

Chapter 6

Support-verb constructions and other periphrases in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (books 1 and 2)

Tomas Veteikis^a

^aVilnius University

This chapter discusses empirically periphrastic constructions from books 1 and 2 of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, treated holistically as a multilayered corpus. Some, e.g., ποιεῖσθαι λόγον *poieisthai lōgon*, reflect the canonical features of support-verb constructions. The chapter illustrates the relationship between these constructions and the rhetorical strategies of alternating between brevity and expansion. Furthermore, the stylistic diversity of phrases and issues with their terminological conception are addressed. The chapter considers the concepts developed in Graeco-Roman rhetorical theory, such as *periphrasis*, *makrología*, *brakhulogía*, and their alignment with modern views, and hypothesises that the term 'periphrasis', elaborated in ancient rhetoric, is descriptively adequate for a range of multi-word constructions. It also classifies phraseological material based on verb semantic role and introversion and extraversion categories, reinterpreting theories of valency change.

Šiame skyriuje aptariamos empiriškai atrinktos perifrastinės konstrukcijos iš Aristotelio *Retorikos* I ir II knygų, traktuojamų holistiškai kaip daugiasluoksnis korpusas. Kai kurios, pavyzdžiui, ποιεῖσθαι λόγον *poieisthai lōgon*, atspindi kanoninius leksinių analitinių konstrukcijų bruožus. Čia siekiama parodyti šių konstrukcijų ryšį su retorinėmis suglaudimo ir išplėtojimo kaitaliojimo strategijomis, nagrinėjama stilistinė frazių įvairovė, jų terminologinės sampratos klausimai, aptariamos graikų-romėnų retorikos teorijoje išplėtos sąvokos, tokios kaip *periphrasis*, *makrología*, *brakhulogía*, jų atitikimas šiuolaikiniam požiūriui, taip pat keliama hipotezė, kad senovės retorikoje išplėta sąvoka "perifrazė" tinkama apibūdinti įvairioms daugiažodėms konstrukcijoms. Skyriuje klasifikuojama frazeologinė medžiaga, remiantis veiksmažodžio semantine role ir introversijos bei ekstrasijos kategorijomis, naujai interpretuojant valentingumo kaitos teorijas.



1 Introduction

Aristotle's *Rhetoric*¹, like any ancient literary monument, is a 'repository' of expressions which contains a sizable collection of compound words and phrases,² some rather challenging to detect and translate into another language. This chapter reflects a significant effort to evaluate and classify the verb and complement constructions of an Ancient Greek text being translated into another language, with a focus on Ancient Greek rhetorical terminology. However, cross-linguistic parallels (such as Greek "ποιεῖσθαι λόγον" *poieîsthai lógon* (lit. "make a speech") and its English or Lithuanian equivalents), as part of the greater phenomenon of translation issues, will not be treated here. Instead, this chapter focuses only on the nature and classification of single-language (Ancient Greek) constructions. Particular attention in this chapter is paid to the identification of verbal constructions, termed light-verb constructions (LVCs henceforth) or support-verb constructions (SVCs henceforth),³ which are treated as part of a larger phenomenon—linguistic, rhetorical, or poetic variation.

Aimed at a synthesis of empirical research, the chapter combines two major theoretical approaches: the classical theory of style with its basic 'idea that a thought can be formulated in several ways with different effects'⁴ and the modern theories and insights of verb valency, transitivity, and non-causal-causal alternations.⁵ Two thirds of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, Books 1 and 2, dealing with so-called rhetorical invention, form the basis of the empirical study. This choice of the corpus of limited scope was due, *inter alia*, to the large amount of heterogeneous material obtained over the course of the research.

Even though the results' breadth may appear constrained, they may nonetheless contribute to a perceptual testing of the methodology: once the phraseological principles of these two books are established, the third book can be evaluated in a similar framework. This study is distinguished by its limited use of automated processes: many of the word combinations were found in the corpus by

¹The dataset is accessible here: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5287/ora-n652gamyj>.

²For the purposes of this article, we use the term *phrases* to refer to all the lexical expressions longer than one word and not forming a sentence. For a similar use of the corresponding term in Lithuanian phraseology, see Marcinkevičienė (2010: 121–122).

³The synonymy of these terms is not questioned here on the basis of the terminology available to us in the research materials, such as Langer (2004), Kovalevskaitė et al. (2020), Fotopoulou et al. (2021). In this article, preference will be given to the term SVC, while LVC may appear sporadically in commenting on the literature where there is a preference for the latter term.

⁴de Jonge (2014: 326)

⁵E.g. Lavidas (2009), Arkadiev & Pakerys (2015), Haspelmath (2016), Grossman & Witzlack-Makarevich (2019).

way of a close reading and manual extraction. On this basis, a number of constructions pertinent to the study were then selected.

The content of the chapter is divided into the following sections: 1) introductory reflections on the text under discussion (Section 2); 2) observations on the linkage of verb formations from the perspectives of modern linguistics and of the notions known from ancient Greek rhetorical and linguistic theory (Section 3); 3) key points of empirical research and the classification of phraseological material (with a focus on verbal semantics) (Section 4); 4) an overview of recent findings on SVCs and other periphrastic constructions in Aristotle's treatise (Sections 5 and 6); 5) a brief outline of the stylistic functions of verb-based periphrases found in the course of the study (Section 7).

2 Aristotle's *Rhetoric* as a source of Greek phraseology

Τέχνη ῥητορική *Tékhne rhētorikḗ* (as some manuscripts title it⁶), or simply *Rhetoric*, a theoretical work on the art of persuasive speech, which, in Aristotle's view, shares many similarities with dialectics, ethics, politics, and poetics,⁷ discusses the nature and components of this art, the means of persuasion, the arguments relevant to the three types of speech (deliberative, epideictic, and juridical), and describes ethical, emotional and stylistic factors of a persuasive speech. The content of the treatise is roughly divided into three unequal parts: the first two of the three books, which form the core of the author's original vision, deal with rhetorical invention and theory of proofs, while the third book covers more practical issues of style and composition.

The *Rhetoric* is an integral part of the *Corpus Aristotelicum* and contains references to other works by this author, such as treatises on logical reasoning and dialectics, Ἀναλυτικά Πρότερα *Analutikà Prótera*, Κατηγορίαι *Katēgoríai*, and Τοπικά *Topiká*. This study therefore can contribute to our understanding of Aristotle's phraseology and, to some degree, to that of the textual aspects of the treatise in question (e.g. differences across copies), as well as intertextual ones (such as quotations and paraphrasing of other texts, both oral and written).

As a multi-layered text, Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, on the one hand, captures the rich and literarily charged phraseology of Greek spoken in the 4th century BC, of which most modern readers, being non-native speakers, can only have a vague idea. This phraseology is essentially the phraseology of the Attic dialect of the

⁶See Kassel (1976: 3) (in app. crit.)

⁷On the relation of rhetoric to dialectics, ethics, and politics, cf. Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1.2.7 1356a25-27, and on the relationship between rhetoric and poetics, see Kirby (1991) with references.

4th century BC, strongly influenced by literary genres dominant in contemporary Athens, such as Attic drama (apart from the choral parts), rhetorical, philosophical, and historiographical prose, and used in colloquial form not only in Attica but also in interstate communication (including the Macedonian court, with which Aristotle was closely associated). It is uncertain how much this basic dialectal layer of the treatise was influenced by lexical and phrasal variation from other dialects (cf. Aristotle's habit of exemplifying his stylistic points from Herodotus and Homer, the representatives of the literary Ionic and an epic dialectal mixture respectively⁸), but the impact of the stylistic features of Attic drama and oratory is undoubted.⁹ This naturally prompts us to focus principally on the Attic dialect.

On the other hand, to quote Aristotle's translator, 'our knowledge of what Aristotle wrote is based on manuscripts copied by scribes from older manuscripts, which were in turn copied from still earlier ones, going back to Aristotle's personal copy, with opportunity for mistakes at every stage in the transmission. The earliest existing evidence for the text dates from over a thousand years after Aristotle died' (Kennedy 2007: xii). Understanding the textual tradition prompts a nuanced interpretation of Aristotle's phrasing. The decision to use a manuscript version that uses single-word formations and, *inter alia*, compound words rather than two-word combinations, or vice versa, can influence the way in which we perceive the author on the whole — either as a producer of periphrastic formulations or of compound words.¹⁰ As fascinating as this aspect of the study is, we will not delve into the details here because of constraints of time and space. Instead, we will just acknowledge that the material used in this study is based on one of the most widely used Greek editions, that of Ross (Ross 1959), but it also takes one of the most thorough critical editions, that of Kassel (1976), into account.

We are thus dealing with a largely literary version of Greek that shares (*cum variatione*) the characteristics of every document of the ancient tradition which has undergone a change over the course of written transmission. This linguistic form deserves an approach that finds parallels not only with the terms and linguistic phenomena of our time, but also with the terminology and descriptions of poetic and literary phenomena of the period in which the texts under study were

⁸Morpurgo Davies (2002: 168)

⁹Aristotle's treatise on rhetoric is particularly rich in quotations from classical Athenian tragedy and from the speeches of the orators of Aristotle's time (esp. Isocrates and his students).

¹⁰So e.g. in Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1.7.26, 1364b31, one version has ἀβεβαιωτέρων *abebaiotérōn*, another μη βεβαιωτέρων *mē bebaiotérōn*, in Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 2.23.11, 1398b11, we find either βλάσφημον ὄντα *blásphēmon ónta* or βλάσφημήσαντα *blasphēmésanta*, in 1.12.4, 1372a20, we find either φίλοι ὄσι *phíloi ósi* or φιλωσιν *philōsin*, in 2.4.26, 1381b28, either τοὺς φιλεῖν ἀγαθοὺς *toùs phileîn agathoûs* or φιλαγάθους *philagáthous*. For these and other examples see app. crit. ad loc. in Kassel (1976).

written. In other words, in addition to the complex typology of different expressions developed by modern linguistics, it is worth recalling the discoveries and insights of ancient thinkers and stylists, and combining their terminology with the terms we use today, such as Multi-word Expressions (MWEs henceforth), SVCs, LVCs, Function-Verb Constructions (FVCs henceforth)¹¹ or V-PCs (V-PP-Cs),¹² etc. This chapter does not focus on this issue in detail, but offers some insights.

3 Reflections on verbal constructions: Between the modern concept of support-verb constructions and ancient rhetorical tradition

The concepts just mentioned, especially multi-word expressions (MWEs henceforth) (i.e. phrasal units of great variety and certain 'semantic opaqueness' and a universal phenomenon inherent to a variety of language sources)¹³ and SVCs (i.e. verb + noun combinations acting as predicates of a sentence)¹⁴, are central to this discussion, which focuses on their forms and functions within Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. In addition to that, it is also worth considering the issue of the relevance of concepts employed in modern linguistics and their compatibility with the old ones, as well as that of the commensurability of phenomena covered by the two families of concepts.

When it comes to multi-word phenomena, we believe that some ancient concepts could be used more widely both in modern linguistics and in the study of ancient languages. One of these is *περίφρασις* *periphrasis* (from late Greek *περιφράζομαι* *peri-phrázomai*, 'to express in a roundabout manner') with its Latin equivalent *circumlocutio* (cf. Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 8.6.61; Servius, *Commentary on Vergil's Aeneid* 1.65: 17-19) coined by the Graeco-Roman rhetoricians and grammarians. As attested in ancient literary critics, beginning with Dionysius of Halicarnassus (cf. v. *περίφρασις* *periphrasis* in Liddell & Scott 1996), it denotes the use of a longer phrase instead of a possible shorter form (e.g. a combination of words instead of one word). Despite the ramified use of the term in our time, it often retains a fairly universal meaning, applying to phenomena of various linguistic and stylistic categories (cf. Haspelmath 2000). Even when discussing a specific linguistic phenomenon, such as verbal periphrasis, a hint of

¹¹Or FVG (for *Funktionsverbgefüge*) in German literature, e.g. Schutzzeichel (2014).

¹²On verb-preposition constructions cf. Farrell (2005), Keizer (2009), cf. Langer (2004: 8).

¹³For this kind of definition, cf. Rayson et al. (2010) and a set of facts about MWEs available on the PARSEME network website (<https://typo.uni-konstanz.de/parseme/index.php/the-action>).

¹⁴Fendel (2022: 382)

that broad meaning is retained (cf. Bentein's examples of synthetic vs analytic forms with the latter being called both multi-word and 'periphrastic' ones).¹⁵

The breadth of the import of the term periphrasis parallels that of the term MWE, both of which are sometimes explicitly linked and have similar definitions (cf. the definition of MWE as 'linguistic objects consisting of two or more words' and 'a highly varied set of objects (from idioms to collocations, from formulae to expressions)', Masini 2019). In the context of such juxtapositions, for texts written in an ancient language, it is natural to favour the terms originating from that language. On the other hand, given the complexity of the concept of MWE, it is useful to have an alternative short and inclusive synonym, as is the case with periphrasis.

Regarding SVCs, their connection to the concept of periphrasis has been noticed (cf. Jiménez López 2016: 183), but it has yet to be thoroughly investigated. Given the relative abundance of studies on periphrasis, such an enterprise would be valuable.

Although linguists have noted that the concept periphrasis can be employed at various degrees of strictness,¹⁶ a theoretical framework has also been developed to identify characteristics of a 'canonical periphrastic construction' (e.g. the expression of the grammatical meaning, lexical applicability, regularity, recognizable syntactic relations, and head of a construction).¹⁷ Compared to rhetorical periphrasis, linguistic periphrasis has been more intensively studied in several forms. Perhaps the best known of these are nominal (or 'inflectional', filling of a cell of the inflectional paradigm; cf. Chumakina 2011, Chumakina & Corbett 2012) and verbal (or 'participial') periphrasis, the latter extensively studied in Bentein (2016). However, there is still a lack of clarity concerning the applicability of this concept to other constructions, including SVCs. One of the reasons for this may be that linguistic research pays little attention to the rhetorical (persuasion-targeted) and poetic (creation-targeted) background of periphrasis. Therefore, we have to offer several considerations on this issue.

