphrastic constructions typically denote events, as verbs canonically do, and are thus characterized as [$+$ VERBAL], while scarcely periphrastic constructions typically denote states, properties or conditions, as adjectives canonically do, and are thus characterized as [$-$ VERBAL].

The conceptual collocation of constructions with reference to the (more or less) prototypical pattern types can be represented on a gradient (fig. 1), which Nardi and Romagno³⁷ call the periphrasticity continuum:

²⁹ Cfr. NARDI - ROMAGNO 2022, p. 228 and ff.

³⁰ Desemanticization, or “semantic bleaching”, defines «a process whereby in specific contexts a lexical item is emptied of its lexical semantics and acquires a grammatical function» (HEINE 1993, p. 54; among others, cfr. also LEHMANN 2015, p. 136).

³¹ Cfr. NARDI - ROMAGNO 2022, p. 231 and ff.

³² Cfr. *ivi*, pp. 231-232.

³³ Cfr. *ivi*, pp. 233-234

³⁴ By “Homeric” perfect participles I refer to those instances that retain the old value of the perfect, as attested in Homeric Greek (cfr. ROMAGNO 2005).

³⁵ For a detailed discussion on this type, cfr. NARDI - ROMAGNO 2022, pp. 241-242

³⁶ Cfr. NARDI - ROMAGNO 2022, p. 238 and ff.

³⁷ NARDI - ROMAGNO 2022, p. 241.

Statives	predicate (a) or (a, b) “John is lying”: to lie (John) “John is home”: to be (John, home)
Activities	(DO (a)), [predicate (a) or (a, b)] “John runs”: to run (John) “John drinks beers”: to drink (John, beers)
Achievements	BECOME predicate (a) or (a, b) “John was born”: BECOME born (John) “John arrived home”: BECOME to be (John, home)
Accomplishments	<i>c</i> CAUSE <i>d</i> , such that <i>c</i> is an activity predicate and <i>d</i> is an achievement predicate “John ran home”: [run (John)] CAUSE [BECOME to be (John, home)] “John ate a sandwich”: [eat (John, sandwich)] CAUSE [BECOME eaten (sandwich)]

Statives and telics (achievements and accomplishments) contain a state predicate in their logical structure: while statives represent the state as an inherent condition, telic verbs denote the attainment of a state as a new condition. Activities do not show a state predicate in their logical structure, which corresponds to an activity predicate.

2.3. The *εἶναι*-periphrasis and its paradigmatic function

Following a distinction proposed by AERTS (1965, p. 3) and slightly re-elaborated by HASPELMATH (2000), periphrases can be classified with respect to the role that they cover within the inflectional paradigm of a given language. As it will be clarified in §3.1, this classification turns out to be useful in establishing if the usage of the periphrasis, or certain types of periphrastic patterns, is obligatory in Homeric Greek.⁴⁵

Aerts⁴⁶ puts forth a threefold distinction between ‘substitute’, ‘suppletive’ and ‘expressive’ periphrases: the substitute periphrasis is essentially equivalent to the corresponding synthetic form (e.g. γεγραμμένον ἦν = ἐγγράπτω), the suppletive periphrasis replaces a non-extant or no longer extant synthetic form (e.g. γεγραμμένοι εἰσὶν vs. γεγράφαι), and the expressive periphrasis, in very general terms, «appears to be used with a special purport» (*ibidem*). By contrast, Haspelmath’s classification is twofold, though not substantially different from Aerts’, and distinguishes between ‘suppletive’ periphrasis, which fills a gap in a paradigm (one of Haspelmath’s examples is the same as Aerts’: γεγραμμένοι εἰσὶν vs. γεγράφαι; cfr. HASPELMATH 2000, p. 656 and ff.),⁴⁷ and ‘categorical’ periphrasis, which conveys a specific grammatical meaning with some additional semantic distinction (e.g. the French *aller*-future).⁴⁸

Whereas Haspelmath disregards the substitute periphrasis, it appears that his and Aerts’ “suppletive” type are substantially the same: replacing a non-extant synthetic form⁴⁹ and filling a gap in the paradigm⁵⁰ are roughly the same concept expressed in different terms (and different perspectives). Both the expressive and the categorical periphrasis have something “more” than synthetic forms, but Aerts puts it in looser terms than Haspelmath: according to the former, any periphrasis that is used with a “special purport” (simply emphasis, for example) is expressive, while according to the latter only those periphrases that convey a specific and/or additional grammatical meaning can be regarded as categorical.

⁴⁵ It is worth clarifying that, by this type of examination, I do not mean to touch upon the question of the relation between periphrasticity and the parameter of obligatorification (on which cfr. BENTEIN 2016, p. 72).

⁴⁶ AERTS 1965, p. 3.

⁴⁷ HASPELMATH (2000, p. 656 and ff.) provides a further twofold distinction of suppletive periphrases, concerning paradigm symmetry and inflectional generality. Since this distinction is not relevant to this study, it will not be further discussed.

