
SUPPORT-VERB CONSTRUCTIONS IN THE CORPORA OF GREEK: BETWEEN LEXICON AND GRAMMAR?

FACULTY OF CLASSICS, UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

5 – 6 SEPTEMBER 2023

BOOKLET OF ABSTRACTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 Introduction: ECF-2020-181 Giving Gifts and Doing Favours: Unlocking Greek Support-Verb Constructions (classical literary Attic)	3
2 Annotating support-verb construction in Modern Greek	4
3 SVCs and other periphrases in Aristotle's <i>Rhetoric</i>	5
4 Analytical and synthetic verbs and the lightness degree of ποιέω	6
5 χράομαι as a support verb in the medical jargon of the <i>Hippocratic Corpus</i>	7
6 On support verb constructions in the corpus of Herculaneum papyri	9
7 Support the sin not the sinner: support-verb constructions and NT ethical frameworks.....	10
8 The grateful head: Χάριν οἶδα and multi-word expressions in Atticist lexica.....	11
9 Support-verb constructions in postclassical Greek as level-of-speech markers in a corpus of hagiographical literature	12
10 What can be <i>used</i> in Greek and Latin? A comparative study of support verbs χράομαι and <i>utor</i> 14	
11 Remarks on the voice of the verb 'to make, to do' in support and auxiliary verb constructions in Ancient Greek and Old Indo-Aryan	Error! Bookmark not defined.
12 Presence and Absence of Support Verbs for Greek loan verbs in Coptic	15
[volume only] 13 Verb-noun collocations in the New Testament: a comparative study between Greek and Latin.....	18
[volume only] 14 Proto-Indo-European light verbs and light verb constructions	20
References	21

1 INTRODUCTION: ECF-2020-181 GIVING GIFTS AND DOING FAVOURS: UNLOCKING GREEK SUPPORT-VERB CONSTRUCTIONS (CLASSICAL LITERARY ATTIC)

Victoria Beatrix Fendel, victoria.fendel@classics.ox.ac.uk, University of Oxford, UK

Keywords: prototypes, classical literary Attic, interface, internal heterogeneity

The Leverhulme-funded project ‘Giving gifts and doing favours: unlocking Greek support-verb constructions’ is a foundational study of support-verb constructions in classical Greek. The project has shown that support-verb constructions in Greek form a heterogeneous group of constructions, yet an essential part of the Greek lexicon-grammar and hover at three interfaces (lexicon-syntax, syntax-semantics, and syntax-pragmatics). This makes them challenging for any deterministic model.

Support-verb constructions are defined as combinations of a verbal and a nominal element filling the predicate slot in the f-structure of a sentence and the verb and object slots in the c-structure of a sentence. The copular verbs γίγνομαι and εἶναι are excluded from the range of support verbs due to their syntax in Greek (i.e. a predicative element rather than an object) (Gross 1998; Kamber 2008; Tronci 2016; Jiménez López 2021). Only lexical nominalisations in Chomsky’s terms rather than syntactic nominalisations are considered (Meinschaefer 2016). Yet breaking with tradition, deverbal and non-deverbal event nouns as well as nouns that undergo reconceptualization or metaphorical extension when used as predicative nouns are considered (Huyghe et al. 2017; Grimshaw 1990; Bel, Coll & Resnik 2010; Radimský 2011; Sheinfux et al. 2019).

The data sample is a corpus of half a million words of literary classical Attic oratory, historiography and prose to approximately equal amounts. One fifth of the data sample was annotated manually for support-verb constructions. From this, the range of permissible support verbs and predicative nouns of interest was deduced. The remaining data sample was searched semi-automatically using a purpose-built Sketch Engine corpus of the data sample as well as the lemmatised version of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (see also Fendel & Ireland 2023). The method of data collection impacts on the results that can be drawn from each part of the data sample.

The project looks at support-verb constructions from four perspectives, (i) component compatibility (and the lexicon) (Savary et al. 2018), (ii) external and internal modifiability (and the morpho-syntax) (Fendel 2024; Fendel 2023), (iii) compositionality (and semantics) (Van Camp 2005; Baños & Jiménez López 2018; Keenan & Dryer 2007), and (iv) the accessibility of the event (and pragmatics) (Halliday & Hasan 1976: esp. 278–286; von Heusinger & Schumacher 2019; Altshuler & Truswell 2022: chap. 6; Storrer 2009; Luraghi 2003). For each perspective, two specific patterns are selected for analysis.

