

---

# Celebrating diversity: The origins and pathways of three support-verb constructions

Victoria Beatrix Fendel

---

**Electronic version**

URL: <https://journals.openedition.org/lexis/8217>

DOI: 10.4000/12cvp

ISSN: 1951-6215

**Publisher**

Université Jean Moulin - Lyon 3

Provided by Bodleian Libraries of the University of Oxford

**Electronic reference**

Victoria Beatrix Fendel, "Celebrating diversity: The origins and pathways of three support-verb constructions", *Lexis* [Online], 24 | 2024, Online since 25 September 2024, connection on 14 November 2024. URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/lexis/8217> ; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/12cvp>

---

This text was automatically generated on October 10, 2024.



The text only may be used under licence CC BY-SA 4.0. All other elements (illustrations, imported files) are "All rights reserved", unless otherwise stated.

---

# Celebrating diversity: The origins and pathways of three support-verb constructions

Victoria Beatrix Fendel

---

*The article was written in the context of the project Giving gifts and doing favours: Unlocking Greek support-verb constructions (University of Oxford, 2020-2024), which was funded by the Leverhulme Trust (grant n. ECF-2020-181) with the author as the PI.*

## 1. Support-verb constructions as phraseological units

- 1 Support-verb constructions<sup>1</sup> are combinations of a verb and a noun that fill the predicate slot of a sentence, as *to make a suggestion* in *he made the suggestion that she join*. The predicative noun is the semantic head of the support-verb construction referring to the event happening (here *suggestion*) and the support verb is the syntactic head of the support-verb construction taking the predicative noun as its object (here *to make*)<sup>2</sup>. The present chapter is interested in the birth and rebirth(s) of three classical and postclassical Greek support-verb constructions: δίκην δίδωμι *dikēn didōmi* ‘to pay the price for one’s actions’, χάριν ἀπολαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin apolambanō* ‘to receive a favour’, and προσέχω τὸν νοῦν *prosek<sup>h</sup>ō ton noun* ‘to pay attention’.
- 2 Support-verb constructions are phrasemes, in Mel’čuk’s lexicographic Sens-Texte framework. Mel’čuk [2023: 29] defines a phraseme as a complex sign since the ‘signifier includes more than one component’. These complex signs can be compositional or non-compositional (Mel’čuk [2023: 29-32]). Compositionality is categorical for Mel’čuk, because a complex sign AB is compositional when  $AB = A \oplus B$  (Mel’čuk [2023: 29 and 32]). Compositional phrasemes have semantic pivots (e.g. *attention* in *to pay attention*, which has its context-free meaning) which are different from their syntactic heads (e.g. *pay* in *to pay attention*), ‘which as a rule, express the communicatively dominant component’ (Mel’čuk [2023: 34-35]). Mel’čuk’s ‘communicatively dominant component’ (the support verb) is the component that ‘initiat[es] and anchor[s] the predication’

(Matras [2015: 48]) and serves to embed it into the surrounding argument structure.<sup>3</sup> Phrasemes are subdivided into lexemic, morphemic, and syntactic phrasemes (Mel'čuk [2023: 38]) depending on the nature of their components. Support-verb constructions cut across the classes of semantic-lexemic phrasemes, which are divided into compositional collocations and non-compositional idioms, and pragmatemes (Mel'čuk [2023: chaps. 3 and 9]).<sup>4</sup>

- 3 By our definition of support-verb constructions above, *to pay attention*, *to spill the beans*, and *to take aim* qualify (Mel'čuk [2023: 34-35, 72-75, and 164]). By Mel'čuk's subdivision into types of phrasemes, *to pay attention* is a collocation containing the semantic pivot attention and the quasi-unilexeme, i.e. a degenerate lexeme (Mel'čuk [2023: 46]), *pay*; *to spill the beans* is an idiom as it withstands syntactic transformations (see Section 3); and *take aim!* is a pragmateme, which is context-dependent. We thus observe an internally heterogeneous group of constructions. That support-verb constructions form an internally heterogeneous group of constructions, Mel'čuk's [2023] Sens-Texte approach, Kamber's [2008] function-verb construction approach, Gross' [1998] Lexicon-Grammar approach in the context of the *Laboratoire d'Automatique Documentaire et Linguistique*, and the Natural-Language-Processing-inspired PARSEME terminology all find. In line with Mel'čuk, the present chapter adopts Gross' [1998] definition of support-verb constructions as opposed to narrower definitions such as the PARSEME light-verb constructions.
- 4 Support-verb constructions consist of a predicative noun and a support verb. The predicative-noun slot can be filled by any eventive noun (e.g. Meinschaefer [2016: 393]; Huyghe *et al.* [2017: 127]; Grimshaw [1990]; Bel, Coll & Resnik [2010: 46]) including nouns that assume an eventive meaning only due to reconceptualization, e.g. *picture* in *to take a picture* (Radimský [2011]), or due to metaphorical extension, e.g. *heart* in *to take heart* (Sheinflux *et al.* [2019]). The predicative noun can be derivationally related to a verb, e.g. *συντάτω* *suntattō* 'to order' and *σύνταξις* *suntaxis* 'order' by means of the derivational suffix *-σι-* *-si-* (van Emde Boas *et al.* [2019: 262-269]), but this does not have to be the case.
- 5 The three predicative nouns of interest are root formations, *χάρις* *k<sup>h</sup>aris* from *χαίρω* *k<sup>h</sup>airō* (with reduced vowel grade in the noun) and *δίκη* *dikē* from *δείκνυμι* *deiknumi* (with reduced vowel grade in the noun, note also the present infix *-νυ-* *-nu-* in the verb), and of non-verbal origin, *νόος* / *νοῦς* *noos* / *nous*.<sup>5</sup> Denominal verbs were created from them, e.g. *δικάζω* *dikazō* from *δίκη* *dikē* by means of *-άζω* *-azō*, *χαρίζω* *kharizō* from *χάρις* *k<sup>h</sup>aris* by means of *-ίζω* *-izō* (van Emde Boas *et al.* [2019: 274]), and *νοέω* *noeō* from *νόος* / *νοῦς* *noos* / *nous* by means of forming an *-ε-* *-e-* contract verb (van Emde Boas *et al.* [2019: 273]). The three predicative nouns of interest are polysemous but each has an eventive meaning: *χάρις* *k<sup>h</sup>aris* 'favour, gratitude, thank-offering'; *δίκη* *dikē* 'order, judgement, penalty'; *νοῦς* *nous* 'mind, sense, attention'.
- 6 The support verb is morphologically marked for tense, mood, and grammatical aspect, e.g. *I was making a suggestion* vs *I make a suggestion*, but in Gross' [1998] framework can also indicate lexical aspect, e.g. *to begin a speech* vs *to give a speech*, voice, e.g. *to receive a favour* vs *to do a favour* (cf. Keenan & Dryer [2007]), and polarity, e.g. *to lack an idea* vs *to have an idea* (Fendel [2023a]) through lexical replacement (cf. Joshi [2020]). Support-verb constructions are commonly involved in transitivity operations, both transitivity reducing, e.g. *to suggest* vs *to make a suggestion* (cf. Marini [2010]), and causativisation,

e.g. German *jemandem Angst machen* ‘to induce fear in somebody’ vs *Angst haben* ‘to have fear / to be afraid’ (cf. Marini [2018]).

- 7 Support verbs differ from auxiliaries in that they contribute to the event structure (Butt [2010]) as visible e.g. in their profiling of the subject component. In *Paul lacked a good idea for the project*, the subject component (*Paul*) is a frustrative; in *Paul had a great idea for the project*, the subject component (*Paul*) is a Volitional undergoer (Næss [2007]). The change in the participant role of the subject component is regulated by the support verb. Support verbs also differ from auxiliaries in that they are not fully productive (Kamber [2008: 143]; Bonial [2021]), i.e. they cannot predictably be applied to any noun, and in that they do not appear in a phonetically reduced form (Loporcaro [2022: 228 n. 16]).
- 8 Mel’čuk differentiates between support verbs and verbs of realisation. Verbs of realisation are ‘des verbes collocationnels qui ont le comportement syntaxique des  $V_{supp}$ , mais qui, à la différence de ceux-ci, sont sémantiquement pleins’ (Mel’čuk [2004 : 208])<sup>6</sup>, e.g. French *infliger* ‘to inflict’ (official) or *filer* ‘to give’ (colloquial) with *une amende* ‘a fine’ instead of *donner une amende* ‘to give a fine’. Mel’čuk’s [2023: 119] division between support verbs and verbs of realization reflects the fact that the verbal component of a support-verb construction (i) can be varied for syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic reasons (cf. Mel’čuk [2004]; Gavriilidou [2004]), (ii) can have varying degrees of semantic weight (cf. Rosén [2020]; Gross [1998]), and (iii) can be adjusted in a highly context-specific way which is not necessarily artistic, e.g. legal texts (cf. Bentein [2019]).
- 9 The three support verbs of interest are a simplex verb commonly accepted as a support verb across languages, *δίδωμι* *didōmi* ‘to give’, a compound verb with a compositional prefix referring to space, *προσέχω* *prosek<sup>h</sup>ō* ‘to hold to, to turn to’, and a compound verb with a non-compositional prefix relating to either intensity or reciprocity, *ἀπολαμβάνω* *apolambanō* ‘to take, to receive / to take, to receive (in return)’.<sup>7</sup> The question to ask is whether a prefix turns a support verb into a verb of realisation due to adding semantics and how to classify those compound verbs with non-compositional prefixes (cf. Luraghi [2003]).<sup>8</sup> A complicating aspect is that reverse selection by the predicative noun may form what Gross [2012] terms *verbes supports appropriés*, such as Latin *committere* ‘to commit’ with nouns referring to crimes and the like (Roesch [2018]), yet see also *to do / conduct an experiment* and *to give / provide an explanation*. A canonical support verb exists in these cases but a prototypical verb of realisation seems the preferred option (see Section 5).
- 10 Support-verb constructions are lexically speaking verbal multi-word expressions which are ambiguous (Savary *et al.* [2019]; Krstev & Savary [2017]; Butt & Lahiri [2013]), variable (Tutin [2016]; Savary *et al.* [2018]), and discontinuous (Sag *et al.* [2002]; Lehmann [2020]). All of these aspects impact on lexical affinity measures, such as the *logDice* (Rychlý [2008]), due to how they are computed. Section 3 looks in more detail at how these lexical characteristics of support-verb constructions are intertwined.
- 11 Syntactically speaking, support-verb constructions as complex predicates are monoclausal (Butt [1995]; Butt [2010]), show both components contributing to the event structure of the predicate (Butt [2010]; Bowerman [2008: 165]), i.e. show ‘a unified argument structure, a single temporal modification and the lack of a clausal embedding structure’ (Nash & Samvelian [2016: 2]), and contain a predicative noun that is morphologically marked as an object but syntactically forms part of the predicate

phrase (Markantonatou & Samaridi [2017]). For example, in *I paid attention to the talk*, the combination of *to pay* and *attention* fills the predicate slot. The tense and mood are marked on the verb (*paid*); the event referred to is attention-ing.<sup>9</sup> The present chapter is primarily interested in the lexical characteristics of support-verb constructions and all the examples discussed qualify syntactically as complex predicates. Section 6 on pragmaticalisation will return to the accessibility of the internal as opposed to external syntax of the phraseme.

- 12 As the present chapter is interested in origins and pathways of δίκην δίδωμι *dikēn didōmi* ‘to pay the price for one’s actions’, χάριν ἀπολαμβάνω *kharin apolambanō* ‘to receive a favour’, and προσέχω τὸν νοῦν *prosekho ton noun* ‘to pay attention’ in classical and postclassical Greek, we embrace the diversity within the group of support-verb constructions. Diversity, or internal heterogeneity, is visible not only synchronically (e.g. diatopic and diastratic distinctions) but also diachronically due to support-verb constructions hovering at three interfaces: the syntax-lexicon interface (as obvious from constructions such as lexical passives) (Heine [2020: 15]; Croft [2022: 423]; Boye [2023]), the syntax-semantics interface (as obvious from the variations triggering foreseeable and unforeseeable changes sometimes even pushing structures out of the group) (Gross [1998]), and the syntax-pragmatics interface as they can take Heine and Kaltenböck’s [2021] ‘quantum leap’ towards Mel’čuk’s pragmatemes like any other phraseme (see Section 6). Thus, a primarily lexical approach such as the Sens-Texte framework cannot fully capture them.
- 13 The present chapter is interested primarily in the aspect of lexical and morpho-syntactic variability of support-verb constructions and the question when this variability creates a form-function pairing that differs semantically more than expected based on the formal change from its presumed base. Mel’čuk [2023: 71] offers morphological, morpho-syntactic, and syntactic tests to differentiate between his collocations and idioms, however without a strict order of proceeding through these tests (see Section 3).
- 14 A strict order is imposed in the decision-tree approach in the PARSEME guidelines with the caveat that their definition of light-verb constructions is significantly narrower than our definition of support-verb constructions here.<sup>10</sup> The decision trees test the morphological, morphosyntactic, and syntactic variability of a structure in order to classify it as an LVC (light-verb construction), Mel’čuk’s compositional semantic-lexemic phrasemes, a VID (verbal idiomatic expression), Mel’čuk’s non-compositional semantic-lexemic phrasemes, and Not MWE (not a multi-word expression), Gross’ aspectual, voice- and polarity-related variants.<sup>11</sup> Thus, form and function are perceived as going hand in hand (Ledgeway & Vincent [2022: 51]).
- 15 Due to the decision tree procedure, a combination could qualify in one corpus of Greek as an LVC (light-verb construction) and in a different one as a VID (verbal idiomatic expression) (similarly Mel’čuk [2023: 76]). Such shifts are not limited to a diachronic scenario. The three structures of interest here qualify as Not MWE (not a multi-word expression), VID (verbal idiomatic expression), and LVC.full (light-verb construction full) respectively in classical Greek (5<sup>th</sup> / 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC) but change categories over time apart from the lexical passive formation which is currently excluded from the PARSEME terminology.
- 16 The issue of variability of form and function in support-verb constructions is not specific to classical and postclassical Greek nor to Greek. In fact, support-verb

constructions exist across languages and are considered a near-universal category (Savary *et al.* [2018: 96]; Hoffmann [2023: 29-31]). They are a comparative concept (Haspelmath [2010: 665]) the instantiation of which differs between languages and varieties, as a descriptive category (Haspelmath [2010: 664]), and thus for a corpus language, between corpora (Fleischman [2000: 34]).

- 17 The shared event structure of support-verb constructions feeds into research question 1, their lexical variability into research question 2, and their sitting at three interfaces into research question 3:
1. How do changes in **analyticity and compositionality** affect the status of a phraseme (as a collocation vs idiom)? [test case: δίκη & δίδωμι *dikē & didōmi* ‘to pay the price for one’s actions’]
  2. What degree of **lexical renewal** do we accept as modification of a phraseme before positing a new phraseme? [test case: χάρις & ἀπολαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>aris & apolambanō* ‘to get thanks / to receive a favour’]
  3. Why are pragmatemes instances of **rebirth** rather than continuity? [test case : προσέχω & νοῦς *prosek<sup>h</sup>ō & nous* ‘to pay attention’]<sup>12</sup>
- 18 After this introductory section, the chapter falls into six sections. Section 2 introduces the data sample and methods of data collection. Section 3 details how variability, ambiguity, and discontinuity interplay in support-verb constructions and how they can be utilised to determine when a new phraseme is born. Section 4 considers research question 1, Section 5 research question 2, and Section 6 research question 3. Section 7 summarises the results and offers conclusions.

## 2. Data samples and data collection

- 19 The chapter is based on (i) the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, which compiles literary texts from the archaic to the early modern periods, <https://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu> (subscription-only)<sup>13</sup>, and (ii) the *Duke Database of Documentary Papyri*, which compiles documentary texts of the postclassical and early medieval periods, <https://papyri.info> (open-access). From these datasets are drawn.
- 20 The distinction between literary and documentary texts is adopted from studies on Greek from the perspectives of Classics, Papyrology, and related disciplines. A literary text is thus a text that has been written with an artistic intent and literary texts thus include oratory, historiography, and prose along with texts in verse. Instances of carefully crafted technical writings also fall into this category. Literature is not limited to fictional writings. The genre divisions adopted are the following: (i) technical writing: commentaries, medical writing, lexicography, homilies, (ii) oratory: speeches, sermons, (iii) prose: philosophical writings, dialogues, vitae, epistles, (iv) historiography. By contrast, documentary texts are those that are written for specific purposes in everyday life, both at personal and at higher (e.g. governmental) levels. Documentary text types are e.g. letters, contracts, wills, receipts, and reports of court dealings. The present chapter adopts the text types assigned to texts in the *Duke Database of Documentary Papyri*.
- 21 Both literary and documentary texts are drawn upon because (i) documentary texts are less influenced by genre-related pressures in the sense of artistic creativity, (ii) documentary texts are less influenced by intertextual links stylistically speaking,

and (iii) documentary texts allow for idiolectal idiosyncracies to surface (Biber & Conrad [2009]; Mel'čuk [2023: 71]). However, both literary and documentary texts involve a range of degrees of flexibility as regards register, genre, and style displayed, consider e.g. the texts often labelled 'official' amongst the documentary texts, such as court proceedings (cf. Palme [2009: 361-363]). The bulk of documentary texts dates from the 3<sup>rd</sup> c. BC onwards, whereas the earliest literary texts date from around the 8<sup>th</sup> c. BC. The variety of sources allows us to trace the three structures of interest through the centuries in varying environments and thus to trace traditions and independent developments.

- 22 Support-verb constructions have existed since the earliest records of the language and survive into the modern variety (e.g. Bakker [2020]; Fendel [2023a]; Fendel [2024a]; Anastassiadis-Symeonidis, Fotopoulou & Kyriacopoulou [2019]). The present chapter capitalises on the over 2000 years of continuous written history of Greek. The following **timeframes** are adopted: Archaic Greek (AG) pre 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC; Classical Greek (CG) 5<sup>th</sup> / 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC; Ptolemaic Greek (PG) 3<sup>rd</sup>-1<sup>st</sup> c. BC; Roman Greek (RG) 1<sup>st</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> c. AD; Early Byzantine Greek (EBG) 4<sup>th</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> c. AD; Medieval Greek (MG) post 8<sup>th</sup> c. AD.<sup>14</sup> If items are e.g. 4<sup>th</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> c. BC, they are counted in PG; if items are e.g. 7<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> c. AD, they are counted in EBG.
- 23 Support-verb constructions largely withstand automated procedures of data collection (e.g. Sag *et al.* [2002]; Savary *et al.* [2018]) due to their variability, ambiguity, and discontinuity.<sup>15</sup> Data collection was carried out here considering the iconicity of the structure, i.e. that the functional relationship between support verb and predicative noun is reflected in their formal tendency to appear close to each other (cf. Lakoff & Johnson [1980: 130]; Frenda [2017: 133]).<sup>16</sup> Section 3 further motivates this procedure. Thus, the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* and the *Duke Database of Documentary Papyri* were queried for the lemmata of the support verb and the predicative noun appearing within 5 words of each other. Note that in the *Duke Database of Documentary Papyri* this involves running separate searches for the lemma of the support verb occurring within 5 words of the accusative case of the predicative noun (singular and plural have to be queried separately).
- 24 The three support-verb constructions δίκην δίδωμι *dikēn didōmi* 'to pay the price for one's actions', χάριν ἀπολαμβάνω *kharin apolambanō* 'to receive a favour', and προσέχω τὸν νοῦν *prosekho ton noun* 'to pay attention' were selected (i) because they are all listed in the authoritative Liddell-Scott-Jones dictionary, unlike support-verb constructions otherwise, but as 'prose phrases'<sup>17</sup>, (ii) because they appear across several periods of time, (iii) because they reflect three different pathways that support-verb constructions can take as the subsequent sections will show, and (iv) because they differ as to the nature of their constituent components, as outlined in Section 1. Thus, we are embracing diversity by choosing these.
- 25 The following data samples inform Sections 4 to 6 and are fully accessible here: DOI 10.5287/ora-zovd9gfv0 and DOI 10.5287/ora-g2op5v0em.

Table 1. Datasets

Dataset 1	ECF <i>Leverhulme corpus</i> <sup>18</sup> search for morphological passives
--------------	--

Dataset 2	<i>Thesaurus Linguae Graecae</i> proximity search for the lemmata δίκη <i>dikē</i> and δίδωμι <i>didōmi</i> (manual correction for support-verb constructions, Classical Greek (CG) catalogued)
Dataset 3	<i>Thesaurus Linguae Graecae</i> proximity searches for the lemmata δίκη <i>dikē</i> and δίδωμι <i>didōmi</i> and the preposition heading an agent expression, i.e. ὑπό <i>hupo</i> , ἀπό <i>apo</i> , παρά <i>para</i> , πρὸς <i>pros</i> , ἐκ <i>ek</i> (manual correction for support-verb constructions and agent expressions, all catalogued)
Dataset 4a	<i>Duke Database of Documentary Papyri</i> proximity search for δίκην <i>dikēn</i> and the lemma δίδωμι <i>didōmi</i> (manual correction for support-verb constructions and agent expressions)
Dataset 4b	<i>Duke Database of Documentary Papyri</i> proximity search for δίκας <i>dikas</i> and the lemma δίδωμι <i>didōmi</i> (manual correction for support-verb constructions and agent expressions)
Dataset 5	<i>Thesaurus Linguae Graecae</i> proximity search for the lemmata λαμβάνω <i>lambanō</i> and χάρις <i>k<sup>h</sup>aris</i> (manual correction for support-verb constructions, up to and including Roman Greek (RG) catalogued)
Dataset 6	<i>Thesaurus Linguae Graecae</i> proximity search for the lemmata ἀπολαμβάνω <i>apolambanō</i> and χάρις <i>k<sup>h</sup>aris</i> (manual correction for support-verb constructions, all catalogued)
Dataset 7a	<i>Duke Database of Documentary Papyri</i> proximity search for χάριν <i>k<sup>h</sup>arin</i> and the lemma ἀπολαμβάνω <i>apolambanō</i> (manual correction for support-verb constructions)
Dataset 7b	<i>Duke Database of Documentary Papyri</i> proximity search for χάριτα <i>k<sup>h</sup>arita</i> and the lemma ἀπολαμβάνω <i>apolambanō</i> (manual correction for support-verb constructions)
Dataset 7c	<i>Duke Database of Documentary Papyri</i> proximity search for χάριτας <i>k<sup>h</sup>aritas</i> and the lemma ἀπολαμβάνω <i>apolambanō</i> (manual correction for support-verb constructions)
Dataset 8a	<i>Duke Database of Documentary Papyri</i> proximity search for χάριν <i>k<sup>h</sup>arin</i> and the lemma λαμβάνω <i>lambanō</i> (manual correction for support-verb constructions)
Dataset 8b	<i>Duke Database of Documentary Papyri</i> proximity search for χάριτα <i>k<sup>h</sup>arita</i> and the lemma λαμβάνω <i>lambanō</i> (manual correction for support-verb constructions)
Dataset 8c	<i>Duke Database of Documentary Papyri</i> proximity search for χάριτας <i>k<sup>h</sup>aritas</i> and the lemma λαμβάνω <i>lambanō</i> (manual correction for support-verb constructions)
Dataset 9	<i>Thesaurus Linguae Graecae</i> proximity search for the lemmata προσέχω <i>prosek<sup>h</sup>ō</i> and νόος <i>noos</i> (manual correction for support-verb constructions, all catalogued)
Dataset 10a	<i>Duke Database of Documentary Papyri</i> proximity search for νόον <i>noon</i> and the lemma προσέχω <i>prosek<sup>h</sup>ō</i> (manual correction for support-verb constructions)
Dataset 10b	<i>Duke Database of Documentary Papyri</i> proximity search for νοῦν <i>noun</i> and the lemma προσέχω <i>prosek<sup>h</sup>ō</i> (manual correction for support-verb constructions)

- 26 Note that the searches rely on the form of an item (the lemma). The three case studies presented show that the function (meaning) varies synchronically and changes diachronically. Form and function of an item can become increasingly independent, e.g.

the suffix  $-\sigma\iota-$   $-si-$  forms deverbal event nouns initially, but these event nouns may go down the regular path of functional development from *nomen actionis* to *nomen agentis*.<sup>19</sup>

### 3. Support-verb-construction fields as a metric

27 Mel'čuk [2023: 71] offers morphological, morpho-syntactic, and syntactic tests to differentiate between his collocations and idioms. Consequently, a phraseme could qualify as a collocation in one corpus but an idiom in another (Mel'čuk [2023: 76]). The syntactic transformations used to distinguish between a collocation and an idiom are the following:

(1) Tests (Mel'čuk [2023: 72])

1. **Passivization** of a verbal idiom involving its nominal lexemic components;
2. semantic **inflection** of an internal nominal component of the idiom (an internal component of an idiom is a lexemic component that is not the idiom's syntactic head);
3. internal syntactic modification of the idiom – that is, adding a **modifier** to an internal lexemic component;
4. changing linear **order** of the idiom's components.