⁴⁸ Cfr. HASPELMATH 2000, pp. 660-661.

⁴⁹ AERTS 1965, p. 3.

⁵⁰ HASPELMATH 2000, p. 656.

3. THE PARTICIPIAL CONSTRUCTIONS IN HOMER: DATA AND FEATURES

The Homeric poems total 60 participial constructions (31 in *Iliad* and 29 in *Odyssey*), 52 periphrases and 8 predicative participles.⁵¹ At the morphological level, the constructions exhibit a remarkable variability, especially the periphrases: while the predicative participles only occur in the perfect tense, 6 in the active voice and 2 in the middle (passive),⁵² the periphrases may select a copula basically in any tense and mood that are available in Ancient Greek (indicative present, imperfect and future, subjunctive, optative, imperative, infinitive and even participle in T 80), and take the participle either in the perfect (46 instances) or the present (6 instances).⁵³ Tab. 1 below illustrates the distribution of the morphological features of the periphrases, with reference to the numbers of constructions for each pattern.

Table 1: the morphological features of the periphrases in *Iliad* and *Odyssey*

	perfect participle	present participle
indicative present copula	12	1
indicative imperfect copula	5	2
indicative future copula	14	—
subjunctive copula	—	1
optative copula	6	—
imperative copula	1	—
infinitive copula	8	1
participle copula	—	1

With regard to the dimension of periphrasticity and the interrelated distinction between eventivity and stativity (discussed in §2.1), the absolute majority of periphrases exhibit a scarce level of periphrasticity, representing manifestations of the least periphrastic types (A)-(D) (predominantly, type (A)), and consistently denote stative states of affairs, thus constituting adjectival periphrases;⁵⁴ for example:

- (4) ὧδε γὰρ ἐξερέω, τὸ δὲ καὶ τετελεσμένον ἔσται ...
 thus for speak.FUT.1SG DEM.NOM.SG PTCL and fulfill.PTCP.PRF.PASS be.FUT.3SG
 For thus will I speak, and this thing *shall truly be brought to pass* [lit. ‘will be fulfilled’]: [...] (A 212)

⁵¹ Namely, periphrases occur in A 212, 388, B 257, 260, 295, Γ 309, E 24, 873, Z 488, Θ 286, 401, 454, 524, I 310, Λ 689, N 269, 525, Ξ 172, 196, Σ 4, 427, T 80, Ψ 343 (2 instances), 410, 672; α 18, β 61, 187, γ 20, 328, δ 190, 807, ε 90, 182, ζ 244, θ 196, 388, ι 48-49, 455, λ 443, ο 536, π 440, ρ 163, 229, σ 82, 125, τ 309, 487, 547, φ 337, ω 491. Predicative participles occur in E 245, Z 510 = O 267, K 547, Π 538; γ 124, δ 754, τ 175.

⁵² The participle λελασμένος in Π 538 is formally middle, but functionally active (‘thou art forgetful’, *i.e.* ‘you forget’): as such, it is counted among the participles in the active voice.

⁵³ Four cases of possible periphrastic constructions with the aorist participle occur in the corpus (Δ 211, E 177, 191, N 764), but these are all interpretatively ambiguous (cf. BENTEIN - JANSE 2017, p. 6); see footnote 6.

⁵⁴ It is worth noting that the vast majority of participles selected in participial constructions are functionally analogous to adjectives: this is particularly blatant in T 80, in which the combination of the participle ἐπισταμένῳ with a copula in the participle (ἔόντι) provides ἐπισταμένῳ with a fully adjectival status (cf. BENTEIN 2016, pp. 210-211). Further points in support of this affinity are the widely-known functional proximity between (passive) perfect participles and adjectives (among many others, cf. CHANTRAINE 1953, pp. 321-322, NARDI - ROMAGNO 2022, pp. 239-240), and the frequent usage of (passive) perfect participles in attributive function, exactly as full-fledged adjectives (*e.g.* Εὐρύπυλος βεβλημένος ‘wounded Eurypylus’ in Λ 592, πεπνυμένος ‘wise’, often used as Telemachus’ epithet, etc.; cf. CHANTRAINE 1953, p. 319).

- (5) Χάρμα δὲ τοῖς ἄλλοισιν, ἐλεγχείῃ δὲ σοὶ αὐτῷ | ἔσσειται
 joy.NOM.SG PTCL ART.DAT.PL other.DAT.PL reproach.NOM.SG PTCL 2SG.DAT 3SG.DAT be.FUT.3SG
 ἀλλὰ φίλος φρονέων πεφυλαγμένος εἶναι.
 but dear.NOM.SG be.wise.PTCP.PRS guard.PTCP.PRF.PASS be.INF
 So should there be joy for the rest, but reproach it for thyself. Nay, dear son, *be thou wise and on thy guard.* (Ψ 343)