Periphrasis (a multi-word substitution of a single-word lexical unit) is a tool employed for pragmatic or stylistically motivated objectives rather than merely a lexical and grammatical category referring to the usage of a combination of words in place of the appropriate lexical meaning and morphological form. Its essence is well reflected in Lausberg's definition based on various references to

¹⁵Bentein (2016: 2)

¹⁶See e.g. Haspelmath (2000: 654–655), where periphrasis has 3 main definitions: 'the use of longer, multi-word expressions in place of single words', 'one of the canonical literary rhetorical figures', and 'a situation in which a multi-word expression is used in place of a single word in an inflectional paradigm'.

¹⁷Cf. Chumakina (2011: 249–250); Brown et al. (2012: 244).

it in the Graeco-Roman rhetorical tradition: periphrasis is 'paraphrasing of one word by several words' (Lausberg 1998: §590). This definition refers to a wide variety of quantitative (several instead of one) and qualitative (different degrees of semantic equivalence) substitution, some of which are explicitly illustrated in examples of the late manuals of rhetoric.

Thus, for example, Alexander Numenius, a rhetorician of the 2nd century AD, gives examples to show that periphrasis, originally a poetic (creation-targeted) device, has become a stylistic flourish in prose as well (Spengel 1853: 32). Here, beside nominal expressions, such as βίη Ἡρακλεΐη *bíē Hēraklēīē* (lit. 'strength of Heracles') and μένος Ἀλκινόοιο *ménos Alkinóoio* (lit. 'might of Alcinous') standing for nouns (Ἡρακλῆς *Hēraklēs* and Ἀλκίνοος *Alkínoos*), we see Thucydides' phrase τὴν μάθησιν ἐποιεῖσθε *tēn máthēsīn epoieĩsthe*, 'you were doing learning' with the rhetorician's remark: 'instead of ἐμανθάνετε *emanthánete*', which corresponds to the well-known type of SVCs with the verb ποιεῖσθαι *poieĩsthai*.¹⁸ This and other support verbs appear in similar constructions in many classical Greek literary texts, but even a single multi-layered text like Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, which combines the author's own expressions with those borrowed for paraphrasing or quotation, shows that such a phenomenon exists in both spoken and literary Greek. Two examples will suffice here, see (1) and (2):

- (1) διὸ εἴρηται ὄθυμὸς δὲ μέγας ἐστὶ
diò eírētai óthumòs dè mégas estì
 therefore say.PRF.3SG wrath.NOM.SG but big.PRED-ADJ be.PRS.3SG
 διοτρεφέων βασιλῆων καὶ ἄλλα τε καὶ μετόπισθεν
diotrophéōn basilēōn kai allá te kai metópiσthen
 Zeus-nurtured.GEN king.GEN.PL and yet PRT even afterwards
 ἔχει κότον ἄγανακτοῦσι γὰρ διὰ
ékhei kóton; aganaktoῦsi gàr dià
 have.PRS.3SG grudge.ACC.SG feel.irritation.PRS.3PL for/since by.reason.of
 τὴν ὑπεροχὴν
tēn huperokhén
 ART.ACC supremacy.ACC.SG

'Wherefore it has been said: 'Great is the wrath of kings cherished by Zeus,' (Homer, *Iliad* 2.196) and 'Yet it may be that even afterwards he cherishes his resentment,' (Homer, *Iliad* 1.82) for kings are resentful in consideration of their superior rank.'

(Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 2.2.7, 1379a3-7, translated by J. H. Freese).

¹⁸On this popular type of analytic predicate (ποιεῖμαι *poioūmai* + event noun), see e.g. Jiménez López and Baños and Pompei, Pompei, and Ricci in this volume.

- (2) καὶ τὸ Πολυεύκτου εἰς ἀποπληκτικόν τινα
kai tò Polueúktou eis apoplēktikón tina
 and that.[saying] Polyeuctus.GEN.SG in/towards apoplectic.ACC.SG some
 Σπεύσιππον, τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι ἡσυχίαν
Speúsippon tò mē dúnasthai hēsukhían
 Speusippus.ACC.SG ART NEG be.able.INF stillness.ACC.SG
 ἄγειν ὑπὸ τῆς τύχης ἐν πεντεσυρίγγῳ
ágein hupò tēs túkhēs en pentesuríngōi
 keep/observe.PRS.INF by ART.GEN fortune.GEN in five.holed.DAT
 νόσῳ δεδεμένον
nósōi dedeménon
 disease.DAT.SG bind.PRF.PTCP.PASS.ACC.SG
 ‘And the saying of Polyeuctus upon a certain paralytic named Speusippus,
 that he could not **keep quiet**, although Fortune had bound him in a
 five-holed pillory of disease.’
 (Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3.10.7, 1411a21-23, translated by J. H. Freese)

The phrase ἔχει κότον *ékhei kóton* ‘holds wrath’, ‘cherishes resentment’ in example (1), as quoted from the *Iliad*, in Book 2 (Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 2.2.7), for the sake of brevity, could be replaced by the epic verb κοτέει *kotéei*,¹⁹ while another one, ἡσυχίαν ἄγειν *hēsukhían ágein* (example 2), paraphrased in Book 3 from an unknown speech by Polyeuctus, stands for ἡσυχάζειν *hēsukházein*, which is quite a common verb for Aristotle himself and his contemporary writers.²⁰ Both examples conform with Alexander’s definition of periphrasis, both are rather verbose or ‘macrological’ than the reverse, and both resemble a typical SVC definition (desemanticised verb of frequent use acting as the syntactic operator + verbal noun, functioning together as one predicate).

Although περίφρασις *períphrasis* is absent from the extant rhetorical τέχναι *tékhnai* of Aristotle’s time, some discussion of the phenomenon could be found in Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* too, especially in his discussion of style in Book 3.²¹ Here, in the context of the treatment of so-called virtues of style, clarity, correctness (τὸ ἐλληνίζειν *tò hellēnízein*), and propriety (τὸ πρέπον *tò prēpon*), we read a statement that must have been dear to Aristotle, both as a writer and as a teacher of a rhetorical doctrine:

¹⁹Only other forms are attested in Homer, but cf. famous dictum in Hes. *Op.* 25.

²⁰As becomes clear from the entry for ἡσυχάζω *hēsukházō* in Liddell & Scott (1996) and a simple search for this verb in the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*.

²¹The greater part of this book of *Rhetoric* (chapters 1–12) is devoted to the rhetorical aspect of λέξις *léxis*, and the remainder (13–19) to that of τάξις *táxis*.

- (3) ὅλως δὲ δεῖ εὐανάγνωστον εἶναι τὸ
hólōs dè deĩ euanágnōston eĩnai tò
 generally PRT it.is.necessary easy.to.read be.INF the.ACC
 γεγραμμένον καὶ εὐφραστον: ἔστιν δὲ τὸ
gegramménōn kai eúphrastōn: éstin dè tò
 write.PRF.PTCP.PASS.ACC and easy.to.utter be.PRS.3SG PRT the.NOM
 αὐτό
autó
 same.NOM
 ‘Generally speaking, that which is written should be easy to read or easy
 to utter, which is the same thing.’
 (Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3.5.6, 1407b11-12, translated by John H. Freese).

An anonymous scholion on this passage interprets the identity of the terms εὐανάγνωστον *euanágnōston* and εὐφραστον *eúphrastōn* as a measure of the text's clarity. Despite Freese's translation 'easy to utter', *eúphrastos*, according to the meaning of the synonym εὐφραδής *euphradēs* in Liddell-Scott-Jones' *Greek-English Lexicon* (Liddell & Scott 1996), and the etymology of the root -φραδ-*phrad*-²² of the verb φράζειν *phrázein*, the two terms mean rather 'easy to understand', 'easy to express', or 'well expressed', 'well explained'. Of course, there is not yet the term of periphrasis here, to be coined by later rhetoricians, but this already implies a search for terms that refer to different linguistic strategies of expressing thoughts.

In fact, there were at least two such strategies in Aristotle's time with appropriate, albeit not well-established, terms for each: συντομία *suntomía* 'brevity', as used by Plato and Aristotle, or βραχυλογία *brakhulogía*, as in the *Rhetoric to Alexander* (Aristotle, *Rhetoric to Alexander* 6.3; cf. 22.5), and possibly (though not surely)²³ and μακρολογία *makrología*, called ὄγκος *ónkos* by Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3.6.1, 1407b.

βραχυλογία *brakhulogía* and μακρολογία *makrología* are not systematically discussed in ancient theories of style and their meanings are usually reduced to asyndeton (Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 9.3.50) and redundancy (Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 8.3.53). In fact, the compounds βραχυλογεῖν *brakhulogeîn*,

²²The verb φράζειν *phrázein* (according to Aristarchus, cf. Liddell & Scott 1996 s.v.) was not used by Homer in the sense 'to say, tell'.

²³It should be noted that in the texts of Aristotle's contemporaries, where the words μακρολογεῖν *makrologeîn* μακρολογία *makrología* are used, they do not have a strictly technical meaning of a linguistic nature (choice of words, expansion of the text by longer lexical-syntactic units); rather, they are used in a more general sense in terms of genre (rhetorical speech vs. dialogue) and content (richness vs. scarcity of the elements of some topic).

μακρολογεῖν *makrologeîn*, and their derivatives in Aristotle's time also referred to a stylistic tactic of linguistic communication: βραχυλογία *brakhulogía* was the principle of naming things concisely, μακρολογία *makrología* was the opposite. The former was associated with the pointed questions and straight answers of dialectics, the latter with rhetorical speeches.²⁴

It is not impossible in this context that Aristotle distinguished between the tactics of style not only as a theorist but also as a practitioner, language user (writer, imitator, creator, teacher).²⁵ The frequent presence of both elliptical and amplificatory expressions in the text of his Τέχνη *Tékhnē* reinforces this assumption. Example (4) shows a typical syntax of rather unpolished text which nevertheless shows signs of professional stylistic skills even in a text of esoteric nature.²⁶

- (4) ἔτι ὑφ' ὧν τις οἶεται εὖ πάσχειν
éti huph' hōn tis oíetai eũ páskhein
 yet from whom.GEN.PL someone thinks.PRS.3SG well suffer.PRS.INF
 δεῖν· οὗτοι δ' εἰσὶν οὓς εὖ πεποίηκεν
deîn; hoũtoi d' eisin hoũs eũ pepoíēken
 there.is.need.PRS.INF these.NOM.PL and be.PRS.3PL whom well do.PRF.3SG
 ἢ ποιεῖ, αὐτὸς ἢ δι' αὐτόν τις ἢ τῶν
ē poieĩ, autòs ē di' autón tis ē tōn
 or do.PRS.3SG himself or by.aid.of he.ACC.SG someone or those.GEN.PL
 αὐτοῦ τις, ἢ βούλεται ἢ ἐβουλήθη.
autoũ tis, ē boulétai ē ebouléthē
 he.GEN.SG someone or wishes/desires.PRS.3SG or wish.AOR.3SG

'Further, [men are angry at slights from those]²⁷ by whom they think they have a right to expect to be well treated; such are those on whom they have conferred or are conferring benefits, either themselves, or someone else for them, or one of their friends; and all those whom they desire, or did desire, to benefit'

(Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 2.2.8, 1379a6-8, translated by J. H. Freese).

²⁴These principles are well expressed by Plato, especially in the dialogues devoted to sophistic topics, see Plato, *Protagoras* 335b8, Plato, *Gorgias* 449c4-d6, Plato, *Sophist* 268b1-9 etc. Aristotle himself mentions μακρολογία *makrología* in Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3.17.16, 1418b25, referring more to a naturally occurring practice in which the speaker exaggerates his self-presentation than to a cleverly balanced or consciously extended rhetorical strategy.

²⁵On Aristotle's careful construction of sentences and the application of the rhetorical figure *hyperbaton* in a particular passage of the *Rhetoric*, see Martin (2001), and on Aristotle's experimental attitude to language and important inventions, see Allan (2004).

²⁶On the esotericism of the Aristotelian Corpus and the 'quite rough prose' of the *Rhetoric*, cf. Poster (1997) and Kennedy (2007: 3).

²⁷Here we use square brackets to mark the ellipsis.

Here, ἔτι *éti*, which is used in the same way as in the previous sentence, precedes the implied governing phrase προσήκειν οἶται πολυωρεῖσθαι *prosékein oietai poluōreîsthai* 'he thinks it is proper for him to be highly esteemed', which is omitted, as is the genitive of the omitted phrase ὑπὸ τούτων *hupò toutōn* 'by these'. Extended speech is indicated by the following additional factors: the separation of subject and predicate by the particle ἢ *ē*, the use of εὖ πάσχειν *eũ páskhein* instead of something like one-word εὐπαθεῖν *eupatheîn* or εὐπραγεῖν *euprageîn*,²⁸ and the use of the passive construction (ὕφ' ὧν *huph' hōn...*) rather than the active.

All this shows that the lexical and syntactic material of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* can be seen as the result of the interplay of 'brachylogical' and 'macrological' strategies and that the MWEs ('linguistic objects consisting of two or more words') can be hypothetically associated with the latter.

Since SVCs, like periphrases, imply the use of more than one word and, in some cases, the substitution of a single word (a lexical verb whose meaning is echoed by a noun of verbal derivation, the constituent of an SVC) by a longer phrase, as if transforming the meaning of that word in the combination of two, albeit of unequal semantic weight, it is conceivable to think of these terms as synonyms by virtue of this similarity: SVCs as a type of periphrasis (verbal or predicative), and periphrasis itself as a general name for multi-word combinations of a similar category in which the substitution of a shorter lexical unit by a longer expression is discernible.