This makes Mel'čuk [2023: 74–75] classify *to spill the beans* as an idiom but *to pull strings* and *to pay attention* as a collocation with a quasi-unilexeme (*strings* and *pay*). However, with regard to support-verb constructions in classical and postclassical Greek, three aspects of Mel'čuk's, and by extension the above-mentioned PARSEME terminologies, are problematic: morphological passivisation, the attestation of canonical forms, and creativity as opposed to productivity.

28 Firstly, support-verb constructions in (post)classical Greek seem to disprefer morphological passivisation, which may be due to transitivity issues, i.e. passivisation in (post)classical Greek is only permissible if the item is transitive enough.<sup>20</sup> Luraghi [2010: 69] observes that 'a number of verbs that have an experiencer subject and a stimulus object never occur in the passive'. Thus, most support-verb constructions fail Mel'čuk's test 1. Dataset 1 drawn from the *ECF Leverhulme corpus*, a sample of literary classical Attic (5<sup>th</sup> / 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC), shows that of the 1,868 tokens of support-verb constructions identified in the sample of 492,620 words, only 64 appear in the form of a morphological passive, i.e. with the predicative noun in the subject slot and the support verb inflected in the passive voice (e.g.  $\tau\iota\mu\grave{\eta}$   $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\tau\alpha\iota$  *time didotai* 'honour is given').<sup>21</sup> This is about 3% of all instances. Out of these 64 morphological passive tokens, only 16 contain a support verb as opposed to a verb of realisation ( $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\mu\iota$  *didōmi* 'to give' 8 times,  $\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\eta\mu\iota$  *tithēmi* 'to put' 7 times, and  $\kappa\tau\acute{\alpha}\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  *ktaomai* 'to gain' once). The predicative nouns are one-offs except for  $\nu\acute{o}\mu\omicron\varsigma$  *nomos* 'law' (with  $\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\eta\mu\iota$  *tithēmi* 'to put', 6 times) and  $\tau\iota\mu\grave{\eta}$  *timē* 'honour' (with  $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\mu\iota$  *didōmi* 'to give', twice). Thus, both the prevalence of verbs of realisation over support verbs and the prevalence of unestablished patterns over established ones would suggest that passivisation is a theoretically possible option when the support-verb construction is internally analytic and compositional enough but not an option that is widely used in classical Greek. Instead, lexical passivisation seems preferred. In the *ECF Leverhulme corpus*, 268 tokens of lexical passivisation appear out of the total of 1,868 tokens catalogued, this is about 14% of all instances. Lexical passives are primarily recipient rather than patient passives (see Sections 4 and 5).

- 29 Secondly, support-verb constructions in a corpus language cannot be transformed freely but the transformation must be attested. This involves the element of chance of preservation along with the aspect that not every structure will be needed to the same extent in the contexts that are attested (Hoffmann [2005: chap. 8]). This affects Mel'čuk's tests 2, 3, and 4. The same problem applies to reverse-engineering the canonical form in the PARSEME terminology (cf. Fleischman [2000]). In Sections 3 to 5, the attested transformations are catalogued; unattested transformations are not considered.<sup>22</sup>
- 30 Since the issue of variability of form and function in support-verb constructions is not specific to classical and postclassical Greek nor to Greek but support-verb constructions are a comparative concept (Haspelmath [2010: 665]), the following paragraphs explore based on French data the interplay between Mel'čuk's passivisation, internal inflection, addition of a modifier, and order of components before returning to classical and postclassical Greek. We use modern French support-verb constructions as a case study here (i) because significant work has been done (unlike for Greek), (ii) annotated large corpora exist (unlike for Greek), and (iii) French is a spoken language for which canonical forms can be reverse-engineered and modifications tested with native speaker judgements (unlike for Greek) (e.g. Bonial [2021]). Note that French word order is syntactically rather than information-structurally driven and that French morpho-syntax is left-branching, i.e. we have auxiliaries and prepositions where Greek (and French's predecessor Latin) would have had endings.
- 31 The segmentation of support-verb constructions at the syntactic and semantic levels differs. While the predicative noun and support verb fill the predicate slot at the semantic level (the f-structure in the terms of Lexical-Functional Grammar), they fill two slots at the syntactic level (the c-structure in the terms of Lexical-Functional Grammar) (see further Andrews [forthcoming]; Butt [2019]). The mismatch between their syntactic and semantic structures accounts for claims of their diachronic potential to univerbate, that is 'the union of two syntagmatically adjacent word forms into one' (Lehmann [2020: 206]). Their discontinuous structure (Nagy, Vincze & Farkas [2013: 329]) goes hand in hand with their analyticity and accounts for their synchronic variability (Cordeiro & Candito [2019]; Pasquer *et al.* [2018]; Sag *et al.* [2002]; Savary *et al.* [2018]).
- 32 Discontiguity of components is the standard rather than an exception. For example, in the PARSEME 1.0 French corpus, 281 of the 1,298 light-verb constructions of the form verb-noun are continuous (Pasquer [2017: 166 and 169]).<sup>23</sup> Pasquer *et al.* [2018: 2589] consider the items intervening between the components of the support-verb construction solely from a syntactic perspective and find that a maximum of two syntactic units can intervene. However, other discontinuous verbal multi-word expressions show the length of intervening syntactic material to play a role as to the permissibility of such syntactic material between the components of the multi-word expression. For example, in English phrasal verbs (e.g. *to look up*), overly long objects cannot intervene (Gries [2003]).<sup>24</sup>
- 33 The discontinuity of the structure means that the lexical unit is interrupted and discontinuity often comes with internal analyticity, in that each component of the support-verb construction can be modified separately, e.g. *I quickly made an important decision*, where the adverb *quickly* modifies the verb and the adjective *important* the noun (Pasquer *et al.* [2018: 2585]; Savary *et al.* [2018: 88-90]; Tutin [2016]).

Modifications can trigger a literal rather than a support-verb-construction reading, e.g. *he broke her **chocolate** heart when he stepped on it* vs *he broke the heart of his class mate* (Pasquer *et al.* [2018 : 2585]). Thus, synchronically, we need to define precisely what can intervene between the two components of a support-verb construction without breaking up the structure, i.e. triggering a verb-object rather than a support-verb-construction reading. The number and type of permissible intervening items are termed the support-verb-construction field henceforth.

- 34 The differing segmentations in the semantic and syntactic structures are most pronounced in relatively compositional support-verb constructions, in that by adding up the meaning of the parts we arrive at the meaning of the whole lexical unit (e.g. *to have an idea*). Conversely, in lexicalised support-verb constructions (e.g. *to take heart*), the differing segmentations are often less pronounced as the decreased semantic compositionality coincides with decreased syntactic flexibility (Nunberg, Sag & Wasow [1994]; Tutin [2016]). This is a tendency rather than an absolute rule (Sheinfx *et al.* [2019]). We take lexicalisation to be ‘die Erscheinung, daß einmal gebildete komplexe Lexeme bei häufigem Gebrauch dazu tendieren, eine einzige lexikalische Einheit mit spezifischem Inhalt zu werden. Durch die Lexikalisierung geht der Syntagmcharakter in mehr oder weniger starkem Maße verloren’ (Lipka [1981: 120]).<sup>25</sup> Examples include compounds such as *housewife* and *Feierabend* (Hopper & Traugott [2003: 53]). The meaning of the compound is in both cases a lexical unit with a meaning different from the sum of the meanings of its parts. Lexical units are what we list in dictionaries, and what automated tools have to look up in a dictionary.
- 35 Creissels [2016: 52-53] hypothesises that diachronically structures of the type A[gent] [X] p[atient] V[erb], e.g. *Will quickly made a decision*, are reanalysed as A[gent] [X] V[erb], e.g. *Will quickly decision-made*<sup>26</sup>, with the latter being intransitive. This would downgrade the syntactic boundary between the verb and the noun and thus bring to the surface the syntagm character (Lehmann [2020]).
- 36 In order to keep the dataset homogenous as regards genre and register (Biber & Conrad [2009]), we choose a journalistic corpus, the *Le Monde 1998* corpus.<sup>27</sup> It consists of 1,110,392 words. For comparative purposes, two existing corpora are drawn upon, the PARSEME 1.0 French corpus and the Sketch Engine corpus *frTenTen17*:
- The PARSEME 1.0 French<sup>28</sup> corpus consists of 48,539 words and is tagged for verbal multi-word expressions. It contains 1,633 light-verb constructions (Savary *et al.* [2018: 118]), of which 1,298 take the form verb-noun (Pasquer [2017: 166]). However, most types are represented by relatively few tokens.<sup>29</sup>
  - The Sketch Engine corpus *frTenTen17*<sup>30</sup>, made up of internet data, consists of 5.7 billion words and is part-of-speech tagged and lemmatised. Support-verb constructions for defined support verbs and/or predicative nouns can be accessed through Sketch Engine’s concordancing tool, yet with the caveat that concordances need manual correction for support-verb constructions due to the issues of ambiguity, variability, and discontinuity mentioned.
- 37 In order to obtain a dataset large enough to show quantitative tendencies, we accept the limitation of selecting predicative-noun candidates – *peur* ‘fear’, *envie* ‘desire’, *attention* ‘attention’, *confiance* ‘trust’, *décision* ‘decision’, *espoir* ‘hope’, and *raison* ‘reason’.<sup>31</sup> *Envie* ‘desire’ and *peur* ‘fear’ are commonly accepted as predicative nouns; *attention* ‘attention’, *confiance* ‘trust’ and *décision* ‘decision’ are event nouns, *espoir* ‘hope’ and

*raison* ‘reason’ are primarily abstract nouns, both categories are commonly accepted as predicative nouns.

- 38 From the *Le Monde 1998* corpus, concordances for the selected predicative nouns, in their singular and plural forms, are drawn. The concordances are manually annotated deciding whether an entry is a support-verb construction or not, whether determiner phrases and/or attributive phrases accompany the predicative noun, whether adverbs and/or negatives accompany the support verb, how many and what type(s) of items intervene between the predicative noun and the support verb, and whether pronominalisation / morphological passivisation / coordination of predicative nouns appears.<sup>32</sup> Structures were rated support-verb constructions (i) if they consist of a verb and a noun [morphology], (ii) if the noun fills the direct object slot of the verb [syntax], (iii) if the noun is the semantic head of the construction [semantics], (iv) if the grammatical subject of the verb and the agent / volitional undergoer of the event referred to by the noun are co-referential<sup>33</sup>, and (v) if the verb and the noun do not share the same root.<sup>34</sup> For example, in *ils redonnent un peu de confiance au combat syndical* (lamarseillaise.fr via Sketch Engine) ‘they restore some confidence in the union battle’, (i) the support-verb construction consists of the verb *redonner* ‘to restore’ and the noun *confiance* ‘trust’, (ii) the noun functions as the direct object of the verb, (iii) the noun is the semantic head in that they are confidenc-ing as it were – this is also visible in the attachment of the logical object to the noun –, (iv) the grammatical subject of *redonnent* is ‘they’ and the agent of the event of confidenc-ing is also ‘they’, and (v) the verb and the noun are not related formally, unlike in e.g. *confier en toute confiance* ‘to entrust confidently’.
- 39 We are interested only in support-verb-construction types with the selected predicative nouns that appear  $\geq 5$  times, in order to observe quantitative tendencies, and appear in active declarative clauses. We exclude non-declarative clauses (e.g. interrogatives), morphological passives (e.g. *pour que l’attention soit attirée sur* ‘in order for attention to be drawn to’), instances in which the support verb and the predicative noun do not appear in the same clause (e.g. through pronominalisation, *la décision qu’il doit prendre est délicate* ‘the decision which he must take is tricky’) and instances in which several predicative nouns are co-ordinated (e.g. *ça donne le moral et l’envie de travailler* ‘this provides morale and the desire to work’). This is because (i) we want to compare same with same, i.e. noun-verb and verb-object combinations<sup>35</sup> (e.g. *j’ai peur* ‘I am afraid’ but not *je mets en relief* ‘I emphasise’ where the predicative noun *relief* ‘prominence’ is not the direct object of *mettre* ‘to put’), (ii) the information-structural value of the intervening items plays a role, and information packaging differs between environments (Bertrand [2014]; Foley [2007]; Keenan & Dryer [2007]), and (iii) we want to determine the number and type of items that intervene in the most basic representative of a support-verb construction, in order to use this information to draw inferences about the type.<sup>36</sup>
- 40 Table 2 is ordered by the mean number of items in the support-verb-construction field.  
<sup>37</sup> Column 2 counts all the co-occurrences of the relevant lemmata; column 3 counts those that qualify as support-verb constructions. All the support-verb constructions in Table 2 are active or stative. This is because semantic passives, etc. are not frequent enough in the corpus. ‘n/a’ is used when a modification of a type (e.g. passivisation) is not attested; ‘0’ is used where a value was calculated.

Table 2. Selected support-verb constructions (SVCs) in *Le Monde 1998*<sup>38</sup>

Support-verb construction	Tokens in the corpus		Co-ordination of predicative nouns	Passivisation	Pronominalisation	Support-verb-construction field	
	Total	SVC				Type	Mean
<i>redonner confiance</i> 'to restore confidence'	144	7	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0
<i>donner raison</i> 'to confirm'	300	8	n/a	n/a	n/a	ADV, NEG ( <i>pas</i> )	0.357
<i>avoir peur</i> 'to be afraid'	77	22	n/a	n/a	n/a	ADV, NEG ( <i>pas</i> )	0.45
<i>avoir envie</i> 'to want'	45	29	n/a	n/a	n/a	NEG ( <i>once aucune</i> ), ADV	0.48
<i>faire confiance</i> 'to trust (somebody)'	144	16	n/a	n/a	n/a	DP, ADJ, ADV, NEG	0.5
<i>avoir confiance</i> 'to have confidence'	144	5	n/a	n/a	1	NEG	0.5
<i>faire peur</i> 'to scare'	77	8	n/a	n/a	n/a	ADV	0.5
<i>avoir raison</i> 'to be right'	300	23	n/a	n/a	n/a	NEG ( <i>aucune, plus de</i> ), DP, ADV	0.57
<i>prendre décisions</i> 'to take decisions'	72	17	n/a	9	1 (+ 2 passives)	DP, ADJ, ADV	1
<i>avoir espoir</i> 'to have hope'	95	7	1	n/a	n/a	ADJ, DP	1
<i>restaurer confiance</i> 'to restore confidence / trust'	144	5	n/a	n/a	n/a	DP, ADJ,	1.2
<i>retenir attention</i> 'to retain attention'	98	13	n/a	1	n/a	DP, NEG, ADV	1.33
<i>avoir raisons</i> 'to have reasons'	104	8	n/a	n/a	n/a	DP, ADJ	1.57
<i>prendre décision</i> 'to take a decision'	245	45	n/a	29	1 (+ 4 passives)	NEG, DP, ADJ, ADV	1.81
<i>attirer attention</i> 'to draw attention'	98	7	n/a	1	n/a	PRT <sup>39</sup> , DP, ADV	1.83

- 41 The support-verb-construction field in the selected structures never exceeds a mean of two items. The types of items that appear are modifications of the predicative noun (determiners, adjectives) or modifications of the support verb (adverbs, negatives). Modifications of the predicative noun do not appear with structures 1 to 4, which have the smallest support-verb-construction fields. Modifications of the predicative noun appear from 5 downwards – yet notice *aucune* ‘no’ with 4 once. Operations such as pronominalisation / passivisation / co-ordination of predicative nouns appear from 6 downwards.
- 42 In Table 2, the singular and plural forms of the selected nouns are considered separately as they can form distinct form-function pairings with the support verbs – compare 8 and 13, 9 and 14 for illustration. For *prendre décision* and *prendre décisions*, the formal change (pluralisation) does not provoke a functional change greater than what is expected due to the formal change. They are kept separate in Table 2 partly to align them with other selected predicative nouns, but also because the singular form is significantly more frequent than the plural form but seems to allow for a larger and more diverse support-verb-construction field than the plural form.
- 43 For comparison, the support-verb-construction types from Table 2 are run through the PARSEME 1.0 corpus. The results are summarised in Table 3. There were no hits for *faire peur* ‘to scare’, *redonner confiance* ‘to restore confidence’, *avoir confiance* ‘to have confidence / trust’, *restaurer confiance* ‘to restore confidence’, *avoir raison* ‘to be right’, *avoir raisons* ‘to have reasons’, *donner raison* ‘to confirm’, *attirer attention* ‘to draw attention’, *retenir attention* ‘to retain attention’.

Table 3. PARSEME 1.0 CQL query (lemma = “[predicative noun]” & mwe = “LVC”)<sup>40</sup>

Support-verb construction	Tokens		Support-verb-construction field		<i>Le Monde 1998</i>
	Total	Active declarative	Type	Mean	SVC field
<i>avoir peur</i> ‘to be afraid’	5	5	NEG	0.2	0.45
<i>faire confiance</i> ‘to trust (somebody)’	6	5	PRT, ADJ	0.4	0.5
<i>avoir envie</i> ‘to want’	5	5	NEG ( <i>aucune</i> ), ADV	0.4	0.48
<i>avoir espoir</i> ‘to have hope’	1	1	ADJ	1	1
<i>prendre décisions</i> ‘to take decisions’	5 (1 passive, 1 pronominalised)	3	DP	1	1
<i>prendre décision</i> ‘to take a decision’	3 (1 passive)	2	ADV, DP	1.5	1.81

- 44 The PARSEME 1.0 corpus is smaller than the *Le Monde 1998* corpus, which explains the smaller number of relevant tokens. However, similarities between Table 2 and Table 3 are visible with regard to the size of the support-verb-construction field and the type of permissible items with specific types (cf. right-most column of Table 3 for comparison).
- 45 For the four apparently most invariable support-verb constructions in Table 2, concordances from the *frTenTen17* corpus are drawn by means of Sketch Engine<sup>41</sup>:
- In this very large corpus, it appears that even highly fixed *redonner confiance* ‘to restore confidence’ (5,491 tokens) appears at times with a determiner phrase (*ils redonnent un peu de confiance au combat syndical* ‘they restore some confidence in the union battle’, lamarseillaise.fr) or an adverb (*nos succès d’antan redonneront peut-être confiance en nos capacités* ‘our past success may perhaps restore confidence in our ability’, metiseurope.eu) intervening.
  - For *donner raison* (30,034 tokens), the addition of modifications on the predicative noun breaks up the lexicalised support-verb construction (*donner raison* ‘to confirm’) and triggers a different form-function pairing (*donner une raison* ‘to have a reason’).<sup>42</sup>
  - For *avoir peur* ‘to be afraid’ (226,425 tokens), the addition of a determiner phrase seems to have a particularising effect (‘to have a specific fear’) (*la bureaucratie a une peur terrible de la population* ‘the bureaucratic apparatus has a terrible fear of the population’, free.fr; *J’ai cette peur qui revient* ‘I have this fear which comes back’, cowblog.fr). Determiner phrases with *avoir peur* ‘to be afraid’ are rare in the *frTenTen17* corpus.<sup>43</sup>
  - Finally, modifications of the noun in *avoir envie* (316,717 tokens) are rare and seem to have a particularising function (*tous les laquais avaient une grande envie de dormir* ‘all the lackeys had a great desire to sleep’, roi-mathias.fr).<sup>44</sup>

These impressionistic findings align with Sheinflux *et al.*’s [2019: 66] that even the seemingly most fixed structures show variations in corpora that are large enough.

- 46 However, the variations may be rather in the sense of Finkbeiner’s [2008: 401] options that are theoretically available but by language users rarely drawn upon. In the present chapter, the key question is when do we accept a combination (and its variations) as a phraseme and which instances do we dismiss as creativity (Bonial [2021]; Baayen [2009]; Hoffmann [2005: chap. 8]; Matushansky & Zwarts [2021]). The *frTenTen17* corpus is a corpus representing little-curated language usage on the internet, whereas the *Le Monde 1998* corpus is a highly curated journalistic corpus. Thus, we expect innovative non-canonical structures in the former but less so in the latter.
- 47 Overall, support-verb constructions with larger fields allow for more operations such as passivisation / pronominalisation / co-ordination of predicative nouns than those with smaller fields. With the selected support-verb constructions, the support-verb-construction field seems constrained to no more than two items and only modifications of the noun and/or the verb (determiners, adjectives, negatives, adverbs). All these items have limited flexibility in the syntactic frame, such that their displacement to the outside of the support-verb construction would indicate that the formerly discontinuous lexical unit is tending towards continuity (e.g. if the negative *ne ... pas* was placed around the noun and the verb). Thus, the mean length of and the types of items permissible in the support-verb-construction field seem a good measure for the analyticity of support-verb constructions. The low frequency of large support-verb-construction fields may resemble what has been found e.g. for phrasal verbs in English, which allow for items to intervene but speakers disprefer heavy / long constituents

(e.g. ?I looked **the formerly unknown word** up vs I looked **it** up) (Gries [2003]) as well as for tmetic constructions in archaic Greek (pre 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC) (Bertrand [2014]; Pompei [2014]).