The construction in (4) is formulaic, and particularly frequent in both poems: with some variation in the morphological features of the copula, it occurs in A 212 (example (4)), 388, B 257, Θ 286, 401, 454, I 310, Ξ 196, Σ 4, 427, Ψ 410, 672, β 187, ε 90, ο 536, π 440, ρ 163, 229, σ 82, τ 309, 487, 547, φ 337. Example (5) is particularly useful, as it illustrates not only instances of two of the least periphrastic pattern types (πεφυλαγμένος εἶναι for type (A), φρονέων εἶναι for type (C)), but also a construction selecting a copula in the infinitive with imperative function (another case occurs in λ 443); it is worth noting that the (synthetic) infinitive bearing an imperative meaning is not infrequent in Homer (*e.g.* E 124, H 79, λ 441-443, etc.; *cfr.* CHANTRAINE 1953, p. 316).

The data also include three cases (examples (6)-(8)) that differ from the rest of the constructions with respect to periphrasticity and eventivity/stativity.

- (6) Ἡμῖν δ' εἵνατός ἐστι περιτροπέων ἐνιαυτός | ἐνθάδε μῖνοντεςσι ...
 1PL.DAT PTCL ninth.NOM.SG be.PRS.3SG turn.around.PTCP.PRS year.NOM.SG here remain.PTCP.PRS
 But for us *is* the ninth year *at its turn* [lit. 'is turning complete'], while we abide here; [...] (B 295-296)
- (7) Ἐξελθὼν τις ἴδοι, μὴ δὴ σχεδὸν ᾧσι κίοντες.
 go.out.PTCP.AOR INDF.NOM.SG see.OPT.3SG NEG PTCL near be.SBJV.3PL go.PTCP.PRS
 Let one go forth and see whether they *be* not now *drawing near.* (ω 491)
- (8) Ἀλείψατο δὲ λίπ' ἐλαίῳ | ἀμβροσίῳ ἐδανῷ, τό ρά
 anoint.AOR.3SG PTCL abundantly oil.DAT.SG ambrosial.DAT.SG pleasant.DAT.SG REL.ACC.SG PTCL
 οἱ τεθωμένον ἦεν' ...
 3SG.DAT perfume.PTCP.PRF.PASS be.IPRF.3SG
 And anointed herself richly with oil, ambrosial, soft, which *had been perfumed* by her; [...] (Ξ 171-172)⁵⁵

The periphrases in (6) and (7) encode progressive aspect,⁵⁶ represent highly periphrastic constructions according to the parameter of “modal-aspectual relevance” (type F), and clearly denote eventive states of affairs. In example (8), the expression of the agent (οἱ) provides the passive construction τεθωμένον ἦεν, literally “it was perfumed”, with an eventive nuance (whence the rendering “it had been perfumed”): as a consequence, the periphrasis should be regarded as a manifestation of the pattern “εἶναι + eventive participle” in the periphrasticity continuum (see fig. 1), and collocated closer to the pole [+PERIPHRAISIS, +VERBAL] than the opposite pole [-PERIPHRAISIS, -VERBAL].

With regard to the semantic-functional dimension, all the participial constructions in Homer are characterized by a noteworthy homogeneity, which is manifested in two features:

1. all the constructions select either stative or telic predicates, that is, event types that incorporate a state predicate in their logical structure (*cfr.* §2.2);
2. (almost) all the constructions signify the state of the syntactic subject, either inherent (in the cases of statives) or attained (in the cases of telics).

In addition to the examples discussed above (on the progressive periphrases in (6) and (7), see also below), it is worth addressing another instance of predicative participle, which has not been as well-represented as periphrases:

⁵⁵ I preferred modifying Murray's translation (“and anointed her richly with oil, ambrosial, soft, and of rich fragrance”), because it does not render clearly enough the structure of the periphrasis.

⁵⁶ On which, among many others, *cfr.* BERTINETTO 1986, p. 120 and ff.

- (9) Ἐν δ’ ἄνθρωποι | πολλοὶ ἀπειρέσιοι, καὶ ἐννήκοντα πόλεις |
 in PTCL human.NOM.PL many.NOM.PL unlimited.NOM.PL and ninety city.NOM.PL
 ἄλλη δ’ ἄλλων γλῶσσα μεμιγμένη.
 other.NOM.SG PTCL other.GEN.PL tongue.NOM.SG mix.PTCP.PRF.PASS
 And therein are many men, past counting, and ninety cities. They have not all the same speech, but their tongues *are mixed*. (τ 173-175)

Similarly to all the other participial constructions in the data, the predicative participle in (9) denotes the state of the subject γλῶσσα “language”, which is in the condition of being mixed, μεμιγμένη, with other languages.

Within this mostly coherent scenario, it is possible to individuate a few potential exceptions, which, however, turn out to be only apparent, as they ultimately conform to either above-mentioned feature.