In this way, the tripartite typology of word combinations (e.g. Van der Meer 1998, also in Marcinkevičienė 2010) could be merged with the typology of periphrases, so that periphrases could also include collocations, idioms, and other word combinations (e.g. compositional phrases, CPs henceforth). If it is possible to name a sequence of word combinations according to the looseness of their syntactic, lexical, and semantic relationships (free combinations – collocations – idioms; cf. Marcinkevičienė 2010: 88), some periphrases can be classified as freely formed, others as collocations, since they are already characterised by the suspension of word meaning and their frequent use (which does not, however, prohibit their formation in the form of paraphrases, especially in poetry), and the others as idioms – word combinations characterised by the greatest suspension of meaning.

²⁸ εὐπαθεῖν *eupatheîn* is attested in Plato (esp. Plato, *Phaedrus* 247d4, Plato, *Republic* 347c7), and εὐπραγεῖν *euprageîn* in Aristotle (e.g. Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 2.9.7, 2.9.9)

4 In search of support-verb constructions in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*: Key points of empirical research on multi-word expressions

What follows below is a brief description of the stages of empirical work of the author of the present chapter. This work roughly happened in three interwoven stages: 1) empirical collection of the material, 2) search for theoretical models to classify the results, and 3) counting and sorting the material. In the first stage, about 900 two-plus-word phrases were collected, of which 350 items were most similar either to verb-based collocations, or SVCs. To achieve this, some sort of sifting and exclusion was necessary: the so-called free word combinations were excluded, while collocation-like expressions and combinations of verb derivatives (participles, adjectives) with nouns were accepted. Not only verb + noun formations were taken into consideration, but, as our concern is with various periphrases, also verb combinations with other complements (esp. adjectives and adverbs).²⁹

The second stage, which dealt with terminological questions of naming and classifying expressions, was by no means easier. There are still many ambiguities in this area (how many different types of word combinations and periphrases there are in general, how they differ from each other, whether periphrasis is morphologically primary (cf. Chumakina & Corbett 2012: 5) or not, whether it belonging to an inflectional paradigm and having multiple exponents is a necessary prerequisite of periphrasis, etc.), but this does not prevent us from sticking to the favoured term (periphrasis): it is quite flexible and can serve as a general term for different constructs, including SVCs.

On the other hand, the variety of SVCs and expressions similar to them need further clarification and subdivision (as is not the case currently), since even the examples of the periphrases given by the above-mentioned rhetorician Alexander Numenius (2nd c. AD), are of at least two different types, one with the same subject (τὴν μάθησιν ἐποιεῖσθε *tēn máthēsin epoeiēsthe* = ἐμανθάνετε *emanthánete*, the subject being ὑμεῖς *humeĩs*, 'you' (pl.), in both cases), and another with a change in the subject of the sentence (ἐννοιὰ ποθ' ἡμῖν ἐγένετο *énnoiá poth' hēmīn egéneto* = ἐνενοήσαμεν *enenoēsamen*). In this study, we would like to highlight that, while a noun may have a greater significance as the semantic head in the typology of SVCs, a particular verb's semantic import may also play a role.

²⁹Adjectives of neuter gender can frequently express the meaning of a noun (and so, in fact, substitute nouns), whereas the more common combinations of verbs and adverbs (in fact collocations) are found in grammars under the name of periphrases (cf. Smyth 1920: §1438 on adverbs with ἔχειν *ékhein* or διακεῖσθαι *diakeĩsthai*).

5 On verbs forming periphrastic constructions: The idea of extra- and introversive verbs

While the definitions of SVCs emphasise the reduction of the semantic role of the verb, our intuition is that some of the verbs' fundamental morpho-semantic aspects or features can be retained, leading to different verb-noun combinations with the same noun.

One such primary retainable aspect relates to the valency properties of the verb, i.e. the ability or inability to handle one or more complements. This intuition is in line with several theoretical frameworks, first of all, with the grammatical theory of valency, based on verb centrality (verbs structure sentences by binding the specific elements (complements and actants) in the same way as atoms of chemical elements do), with Lucien Tesnière's theory of actants (agents or persons accompanying a verb in the form of the nominative, the accusative, and the dative cases respectively)³⁰ and verbal node with its theatrical metaphor ('like a drama, it obligatorily involves a process and most often actors and circumstances', Tesnière 2015: 97). Notably, even when not acting in their full lexical meaning, verbs that form SVCs retain their bivalence (+nominative, +accusative), and in combination with the complement they can also become/seem to become trivalent (cf. ἔχω *ékhō* + accusative > χάριν ἔχω *khárin ékhō* + dative).

The observations on the verbal node as a metaphorical drama (or verb-governor in dependency grammar) and research on verbal derivations and valency change (variety of cross-linguistic morpho-syntactic strategies in transitivity alternations) reflect a general paradigm comparable, from our point of view, with Aristotle's rhetorical model of persuasion, consisting of a triad of factors in the process of rhetorical action (also full of alternating stylistic strategies): the speaker's ἦθος *ēthos* (moral nature), the hearer's πάθος *páthos* (emotional condition), and the λόγος *lógos* (rational basis, logical validity) of the speech.

Aristotle's scheme, most explicitly stated in Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1.2.3, parallels the semantic and syntactic relations between the participants (or actors) of the sentence in their connection to verbs of different valencies.³¹ The speaker, the messenger, as if the agent of the sentence, is the initiating actor who, through his self-presentation and speech (or act of predication comparable to the function of a verb in a sentence), affects one or more 'actors', one of whom is the product

³⁰See further Tesnière (2015: 100–109).

³¹In rhetoric, the activity of verbs is probably paralleled by the ὑπόκρισις *hypókrisis*, which, depending on the characteristics of each situation and the characters of the actors, can be different, both highly static and dynamic.

of the logical material, the λόγος *lógos*, the meaningful text (parallel to the object of the sentence, which represents the great variety of things), and another, the listener (or group of listeners) is the reactive agent, the recipient of the affection or message (like the secondary objects of the sentence).

However, every text (oral or written) is not just a collection of identical sentences with identical verb properties. Variation, or variability, is important for rhetorical success, and the possibilities of word derivation help to achieve it. In Greek, the possibilities of derivation, both synthetic and analytic, are rather vast.³² From some studies on word derivation we have important terms coined that describe variations in verb valency: extraversion and introversion. According to Lehmann and Verhoeven, extraversion is the process by which an intransitive (or monovalent) verb becomes a transitive (or bivalent) verb, and the reverse process is called introversion (Lehmann & Verhoeven 2006: 468–469).

A simplified example of derivational extraversion would be to change the intransitive exhortation ‘let’s gamble’ (cf. Lith. *loškime*, and Gr. κυβεύωμεν *kubeúōmen*) into a sentence where the same verb becomes transitive: ‘I gambled away all my money’ (cf. Lith. *aš pralošiau visus savo pinigus*, and Gr. κατεκύβευσά ἅπαν τὸ ἀργύριον *katekúbeusa hápan tò argúrion*³³). This example of extraversion shows the ability of language to derive a transitive verb from an intransitive verb by adding certain analytical adjuncts. The phenomenon is well attested across languages and the term ‘ambi-transitive’ or ‘labile’ is applied to such verbs (Arkadiev & Pakerys 2015: 57, Lavidas 2009: 68, Haspelmath 2016: 38, etc.). This is a situational and context-dependent change, i.e. situational extraversion.

It is important to note, though, that Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* exhibits both situational valency (cf. the transitive πράττειν *práttein* in πράττειν τὰ καλὰ *práttein tà kalá* in Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1.7.38, 2.12.12, and the intransitive one κακῶς / εὖ πράττειν *kakōs / eū práttein* in Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 2.9.2, 2.9.4), which is dependent on the production process of the phrases, and the internal valency, the latter innate to each verb. The premise of this observation is that most transitive verbs fall into two categories depending on their underlying meaning: introversive and extraversive.

This intuition is based on the assumption that transitive verbs can be used to express the direction of an action in one of two ways: either inwards, i.e. towards the area that is closer to the main performer of the action, or outwards, i.e. towards a more open area that does not belong to the performer or is distant from

³²For a significant account of the possibilities of derivation and compounding, or word formation in general, in ancient Greek and Aristotle’s contribution to the conceptualization of these processes, see e.g. Wouters et al. (2014) and Vaahtera (2014).

³³Cf. Lysias, *In Alcibiadem I* 27: κατακυβεύσας τὰ ὄντα *katakubeúsas tà ónta*.

him/her. When we say 'he/she gives, sells, carries, strikes, draws', if we do not add the reflexive form, we refer to actions that are distant from the performer, and we focus on the exterior object, a component of the world that does not belong to the performer ('gives, sells', thus 'takes away from himself', 'carries, strikes', thus 'uses his strength instead of replenishing it', 'draws', thus 'puts the idea on display to be seen by others'). When we say 'takes, buys, owns, feels, sees', we are focusing on the performer's inner world. In a way, this classification of verbs is reminiscent of semantic classes such as action verbs and stative verbs, except that it primarily concerns the categorisation of transitive verbs.

Thus, based on these considerations, extraversive verbs are those transitive and ambi-transitive verbs which imply a transfer in attention to an external object ('I make, give, send, say' etc.), while introversive verbs suggest a change in emphasis from an exterior object and/or subject to the main subject ('I feel, receive, get, hear'). This difference in verbs might also be a prerequisite for the ramification of the semantic or syntactic roles of the respective phrases and for the nuances of their translation.³⁴

6 Most frequent 'support verbs' and potential support-verb-construction-type periphrases in Aristotle

Among the 350 constructions,³⁵ selected from around 900 phrasal combinations, we identified the following most frequent extraversive verbs: *διδόναι* *didónai* 'to give', *λέγειν* *légein* 'to say', *ποιεῖν* *poieîn* 'to make' and *ποιεῖσθαι* *poieîsthai* 'to make (for oneself)', *τιθέναι* *tithénai* 'to put', and *φέρειν* *phérein* 'to bring', 'carry'.

Most of them correspond to English light verbs. They typically direct the action towards the object (accusativus rei) and/or the recipient of the benefit or harm, expressed by the dative case or its syntactic equivalents (*πρός τινα* *prós tina*, *εἰς τινα* *eís tina* etc.). Versions with prefixes, such as *ἀποδιδόναι* *apodidónai*, *ἐπιλέγειν* *epilégein*, *ἐμποιεῖν* *empoieîn*, *διατιθέναι* / *διατίθεσθαι* *diatithénai* / *diatithesthai*, *κατασκευάζειν* *kataskeuázein*, and *παρασκευάζειν* *paraskeuázein*, were also included in the analysis. However, verbs with objects in the dative and genitive cases (such as *χρῆσθαι* *khre̓sthai* + dative or *τυγχάνειν* *tunkhánein* +

³⁴For example, the extraverted phrase may be 'exert pressure' and the introverted one 'feel pressure' or the extraverted phrase could be 'tell the truth', and the introverted one 'know the truth'. So perhaps *ἔχω χάριν* *ékhō khárin* = *χαρίζομαι* *kharízomai* 'I feel grateful', *χάριν διδῶμι* *khárin didōmi* = *χαρίζω* *kharízō* 'I express/share my gratitude'?

³⁵This figure can be verified by summing up the number of constructions given in Table 1, Table 12, and the table provided as the dataset for this chapter, see n. 1.

genitive) were not thoroughly examined at this stage of the research, so they are not covered in the present discussion.

Of all the verbs mentioned, 104 tokens (constructions with direct objects) were found in the analysed corpus (76 different types). The count includes formations with the suppletive forms and verbal derivatives (e.g. *adiectiva verbalia*) as well. Table 1 shows a simplified characterisation of periphrases with extraversive verbs. Table 1 serves as a numeric overview, relevant examples are provided in Table 2 to Table 11. For the sake of simplicity, all the morphological variations are counted as though they are reducible to a single phrasal formula (infinitive + accusative of the object), including verb tenses, verbal adjectives, participles, singular and plural forms of nominals. The individual columns indicate the number of repeated

Table 1: Overview

	tokens/types	repeated*	unrepeated*	types SO [†]	types with CO [†]
διδόναι, ἀποδιδόναι, ἀνταποδιδόναι (<i>didónai, apodidónai,</i> <i>antapodidónai</i>) + Acc.	14 / 9	3 (3+0)	6 (5+1)	8 (3+5)	1 (0+1)
λέγειν, εἰπεῖν (<i>légein,</i> <i>eipeîn</i>) + Acc.	29 / 19	4 (3+1)	15 (11+4)	14 (3+11)	5 (1+4)
ποιεῖν, ποιῆσαι, ἐμποιεῖν (<i>poieîn,</i> <i>poiēsai, empoieîn</i>) + Acc.	29 / 26	2 (1+1)	24 (9+15)	10 (1+9)	16 (1+15)
κατασκευάζειν (<i>kataskeuázēin</i>) + Acc.	3 / 3	0	3 (0+3)	0	3 (0+3)
παρασκευάζειν (<i>paraskeuázēin</i>) + Acc.	2 / 2	0	2 (0+2)	0	2
ποιεῖσθαι (<i>poieîsthai</i>) + Acc.	9 / 8	1 (1+0)	7 (3+4)	4 (1+3)	4 (0+4)
πράττειν (<i>práttein</i>) + Acc.	5 / 4	1 (1+0)	3 (1+2)	2 (1+1)	2 (0+2)
τιθέναι, θεῖναι (<i>tithénai,</i> <i>theînai</i>) + Acc.	3 / 1	1	0	1 (1+0)	0
φέρειν, ἐνεγκεῖν (<i>phérein, enenkeîn</i>) + Acc.	10 / 4	3 (3+0)	1 (1+0)	4 (3+1)	0
Total	104 / 76	15	61	43	33

* In the brackets, the first number indicates the amount of verb-controlled single objects, and the second number refers to complex objects and objects with attributes.