- 48 A tmetic construction is a pattern that shows the separation of the preverb from the verb, as in e.g. Homer, *Iliad*, 2.317-318  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \tau\epsilon\kappa\nu\ \epsilon\phi\alpha\gamma\epsilon$  *kata tekn' ep<sup>h</sup>age* up children eat.AOR.3sg 'he had eaten (up) the children'. Bertrand [2014] distinguishes two types of tmesis, lexical tmesis, i.e. a lexical component intervenes between preverb and verb as in the example cited, and non-lexical tmesis, i.e. a postpositive item intervenes, which cannot easily be moved in the morpho-syntactic frame (vs Rosén [1999]). Noticeably, the number of intervening items is constrained, the morpho-syntactic type of intervening items is constrained (primarily direct objects in lexical tmesis), and the information-structural value of intervening items is constrained (primarily ratified topics or narrow foci<sup>45</sup>). Pompei [2014] sees a link between tmetic structures and verb-particle patterns, such as English phrasal verbs. Phrasal verbs proper do not seem to appear in Greek before the postclassical period (Fendel [2020b]). The important aspect to note however is that the items intervening between the components of verbal multi-word expressions are constrained in number, morpho-syntactic type, and pragmatic function thus reflecting the principle of iconicity that items that functionally belong together (i.e. form the predicate phrase) tend to appear close to each other in the surface representation.
- 49 While the French data illustrates the interplay between variability, discontinuity, and ambiguity of the lexical unit, we have to bear in mind that for comparative concepts (Haspelmath [2010: 665]), here support-verb constructions, the instantiation differs between languages and varieties, as a descriptive category (Haspelmath [2010: 664]). We noted above that classical Greek support-verb constructions disprefer morphological passivisation, the first of Mel'čuk's tests. Another of Mel'čuk's tests (passivisation, internal inflection, addition of a modifier, and order of components) deserves commenting too, that is the order of components.
- 50 While word order is syntactically driven in modern French (see data above)<sup>46</sup>, classical and postclassical Greek word order is information-structurally driven.<sup>47</sup> Thus, rather than considering the syntactic function of an item (e.g. subject, verb, object), we have to consider the information-structural value of an item, i.e. topic and focus (with various sub-categories) (for classical Greek, see Dik [1995]; Dik [2007]; Mastrorarde [2013]; Celano [2013]; Matić [2003]; Beschi [2018]; for postclassical Greek, see Bailey [2009]; Kirk [2012]). The modern language while still showing the reflexes of information-structural influence seems to have settled on an unmarked Subject-Verb-Object word order (Holton *et al.* [2011: 520-521]). For support-verb-construction fields, this means that (i) there is no fixed order of support verb and predicative noun and thus expected components in the support-verb construction field such as determiner phrases in syntactically-driven Subject-Verb-Object languages such as French (and modern English), and (ii) there is no external morpho-syntactic pressure towards the appearance of the support verb and predicative noun relatively close to each other but e.g. if the noun was the focus component in the discourse, it could be moved to the focus position (cf. Dik [1995: 241]).<sup>48</sup> Thus, if the support verb and the predicative noun appear close to each other and the support-verb-construction field is constrained with regard to the number and type of items that are permissible, this indicates that the functional structure of the support-verb construction is losing analyticity even if this is not (yet) reflected in the formal representation.

- 51 With the notion of the support-verb-construction field in place, Sections 4 to 6 turn to the three case studies which reflect diastratic, diatopic, and diachronic variation and development in support-verb constructions and due to this variation the births of phrasemes.

## 4. Diastratic differentiation and the syntax-lexicon interface

- 52 The first support-verb-construction phraseme to be considered is the oldest of the three selected for analysis, δίκην δίδωμι *dikēn didōmi* ‘to pay the price for one’s actions’. δίκην δίδωμι *dikēn didōmi* is a semantic-lexemic phraseme. It seems to act as a short-lived idiom in classical Greek legal jargon, whereas the phraseme in general exists from archaic times onwards and into the medieval period as a collocation. The present section is interested in the origins of the idiom from the perspective of how changes in **analyticity and compositionality** affect the status of a phraseme (as a collocation vs idiom).
- 53 The idiom δίκην δίδωμι *dikēn didōmi* means ‘to pay the price for one’s actions’ which is only derivable from the combination of the verb δίδωμι *didōmi* ‘to give’ and the noun if we assume a resultative meaning for the noun, i.e. δίκη *dikē* ‘penalty’ (Liddell-Scott-Jones (LSJ) IV.3). The recipient of the penalty / fine would consequently be the one having imposed the fine, i.e. the agent, and the subject referring to the one paying the fine would be the patient. This situation of a lexical passive created by means of δίδωμι *didōmi* ‘to give’, which otherwise appears in causative (τιμὴν δίδωμι *timēn didōmi* ‘to honour (somebody)’) and active (λόγον δίδωμι *logon didōmi* ‘to talk (to somebody)’) support-verb constructions<sup>49</sup>, already struck ancient commentators.
- 54 Plato (5<sup>th</sup> / 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC), in his dialectic dialogue *Gorgias*, has Socrates debate the meaning of δίκην δίδωμι *dikēn didōmi*. In (2), Socrates encourages his interlocutor to compare the meanings of the lexical passive δίκην δίδωμι *dikēn didōmi* and the morphological passive κολάζεσθαι *kolazesthai* ‘to get punished’:

(2) Plato, *Gorgias* 476a τοῦ δίδοναι δίκην καὶ τοῦ κολάζεσθαι δικαίως ἀδικούντα ἄρα τοῦ αὐτοῦ καλεῖς;  
*to didonai dikēn kai to kolazesthai dikaiōs adikounta ara to auto kaleis?*  
 ART.ACC give.INF.ACT punishment.ACC and ART.ACC  
*kolazesthai dikaiōs adikounta ara to*  
 punish.INF.PAS just.ADV wrong.PTC.ACT.ACC PRT.ITR ART.ACC  
*auto kaleis?*  
 same.ACC call.PR.ACT.2sg  
 ‘Are you saying that ‘paying the price for one’s actions’ and ‘justly getting punished’ when one does wrong are the same?’

The subsequent exchange clarifies that Socrates (and by inference) Plato does not consider the lexical and morphological passives semantically equivalent. Socrates even questions whether δίκην δίδωμι *dikēn didōmi* is a passive in (3):

(3) Plato, *Gorgias* 476d Τοῦτων δὲ ὁμολογουμένων, τοῦ δίκην δίδοναι ποῦτερον πάσχειν τί ἐστιν ἢ ποιεῖν  
*toutōn dē homologoumenōn to dikēn didonai poteron paskhein ti estin ē poiēin*  
 these.GEN PRT agree.PTC.PAS.GEN ART.NOM punishment.ACC  
*didonai poteron paskhein ti estin ē*  
 give.INF.ACT whether suffer.INF.ACT what be.PR.3sg or

*poiein*

do.INF.ACT

'With these things being agreed upon, is 'paying the price for one's actions' suffering or doing (something)?'

The subsequent exchange sees Socrates and his interlocutor agree that δίκην δίδωμι *dikēn didōmi* is in fact a passive even if not semantically equivalent to the morphological passive of the simplex verb (κολάζεσθαι *kolazesthai*). This is not surprising given that while δίκην δίδωμι *dikēn didōmi* is a recipient passive, i.e. profiling the subject as a volitional undergoer, κολάζεσθαι *kolazesthai* is a patient passive, i.e. profiling the subject as the patient (Keenan & Dryer [2007]; Næss [2007]).

- 55 Noticeably, the fine semantic nuancing seems to be no longer accessible in later scholia (3<sup>rd</sup> c. BC to 3<sup>rd</sup> c. AD) which equate δίκην δίδωμι *dikēn didōmi* with the morphological passive τιμωρέομαι (ὑπό) *timōreomai* (<sup>h</sup>υπο) 'to get punished (by)', see (4):

(4) *Scholia in Euripidem*, 1052

δίκην δέ μοι δέδωκε: τετιμώρηται ὑπ' ἐμοῦ. Gr. ἔδωκε δίκην ὁ τιμωρούμενος, λαμβάνει δίκην ὁ τιμωρῶν.

*dikēn de moi dedōke: tetimōrētai*

punishment.ACC PRT I.DAT give.PRF.ACT.3sg punish.PRF.PAS.3sg

<sup>h</sup>yp' emōũ. Gr. edōke dikēn <sup>h</sup>o

by I.GEN Gr. give.AOR.ACT.3sg punishment.ACC ART.NOM

*timōroumenos, lambanei dikēn* <sup>h</sup>o

punish.PTC.PAS.NOM take.PR.ACT.3sg punishment.ACC ART.NOM

*timōrōn.*

punish.PTC.ACT.NOM

'He pays the price for his actions to me: he is punished by me. Gr. The one who is being punished paid the price for his actions, the one who punishes collects punishment / fines.'

(see also *Scholia in Aelianum* 1.2.128)

Yet, like in Plato's metalinguistic debate, the simplex verb chosen to illustrate the meaning of the phraseme is not formally related to the predicative noun (such as δικάζομαι *dikazomai* from δίκη *dikē* by means of the derivational suffix -αζω -*azō*) and is fully transitive, i.e. with a patient object in the accusative case required (Lavidas [2009: 92-93]; Luraghi [2010: 69]). Noticeably, the agent is expressed in the dative case with the support-verb construction but in the form of a prepositional phrase with the simplex verb.

- 56 The prepositional agent expression in (4) is considered the standard pattern of agent expressions. However, non-standard agent expressions exist in classical Greek alongside. George [2005: 104-105] lists the following: ἀπό *apo* + genitive 'away from', ἐκ *ek* + genitive 'out of', παρά *para* + genitive 'from (beside)', παρά *para* + dative 'beside / before', πρός *pros* + genitive 'from', πρός *pros* + dative 'near / with'. For non-standard agent-expressions in prose writers, he finds an overall tendency for verbs of sending and giving to appear with ablative markers (e.g. ἐκ *ek* + genitive 'out of'), whereas verbs of thinking prefer locative markers (e.g. πρός *pros* + dative 'beside / before') (George [2005: 114]). Differences in the preference for and use of non-standard agent-expressions exist between prose writers.<sup>50</sup>
- 57 The agent expression in (4) depends on the whole verb phrase (τετιμώρηται *tetimōrētai*) and appears with a verb that is fully transitive in its active form, i.e. τιμωρέω *timōreō* takes a patient object and agent subject (cf. Næss [2007]).<sup>51</sup> While in the case of a simplex verb, the prepositional agent expression is dependent on the whole verb

phrase by default, in the case of support-verb constructions multiple possible valency centres exist (Hoffmann [2018]; Montaut [2016]; see also Didakowski & Radtke [2020]). The agent expression could be governed by the support verb, as is often the case for indirect objects, (5), the predicative noun, as is the case for objective genitives, (6), or the support-verb construction as a whole, (7) where the subjunctive indicates internal dependency:

- (5) Ich habe **ihm** Angst gemacht.  
I.NOM AUX.1sg he.DAT fear.ACC make.PTC  
'I have scared him.'
- (6) J' ai envie **de lui écrire**  
I have.1sg desire of him write.INF  
'I want to write to him'
- (7) I made the suggestion **that she join us**.

The former two options would attest to the analysability of the support-verb construction (i.e. syntagm-like), the latter option to the support-verb construction being treated akin to a lexical simplex verb (i.e. word-like).

- 58 The phenomenon of support-verb constructions being treated as words rather than syntagms is observed by George although without explicit mention of support-verb constructions. He discusses the passage in (8):

- (8) Herodotus, *Histories* 4.35.2 τη̅ν δε̅ Ἀ̅ργην τε και̅ τη̅ν Ὀ̅πιπιν ἄ̅μα  
αυ̅τῆ̅σι θεοῖ̅σι ἀ̅πικε̅σθαι. λε̅γουσι και̅ σφι τιμα̅ς ἄ̅λλας  
δεδο̅σθαι προ̅ς σφε̅ων.  
*tēn de Argēn te kai tēn Ōpin*  
ART.ACC PRT Arge.ACC PRT and ART.ACC Opis.ACC  
*<sup>h</sup>ama autēsi tēsi t<sup>h</sup>eoisi apikest<sup>h</sup>ai.*  
together they.DAT ART.DAT god.DAT.PL arrive.AOR.INF  
*Legousi kai sp<sup>h</sup>i timas allas*  
say.PR.ACT.3pl also they.DAT honour.ACC.PL other.ACC.PL  
*dedost<sup>h</sup>ai pros sp<sup>h</sup>eōn;*  
give.PRF.INF.PAS by they.GEN  
'[they say that] Arge and Opis arrived together with the gods and they say that  
**other honours have been given** to them by them'

- 59 With regard to (8), George [2005: 125-126] observes: 'For δι̅δωμι τιμα̅ς [*didōmi timas*], taken together, can be understood approximately equivalent to τιμα̅ω [*timaō*], and τιμα̅ω [*timaō*] is a verb that denotes a particular mental attitude towards the object, and whose passive, like that of νομι̅ζω [*nomizō*], construes five times with προ̅ς [*pros*] – and never with ε̅κ [*ek*] [...] Because προ̅ς [*pros*] so often marks the agent of τιμα̅ω [*timaō*], this usage will have been transferred to the phrase τιμα̅ς δεδο̅σθαι [*timas dedost<sup>h</sup>ai*]. Giving is typically a concrete, punctual act, and so we would expect the passive of δι̅δωμι [*didōmi*] to be marked other than by προ̅ς [*pros*]: the usual construction of δι̅δωμι [*didōmi*] with ε̅κ [*ek*] confirms this. But when it is honors that are given, the verb's semantics are closer to those of the verbs that construe with προ̅ς [*pros*], thus causing the use of the anomalous agent marker'. The passive he is commenting on is a morphological rather than a semantic passive of a support-verb construction. Yet the observation that the agent expression is chosen by reference to the support-verb construction as a whole rather than based on the support verb is of interest.<sup>52</sup>

60 The earliest attestations of the phraseme δίκην δίδωμι *dikēn didōmi* appear in archaic Greek (pre 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC), 7 instances in total, and show either a dative indicating the recipient (5 instances) or no recipient, see (9) and (10):

(9) Hymni Homericī, *To Hermes* (8<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> c. BC), l. 312  
 δὸς δὲ δίκην καὶ δέξο παρὰ Ζηνὶ Κρονίῳ.  
*dos de dikēn kai dexo*  
 give.AOR.IMP.2sg PRT punishment.ACC and receive.AOR.IMP.2sg  
*para Zēni Kroniōni.*  
 from Zeus.DAT son.of.Kronos.DAT

‘Give justice and receive [it] from Zeus, the son of Kronos.’

(10) Hesiod, *Works and Days* (8<sup>th</sup> / 7<sup>th</sup> c. BC), ll. 225-227

Οἱ δὲ δίκας ξείνοισι καὶ ἐνδήμοισι διδοῦσιν  
 ἰθείας καὶ μὴ τι παρεκβαίνουσι δικαίου,  
 τοῖσι τέθηλε πόλις, λαοὶ δ’ ἀνθεῦσιν ἐν αὐτῇ:  
*hoi de dikas xeinoisi kai endēmoisi*  
 REL PRT judgement.ACC.PL stranger.DAT and inhabitant.DAT  
*didousin*  
 give.PR.ACT.3pl  
*it<sup>h</sup>eias kai mē ti parekbainousi dikaïou,*  
 straight.ACC.PL and not anything deviate.PR.ACT.3pl just.GEN  
*toisi tethēle polis, laoi d’*  
 they.DAT thrive.PRF.ACT.3sg city.NOM people.NOM PRT  
*antheusin en autē:*  
 blossom.PR.ACT.3pl in it.DAT  
 ‘For those who give straight judgements to strangers and inhabitants and do not deviate from what is just, the city thrives and the people blossom in it [sc. the city].’

61 However, at this point, the meaning of the phraseme seems to be compositional and the noun seems to have a meaning ‘justice / judgement’ (Liddell-Scott-Jones (LSJ) s.v. δίκη *dikē* III). This is particularly obvious in (9) where co-ordinated δέξο *dexo* ‘receive’ constitutes a contrast profiling the subject as a recipient.<sup>53</sup> Note also the internal inflection (of the predicative noun) and the addition of a modifier to an internal lexemic component (i.e. the predicative noun) in (10). Both these aspects point towards a compositional collocation.

62 In classical times (5<sup>th</sup> / 4<sup>th</sup> c. AD), the situation changes. Table 4 shows the 536 classical attestations of the support-verb construction divided by the syntactic frame they appear in, i.e. with a dative (pointing to a compositional collocation), with an agent expression (pointing to a non-compositional idiom), or without either (and thus inconclusive). Percentages apply to rows :

Table 4. Classical Greek<sup>54</sup>

Syntactic context	Text type		Inflection / Modification			SVC Field		Total
	Prose	Verse	With DP	With ATT	Pluralisation	Mean size	NEG <sup>55</sup>	

+ agent expression	7 88 %	1 12 %	0 0 %	1 (Verse) 13 % <sup>56</sup>	1 (παρά para + dative) 13 % <sup>57</sup>	0.38	precedes × 2 25 % <b>never intervenes</b> 0 %	8
+ dative	45 64 %	25 36 %	8 11 %	10 14 %	14 20 %	0.89	precedes × 1 1 % <b>intervenes × 3</b> 4 %	70
neither	403 88 %	55 12 %	50 11 %	46 10 %	40 9 %	0.39	<b>precedes × 56</b> 12 % intervenes × 33 7 %	458
Total	455	81	58	57	55			536

- 63 The correlations that are illustrated by Table 4 are: (i) instances with agent expressions appear prevalently in prose contexts, allow for limited modification and inflection only, and constrain support-verb-construction fields with regard to their size and the type of items appearing in the field. Conversely, (ii) instances with a dative appear in prose and verse yet with a prevalence in prose, allow for some modification and inflection, and constrain support-verb-construction fields comparatively less with regard to their size and the type of items in the field. The majority of instances appear without either an agent expression or a dative and thus without a syntactic cue as to the meaning of the support-verb construction.
- 64 Generally speaking, the addition of modifiers, here attributive and determiner phrases with the predicative noun, and internal inflection, here of the predicative noun, is limited in support-verb constructions (both Mel'čuk's collocations and idioms) at the point when it forces a referential meaning onto the noun, e.g. *to break one's heart* vs *to break one's chocolate heart* (Pasquer *et al.* [2018: 2583]; Savary *et al.* [2019]). Determiner phrases take the form of definite articles, negative determiners, and indefinites in Greek. Attributive phrases take the form of qualitative genitives or adjectives.
- 65 We established above that while the collocation draws on the *nomen actionis* / event meaning of the predicative noun, the idiom draws on the *nomen acti* / result meaning of the predicative noun even if reconceptualised as eventive in the support-verb construction, compare e.g. *to take a picture* (Radimský [2011]).<sup>58</sup> The eventive meaning 'judgement' allows for modifications by means of attributive phrases referring to what kind of judgement is given, (11), along with determiner phrases and pluralisation applying count-noun morpho-syntax to the predicative noun (cf. Wittenberg & Levy [2017]).

(11) Euripides, *Orestes*, ll. 612-614 (tragedy)  
 μολῶν γὰρ εἰς ἔκκλητον Ἀργείων ὄχλον  
 ἔκοῦσαν οὐχ ἔκοῦσαν ἐπισειῶ πόλιν

σοὶ σῆ τ' ἀδελφῆ, λεύσιμον δοῦναι δίκην.  
*molōn gar eis ekklēton Argeiōn ok<sup>h</sup>lon*  
 go.PTC.NOM PRT to select.ACC Argive.GEN.PL crowd.ACC  
*<sup>h</sup>ekousan ouk<sup>h</sup> <sup>h</sup>ekousan episeisō polin*  
 voluntary.ACC NEG voluntary.ACC shake.FUT.1sg city.ACC  
*soi sē t' adelphē, leusimon dounai*  
 you.DAT your.DAT and sister.DAT stoning.ACC give.AOR.INF  
*dikēn*  
 judgement.ACC

'For, going to the selected crowd of Argives, I will shake/urge the city, voluntary or involuntary, to give the judgement of stoning to you and your sister.'

By contrast, the result meaning 'penalty/punishment' does not allow for modification or any count-noun morpho-syntax but seems to be treated as a mass noun.

- 66 At the latest from about the time of Plato's metalinguistic debate onwards we can assume that a lexical passive meaning existed. Usually metalinguistic commentary reflects upon current practice. In fact, agent expressions indicating unambiguous passive patterns are rare. Table 5 shows all the standard and non-standard agent expressions attested with the phraseme, note that no relevant examples appear in non-literary texts:

Table 5. Agent expressions<sup>59</sup>

Preposition	AG	CG	PG	RG	EBG	MG
ὑπό <sup>h</sup> upo + genitive	-	5 <sup>60</sup>	-	2	3	7
ἐκ <i>ek</i> + genitive	-	-	-	2	2	5
ἀπό <i>apo</i> + genitive	-	-	-	-	-	-
παρά <i>para</i> + dative	-	1	2	3	3	3
παρά <i>para</i> + genitive	-	2 (ambiguous)	-	-	1 (ambiguous)	-
πρός <i>pros</i> + dative	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	8	2	7	9	15

- 67 However, while Table 5 seems to evidence continuity of the (passive) idiom into the medieval period, it is in fact one Plato passage that gets requoted repeatedly<sup>61</sup>:

(12) Plato, *Gorgias* 525b5  
 καὶ δίκην δίδοντες ὑπὸ θεῶν τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων  
*kai dikēn didontes <sup>h</sup>upo t<sup>h</sup>eōn te kai*  
 and punishment.ACC give.PTC.NOM by god.GEN.PL and and *ant<sup>h</sup>rōpōn*  
 man.GEN.PL  
 'and getting punished by both gods and men'

- 68 In later Christian literature, the quote is adapted to Christian thought, i.e. 'god' is used in the singular (e.g. Georgius, *Chronicon* 110.132.22, Medieval Greek (MG)). All Roman-period instances show co-ordination of the support-verb construction with the simplex verb *κολάζω kolazō* (in the passive voice) (Plutarch, *De superstitione* 168B4; Plutarch, *De*

*tranquillitate animi* 470D1). Noticeably, ἀπο + genitive ‘away from’ never takes over as would be expected in postclassical times (Bortone [2010: 184-185]; George [2005: 130]). All the instances with ἐκ + genitive ‘out of’ are ambiguous and can be interpreted as a reason/cause rather than an agent.

- 69 Furthermore, several of the non-standard agent expressions are in fact replacements of the dative in the role of the indirect object especially when the indirect object refers to a recipient or goal in post-classical times (Blass [1990: paras. 187-202]; Mayser [1906: paras. 91-98]; Wahlgren [2014]; Stolk [2017: 188 and 209]). This means that rather than functioning as agent expressions they function as goal / recipient expressions and thus point to the collocation rather than the idiom. This ambiguity affects specifically παρα + dative ‘beside / before’ and προς + dative ‘near / with’.
- 70 Thus, what we seem to witness is a collocation ‘to judge / to give judgement(s)’ existing from archaic and into medieval times and an idiom ‘to pay the price for one’s action’ during the classical period. The scholia are the *terminus ante quem* at which point in time the idiom apparently needed glossing. The idiom seems to appear very specifically in legal contexts where the lexical and the morphological passives seem to assume different underlying situations of liability. (13) from one of Lysias’ courtroom speeches illustrates this:

(13) Lysias, *Speech* 30.23-24 εἰς αὐτὸν δεῖ καταψηφισάμενοι τῶν ἐσχάτων αὐτῶν τιμῆσητε, τῆς αὐτῆς ψήφου τοῦς τε ἄλλους βελτίους ποιήσετε καὶ παρα τοῦτου δίκην εὐληφοῦτες ἐσεσθε. ἐπιστάσθε δεῖ, ὡς ἄνδρες δικασταί, ὅτι παραδείγμα τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐστὶ μὴ τολμᾶν εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐξαμαρτάνειν οὐχ ὅταν τοῦς ἀδυνατοῦς εἰπεῖν κολάζητε, ἀλλ’ ὅταν παρα τῶν δυναμένων λεγεῖν δίκην λαμβάνητε. τίς οὖν τῶν ἐν τῆ πόλει ἐπιτηδειότερος Νικομάχου δοῦναι δίκην; τίς ἐλάττω τῆν πόλιν ἀγαθὰ πεποιήκεν ἢ πλειῶν ἠδίκηκεν;

*ean de katapsēp<sup>h</sup>isamenoi tōn esk<sup>h</sup>atōn autō timēsēte, tē autē psēp<sup>h</sup>ō tous te allous beltious poiēsēte kai para toutou dikēn eilēp<sup>h</sup>otes esest<sup>h</sup>e. epistast<sup>h</sup>e de, ō andres dikastai, <sup>h</sup>oti paradeigma tois allois estai mē tolman eis <sup>h</sup>umas examartanein ouk<sup>h</sup> hotan tous adunatous eipein kolazēte, all’ hotan para tōn dunamenōn legein dikēn lambanēte. tis oun tōn en tē polēi epitēdeiōteros Nikomakh<sup>h</sup>ou dounai dikēn? tis elattō tēn polin agath<sup>a</sup> pepoiēken ē pleiō edikēken?*

‘If you have condemned him and award the utmost penalty to him, by the same vote you will make the others better people and **you will have punished** this man. Know, men of the jury, that he will be a paradigm to others not to dare to wrong against you – not when **you punish** those who are unable to speak but when **you punish** those who are able to speak. For who would be more suitable of those in the city than Nicomachus **to pay the price for his actions**? Who has done less good and **has wronged** more against the city (than him)?