In the first place, the progressive periphrases addressed in (6) and (7) do not signify a state, but an ongoing process, and resemble much more activity predicates than statives or telics. However, the predicates selected in the constructions are, respectively, περιτροπέω “I turn around completely, I make a complete rotation” and σχεδὸν κίω “I go near, I approach”, which are both telic predicates. The constructions resemble activity verbs because of the “imperfective paradox”,⁵⁷ according to which telic predicates conjugated to the imperfective aspect (and prototypically in the progressive) have their telicity suspended or neutralized: in *the ice is melting in the sun*, the ice is in the process of melting, but the inherent terminal point of the event, the ice being melt, is not reached yet. Therefore, also the two cases of progressive periphrases appear to be ultimately consistent with the above-sketched scenario, as they select telic predicates: the denotation of a state for these cases – as to speak – is in potency, rather than in act.

In the second place, a few instances can be found in which the constructions select divalent transitive predicates, with either a direct (example 10) or indirect (example 11) object.⁵⁸ In these cases, as transitive constructions canonically do, the predicate is expected to signify the state of the object, rather than the subject: in *John is eating an apple*, it is the apple that will eventually attain the state of being eaten. However, a closer analysis to the data reveals that even the transitive participial constructions are in fact consistent with the above-mentioned features.

- (10) Μοῖραν δ’ οὐ τίνα φημι πεφυγμένον ἔμμεναι ἀνδρῶν, | οὐ
 doom.ACC.SG PTCL NEG INDF.ACC.SG say.PRS.1SG escape.PTCP.PRF be.INF man.GEN.PL NEG
 κακὸν οὐδὲ μὲν ἐσθλόν, ἐπὶ τὰ πρῶτα γένηται.
 bad.ACC.SG NEG.PTCP PTCL valiant.ACC.SG after ART.ACC.PL first.ACC.PL become.AOR.SBJV.3SG
 Only his doom, methinks, no man *hath* ever *escaped*, be he coward or valiant, when once he hath been born. (Z 488-489)
- (11) Οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδ’ ἐμέ φημι λελασμένον ἔμμεναι ἀλκῆς, ...
 NEG.PTCP PTCL NEG.PTCP 1SG.ACC say.PRS.1SG forget.PTCP.PRF be.INF strength.GEN.SG
 For I deem that I too *am* not *forgetful* of valour, [...] (N 269)

The divalent transitive constructions, as exemplified in (10) and (11),⁵⁹ always select predicates that signify a psychological/mental or physical condition experienced by the subject: the argument that is in the condition of (not) escaping and being forgetful, in (10) and (11) respectively, is the subject, not the object; as such, also in these cases it appears that the participial constructions denote the state of the subject.

To conclude this section, a brief observation from the viewpoint of discourse analysis is worth being pointed out. Predicative participles appear more frequently in direct speeches (6 instances out of 8: E 245, K 547, Π 538, γ 124, δ 754, τ 175). As it can be extrapolated from the data collected by GUIRAUD (1962), a similar scenario is found in the Attic tragedy, wherein predicative participles are particularly common in stichomythia passages. This analogy may suggest that the predicative participle was employed by the poets as a strategy to imitate the spoken speech: the omission of a potentially suitable copula and the syntactically-nonlinear, anacoluthic-like style that may derive from the absence of a finite verb are ideal techniques to reproduce the vivacity, the spontaneity and the “anarchic” syntax typical of the spoken language. This hypothesis, however,

⁵⁷ DOWTY 1979, p. 133 and ff., among others.

⁵⁸ On transitivity, among others, cfr. HOPPER - THOMPSON 1980, NÆSS 2007.

⁵⁹ In addition to the instances in (10) and (11), other divalent transitive constructions occur in E 245, 873, α 18, β 61, ε 182 and ι 455 (sometimes, as in E 873 or ε 182, the accusative may as well be interpreted adverbially rather than as a direct object). Passive divalent constructions occur in Ξ 172 (example (8)) and δ 754, in which the denoted state is regularly the subject’s (on passive constructions, among others, cfr. SHIBATANI 1985, GIVÓN 2001, p. 125 and ff.).

is but conjectural, and would require a far more extensive and accurate investigation in order to be properly assessed.

3.1. The paradigmatic function of the εἶναι-periphrasis in Homer

In this sub-section, the relation between periphrases and the corresponding synthetic forms is addressed, with reference to the functional-paradigmatic classification proposed by Aerts and Haspelmath (see §2.3), and, in particular, the suppletive function. The argumentative line is fairly plain: if a given synthetic form is not available in Homeric Greek to encode a specific grammatical value, its periphrastic equivalent certainly features suppletive character, and its usage is thus obligatory for the encoding of that specific value; if, on the other hand, the synthetic form is attested in Homer, its periphrastic equivalent features substitute or expressive/categorial character,⁶⁰ but certainly not suppletive, and its usage is thus not necessarily mandatory. Let us begin with the constructions with the present participle, which appear fairly plain to discuss (for a general overview on the patterns that are addressed below, see tab. 1). Bar the instance with the copula in the participle, which is somewhat an extraordinary case (see footnote 54), the data include the following patterns: present participles plus copula in the indicative present and imperfect, which correspond to synthetic indicative present and imperfect forms, respectively; present participles plus copula in the subjunctive and infinitive, which correspond to synthetic present subjunctive and infinitive forms, respectively. Since all these synthetic forms are robustly attested in Homer,⁶¹ the usage of their periphrastic equivalents is not obligatory (*i.e.* these analytic patterns are not suppletive periphrases).

