Epilogue: Taking wing

Victoria Beatrix Fendel[a]

[a]University of Oxford

This epilogue reflects on the shift in perspective between *taking initiative* which we began with and *taking wing* which we end on. It further sets out desiderata in the study of support-verb constructions, namely suitably annotated large-scale corpora, their coverage in authoritative lexicon resources, and their visibility in grammar books. It explains why and how support-verb constructions have so far-reaching an impact, using three poignant examples from Homer's *Odyssey* (epic), Thucydides' *Histories* (historiography), and Lysias' courtroom speeches (oratory). The epilogue finishes by outlining four concrete avenues for further research, namely corpora, corpus-language annotation procedures, cooperation with educators, and collaboration between disciplines.

Dieser Epilog zieht Bilanz in Bezug auf den Perspektivenwechsel betreffend Konstruktionen wie z.B. *to take initiative* „die Initiative ergreifen" im Gegensatz zu *to take wing* „Flügel bekommen" (metaphorisch), den wir durchlaufen haben. Er zeigt dabei Desiderata in der Forschung im Hinblick auf support-verb constructions auf, wie die Existenz von großen Korpora mit entsprechender Annotation, ihre Erfassung in einschlägigen lexikalischen Ressourcen sowie ihre Sichtbarmachung in Referenzgrammatiken. Anhand von drei aussagekräftigen Beispielen aus Homers Ilias (Epos), Thukydides Historien (Historiographie), and Lysias Gerichtsreden (Rhetorik) wird erklärt, wie und warum support-verb constructions einen so weitreichenden Einfluss haben. Der Epilog schließt mit vier konkreten Vorschlägen für künftige Forschung im Gebiet der support-verb constructions. Diese sind die Erstellung großer kommentierter Korpora, die Etablierung von Annotationsschemata und -verfahren, die auf Korpussprachen abgestimmt sind, die Kooperation mit Lehrkräften, und eine stärkere Zusammenarbeit von Fachdisziplinen in diesem Rahmen.

The *Oxford English Dictionary* (s.v. epilogue 3a) defines an epilogue in a theatrical context as "[a] speech or short poem addressed to the spectators by one of the actors after the conclusion of the play". In this sense, this epilogue rather than *taking stock* or *drawing conclusions* takes wing in that it briefly comments on what we hope will come next.

Purposefully, the *proemium* was entitled *taking initiative*, a support-verb construction that few would object to as the noun *initiative* is eventive and encodes inchoativity by itself. Conversely, some may have objected to *taking wing* being analysed as a support-verb construction early on when reading this volume, and some contributions in this volume do object (Ittzés [Chapter 1], Giouli [Chapter 2], and Pompei, Pompeo, and Ricci [Chapter 9]). We have pushed the boundaries with the chapters of this volume as regards approaches to support-verb constructions, corpora of Greek, and the interpretation of interfaces. As Squeri [Chapter 5] (similarly to Radimský 2011) has shown, concrete nouns such as *wing* can be reconceptualised as eventive in support-verb constructions. Support verbs can indicate aspect and voice (see Jiménez López and Baños [Chapter 4], Madrigal Acero [Chapter 3], and Vives Cuesta [Chapter 7]), even when morphologically functioning as clitics (Miyagawa [Chapter 10]). Crucially, we are not *winging* it but *taking wing*. What seems to be a formally related base-verb construction (see Veteikis [Chapter 6]) at first sight turns out to be semantically fundamentally different (see Ryan [Chapter 8]).

1 Desiderata

As support-verb constructions are highly susceptible to variation, we would need **diatopically**, **diastratically**, **and diachronically diverse corpora**, including those that are rather invisible in the current research landscape, **annotated for support-verb constructions**. Interest had focussed on three aspects which we have gone beyond. Firstly, instead of focussing only on a specific (small) range of support verbs ('to do', 'to put', 'to have', and 'to give'), various chapters have discussed e.g. the verb 'to use'. Secondly, instead of accepting only deverbal and non-deverbal eventive nouns as predicative nouns, several chapters questioned this approach and instead considered how nouns can be reconceptualised in support-verb constructions (Squeri [Chapter 5]) and how the polysemy of many nouns plays into their use in support-verb constructions (Pompei, Pompeo, and Ricci [Chapter 9]). Thirdly, instead of relying on a small range of very visible corpora including the Homeric epics (Bakker 2020, Vanséveren 1995, Schutzeichel 2014), classical literary Attic, and New Testament corpora, we have included e.g. classical technical texts and later hagiographical corpora.