- 71 The contrast between the simplex verb (κολάζω *kolazō*) and the support-verb construction (δίκην λαμβάνω (παρά) *dikēn lambanō (para)*) seems to be one between simple punishment and punishment within the framework of the law. In simple punishment, the defendant is fully affected, as reflected in the syntactic structure by the reference to him/her in the form of an accusative object, and is unable (possibly due to not being given the opportunity) to defend himself/herself (τοῦς ἀδυνατοῦς εἰπεῖν *tous adunatous eipein*). In punishment within the framework of the law, the defendant is less affected, as reflected in the syntactic structure by the reference to him/her in the form of a prepositional phrase, and is able to influence the

severity of the punishment through his/her defence (τῶν δυναμένων λεγεῖν *tōn dunamenōn legein*) (Fendel [2023b]).

- 72 It appears that the idiom underwent domain specialisation, which is attested for support-verb constructions in Greek (e.g. Squeri [forthcoming] on the Hippocratic corpus; Fendel & Ireland [2023] on Xenophon's *On Horsemanship*) and across languages, e.g. *to make a contribution* vs *to make a comment* in English (Özbay [2020]). The hypothesis put forward here is that the idiom 'to pay the price for one's actions' is only born in the classical period and specifically in the technical context of legal language. If we consider the 458 passages in classical Greek which show neither an agent expression nor a dative pointing towards them being an idiom or a collocation and we select only those that show no modification or internal inflection, which seem to be linked to the collocation, we find 353 passages. The mean support-verb-construction field size for these is 0.25. A small field would point towards the idiom. Of these 353 passages, 46 appear in verse and 307 in prose; of the 307 passages in prose, 226 appear in (courtroom) oratory (74%). This number must be taken with caution as we draw on inferences made above about the lexical and morpho-syntactic behaviour of the idiom.
- 62
- 73 If we zoom in on the instances with agent expressions, i.e. those instances that are definitely the (passive) idiom<sup>63</sup>, a timeline emerges starting from Lysias' (ca. 445-380 BC) apparently experimental use of the idiom. This observation already runs counter to claims such as Carey's [1989: 8] that '[t]he dominant impression created is one of artlessness' (similarly van Emde Boas [2022]). Lysias was a speechwriter rather than a lawyer representing the defendant in court, a situation created by the direct democracy at the time in Athens. This organisation of the courts 'prevented not only the creation of an inaccessible legal language, but also the folk-linguistic idea that legal language is hard to understand and employ' (Willi [2003: 79]). The next to pick up the (passive) idiom is Aristophanes (ca. 446-386 BC) in his political comedy. Aristophanes reflects on current practice: 'if Aristophanes, in a play centred on legal matters, did not make fun of legal vocabulary, this vocabulary was probably not regarded as technical' (Willi [2003: 79]). The (passive) idiom subsequently appears in Xenophon's (ca. 430-355 BC) historiographic works, yet noticeably in two out of three instances in speeches and dialogues rather than the narrative. The speeches in Xenophon 'can affect ensuing events, shaping reality for example through decisions made in an assembly or court of law' (Baragwanath [2016: 282-283]). Finally, we find the (passive) idiom in Plato's (ca. 427-348 BC) *Gorgias*, (12) above. It is this passage taken from a metalinguistic commentary that is requoted in later texts as mentioned.
- 74 This re quoting may be partially motivated by the backward-looking movements of Atticism (ca. 1<sup>st</sup>. c. BC) (Benaissa [2012]; Horrocks [2014: 133-141]; Sean Adams [2013]; Wisse [2001]; Lee [2013]; Caragounis [2014]; la Roi [2022a]) and the Second Sophistic (ca. 1<sup>st</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> c. AD) (Bowie [2012]; Kemezis [2014]) during which aspects of classical language that had since fallen out of use were artificially resuscitated especially in higher-register contexts (Bentein [2019: 146-148 and 155]). The only two later papyrological instances (p. Louvre 3.172, edict, Roman Greek (RG) and P. Berl. Frisk 4, petition, Early Byzantine Greek (EBG)) seem to confirm this, in that they come from a Roman-period edict and an Early Byzantine petition, both of which are higher-register text types (Palme [2009]).

- 75 However, in the case of the idiom in question its ties to the legal domain may be relevant too and may even explain its quick demise. Language acts as a semiotic system expressing meanings beyond the referential meaning of the words used. Language, thus, like any sign, can be an icon (resemblance between form and meaning), an index (contiguity of form and meaning), and a symbol (arbitrary relationship between form and meaning) (cf. Peirce [1933]; Bentein [2019]). We are interested in the indexical function of language here. Bentein [2019:123] defines linguistic indexes as “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 (cf. Ochs [1996: 411]).
- 76 Linguistic indexes can be of two kinds, direct and indirect (Ochs [1992]; Ochs [1996]) or first-order and second-order (Silverstein [1979]; Silverstein [2003]). These two categories broadly refer to indexes having a referential meaning as opposed to a social meaning (Hultgren [2014: 316]; for a phonetic example, see Eklund [2008]; Eklund [2015]; Gardner [2024]; Coupland [2016: 414] on the vernacular). However, ‘the meanings of variables are not precise or fixed but rather constitute a field of potential meanings – an *indexical field*, or constellation of ideologically related meanings, any one of which can be activated in the situated use of the variable’ (Eckert [2008: 453]). Thus, the value of the index may vary by context (on contexts in which RP pronunciation is “risible” Coupland [2016: 418]; on the internal structure of indexical fields Jaffe [2016]). The (passive) idiom δίκην δίδωμι *dikēn didōmi* ‘to pay the price for one’s actions’ seems to have had a referential meaning within the Athenian democratic legal context but acquired secondarily an index for technical language. It was this indexing that made it interesting to later writers who conceptualised technical language as elitist (Bentein [2019: 155]).<sup>64</sup>

## 5. Diatopic renewal and the syntax-semantics interface

- 77 The second support-verb-construction phraseme to be considered of the three selected for analysis, χάριν ἀπολαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin apolambanō* ‘to receive a favour’, is a lexical passive and only appears from the classical period onwards, like the idiom δίκην δίδωμι *dikēn didōmi* ‘to pay the price for one’s actions’ discussed in Section 4. However, it has an active counterpart in the same support-verb-construction family that appears in archaic times already, χάριν ἀποδίδωμι *k<sup>h</sup>arin apodidōmi* ‘to give / render / return thanks / a favour’ (first attested in the Septem Sapientes, *Sententiae* 215.12 (7<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> c. BC), then several times in Aesop’s *Fables* (6<sup>th</sup> c. BC), and in Simonides, *Epigrammata* 7.77.2 (6<sup>th</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> c. BC) in archaic times).
- 78 In English, one *does* and *gets* a favour or favours, in Greek the opposition is between *to give* and *to take/to receive*. This is a semi-productive alternation both in English and in Greek which applies to a large range of predicative nouns, unlike the idiom discussed in Section 4 (cf. Bonial [2021]; Kamber [2008: 143]; Butt & Geuder [2001]). χάριν ἀπολαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin apolambanō* ‘to receive a favour’ also has a counterpart in χάριν λαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin lambanō* ‘to receive a favour’ which seems subject to fewer morpho-syntactic and pragmatic/contextual constraints.

- 79 The question is what degree of **lexical renewal** we accept as modification of a phraseme before positing a new phraseme. The question falls into two sub-questions: Is  $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$   $k^h\text{arin apolamban}\bar{o}$  a (semi-)productively formed lexical passive of  $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\mu\iota$   $k^h\text{arin apodid}\bar{o}\mu\iota$  and hence not a new phraseme but a derivation? Is  $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$   $k^h\text{arin apolamban}\bar{o}$  distinct from  $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\nu\ \lambda\alpha\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$   $k^h\text{arin lamban}\bar{o}$  and should be considered a different phraseme? The two questions are addressed one after the other below.
- 80 Both sub-questions have to do with lexical renewal. Lexical renewal is the process by which an item in the lexicon is replaced by a different lexeme taking on the same function(s). The process has affected Greek support-verb constructions from the first recorded instances.<sup>65</sup> Meissner [2016: 28] points to  $\acute{\iota}\epsilon\rho\alpha\ \acute{\rho}\acute{\epsilon}\zeta\omega$   $^h\text{iera r}^hez\bar{o}$  ‘to do sacrifices / to sacrifice’ with the support verb  $\acute{\rho}\acute{\epsilon}\zeta\omega$   $r^hez\bar{o}$  derived from the Indo-European root  $*u\acute{e}rg-$  from which Mycenaean (ca. 13<sup>th</sup>/12<sup>th</sup> c. BC)  $-wo-ko$  in  $i-je-ro-wo-ko$  ‘doer of sacrifices’. From the same root, we find in archaic times the support verb  $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\delta\omega$   $erdo\bar{\omega}$  (Tribulato [2015: 278 n. 32]) and in post-classical times  $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$   $ergazomai$  (Baños & Jiménez López [forthcoming]). In classical times, and surviving until its replacement by  $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$   $kano\bar{\omega}$  ‘to do’ (derived from classical  $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\mu\upsilon\omega$   $kamn\bar{o}$  ‘to exhaust oneself’), the doing verb is  $\pi\omicron\iota\acute{\epsilon}\omega$   $poi\acute{e}\bar{o}$  ‘to do / to make’.<sup>66</sup> However, the reflex of the Indo-European  $*d^heh_1$  ‘to do’ shows up in Greek as  $\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\eta\mu\iota$   $tith\bar{e}\mu\iota$  ‘to put’ as opposed to Latin *facere* ‘to do’ or Old-High German *tuon* ‘to do’ (Ittzés [forthcoming]). This explains common claims about lexical substitution of ‘to do’ for older ‘to put’ in archaic / classical Greek support-verb constructions (Cock [1981: 24]; Schutzeichel [2014: 84, 154, and 162]; De Pasquale [2023: 263]).
- 81 Lexical substitution also seems to affect lexical passives, with archaic  $\lambda\alpha\gamma\chi\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$   $lagk^hano\bar{\omega}$  being ousted by  $\tau\upsilon\gamma\chi\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$   $tugk^hano\bar{\omega}$  ‘to receive’ in classical times. They differ etymologically, in that the former is derived from a root ‘share / lot’ whereas the latter comes from a root ‘chance / lot’, but not significantly in meaning (Beekes [2010]). According to the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* statistics, none of the lemmata mentioned dies out at any point over the course of the history of Greek, substitution only seems to affect their use as support verbs.
- 82 Section 3 discussed that Greek support-verb construction generally fail Mel’čuk’s [2023] passivisation test, possibly for reasons of reduced transitivity of the verb phrase (being a complex predicate) (see also Marini [2010]) but possibly also for lexical reasons (being a unit) (Mel’čuk [2023: 74-75]). Theoretically, four ways of passivisation of a support-verb construction are imaginable. The examples are taken from the classical *ECF Leverhulme corpus*.  $\tau\iota\mu\acute{\eta}$  *time* ‘honour’ is used as the predicative noun as all four structures are attested for it:
- (14)  $\tau\iota\mu\acute{\eta}\ \gamma\acute{\iota}\gamma\upsilon\eta\tau\alpha\iota$  ‘there is honour’ ( $\emptyset$ ) >> 2 attestations  
 $\tau\iota\mu\bar{e}\ gignetai$   
 honour.NOM become.PR.IND.ACT.3sg
- (15)  $\tau\iota\mu\acute{\eta}\ \delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\tau\alpha\iota$  ‘honour is given’ (by) >> 2 attestations  
 $\tau\iota\mu\bar{e}\ didotai$   
 honour.NOM give.PR.IND.PAS.3sg
- (16)  $\tau\iota\mu\acute{\eta}\ \lambda\alpha\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$  ‘I receive honour’ (from) >> also  $\tau\iota\mu\acute{\eta}\varsigma\ \tau\upsilon\gamma\chi\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$   
 $\tau\iota\mu\bar{e}\n\ lamban\bar{o}\ \tau\iota\mu\bar{e}\varsigma\ tunk^hano\bar{\omega}$   
 honour.ACC receive.PR.IND.ACT.1sg
- (17)  $\tau\iota\mu\acute{\eta}\ \acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega$  ‘I have honour / I am honoured’ ( $\emptyset$ )

*timēn ek<sup>h</sup>ō*

honour.ACC have.PR.IND.ACT.1sg

- 83 (14) has been proposed by Jiménez López [2021] in analogy to the situation in Modern Greek (Kyriacopoulou & Sfetsiou [2002])<sup>67</sup> and constitutes an existential expression ('there is'); (15) is a morphological passive breaking up the unit of the support-verb constructions (Hoffmann [2015]; Foley [2007]) and is dispreferred in (post)classical Greek (Section 3, Dataset 1); (16) is a recipient passive which does not change the morpho-syntactic structure but only the functional structure; and (17) is a stative which does not change the morpho-syntactic structure but only the functional structure (cf. processual vs statal passives). Only structures like (16) and (17) are support-verb constructions. Passivisation in these does not change the morpho-syntactic structure but only the event structure and does not delete but only reprofiles the subject of the active counterpart, i.e. here 'to give honour / to honour' (Benedetti [2011]; Brunet [2008]). In these, agent expressions can appear in the form of source expressions ('from').
- 84 The situation for χάρις *k<sup>h</sup>aris* in the classical *ECF Leverhulme corpus* is slightly more pointed in that the morphological passive option is not attested and the existential appears only twice (Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1385a30, Demosthenes, *Speech* 18.36). Agent expressions with παρά *para* + genitive 'from' appear with the recipient passive. If indeed the only option to form a processual (as opposed to a statal) passive with support-verb constructions is lexical substitution of the support verb by means of a verb of receiving, could this qualify as a categorial periphrastic?
- 85 Haspelmath's [2000: 662-663] categorial periphrasis<sup>68</sup> refers to forms that lie outside the paradigm but express something very close to a form defined in the paradigm, e.g. the English *have*-perfect and the French *aller*-future (Wolfe & Paoli [2022]). Haspelmath [2000: 664] describes these forms as having 'a sufficiently high degree of grammaticalization to be described as part of the verbal paradigm', yet they are not the equivalent of forms in the paradigm, but rather add-ons to the paradigm.<sup>69</sup> The French *aller*-future competes with the synthetic future in modern French with regard to its temporal and modal values, especially in the spoken registers (Popescu [2018: 4]), yet the synthetic future remains fully intact (Lindschouw [2011: 92]), especially with regard to its modal values (epistemic, deontic, attenuative) (Lindschouw [2011: 84-85]).
- 86 Recipient passives can be the only option of passivisation that is permissible, e.g. German *helfen* 'to help' and *rückerstatten* 'to reimburse' do not morphologically passivise but recipient passives can be created with *bekommen* 'get' (*Hilfe bekommen* 'to get help', *eine Rückerstattung bekommen* 'to get a reimbursement'). Greek morphological passives can be patient or recipient passives, similarly to English, but unlike e.g. German where we find a split between recipient passives and patient passives and only the latter can be morphological passives.
- (18) to get a refund / to get refunded  
The purchase will be refunded to you. AND You will be refunded for the purchase.
- (19) zurückerstatten / eine Rückerstattung erhalten  
Der Einkaufswert wird Ihnen (zurück)erstattet. BUT NOT #Sie werden (zurück)erstattet für den Einkaufswert.  
'The purchase will be refunded to you.' BUT NOT 'You will be refunded for the purchase.'  
INSTEAD Sie erhalten eine Rückerstattung für den Einkaufswert.  
'You will receive a refund for the purchase.'

Lexical passives can thus function almost akin to a categorial periphrasis (Haspelmath [2000]), as in German, but also as an alternative that is possibly indexed pragmatically or socially, as in English.<sup>70</sup>

- 87 Is χάριν ἀπολαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin apolambanō* a (semi-)productively formed lexical passive of χάριν ἀποδίδωμι *k<sup>h</sup>arin apodidōmi* and hence not a new phraseme but a derivation? While from the perspective of prototype semantics both support-verb constructions appear in the same family centred around the predicative noun with one being the active and the other the passive option (cf. Kamber [2008]), from the perspective of the morpho-syntax the question is more complicated. From the perspective of derivational morphology, we would ask whether the support-verb construction and a simplex verb derived from the same root as the predicative noun in the support-verb construction are equivalent. If so, the simplex verb could be passivized instead of the support-verb construction. Wittenberg and Levy [2017] show that this is not the case semantically (duration of event), Wittenberg and Snedeker [2014] that this is not the case syntactically (argument structure), and Wittenberg and Trotzke [2021] that this is not the case pragmatically (discourse cohesion) (for Greek specifically, see Fendel & Ireland [2023]; Marini [2010]). From the perspective of inflectional morphology, we would ask whether we can integrate a semi-lexical component (the support verb) into the paradigm (e.g. Haspelmath [2000]; Thornton [2011]; Dragomirescu, Nicolae & Zafiu [2022]; Ledgeway & Vincent [2022]).<sup>71</sup> This seems unlikely based on the structure of the paradigm and the fact that support verbs do not grammaticalize (see Section 1). While multiple passive formations alongside each other are unproblematic in Greek, both diachronically (Willi [2018: 523]) and synchronically (Keenan & Dryer [2007: 340]), the semi-lexical nature of support verbs seems to preclude their integration as categorial periphrastics by Haspelmath's [2000: 664] standards. Mel'čuk [2023] would consider χάριν ἀπολαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin apolambanō* and χάριν ἀποδίδωμι *k<sup>h</sup>arin apodidōmi* separate phrasemes but would have a different question to answer.
- 88 Is χάριν ἀπολαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin apolambanō* distinct from χάριν λαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin lambanō* and should be considered a different phraseme (akin to *to have a shower* vs *to take a shower* (Leech 2009), or *to do a favour* vs *to return a favour*)? The two combinations differ in that ἀπολαμβάνω *apolambanō* is a compound verb with a prefix that seem to add intensifying or reciprocal semantics, whereas λαμβάνω *lambanō* is a simplex verb. Table 6 shows the numerical preference for the compound over the simplex in the classical period when both combinations are first attested. Percentages apply to columns:

Table 6. Overview: ἀπολαμβάνω *apolambanō* vs λαμβάνω *lambanō*<sup>72</sup>

	AG	CG	PG	RG	EBG	Total
ἀπολαμβάνω <i>apolambanō</i>	–	18 55 %	7 29 %	13 <sup>73</sup> 13 %	20 <sup>74</sup>	58
λαμβάνω <i>lambanō</i>	–	15 45 %	17 71 %	90 <sup>75</sup> 87 %	[not catalogued]	122
TOTAL	–	33	24	103		

- 89 We may thus classify λαμβάνω *lambanō* as the canonical support verb but ἀπολαμβάνω *apolambanō* as a prototypical verb of realisation. Smith [2022: 73-74] distinguishes between prototypicality and canonicity as follows: ‘Prototypicality involves psychological salience, which is often the result of frequency, whereas canonicity is an analytical tool, which predicts that truly canonical forms are ‘likely to be rare or even non-existent’ ... Prototypicality is an empirical psycholinguistic notion, whilst canonicity is a theoretical idealization’ (cf. also Brown *et al.* [2012 : 237]; Finkbeiner [2008]).
- 90 Table 7 catalogues by author the earliest attestations of both combinations, i.e. χάριν ἀπολαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin apolambanō* and χάριν λαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin lambanō*. The attestations are sorted diachronically from oldest to newest, approximate dates of birth and death for the authors are provided in round brackets (all BC) and the number of attestations in square brackets. The genre / text type is provided in italics with each author:

Table 7. Distribution across authors in classical times

ἀπολαμβάνω <i>apolambanō</i>	λαμβάνω <i>lambanō</i>
	Sophocles (497-406 BC) [1] <i>Verse</i>
	Euripides (480-406 BC) [2] <i>Verse</i>
	Critias (460-403 BC) [1] <i>Verse</i>
	Aristophanes (446-386) [1] <i>Verse</i>
<b>Lysias (445-380) [4] <i>Oratory</i></b> Isocrates (436-338) [1] <i>Oratory</i>	<b>Lysias (445-380) [1] <i>Oratory</i></b>
<b>Xenophon (430-355) [3] <i>Historiography</i></b>	<b>Xenophon (430-355) [1] <i>Historiography</i></b>
	Ephorus (400-330) [1] <i>Oratory</i>
	Lycurgus (390-325) [1] <i>Oratory</i>
	Hyperides (390-322) [1] <i>Historiography</i>
<b>Demosthenes (384-322) [2] <i>Oratory</i></b>	<b>Demosthenes (384-322) [2] <i>Oratory</i></b>
Aeschines (389-314) [2] <i>Oratory</i>	
<b>Aristotle (384-322) [1] <i>Prose</i></b>	<b>Aristotle (384-322) [3] <i>Prose</i></b>
Axionicus (400-320) [3] <i>Middle comedy</i>	
Demades (380-318) [2] <i>Oratory</i>	

- 91 Table 7 shows that while χάριν λαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin lambanō* starts out in verse literature (tragedy and comedy), χάριν ἀπολαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin apolambanō* seems to arise amongst Attic orators without ever ousting χάριν λαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin lambanō*. While χάριν

ἀπολαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin apolambanō* seems to remain the preferred option in oratory, by the latter classical period, Aristotle in his prose writings prefers χάριν λαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin lambanō* which is going to numerically outdo χάριν ἀπολαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin apolambanō* from the Ptolemaic period onwards, as Table 6 above shows.

- 92 For χάριν ἀπολαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin apolambanō*, there seems to be a gradual retreat into higher registers possibly along the lines of what we described in Section 4. Tables 8 to 10 show the development of both combinations over the course of the classical, Ptolemaic, and Roman periods with regard to the permissibility of modification and internal inflection, their appearance in verse as opposed to prose, and their co-occurrence with agent expressions pointing towards the lexical passive function still being in place. Percentages apply to rows.