The scenario is more complex with respect to the patterns with the perfect participle. The data feature perfect participles plus copula in the indicative present and imperfect, which correspond to synthetic indicative perfects and pluperfects: since these synthetic forms are widely attested in Homer,⁶² their periphrastic equivalents do not have suppletive character. Similarly, the synthetic infinitive perfect is robustly attested in Homer,⁶³ even in the passive:⁶⁴ therefore, the corresponding periphrasis made up of the copula in the infinitive and the perfect participle does not have suppletive character. By contrast, the synthetic imperative perfect passive is unattested in Homer,⁶⁵ and the only periphrasis encoding this meaning (εἰρημένοσ ἔστω “let it be said” in Θ 524) can be thus considered suppletive.

The remaining patterns and their relation to their synthetic counterparts are particularly complex, and deserve a more detailed discussion. The patterns made up of a perfect participle plus a copula in the future, corresponding to synthetic future perfects, should be distinguished with respect to voice. In the passive, although the periphrastic construction seems more frequent, cases of synthetic future perfects are attested in Homer,⁶⁶ and are fully equivalent to their analytic counterparts. As for the active voice (including forms with middle endings, but active meaning), even though the synthetic future perfect is attested in Homer,⁶⁷ it appears to convey a different meaning from the periphrasis. On the one hand, the only periphrastic occurrence found in the corpus is semantically analogous to the perfect: ἐσόμεσθα οὐ δεδαηκότες “we will not know” (β 61), from an unattested present *δάω “I teach, I instruct”, conveys the same meaning of the (attested) perfect δεδάηκα “I have learnt, I know”.⁶⁸ On the other hand, the synthetic future perfects (active), which Chantraine⁶⁹ calls «futurs à redoublement» and regards as formed on a reduplicated aorist, seem to retain nothing of a perfect meaning, but are roughly equivalent to indicative futures: *e.g.* πεπιθήσω (X 223) “I will persuade”, not * “I will have persuaded / I will be convinced”; πεφιδήσεται (O 215, etc.) “he shall spare”, not * “he will have spared”. Therefore, while in the passive the periphrastic future perfect does not constitute a suppletive

⁶⁰ In Homeric Greek it is difficult to establish if a periphrasis has exactly the same meaning as its synthetic equivalent (substitute periphrasis), or encodes a specific additional meaning or any special nuance (categorial and expressive periphrasis, respectively): as a consequence, no clearcut distinction between these functions will be made.

⁶¹ Among others, *cfr.* SCHWYZER 1939, CHANTRAINE 1948.

⁶² While the perfect – I believe – does not need specific exemplification, a few instances of synthetic pluperfects may be opportune (*cfr.* SCHWYZER 1939, pp. 776-777): τετέλεστο “it was done” (T 242 = χ 479, ε 262), τὰ δ’ οὐκ ἴσαν ὡς ἐτέτυκτο “but they knew not how these things were” (ν 170 = ψ 152), ἐτετεύχαστο “were built” (Λ 807), etc.

⁶³ CHANTRAINE 1948, pp. 488-489.

⁶⁴ For example: τετιμήσθαι “to be honoured” (I 38, Ψ 649), τετυκέσθαι “to be made ready” (φ 428).

⁶⁵ *Cfr.* SCHWYZER 1939, CHANTRAINE 1948.

⁶⁶ For example (*cfr.* SCHWYZER 1939, p. 783, CHANTRAINE 1948, pp. 447-448): βεβρώσεται “it shall be devoured” (β 203), ειρήσεται “it shall be spoken” (Ψ 795), κεκλήσῃ “shalt thou be called” (Γ 138), λελείνεται “it shall be left” (Ω 742).

⁶⁷ Namely (*cfr.* CHANTRAINE 1948, p. 448): κεκαδήσει “it shall rob” (φ 153, 170) and κεκαδησόμεθα “we shall take thought” (Θ 353), πεπιθήσω “I will persuade” (X 223), πεφιδήσεται “he shall spare” (O 215, Ω 158, 187).

⁶⁸ *Cfr.* ROMAGNO 2005, pp. 82-83.

⁶⁹ CHANTRAINE 1948, p. 448.

periphrasis, in the active, despite the limited amount of data, the synthetic form seems not fully equivalent to the periphrastic counterpart, which, thus, apparently represents an obliged choice.