The project arrives at a succinct typology of support-verb constructions in classical literary Attic historiography, oratory, and prose (akin to Kamber’s (2008) *Umrahmte Schnittmengen*) and shows how support-verb constructions sit at three interfaces. However, it has also become clear through comparison with other genres (e.g. drama and comedy) and dialects (e.g. Ionic) as well as non-literary post-classical data (e.g. documentary papyri) that the typology developed would need adjustment for diachronically, diastatically and/or diatopically different corpora due to the diversity and diversification of the support-verb construction. This is where the idea for this workshop arose.

2 ANNOTATING SUPPORT-VERB CONSTRUCTION IN MODERN GREEK

Voula Giouli, youla@athenarc.gr, Institute for Language and Speech Processing, ATHENA Research Centre, Athens, Greece

Keywords: PARSEME, modern Greek, computation model, automated identification and discovery, fixed expression

Multi-word expressions (MWEs henceforth) have been "a pain in the neck for Natural Language Processing" (Sag et al. 2002) due to their lexical, syntactic, semantic, and even pragmatic idiosyncrasies (Gross 1982; Baldwin & Kim 2010). In this regard, considerable effort has been made within the research community to model them in lexical resources – both lexica and corpora - in a way that facilitates their robust treatment in view of various applications (Constant et al. 2017). In this context, their classification in linguistically grounded categories is useful – a task that poses serious theoretical as well as practical difficulties. Verbal fixed or idiomatic expressions (VIDs henceforth), that is, word sequences which constitute a distinct semantic unit or a complex lexical unit are characterized as having a compound phonological, lexical, and morphological structure and a non-compositional meaning (Gross 1982). Similarly, support-verb or light-verb constructions (LVCs henceforth), that is word combinations that consist of a support or light verb and a predicative noun are also ambiguous and variable across texts. However, the distinction between LVCs and VIDs is not always easy or straightforward and the line between the two is often fuzzy. One could even maintain that there is a visible scalar passage between the two types of structures (Fotopoulou & Giouli 2016). In other words, a number of expressions seem to bear properties normally inherent to LVCs despite their primarily being classified as fixed expressions and vice-versa.

This contribution presents a Greek corpus annotated for LVCs in the framework of modelling verbal MWEs (VMWEs henceforth). The corpus is used to train and evaluate systems with regard to the robust discovery and identification of complex verbal predicates in running text. The corpus was developed in the framework of PARSEME, an initiative to create multilingual harmonized language resources, namely annotated corpora and dedicated tools that would serve as a workbench for the automatic detection of VMWEs (Savary et al. 2017; Ramisch et al. 2018; Ramisch et al. 2020). Annotation guidelines were universal but were adopted in a way that the idiosyncrasies of each language are taken into account; for this reason, language-specific guidelines were also elaborated. The corpus has been annotated by a group of linguists with prior background in MWEs and inter-annotator agreement was calculated to show discrepancies – and reveal fuzzy instances.

We present the Greek corpus, the annotation specifications set for LVCs and the criteria set for their disambiguation, the annotation methodology adopted and our results in terms of the types and properties of LVCs identified in the corpus. We also report on the inter-annotator agreement focusing on the fuzzy instances that fall in between VIDs and LVCs posing thus a challenge with regard to their identification.

3 SVCS AND OTHER PERIPHRASES IN ARISTOTLE'S RHETORIC

Tomas Veteikis, tveteikis@gmail.com, Vilnius University, Lithuania

Keywords: Aristotle, translation (into Lithuanian), stylistics, object-oriented and subject-oriented verbs

The contribution discusses the periphrastic constructions in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (which I am currently translating into Lithuanian), some of which correspond to the canonical characteristics of so-called support-verb constructions (SVCs henceforth) or light-verb constructions (LVCs henceforth) (Langer 2004; Tan, Kan & Cui 2006). LVCs, as recent research on the Lithuanian language shows, have certain limitations, and their properties vary between languages (Kovalevskaitė, Rimkutė & Vilkaitė-Lozdienė 2020). It is therefore unsurprising that finding equivalents for Greek phrases in Lithuanian is challenging. Neither ποιεῖσθαι λόγον nor χάριν ἔχειν can be easily conveyed into Lithuanian with analogous "calques": the meanings of the relevant words must be selected carefully.