Secondly, as support-verb constructions show significant lexical variability and can be collocations or idioms in Mel'čuk's sense, they would need to be **integrated in dictionaries not as prose phrases or idioms but as a category in their own right**. For example, one of the better catalogued support-verb-construction

families is that around δίκη *dike*, shown in (1). The reason for the support-verb-construction family around δίκη *dikē* 'judgement, penalty' having found a place in the dictionary in the first instance is likely the idiomatic nature of its most frequent exponents, i.e. δίκην δίδωμι *dikēn didōmi* 'to pay the price for one's actions' and δίκην λαμβάνω *dikēn lambanō* 'to exact punishment (from)'.

(1) Liddell-Scott-Jones s.v. δίκη *dikē* IV.3

the object or consequence of the action, atonement, satisfaction, penalty, δίκην ἐκτίνειν, τίνειν [*dikēn ektinein, tinein*], Hdt.9.94, S.Aj.113: adverbially in acc., τοῦ δίκην πάσχεις τάδε [*tou dikēn pask^heis tade*]; A.Pr.614; freq. δίκην or δίκας διδόναι [*dikēn* or *dikas didonai*] suffer punishment, i. e. make amends (but δίκας δ. [*dikas d.*], in A.Supp.703 (lyr.), to grant arbitration); δίκας διδόναι τινί τινος [*dikas didonai tini tinos*] Hdt.1.2, cf. 5.106; ἔμελλε τῶνδέ μοι δώσειν δίκην [*emelle tōnde moi dōsein dikēn*] S.El.538, etc.; also ἀντί or ὑπέρ τινος [*anti* or *huper tinos*], Ar.Pl. 433, Lys.3.42; also δίκην διδόναι ὑπὸ θεῶν [*dikēn didonai ^hupo t^heōn*] to be punished by . . , Pl. Grg.525b; but δίκας ἤθελον δοῦναι [*dikas ēt^helon doūnai*] they consented to submit to trial, Th.1.28; δίκας λαμβάνειν sts. = δ. διδόναι [*dikas lambanein* sts. = *d. didonai*], Hdt.1.115; δίκην ἀξίαν ἐλάμβανες [*dikēn axian elambanes*] E.Ba.1312, Heracl.852; more freq. its correlative, inflict punishment, take vengeance, Lys.1.29, etc.; λαβεῖν δίκην παρά τινος [*labein dikēn para tinos*] D.21.92, cf.9.2, etc.; so δίκην ἔχειν [*dikēn ek^hein*] to have one's punishment, Antipho 3.4.9, Pl.R.529c (but ἔχω τὴν δ. [*ek^hō tēn d.*] have satisfaction, Id.Ep.319e; παρά τινος [*para tinos*] Hdt.1.45); δίκας or δίκην ὑπέχειν [*dikas* or *dikēn ^hupek^hein*] stand trial, Id.2.118, cf. S. OT552; δίκην παρασχεῖν [*dikēn parask^hein*] E.Hipp.50; θανάτου δίκην ὀφλεῖν ὑπό τινος [*t^hanatou dikēn op^hlein ^hupo tinos*] to incur the death penalty, Pl.Ap.39b; δίκας λαγχάνειν τινί [*dikas lagk^hanein tini*] D.21.78; δίκης τυχεῖν παρά τινος [*dikēs tuk^hein para tinos*] ib.142; δίκην ὀφείλειν, ὀφλεῖν [*dikēn op^heilein, op^hlein*], Id.21.77, 47.63; ἐρήμην ὀφλεῖν τὴν δ. [*erēmēn op^hlein tēn d.*] Antipho 5.13; δίκην φεύγειν [*dikēn p^heugein*] try to escape it, be the defendant in the trial (opp. διώκειν [*diōkein*] prosecute), D. 38.2; δίκας αἰτέειν [*dikas aiteein*] demand satisfaction, τινός [*tinos*] for a thing, Hdt.8.114; δ. ἐπιτιθέναι τινί [*d. epiti-t^henai tini*] Id.1.120; τινός [*tinos*] for a thing, Antipho 4.1.5; δίκαι ἐπιφερόμεναι [*dikai epip^heromenai*] Arist.Pol.1302b24; δίκας ἀφιέναι τινί [*dikas ap^hienai tini*] D.21.79; δίκας ἑλεῖν [*dikas ^helein*], v. ἔρημος [*erēmos*] II; δίκην τείσασθαι [*dikēn teisast^hai*], v. τίνω [*tinō*] II; δὸς δὲ δίκην καὶ δέξο παρὰ Ζηνί [*dos de dikēn kai dexo para Zēni*] h.Merc.312; δίκας

διδόναι καὶ λαμβάνειν παρ' ἀλλήλων [*dikas didonai kai lambanein par' allēlōn*], of communities, submit causes to trial, Hdt.5.83; δίκην δοῦναι καὶ λαβεῖν ἐν τῷ δήμῳ [*dikēn dounai kai labein en tō dēmō*] X.Ath.1.18, etc.; δίκας δοῦναι καὶ δέξασθαι [*dikas dounai kai dexast^hai*] submit differences to a peaceful settlement, Th.5.59.