The pattern composed of the perfect participle, only attested in the middle, plus a copula in the optative exhibits a less clearcut relation to the synthetic counterpart. Whereas most periphrases clearly convey a passive meaning,⁷⁰ the instance ἀκαχήμενος εἶη “he might be in grief” (E 24) selects a verb that features a voice-related semantic distinction: ἄχομαι/ἄχνομαι encodes a causative meaning in the active (“I distress, I trouble”) and a (non-prototypical) unaccusative meaning in the middle (“I am distressed, I am troubled”).⁷¹ Consistently with this semantic distinction, the periphrasis with the middle participle conveys an unaccusative value. On the other hand, the synthetic optative perfect, attested both in the active and the middle (albeit very scarcely), never seems to encode a clearly passive value: according to CHANTRAINE (1948, pp. 465-466), we find μεμνήμην “I might have pondered” (Ω 745), μεμνέωτο “he might mark [lit. “he might recall”]” (Ψ 361) and λελῦτο (< *λελυιτο) “were loosened” (σ 238) with anticausative value, which is a prototypical manifestation of unaccusativity.⁷² Then, it seems that, while in most cases the periphrastic optative perfect encodes the passive function, both the synthetic and analytic forms may as well convey the unaccusative value (λελυτο and ἀκαχήμενος εἶη): in this situation, also considering the limited amount of available data, it is difficult to assess with certainty whether the periphrasis has suppletive character (although we may be inclined towards a negative answer).

To sum up, most periphrastic patterns found in the data are paralleled by fully equivalent synthetic forms, and do not need to be regarded as suppletive periphrases. However, two pattern types appear to constitute suppletive periphrases, and their usage seems to be obligatory, as they either lack a synthetic parallel in the paradigm (imperative copula plus passive perfect participle), or their synthetic equivalent does not encode the same function as the analytic form (future copula plus active perfect participle). By contrast, the data do not allow us to assess with certainty the optative middle perfect periphrasis: although most cases point to a functional difference between the synthetic (which is very scarcely represented, though) and the analytic form, a couple of instances can be found in which this distinction does not apply clearly.

3. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, I have addressed the participial constructions termed εἶναι-periphrasis and predicative participle in Homeric Greek, on the previously unexplored ground of the morphosyntax-semantics interface.

With reference to the theoretical framework elaborated by Nardi and Romagno,⁷³ by which the construction ‘εἶναι + participle’ is viewed as a prototype category, of which the εἶναι-periphrasis and the predicative participle are formally different, but functionally analogous manifestations, the neat majority of examined constructions represent instances of the least periphrastic pattern types, and denote non-eventive, *i.e.* stative, situations, being characterized by an adjective-like status. The data also comprise few (namely, three) cases that do not comply with this otherwise coherent picture, as they are characterized by a higher level of periphrasticity (two of these constructions constitute instances of the highest periphrastic pattern types), and denote eventive states of affairs.

Furthermore, the analysis at the morphosyntax-semantics interface revealed that all the constructions exhibit two specific features: they select event types that incorporate a state predicate in their logical structure (either stative or telic predicates), and signify the state of the syntactic subject, either inherent or attained (in the cases of statives and telics, respectively). A closer investigation into a few cases that may represent potential exceptions to this homogeneous scenario indicates that such exceptions are only apparent and that, in fact, they conform to the above-mentioned features.

⁷⁰ Namely: κεκλημένος εἶη “I may be called” (B 260, ζ 244) and τετελεσμένον εἶη “it might be fulfilled” (ο 536, ρ 163, τ 309).

⁷¹ On unaccusativity, among many others, cfr. LEVIN - RAPPAPORT HOVAV 1995, SORACE 2000. Voice-related semantic distinctions are a well-known and widely-represented feature of the Ancient Greek verbal system (for example, cfr. ROMAGNO 2010, 2021). It is worth noting that the anticausative middle discussed by ROMAGNO (2010, pp. 432-434) exhibits some similarities with the instance addressed here: in both cases, a causative value in the active is opposed to an unaccusative value in the middle. However, while the verbal lexemes analyzed by Romagno convey the prototypical unaccusative value of the anticausative (on which cfr. LEVIN - RAPPAPORT HOVAV 1995, p. 79 and ff., LOMASHVILI 2011, p. 37 and ff.), the value encoded by ἀκαχήμενος εἶη, though definitely unaccusative, cannot be regarded as a prototypical manifestation of unaccusativity.

⁷² cfr. ROMAGNO 2021, pp. 25-26. On anticausatives and the so-called causative alternation, cfr. LEVIN - RAPPAPORT HOVAV 1995, p. 79 and ff., LOMASHVILI 2011, p. 37 and ff.; see also footnote 71.

⁷³ NARDI - ROMAGNO 2022.

Remarkably, the signification of the state of the subject correlates the examined participial constructions to the Homeric perfect,⁷⁴ as both happen to encode that identical function: therefore, we may refer to the participial construction as to an alternative to the perfect. As seen, while most often the choice of either alternative is not obligatory, since Homeric Greek features both a periphrasis and a synthetic form available for expressing the same grammatical value, in a few cases there appears to be no real possibility of choice, because Homeric Greek lacks a synthetic way of encoding those values: in these cases, the periphrasis fills a gap in the verbal paradigm, and its usage seems obligatory.