† These brackets show the data from the second and third columns.

and non-repeated expressions, and for each verb (or group of verbs) two categories of objects are distinguished: a single object (SO henceforth), and a complex object (CO henceforth), where verb constructions with an SO are labelled with the abbreviation V + SO and constructions with a CO are labelled V + CO. When CO is an accusative duplex, the direct object (DO henceforth) is marked in bold.

Of all the verb + object (V+O) combinations, the most important feature that brings such a combination closer to the concept of an SVC (a periphrasis of the direct lexical verb) is when the verb has only a single object (V+SO). But the presence of variants with a complex object, CO (noun + adjective or pronoun, noun + noun joined with a conjunction, or accusative duplex), especially the repeated ones, such as (τὰ) ἔξω τοῦ πράγματος λέγειν / (τὰ) ἐξὼ τοῦ πράγματος *légein* and τοὺς λόγους ἠθικοὺς ποιεῖν / τοὺς λόγους *ēthikoùs poieîn*, encourages us to distinguish another category next to the SVC category, more ‘macrologic’ an expression than the SVC category.

It should be noted that some polysemous verbs, such as ποιεῖν *poieîn*, have synonyms (verbs with closely related meanings and similar causative functions) that can form analogous periphrases, or rather patterns of periphrasis, with some variability. For example, the expression ‘(by one’s own speech) to make a judge of a certain state of mind’ occurs several times in Aristotle’s treatise (cf. ὅπως τὸν κριτὴν ποιόν τινα ποιήσωσιν / *hópōs tòn kritēn poíon tina poiēsōsin* (Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1.1.9), κατασκευάζειν τῷ λόγῳ [τοὺς κριτὰς] τοιοῦτους / *kataskeuázēin tōi lógōi [toùs kritàs] toioútous* (Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 2.2.27), ἐὰν τοὺς τε κριτὰς τοιοῦτους παρασκευάσῃ ὁ λόγος / *eàn toús te kritàs toioútous paraskeuásēi ho lógos* (Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 2.9.16)), and always with some difference: the verbs vary (ποιεῖν, κατασκευάζειν, παρασκευάζειν *poieîn, kataskeuázēin, paraskeuázēin*), as does the way the verb’s object is inflected (singular, plural, or naturally omitted), and the predicative object is also inflected differently (either the accusative of τοιοῦτος *toioútōs* or a combination of pronouns denoting indefiniteness, ποίος *poíos tis*).

The following tables also show the variability of the grammatical tense categories and the suppletive forms of the verbs involved in the periphrases (cf. λέγειν *légein* and εἰπεῖν *eipeîn*, φέρειν *phéreîn* and ἐνεγκεῖν *enenkeîn*, etc.), and thus the irregularity that prevents the conclusion of a fixed rule for certain word combinations.

The data in the tables are purposefully grouped by the repetition of words and the complexity of their complements: in addition to the low semantic weight of the verb, SVCs/LVCs are usually identified by the single non-composite complement (SO) and the repetitive use of the whole phrase (cf. column ‘Repeated

Table 2: δίδοναι, ἀποδιδόναι, ἀνταποδιδόναι (*didónai, apodidónai, antapodidónai*) + Acc.

Repeated types (with morphological variations), and list of V+SO and V+CO	Unrepeated types (occurring only once), and list of SO and CO
V+SO: 1) χάριν δίδοναι / ἀνταποδιδόναι / ἀποδιδόναι (<i>khárin didónai / antapodidónai / apodidónai</i>) (thrice in total: Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.1.10, 2.2.17, 2.2.23); 2) δοῦναι δίκην <i>doūnai díkēn</i> (twice: Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.12.1, 1.12.3); 3) δίδοναι / δοῦναι φυλακὴν (<i>didónai / doūnai phulakēn</i>) (twice: Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.20.5 (<i>bis</i>))	SO: 1) τὰς κρίσεις <i>tàs kríseis</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.2.5), 2) τὰ δίκαια <i>tà díkaia</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.23.12), 3) [ὅρκους] [<i>hórkous</i>] (omitted Acc.) (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.15.2), 4) τὴν πρόθεσιν <i>tēn prōthesin</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.18.5), 5) αἵρεσιν <i>haíresin</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.24.9). CO: 1) τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τὸ συμφέρον <i>tò díkaion kai tò sumphéron</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.1.7)

types' in each table). In this way, phrases such as: χάριν δίδοναι, *khárin didónai*, δοῦναι δίκην, *doūnai díkēn*, δίδοναι φυλακὴν, *didónai phulakēn*, ποιῆσθαι τὸν λόγον, *poieîsthai tòn lógon*, λέγειν τὴν αἰτίαν, *légein tēn aitían*, ἐνθυμήματα λέγειν, *enthumémata légein*, νόμον θεῖναι, *nómon theînai* seemingly fall within this category.

Of course, some may be disqualified due to high variability³⁶ (such as the phrase λέγειν τὴν αἰτίαν *légein tēn aitían*, which attests the variants τὴν αἰτίαν ἐρεῖν, *tēn aitían ereîn*, διὰ τὰς εἰρημένας αἰτίας, *dià tàs eirēménas aitías*, λεχθέντος τοῦ αἰτίου, *lekthéntos toû aitíou*), while other phrases, although occurring only once, can be considered SVCs because they are quite frequent in other texts or can be created by analogy (e.g. various phrases with the verbs ποιεῖν *poieîn*, ποιῆσθαι *poieîsthai*, and λέγειν *légein*) and serve as analytic counterparts for the corresponding simplex or compound words (cf. τὰ ψευδῆ λέγειν *tà pseudḗ légein* 'to speak/tell lies' = ψευδολογεῖν *pseudologeîn* 'to speak falsely' (cf. LSJ s.v.), τὰς γνώμας λέγειν *tàs gnōmas légein* 'to say maxims' ≈ γνωμολογεῖν *gnōmologeîn* 'to speak in maxims', ποιεῖν ἡδύ *poieîn hēdú* 'to make pleasant/sweet' = ἡδύνειν

³⁶This creates an irregularity factor, and the phrase begins to resemble a free word combination, arbitrarily created by the speaker/writer for the occasion rather than taken from common usage. If one sees a full realisation of the lexical meaning of the verb rather than a partial one, disqualification is inevitable.

Table 3: λέγειν, εἰπεῖν (*légein, eipeîn*) + Acc.

Repeated types (with morphological variations), and list of V+SO and V+CO	Unrepeated types (occurring only once), and list of SO and CO
<p>V+SO:</p> <p>1) λέγειν / ἐπιλέγειν τὴν αἰτίαν / τὰς αἰτίας / τὸ αἴτιον (<i>légein / epilégein tēn aitían / tās aitías / tò aítion</i>) (five times in total: Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.2.11 (ἐρεῖν <i>ereîn</i>), Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.9.5 (τὰς εἰρημένους αἰτίας <i>tās eirēménous aitías</i>), Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.23.24 (twice: λέγειν τὴν αἰτίαν <i>légein tēn aitían</i> and λεχθέντος τοῦ αἰτίου <i>lekthéntos toû aitíou</i>), Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.21.14 (ἐπιλέγειν <i>epilégein</i>))</p> <p>2) (τὰ) ἐνθυμήματα λέγειν / ἐνθύμημα εἰπεῖν ((<i>tà enthumémata légein / enthýmēma eipeîn</i>) (four times in total: Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.2.8, 1.2.14, 1.15.19, 1.2.21),</p> <p>3) τάληθῃ <i>talēthē</i> (twice: Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.15.26 (<i>bis</i>)) V+CO: 1) (τὰ) ἔξω τοῦ πράγματος λέγειν / τεχνολογεῖν (<i>tà éxō toû prágmatos légein / tekhnologeîn</i>) (thrice in total: Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.1.5, 1.1.9, 1.1.10)</p>	<p>SO:</p> <p>1) οὐδέν <i>oudén</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.1.3),</p> <p>2) παραδείγματα <i>paradeigmata</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.2.8),</p> <p>3) ὑποθήκας <i>hupothēkas</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.9.36),</p> <p>4) τὰ ψευδῆ <i>tà pseudē</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.15.26),</p> <p>5) παράδοξον <i>parádoxon</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.21.4),</p> <p>6) τὰς γνώμας <i>tās gnōmas</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.21.13),</p> <p>7) φανερά <i>phanerá</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.22.3),</p> <p>8) τὰ δίκαια <i>tà díkaia</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.23.15),</p> <p>9) τὰ ἄδिका <i>tà ádika</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.23.15)</p> <p>10) λόγον <i>lōgon</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.20.5 (εἰπεῖν <i>eipeîn</i>)),</p> <p>11) τάναντία <i>tanantía</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.23.12);</p> <p>CO:</p> <p>1) [τοὺς ἐπαίνους καὶ τοὺς ψόγους <i>toûs epáinous kai toûs psógous</i>] (ex pass. οἱ ἔπαινοι καὶ οἱ ψόγοι λέγονται <i>hoi épainoi kai hoi psógoi légontai</i>) (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.9.41),</p> <p>2) τὰ κοινὰ καὶ καθόλου <i>tà koinà kai kathólou</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.22.3),</p> <p>3) [τὰ] ἔξ ὧν ἴσασι καὶ τὰ ἐγγύς [<i>tà</i>] ex <i>hōn ísasi kai tà engús</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.22.3),</p> <p>4) δόξαν τινὰ <i>dóxan tiná</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.26.4)</p>

Table 4: ποιεῖν, ποιῆσαι, ἐμποιεῖν (*poieîn, poiēsai, empoieîn*) + Acc.

Repeated types (with morphological variations), and list of V+SO and V+CO	Unrepeated types (occurring only once), and list of SO and CO
V+SO: 1) τὰυτὸ / τὰυτὰ ποιεῖν (<i>tautò / tautà poieîn</i>) (twice in total: Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.2.9; 2.2.16); V+CO: 1) τοὺς λόγους ἠθικοὺς ποιεῖν (<i>toûs lógous ēthikóus poieîn</i>) (thrice in total with variations in word order: Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.18.1; 2.18.2; 2.21.16)	SO: 1) μεγάλα <i>megála</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.7.32), 2) ἡδύ <i>hēdú</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.11.4), 3) ὑπερβολήν <i>hyperbolēn</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.11.20), 4) [ἀγαθὰ] [<i>agathá</i>] (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.13.18: ἀγαθῶν ὧν ἐποίησεν > [ποιῆσαι ἀγαθὰ] <i>agathōn hōn epoīēsen</i> > [<i>poiēsai agathá</i>]), 5) τάναντία <i>tanantía</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.2.17), 6) τὸν ἔλεον <i>tòn éleon</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.8.16), 7) τὴν συκοφαντίαν <i>tēn sukophantían</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.24.10), 8) τὴν ὀργήν <i>tēn orgēn</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.1.9), 9) ἡδονήν <i>hēdonēn</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.2.2);

hēdúnein ‘to sweeten’, τὴν ὀργήν ἐμποιεῖν *tēn orgēn empoieîn* ‘to produce/cause anger’ = ὀργίζειν *orgízein* ‘to make angry’, ‘to irritate’, etc.).

Some phrases with the same verbs, although used repeatedly, e.g. τὰυτὸ ποιεῖν *tautò poieîn* ‘to do the same thing’ or πράττειν τὰ καλὰ *práttein tà kalá* ‘to do/practice good [deeds]’, are on the edge of SVCs because they have a non-noun complement. The bivalent/trivalent verbs ποιεῖν *poieîn* ‘to make/cause’, κατασκευάζειν *kataskeuázein* ‘to furnish’, ‘to make/render’, and παρασκευάζειν *paraskeuázein* ‘to furnish’, ‘to make/render’, which govern the accusative duplex and in which a predicate adjective together with the verb can replace the causative verb, are also reminiscent of the SVC-like periphrases, esp. e.g. ποιεῖν στρεβλόν *poieîn streblón* ‘to make crooked/distorted’ = στρεβλοῦν *strebloûn* ‘to crook’, ‘to distort’, ποιεῖν σεμνότερον *poieîn semnóteron* ‘to make more solemn’ ≈ σεμνοῦν *semnoûn* ‘to make solemn’, ‘to magnify’, etc.

6 Support-verb constructions and other periphrases in Aristotle's Rhetoric

Table 5: ποιεῖν, ποιῆσαι, ἐμποιεῖν (*poieîn, poiēsai, empoieîn*) + Acc. (continued from previous table)

Repeated types (with morphological variations), and list of V+SO and V+CO	Unrepeated types (occurring only once), and list of SO and CO
None	<p>CO:</p> <p>1) τὸν κανόνα στρεβλόν <i>tòn kanóna^a streblón</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.1.5),</p> <p>2) ὡς ἐλαχίστων κύριον τὸν κριτήν <i>hōs elakhístōn kúrion tòn kritēn</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.1.8),</p> <p>3) τὸν κριτήν ποιόν τινα <i>tòn kritēn poíon tina</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.1.9),</p> <p>4) ἀξιόπιστον τὸν λέγοντα <i>axiópiston tòn légonta</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.2.4),</p> <p>5) τὸν λέγοντα ἔμφρονα <i>tòn légonta émphrona</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.2.21),</p> <p>6) μὴ βραδυτέρας τάς κινήσεις <i>mē bradutéras tās kinēseis</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.5.13),</p> <p>7) πιστάς ἢ ἀπίστους [τάς συνθήκας] <i>pistàs ē apístous [tās sunthēkas]</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.15.20),</p> <p>8) τὸν νόμον κύριον <i>tòn nómon kúrion</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.15.21),</p> <p>9) βουλευτικούς [sc. τοὺς ἀνθρώπους] <i>bouleutikóus [sc. toús anthrōpous]</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.5.14),</p> <p>10) πρὸ ὀμμάτων [τὰ κακά] <i>prò ommátōn [tā kaká]</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.8.13),</p> <p>11) μὴ ἐλεεινὰ ἅπαντα <i>mē eleeinà hápanta</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.9.5),</p> <p>12) δίκαια πολλά <i>dikaia pollá</i> 13) [τοὺς δυναμένους] σεμνοτέρους [<i>toús dunaménous</i>] <i>semnotérous</i> (Ross) : ἐμφανεστέρους <i>emphanestérous</i> (Kassel) (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.17.4), (opp. ἀδικεῖν ἔνια <i>adikeîn énia</i>) (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.12.31), 14) τὸν ἥττω λόγον κρείττω <i>tòn hēttō lógon kreíttō</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.24.11), 15) [λόγους] ὥσπερ καὶ παραβολάς [<i>lógous</i>] <i>hōsper kai parabolás</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.20.7)</p>

^aThe direct object (DO) is highlighted in a bolder font.