(transcriptions and boldface were added, Liddell-Scott-Jones provides a full list to abbreviations used[1], abbreviations are not resolved here)

However, the distinction between support verbs and verbs of realisation is not made (Fendel 2023a), modifications (such as pluralisation or determiner phrases) triggering meaning changes are listed as exceptions ("but"), collocations and idioms (in Mel'čuk's sense) are mixed indiscriminately (Fendel 2023b, submitted[a]). The entry could be reorganised e.g. by drawing on the notion of support-verb-construction families and subdividing entries along the lines of Mel'čuk's compositional vs. non-compositional semantic-lexemic phrasemes (collocations vs. idioms) (Mel'čuk 2023). We would thus distinguish between active collocation, active idiom, passive collocation, passive idiom, aspectual collocation, aspectual idiom, etc. A further caveat regards the text type from which the examples referenced come as support-verb constructions are susceptible to pragmatic indexing.

Thirdly, support-verb constructions sit at three interfaces, such that in addition to the lexical notions of collocation and idiom, the morphological notion of periphrasis and the syntactic notion of complex predicate have been discussed in this volume. They would need to be **integrated in grammar books**, similarly to what we find in Latin. Pinkster (2015: 74–77) dedicates a subsection in his chapter on verb frames in Latin to support verbs. The situation is considerably different in Greek. While Kühner and Gerth's classical *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* still has some brief, but insightful notes, shown in 2, the newer *Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek* (Van Emde Boas et al. 2019) does not account for support-verb constructions.

(2)   Kühner & Gerth 1894: 322[2]

Statt des einfachen Verbs bedienen sich die Griechen zuweilen einer Umschreibung durch den Akkusativ eines abstrakten Substantivs und die Verben ποιεῖσθαι [*poieist^hai*], τίθεσθαι [*tit^hest^hai*], ἔχειν [*ek^hein*], um den Verbalbegriff nachdrücklicher zu bezeichnen, wie συμβολὴν ποιεῖσθαι [*sumbolēn poieist^hai*] Hdt. 6, 110. ὀργὴν π. [*orgēn p.*] 3, 25. 7, 105. ἀπόπειραν π.

---

[1] https://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/lsj/05-general_abbreviations.html (last accessed 23 April 2024).

[2] Abbreviations are those used in Liddell-Scott-Jones, see https://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/lsj/05-general_abbreviations.html (last accessed 23 April 2024).

[*apopeiran p.*] 8, 10. πρόσοδον π. = προσιέναι [*prosodon p. = prosienai*] 7, 223. λήθην π. = ἐπιλανθάνεσθαι [*lētʰēn p. = epilantʰanestʰai*] 1, 127. σκῆψιν π. [*skēpsin p.*] 5,30. μάθησιν ποεῖσθαι = μανθάνειν [*matʰēsin poeistʰai = mantʰanein*] Th. 1, 68).

(my translation) ʿInstead of simplex verbs, the Greeks at times use periphrastic expressions with the accusative case of an abstract noun and verbs such as ποιεῖσθαι [*poieistʰai*], τίθεσθαι [*titʰestʰai*], ἔχειν [*ekʰein*] in order to express the predication with more intensity, e.g. συμβολὴν ποιεῖσθαι [*sumbolēn poieistʰai*] Hdt. 6, 110. ὀργὴν π. [*orgēn p.*] 3, 25. 7, 105. ἀπόπειραν π. [*apopeiran p.*] 8, 10. πρόσοδον π. = προσιέναι [*prosodon p. = prosienai*] 7, 223. λήθην π. = ἐπιλανθάνεσθαι [*lētʰēn p. = epilantʰanestʰai*] 1, 127. σκῆψιν π. [*skēpsin p.*] 5,30. μάθησιν ποεῖσθαι = μανθάνειν [*matʰēsin poeistʰai = mantʰanein*] Th. 1, 68).ʾ

Kühner and Gerth only include support verbs that are common across languages and that form active and stative predicates. Equivalence between the support-verb construction and the simplex verb related to the predicative noun is assumed with the only difference identified being "Nachdruck" (intensity).[3] The examples come primarily from Herodotus' *Histories*, an early historiographic text in the Ionic dialect, yet support-verb constructions are highly susceptible to diatopic variation (Fendel 2024b).