As a final remark, it is opportune to note that the scenario exhibited by the participial constructions is much less complex and heterogenous than that shown by the perfect, and many issues that have to be taken into account for the latter does not need to be considered for the former (such as a specific discussion on instances selecting activity predicates, or the distinction between syntactic and thematic roles).⁷⁵ Nevertheless, the results of the analysis carried out in this paper suggest that the analogy between the two formations, the participial constructions and the old perfect, appears to be fairly clear.

REFERENCES

- AERTS 1965 : W. J. Aerts, *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, 1965.
- AMENTA 2003 : L. Amenta, *Perifrasi aspettuali in greco e in latino. Origini e grammaticalizzazioni*, Milano, Franco Angeli, 2003.
- BENTEIN 2011 : K. Bentein, *Towards the identification of verbal periphrasis in Ancient Greek: a prototype analysis*, «Acta Classica» 54 (2011), pp. 1-25.
- BENTEIN 2012 : K. Bentein, *Verbal periphrasis in Ancient Greek: a state of art*, «Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire» 90, 1 (2012), pp. 5-56.
- BENTEIN 2016 : K. Bentein, *Verbal Periphrasis in Ancient Greek. Have- and Be- Constructions*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2016.
- BENTEIN - JANSE 2017 : K. Bentein – M. Janse, *Βλήμενος ἦν (Iliad 4.211): lexical or periphrastic?*, «Symbolae Osloenses» 91, 1 (2017), pp. 2-12.
- BERTINETTO 1986 : P. M. Bertinetto, *Tempo, aspetto e azione nel verbo italiano. Il sistema dell'indicativo*, Firenze, Accademia della Crusca, 1986.
- BERTINETTO - SQUARTINI 1995 : P. M. Bertinetto – M. Squartini, *An attempt at defining the class of 'gradual completion verbs'*, in *Temporal Reference, Aspect and Actionality. Volume I: Semantic and Syntactic Perspectives*, a cura di P. M. Bertinetto - V. Bianchi – J. Higginbotham – M. Squartini, Torino, Rosenberg & Sellier, 1995, pp. 11-26.
- BJÖRCK 1940 : G. Björck, *HN ΔΙΑΣΚΩΝ. Die periphrastischen Konstruktionen im Griechischen*, Uppsala, Almqvist & Wiskell, 1940.
- BRUGMANN 1900 : K. Brugmann, *Griechische Grammatik. Lautlehre, Stammbildungs und Flexionslehre und Syntax*, München, Beck, [1885] 1900.
- CEGLIA 1998 : L. Ceglia, *L'evoluzione della costruzione perifrastica verbale nel greco del Nuovo Testamento*, «Archivio Glottologico Italiano» 83, 1 (1998), pp. 20-44.
- CHANTRAINE 1926 : P. Chantraine, *Histoire du parfait grec*, Paris, Champion, 1926.
- CHANTRAINE 1948 : P. Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique. Tome I: phonétique et morphologie*, Paris, Klincksieck, 1948.
- CHANTRAINE 1953 : P. Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique. Tome II: syntaxe*, Paris, Klincksieck, 1953.
- CRESPO - CONTI - MAQUIEIRA 2003 : E. Crespo – L. Conti – H. Maquieira, *Sintaxis del griego clásico*, Madrid, Gredos, 2003.

⁷⁴ Cfr. ROMAGNO 2005.

⁷⁵ Cfr. *ivi*.