Table 6: κατασκευάζειν (*kataskeuázein*) + Acc.

Repeated types (with morphological variations), and list of V+SO and V+CO	Unrepeated types (occurring only once), and list of SO and CO
None	<p>CO:</p> <p>1) καὶ αὐτὸν ποιόν τινα καὶ τὸν κριτήν <i>kai hautòn poión tina kai tòn kritḗn</i> [sc. ποιόν τινα / <i>poión tina</i>] (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.1.2),</p> <p>2) ἐαυτὸν τοιοῦτον <i>heautòn toioûton</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.1.7),</p> <p>3) [τοὺς ἀκροατὰς <i>toùs akroatàs</i>] τοιούτους <i>toioutous</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.2.27)</p>

Table 7: παρασκευάζειν (*paraskeuázein*) + Acc.

Repeated types (with morphological variations), and list of V+SO and V+CO	Unrepeated types (occurring only once), and list of SO and CO
None	<p>CO:</p> <p>1) αὐτοὺς τοιούτους <i>hautòus toioutous</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.3.17),</p> <p>2) τοὺς κριτὰς τοιούτους <i>toùs kritàs toioutous</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.9.16)</p>

Table 8: ποιεῖσθαι (*poieisthai*) + Acc.

Repeated types (with morphological variations), and list of V+SO and V+CO	Unrepeated types (occurring only once), and list of SO and CO
V+SO: 1) ποιεῖσθαι τὸν λόγον ποιεῖσθαι τὸν λόγον (twice in total with variation in word order: Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.5.18, 2.18.1)	SO: 1) τὰς πίστεις τὰς <i>písteis</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.2.8), 2) τὴν κρίσιν τὴν <i>krísin</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.1.4), 3) τοὺς συλλογισμοὺς <i>toús sullogismóús</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.10.1) CO: 1) τὰς πίστεις καὶ τοὺς λόγους τὰς <i>písteis kai toús lógous</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.1.12), 2) φίλον γέροντα <i>philon géronta</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.15.14), 3) πολίτας τοὺς μισθοφόρους <i>polítas toús misthophórous</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.23.17), 4) φυγάδας τοὺς [...] διαπεπραγμένους <i>phugádas toús [...] diapepragménous</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.23.17)

Table 9: πράττειν (*práttein*) + Acc.

Repeated types (with morphological variations), and list of V+SO and V+CO	Unrepeated types (occurring only once), and list of SO and CO
V+SO: 1) πράττειν τὰ καλὰ <i>práttein tà kalá</i> (twice: Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.7.38, 2.12.12)	SO: 1) τὰ συμφέροντα <i>tà sumphéronta</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.12.12). CO: 1) τὰ συμφέροντα ἢ βλαβερὰ <i>tà sumphéronta ē blabará</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.3.6), 2) πολλὰ δίκαια <i>pollà díkaia</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.12.31).

Table 10: τιθέναι, θεῖναι (*tithénai, theînai*) + Acc.

Repeated types (with morphological variations), and list of V+SO and V+CO	Unrepeated types (occurring only once), and list of SO and CO
V+SO: 1) [νόμον θεῖναι (τεθηκέναι)] [<i>nómon theînai (tethēkénai)</i>] (thrice: Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.1.7, 1.14.4, 1.15.11, always in passive construction; hence the periphrasis is only reconstructed)	None

Table 11: φέρειν, ἐνεγκεῖν (*phérein, enenkeîn*) + Acc.

Repeated types (with morphological variations), and list of V+SO and V+CO	Unrepeated types (occurring only once), and list of SO and CO
V+SO: 1) πίστει φέρειν <i>písteis phérein</i> (twice: Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.7.40, 2.18.2), 2) φέρειν τὰ ἐνθυμήματα (ἐνθυμήματα φέρειν) <i>phérein tà enthumémata (enthumémata phérein)</i> (twice in total: Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.22.16, 2.26.3), 3) ἔνστασιν (ἐνστάσεις) φέρειν (ἐνεγκεῖν) / <i>énstasin (enstáseis) phérein (enenkeîn)</i> (five times in total: Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.25.1, 2.25.3, 2.25.5, 2.25.8, 2.26.3)	SO: 1) τεκμήριον <i>tekmeríaon</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.2.17)

Among the introversive verbs, the following components of periphrases were found most frequently in Aristotle's treatise: ἔχειν *ékhein* 'to have', 'to have the potential', λαμβάνειν *lambánein* 'to take', 'to accept', 'to admit' etc., πάσχειν *páskhein* 'to be treated', 'to suffer', 'to experience', and πράττειν *práttein* 'to experience certain fortunes', 'to fare'.

These verbs frequently direct the action towards the object (accusativus rei) and/or maintain the recipient of the profit or harm, expressed in the nominative case, although sometimes they can also be related to the subject-giver (ἐκ τινος *ék tinos*, παρά τινος *pará tinos*, ὑπό τινος *hupó tinos*). There are 64 different constructions (types) with these verbs + DOs, which occur 83 times in the text under consideration. Their brief characteristics are shown in Table 12. Table 12 serves as a numeric overview, relevant examples are provided in Table 13 to Table 18.

Table 12: Periphrases with introversive verbs

	tokens/types	repeated*	unrepeated*	types SO [†]	types with CO [†]
ἔχειν (<i>ékhein</i>) + Acc.	49 / 35	9 (9+0)	26 (18+8)	27 (9+18)	8 (0+8)
λαμβάνειν, λαβεῖν (<i>lambánein, labeîn</i>) + Acc.	27 / 23	3 (3+0)	20 (6+14)	9 (3+6)	14 (0+14)
πάσχειν, παθεῖν, πεπονθέναι (<i>páskhein, patheîn, peponthénai</i>) + Acc.	6 / 5	1 (1+0)	4 (4+0)	5	0
πράττειν <i>práttein</i> * + Acc.	1 / 1	0	1	1	0
total	83 / 64	13	51	42	22

* In the brackets, the first number indicates the amount of verb-controlled single objects, and the second number refers to complex objects and objects with attributes.

† These brackets show the data from the second and third columns.

Tables 1 and 12 show an equal number of recurrent V+CO phrases (see column 3), but the table on introversive verbs does not contain any recurrent V+CO phrases, and on the whole only 2 out of 4 (50%) of the introversive verbs have a one-time phrase of the latter type, while among the extraversive verbs, as many as 7 out of 9 (~78%) do.

Some of the verbs mentioned of both kinds, but especially the introversive ones (those listed in Table 12), form adverbial, prepositional, and parenthetical constructions. The text under study has a total of 163 of such constructions (on this see the dataset, see n. 1), with the number of non-repeated constructions

being 73; the leading type here is ἔχειν *ékhein* + adverb, called explicitly a periphrasis by Smyth³⁷ (73 occurrences of 22 different phrases).

Table 13: ἔχειν (*ékhein*) + Acc.

Repeated types	Unrepeated types (occurring only once), and list of SO and CO
SO: 1) ἔχειν διαφοράς <i>ékhein diaphorás</i> / διαφορὰν ἔχειν <i>diaphoràn ékhein</i> (twice in total: Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.1.11, 2.25.13), 2) ἔχειν ἀγαθόν <i>ékhein agathón</i> (twice: Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.2.10, 2.20.7), 3) ἔχειν (τὰς) προτάσεις <i>ékhein (tàs) protáseis</i> (thrice: Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.3.7, 1.3.8, 1.4.13), 4) ἔχειν μέγεθος <i>ékhein mégethos</i> / μέγεθος ἔχειν <i>mégethos ékhein</i> (twice: Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.7.32, 2.8.8), 5) χάριν ἔχειν <i>khárin ékhein</i> (thrice: Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.13.12, 2.7.1, 2.7.2), 6) συγγνώμην ἔχειν <i>sungnómēn ékhein</i> (twice: Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.13.16, 2.25.7), 7) δύναμιν ἔχειν <i>dúnamin ékhein</i> / ἔχειν δύναμιν <i>ékhein dúnamin</i> (four times in total: Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.5.4, 2.5.5, 2.5.8, 2.5.17), 8) λόγον ἔχειν (τινός) <i>lógon ékhein (tinòs)</i> (twice: Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.6.14, 2.6.15), 9) ἔχειν τὰ ἦθη <i>ékhein tà êthē</i> / ἦθος ἔχειν <i>êthos ékhein</i> (thrice: Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 12.17.1, 2.17.5, 2.21.16).	SO: 1) ἐπιστήμην <i>epistēmēn</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.1.12), 2) τὸ πιστόν <i>tò pistón</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.15.26), 3) τέχνας <i>tékhnas</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.2.12), 4) τὰς ἀρχάς <i>tàs arkhás (tinòs)</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.2.21), 5) μοχθηρίαν <i>mokhthērian</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.10.4), 6) κακόν <i>kakón</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.11.8), 7) ἐπιθυμίαν <i>epithumían</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.11.14), 8) ἀπολογίαν <i>apologían</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.12.7), 9) πρόφασιν <i>próphasin</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.12.23), 10) κότον <i>kóton</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.2.7), 11) τιμὴν <i>timēn</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.2.6), 12) τὴν ὑπουργίαν <i>tēn hupourgían</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.7.4), 13) βοήθειαν <i>boētheian</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.21.15), 14) δόξας <i>dóxas</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.21.15), 15) ὠφέλειαν <i>ōphéleian</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.21.16), 16) δίκην <i>dikēn</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.3.5), 17) τὴν αἰτίαν <i>tēn aitían</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.24.4), 18) ἔνστασιν <i>énstasin</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.25.10).

³⁷Smyth (1920: §1438): “An adverb with ἔχειν [*ékhein*] or διακεῖσθαι [*diakeîsthai*] is often used as a periphrasis for an adjective with εἶναι [*eînai*] or for a verb.”

6 Support-verb constructions and other periphrases in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*

Table 14: ἔχειν (*ékhein*) + Acc. (continued from previous table)

Repeated types	Unrepeated types (occurring only once), and list of SO and CO
none	<p>CO:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) οὐδέν, ὃ τι λέγωσιν (ἄν) <i>oudén, hó ti légōsin (án)</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.1.4), 2) ὃ τι ἀπολέσει <i>hó ti apolései</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.12.8), 3) κυριωτάτην πίστιν <i>kuriōtātēn pístin</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.2.4), 4) κοινὸν εἶδος <i>koinòn eîdos</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.9.35), 5) τὸ ἡδὺ καὶ τὸ καλόν <i>tò hēdù kai tò kalón</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.12.27), 6) δύναμιν μεγάλην <i>dúnamin megálēn</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.5.2), 7) μίαν χρήσιν <i>mían khṛēsín</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.21.16), 8) πλείω τῶν ὑπαρχόντων <i>pleiō tōn huparkhóntōn</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.22.11)

Table 15: λαμβάνειν, λαβεῖν (*lambánein, labeîn*) + Acc.

Repeated types	Unrepeated types (occurring only once), and list of SO and CO
<p>SO:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) λαμβάνειν/λαβεῖν πίστεις <i>lambánein/ labeîn písteis</i> (thrice in total: Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.2.7 (aor.), Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.6.30 (adj.verb.), Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.8.7), 2)) λαβεῖν / λαμβάνειν προτάσεις <i>labeîn/ lambánein protáseis</i> (twice: Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.3.9 (aor.), Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.9.2 (adj.verb.)), 3) λαμβάνειν / εἰληφέναι τιμωρίαν <i>lambánein/ eilēphénai timōrían</i> (twice: Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.3.13 (aor. pass.: ληφθεῖσα τιμωρία <i>lēphtheîsa timōría</i>), Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.3.14 (pf.)).^a 	<p>SO:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) δίκην <i>díkēn</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.14.2), 2) [ὄρκους <i>hórkous</i>] (omitted Acc.) (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.15.27), 3) τὰς αὐξήσεις <i>tàs auxéseis</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.19.26), 4) συμφοράς <i>sumphorás</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.23.20), 5) [δόξας <i>dóxas</i>] (restored Acc. from pass. <i>eilēmménai dóxai</i>) (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.18.2), 6) [τοὺς τόπους <i>toùs tóπους</i>] (from pass. <i>eilēmménoi ... hoi tópoi</i>) (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.22.16).

^aAs can be seen, there is some modification rather than a precise replication of the construction.