2 Relevance

Support-verb constructions **permeate** all the corpora of Greek such that they cause issues in canonical or less canonical texts. Support-verb constructions are inherently **ambiguous** due to the polysemy of the constituent parts (e.g. Savary et al. 2019) such that they cause issues in any environment. Support-verb constructions sit at three **interfaces** such that they cause issue to everyone, notwithstanding whether they are interested in the syntax, semantics, or pragmatics of a text. This is illustrated below with three examples from well-known corpora, i.e. where contextual information should be able to aid the modern reader. In all three cases, the correct reading of the support-verb constructions has implications well beyond the sentence(s) quoted, e.g. for the reconstruction of the composition process, for the narratological structure of the narrative, or for the embedding of the text into its socio-political reality.

---

[3]The interest appears stylistic (similarly Aerts 1965 is primarily focussed on the inflexional and not the derivational morphology).

Example one, (3), comes from Homer's epics (pre 7th c. BC). The support-verb construction of interest is κακὸν εὑρίσκομαι *kakon ʰeuriskomai* 'to bring harm upon oneself', which is anaphorically resumed in the subsequent sentence by means of the noun phrase μέγα πῆμα *mega pēma* 'great harm'. The translation of West's classical edition of the text and of the text containing Probert's editorial suggestion are provided with the example.

(3) ἐξ   οὗ   Κενταύροισι καὶ ἀνδράσι νεῖκος
     ex   *ʰou*   *Kentaurioisi kai andrasi veikos*
     out.of REL.GEN Centaurs.DAT and men.DAT battle.NOM

     ἐτύχθη,   οἳ   δ'   αὐτῷ πρώτῳ **κακὸν**
     etukʰtʰē   *ʰoi*   *d'* *autō* *prōtō* *kakon*
     happen.AOR.IND.PASS.3SG   they.NOM PRT he.DAT first.DAT evil.ACC

     ηὕρετο   οἰνοβαρείων.   ὣς καὶ σοὶ   μέγα
     ʰēureto   *oinobareiōn*   *ʰōs kai soi*   *mega*
     find.AOR.IND.MID.3SG heavy.with.wine.NOM   so also you.DAT great.ACC

     πῆμα   πιφαύσκομαι   […]
     pēma   *piphauskomai*   […]
     harm.ACC foretell.PRS.IND.1SG

     'Out of which arose the battle between centaurs and humans but he
     brought harm upon himself first, being heavy with wine. In the same way
     I foretell great harm for you too […]' (translation of the text as provided
     by West 2017: 447–448)
     'Ever since the battle between the centaurs and humans occurred, one
     who is heavy with wine brings harm first and foremost upon himself. In
     the same way I foretell great harm for you too […]' (translation of the
     text with τ' *t'* instead of δ' *d'* by Probert 2023)[4]
                              (Homer, *Odyssey* 21.303–305 (pre 7th c. BC))

The support-verb construction in question is interesting for two reasons, firstly since the predicative noun is a syntactic nominalisation rather than a lexical one, and secondly because the support verb is a verb that can appear in various argument frames.

---

[4]On Probert's reading, the support-verb construction appears in a gnomic phrase, a general rule, after which the discourse returns to the main line of events. The anaphoric noun phrase μέγα πῆμα *mega pēma* 'great harm' acts as the discursive link (cf. Halliday & Hasan 1976: 278 on reiteration). While the syntactic nominalisation and the lexical noun are not formally related, they are functionally akin. πῆμα *pēma* 'harm' is a verbal noun from a root **pē-*, possibly also found in e.g. ταλαίπωρος *talaipōros* 'enduring hardship' (Beekes 2010).

The syntactic nominalisation κακόν *kakon* 'evil' has to fill the object slot of the verb (εὑρίσκομαι *ʰeuriskomai* 'to find'), unlike in constructions with two accusatives (e.g. δίδωμι Χ μισθόν *didōmi* Χ *mistʰon* 'to give X as salary') or in constructions in which the verb could be read intransitively (e.g. ποιέω κακόν *poieō kakon* 'to act badly'). A support verb meaning 'to find' in Greek, as in English, can appear in various argument frames. (4) illustrates argument frames in English (see *British National Corpus*):

(4)   'to find' in the *British National Corpus*

    a.   Paul finds fault with his parents. ≈ Paul blames his parents. [causative]

    b.   Paul finds a compromise. ≈ Paul compromises. [active]

    c.   Paul finds fame. ≈ Paul becomes famous. [stative]

    d.   Paul finds favour with his parents. ≈ Paul becomes liked by his parents. [passive]