Table 8. Classical Greek<sup>76</sup>

	DP	ATT	Plural	Verse	Agent expression	Total
ἀπολαμβάνω <i>apolambanō</i>	3 17 %	5 28 %	–	3 17 %	6 (παρά <i>para</i> + genitive) 33 %	18
λαμβάνω <i>lambanō</i>	3 20 %	2 13 %	2 13 %	5 33 %	4 (παρά <i>para</i> + genitive) 27 %	15
Total						33

Table 9. Ptolemaic Greek

	DP	ATT	Plural	Verse	Agent expression	Total
ἀπολαμβάνω <i>apolambanō</i>	3 43 %	2 29 %	3 43 %	3 43 %	2 (παρά <i>para</i> + genitive) 29 %	7
λαμβάνω <i>lambanō</i>	3 18 %	6 35 %	–	7 41 %	3 (παρά <i>para</i> + genitive) 18 %	17
Total						24

Table 10. Roman Greek

	DP	ATT	Plural	Verse	Agent expression	Total
ἀπολαμβάνω <i>apolambanō</i>	2 15 %	4 31 %	1 8 %	1 8 %	5 (παρά <i>para</i> + genitive) 38 %	13
λαμβάνω <i>lambanō</i>	27 30 %	22 24 %	5 6 %	–	20 (παρά <i>para</i> + genitive [9], από <i>apo</i> + genitive [5], ἐκ <i>ek</i> + genitive [6]) 22 %	90

Total						103
-------	--	--	--	--	--	-----

- 93 Tables 8 to 10 show that χάριν ἀπολαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin apolambanō* numerically yielded to χάριν λαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin lambanō* from the Ptolemaic period onwards. However, it became the preferred option in verse, i.e. in the higher registers. Agent expressions appear throughout comparatively speaking more often with χάριν ἀπολαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin apolambanō* than with χάριν λαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin lambanō* which may point to the passive value being in need of being indicated (cf. George [2005: 178]). The phraseme used regularly in Attic oratory became gradually associated with technical contexts and subsequently with higher registers (Bentein [2019]). However, indexing may also have happened through the route of the Attic dialect and Attic oratory as its exponent gaining a standing as elitist (cf. Atticism and the Second Sophistic).
- 94 In the papyri, χάριν ἀπολαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin apolambanō* appears only once in a literary papyrus (p. Oxy. 13.1606 A Roll with Lysias, *Contra Hippothersem, Contra Theomnestum* and Four Other Unknown Orations). χάριν λαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin lambanō*, on the other hand, seems to have retreated into epistolary formulae (Fendel 2022: chap. 9), yet seems to have assumed a stative meaning:

(20) P. Michael 26, ll. 9-11 (unknown, AD 300, fragment of private letter) κέλευε δὲ ἐμοὶ ἐν οἷς βούλει καὶ γνώσεαι ὅτι καὶ χάριν λαμβάνω.

*keleue de emoi en hois boulei kai*

order.IMP.2sg PRT I.DAT in REL.DAT want.2sg and

*gnōsei hoti kai k<sup>h</sup>arin lambanō.*

know.FUT.2sg that also gratitude.ACC take.PR.1sg

‘Tell me whatever you want (to have) and know that I am grateful (sc. to get it for you).’

(21) P. Neph. 4, ll. 23-25 (Alexandria, AD 301-400, private letter)

ἐγὼ γὰρ χάριν λαμβάνω, ὅτε καταξιοῖς παρ’ ἐμοῦ δεῖξασθαι ὁδὴποτε.

*egō gar k<sup>h</sup>arin lambanō, hote kataxiois par’*

I.NOM PRT gratitude.ACC take.PR.1sg that consider.right.PR.2sg from

*emou dexast<sup>h</sup>ai hodēpote.*

me.GEN receive.INF whatever.ACC

‘For I am grateful that you consider it right to receive anything from me.’

While in (20) and (21), χάριν ἀπολαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin apolambanō* appears in a fixed letter formula and the entity that the writer is grateful to is the addressee, in (22), the entity the writer addresses is God and the agent expression with ἐκ *ek* points to a lexical passive.

(22) SB 14 11494, ll. 1-9 (unknown, AD 401-500, prayer regarding eye illness)

Ἐ λαβοῦσα χάριν ἐκ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου υἱοῦ στησον τὸ ρεῦμα τοὺς πόνους τῶν

ὀφθαλμῶν φοιβάμμωνος υἱοῦ Ἀθανασίου ὁ κατοικῶν ἐπὶ βοηθίᾳ τ[ο]ῦ

ὑψί[στο]υ ἐν σκέπη [τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ οὐ]ρανοῦ ἀλίσθησεται -ca.?-]

*labousa k<sup>h</sup>arin ek tou monogenous*

receive.AOR.PTC.NOM favour.ACC from the.GEN of.one.blood.GEN

*sou huiou stēson to rheuma*

you.GEN son.GEN stop.AOR.IMP.2sg the.ACC discharge.ACC

*tous ponous tōn op<sup>h</sup>talmōn Phoibammōnos*

the.ACC pains.ACC the.GEN eyes.GEN Phoibammon.GEN

*huiou Athanasiou ho katoikōn epi*

son.GEN Athanasius.GEN the.NOM inhabitant.NOM for

*boēthia t[ou] hupsi[sto]u en skepē [tou]*

help.DAT the.GEN highest.GEN in cover.DAT the.GEN

*T<sup>h</sup>euou tou ou]ranou aulis[t<sup>h</sup>ēsetai -ca. ?-]*

God.GEN the.GEN heaven.GEN lie.in.the.courtyard.FUT.3sg

'Having received a favour/blessing from your son of one and the same blood, stop the discharge, the pain of the eyes, of Phoibammon, son of Athanasius! For the help of the highest under the cover/protection of God of the heaven, the inhabitant will lie in the courtyard [...]'

- 95 One aspect that we need to consider is to what extent the structure may have changed meaning in later centuries as indicated by attributes but possibly also by the preference for the simplex over the compound verb. In other words, was a new phraseme born in later centuries? Given the attributes with the predicative noun, such as πνεύματος *pneumatōs* 'of the spirit' (Origines, *Selecta in Psalmos*, 12.1637.13), διδασκαλικήν *didaskalikēn* 'of/for teaching' (Origines, *Homiliae in Job*, 17.80.52), θειοτέραν *t<sup>h</sup>eioteran* 'more divine' (Origines, *Commentarii in evangelium Joannis*, 6.6.35.8) in Roman times, it seems that a meaning 'blessing' has developed in Christian contexts (possibly as a *nomen rei* from the earlier *nomen actionis* 'favour' and *nomen acti* 'gratitude') (cf. Panagl [2020: 394]). This may underlie (22).
- 96 The simplex verb λαμβάνω *lambanō* unlike the compound ἀπολαμβάνω *apolambanō* is not implying reciprocity.<sup>77</sup> Reciprocity can be indicated adverbially, as in the frequently quoted New Testament passage: John 1.16 Ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐλάβομεν καὶ χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος. *Ek tou plērōmatos autou ēmeis pantes elabomen kai k<sup>h</sup>arin anti k<sup>h</sup>aritos*. 'Due to his fullness, we all have received favour for favour.' The lexical affinity between χάρις *k<sup>h</sup>aris* and prototypical ἀπολαμβάνω *apolambanō* as opposed to canonical λαμβάνω *lambanō* in classical times may be due to the reciprocal meaning inherent in the predicative noun and reflected in the prefix of the support verb. This made the compound verb however less viable when the meaning of the predicative noun changed. Furthermore, the compound verb seems to have undergone indexing perhaps initially diatopically (cf. *to have a shower vs to take a shower*) but subsequently also diastatically (cf. *to do a favour vs to return a favour*) and retreated into higher registers and specifically literature, whereas the simplex verb formed the basis for the birth of a new phraseme at the very latest in Christian times.

## 6. Diachronic reanalysis and the syntax-pragmatics interface

- 97 The third and final support-verb-construction phraseme to be considered of the three selected for analysis, προσέχω τὸν νοῦν *prosek<sup>h</sup>ō ton noun* 'to pay attention to', is the only one of the three that survives throughout the periods under investigation, yet after taking what Heine and Kaltenböck [2021: 5] describe as a 'quantum leap': 'With the label 'quantum leap' we are referring to the operation of cooptation, whereby segments of sentence grammar, such as main clauses without their complements, are taken out of sentence grammar and transferred to the metatextual level of discourse processing [...]. This operation [...] does not involve parameters of grammaticalization.' Consider English *pay attention* in which the form of the predicative noun (and the determiner phrase) is fixed and which relates to a specific context. *Pay attention* is used as a syntactically independent exclamative functioning at the discourse level.
- 98 The support-verb construction seems related to earlier τὸν νόον / νοῦν ἔχω πρὸς *ton noon / noun ek<sup>h</sup>ō pros* (Aesop, *Fables* 40.1.3 τὸν νοῦν ὅλον ἔχων πρὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν *ton*

noun *ḥolon ekḥōn pros ton ouranon* ‘directing all attention to the sky’ (6<sup>th</sup> c. BC), Aesop, *Fables* 198.1.8 ὄλον τε τὸν νοῦν πρὸς τὴν ὀπλὴν ἔχοντος *ḥolon te ton noun pros tēn hoplēn ekḥontos* ‘directing all attention to the hoof’ (6<sup>th</sup> c. BC)), which remains in use in classical times (e.g. Thucydides, *Histories* 3.22.5.6 πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὸν νοῦν ἔχοιεν *pros autous ton noun ekḥoien* ‘they may direct (their) attention to them’) and postclassical times (e.g. Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae* 16.221.3 καὶ τὸν νοῦν ἔσχεν πρὸς αὐτήν *kai ton noun eskḥen pros autēn* ‘and he directed (his) attention to her’ (1<sup>st</sup> c. AD)) but which is outnumbered by προσέχω τὸν νοῦν *prosekḥō ton noun* ‘to pay attention to’ in literary texts throughout periods of time and does not appear in the papyri. The present section considers προσέχω τὸν νοῦν *prosekḥō ton noun* ‘to pay attention to’ from the perspective of why Mel’čuk’s pragmatemes are instances of rebirth rather than continuity (see (24) for his definition of pragmatemes).

- 99 Table 11 provides an overview of the 1010 instances of the support-verb construction in question in the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (Dataset 9). The columns word order, determiner phrase, and support-verb-construction field provide information about the permissibility of Mel’čuk’s modification, internal inflection, and word order changes. The columns on object patterns provide information about the morpho-syntactic integration of the support-verb construction. The columns ‘verse’ and ‘technical writing’ consider the text type in which the relevant attestations appear. Percentages refer to rows not columns.

Table 11. προσέχω τὸν νοῦν *prosekḥō ton noun* ‘to pay attention to’<sup>78</sup>

Time period	Word order	DP	Field		Object			Alternative syntax	Verse	Technical writing	Total
	VN		Yes	Size	Type	DAT	Other				
AG	0 %	50 %	0.5	VOC	50 %	50 %	–	100 %	100 %	–	2
CG	85 %	99 %	0.35	various	69 %	11 %	20 %	–	9 %	17 5 %	316
PG	81 %	98 %	0.26	ADV, DAT, PRT, 1x NOM (pronominal)	85 %	3 %	12 %	– (1x implied PN)	7 %	10 17 %	59
RG	91 %	99 %	0.41	various	73 %	9 %	18 %	(3x; 3x PN implied)	(1x)	306 (Galen = 295) 78 %	393
EBG	83 %	96 %	0.39	various	73 %	13 %	14 %	8 % (+ 7x PN implied)	(1x)	118 49 %	240
TOTAL										451	1010

- 100 There is only one instance in the papyri that appears neither in a literary papyrus (representing classical writing) nor shows the restoration of the predicative noun and determiner phrase in a damaged passage, which is problematic as Modern Greek προσέχω *prosek<sup>h</sup>ō* has the function of older προσέχω τὸν νοῦν *prosek<sup>h</sup>ō ton noun* ‘to pay attention to’ without needing the predicative noun. This usage is foreshadowed in the New Testament (cf. Bauer [1957]; Lampe [1961]). The one relevant instance comes from the Roman petition P. Oxy. 8.1119 (l. 9). The support verb appears as a participle in the nominative case (masculine, singular) and is accompanied by a dative referring to the object of the attention.
- 101 Heine and Kaltenböck’s [2021: 5] ‘quantum leap’ is often referred to as pragmaticalisation. Pragmaticalisation is the process by which an item / phrase moves ‘from a fully propositional (or referential) meaning to meanings that are more textual/discourse-oriented ... and/or interpersonal’ (Claridge & Arnovick [2010: 179]). This divorces the item / phrase from the sentence grammar, which is visible in the extension of scope (Claridge & Arnovick [2010: 180]), the decategorialisation ‘in the sense that the item loses morphological and syntactic properties that previously identified it as a member of a (more) major grammatical category’ (Claridge & Arnovick [2010: 181]), and the appearance of the item in extra-sentential positions (Claridge & Arnovick [2010: 181]; Koev [2022: 18]). However, the pragmaticalised and non-pragmaticalised patterns often co-exist. Debaisieux [2016] observes this e.g. for French *parce que* and labels the syntactic pattern ‘construction’ and the discursive usage ‘configuration’. Examples of pragmaticalised phrasemes include *you know* (Erman [2001]), *I mean* (Beeching [2011]), Latin *rogo* ‘I ask / please’ (Molinelli [2010]), postclassical (Egyptian) Greek ἀξιωθείς *axiōt<sup>h</sup>eis* ‘please’ (Fendel [2019]), and ἀμέλει *amelei* ‘of course’ (Ia [Roi 2022b]).
- 102 As illustrated by Table 11, in archaic times, the support-verb construction shows reasonable flexibility with regard to Mel’čuk’s modification, internal inflection, and word order changes. This flexibility is considerably reduced in classical times. However, this relative inflexibility aligns with Mel’čuk’s idioms (similarly to *περὶ πολλοῦ ποιεῖσθαι* *peri pollou poieomai* about much.GEN do.PR.1sg ‘to value / to consider important’<sup>79</sup>) while the syntactic embedding of the structure is preserved, as internally dependent object clauses, as in (23), reflect:
- (23) Isocrates, *Speech* 2.11 Ὡς ἐνθυμουμένον χρη̅ προσε̅χειν τὸν νοῦν, ὅπως ὅσονπερ ται̅ς τιμαι̅ς τῶν ἄλλων προε̅χεις, τοσούτον και̅ ται̅ς ἀρεται̅ς αὐτῶν διοίσεις.  
<sup>h</sup>ōn ent<sup>h</sup>umoumenon k<sup>h</sup>rē prosek<sup>h</sup>ein ton  
 they.GEN consider.PTC.PR.GEN it.is.necessary pay.INF the  
 noun, <sup>h</sup>opōs <sup>h</sup>osonper tais timais tōn  
 attention.ACC that as.much the.DAT honour.DAT the.GEN  
 allōn prosek<sup>h</sup>eis, tosouton kai tais  
 others.GEN surpass.PR.2sg so.much also the.DAT  
 aretais autōn dioiseis.  
 virtues.DAT they.GEN differ.FUT.2sg  
 ‘It is necessary that (you) while considering this **pay attention** that inasmuch as  
 you surpass the others in honour, you differ from them also in virtue.’
- 103 The object clause in the form of ὅπως <sup>h</sup>opōs + future indicative (διοίσεις *dioiseis*) indicates that it is dependent on the support-verb construction as a whole as object clauses of this form in classical Greek only appear with verbs of making an effort (van

Emde Boas *et al.* [2019: 526-527]). No component of the support-verb construction on its own qualifies as a verb of making an effort but the support-verb construction as a whole, as a lexical unit, does. This ties in further with Mel'čuk's idioms.

- 104 In Ptolemaic times, tighter constraints on the size of the support-verb-construction field and the type of permissible items in it seem to suggest a solidification of the support-verb construction as a reasonably invariable idiom. In the Roman period and very specifically Galen's idiolect which dominates the Roman-period attestations, the support-verb construction seems to become a technical term. Galen, similarly to Hippocrates in classical times, seems to use the non-pragmaticalised support-verb construction in order to draw attention to the symptoms of a medical condition. The dative object refers to the symptoms the patient is showing. In Mel'čuk's terms that would make it a pragmateme (similar to classical δίκην δίδωμι *dikēn didōmi* 'to pay the price for one's actions' in legal contexts, cf. Section 4):

(24) Definition 9-1: Pragmateme (Mel'čuk [2023: 160])

'A linguistic expression is called a pragmateme if and only if (iff) it is constrained pragmatically, that is, iff a special communication situation requires its use.'

Mel'čuk defines a 'special communication situation' as follows:

(25) Special communication situation (Mel'čuk [2023: 162])

'A normal situation of linguistic communication is either an oral or written monologue (a narration, a journalistic or technical paper, a literary text), or a dialog. Then special situations of linguistic communication include:

- written warnings, prescriptions and instructions coming from an officially recognized authority, that is, texts on signs, on merchandise packing/labels, on medical prescriptions, etc.
- written messages: letters of all sorts, including circulars
- telecommunication: a telephone conversation, texting, emails
- oral signs: commands, warnings, calls for help
- ritualized social situations.'

In the above, we have preferred the more concise sociolinguistically based definition along the lines of genre, register, and style by Biber and Conrad [2009] (adopted by Bentein [2019]) and the functionally driven definition of a 'quantum leap' from the morphosyntactic onto the interpersonal level by Heine and Kaltenböck [2021]. In the early Byzantine period, the link between technical contexts and the idiom becomes more pronounced.

- 105 However, alongside, there are instances of the support-verb construction that seem divorced from the sentence grammar and seem to serve as pragmatic markers. Pragmatic markers can be subdivided into three categories: (i) a stall 'let[s] the person literally stall for time', (ii) a signpost (such as English *but*) 'suggests where the speaker is going with this story or phrase or sentence', and (iii) a guidepost (such as English *so*) 'suggests how you might interpret what the speaker is trying to get across' (e.g. a summary, an invitation) (Davis & Maclagan [2020: 67 and 80]). The relevant instances appear with the support verb in the imperative (2<sup>nd</sup> person) and without an object (41 instances in total, 1 archaic in Aesop's *Fables*, 22 classical of which 12 in comedy and 5 in Plato's dialogues, 3 Ptolemaic of which all in comedy, 8 Roman of which 1 in technical writing, and 7 early Byzantine of which 1 in technical writing).<sup>80</sup> (26) to (28) illustrate the pattern:

(26) Aristophanes, *Clouds* l. 575 (Classical Greek (CG))

ὦ σοφώτατοι θεαταῖ, δευρο τὸν νοῦν προσεῆχετε.

ō *sophōtatoi t<sup>h</sup>eatai, deuro ton*

oh most.sophisticated.VOC spectators.VOC here the.ACC

noun *prosek<sup>h</sup>ete*.

attention.ACC pay.PR.IMP.2pl

'most sophisticated members of the audience, pay attention right here!'

(27) Phrynichus, *Praeperatio sophistica* Frg 133, l. 2 (Roman Greek (RG))

†ἀκούε, σιγά: Κρατινός [fr. 284] 'ἀκούε, σιγά, προσέχε τὸν νοῦν,  
 δευρ' ὄρα'.

†akoue, siga: Kratinos [fr. 284]

listen.PR.IMP.2sg be.quiet.PR.IMP.2sg Kratinos.NOM [fr.284]

'akoue, siga, *prosek<sup>h</sup>e ton*

listen.PR.IMP.2sg be.quiet.PR.IMP.2sg pay.PR.IMP.2sg the.ACC

noun, *deur'<sup>h</sup>ora*'.

attention.ACC here look.PR.IMP.2sg

'listen, be quiet, Kratinos [fr. 284] 'listen, be quiet, pay attention, now look!'

(28) Eusebius, *Praeperatio evangelica* 11.13.4.3 (Early Byzantine Greek (EBG))

ὁμῶς δ' ἐννοεῖ καὶ σφοδρὰ προσέχε τὸν νοῦν  
*hōmōs d' ennoei kai sphōdra prosek<sup>h</sup>e*

nonetheless PRT consider.PR.IMP.2sg and very pay.PR.IMP.2sg

*ton noun*;

the.ACC attention.ACC

'nonetheless, consider (it) and pay attention very much!'

- 106 From a conversation-analytic point of view, προσέχε(τε) τὸν νοῦν *prosek<sup>h</sup>e(te) ton noun* highlights the following piece of information. The speaker/writer is likely to use the phrase when they hope that heightened attention to what is said will result in the preferred response (e.g. acceptance after a request or agreement after an assessment) (Emde Boas [2017: 11]). The 'quantum leap' seems to happen in spoken registers (comedy and the Platonic dialogues) rather than primarily written registers but may be imported into technical writing secondarily. Although, note that (27) seems a quote from Plato's *Kratinos* and is thus not indicative, (28) is more informative in this regard.
- 107 If we apply Debaisieux's distinction between a construction and a configuration to the two (!) phrasemes προσέχω τὸν νοῦν *prosek<sup>h</sup>ō ton noun* 'to pay attention to', we would qualify the idiom in technical (especially medical) writing as a construction and the discursive guidepost that emerges in dialogic contexts as a configuration.

## 7. Summary and conclusion: Birth and propagation of support-verb-construction phrasemes in classical and post-classical Greek

- 108 The present chapter investigated the birth and rebirth(s) of three classical and postclassical Greek support-verb constructions: δίκην δίδωμι *dikēn didōmi* 'to pay the price for one's actions', χάριν ἀπολαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin apolambanō* 'to receive a favour', and προσέχω τὸν νοῦν *prosek<sup>h</sup>ō ton noun* 'to pay attention' by means of Mel'čuk's lexicographic Sens-Texte framework (and with reference to the PARSEME Natural-Language-Processing inspired framework). Support-verb constructions cut across Mel'čuk's classes of semantic-lexemic phrasemes, which are divided into compositional collocations and non-compositional idioms, and pragmatemes. The chapter explored the diversity, or internal heterogeneity, within the group of support-verb constructions, which is visible not only synchronically (e.g. diatopic and diastratic variation) but also diachronically due to support-verb constructions hovering at three interfaces. The chapter drew its data from the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, which

compiles literary texts from the archaic to the early modern periods and the *Duke Database of Documentary Papyri*, which compiles documentary texts of the postclassical and early medieval periods.

- 109 Mel'čuk's [2023: 71-72] morphological, morpho-syntactic, and syntactic tests were used in order to differentiate between types of semantic-lexemic phrasemes. For these, Section 3 highlighted the issue of a reverse-engineered canonical form (in order to carry out tests) for corpus languages in general, as the native speakers of a corpus language are the texts (Fleischman [2000]), along with the Greek-specific issue that support-verb constructions withstand morphological passivisation (Mel'čuk's test 1). The section proceeded to introduce the metric of the support-verb-construction field, that is the space between the support verb and the predicative noun when they appear in an active, declarative clause. This metric was first tested on French data, a living language for which reverse engineering of a canonical form is unproblematic, and a language that allows for morphological passivisation in some support-verb constructions. Furthermore, word order in modern French is syntactically driven (unlike in (post)classical Greek) such that there are some predictable items in the support-verb-construction field (e.g. negatives, determiner phrases, adverbs) (cf. Mel'čuk's test 4). The French data allowed us to gain an impression of how the permissibility of operations such as passivisation (Mel'čuk's test 1), and the degree of permissibility of modification and internal inflection (Mel'čuk's tests 2 and 3) correlate. Given that other verbal multi-word expressions in (post)classical Greek show the same sensitivity to the number and type of items intervening between their components, the metric was adopted for the three case studies in Sections 4 to 6.
- 110 Using δίκην δίδωμι *dikēn didōmi* as the test case, we asked how changes in **analyticity and compositionality** affect the status of a phraseme (as a collocation vs idiom) (Section 4). It appeared that while δίκην δίδωμι *dikēn didōmi* existed as a collocation 'to give judgement(s) / to judge' from archaic times and into the medieval period, in classical times, the idiom δίκην δίδωμι *dikēn didōmi* 'to pay the price for one's actions / to get punished' arose. The idiom became indexed for technical (legal) and subsequently higher registers but survived beyond the classical period primarily only in quotes. The non-analytic and non-compositional idiom acted as a word rather than a syntagm, as agent expressions show.
- 111 Using χάριν ἀπολαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin apolambanō* 'to receive a favour' as the test case, we asked what degree of **lexical renewal** we accept as modification of a phraseme before positing a new phraseme (Section 5). We broke this overarching question into two sub-questions first evaluating χάριν ἀπολαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin apolambanō* 'to receive a favour' vs χάριν ἀποδίδωμι *k<sup>h</sup>arin apodidōmi* 'to return a favour' against Haspelmath's notion of categorial periphrasis as a lexical passive within the support-verb-construction family around the predicative noun, and subsequently χάριν ἀπολαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin apolambanō* vs χάριν λαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin lambanō* from the perspective of prototypicality as opposed to canonicity of the support verb. Due to the semi-lexical nature of the support verb, Haspelmath's notion of categorial periphrasis does not seem to apply perfectly to χάριν ἀπολαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin apolambanō* 'to receive a favour'. The prototypical compound (ἀπολαμβάνω *apolambanō*) seems to be diatopically (cf. English *to take a shower* vs *to have a shower* (Leech [2009])) and subsequently diastatically (cf. English *to do a favour* vs *to return a favour*) indexed but retreats into higher registers after the classical period; the canonical simplex verb (λαμβάνω *lambanō*) predates it in early classical verse and

postdates it as well as forms the base for the later phraseme ‘to receive a blessing’ without reciprocity implied.