Table 16: λαμβάνειν, λαβεῖν (*lambánein, labeîn*) + Acc. (continued from previous table)

Repeated types	Unrepeated types (occurring only once), and list of SO and CO
CO:	
1) τὰ στοιχεῖα καὶ τὰς προτάσεις <i>tà stoikheia kai tās protáseis</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.2.22),	
2) τὰ στοιχεῖα περὶ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ συμφέροντος ὁπλῶς <i>tà stoikheia perì agathoû kai sumphérontos haplōs</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.6.1),	
3) νοῦν καὶ φρόνησιν <i>noûn kai phrónēsin</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.7.3),	
4) <i>toúnoma touûto</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.8.4),	
5) τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ἢ δοκοῦντα ὑπάρχειν <i>tà hupárkhonta ḥ dokoûnta hupárkhein</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.22.8),	
6) τὸ τί ἐστὶ <i>tò tí esti</i> (2.23.20),	
7) <i>tò kathólou</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.25.8),	
8) ψεῦδός τι <i>pseûdós ti</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.26.4),	
9) τὰ σύνεγγυς τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν ὡς ταῦτ' ὄντα <i>tà súnengus toîs hupárkhousin hōs tautà ónta</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.9.28),	
10) τὰ ἀπὸ τύχης <i>tà apò túkhēs</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.9.32),	
11) τὰ συμφέροντα καὶ τὰ ἡδέα <i>sumphéronta kai tà hēdéa</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.10.19),	
12) πόσα καὶ ποῖα <i>pósa kai poîa</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.10.19),	
13) τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο ὡς διὰ τοῦτο <i>tò metà touûto hōs dià touûto</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.24.8),	
14) τὴν Δημοσθένους πολιτείαν ... κακῶν αἰτίαν <i>tēn Dēmōsthénous politeían ... kakōn aitían</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.24.8)	

6 Support-verb constructions and other periphrases in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*

Table 17: *πάσχειν, παθεῖν, πεπονθέναι* (*páskhein, patheîn, pepon-thénai*) + Acc.

Repeated types	Unrepeated types (occurring only once), and list of SO and CO
SO: 1) <i>πάσχειν κακά / κακόν páskhein kaká / kakón</i> (twice in total: Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.13.18, 2.3.14)	SO: 1) <i>ἀγαθὰ agathá</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.13.18), 2) <i>τὸ ἔσχατον tò éskhaton</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.3.16), 3) <i>anáxia</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.12.15), 4) <i>τὸ αὐτό tò autó</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.20.5)

Table 18: *πράττειν práttein**

Repeated types	Unrepeated types (occurring only once), and list of SO and CO
None	SO: <i>μεγála πράττειν megála práttein</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.10.2) ("experience great things (great fortunes)")

However, the general weakening of the semantic function of the verb and the closeness of the syntactic-semantic link between the verb and the adverb are important features that suggest parallels between verb + adverb phrases and SVCs (e.g. between phrases such as *εὖ ἔχειν eũ ékhein* and *χάριν ἔχειν khárin ékhein*). Since some of these constructions undergo a semantic change in the properties of the verb (the meaning is or seems to be non-literal) and the overall meaning of the expression is perceived only in the light of some non-literal interpretation. Periphrases of this kind resemble idioms.³⁸

Combining the data in the two tables, the following 23 phrases fall more or less into the category of SVC-type periphrases (in alphabetical order of the verbs). As can be seen from this list, a large proportion of these have lexical verbs that correspond to them in their core meaning (only verbs that are rare or absent in Aristotle's texts and in Attic dialect texts close to his time are marked with a question mark; to be sure, the significant details of these correspondences still need to be checked):

³⁸Idioms not *in sensu lato*, as one finds in Mastronarde (2013) (passim, see esp. examples with *ἔχω ékhō* and *πράττω práttō* and adverbs on pp. 103–104), but in a stricter sense as described in Everaert (2010) and Bruening (2020).

1. χάριν διδόναι (ἀποδιδόναι, ἀνταποδιδόναι) *khárin didónai (apodidónai, antapodidónai)* (1+1+1=3) ‘to give/return favour’ = χαρίζειν *kharízein*, χαρίζεσθαι *kharízesthai*;
2. δοῦναι δίκην *doûnai díkēn* (3) ‘to give right satisfaction’, ‘to suffer punishment’ = ζημιοῦσθαι *zēmioûsthai* (cf. Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1.9.15);
3. ἔχειν διαφοράν *ékhein diaphorán (diaphorás)* (2) ‘to have difference(s)’ = διαφέρειν *diaphéreîn*;
4. ἔχειν δύναμιν *ékhein dúnamin* (5) ‘to have power’ = δύνασθαι *dúnasthai*; ἔχειν ἐπιστήμην *ékhein epistémēn* (1) ‘to have knowledge’ = ἐπίστασθαι *epístasthai*;
5. ἔχειν μέγεθος *ékhein mégethos* (2) ‘to have size, importance’ = μεγαθεῖσθαι *megethoûsthai* (?);
6. ἔχειν συγγνώμην *ékhein sungnómēn* (2) ‘to have compassion/forgiveness’ = συγγιγνώσκειν *sungignóskein*;
7. χάριν ἔχειν *khárin ékhein* (3) ‘to have gratitude’ = χαρίζεσθαι *kharízesthai*;
8. λαμβάνειν τιμωρίαν *lambánein timōrían* (2) ‘to obtain retaliation’ = τιμωρεῖσθαι *timōreîsthai*;
9. λέγειν (εἰπεῖν) ἐνθυμήματα *légein (eipeîn) enthumémata* (4) ‘to speak up enthymemes/pieces of reasoning’ = ἐνθυμεῖσθαι *enthumeîsthai*;
10. λέγειν ἔπαινον *légein épainon* (1) ‘to say a word of praise’ = ἐπαινεῖν *epaineîn*;
11. λέγειν τᾷ ἀληθείᾳ *légein talēthē* (1) ‘to speak the truth’ = ἀληθεύειν *alētheúein*;
12. λέγειν τὰ ψευδῆ *légein tà pseudē* (1) ‘to tell lies’ = ψευδολογεῖν *pseudologeîn*;
13. λέγειν τὰς γνώμας *légein tàs gnōmas* (1) ‘to say maxims’ = γνωμολογεῖν *gnōmologeîn*;
14. λέγειν ὑποθήκας *légein hupothékas* (1) ‘to tell advice’ = ὑποτιθέναι *hupotithénai* / ὑποτίθεσθαι *hupotíthesthai*;

15. λέγειν ψόγον *légein psógon* (1) 'to say a word of blame' = ψέγειν *pségein*;
16. ποιεῖσθαι τὰς πίστεις *poieîsthai tàs písteis* (2) 'to produce proofs/means of persuasion' = πιστοῦν *pistoûn* (?);
17. ποιεῖσθαι τὴν κρίσιν *poieîsthai tèn krísin* (1) 'to make a judgement' = κρίνειν *krínein*;
18. ποιεῖσθαι τὸν λόγον (λόγους) *poieîsthai tòn lógon (lógous)* (2+1=3) 'to make/give a speech' = λέγειν *légein*;
19. ποιεῖσθαι τοὺς συλλογισμούς *poieîsthai toûs sullogismούς* (1) 'to make syllogisms' = συλλογίζεσθαι *sullogízesthai*;
20. φέρειν ἐνθυμήματα *phérein enthumémata* (2) 'to provide enthymemes / pieces of reasoning' = ἐνθυμεῖσθαι *enthumeîsthai*;
21. φέρειν ἔνστασιν *phérein éntasin* (5) 'to bring (forward) an objection' = ἐνιστάσθαι *enístasthai*;
22. φέρειν πίστεις *phérein písteis* (2) 'to provide proof/means of persuasion' = πιστοῦν *pistoûn* (?).

So far, two or three criteria have been used to distinguish these expressions: (1) in most of these, the verb has a more or less³⁹ reduced semantic role and acts as a syntactic operator to convey the basic concept referred to by the noun, while (2) the latter, with few exceptions (cf. δοῦναι δίκην *doûnai díkēn*), retains its basic meaning; (3) the above list contains provisional one-word equivalents of the phrases, implying that they are possible periphrases, or phraseological alternations, of individual verbs.

In addition, many of these expressions seem to be transformable into nominal phrases without changing the noun's core meaning⁴⁰ (e.g. ἀδικία δύναμιν ἔχουσα *adikía dúnamin ékhousa* (Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 2.5.4), 'injustice that has power' > *ἀδικίας δύναμις *adikías dúnamis*, 'the power of injustice'), but in reality it is very rare to find in the texts of Aristotle and his contemporaries the nominalisations equivalent to the phrases at hand. So there is still more to discover here,

³⁹ ἔχειν *ékhein* and ποιεῖσθαι *poieîsthai*, for example, are less specific because they do not imply a clear instrument and situation for the action, whereas λέγειν *légein* and φέρειν *phérein* hint either at the mental/linguistic/rhetorical world and the organs and instruments involved in the action, or at a dramatic change of situation.

⁴⁰ On this important criterion for the identification of SVCs/LVCs, see e.g. Jiménez López (2016: 190–191) and Kovalevskaitė et al. (2020: 8).

and the number of SVC-type periphrases may change after additional categorisation.

A broader intertextual investigation is also needed to reveal whether there is any regularity, in that different verbs are used with the base noun for similar meanings (e.g. χάριν διδόναι *khárin didónai* ‘to give/express favour’ and χάριν ἔχειν *khárin ékhein* ‘to have gratitude’, ποιεῖσθαι τὰς πίστεις *poieîsthai tàs písteis* ‘to produce proofs’ and φέρειν πίστεις *phéreîn písteis* ‘to bring/provide proofs’). Similarly, the reason why the author prefers the periphrases ἔχειν συγγνώμην *ekhein sungnómēn* and λέγειν ἔπαινον *légein épainon* to the forms with ποιεῖσθαι *poieîsthai* recorded in other contemporary writings remains to be clarified.⁴¹

The material under study contains the following most common nouns in SVC-type periphrases: ἐνθύμημα *enthýmēma* (6) ‘enthymeme’, ‘piece of reasoning’, δύναμις *dúnamis* (5) ‘power’, ἔνστασις *énstasis* (5) ‘objection’, πίστις *pístis* (4) ‘proof’, λόγος *lógos* (3) ‘speech’, χάρις *kháris* (3) ‘favour’, ‘gratitude’. These are abstract nouns, and given the Aristotelian concept of rhetoric, which assigns specific weight to various forms of persuasion and psychological effect, some of them could be classified as part of his rhetorical ‘technolect’. Their verbal partners may vary (e.g. ἐνθύμημα *enthýmēma* goes with λέγειν *légein* and φέρειν *phéreîn*, χάρις *kháris* with διδόναι *didónai* and ἔχειν *ékhein*). Common objects include the neuter adjectives κακόν *kakón* and ἀγαθόν *agathón* representing either nouns or adverbs (i.e. typical derivatives of abstract adjectives). However, adverbial periphrases are more common here, the four following constructions being the most frequent: οὕτως ἔχειν *houtōs ékhein* (26), πῶς ἔχειν *pōs ékhein* (17), εὖ ποιεῖν *eũ poieîn* (12) and εὖ πάσχειν *eũ páskhein* (9) (40% of the 163 adverbial and adverbial-like constructions and over 18% of the 350 verbal phrases selected from the currently analysed portion of Aristotle’s text).

7 On the stylistic function of the support-verb-construction-type periphrases

As already mentioned (see the discussion above of stylistic tactics of brachylogy and macrology), periphrases can be classified according to their stylistic function. They indicate the author’s taste and intentions (aesthetic or pragmatic):

⁴¹Cf. Herodotus, *Histories* 2.110: Δαρεῖον ... λέγουσι ... συγγνώμην ποιήσασθαι *Dareïon ... légousi ... sungnómēn poiēsasthai*; Lysias, *Pro milite* 22: ὑπὲρ τῶν περιφανῶν ἀδικημάτων συγγνώμην ποιεῖσθε... *hypèr tōn periphanōn adikēmátōn sungnómēn poieîsthe...*; Plato, *Politicus*. 286c5-7: χρὴ δὴ μεμνημένους ἐμὲ καὶ σὲ τῶν νῦν εἰρημένων τόν τε ψόγον ἐκάστοτε καὶ ἔπαινον ποιεῖσθαι *khre̐ dē memnēménous emē kai sē tōn nūn eirēménōn tón te psógon hekástote kai épainon poieîsthai*.

either he/she aims at artistic effect (*ornatus*⁴²) or seeks to improve comprehensibility, maintain *decorum* (e.g. avoiding *verba obsцена*), or put a spontaneously caught thought into words. Thus, the expressions we encounter have their different occasion-related backgrounds: some are easy to grasp, others unclear due to an irregular sentence structure; some are often repeated, others are rare, occasional, and experimental.

A noteworthy stylistic phenomenon is the switching back and forth between MWEs and their shorter equivalents, the mutual substitution of words and phrases to avoid monotony and tautology. A good example of this alternation or variation (μεταβολή *metabolē* or ἐναλλαγή *enallagē* in Greek rhetorical terms)⁴³ is in Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 2.19, see (5), which deals with the topic of the possible and the impossible. Here the expression δυνατός ἐστι *dunatós esti* alternates with the verb δύναται *dúnatai* or with its own semantic head, the adjective δυνατός *dunatós*, omitting the copula:

- (5) ἄν δὲ τὸ ἐναντίον ἢ δυνατόν
 àn dè tò enantíon ēi dunatòn
 if but ART.NOM contrary.thing.NOM COP.PRS.SBJV.3SG possible.NOM
 ἢ εἶναι ἢ γενέσθαι, καὶ τὸ ἐναντίον
 ē eīnai ē genésthai, kai tò enantíon
 either be.PRS.INF or become.AOR.INF and ART.NOM contrary.thing.NOM
 δόξειεν ἄν εἶναι δυνατόν, οἷον εἰ
 dóxeien àn eīnai dunatón, hoïon ei
 seem.AOR.OPT.3SG PRT COP.INF possible.NOM for.instance if
 δυνατόν ἄνθρωπον ὑγιασθῆναι, καὶ νοσήσαι.
 dunatón ánthrōpon hugiasthēnai, kai nosēsai.
 possible.NOM.SG.N man.ACC.SG cure.AOR.INF.PASS and fall.ill.AOR.INF.ACT
 καὶ εἰ τὸ ὅμοιον δυνατόν, καὶ τὸ
 kai ei tò hómoion dunatón, kai tò
 and if ART.NOM similar.thing.NOM possible.NOM so.and ART.NOM
 ὅμοιον [...] καὶ οὗ ἢ ἀρχὴ
 hómoion [...] kai hoũ hē arkhē
 similar.thing.NOM [...] and REL.GEN ART.NOM beginning.NOM

⁴²On the functions of the periphrasis (esp. according to Quintilian's theory), see Lausberg (1998: §592, 269–270).