εὑρίσκω/ομαι *ʰeuriskō/omai* 'to find' would deserve a study of its own. A cursory look through the literary classical Attic *ECF Leverhulme Corpus* reveals passages such as σπονδὰς εὑρίσκομαι *spondas ʰeuriskomai* 'to reach a truce' (Thucydides, *Histories* 5.32.6), contrasting with more frequent σπονδὰς ποιέομαι *spondas poieomai* 'to make a truce', and φιλίας εὑρίσκω *pʰilias ʰeuriskō* 'to make friends' (Isocrates, *Speech* 4.45), akin to Euripides, *Electra* l. 650 (tragedy) εὑρίσκεις δὲ μητρὶ πῶς φόνον; *ʰeuriskeis de mētri pōs pʰonon* 'how are you bringing about the murder of the mother?'. The frames seem active and causative. Examples of passive and stative frames appear in the Liddell-Scott-Jones' entry for the verb (s.v. εὑρίσκω *ʰeuriskō* 'to find' IV middle voice). The passive ones come primarily from passages cited from tragedy and hence predisposed to fall into the category of 'to suffer, get oneself into, find [something negative such as fate, pain, etc.]'. The stative ones include κλέος εὑρίσκομαι *kleos ʰeuriskomai* 'to find fame' (Pindar, *Pythiae* 3.111 (lyric poetry), ἐλπίδ' ἔχω κλέος εὑρέσθαι *elpid' ekʰō kleos ʰeuriskestʰai* 'I hope to gain/ find fame'). The issue with the Liddell-Scott-Jones entry is the great variety of dialects, genres, registers, and periods of time evidenced by the examples. Corpus-based studies would be needed to gain a clear picture of the support-verb constructions with εὑρίσκω/ομαι *ʰeuriskō/omai* 'to find' by dialect, genre, register, and period of time.

The impression gained is that at least in classical Greek, εὑρίσκω/ομαι *ʰeuriskō/omai* 'to find' aligns with ποιέω/ομαι *poieō/omai* 'to act, to do, to make' in that the middle ending has a transitivity-reducing function (stative and passive frames).

However, this is not a hard-and-fast rule and verb lability allows for middle endings with causative semantics and active endings with reflexive semantics (Lavidas 2009) at times. Thus, without the syntactic (argument frame, esp. the indirect object), semantic (anaphoric resumption), and pragmatic (gnomic aorist and cue to return to main storyline) cues in (3), ambiguity abounds.

Example two, (5), comes from Thucydides' *Histories* (5th c. BC). The support-verb construction of interest is ἐκβολὴν ποιέομαι *ekbolēn poieomai* which is coordina-ted with preceding ἔγραψα *egrapsa* 'I wrote'. A genitive λόγου *logou* 'word, plan' is bracketed between the predicative noun and the support verb.

(5) ἔγραψα   δὲ αὐτὰ   καὶ τὴν   **ἐκβολὴν**
     egrapsa   *de auta*   *kai tēn*   *ekbolēn*
     write.AOR.IND.ACT.1SG PRT they.ACC and the.ACC throwing.away.ACC

     τοῦ   λόγου   **ἐποιησάμην**   διὰ   τόδε,   ὅτι (...)
     tou   logou   *epoiēsamēn*   *dia   tode*   *ʰoti* (...)
     the.GEN word/plan.GEN make.AOR.IND.MID.1SG due.to this.ACC that

     'And I have made a digression to write of these matters for the reason
     that (...)' (Forster Smith 1928: 165)

     'I have written these things and discarded the plan due to the fact that
     (...)' (Rusten 2020)

                                    (Thucydides, *Histories* 1.97.2 (5th c. BC))

The difference between the classical and Rusten's readings of the passage boils down to (i) the semantics of the (polysemous) predicative noun ('digressing' or 'tossing out'), (ii) the syntactic function of the genitive λόγου *logou* 'word, plan' (qualitative or objective), and (iii) the semantics of the (polysemous) noun λόγου *logou* 'narrative' or 'plan'. Rusten (2020: 233) argues that the support-verb construction is "a periphrasis for ἐξέβαλον τὸν λόγον" *exebalon ton logon* meaning 'to toss out' (for reasons of consideration or rejection). This assumption entails that the genitive λόγου *logou* is objective for him. Rusten (2020: 234) further argues that multi-functional λόγος *logos* does not refer to "a unit of narrative" in Thucydides, as it does in Herodotus. From this, Rusten (2020: 251) concludes: "If 1.98–118 were a digression it would not have needed this preface. It is more than a digression like 88–96 (from which it is launched); it is instead a composition that nominally performs the mundane task (as does 5.25–116) of filling a gap in the record, but exploits it to reveal the terrible transformation of Athens from ξύμμαχος [*xummakʰos* 'ally'] to ἡγεμών [*ʰēgemōn* 'ruler'] to ἄρχων [*arkʰōn* 'sole ruler'], and to document the fully developed character of the newborn Athenian Empire." Rusten's new reading of the passage has far-reaching implications for the reconstruction of the composition process and the narratological structure of book 1 of the *Histories*.