- 112 Using προσέχω τὸν νοῦν *prosek<sup>h</sup>ō ton noun* ‘to pay attention to’ as the test case, we asked why Mel’čuk’s pragmatemes are instances of rebirth rather than continuity (Section 6). *προσέχω τὸν νοῦν prosek<sup>h</sup>ō ton noun* exists as an idiom, in the sense of Debaisieux’s construction, especially in medical discourse from at least classical times onwards (cf. Hippocrates). *προσέχω τὸν νοῦν prosek<sup>h</sup>ō ton noun*, however, also exists as a pragmateme (with the support verb in the imperative and no object expressed) in the sense of Debaisieux’s configuration, from archaic times onwards especially in dialogic contexts there serving as a discursive guidepost. The pragmateme has taken a ‘quantum leap’ (Heine & Kaltenböck [2021: 5]) out of the sentence grammar (morpho-syntactic level of functional grammar) and into the discourse grammar (interpersonal level of functional grammar). Thus, there is no continuity but rupture in the transition.
- 113 Table 12 summarises the phrasemes discussed and the sub-types identified, their period of birth, and their context(s) of application:

Table 12. Summary of phrasemes<sup>81</sup>

Phraseme	Meaning	Mel’čuk’s type	Time period(s)	Context(s)
δίκην δίδωμι <i>dikēn didōmi</i> + agent expression	to pay the price for one’s actions	non-compositional semantic-lexemic phraseme (idiom)	CG only	technical writing (legal texts) – higher register
δίκην δίδωμι <i>dikēn didōmi</i> + dative or equivalent	to give judgement / to judge	compositional semantic-lexemic phraseme (collocation)	from AG onwards	n/a
χάριν ἀπολαμβάνω <i>k<sup>h</sup>arin apolambanō</i>	to get a favour in return	compositional semantic-lexemic phraseme (collocation)	CG primarily	Attic oratory – higher register
χάριν λαμβάνω <i>k<sup>h</sup>arin lambanō</i>	to receive a favour	compositional semantic-lexemic phraseme (collocation)	from CG onwards (with possible rebirth in postclassical times)	n/a
προσέχω τὸν νοῦν <i>prosek<sup>h</sup>ō ton noun</i>	to pay attention	non-compositional semantic-lexemic phraseme (idiom)	from AG onwards	technical writing – medical texts
προσέχω τὸν νοῦν <i>prosek<sup>h</sup>ō ton noun</i> support verb in the imperative, no object	to pay attention	pragmateme	from AG onwards (marginal)	primarily dialogic contexts initially

- 114 If implemented into the PARSEME terminology, which is Natural-Language-Processing inspired and fiercely synchronically focused, (i) δίκην δίδωμι *dikēn didōmi* + agent expression would be a VID (verbal idiomatic expression), (ii) δίκην δίδωμι *dikēn didōmi* + dative or equivalent an LVC.cause (light-verb construction causative), (iii) χάριν ἀπολαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin apolambanō* and χάριν λαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin lambanō* would be NotMWE (not a verbal multi-word expression) because lexical passives are not implemented currently, (iv) προσέχω τὸν νοῦν *prosek<sup>h</sup>ō ton noun* would be an LVC.full (light-verb construction full), and (v) προσέχω τὸν νοῦν *prosek<sup>h</sup>ō ton noun* with the support verb in the imperative and no object expressed would currently also be marked as an LVC.full (light-verb construction full).
- 115 In authoritative dictionaries, such as Liddell-Scott-Jones, a consistent implementation of support-verb constructions would be necessary. The following shows the cataloguing (or not) of the support-verb constructions discussed:
- (29) Liddell-Scott-Jones (LSJ)
- s.v. νόος / νοῦς *noos / nous* I.1.2.b mentions in brackets προσέχω τὸν νοῦν *prosek<sup>h</sup>ō ton noun* as the equivalent of τὸν ν. ἔχειν πρὸς τινα *ton n. ek<sup>h</sup>ein pros tina* or τι τι ‘to have one’s mind directed to someone / something’;
- s.v. δίκη *dikē* IV.3 lists δίκην *dikēn* or δίκας δίδόναι *dikas didonai* ‘to suffer punishment’;
- s.v. χάρις II.2 (‘gratitude’) lists χάριν λαβεῖν τινος *k<sup>h</sup>arin labein tinos* receive thanks from one; ἀπολαβεῖν παρὰ τινῶν *apolabein para tinōn*;
- III.1.a (‘favour’) lists χ. δοῦναι *k<sup>h</sup>[arin] dounai*= χαρίζεσθαι *k<sup>h</sup>arizest<sup>h</sup>ai*.
- 116 προσέχω τὸν νοῦν *prosek<sup>h</sup>ō ton noun* fares best with even its predecessor mentioned briefly, although no distinction is made between the idiom and the pragmateme. For δίκην δίδωμι *dikēn didōmi*, only the idiom is mentioned yet with some inaccuracy as to the permissibility of internal inflection, whereas the collocation is not catalogued. For χάριν ἀπολαμβάνω *k<sup>h</sup>arin apolambanō*, the lexical passive is mentioned but the distinction between simplex and compound verbs remains unexplained. Another issue appears in the paragraph after where the corresponding active χάριν δίδωμι *k<sup>h</sup>arin didōmi* is equated with the formation with derivational suffix -ίζω -ίζω, which as explained in Section 4 does not have the same function morpho-syntactically, semantically, or pragmatically. Thus, while authoritative dictionaries show some awareness of all three support-verb constructions (and the corresponding six phrasemes identified), the entries would require an update to reflect their actual diversity.

---

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, James. 2013. *Social variation and the Latin language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Adams, Sean. 2013. Atticism, classicism, and Luke-acts: discussions with Albert Wifstrand and Loveday Alexander. In Stanley Porter & Andrew Pitts (eds.), *The language of the New Testament: Context, history, and development*, 91-111. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- 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: AMHakkert.
- Anastassiadis-Symeonidis, Anna, Angeliki Fotopoulou & Tita Kyriacopoulou. 2019. Multiword expressions in modern Greek: synthetic review on their nature. *Bulletin of Scientific Terminology and Neologisms, Special Issue: MWEs in Greek and Other Languages: From Theory to Implementation*.
- Andrews, Avery. Forthcoming. Complex predicates. In Mary Dalrymple (ed.), *Handbook of lexical functional grammar*. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Baayen, R. Harald. 2009. Corpus linguistics in morphology: Morphological productivity. In Merja Kytö & Anke Lüdeling (eds.), *Corpus linguistics: An international handbook*, 899-919. Berlin and Boston: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Bailey, Nicholas. 2009. *Thetic constructions in Koine Greek*. Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam PhD thesis.
- Bakker, Egbert. 2020. The language of Homer. In Corinne Ondine Pache (ed.), *The Cambridge guide to Homer*, 70-79. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baños, José Miguel & María Dolores Jiménez López. Forthcoming. Translation as a mechanism for the creation of collocations (I): the alternation ἐργάζομαι / ποιέω in the Bible. Submitted to *Glotta*.
- Baragwanath, Emily. 2016. The character and function of speeches in Xenophon. In Michael Flower (ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Xenophon*, 279-298. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bauer, Brigitte. 1995. *The emergence and development of SVO patterning in Latin and French: diachronic and psycholinguistic perspectives*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bauer, Walter. 1957. *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*. 5., verb. und stark verm. Aufl. Berlin: A. Töpelmann.
- Beeching, Kate. 2011. The translation equivalence of bon, enfin, well and I mean. *Revue française de linguistique appliquée* 16(2). 91-105.
- Beekes, Robert. 2010. *Etymological dictionary of Greek*. Leiden: Brill.
- Bel, Nuria, Maria Coll & Gabriela Resnik. 2010. Automatic detection of non-deverbal event nouns for quick lexicon production. In Chu-Ren Huang & Dan Jurafsky, *Proceedings of the 23<sup>rd</sup> international conference on computational linguistics (Coling 2010)*, 46-52. Beijing, China: Coling 2010 Organizing Committee.
- Benaissa, Amin. 2012. Greek language, education, and literary culture. In Christina Riggs (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of roman Egypt*, 526-542. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Benedetti, Marina. 2011. Linguistik und alte Sprachen: "Experimente" zu altgr. ἔχειν. In Thomas Krisch & Thomas Lindner (eds.), *Indogermanistik und Linguistik im Dialog. Akten der XIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 21. Bis 27. September 2008 in Salzburg*, 59-68. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Bentein, Klaas. 2019. Dimensions of social meaning in post-classical Greek: Towards an integrated approach. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 19(2). 119-167.

- Bertrand, Nicolas. 2014. On tmesis, word order, and noun incorporation in Homeric Greek. In Annamaria Bartolotta (ed.), *The Greek verb: Morphology, syntax, and semantics (proceedings of the 8<sup>th</sup> international meeting on Greek linguistics, Agrigento, October 1-3, 2009)*, 11-30. Louvain-la-Neuve and Walpole, MA: Peeters.
- Beschi, Fulvio. 2018. The Ancient Greek sentence left periphery: A study on Homer. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 18(2). 172-210.
- Biber, Douglas & Susan Conrad. 2009. *Register, genre, and style*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blass, Friedrich. 1990. *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*. 17. durchgesehene Aufl. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- Bonial, Claire. 2021. Take a look at this! Form, function, and productivity of English light verb constructions. *Colorado Research in Linguistics* 25.
- Bortone, Pietro. 2010. *Greek prepositions: from antiquity to the present*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bowern, Claire. 2008. The diachrony of complex predicates. *Diachronica* 25(2). 161-185.
- Bowie, Ewen. 2012. Second Sophistic. In Simon Hornblower, Antony Spawforth & Esther Eidinow (eds.), *The Oxford classical dictionary*. 4<sup>th</sup> edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Boye, Kasper. 2023. Grammaticalization as conventionalization of discursively secondary status: Deconstructing the lexical-grammatical continuum. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 121(2). 270-292.
- Brown, Dunstan, Marina Chumakina, Greville Corbett, Gergana Popova & Andrew Spencer. 2012. Defining “periphrasis”: key notions. *Morphology* 22. 233-275.
- Brunet, Claude. 2008. Accipere, verbe support et élément du passif nominal chez Sénèque et Valère-Maxime. In Ghislaine Viré (ed.), *Autour du lexique latin, XIIIe colloque international de linguistique latine, Bruxelles 4 au 9 avril 2005*, 167-179. Brussels: Latomus.
- Butt, Miriam. 1995. *The structure of complex predicates in Urdu*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Butt, Miriam. 2010. The Light verb jungle: Still hacking away. In Mengistu Amberger, Brett Baker & Mark Harvey (eds.), *Complex predicates: Cross-Linguistic perspectives on event structure*, 48-78. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Butt, Miriam. 2019. Complex predicates and multidimensionality in grammar. *Linguistic Issues in Language Technology* 17(4). 1-14.
- Butt, Miriam & Wilhelm Geuder. 2001. On the (semi)lexical status of light verbs. In Henk van Riemsdijk & Norbert Corver (eds.), *Semi-lexical categories: The function of content words and the content of function words*, 323-370. Berlin and Boston: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Butt, Miriam & Aditi Lahiri. 2013. Diachronic pertinacity of light verbs. *Lingua* 135. 7-29.
- Cap, Fabienne, Manju Nirmal, Marion Weller & Sabine Schulte im Walde. 2015. How to account for idiomatic German support verb constructions in statistical machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 11<sup>th</sup> workshop on multiword expressions*, 19-28. Denver, Colorado: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Caragounis, Chrys. 2014. Atticism. In Georgios Giannakis (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek language and linguistics*. Leiden: Brill.
- Carey, Christopher. 1989. *Lysias: Selected speeches*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Celano, Giuseppe. 2013. Argument-focus and predicate-focus structure in Ancient Greek. *Studies in Language* 37(2). 241-266.
- Claridge, Claudia & Leslie Arnovick. 2010. Pragmaticalisation and discursisation. In Andreas Jucker & Irma Taavitsainen (eds.), *Historical pragmatics*, 165-192. Berlin and Boston: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Cock, Alwies. 1981. ΠΟΙΕΙΣΘΑΙ: Poiein. Sur les critères déterminant le choix entre l'actif Poiein et le moyen ΠΟΙΕΙΣΘΑΙ. *Mnemosyne* 34(1/2). 1-62.
- Cordeiro, Silvio Ricardo & Marie Candito. 2019. Syntax-based identification of light-verb constructions. In *Proceedings of the 22<sup>nd</sup> nordic conference on computational linguistics (NoDaLiDa), September 30 – October 2, Turku, Finland*, 97-104. Turku: Linköping Electronic Conference Proceedings.
- Coupland, Nikolas. 2016. Labov, vernacularity and sociolinguistic change. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 20(4). 409-430.
- Creissels, Denis. 2016. Univerbation of light verb compounds and the obligatory coding principle. In Léa Nash & Pollet Samvelian (eds.), *Approaches to complex predicates*, 46-69. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Croft, William. 2022. *Morphosyntax: constructions of the world's languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Davis, Boyd & Margaret Maclagan. 2020. Signposts, guideposts, and stalls: Pragmatic and discourse markers in dementia discourse. In Trini Stickle (ed.), *Learning from the talk of persons with dementia: A practical guide to interaction and interactional research*, 63-83. Cham: Springer.
- De Pasquale, Noemi. 2023. Making a move towards Ancient Greek light verb constructions. In Anna Pompei, Lunella Mereu & Valentina Piunno (eds.), *Light verb constructions as complex verbs*, 257-274. Berlin and Boston: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Debaisieux, Jeanne-Marie. 2016. Toward a global approach to discourse uses of conjunctions in spoken French. *Language Sciences* 58. 79-94.
- D'Hertefelt, Sarah & Jean-Christophe Verstraete. 2014. Independent complement constructions in Swedish and Danish: Insubordination or dependency shift? *Journal of Pragmatics* 60. 89-102.
- Didakowski, Jörg & Nadja Radtke. 2020. Verwendung der deutschen Stützverbgefüge mit Adjektiven und ihre Ermittlung mithilfe des DWDS-Wortprofils. In Sabine De Knop & Manon Hermann (eds.), *Funktionsverbgefüge im Fokus*, 101-136. Berlin and Boston: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Dik, Helma. 1995. *Word order in Ancient Greek: A pragmatic account of word order variation in Herodotus*. Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- Dik, Helma. 2007. *Word order in Greek tragic dialogue*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 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.
- Dragomirescu, Adina, Alexandru Nicolae & Rodica Zafiu. 2022. The loss of analyticity in the history of Romanian verbal morphology. In Adam Ledgeway, John Charles Smith & Nigel Vincent (eds.), *Periphrasis and inflexion in diachrony: a view from romance*, 241-271. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eckert, Penelope. 2008. Variation and the indexical field. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12(4). 453-476.

- Eklund, Robert. 2008. Pulmonic ingressive phonation: Diachronic and synchronic characteristics, distribution and function in animal and human sound production and in human speech. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 38(3). 235-324.
- Eklund, Robert. 2015. Languages with pulmonic ingressive speech: updating and adding to the list. In Svensson Lundmark, Gilbert Ambrazaitis & Joost van de Weijer (eds.), *Proceedings of fonetik 2015, Lund University, Sweden*, 31-34. Linköping: Linköping University Electronic Press.
- Emde Boas, Evert van. 2017. *Language and character in Euripides' Electra*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Emde Boas, Evert van. 2022. Mind style, cognitive stylistics, and ēthopoiia in Lysias. *Trends in Classics* 14(2). 233-254.
- Emde Boas, Evert van, Albert Rijksbaron, Luuk Huitink & Mathieu de Bakker. 2019. *Cambridge grammar of classical Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Erman, Britt. 2001. Pragmatic markers revisited with a focus on you know in adult and adolescent talk. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33(9). 1337-1359.
- Fendel, Victoria. 2019. The paradox of Kellis (Western Egyptian Desert). *Journal for Graeco-Roman Studies* 58(3). 101-133.
- Fendel, Victoria. 2020a. Taking stock of support-verb constructions in journalistic French. *Xanthos: A Journal of Foreign Literatures and Languages* 2. 13-44.
- Fendel, Victoria. 2020b. Phrasal verbs in a corpus of Post-Classical Greek letters from Egypt. In Martti Leiwo, Marja Vierros & Sonia Dahlgren (eds.), *Papers on Ancient Greek linguistics proceedings of the ninth international colloquium on Ancient Greek linguistics (ICAGL 9) 30 August - 1 September 2018, Helsinki*, 63-98. Vaasa: Grano Oy.
- Fendel, Victoria. 2022. *Coptic interference in the syntax of Greek letters from Egypt*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fendel, Victoria. 2023a. 'I haven't got a clue!': assessing negation in classical Greek support-verb constructions. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 23(2). 139-163.
- Fendel, Victoria. 2023b. Support-verb constructions with objects: Greek-Coptic interference in the documentary papyri? In Robin Meyer & Michele Bianchoni (eds.), *Contact-induced change in morphosyntax*, 382-403. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Fendel, Victoria. 2024a. Taking stock of Greek support-verb constructions: synchronic and diachronic variability in the documentary papyri. In Jesus de la Villa (ed.), *Proceedings of the 10<sup>th</sup> international colloquium of Ancient Greek linguistics (ICAGL)*. Berlin and Boston: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Fendel, Victoria. 2024b. 'To do or not to do': Semi-lexical affixes in (post)classical Greek. *Finnish Journal of Linguistics*.
- Fendel, Victoria. Forthcoming. *Giving gifts and doing favours: unlocking Greek support-verb constructions*. Brill in Leiden.
- Fendel, Victoria & Matthew Ireland. 2023. Discourse cohesion in Xenophon's *On Horsemanship* through sketch engine. *Digital Humanities Quarterly* 17(3). <https://www.digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/17/3/000683/000683.html>
- Finkbeiner, Rita. 2008. Zur Produktivität idiomatischer Konstruktionsmuster. Interpretierbarkeit und Produzierbarkeit idiomatischer Sätze im Test. *Linguistische Berichte* 216. 391-430.

- 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*, 33-58. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Foley, William. 2007. A typology of information packaging in the clause. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description*, vol. 1: *Clause structure*, 325-361. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Frenda, Alessio. 2017. Non-conventional arguments: Finite and non-finite verbal complementation in Sicilian. In Brian Nolan & Elke Diedrichsen (eds.), *Argument realisation in complex predicates and complex events: Verb-verb constructions at the syntax-semantics interface*, 117-136. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Gardner, Matt. 2024. "Yup ↓ : Subverting stereotypes with ingressive pulmonic discourse particles in Canadian Maritime English". Presented at the general linguistics seminar, Oxford.
- Gavriilidou, Zoé. 2004. Verbes supports et intensité en grec moderne. In Gaston Gross & Sophie de Pontonx (eds.), *Verbes supports: nouvel état des lieux*, 295-308. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- George, Coulter. 2005. *Expressions of agency in Ancient Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gries, Stefan. 2003. *Multifactorial analysis in corpus linguistics: a study of particle placement*. London: Continuum.
- Grimshaw, Jane. 1990. *Argument structure*. Cambridge, Mass and London: MIT Press.
- Gross, Maurice. 1998. La fonction sémantique des verbes supports. *Travaux de Linguistique : Revue Internationale de Linguistique Française* 37(1). 25-46.
- Gross, Gaston. 2012. *Manuel d'analyse linguistique*. Lille: Presses universitaires du Septentrion.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2000. Periphrasis. In Geert Booij, Christian Lehmann & Joachim Mugdan (eds.), *Morphologie / Morphology. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Flexion und Wortbildung / An international handbook on inflection and word-formation*, vol. 1, 654-664. Berlin and Boston: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2010. Comparative concepts and descriptive categories in crosslinguistic studies. *Language* 86(3). 663-687.
- Haugen, Einar. 1966. Dialect, language, nation. *American Anthropologist* 68(4). 922-935.
- Heine, Antje. 2020. Zwischen Grammatik und Lexikon. Ein forschungsgeschichtlicher Blick auf Funktionsverbgefüge. In Sabine De Knop & Manon Hermann (eds.), *Funktionsverbgefüge im Fokus*, 15-38. Berlin and Boston: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Heine, Bernd & Gunther Kaltenböck. 2021. From clause to discourse marker: on the development of comment clauses. *Language Sciences* 87. 1-16.
- Hengeveld, Kees. 2008. *Functional discourse grammar: a typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hermann, Manon. 2020. Über Funktionsverbgefüge und verbale Mehrwortverbindungen. Eine Analyse am Beispiel von stellen. In Sabine De Knop & Manon Hermann (eds.), *Funktionsverbgefüge im Fokus*, 39-74. Berlin and Boston: Mouton De Gruyter.

- Hoffmann, Roland. 2015. On sentential complements of Latin function verb constructions. In Gerd Haverling (ed.), *Proceedings of the 16<sup>th</sup> international colloquium on Latin linguistics*, 362-373. Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet.
- Hoffmann, Roland. 2018. Criteria for describing valency in Latin function verb constructions. In Olga Spevak & Colette Bodelot (eds.), *Les constructions à verbe support en latin*, 75-93. Clermont-Ferrand: Presses universitaires Blaise Pascal.
- Hoffmann, Roland. 2023. Latin support-verb constructions: a view from language typology. In José Miguel Baños, María Dolores Jiménez López, María Jiménez Martínez & Cristina Tur (eds.), *Collocations in theoretical and applied linguistics: From classical languages to Romance languages*, 21-56. Madrid: SEEC.
- Hoffmann, Sebastian. 2005. *Grammaticalization and English complex prepositions: A corpus-based study*. Florence, US: Taylor & Francis.
- Holton, David, Vassilios Spyropoulos, Peter Mackridge & Irene Philippaki-Warbuton. 2011. *Greek: a comprehensive grammar*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Hopper, Paul & Elizabeth Traugott. 2003. *Grammaticalization*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horrocks, Geoffrey. 2014. *Greek: a history of the language and its speakers*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell.
- Hultgren, Anna Kristina. 2014. Lexical variation at the internationalized university: are “indexicality” and “authenticity” always relevant? In Véronique Lacoste, Jakob Leimgruber & Thiemo Breyer (eds.), *Indexing authenticity: sociolinguistic perspectives*, 304-323. Berlin and Boston: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Huyghe, Richard, Lucie Barque, Pauline Haas & Delphine Tribout. 2017. The semantics of underived event nouns in French. *Journal of Linguistics* 29(1). 117-142.
- Ittzés, Máté. Forthcoming. Proto-Indo-European support verbs and support-verb constructions. In Victoria Fendel (ed.), *Between lexicon and grammar: Support-verb constructions in the corpora of Greek*. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Jaffe, Alexandra. 2016. Indexicality, stance and fields in sociolinguistics. In Nikolas Coupland (ed.), *Sociolinguistics: Theoretical debates*, 86-112. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jiménez López, María Dolores. 2021. Γίγνομαι as the lexical passive of the support verb ποιέω in Ancient Greek. In Georgios Giannakis, Luz Conti, Jesus de la Villa & Raquel Fornieles (eds.), *Synchrony and diachrony of Ancient Greek: Language, linguistics and philology*, 227-240. Berlin and Boston: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Jiménez Martínez, María Isabel. 2023. Continuidad y cambio en las colocaciones del latín a las lenguas romances. In José Miguel Baños, María Dolores Jiménez López, María Isabel Jiménez Martínez & Cristina Tur (eds.), *Collocations in theoretical and applied linguistics: From classical languages to romance languages*, 335-370. Madrid: SEEC.
- Joshi, Shrikant. 2020. Affixal negation. In Viviane Déprez & Espinal Teresa (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of negation*, 75-90. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kaltenböck, Gunther. 2019. Delimiting the class: A typology of English insubordination. In Karin Beijering, Gunther Kaltenböck & María Sansinena (eds.), *Insubordination*, 167-198. Berlin and Boston: Mouton De Gruyter.