Given that these constructions (cf. also δοῦναι δίκην, ἡσυχίαν ἄγειν, τελευτήν ποιεῖν, all found incidentally in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*) are not only valuable material for lexicography and grammar but also for the study of rhetoric (or stylistics), I would like to focus on rhetorical devices and consider LVCs *periphrases*, part of so-called figures of substitution. I assume that phrases (no less than other σχήματα) are original inventions by poets, writers, orators, and philosophers (named and unnamed), affected by certain circumstances. Multi-layered works such as Aristotle's *Rhetoric* show this because they quote and adopt the discoveries of others. In Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, there are numerous references to and quotations from other authors' texts (some even unidentified); in each case, when quoting or paraphrasing an original saying of, e.g. Euripides or Isocrates, Aristotle adopts the discovery of the earlier writers.

The contribution compares various examples of parallel constructions from Aristotle's treatise that meet (or almost meet) the definition of LVCs. The focus is less on nouns than on phrasal verbs. I distinguish between extraversive, object-oriented verbs such as ποιεῖν, διδόναι, and introversive, subject-oriented ones like ἔχειν or λαμβάνειν. For nouns, I consider their substitutes too (e.g. adjectival complements). Some of the phrases used by Aristotle (both in the main text and references) coincide with popular examples of LVCs, while others are rarer (e.g. ποιεῖσθαι πίστεις or ἔχειν ἔνστασις). The contribution summarizes the distribution of the phrases (with a special focus on periphrastic expressions that resemble SVCs) from Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and offers a twofold classification: one according to the semantic classes of the verbs, the other according to the possible stylistic function. The semantic aspects of verbs show the dynamics of inner relations between the subject (creator or benefactor) and the recipient. The stylistic function (identified by contextual elements) shows the tastes and strategies (esthetic or pragmatic) of the author. The linguistic and stylistic data from the multi-layered text in question increase our knowledge of the variety of its phrases, the contribution of the LVCs and the rhetorical strategies employed in the use of phrases.

4 ANALYTICAL AND SYNTHETIC VERBS AND THE LIGHTNESS DEGREE OF ΠΟΙΕΩ

Anna Pompei, anna.pompei@uniroma3.it, Roma Tre University, Italy; Eleonora Ricci, e.ricci@uniroma1.it, Sapienza University and Roma Tre University, Italy; Flavia Pompeo, flavia.pompeo@uniroma1.it, Sapienza University, Italy

Keywords: Homer to Hellenistic times, noun incorporation, ποιέω, denominal verbs

This talk aims at reflecting on the reason for selecting either support-verb constructions (SVCs henceforth), e.g. τέκνα ποιοῦμαι (Jiménez López 2011), or synthetic verbs, mainly incorporated verbs, e.g. τεκνοποιέω, and denominal ones, e.g. τεκνώνω, in Ancient Greek.

SVCs as well as incorporations are complex predicates, analytical and synthetic, respectively (Ricci 2016). Diachronically, incorporations are usually considered as formations derived by conversion from both compound nouns (e.g. λογογράφω < λογογράφος) and adjectives (e.g. καρπολογέω < καρπολόγος). However, when the incorporating verb can also occur as a free form, incorporation can also be considered as the result of a compounding process from SVCs, e.g., παιδοποιέω < παῖδας ποιοῦμαι; σιτομετρέω < σῖτον μετρέω (Pompei 2006; Pompei & Grandi 2012), at least in synchrony.

Our hypothesis is that the correspondence between SVCs and incorporations occurs exclusively when the noun is referential (von Heusinger 2002), i.e. a first-order entity, in the terms of Lyons (1977). In this case, the verb ποιέω retains its full meaning, of ‘to create, to realize’ – well defined by Plato (*Sym.* 205b) with regards to ποιήσις – as is very clear in many instances (e.g., οἰνοποιέω, τυροποιέω). Conversely, when SVCs are equivalent to denominal verbs (e.g. θήραν ποιέω/ ποιοῦμαι ~ θηράω), the eventiveness is entirely in the noun.

In other words, our idea is that in incorporation ποιέω is not an effective ‘light’ verb, unlike what usually happens in SVCs. This means that incorporations are real collocations, whereas SVCs are normally considered as ‘unbalanced on the noun’ (Ježec 2016), i.e. collocations where the noun is the real nucleus of the predicativeness. The case of τεκνοποιέω is ambiguous, as τέκνον can indicate either a first-order noun, i.e. a result noun, or a second-order noun in Lyons’ terms, i.e. an eventive noun, by metonymy. Indeed, also τεκνώνω exists.