Example three, (6), comes from Lysias' courtroom speeches (5th / 4th c. BC). The support-verb construction of interest is δίκην λαμβάνω *dikēn lambanō* 'to exact punishment' which is contrasted in a parallel structure (ὅταν *ʰotan* … ἀλλ' ὅταν *all' ʰotan* 'whenever … but whenever') with the simplex verb κολάζω *kolazō* 'to punish'.

(6) οὐχ ὅταν τοὺς   ἀδυνάτους εἰπεῖν
     oukʰ ʰotan tous   adunatous eipein
     NEG when the.ACC unable.ACC speak.AOR.INF.ACT

     κολάζητε,   ἀλλ' ὅταν παρὰ τῶν
     kolazēte,   all' ʰotan para tōn
     punish.PRS.SBJV.ACT.2PL but   when from the.GEN

     δυναμένων   λέγειν   **δίκην**
     dunamenōn   legein   dikēn
     be.able.PRS.PTCP.ACT.GEN speak.PRS.INF.ACT punishment.ACC

     λαμβάνητε
     lambanēte
     take.PRS.SBJV.ACT.2PL

     'if instead of punishing unskilful speakers you exact requital from the skilful' (Lamb 1930: 627)

     'not when you punish those who cannot speak/defend themselves, but when you collect punishment from those who are able to speak/defend themselves' (Fendel 2023b: 397)

     (Lysias, *Speech* 30.23–24)

In (6), the relationship between the base-verb construction (κολάζω *kolazō* 'to punish' + accusative object) and the support-verb construction (δίκην λαμβάνω *dikēn lambanō* 'to exact punishment' + prepositional object with παρά *para* 'from' + genitive) can perhaps be described of one of hyponymy semantically speaking.

The support-verb construction describes a specific type of punishing: "Suppose that simple punishment is the act of punishing someone without giving them the chance of defending themselves, i.e. using their rights within the legal framework, whereas punishment using the law (in the sense of 'exacting justice') means that the person to suffer the punishment is given the opportunity of a defence within the framework of the law. In the former case, the defendant will suffer punishment without any mediation; in the latter case, it is likely that the severity of the punishment and thus the impact on the one to be punished is mediated by the framework of the law (and the defendant's defence)" (Fendel

2023b: 397). The different encoding of the object indicates the lower degree of affectedness of the object with the support-verb construction. Pointedly, in (6), the object of the simplex verb is τοὺς ἀδυνάτους εἰπεῖν *tous adunatous eipein* 'those unable to speak' and the object of the support-verb construction is τῶν δυναμένων λέγειν *tōn dunamenōn legein* 'those who are able to speak'.

However, there is also a pragmatic index applied to the support-verb construction that the base-verb construction does not have. Bentein (2019: 123) considers linguistic indexes ""structures" (lexemes, affixes, diminutives, syntactic constructions, emphatic stress, etc.) that have become conventionally associated with a particular situational dimension, and that invoke that situational dimension whenever they are used (Ochs 1996: 411)". While the support-verb construction seems to index the legal framework, the base-verb construction is domain-unspecific.[5]

The three passages illustrate (i) how support-verb constructions sit at three interfaces, (ii) how their correct reading can have far-reaching implications for the flow of the narrative, the reconstruction of the composition process, and the embedding of the text into the extra-linguistic reality, and (iii) how the polysemy of many nouns in Greek and the ambiguity inherent in support-verb constructions create a language barrier between us and the ancient native speakers, i.e., the texts.

3 Avenues

The reader will have noticed that the chapters of this volume are suspiciously focussed around literary texts. This is no coincidence but it does in no way mean that support-verb constructions do not appear in papyrological and epigraphic material – in fact, they do in great variety (e.g. Fendel 2021, 2022, 2023b on bilingual letter archives, Fendel submitted(b) on the Magical papyri, Fendel 2024b on structures with φροντίς *pʰrontis* 'care' and χρεία *kʰreia* 'need' in the documentary papyri, Fendel submitted(c) on support verb + prepositional phrase constructions in the documentary papyri).