- Kamber, Alain. 2008. *Funktionsverbgefüge – empirisch: eine korpusbasierte Untersuchung zu den nominalen Prädikaten des Deutschen*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Keenan, Edward & Matthew Dryer. 2007. Passive in the world's languages. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description*, vol. 1: *Clause structure*, 325-361. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kemezis, Adam. 2014. Greek ethnicity and the second sophistic. In Jeremy McInerney (ed.), *A Companion to ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean*, 390-404. Chichester and Malden: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kirk, Allison. 2012. *Word order and information structure in New Testament Greek*. Leiden: University of Leiden Dissertation.
- Koev, Todor. 2022. *Parenthetical meaning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krstev, Cvetana & Agata Savary. 2017. Games on multiword expressions for community building. *INFOtheca: Journal of Information and Library Science* 17(2). 7-25.
- Kyriacopoulou, Tita & Vasso Sfetsiou. 2002. Les constructions nominales à verbe support en grec moderne. In Stefania Nuccorini (ed.), *Phrases and phraseology – data and descriptions*, 163-180. Oxford: Peter Lang.
- Lakoff, George & Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Lampe, Geoffrey. 1961. *A Patristic Greek lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Langer, Stefan. 2004. A linguistic test battery for support verb constructions. *Lingvisticae Investigationes* 27(2). 171-184.
- Lavidas, Nikolaos. 2009. *Transitivity alternations in diachrony: changes in argument structure and voice morphology*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2017. Late Latin verb second: The sentential word order of the “Itinerarium Egeriae.” *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 16. 163-216.
- Ledgeway, Adam & Nigel Vincent. 2022. Periphrasis and inflexion: Lessons from romance. In Adam Ledgeway, John Charles Smith & Nigel Vincent (eds.), *Periphrasis and inflexion in diachrony: A view from romance*, 11-60. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lee, John. 2013. The atticist grammarians. In Stanley Porter & Andrew Pitts (eds.), *The language of the New Testament: Context, history, and development*, 283-308. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Leech, Geoffrey. 2009. *Change in contemporary English: A grammatical study*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lehmann, Christian. 2020. Univerbation. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 41(1). 205-252.
- Lindschouw, Jan. 2011. L'évolution du système du futur du moyen français au français moderne: La réorganisation comme un cas de régrammation. *Revue de Linguistique Romane* 75(297-298). 51-97.
- Lipka, Leonhard. 1981. Zur Lexikalisierung im Deutschen und Englischen. In Leonhard Lipka & Harmut Günther (eds.), *Wortbildung*, 119-132. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- López Martín, Iván. 2021. *Las construcciones con verbo soporte en latín tardío: la Historia Augusta*. Madrid: Universidad Complutense de Madrid PhD.

- Loporcaro, Michele. 2022. The morphological nature of person-driven auxiliation. In Adam Ledgeway, John Charles Smith & Nigel Vincent (eds.), *Periphrasis and inflexion in diachrony: A view from romance*, 213-237. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Luraghi, Silvia. 2003. *On the meaning of prepositions and cases: The expression of semantic roles in Ancient Greek*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Luraghi, Silvia. 2010. The extension of the transitive construction in Ancient Greek. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 42(1). 60-74.
- Marchello-Nizia, Christiane. 1996. Les verbes supports en diachronie: le cas du français. *Langages* 30(121). 91-98.
- Marini, Emanuela. 2010. L'antipassivo in greco antico: ποιείσθαι come verbo supporto in Aristotele. *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 11(1). 147-180.
- Marini, Emanuela. 2018. La fonction support et ses facettes: facere [+support] [+causatif] dans le type sacra facere. In Olga Spevak & Colette Bodelot (eds.), *Les constructions à verbe support en latin*, 129-147. Clermont-Ferrand: Presses universitaires Blaise Pascal.
- Markantonatou, Stella & Niki Samaridi. 2017. Revisiting the grammatical function "object" (OBJ and OBJ $\theta$ ). In Stella Markantonatou & Manfred Sailer (eds.), *Multiword expressions: Insights from a multi-lingual perspective*, 187-213. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Mastrorarde, Donald. 2013. *Ancient Greek tutorials (atticgreek.org) as complementary content for use with introduction to Attic Greek*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Matić, Dejan. 2003. Topic, focus, and discourse structure: Ancient Greek word order. *Studies in Language* 27(3). 573-633.
- Matras, Yaron. 2015. Why is the borrowing of inflectional morphology dispreferred? In Francesco Gardani, Peter Arkadiev & Nino Amiridze (eds.), *Borrowed morphology*, 47-80. Berlin and Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Matushansky, Ora & Joost Zwarts. 2021. Parameters of nominal deficiency in complex prepositions. In *Complex prepositions in French: theories, descriptions, applications*. Toulouse, France.
- Mayser, Edwin. 1906. *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit mit Einschluss der gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfassten Inschriften 2: Satzlehre*. 2 vols. Berlin and Leipzig: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Meinschaefer, Judith. 2016. Nominalizations. In Susann Fischer & Christoph Gabriel (eds.), *Manual of grammatical interfaces in romance*, 391-418. Berlin and Boston: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Meissner, Torsten. 2016. Archaeology and the archaeology of the Greek language: On the origin of the Greek nouns in -εύς. In John Bintliff & N. Keith Rutter (eds.), *The archaeology of Greece and Rome: Studies in honour of Anthony Snodgrass*, 22-30. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Mel'čuk, Igor. 1996. Lexical functions: A tool for the description of lexical relations in a lexicon. In Leo Wanner (ed.), *Lexical functions in lexicography and natural language processing*, 37-102. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mel'čuk, Igor. 2004. Verbes supports sans peine. *Lingvisticæ Investigationes* 27(2). 203-217.
- Mel'čuk, Igor. 2023. *General phraseology: Theory and practice*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Milroy, James & Lesley Milroy. 2012. *Authority in language: Investigating standard English*. 4<sup>th</sup> edn. London: Routledge.

- Molinelli, Piera. 2010. From verbs to interactional discourse markers: The pragmaticalization of Latin *rogo*, *quaeso*. *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 11. 181-192.
- Montaut, Annie. 2016. Noun-Verb complex predicates in Hindi and the rise of non-canonical subjects. In Léa Nash & Pollet Samvelian (eds.), *Approaches to complex predicates*, 142-174. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Næss, Åshild. 2007. *Prototypical transitivity*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Nagy, István, Veronika Vincze & Richárd Farkas. 2013. Full-coverage identification of English light verb constructions. In *Proceedings of the sixth international joint conference on natural language processing*, 329-337. Nagoya, Japan: Asian Federation of Natural Language Processing.
- Nash, Léa & Pollet Samvelian. 2016. Introduction: Approaches to complex predicates. In Léa Nash & Pollet Samvelian (eds.), *Approaches to complex predicates*, 1-19. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Nunberg, Geoffrey, Ivan Sag & Thomas Wasow. 1994. Idioms. *Language* 70. 491-538.
- Ochs, Elinor. 1992. Indexing gender. In Alessandro Duranti & Charles Goodwin (eds.), *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*, 335-358. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, Elinor. 1996. Resources for socializing humanity. In John Gumperz & Stephen Levinson (eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity*, 407-438. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Özbay, Ali. 2020. A corpus analysis of support verb constructions in British English with a specific focus on sociolinguistic variables. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)* 14(2). 38-57.
- Palme, Bernhard. 2009. The range of documentary texts: Types and categories. In Roger Bagnall (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of papyrology*, 358-394. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Panagl, Oswald. 2020. Wortbildung und Textsorte: Verbalabstrakta in der spät(er)en Latinität. *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 59. 387-397.
- Pasquer, Caroline. 2017. Expressions polylexicales verbales: Étude de la variabilité en corpus (Verbal MWEs: a corpus-based study of variability). In Helene Flamein & Yannick Parmentier (eds.), *Actes des 24e conférences sur le traitement automatique des langues naturelles. 19e Rencontres jeunes chercheurs en informatique pour le TAL (RECITAL 2017), Orléans (France)*, 161-174. Orléans: ATALA.
- Pasquer, Caroline, Agata Savary, Carlos Ramisch & Jean-Yves Antoine. 2018. If you've seen some, you've seen them all: Identifying variants of multiword expressions. In *Proceedings of the 27th international conference on computational linguistics*, 2582-2594. Santa Fe, New Mexico, USA: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Peirce, Charles. 1933. Three kinds of signs. In Charles Hartshorne & Paul Weiss (eds.), *Collected papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*, 359-364. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Pompei, Anna. 2014. Verb-particle constructions and preverbs in Homeric Greek between telicization, incorporation and valency change. In Annamaria Bartolotta (ed.), *The Greek verb: Morphology, syntax, and semantics. Proceedings of the 8th international meeting on Greek linguistics (Agrigento 2009)*, 253-275. Louvain-la-Neuve and Walpole, MA: Peeters.
- Popescu, Cecilia-Mihaela. 2018. The diachronic evolution of future tense forms in French from the perspective of the re-grammaticalization theory. *Diacronia* 7. 1-11.
- Radimský, Jan. 2011. Noms prédicatifs, noms de résultat et noms concrets dans les constructions à verbe support. *Lingvisticæ Investigationes* 34(2). 204-227.

- Roesch, Sophie. 2018. *Facinus facere / facinus committere: de la figura etymologica à la construction à verbe support*. In Olga Spevak & Colette Bodelot (eds.), *Les constructions à verbe support en latin*, 187-206. Clermont-Ferrand: Presses universitaires Blaise Pascal.
- Roi, Ezra la. 2022a. The atticist lexica as metalinguistic resource for morphosyntactic change in Post-Classical Greek. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 22. 199-231.
- Roi, Ezra la. 2022b. Weaving together the diverse threads of category change: Intersubjective ἄμειλι ‘of course’ and imperative particles in Ancient Greek. *Diachronica* 39(2). 159-192.
- Rosén, Hahm. 1999. Der Wirkungsbereich des Wackernagelschen Gesetzes und die Entstehung der Präpositionen. In Peter Anreiter & Erzsébet Jerem (eds.), *Studia celtica et indogermanica. Festschrift für Wolfgang Meid zum 70. Geburtstag*, 385-396. Budapest: Archaeolingua Foundation.
- Rosén, Hannah. 2020. Composite predicates in the layers of latin. *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 19(2). 231-279.
- Rychlý, Pavel. 2008. A lexicographer-friendly association score. In Petr Sojka & Ales Horak (eds.), *Proceedings of recent advances in Slavonic natural language processing, RASLAN 2008*, 6-9. Brno: Masaryk University.
- 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 3<sup>rd</sup> international conference on computational linguistics and intelligent text processing*, 1-15. Berlin and Heidelberg: Springer.
- Salvi, Giampaolo. 2011. Morphosyntactic persistence. In Martin Maiden, John Smith & Adam Ledgeway (eds.), *The Cambridge history of the romance language*, 318-381. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Savary, Agata, Marie Candito, Verginica Mititelu, Eduard Bejček, Fabienne Cap, Slavomír Čéplö, Silvio Cordeiro, et al. 2018. PARSEME multilingual corpus of verbal multiword expressions. In Stella Markantonatou, Carlos Ramisch, Agata Savary & Veronika Vincze (eds.), *Multiword expressions at length and in depth: Extended papers from the MWE 2017 workshop*, 87-147. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Savary, Agata, Silvio Cordeiro, Timm Lichte, Carlos Ramisch, Uxoia Iñurrieta & Voula Giouli. 2019. Literal occurrences of multiword expressions: Rare birds that cause a stir. *The Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics* 112. 5-54. Univerzita Karlova v Praze.
- Schafroth, Elmar. 2020. Überlegungen zu Funktionsverbgefügen aus sprachvergleichender Sicht. In Sabine De Knop & Manon Hermann (eds.), *Funktionsverbgefügen im Fokus: Theoretische, didaktische und kontrastive Perspektiven*, 179-210. Berlin and Boston: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Schutzzeichel, Marc. 2014. *Indogermanische Funktionsverbgefüge*. Münster: Monsenstein und Vannerdat OHG.
- Scrivner, Olga. 2015. *A probabilistic approach in historical linguistics word order change in infinitival clauses: From Latin to Old French*. Ann Arbor: Indiana university PhD thesis.
- Sheinflux, Livnat, Tali Greshler, Nurit Melnik & Shuly Winter. 2019. Verbal multiword expressions: Idiomaticity and flexibility. In Yannick Parmentier & Jakub Waszczuk (eds.), *Representing and parsing of multiword expressions*, 35-68. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1979. Language structure and linguistic ideology. In Paul Cline, William Hanks & Carol Hofbauer (eds.), *The elements: A parasession on linguistic units and levels*, 193-247. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

- Silverstein, Michael. 2003. Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language and Communication* 23. 193-229.
- Smith, John Charles. 2022. The boundaries of inflexion and periphrasis. In Adam Ledgeway, John Charles Smith & Nigel Vincent (eds.), *Periphrasis and inflexion in diachrony: A view from romance*, 61-90. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Squeri, Elena. forthcoming. χρᾶομαι as a support verb in the medical jargon of the Hippocratic Corpus. In Victoria Fendel (ed.), *Support-verb constructions in the corpora of Greek: Between lexicon and syntax?* Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Stolk, Joanne. 2017. Dative and genitive case interchange in Greek papyri from Roman-Byzantine Egypt. *Glotta* 93. 180-210.
- Thornton, Anna M. 2011. Overabundance (multiple forms realizing the same cell): A non-canonical phenomenon in Italian verb morphology. In Martin Maiden, John Charles Smith, Maria Goldbach & Marc-Olivier Hinzelin (eds.), *Morphological autonomy: Perspectives from romance inflectional morphology*, 358-381. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tribulato, Olga. 2015. *Ancient Greek verb-initial compounds: Their diachronic development within the Greek compound system*. Berlin and Boston: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Tronci, Liana. 2016. Sur le syntagme prépositionnel en N du grec ancien: Syntaxe et lexique de ses combinaisons avec le verbe ékhein "avoir." In Christina Marque-Pucheu, Fryni Kakoyanni-Doa, Peter Machonis & Harald Ulland (eds.), *À la recherche de la prédication : Autour des syntagmes prépositionnels*, 141-158. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Tronci, Liana. 2017. At the lexicon-syntax interface Ancient Greek constructions with ἔχειν and psychological nouns. In Thanasis Georgakopoulos, Theodossia-Soula Pavlidou, Miltos Pechlivanos, Artemis Alexiadou, Jannis Androutsopoulos, Alexis Kalokairinos, Stavros Skopeteas & Katerina Stathi (eds.), *Proceedings of the ICGL12*, vol. 2, 1021-1033. Berlin: Edition Romiosini/CeMoG.
- Tutin, Agnès. 2016. Comparing morphological and syntactic variations of support verb constructions and verbal full phrasemes in French: A corpus based study. In *PARSEME COST Action. Relieving the pain in the neck in natural language processing: 7<sup>th</sup> final general meeting*. Dubrovnik, Croatia.
- Vassilaki, Sophie. 2010. La voix médio-passive du grec moderne, aspects prédicatifs et énonciatifs. *Faits de Langue - Les Cahiers* (2). 41-76.
- Wahlgren, Staffan. 2014. Case, style and competence in Byzantine Greek. In Martin Hinterberger (ed.), *The language of Byzantine learned literature*, 170-175. Turnhout: Brepols Publishers.
- Willi, Andreas. 2003. *The languages of Aristophanes: Aspects of linguistic variation in Classical Attic Greek*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Willi, Andreas. 2018. *Origins of the Greek verb*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wisse, Jakob. 2001. Greeks, Romans, and the rise of Atticism. In Gregory Nagy (ed.), *Greek literature in the Roman period and in late antiquity: Greek literature*, 65-82. London: Routledge.
- Wittenberg, Eva & Roger Levy. 2017. If you want a quick kiss, make it count: How choice of syntactic construction affects event construal. *Journal of Memory and Language* 94. 254-271.
- Wittenberg, Eva & Jesse Snedeker. 2014. It takes two to kiss, but does it take three to give a kiss? Categorization based on thematic roles. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 29(5). 635-641.

Wittenberg, Eva & Andreas Trotzke. 2021. Semantic incorporation and discourse prominence: Experimental evidence from English pronoun resolution. *Journal of Pragmatics* 186. 87-99.

Wolfe, Sam & Sandra Paoli. 2022. The GO-future and GO-past periphrasis in Gallo Romance: A comparative investigation. In Adam Ledgeway, John Charles Smith & Nigel Vincent (eds.), *Periphrasis and inflexion in diachrony: A view from romance*, 123-144. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

## APPENDIXES

### Abbreviations

ACC accusative case

ACT active voice

ADJ adjective

ADV adverbial phrase

AG Archaic Greek (pre 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC)

AOR Greek aorist tense

ART definite article

ATT attributive phrase

AUX auxiliary

CG Classical Greek (5<sup>th</sup> / 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC)

DAT dative case

DDbDP *Duke Database of Documentary Papyri*

DP determiner phrase

EBG Early Byzantine Greek (4<sup>th</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> c. AD)

FUT future tense

GEN genitive case

IMP imperative mood

IND indicative mood

INF infinitive mood

ITR interrogative

LSJ Liddell, Henry, and Robert Scott and Henry Jones, *Greek-English Lexicon* 1996

[accessible via <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/lsj/>]

LVC light-verb construction (PARSEME)

MG Medieval Greek (post 8<sup>th</sup> c. AD)

MWE multi-word expression (PARSEME)

NEG negation (sentence negative, negative determiner)

NOM nominative case

PAS passive voice

PG Ptolemaic Greek (3<sup>rd</sup>-1<sup>st</sup> c. BC)

pl plural

PN predicative noun

PR present tense

PRF perfect tense

PRT discourse particle

PTC participle mood

REL relative pronoun

RG Roman Greek (1<sup>st</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> c. AD)

sg singular  
 SVC support-verb construction  
 SVO subject-verb-object word order  
 TLG *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*  
 VID verbal idiomatic expression (PARSEME)  
 VOC vocative case

## NOTES

1. Greek examples are transcribed. Where lexical or syntactic analysis applies, Greek examples are also glossed by means of interlinear glosses. Abbreviations are listed at the end of the chapter. References to papyri and ostraca follow the system of the *Duke Database of Documentary Papyri*; references to literary texts follow the system of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*.
2. We leave aside here verb-prepositional phrase constructions, such as *to take into consideration*, which would deserve a study of their own (e.g. Schafroth [2020]; Hermann [2020]; Tronci [2016]; Tronci [2017]).
3. Matras discusses inflexional morphology. The support verb serves the functions of inflexional morphology yet has additional functions which sets it apart from e.g. auxiliaries as detailed below.
4. As support-verb constructions are part of the groups of collocations and idioms but not identical with either, we need a cut-off point. This comes in the form of Sheinflux *et al.*'s [2019: 42] figuration – ‘figuration reflects the degree to which the idiom can be assigned a literal meaning’ – and transparency – ‘transparency [or opacity] relates to how easy it is to recover the motivation for an idiom’s use’. Thus, e.g. *to kick the bucket* is excluded. Note that Mel’čuk [2023: 53] dismisses transparency as a ‘psychological property of idioms’.
5. ‘No doubt an old inherited verbal noun (cf. λόγος [*logos*], φόρος [*p<sup>h</sup>oros*], etc.), though there is no certain etymology’ (Beekes [2010]). Contraction of vowels to avoid hiatus is dialectally conditioned, while Attic contracts (νοῦς *nous*), e.g. Ionic does not (νόος *noos*).
6. My translation: ‘Verbs of realisation are collocating verbs which behave syntactically like support verbs, but which, unlike support verbs, are semantically full’.
7. Note that ἀπολαμβάνω *apolambanō* in the sense of ‘to take away’ in which the prefix is compositional and referring to space does not appear in this support-verb construction. An anonymous reviewer queried when prefixes are compositional in Greek. Prefixes on verbs (preverbs) can have spatial, temporal, and/or metaphorical meanings (to use Luraghi’s [2003] terminology). In which way they relate to the verbal roots they are attached to and how productively they can be attached to verbal roots depends on the degree of lexicalization of the preverb-verb lexeme.
8. Note that formally, the prefix is still analysable unlike in formations such as ἐπίσταμαι *epistamai* ‘to know’ for which even an augment, which is prefixed to the verbal stem, has to be prefixed to the prefix, i.e. ἐ-επιστάμην = ἠπιστάμην *e-epistamēn = ēpistamēn*. The meaning of the prefix is no longer recoverable semantically either.
9. Logical objects often take the form of prepositional phrases, e.g. French *J’ai envie de lui écrire* ‘I want to write to him’.
10. Decision tree and annotation guidelines: [https://parsemefr.lis-lab.fr/parseme-st-guidelines/1.3/index.php?page=050\\_Cross-lingual\\_tests/030\\_Verbal\\_idioms\\_\\_LB\\_VID\\_RB\\_](https://parsemefr.lis-lab.fr/parseme-st-guidelines/1.3/index.php?page=050_Cross-lingual_tests/030_Verbal_idioms__LB_VID_RB_) (last accessed 26 March 2024).
11. Note the problematic question ‘Is the noun eventive?’ in the LVC decision tree, the best test for which is perhaps objective genitives, but which is complicated by the polysemy of most nouns

in classical / postclassical Greek. However, frameworks like Kamber [2008] would assume that there is a closed class of support verbs (his first question is ‘Is the verb a support verb?’), which is equally problematic for a corpus language if we want to avoid circularity.

12. The translations provided in brackets reflect only one of the phrasemes that are identified in the following sections. They are indicative in order to help the reader follow along. For a full table of the phrasemes related to each noun-verb combination, please see Section 7.

13. Both the proximity search and the statistics tools are drawn upon.

14. Medieval Greek (MG) is included, but our main interest ends with Early Byzantine Greek (EBG).

15. This is particularly prominent in Natural-Language-Processing applications in which variability hampers identification and discovery of relevant structures by the machine (Sag *et al.* [2002]; Doucet & Ahonen-Myka [2004]; Cap *et al.* [2015]; Cordeiro & Candito [2019]). However, from a linguistic perspective the variability also complicates consistent data collection of relevant patterns.

16. Lakoff and Johnson’s iconic example is *I taught Greek to Harry* vs *I taught Harry Greek*. Harry actually learns Greek only in the second option.

17. Liddell-Scott-Jones (LSJ) s.v. νόος / νοῦς *noos / nous* I.1.2.b mentions in brackets προσέχω τὸν νοῦν *prosekḥō ton noun* as the equivalent of τὸν ν. ἔχειν πρὸς τινα *ton n. ekḥein pros tina* or τι τι ‘to have one’s mind directed to someone / something’; Liddell-Scott-Jones (LSJ) s.v. χάρις III.1.a lists χάρις ἀποδίδωμι *kḥaris apodidōmi* ‘to return a favour’; Liddell-Scott-Jones (LSJ) s.v. δίκη *dikē* IV.3 lists δίκην *dikēn* or δίκας διδόναι *dikas didonai* ‘to suffer punishment’.