- DIETRICH 1973 : W. Dietrich, *Der periphrastische Verbalaspekt im Griechischen und Lateinischen*, «Glotta» 51, 3 (1973), pp. 188-228.
- DOWTY 1979 : D. R. Dowty, *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar: The Semantics of Verbs and Times in Generative Semantics and Montague's PTQ*, Dordrecht, Reidel, 1979.
- DRINKA 2017 : B. Drinka, *Language Contact in Europe. The Periphrastic Perfect through History*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- GIVÓN 2001 : T. Givón, *Syntax: an Introduction. Volume II*, Amsterdam, Benjamins, 2001.
- GUIRAUD 1962 : C. Guiraud, *La phrase nominale en grec d'Homère a Euripide*, Paris, Klincksieck, 1962.
- HASPELMATH 2000 : M. Haspelmath, *Periphrasis*, in *Morphology. An International Handbook on Inflection and Word-Formation. Vol. 1*, edited by G. Booij – C. Lehmann – J. Mugdan, Berlin, De Gruyter, 2000, pp. 654-664.
- HEINE 1993 : B. Heine, *Auxiliaries. Cognitive Forces and Grammaticalization*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1993.
- HOPPER - THOMPSON 1980 : P. J. Hopper – S. A. Thompson, *Transitivity in grammar and discourse*, «Language» 56, 2 (1980), pp. 251-299.
- LEHMANN 2015 : C. Lehmann, *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*, Berlin, Language Science Press, [1982] 2015.
- LEVIN - RAPPAPORT HOVAV 1995 : B. Levin – M. Rappaport Hovav, *Unaccusativity at the Syntax-Lexical Semantics Interface*, Cambridge (Massachusetts), MIT Press, 1995.
- LOMASHVILI 2011 : L. Lomashvili, *Complex Predicates. The Syntax-Morphology Interface*, Amsterdam, Benjamins, 2011.
- MOSER 1988 : A. Moser, *The History of the Perfect Periphrasis in Greek*, PhD dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1988.
- MOULTON 1906 : J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek. Volume 1: Prolegomena*, Edinburgh, Clark, 1906.
- NARDI 2023 : E. Nardi, *The spread of participial clauses in Biblical Greek: Semitic interference and multilingualism*, «Journal of Historical Linguistics», Online first: 27th June 2023 (<https://benjamins.com/catalog/jhl.ofa>), <https://doi.org/10.1075/jhl.22040.nar>.
- NARDI - ROMAGNO 2022 : E. Nardi – D. Romagno, *A gradient for periphrastic constructions with εἶναι in post-Hellenistic Greek: between degree of verbiness and event type*, «InVerbis» 12, 1 (2022), pp. 217-245.
- NÆSS 2007 : Å. Næss, *Prototypical Transitivity*, Amsterdam, Benjamins, 2007.
- PORTER 1989 : S. E. Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood*, New York, Peter Lang, 1989.
- RODRÍGUEZ MONESCILLO 1972 : E. Rodríguez Monescillo, *Sobre la oración nominal en Aristófanes*, «Revista española de lingüística» 2, 2 (1972), pp. 377-388.
- ROMAGNO 2005 : D. Romagno, *Il perfetto omerico. Diatesi, azionalità e ruoli tematici*, Milano, Franco Angeli, 2005.
- ROMAGNO 2010 : D. Romagno, *Anticausativi, passivi, riflessivi: considerazioni sul medio oppositivo*, in *La morfologia del greco tra tipologia e diacronia*, a cura di I. Putzu – G. Paulis – G. F. Nieddu – P. Cuzzolin, Milano, Franco Angeli, 2010, pp. 430-441.
- ROMAGNO 2021 : D. Romagno, *The extension of a linguistic category: middle voice in Homeric Greek between subject affectedness, reflexivity and possession*, «Archivio Glottologico Italiano» 106, 1 (2021), pp. 3-42.
- ROSCHE 1973 : E. Rosch, *Natural categories*, «Cognitive Psychology» 4 (1973), pp. 328-350.
- ROSCHE 1978 : E. Rosch, *Principles of categorization*, in *Cognition and Categorization*, a cura di E. Rosch – B. B. Lloyd, Hillsdale (New Jersey), Erlbaum, 1978, pp. 28-49.

SCHWYZER 1939 : E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik. Erster Band: Allgemeiner Teil, Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion*, München, Beck, 1939.

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

SHIBATANI 1985 : M. Shibatani, *Passives and related constructions: a prototype analysis*, «Language» 61, 4 (1985), pp. 821-848.

SMITH 1997 : C. S. Smith, *The Parameter of Aspect*, Dordrecht, Kluwer, [1991] 1997.

SMYTH 1920 : H. W. Smyth, *A Greek Grammar for Colleges*, New York, American Book Company, 1920.

SORACE 2000 : A. Sorace, *Gradients in auxiliary selection with intransitive verbs*, «Language» 76, 4 (2000), pp. 859-890.

VAN VALIN 2005 : R. D. Van Valin jr., *Exploring the Syntax-Semantics Interface*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2005.

VAN VALIN - LAPOLLA 1997 : R. D. Van Valin jr. – J. R. LaPolla, *Syntax. Structure, Meaning and Function*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1997.

VENDLER 1957 : Z. Vendler, *Verbs and times*, «Philosophical Review» 66, 2 (1957), pp. 143-160.

TEXT AND TRANSLATIONS

ALLEN 1917-1919 : T. W. Allen, *Homeri Opera. Odyssey*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, [1908] 1917-1919.

ALLEN - MONRO 1920 : T. W. Allen – D. B. Monro, *Homeri Opera. Iliad*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, [1902] 1920.

MURRAY - DIMOCK 1995 : A. T. Murray – G. E. Dimock, *Odyssey. Translated by Augustus T. Murray. Revised by George E. Dimock*, Cambridge (Massachusetts), Harvard University Press, [1919] 1995.

MURRAY - WYATT 1999 : A. T. Murray – W. F. Wyatt, *Iliad. Translated by Augustus T. Murray. Revised by William F. Wyatt*, Cambridge (Massachusetts), Harvard University Press, [1924-1925] 1999.