However, papyrological and epigraphic corpora are less well prepared (as regards lemmatisation, part-of-speech tagging, etc.) than literary ones and often show a great amount of internal heterogeneity. Thus, the absence of chapters

---

[5]The situation is in fact more complicated for δίκην δίδωμι *dikēn didōmi* 'to pay the price for one's action' and 'to judge', which due to its polysemy in different verb frames (akin to simplex verbs with verb profiles) adopts multiple meanings, only one of which is specifically pragmatically indexed (Fendel 2024a).

on papyrological and epigraphic data is in fact a data-driven issue. Identification and discovery of support-verb constructions is complicated at the best of times (e.g. Doucet & Ahonen-Myka 2004, Sag et al. 2002) and noisy datasets exacerbate the issue. Therefore, the first avenue for further work is a collaborative initiative such as the PARSEME Ancient Greek corpus in order to produce relevant datasets and make them openly available.

In this context, the question of annotation guidelines arises, discussed e.g. by Giouli [Chapter 1]. Her el-PARSEME corpus applies a natural language processing annotation framework which is comparably narrow in the context of the chapters of this volume but has been tested on datasets in 20+ modern languages. However, this framework comes with a significant number of challenges when assessing corpus languages, as e.g. grammaticality judgements on transformations such as the deletion of the verb or the permissibility of pluralisation on the predicative noun cannot be obtained easily. The native speakers of corpus languages are the texts (Fleischman 2000). Thus, a second avenue for further work is to synthesise annotation frameworks and consider not only language-specificity as regards pre-modern Greek but also the intricacies of working with a corpus language.

Support-verb constructions are currently seemingly shut into the ivory tower of academic research despite appearing everywhere and posing a challenge to everyone. Yet, language learners still stumble and fall. The PARSEME Ancient Greek working group actively recruits undergraduate students in order to bridge this gap.[6] An excellent lexical resource has been introduced by Baños and Jiménez López [Chapter 4] in the form of the *Diccionario de Colocaciones del Griego Antiguo*.[7] The key issue is that support-verb constructions are not consistently listed in authoritative resources, such as the Liddell-Scott-Jones. John Temple, for example, describes the situation as expressions "buried within articles".[8] Thus, a third avenue for further work is to enhance visibility of support-verb constructions for all those working with the corpora of Greek, e.g. by means of their integration into authoritative grammar books and dictionaries.

The PARSEME corpus shows the very fruitful collaboration between disciplines. This volume on a smaller scale focussed on the diachronic breadth of the corpora of Greek and thus brought together disciplines as far apart as comparative philology, dealing with the reconstructed proto-language, and natural

---

[6]http://www.ancientgreekmwe.com/ (last accessed 23 April 2024).

[7]https://dicogra.iatext.ulpgc.es/dicogra/ (last accessed 06 April 2024).

[8]Note that his dictionary goes beyond support-verb constructions and is focussed on non-compositional expressions and assembled from the perspective of translation: https://sites.google.com/view/classical-greek-idioms/home.

language processing, dealing with large-scale internet corpora. A fourth avenue for further work is to foster collaboration between disciplines. Nobody knows everything but together we know a lot more than each on our own, especially with the sentiment of a dialogue between antiquity and our present (Vereeck et al. 2023).

We started with Vergil and Homer, we end with Plato, in that the diversity of structures, approaches, and corpora has amply highlighted all the aspects of support-verb constructions that need and deserve further study. We now know how little we know or in the words of Plato's Socrates, we know that we know nothing (Plato, *Apology* 22d).

Acknowledgements

References

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

Bakker, Egbert. 2020. The language of Homer. In Corinne Ondine Pache (ed.), *The Cambridge guide to Homer*, 70–79. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beekes, Robert. 2010. *Etymological dictionary of Greek* (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 10). Leiden: Brill.

Bentein, Klaas. 2019. Dimensions of social meaning in post-classical Greek: Towards an integrated approach. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 19(2). 119–167. DOI: 10.1163/15699846-01902006.

Doucet, Antoine & Helena Ahonen-Myka. 2004. Non-contiguous word sequences for information retrieval. In *Second ACL workshop on multiword expressions: Integrating processing, July 2004*, 88–95. Barcelona: ACL Anthology. DOI: 10.3115/1613186.1613198.

Fendel, Victoria Beatrix. 2021. Greek in Egypt or Egyptian Greek? Syntactic regionalisms (IV CE). In Klaas Bentein & Mark Janse (eds.), *Varieties of post-classical and Byzantine Greek*, vol. 331 (Trends in linguistics. Studies and Monographs), 115–140. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

Fendel, Victoria Beatrix. 2022. *Coptic interference in the syntax of Greek letters from Egypt*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fendel, Victoria Beatrix. 2023a. 'I haven't got a clue!': Assessing negation in classical Greek support-verb constructions. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 23. 139–163. DOI: 10.1163/15699846-02302004.