⁴³Lausberg (1998: §509, 236): other names for 'grammatical changes', but actually more complex inversions: ἐναλλαγή, ἑτεροίωσις, ἀλλοίωσις, ὑπαλλαγή *exallagē*, *heteroíōsis*, *alloíōsis*, *hupal-lagē*, *mutatio*.

δύνανται **γενέσθαι**, καὶ τὸ τέλος· οὐδὲν
dúnatai *genésthai*, *kai* *tò* *télos*; [...]

be.possible.PRS.IND.3SG become.AOR.INF so.and ART.NOM end.NOM [...]

γὰρ γίγνεται οὐδ' ἄρχεται γίγνεσθαι τῶν ἀδυνάτων
kai hoũ tò télos, kai hē arkhē

and REL.GEN ART.NOM end.NOM so.and ART.NOM beginning.NOM

[...] καὶ οὗ τὸ τέλος, καὶ ἡ ἀρχὴ **δυνατή**
dunaté
 possible.NOM

'If of two contrary things it is possible that one should exist or come into existence, then it would seem that the other is equally possible; for instance, if a man can be cured, he can also be ill; [...] Similarly, if of two like things the one is possible, so also is the other. [...] Again, if the beginning is possible, so also is the end; [...] And when the end is possible, so also is the beginning'

(Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 2.19.1-2, 1392a8-12; Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 2.19.5, 1392a15-19, translation by J. H. Freese).

Some further examples of the alternation of periphrases (boldfaced) and their one-word equivalents can be found in (6).

(6) Periphrases and their one-word alternatives

- a. **συγγνώμην ἔχειν** vs συγγινώσκειν
sungnómēn ékhein vs *sunginóskein*

ἐφ' οἷς τε γὰρ δεῖ **συγγνώμην ἔχειν**, ἐπιεικῇ ταῦτα, καὶ τὸ τὰ ἀμαρτήματα καὶ τὰ ἀδικήματα μὴ τοῦ ἴσου ἀξιοῦν, μηδὲ τὰ ἀμαρτήματα καὶ τὰ ἀτυχήματα. [...] καὶ τὸ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις συγγινώσκειν ἐπιεικές.

*eph' hoĩs te gàr deĩ **sungnómēn ékhein**, epieikē taũta, kai tò tà hamartémata kai tà adikémata mē toũ ísou axioũn, mēdè tà hamartémata kai tà atukhémata; [...] kai tò toĩs anthrōpinois sunginóskein epieikés.* (Aristotle, *Rhetoric*. 1.13.15-16, 1374b4-11)

- b. **εὖ ποιεῖν** vs (ἀντ)ευποιεῖν
eũ poieĩn vs *(ant)eupoieĩn*

τὸ χάριν ἔχειν τῷ **ποιήσαντι** εὖ καὶ ἀντευποιεῖν τὸν εὖ **ποιήσαντα**
*tò khárin ékhein tōi **poiésanti** eũ kai anteupoieĩn tòn eũ **poiésanta***
 (Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1.13.12, 1374a23-24)

- c. συμφέρειν vs βλαβερὸν εἶναι
sumphéreîn vs blaberòn eînai

οὐδὲν γὰρ κωλύει ἐνίῳτε ταὐτὸ συμφέρειν τοῖς ἐναντίοις· ὅθεν λέγεται ὡς τὰ κακὰ συνάγει τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ὅταν ἢ ταὐτὸ βλαβερὸν ἀμφοῖν
oudèn gàr kōlúei eníote tautò sumphéreîn toîs enantíois; hóthen légetai hōs tà kakà sunágei toûs anthrṓpous, hótan ēi tautò blaberòn amphoîn. (Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1.6.20, 1362b37-1363a1)

- d. ἀδικεῖν vs δίκαια πράττειν/ποιεῖν
adikeîn vs díkaia práttein/poieîn

καὶ οὗς ἀδικήσαντες δυνήσονται πολλὰ δίκαια πράττειν, ὡς ῥαδίως ἰασόμενοι, ὥσπερ ἔφη Ἰάσων ὁ Θετταλὸς δεῖν ἀδικεῖν ἔνια, ὅπως δύνηται καὶ δίκαια πολλὰ ποιεῖν
kai hoûs adikḗsantes dunḗsontai pollà díkaia práttein, hōs rhadíōs iasómenoi, hōsper éphē Iásōn ho Thettalòs deîn adikeîn énia, hópōs dúnētai kai díkaia pollà poieîn. (Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1.12.31, 1373a24-27)

- e. πράττειν κακῶς vs κακοπραγεῖν
práttein kakṓs vs kakoprageîn

δεῖ γὰρ ἐπὶ μὲν τοῖς ἀναξίως πράττουσι κακῶς συνάχθῃσθαι καὶ ἐλεεῖν, τοῖς δὲ εὖ νεμεσᾶν[...] ὁ μὲν γὰρ λυπούμενος ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀναξίως κακοπραγοῦσιν ἡσθήσεται ἢ ἄλυπος ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐναντίως κακοπραγοῦσιν, οἷον τοὺς πατραλοίας καὶ μαιφόνους, ὅταν τύχῃσι τιμωρίας, οὐδεὶς ἂν λυπηθεῖν χρηστός
deî gàr epì mèn toîs anaxíōs prátτουςι kakṓs sunákthēsthai kai eleeîn, toîs dè eû nemesân;[...] ho mèn gàr lupóúmenos epì toîs anaxíōs kakopragoûsin hēsthēsetai ē álupos éstai epì toîs enantíōs kakopragoûsin, hoîon toûs patraloías kai miaiphónous, hótan túkhōsi timōrias, oudeis àn lupētheíē khrēstós (Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 2.9.2-4, 1386b12-29)

In examples (6a)–(6e), the interchange is rather veiled, e.g. the periphrasis συγγνώμην ἔχειν *sunghnómēn ékhein* in (6a) is replaced by the verb συγγινώσκειν *sunghinóskein* only in the next sentence; the compound verb ἀντ-ευποιεῖν *ant-eupoieîn* in (6b) echoes the phrase εὖ ποιήσαντα *eû poiésanta* (the prefix hides the equivalent of the periphrasis); the verb συμφέρειν *sumphéreîn* in (6c) corresponds to the nominal phrase βλαβερὸν εἶναι *blaberòn eînai* of opposite meaning,

which is interchangeable with the verb βλάπτειν *bláptein* (antonym to συμφέρειν *sumphéreîn*); similarly, the verb ἀδικεῖν *adikeîn* (with complement ἔνια *énia*) in (6d) parallels the opposite phrase δίκαια πολλὰ ποιεῖν *dikaia pollà poieîn*, while κακοπραγεῖν *kakoprageîn* mirrors πράττειν κακῶς *práttein kakōs* in (6e). All this shows that Aristotle actively employed not only analytic but also synthetic constructions, i.e., he alternated the tactics of macrology and brachylogy.

Periphrases with other verbs (less frequent or with non-accusative objects) were not considered, but some possible candidates for SVC-type and Verb-Prepositional Phrase Construction (V-PC)-type periphrases were noted. A few examples can be seen in Table 19.

The variety of periphrases is of course not limited to the verbal periphrases mentioned in this chapter. At least three other types of periphrasis can be identified in the present text: 1) the verbal periphrasis *sensu stricto*,⁴⁴ with disputed terminological purity, most thoroughly studied by Klaas Bentein (Bentein 2016);⁴⁵ 2) a certain kind of elaborated periphrasis which replaces parts of the sentence and makes use of articular infinitives⁴⁶ with complements, and 3) combinations of verbal adjectives in -τός (-*tós*), -τή (-*tḗ*), -τόν (-*tón*), or -τικός (-*tikós*), -τική (-*tikḗ*), -τικόν (-*tikón*) with copular verbs.⁴⁷

⁴⁴Of the type γεγονώς εἰμι *gegonós eimi* or γεγενημένοι ἦσαν *gegenēménoi ēsan*.

⁴⁵A couple of examples of such periphrases in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* include: ἔστι δ' ἀπὸ τύχης μὲν τὰ τοιαῦτα **γιννόμενα** *ésti d' apò túkhēs mèn tà toiaûta gignómena* (Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1.10.12, 1369a32; cf. Bentein 2016: 92) and καὶ ἐὰν μείζον κακὸν **πεπονθότες** ὦσιν *kai eàn meizon kakòn peponthótes ōsin*, (Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 2.3.14, 1380b14; cf. Bentein 2016: 128 n.87).

⁴⁶On articular infinitives see Smyth (1920: §§2025–2037). Aristotle's *Rhetoric* has no shortage of such periphrases, ranging from 2 to 10 words. A couple of examples of longer periphrases include: τὸ παρὰ μικρὸν σώζεσθαι ἐκ τῶν κινδύνων *tò parà mikròn sōzesthai ek tōn kindúnōn* (Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1.11.24, 1371b10–11), τὸ τὰ ἁμαρτήματα καὶ τὰ ἀδικήματα μὴ τοῦ ἴσου ἀξιοῦν' *tò tà hamartēmata kai tà adikēmata mē tou isou axiōūn* (Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1.13.16, 1374b4–5), τὸ ἢ μηδὲν γεγενῆσθαι ἀγαθὸν ἢ γενομένων μὴ εἶναι ἀπόλαυσιν *tò ē mēdēn gegenēsthai agathòn ē genoménōn mē eînai apólausin* (Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 2.8.11, 1386a15–16).

⁴⁷The latter type, not examined by us at present, would be considered a 'true periphrasis' in Lausberg's rhetorical terminology, as it avoids the mention of the *verbum proprium*. The following is one example of such a periphrasis in Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 2.12.3, 1389a3–5: οἱ μὲν οὖν νέοι τὰ ἡθῆ **εἰσὶν ἐπιθυμητικοί** [...] καὶ τῶν περὶ τὸ σῶμα ἐπιθυμῶν μάλιστα **ἀκολουθητικοί** **εἰσι** τῇ περὶ τὰ ἀφροδίσια *hoi mèn oūn néoi tà ēthē eisin epithumētikoi [...] kai tōn perì tò sōma epithumiōn málista akolouthētikoi eisi tē perì tà aphrodísia* 'In terms of their character, the young are prone to desires [...]. Of the desires of the body they are most inclined to pursue that relating to sex' (translation by G. A. Kennedy).

Table 19: Further SVC candidates

SVC-type periphrasis	V-PC-type periphrasis
οὐχ ἑνὸς σώματος ἀγαπᾶν ἀπόλαυσιν <i>oukh henôs sômatos agapân apólausin</i> ⁴⁸ (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.23.8, 1398a23) > ἀγαπᾶν ἀπόλαυσιν <i>agapân apólausin</i> 'to be fond of enjoyment' [= ἀπολαύειν <i>apolaúein</i> ?] τοῖς κακὰ ἀγγέλλουσιν <i>tois kakà angéllousin</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.2.20, 1379b20) > ἀγγέλλειν κακὰ <i>angéllein kaká</i> 'to report bad news' [= κακαγγελεῖν <i>kakangelein</i> ^{50?}]	πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ... τείνει ταῦτα <i>prôs alétheian ... teínei taúta</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.7.40, 1365b15) > τείνειν πρὸς ἀλήθειαν <i>teinein prôs alétheian</i> ⁴⁹ ('to point to the truth') πίπτειν, πεσεῖν, ἐμπίπτειν + εἰς + Acc./ <i>píptein, peseîn, emípítein + eis + Acc.</i> πίπτει ... ἡ αὐξήσις εἰς τοὺς ἐπαίνους / <i>píptei ... hē aúxēsis eis toús epáinous</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 1.9.39, 1368a23) > πίπτειν εἰς τοὺς ἐπαίνους / <i>píptein eis toús epáinous</i> 'to fall among forms of praise' [= προσκεῖσθαι / <i>proskeísthai</i> / προσεῖναι τοῖς ἐπαίνοις? / <i>proseînai tois epáinois?</i>] οὐδὲ τοῖς κακῶς δεδρακόσιν ἀκουσίως δίκαιον εἰς ὀργὴν πεσεῖν / <i>oudè tois kakôs dedrakósin akousiôs dikaion eis orgēn peseîn</i> ⁵¹ (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.23.1, 1397a13-14, quoted from unknown drama) 'it is unjust to fall into anger at those who have unwillingly done wrong' > εἰς ὀργὴν πίπτειν (πεσεῖν) / <i>eis orgēn píptein(peseîn)</i> [= ὀργίζεσθαι, ἐξαγριοῦσθαι / <i>orgízesthai, exagri-ousthai</i>] εἰς τὴν ἔλλειψιν ἐμπίπτει / <i>eis tēn élleipsin emípítei</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.24.7, 1401b29) 'it... falls under the [the fallacy of] omission' > εἰς τὴν ἔλλειψιν ἐμπίπτειν / <i>eis tēn élleipsin emípítein</i>
προσηκόν εἶναι τῷδ' ὀφείλεσθαι χάριν <i>prosekon eînai tōid' ophéilesthai khárin</i> (Aristotle, <i>Rhetoric</i> 2.23.1, 1397a16, from an unknown drama) > χάρις ὀφείλεται <i>kháris ophéiletai</i> (pass. pro act.) > χάριν ὀφείλειν <i>khárin ophéilein</i> 'owe gratitude'	

⁴⁸The phrase is intertextually connected with Isocrates, *Speech* 1.27: ἀγάπα τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ἀγαθῶν μὴ τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν κτήσιν ἀλλὰ τὴν μετρίαν ἀπόλαυσιν *agápa tōn huparkhón-ton agathōn mē tēn tēn hyperbállousan ktēsin allā tēn metrían apólausin* 'value not the excessive acquisition of the goods that accrue to you, but the moderate enjoyment of them'. Cf. also Aristotle's paraphrase recorded in another treatise: διὸ καὶ τὸν βίον ἀγαπῶσι τὸν ἀπολαυστικόν *diò kai tòn bión agapōsi tòn apolaustikón* (Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1095b17 Bekker) 'therefore they value (are fond of) the life based on enjoyment'.