To sum up, we aim at focussing exclusively on SVCs with ποιέω and the corresponding synthetic verbs of the two types (i.e. incorporations and denominal verbs, but also primary verbs – e.g. μάχην ποιέω / ποιοῦμαι ~ μάχομαι). This implies considering a very large sample, starting from Homer up to the Hellenistic age (incorporations grow over time, especially since the Hellenistic age, whereas they are completely absent in Homer, unlike SVCs). The data will be extracted from the TLG (online edition). An initial examination of the data clearly shows that the hypothesis is plausible.

5 XPAOMAI AS A SUPPORT VERB IN THE MEDICAL JARGON OF THE *HIPPOCRATIC CORPUS*

Elena Squeri, elena.squeri@edu.unige.it, University of Genoa, Italy / Sorbonne Université, Paris, France

Keywords: Hippocratic corpus, medical jargon, technical language, χράομαι, change of state

Lately, the strictly predicative (Gross 2005; Gross 2017) – and thus non-referential (Givón 1978) – status of nouns involved in support-verb constructions (SVCs henceforth) has been challenged. Nouns as *shower*, are referential *per se*, but act as predicative when employed in SVCs (*take a shower*; Bowers (2008)). Also the semantic emptiness of the verb has been questioned, since its substitution can evidently produce meaning variations (*enjoy a shower*). These considerations have led to a redefinition of SVCs as ‘complex predicates’, in which predication is shared by both a noun and a verb (Bowers 2008; Butt 2010; Pompei & Mereu 2019). A more reliable proof of the required semantic unity of SVCs is the existence of equivalent synthetic verbs (*to shower*; Langer (2004)).

The present contribution applies this approach to a peculiar structure shown by the Hippocratic texts, which combines names of medical devices with the verb χράομαι, to express the same therapeutic action that could otherwise be predicated by a synthetic verb.

Acut.Sp. 2, p. 69, 17 Joly (2, 398, 12 Littré): κλυσμῶν κατὰ κοιλίην χρῆσθαι.

“Use an enema for the lower abdomen”.

Mul. I 26, p. 72, 24-25 Potter (8, 70, 16 Littré): τὴν κοιλίην κλύσαι χυλῶν πτισάνης.

“Make an enema for the lower abdomen with a barley decoction”.

These structures often involve nouns derived from the verbs whose technical meaning is equivalent to the SVCs with χράομαι. However, these nouns are referential, since they refer to specific devices, for which concrete recipes are given in the *Hippocratic Corpus*.

Moreover, these parallelisms may be found with non-deverbativized nouns as well.

Vict. III 78, p. 210, 12 Joly (6, 622, 12 Littré): τοῖσι δὲ σίτοισι χρῆσθαι τοῖσι δριμέσι καὶ ξηροῖσι.

“Use acrid and dry food”.

Acut.Sp. 20, p. 91, 15-16 Joly (2, 498, 3 Littré): ξηρὰ δὲ καὶ δριμέα ἐσθιέτω.

“The patient must eat dry and acrid food”.

That any object involved in a medical prescription is conceived as a *means* of healing may explain the choice of χράομαι. The selection of χράομαι to meet the expressive needs of the specific semantic field of medicine suggests that its semantic value is not completely bleached. Nevertheless, the verb does not have its standard value either. Dative arguments with verbs such as χράομαι are normally explained by the fact that their referents do not undergo any change of state (Luraghi 2010), while all arguments in the Hippocratic structures do. χράομαι acts as an SV since it prescribes to interact with a concrete object in a prototypical action still defined by that object. However, while acting as a medical *instrument* the object undergoes a somehow standardized change of state. The use of ποιέω would be impossible, since its combination with an argument referring to a concrete object would activate its full meaning

(‘to create’, ‘to realize’), and would therefore express the production of the medical device, not its use on the patient.

This contribution thus supports the identification of SVCs as ‘complex predicates’, without the need for exclusively predicative nouns and semantically empty verbs. It also broadens the analysis of SVs in Ancient Greek to verbs other than ποιέω (Jiménez López 2011; Jiménez López 2012; Jiménez López 2016; Jiménez López 2021; Marini 2010) and ἔχω (Tronci 2017; Vanséveren 1995), while suggesting that the choice of a specific SV may be influenced by specialised jargons.