Fendel, Victoria Beatrix. 2023b. Support-verb constructions with objects: Greek-Coptic interference in the documentary papyri? In Robin Meyer & Michele Bianchoni (eds.), *Contact-induced change in Morphosyntax*, vol. 121 (Transactions of the Philological Society. Special Edition), 382–403. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Fendel, Victoria Beatrix. 2024a. Celebrating diversity: The origins and pathways of three support-verb constructions. *Lexis* 24.

Fendel, Victoria Beatrix. 2024b. Taking stock of Greek support-verb constructions: Synchronic and diachronic variability in the documentary papyri. In Jesus de la Villa (ed.), *Proceedings of the 10th International Colloquium of Ancient Greek Linguistics (ICAGL)*. Berlin & Boston: Mouton De Gruyter.

Fendel, Victoria Beatrix. Submitted(a). 'To do or not to do': Semi-lexical affixes in (post)classical Greek. *Finnish Journal of Linguistics*.

Fendel, Victoria Beatrix. Submitted(b). Support-verb constructions in the Magical Papyri of the later Roman and early Byzantine periods: A special case of technical writing. *Symbolae Osloenses*.

Fendel, Victoria Beatrix. Submitted(c). When the lines get blurred: Support-verb constructions in the documentary papyri. *Pylon*.

Fleischman, Suzanne. 2000. Methodologies and ideologies in historical linguistics: On working with older languages. In Susan Herring, Pieter Reenen & Lene Schøsler (eds.), *Textual parameters in older languages*, vol. 195 (Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science. Current issues in linguistic theory), 33–58. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Forster Smith, Charles. 1928. *Thucydides, history of the Peloponnesian War, books I and II*. London: Harvard University Press.

Halliday, Michael & Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English* (English Language Series 9). London: Longman.

Kühner, Raphael & Bernhard Gerth. 1894. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache 2: Satzlehre*. 3rd edn. Hannover & Leipzig: Hahnsche Buchhandlung.

Lamb, Walter. 1930. *Lysias. Lysias with an English translation*. London: William Heinemann.

Lavidas, Nikolaos. 2009. *Transitivity alternations in diachrony: Changes in argument structure and voice morphology*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.

Mel'čuk, Igor. 2023. *General phraseology: Theory and practice.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/lis.36.

Ochs, Elinor. 1996. Resources for socializing humanity. In John Gumperz & Stephen Levinson (eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity*, 407–438. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

Pinkster, Harm. 2015. *Oxford Latin syntax: The simple clause.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Probert, Philomen. 2023. *Ἐξ οὗ κενταύριοισι καὶ ἀνδράσι νεῖκος ἐτύχθη.* Paper presented at the conference The Making of Books. Oxford.

Radimský, Jan. 2011. Noms prédicatifs, noms de résultat et noms concrets dans les constructions à verbe support. *Lingvisticæ Investigationes* 34(2). 204–227. DOI: 10.1075/li.34.2.02rad.

Rusten, Jeffrey. 2020. Τὴν ἐκβολὴν τοῦ λόγου ἐποιησάμην: Thucydides' chronicle in the Pentekontaetia (1.97–117) is not a digression. *Histos* 14. 230–254.

Sag, Ivan, Timothy Baldwin, Francis Bond & Ann Copestake. 2002. Multiword expressions: A pain in the neck for NLP. In Alexander Gelbukh (ed.), *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Computational Linguistics and Intelligent Text Processing*, 1–15. Berlin & Heidelberg: Springer.

Savary, Agata, Silvio Cordeiro, Timm Lichte, Carlos Ramisch, Uxoa Iñurrieta & Voula Giouli. 2019. Literal occurrences of multiword expressions: Rare birds that cause a stir. *The Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics* 112. 5–54.

Schutzeichel, Marc. 2014. *Indogermanische Funktionsverbgefüge* (Wissenschaftliche Schriften der WWU Münster 13). Münster: Monsenstein und Vannerdat OHG.

Van Emde Boas, Evert, Albert Rijksbaron, Luuk Huitink & Mathieu de Bakker. 2019. *Cambridge grammar of classical Greek.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vanséveren, Sylvie. 1995. Ἔχω, verbe à sens neutre (dans l'épopée homérique). *L'Antiquité Classique* 64. 199–203.

Vereeck, Alexandra, Mark Janse, Katja De Herdt, Arnaud Szmalec, Cathy Hauspie & Wouter Duyck. 2023. Why Plato needs psychology: Proposal for a theoretical framework underpinning research on the cognitive transfer effects of studying classical languages. *Psihološka Obzorja = Horizons of Psychology* 32. 121–130.

West, Martin. 2017. *Odyssea.* Berlin & Boston: Mouton De Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/20234.