⁴⁹In various texts of Aristotle's contemporaries, only the combination of the verb and preposition πρὸς *prós* is repeated (cf. Plato, *Symposium* 188d2-3, Plato, *Republic* 526d9-e1 et al.), sometimes with a prefix (συν-τείνειν *sun-teinein*, 'direct earnestly (to)', 'tend/contribute (towards)'), while the combination with ἀλήθειαν *alétheian* is very rare (used by Aristotle himself only in the quoted passage and in Aristotle, *Topica* 104b1-2, and never by his contemporaries).

⁵⁰The verb κακαγγελεῖν *kakangelein* 'bring evil tidings' is attested once with Demosthenes, cf. Demosthenes, *De Corona* 267, as a quotation from an unidentified tragedy.

⁵¹Cf. Euripides, *Orestes* 696: ὅταν γὰρ ἤβῃ δῆμος εἰς ὀργὴν πεσὼν *hótan gār hēbē dēmos eis orgēn*

8 Conclusions

Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, the source of the phraseology of the fourth-century BC Attic dialect studied in this chapter, is a complex, multi-layered text in which the language of Athens at the height of Athenian drama and oratory is intertwined with Aristotle's scholarly vocabulary and rhetorical 'technolect', and with the phraseology of various dialectal varieties and genres of text, presented as quotations.

An empirical examination of two thirds of this source (Books 1 and 2, covering over 32,500 words) showed that it contains no less than 350 verb-based phrases with popular accusative-taking verbs, of which 23 are of the SVC type. The most important criteria for identifying this type of expressions are the role of the verb as a syntactic operator with a reduced meaning, the semantic dominance of the abstract noun or noun-like adjective, the existence of a one-word equivalent (of the type ποιῆσθαι τὸν λόγον *poiēsthai tòn lōgon* = λέγειν *légein*), and the repetitiveness of the phrase. Other criteria are more difficult to verify due to the lack of textual evidence.

The set of 350 verb-based phrases also includes up to more than 150 verb-noun combinations with the same semantically flexible verbs, and more than 160 combinations with adverbs and complex complements. This contributes to the discussion on the concept of SVC, as it is hypothesised that a support verb can also be a seemingly lexically complete causative verb (such as ποιεῖν *poiēin* 'to do, make') with an accusative duplex, or a subject-oriented transitive verb (such as ἔχειν *ékhein* 'to have'), that drastically changes meaning when used in combinations with adverbs.

Theoretical reflection on the terms and their corresponding phenomena has shown that the linguistic terms MWE, SVC, and others, which are applied universally to phraseological phenomena in various languages, can in principle also account for Ancient Greek phenomena. At the same time, concepts invented by users of Ancient Greek themselves, such as 'periphrasis', or epithets designating stylistic strategies ('macrological', 'brachylogical'), etc., also prove to be descriptively adequate.

Periphrasis is a term that has survived from Graeco-Roman rhetoric into modern linguistics to describe the substitution of a short lexical unit (a word) by a

pesón 'when the people youthfully rave, drowning in anger'. Cf. also: *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* 80, v.1-2 (Nauck 1889):

εἶπερ γὰρ οὐδὲ τοῖς κακῶς δεδρακόσιν

ἀκουσίως δίκαιον εἰς ὀργὴν πεσεῖν

eíper gàr oudè toîs kakōs dedrakósîn

akousiōs dikaion eis orgēn peseîn 'if it is not right to be angry with those who have done wrong involuntarily'.

longer one (a combination of two or more words). The description of the periphrasis by the second-century-AD rhetorician Alexander Numenius, with appropriate examples, matches well in its content with what is nowadays labeled SVC. Since the term 'periphrasis', defined more strictly in linguistic contexts with emphasis on its grammatical function (as a cell-filler for a grammatical paradigm) does not stand in contradiction with the original meaning of the concept, the substitution of one word by two or more words, it may be the key to a possible solution for the terminological problem of reconciling the MWEs and the various phraseological units: the use of the term periphrasis as a synonym for the MWE, provided that both indicate substitution or alternation.

The idea of the dichotomy between the change of valency and the inherent meaning of verbs, inspired by the theories of valency and transitivity change and their possible parallel in Aristotle's conception of the conditions of the effective speech (ἦθος, πάθος, λόγος *ēthos, páthos, lógos*), supports a simplified dichotomous classification of transitive verbs into introversive and extraversive ones, which in turn may help in the future to better assess the nuances of the semantic contribution of verbs in periphrases (or MWEs) to the overall meaning of a phrase.

The author's personal style, scientific interests, aesthetic and occasional preferences (represented by the 'macrological' and 'brachylogical' alternatives) undoubtedly affected the variety and alternation of phrases contained in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. This stylistic flexibility demonstrates the expressive capability of the Greek language, as well as each author's creative contribution to the overall phraseological 'bank' of the language.

Abbreviations

AM	Agent marker	LVC	Light-verb construction
AS	Agent-role subject	MWE	Multi-word expression
CO	Complex object	SO	Single object
CP	Compositional phrase	V+CO	Verb with a complex object
DO	Direct object	V+SO	Verb with a single object
FVC	Function-verb construction		

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank Victoria Beatrix Fendel, Leverhulme Trust Early Career Fellow at the Faculty of Classics, University of Oxford, and

her team for organising the excellent conference on SVCs in the Greek corpora and the fruitful discussions on this topic in September 2023, as well as for the step-by-step encouragement and advice that helped me write and edit the chapter. I am especially grateful to the reviewers for their constructive criticism and comments, which encouraged me to recognise new nuances, and for their accurate observations of the weaknesses and strengths of my work. My special thanks go to Matthew Ireland for the distant introductory lesson on working with Overleaf projects. I would also like to thank my colleague from the Department of French Philology at Vilnius University, Antanas Keturakis, for a brief practical introduction to working with LaTeX. Finally, I would like to thank Dmitry Dundua, who agreed to convert my article into a LaTeX template, thus contributing to the overall quality of the present publication.

References

- Allan, Keith. 2004. Aristotle's footprints in the linguist's garden. *Language Sciences* 26(4). 317–342.
- Arkadiev, Peter & Jurgis Pakerys. 2015. Lithuanian morphological causatives: A corpus-based study. In Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau (eds.), *Voice and argument structure in Baltic*, vol. 2 (Valency, Argument Realization and Grammatical Relations in Baltic), 39–97. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bentein, Klaas. 2016. *Verbal periphrasis in ancient Greek: Have- and Be constructions*. Oxford: Oxford Univeristy Press.
- Brown, Dunstan, Marina Chumakina, Greville Corbett, Gergana Popova & Andrew Spencer. 2012. Defining 'periphrasis': Key notions. *Morphology* 16(1). 233–275.
- Bruening, Benjamin. 2020. Idioms, collocations, and structure: Syntactic constraints on conventionalized expressions. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 38(2). 365–424.
- Chumakina, Marina. 2011. Nominal periphrasis: A canonical approach. *Studies in Language* 35(2). 247–274.
- Chumakina, Marina & Greville Corbett (eds.). 2012. *Periphrasis: The role of syntax and morphology in paradigms* (Proceedings of the British Academy 180). Oxford: Oxford University Press/British Academy.
- de Jonge, Casper. 2014. Style (léxis), ancient theories of. In Georgios K. Giannakis (ed.), *Encyclopedia of ancient Greek language and linguistics*, vol. 3, 326–331. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

- Everaert, Martin. 2010. The lexical encoding of idioms. In Malka Rappaport Hovav, Edit Doron & Ivy Sichel (eds.), *Lexical semantics, syntax, and event structure*, 76–98. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Farrell, Patrick. 2005. English verb-preposition constructions: Constituency and order. *Language* 81(1). 96–137.
- Fendel, Victoria Beatrix. 2022. *Coptic interference in the syntax of Greek letters from Egypt*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fotopoulou, Angeliki, Eric Laporte & Takuya Nakamura. 2021. Where do aspectual variants of light verb constructions belong? In Paul Cook, Jelena Mitrović, Carla Parra Escartín, Ashwini Vaidya, Petya Osenova, Shiva Taslimipoor & Carlos Ramisch (eds.), *Proceedings of the 17th Workshop on Multiword Expressions (MWE 2021)*, 2–21. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Grossman, Eitan & Alena Witzlack-Makarevich. 2019. Valency and transitivity in contact: An overview. *Journal of Language Contact* 12(1). 1–26.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2000. Periphrasis. In Geert E. Booij, Christian Lehmann, Joachim Mugdan, Wolfgang Kesselheim & Stavros Skopeteas (eds.), *Morphologie/Morphology. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Flexion und Wortbildung/An international handbook on inflection and word-formation*, vol. 17 (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft / Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science 1), 654–664. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2016. Universals of causative and anticausative verb formation and the spontaneity scale. *Lingua Posnaniensis* 58(2). 33–63.
- Jiménez López, María Dolores. 2016. On support verb constructions in ancient Greek. *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 101(2). 180–204.
- Kassel, Rudolf (ed.). 1976. *Aristotelis Ars rhetorica*. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter.
- Keizer, Evelien. 2009. Verb-preposition constructions in FDG. *Lingua* 119(8). 1186–1211.
- Kennedy, George A. 2007. *Aristotle, On Rhetoric. A theory of civic discourse*. 2nd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kirby, John T. 1991. Aristotle's *Poetics*: The rhetorical principle. *Arethusa* 24. 197–218.
- Kovalevskaitė, Jolanta, Erika Rimkutė & Laura Vilkaitė-Lodzienė. 2020. Light verb constructions in Lithuanian: Identification and classification. *Kalbotyra: kalbų studijos/Linguistics* 36. 5–16.
- Langer, Stefan. 2004. A linguistic test battery for support verb constructions. *Linguisticæ Investigationes* 27(2). 171–184.
- Lausberg, Heinrich. 1998. *Handbook of literary rhetoric: A foundation of literary study*. Leiden & Boston & Köln: Brill.

- Lavidas, Nikolaos. 2009. *Transitivity alternations in diachrony: Changes in argument structure and voice morphology*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Lehmann, Christian & Elisabeth Verhoeven. 2006. Extraversive transitivization in Yucatec Maya and the nature of the applicative. In Leonid Kulikov, Andrej Malchukov & Peter de Swart (eds.), *Case, valency and transitivity*, 465–493. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Liddell, Henry George & Robert Scott. 1996. *A Greek-English lexicon*. Henry Stuart Jones & Roderick McKenzie (eds.). 9th edn. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Marcinkevičienė, Rūta. 2010. *Lietuvių kalbos kolokacijos [Collocations of the Lithuanian Language]*. Kaunas: Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto leidykla.
- Martin, Troy W. 2001. Sorting the syntax of Aristotle's anger (*Rh.* 2.2.1 1378a30–32). *Hermes* 129(4). 474–478.
- Masini, Francesca. 2019. *Multi-word expressions and morphology*. DOI: 10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.611.
- Mastronarde, Donald J. 2013. *Introduction to Attic Greek*. 2nd edn. Berkeley & Los Angeles & London: University of California Press.
- Morpurgo Davies, Anna. 2002. The Greek notion of dialect. In Thomas Harrison (ed.), *Greeks and barbarians*, 153–171. New York & London: Edinburgh University Press.
- Nauck, August. 1889. *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- Poster, Carol. 1997. Aristotle's rhetoric against rhetoric: Unitarian reading and esoteric hermeneutics. *American Journal of Philology* 118(2). 219–249.
- Rayson, Paul, Scott Piao, Serge Sharoff, Stefan Evert & Begoña Villada Moirón. 2010. Multiword expressions: Hard going or plain sailing? *Language Resources and Evaluation* 44(1/2). 1–5.
- Ross, William David (ed.). 1959. *Aristotelis Ars rhetorica*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Schutzzeichel, Marc. 2014. *Indogermanische Funktionsverbgefüge* (Wissenschaftliche Schriften der WWU Münster, Reihe XII 13). Münster: MV-Verlag.
- Smyth, Herbert W. 1920. *Greek grammar for colleges*. New York: American Book Company.
- Spengel, Leonard (ed.). 1853. *Rhetores Graeci*, vol. I. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- Tesnière, Lucien. 2015. *Elements of structural syntax*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Vaahtera, Jaana. 2014. Word formation (paragōgē/synthesis), ancient theories of. In Georgios K. Giannakis (ed.), *Encyclopedia of ancient Greek language and linguistics*, vol. 3, 529–532. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

- Van der Meer, Geart. 1998. Collocations as One particular type of conventional word combinations. Their definition and character. In Thierry Fontenelle, Philippe Hiligsmann, Archibald Michiels, André Moulin & Siegfried Theissen (eds.), *EURALEX'98 Proceedings*, 313–322. Liège.
- Wouters, Alfons, Pierre Swiggers, Toon van Hal & Lambert Isebaert. 2014. Word formation (derivation, compounding). In Georgios K. Giannakis (ed.), *Encyclopedia of ancient Greek language and linguistics*, vol. 3, 521–529. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