6 ON SUPPORT VERB CONSTRUCTIONS IN THE CORPUS OF HERCULANEUM PAPHRI

Maroula Salemenou, maroula.salemenou@classics.ox.ac.uk, University of Oxford, UK

Keywords: P. Herc. 118, personal register

This contribution represents a preliminary analysis of support-verb constructions with ποιοῦμαι and other support verbs in the Herculaneum corpus. The data has been collected by sifting through the Digital Corpus of Literary Papyri and verified using the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (TLG henceforth), as well as the unedited PHerc. 118, which is the subject of study in the AHRC-funded project ‘Living Virtually: Creating and Interfacing Digital Surrogates of Textual Data Embedded (Hidden) in Cultural Heritage Artifacts (2019 – 2023)’.

The Herculaneum papyri represent, to some extent, the use of support-verb constructions in more personal and epistolary contexts that do not seem to share the same (Atticistic) features of much of the literature of this period (Bentein 2016; Bentein, Janse & Soltic 2017; Bentein & Janse 2020; Fendel 2022; Rafiyenko & Seržant 2020). I set out the papyrological evidence for support-verb constructions within the corpus by considering their use in the text types represented by the papyri. I also investigate the possibility of a distinction between more ‘conventional’ syntactic constructions (formed with a verb and a direct object) with these support verbs and various other permutations between verbs and nouns, which form (more complex) predicates within the corpus. A more comprehensive scholarly analysis of support-verb constructions will elucidate the text that can be extracted from the Herculaneum papyri but will also help to identify the type of text represented by PHerc. 118.

7 SUPPORT THE SIN NOT THE SINNER: SUPPORT-VERB CONSTRUCTIONS AND NT ETHICAL FRAMEWORKS.

Cressida Ryan cressida.ryan@wolfson.ox.ac.uk; University of Oxford, UK

Keywords: New Testament Greek, exegesis, periphrasis, ποιῶ ἁμαρτίαν, ἀγαθοποιῶ

In this contribution, I consider the development of support-verb constructions in New Testament Greek and the potential exegetical impact of philological developments. My key case study verb is ποιῶ (Cock 1981; Ittzés 2007; Jiménez López 2011; Jiménez López 2016; Jiménez López 2017; Jiménez López 2021; Marini 2010). In 1 John, for example, both the verb ἁμαρτάνω and the construction ποιῶ ἁμαρτίαν are used. I investigate to what extent these may be considered synonymous and explore how the use of a support-verb construction may have an exegetical impact of distancing sin from sinner. This distancing allows for the construction of Christian personhood distinguishing between agent and action, which has significant moral implications. The New Testament moves towards periphrastic constructions in general (e.g. ἦν ἐκβάλλων instead of ἐξέβαλλε), and may therefore tend towards support-verb constructions. In this contribution, however, I argue that there is something specific happening with ποιῶ, especially in the case of sin.

The verb ἁμαρτάνω initially refers to a physical missing of a mark with a bow and arrow, but by Christian times it refers to the process of sinning. In Homer, only the verb is used. In the whole Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (TLG henceforth) corpus, the noun ἁμαρτία has a frequency of 1.68:1 compared with the verb; Homer does not use the noun at all. Ratios for some other authors include Sophocles (0.18:1), Plato (0.16:1), Lysias (0.07:1), Aristotle (0.49:1), Plutarch (0.26:1) and Lucian (0.07:1). The noun becomes more frequently used (from zero in Homer to occasional in other authors), but remains less frequent than the verb. In the New Testament, however, the ratio is 4:1. This increase in the use of the noun over the verb makes sin into a substantive, rather than a process. In doing this, sin can be separated from sinner, made into something which can be removed from them and is not necessarily part of their identity.

This move to a support-verb construction with a noun is also evident with the related noun ἁμαρτήμα. I therefore consider its use in the New Testament (x4), particularly 1 Corinthians 6:18 where it is used with ποιῶ. The verb ποιῶ is also used compounded to give ἀγαθοποιῶ (x10) and κακοποιῶ (x3), and I consider how these compound verbs form a further part of the process of constructing a Christian ethical framework where sin is performed, and can be removed from the sinner by the redemptive power of Jesus.

In conclusion, this contribution uses a data-driven analysis of support-verb constructions in the New Testament compared with other Greek genres / dialects to explore the exegetical relationship between philology and theology within an ethical framework.