18. An internally homogenous (regarding register, dialect, timeframe, non-poetic literary genre) sub-sample of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* corpus, implemented in Sketch Engine, an online corpus-analysis tool (Fendel & Ireland 2023). Texts: (i) Historiography [203,186 words]: Thucydides, *Histories*, vol. 1-5 [98,945]; Xenophon, *Anabasis*, vol. 1-4 [32,034], *Memorabilia*, vol. 1-4 [36,465], *Hellenica*, vol. 1-4 [35,742]; (ii) Oratory [143,937 words]: Antiphon, *Speeches* 1-6 [18,605]; Isocrates, *Speeches* 1-6 and 13 [37,311]; Isaeus, *Speeches* 1-8 [25,018], Lysias, *Speeches* 1, 3, 7, 12, 14, 19, 22, 30, 31, 32 [24,130]; Demosthenes, *Speeches* 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 18 [38,873]; (iii) Prose [145,497 words]: Plato, *Gorgias* [27,790], *Phaedrus* [17,271], *Republic*, vol. 1-3 [28,688]; Aristotle, *Rhetoric* [44,312], *Politics*, vol. 1-3 [27,436]. 20% of this corpus are fully annotated for support-verb constructions and the remainder is annotated for specific support-verb-construction families.

19. Panagl [2020: 394] calls the development an irreversible drift: ‘a. Nomen actionis → b. Nomen acti → c. Nomen rei (konkretes, dinghaftes Resultat) → d. Nomen instrumenti → e. Nomen loci → f. (fakultativ) Nomen agentis (häufig kollektiv)’.

20. An anonymous reviewer remarked that modern Greek tends to avoid passivisation in general (Vassilaki [2010]). However, we are specifically interested in passivisation in support-verb constructions. Instances such as ελήφθησαν σημαντικές αποφάσεις *elēphthēsan sēmantikes apophaseis* ‘important decision were made’ appear in the PARSEME-el 1.3 corpus (see [https://parsemefr.lis-lab.fr/parseme-st-guidelines/1.3/index.php?page=010\\_Definitions\\_and\\_scope/030\\_Syntactic\\_variants\\_of\\_VMWEs](https://parsemefr.lis-lab.fr/parseme-st-guidelines/1.3/index.php?page=010_Definitions_and_scope/030_Syntactic_variants_of_VMWEs) (last accessed 07 May 2024)). Suppletive paradigms, as for κάνω *kanō* ‘to do’ and γίνομαι *ginomai* ‘to be done / to happen’, do not seem to exist for every support verb, as shown by the PARSEME-el example.

21. See Fendel [forthcoming] for a detailed study of support-verb constructions in the entire corpus.

22. While this procedure results in clean data samples from a linguistic perspective, it would be problematic for a Natural-Language-Processing approach as training data needs to be consistently annotated.

23. Note the definition of light-verb constructions rather than support-verb constructions in PARSEME as explained in Section 1.

24. Doucet and Ahonen-Myka [2004: 93] state that ‘the larger the distance between the two words, the lower a quantity of relevance is attributed to the corresponding pair’. This ties in with Lakoff and Johnson’s [1980] principle of iconicity according to which a structural link is reflected in the surface structure. In the PARSEME corpus, the length of the field intervening between two components of a verbal multi-word expressions varies greatly between languages (Savary *et al.* [2018: 123]).
25. My translation: ‘The phenomenon that complex lexemes once formed tend to become one lexical unit with a specific meaning when used frequently. Through lexicalisation, the syntagm character is lost to a greater or lesser extent’.
26. Basque and the Andic languages which Creissels investigates are Subject-Object-Verb languages. The phenomenon is observable diachronically for classical Latin and Greek, e.g. λόγον ποιεῖται / λογοποιεῖται *logon poieitai / logopoieitai* ‘to make words / to report’ and *animos adverte / animadverte* ‘to turn attention / to notice’.
27. Accessible here: <https://www.lex Tutor.ca/conc/fr/> (last accessed 14 March 2024).
28. Accessible here: [https://lindat.mff.cuni.cz/services/kontext/first\\_form?corpname=parseme\\_fr\\_a](https://lindat.mff.cuni.cz/services/kontext/first_form?corpname=parseme_fr_a) (last accessed 14 March 2024).
29. A type is a unique form-function pairing, in the case of a support-verb construction forming a lexical unit. If modifications on the noun and/or verb provoke a semantic shift which is larger than what would be expected from the formal change, a new type is assumed, e.g. *donner raison* ‘to confirm’ vs *donner une raison* ‘to have a reason’. A token is any appearance of the defined type in a corpus of texts.
30. Accessible here: <https://www.sketchengine.eu/frtnten-french-corpus/> (last accessed 14 March 2024).
31. The relevant support-verb-construction families in the *Le Monde 1998* corpus are illustrated in Fendel [2020a].
32. The dataset is accessible here: 10.5287/bodleian:KzmP22R9d (last accessed 07 May 2024).
33. Any nouns that do not refer to events, either prototypically or through extension / reconceptualization / etc. (Radimský [2011]) are excluded, such as *child* or *market square*.
34. E.g. *to fight the fight*, *to sing a song*. Equally, combinations in which the verb is the semantic head and the semantically related noun functions as a modifier are excluded, e.g. *to run a (long) race*.
35. E.g. verb-noun-noun structures (with co-ordination of two predicative nouns) would require a different definition of the support-verb-construction field. Do we measure between the verb and the first noun or between the verb and the second noun or do we find a third option? The data sample here is internally coherent as to the verb-noun and verb-object structure of relevant instances such that it is possible to compare the types and tokens catalogued and draw conclusions from the data sample about the support-verb-construction field.
36. This final reason is related to the prototype semantics approach to support-verb constructions, which lets us assemble support-verb-construction families (esp. Gross [1998]; Kamber [2008]; Mel’čuk [1996]; Mel’čuk [2004]).
37. The mathematical mean is the total number of tokens divided by the total number of intervening items.
38. Abbreviations used in Table 2: DP = determiner phrase, ADV = adverb, ADJ = adjective, NEG = negative, PRT = discourse particle, n/a = not applicable; SVC = support-verb construction.
39. *C[e] [...] attire, alors, davantage l’attention* ‘this ... draws, then, more attention’. The commas around *alors* ‘then’ indicate its parenthetical status. Parentheticals are separate from the sentence, syntactically and semantico-pragmatically (Koev [2022]). The examples discussed in Smith [2022: 81-83] may also rather be considered parenthetical insertions between an auxiliary and the event-referring constituent.

40. Abbreviations used in Table 3: DP = determiner phrase, ADV = adverb, ADJ = adjective, NEG = negative, PRT = discourse particle, n/a = not applicable; SVC = support-verb construction; LVC = light-verb construction.

41. Concordances are set to operate on the lemma and are filtered for the singular vs plural (KWIC ordering) of the predicative noun. A maximum distance of  $\leq 5$  words before and after the lemma searched for is allowed when slicing concordances for the relevant combination of a noun and a verb.

42. The same is true also for *avoir raison*. The modifier may disambiguate between a mass-noun and a count-noun reading of *raison*, which may in turn point to the support-verb construction in question not being fully lexicalised.

43. Procedure: We draw a lemma-based concordance for 'peur', query this concordance for the lemma 'avoir' appearing within the range [-5 KWIC 5] items, and sort the left content – this makes it possible to exclude false positives where the two lemmata appear in different clauses or sentences. We create a sub-corpus in order to exclude the false positives identified. (We can also create sub-corpora in order to separate the singular and plural forms of the predicative noun.) One can inspect the content to the left of the KWIC 'peur' by means of the frequency tool (operating on lemmata). We are interested in the item preceding 'peur'. This search reveals the relative infrequency of determiner phrases (incl. *le*, *un*, *aucun*, and *de* as part of a complex quantifier): *le* = 9,382 instances, *de* = 4,457 instances, *un* = 2,728 instances, *ce* = 1,176 instances, *son* = 803 instances, *mon* = 535 instances, *aucun* = 236 instances, *notre* = 181 instances, *votre* = 165 instances, *ton* = 128 instances, *tel* = 72 instances. All of these are below the 5% mark of the total number of instances. The same procedure can be used to assess the (in)frequency of attributive phrases, negatives, and adverbs, to name only a few options.

44. Searches can be carried out in Sketch Engine as described for 'avoir' and 'peur'.

45. A ratified topic is a reference to a contextually known entity. A narrow focus is a reference to a contextually new entity.

46. We rely on this syntactically driven word order e.g. when inspecting the left context in a concordance table.

47. French's ancestor Latin had information-structurally driven word-order patterns too. Word-order changes took place in the post-classical period (e.g. James Adams [2013: 824-830]; Bauer [1995]; Ledgeway [2017]; Salvi [2011]; Scrivner [2015]).

48. Phrasemes can retain outdated word-order patterns (e.g. Marchello-Nizia [1996] on Old French; Holton *et al.* [2011: 521] on Modern Greek).

49. Both ποιέω *poieō* 'to do' and δίδωμι *didōmi* 'to give' can appear in two- and three-argument frames. The two-argument frames produce active support-verb constructions, the three-argument frames causatives ones (Lavidas [2009: 93]).

50. Of the non-standard agent expression markers, Herodotus prefers ἐκ *ek* + genitive (George [2005: 116]), Thucydides ἀπο *apo* + genitive (thus foreshadowing a later development) (George [2005: 130]), Xenophon shows considerable variety (George [2005: 140-141]), Plato a system of verbs that prototypically call for ὑπο *hupo* and those that do not (George [2005: 173 and 178]), and Demosthenes free variation between ὑπο *hupo*, παρα *para* + genitive, and παρα *para* + dative (George [2005: 191]). In comedy and prose, ὑπο *hupo* prevails unlike in tragedy (George [2005: 220-221]).

51. Næss [2007: 86] holds that the maximum distinctness of participants is what lies at the heart of prototypically transitive structures.

52. Note however the equation of support-verb construction and formally related simplex verb which is often not the case, rather the support-verb construction has discourse-pragmatic functions that the simplex verb does not have (Wittenberg & Trotzke [2021]; Fendel & Ireland [2023] on Greek) and may also differ semantically or indexically (Bentein [2019]; Özbay [2020]; Leech [2009]; Langer [2004]; Fendel [2024a] on Greek).

53. While ‘to give justice’ seems to contrast with ‘to receive justice’ (δέχομαι *dek<sup>h</sup>omai*), ‘to pay the price for one’s actions’ seems to contrast with ‘to collect punishment from’ (λαμβάνω παρά *lambanō pará* + genitive), see also (4).
54. Abbreviations used in Table 4: DP = determiner phrase, ATT = attributive phrase, NEG = negative, SVC = support-verb construction.
55. For the negatives, see also Fendel [2023a].
56. Aristophanes, *Thesmophorizusae*, l. 543 διὰ τοῦτο τιλλομένην με δεῖ δοῦναι δίκην ὑφ’ ὑμῶν *dia touto tillomenēn me dei dounai dikēn<sup>h</sup> up<sup>h</sup> umōn* ‘therefore, it is necessary that I receive the ‘plucked’ punishment from you’.
57. Thucydides, *Histories*, 1.28.2 εἰ δέ τι ἀντιποιοῦνται, δίκας ἤθελον δοῦναι ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ παρὰ πόλεσιν αἷς ἄν ἀμφοτέροι ξυμβῶσιν *ei de ti antipoiountai, dikas ēthelon dounai en Peloponnēsō para polesin<sup>h</sup> ais an amphoteroi xumbōsin*; ‘If they had any counter claims, they would want to get judged by / pay the price for their actions to those cities in the Peloponnese who both of them agreed upon’. The instance is ambiguous but may have to be assigned to the collocation rather than the idiom.
58. Panagl [2020: 394] calls this an irreversible drift: ‘a. Nomen actionis → b. Nomen acti → c. Nomen rei (konkretes, dinghaftes Resultat) → d. Nomen instrumenti → e. Nomen loci → f. (fakultativ) Nomen agentis (häufig kollektiv)’.
59. Abbreviations used in Table 5: AG = Archaic Greek, CG = Classical Greek, PG = Ptolemaic Greek, RG = Roman Greek, EBG = Early Byzantine Greek, MG = Medieval Greek. For timeframes, see Section 2.
60. Aristophanes, *Thesmophorizusae*, l. 543 (comedy); Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* (historiography) 1.6.45 (long speech), 3.1.22 (dialogue), 7.5.40 (narrative after speech); Plato, *Gorgias* 525b5 (prose).
61. Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica* 12.6.10 (Early Byzantine Greek (EBG)); Theodoretus, *Graecarum affectionum curatio* 6.28.6 (Early Byzantine Greek (EBG)); Gorgius, *Chronicon* 87.2 (Medieval Greek (MG)); Georgius, *Chronicon* 110.132.22 (Medieval Greek (MG), adapted); Suda, *Lexicon*, P.1709.49 (Medieval Greek (MG), adapted).
62. Noticeably, however, three of the presumably idiomatic passages (all in Plato) appear next to a patient passive most likely to illustrate a contrast: Plato, *Gorgias* 476e2 (δικαία πάσχει *dikaia pask<sup>h</sup>ei* ‘to suffer justice’), Plato, *Gorgias* 479a1 (κολάζομαι *kolazomai* ‘to get punished’), and Plato, *Republic* 380b5 (ὠφελοῦντο ὑπό ὄρ<sup>h</sup>elounto *hupo* ‘to get helped by’).
63. Relevant passages (repeated from above): Aristophanes, *Thesmophorizusae*, l. 543 (comedy); Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* (historiography) 1.6.45 (long speech), 3.1.22 (dialogue), 7.5.40 (narrative after speech); Plato, *Gorgias* 525b5 (prose).
64. While the same idiom seems to exist in several modern languages, it is not indexed for the higher register or technical contexts: *to pay the price for one’s actions*, *payer le prix / payer cher (pour) (qch)*, *etwas teuer bezahlen*.
65. Lexical substitution in support-verb construction is not a Greek-specific phenomenon (e.g. López Martín [2021]; on the transition between Latin and Romance Jiménez Martínez [2023]).
66. ‘Usually derived from a stem \*k<sup>w</sup>ei-u-, akin to Skt. cinóti ‘to pile, arrange, erect’, Av. cinuwaiti ‘to select’ < \*k<sup>w</sup>i-n[e]u-ti (Pok. 637-638), but the exact derivation is unclear’ (Beekes 2010).
67. In Modern Greek, κάνω *kanō* cannot be passivized such that the γίνομαι *ginomai* passive acts as a suppletive.
68. This is similar to Aerts’ [1965: 3] substitute periphrasis: ‘when the periphrasis replaces a monolectic form without any, or scarcely any distinguishable change in meaning’ (e.g. γεγραμμενον ἦν *gegrammeenon ēn* for εγεγραπτο *egegrapto* ‘it had been written’).
69. Hopper and Traugott [2003: 126]: ‘Typically, grammaticalization **does not result in the filling of any obvious functional gap**. On the contrary, the forms that have been

grammaticalized compete with existing constructions so similar in function that any explanation involving "filling a gap" seems out of the question - there is no obvious gap to be filled'.

70. The phrase *Da werden Sie geholfen!* 'There you will be helped!' has developed into a socially indexed (originally associated with call centres, nowadays humoristically stigmatised) phrase in modern German (e.g. <https://home.uni-leipzig.de/grammatik-des-deutschen/da-werden-sie-geholfen/>, last accessed 18 March 2024).

71. This is part of the larger debate whether support verbs can grammaticalize, for which the present chapter leans with Boye [2023] and Butt [2010] towards no, yet see Fendel [2024b] on an indirect path.

72. Abbreviations used in Table 6: AG = Archaic Greek, CG = Classical Greek, PG = Ptolemaic Greek, RG = Roman Greek, EBG = Early Byzantine Greek, MG = Medieval Greek. For timeframes, see Section 2.

73. Two passages are quotes from Demosthenes (oratory, Classical Greek (CG)) and Axionicus respectively (comedy, Classical Greek (CG)).

74. Three passages are quotes from Xenophon (historiography, Classical Greek (CG)) and one from Menander (comedy, Ptolemaic Greek (PG)).

75. Eight passages are a quote from the New Testament (John 1.16  $\text{Ἐκ τοῦ πληρωματος αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐλάβομεν καὶ χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος}$ , *Ek tou plērōmatos autou ēmeis pantes elabomen kai k<sup>h</sup>arin anti k<sup>h</sup>aritos*. 'Due to his fullness, we all have received favour for favour.').

76. Abbreviations used in Tables 8 to 10: DP = determiner phrase, ATT = attributive phrase.

77. For the active counterpart, in classical times, additional prefixes emphasize this semantic nuance:  $\text{χάριν ἀνταποδίδωμι}$  *k<sup>h</sup>arin antapodidōmi* 'to return a favour/gratitude' (Thucydides, *Histories* 3.63.4 and 3.67.6),  $\text{χάριτας ἀνταποδίδωμι}$  *k<sup>h</sup>aritas antapodidōmi* 'to return a favour/gratitude' (Isaeus, *Speech* 7.10),  $\text{χάριτας ἀντιδίδωμι}$  *k<sup>h</sup>aritas antididōmi* 'to return favours/gratitude' (Thucydides, *Histories* 3.63.4),  $\text{χάριν οφειλόμαι}$  *k<sup>h</sup>arin ophēilōmai* 'to owe a favour/gratitude' (Demosthenes, *Speech* 2.4),  $\text{χάριν προσοφείλω}$  *k<sup>h</sup>arin prosopheilō* 'to owe a favour/gratitude' (Demosthenes, *Speech* 3.31). For the whole support-verb-construction family and its verbs of realisation in literary classical Attic, see Fendel [forthcoming].

78. Abbreviations used in Table 11: AG = Archaic Greek, CG = Classical Greek, PG = Ptolemaic Greek, RG = Roman Greek, EBG = Early Byzantine Greek, MG = Medieval Greek (for timeframes, see Section 2), DP = determiner phrase, VN = verb-noun order, VOC = vocative, ADV = adverbial phrase, DAT = element in the dative case; PRT = discourse particle, NOM = element in the nominative case, PN = predicative noun.

79. An anonymous reviewer remarked that this is continued into Modern Greek as  $\text{τον/την έχω περί πολλού}$  *ton/tēn ek<sup>h</sup>ō peri pollou*. Noticeably, the support verb is stative  $\text{έχω}$  *ek<sup>h</sup>ō* 'to have'. Lexical renewal in general is unsurprising given the diachronic fate of  $\text{ποιέομαι}$  *poieomai* but note that the event referred to is reprofiled in the process.

80. The variables coded in Dataset 9 allow to retrieve the relevant instances easily.

81. Abbreviations used in Table 12: AG = Archaic Greek, CG = Classical Greek. For timeframes, see Section 2.

---

## ABSTRACTS

Support-verb constructions are combinations of a verb and a noun that fill the predicate slot of a sentence, such as *to make a suggestion* in *I made the suggestion that she join us*. While qualifying as semantic-lexemic phrasemes (collocations and idioms) in Mel'čuk's Sens-Texte framework, they sit at the lexicon-syntax interface. They qualify as verbal multi-word expressions lexically speaking and form complex predicates syntactically. In classical and post-classical Greek, support-verb constructions form an internally heterogeneous group of constructions, yet one that has existed since the earliest records of the language and survives into the modern variety. The present chapter capitalises on the over 2000 years of continuous written history of Greek, and the internal heterogeneity of the group of support-verb constructions, in that it investigates the origins and pathways of three members of this group in the literary (*Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*) and documentary (*Duke Database of Documentary Papyri*) corpora of Greek. The bulk of documentary texts dates from the 3<sup>rd</sup> c. BC onwards, whereas the earliest literary texts date from around the 8<sup>th</sup> c. BC. The variety of sources allows us to trace the three structures of interest through the centuries in varying environments and thus to trace traditions and independent developments. δίκην δίδωμι *dikēn didōmi* existed as a collocation 'to give judgement(s)' from archaic times and into the medieval period, in classical times, the idiom δίκην δίδωμι *dikēn didōmi* 'to pay the price for one's actions' arose and became indexed for the technical and higher registers. In χάριν ἀπολαμβάνω *h'arin apolambanō* 'to receive a favour', the prototypical compound ἀπολαμβάνω *apolambanō* seems to be diatopically and subsequently diastratically indexed but retreats into the higher registers after the classical period; the canonical simplex verb λαμβάνω *lambanō* predates it in early classical verse and postdates it. προσέχω τὸν νοῦν *prosekhō ton noun* exists as an idiom especially in medical discourse from at least classical times onwards but in parallel also as a pragmateme from archaic times onwards. Support-verb constructions are a pattern that is considered near universal in languages, such that especially the methodological tool of the support-verb-construction field developed and drawn upon in this chapter is transferable beyond Greek.

Les constructions à verbe support sont des combinaisons d'un verbe et d'un nom qui constituent le prédicat d'une phrase, comme « faire une suggestion » dans « J'ai fait la suggestion qu'elle nous rejoigne ». Bien que classées comme phrasèmes sémantico-lexémiques (collocations et idiomes) dans la théorie Sens-Texte de Mel'čuk, elles se situent à l'interface lexique-syntaxe. Elles sont des expressions verbales polylexicales sur le plan lexical et forment des prédicats complexes sur le plan syntaxique. En grec classique et postclassique, les constructions à verbe support forment un groupe de constructions hétérogène sur le plan interne, mais qui existe dès les premières traces écrites de la langue et survit dans la variété moderne. La présente étude s'appuie sur plus de 2000 ans d'histoire écrite continue du grec et sur l'hétérogénéité du groupe des constructions à verbe support afin d'étudier les origines et le parcours de trois de ses membres dans les corpus littéraires (*Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*) et documentaires (*Duke Database of Documentary Papyri*) en langue grecque. L'essentiel des textes documentaires date du 3<sup>ème</sup> siècle avant J.-C., tandis que les premiers textes littéraires datent environ du 8<sup>ème</sup> siècle avant J.-C. La variété des sources nous permet d'étudier les trois structures qui nous intéressent en diachronie et dans des contextes variés, ce qui permet de retracer les traditions et les développements indépendants. δίκην δίδωμι – *dikēn didōmi* (« rendre un jugement ») existait comme collocation depuis l'époque archaïque et jusqu'à l'époque médiévale, puis, à l'époque classique, l'idiome

δίκην δίδωμι – *dikēn didōmi* (« payer le prix de ses actions ») est apparu pour les registres techniques et soutenus. Dans χάριν ἀπολαμβάνω – *kharin apolambanō* (« recevoir une faveur »), le composé prototypique ἀπολαμβάνω – *apolambanō* semble se propager diatopiquement et ensuite diastratiquement, mais disparaît des registres soutenus après la période classique ; le verbe canonique simplex λαμβάνω – *lambanō* le précède dans les premiers vers classiques et lui est postérieur. προσέχω τὸν νοῦν – *prosek<sup>h</sup>ō ton noun* existe en tant qu'idiome surtout dans le discours médical depuis au moins l'époque classique, mais aussi parallèlement en tant que pragmatème depuis l'époque archaïque. Les constructions à verbe support sont un modèle considéré comme quasi-universel dans les langues, ce qui implique que l'outil méthodologique du champ des constructions à verbe support développé et utilisé dans cet article est transférable au-delà du grec.

## INDEX

**Keywords:** sens-texte framework, lexical passive, idiom, pragmateme, support-verb-construction field

**Mots-clés:** théorie Sens-Texte, passif lexical, champ des constructions à verbe support, idiomes, pragmatèmes

## AUTHOR

**VICTORIA BEATRIX FENDEL**

University of Oxford (UK)

victoria.fendel@classics.ox.ac.uk