8 THE GRATEFUL HEAD: ΧΑΡΙΝ ΟΪΔΑ AND MULTI-WORD EXPRESSIONS IN ATTICIST LEXICA

Emmanuel Roumanis, emmanuel.roumanis@students.mq.edu.au, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia

Keywords: Second Sophistic, Phrynichus (*Ecloga*) and Moeris (*Atticist*), χάριν + verb, εὐχαριστέω

The Atticist lexica of Phrynichus (*Ecloga*) and Moeris (*Atticist*) are two of the strictest such works that have come down to us from Antiquity. Composed during the Second Sophistic, they represent the apogee of linguistic Atticism—the tendency to pre- and proscribe particular forms—and contain comments that cut across the various linguistic domains (*lexis*; *morphology*; *orthography*; and *syntax*) and word classes (*noun*; *verb*; *adjective*; etc.). Of the 417 entries in the *Ecloga*, only 18 (4%), in the broadest sense, can be considered to be syntactic; similarly in the *Atticist*, which contains 919 entries, only 17 (2%) can be assigned to this domain (Bentein & Roumanis 2024). Most of these syntactic comments in both lexica pertain to the case, tense, and simple use of different kinds of verbal complements, the function and complementation of selected adverbs, and a few other oddities, including the prescription of Wackernagel’s Law (via μέν in Phryn. *Ecl.* 330) and a singular preference for the synthetic over the periphrastic (έτετάχατο vs τεταγμένοι ἦσαν in Moer. ε 47).

There are, however, three entries in the *Ecloga* in which multi-word expressions (MWEs henceforth) are opposed to monolexical equivalents: Phryn. *Ecl.* 10 (χάριν εἰδέναι vs εὐχαριστεῖν *to be grateful*); Phryn. *Ecl.* 97 (εὖ σχολῆς ἔχειν vs εὐκαιρεῖν *to have leisure*); and Phryn. *Ecl.* 146 ([τὸ] ἐπὶ κόπρης πατάξει vs ῥάπισμα *a slap*). Of these, the *pre-* and *proscriptum* of gloss 10 are well-attested in both the literary and documentary evidence of the Postclassical period (III BCE–VI CE); the *proscriptum* of 97 is not found anywhere (though σχολῆν ἔχω, *inter alia*, is); and those of 146 are nominal, and not relevant here. For this paper I focus on gloss 10, including other combinations of the collocation χάριν + verb, while using the data of 97 as *comparanda*.

Collocations and idioms are generally understood to be distinct sub-branches of what are commonly termed *composites* (Cowie 2001) or *semantic phrasemes* (Mel’čuk 1998), with the main difference between the two being thus: collocations display a (restricted) level of interchangeability in their components, of which one retains a figurative or specialized meaning; idioms, by contrast, though semantically non-compositional, have a figurative meaning that can in most cases be conveyed by a single word. This distinction, however, breaks down when applied to χάριν + verb, since although it can be substituted for the monolexical εὐχαριστέω, it nevertheless remains somewhat semantically decomposable.

Whether the expressions χάριν + verb and εὐχαριστέω are functionally equivalent, and can be freely substituted, requires the collation and analysis of all combinations of the former, so that we might plot their semantic and pragmatic convergence in documentary (papyrological and epigraphic) and literary prose texts of the postclassical period, given their variation in Archaic and Classical Greek (VIII–IV BCE) (Hewitt 1927; Löw 1908). I argue that we can better situate Ancient Greek MWEs as *constructions* in more fluid and adaptable Cognitive frameworks that emphasise the link between meaning and form (e.g. Croft & Cruse 2004), rather than focusing on their fixedness as formulaic phraseological units (e.g. Sánchez López 2020).

9 SUPPORT-VERB CONSTRUCTIONS IN POSTCLASSICAL GREEK AS LEVEL-OF-SPEECH MARKERS IN A CORPUS OF HAGIOGRAPHICAL LITERATURE

Alfonso Vives Cuesta, alfonso.vives@uva.es, Universidad de Valladolid / Instituto Bíblico y Oriental, Spain

Keywords: hagiography, diglossia, Symeon Metaphrastes, diachronic development

This contribution demonstrates the functionality of certain support-verb constructions (SVCs henceforth) as sociolinguistic markers in a large corpus of hagiographical literature (4th-10th century AD). The study of postclassical Greek is necessarily confronted with the complexity of its diglossic situation (Rafiyenko & Seržant 2020). It is generally accepted that the models of scholarly Greek in the Byzantine period were Attic Greek, Koine Greek (in all its register heterogeneity) and the later Atticist Greek of the Imperial Period.

It is well known that Byzantine literature can be placed on a continuum between two opposing levels of language, conventionally called (H)igh and (L)ow. H is the language acquired only by a cultural elite and L is the mother tongue of all speakers (vernacular). Since Ševčenko (1982) published his seminal work on the linguistic and literary variability of Postclassical Greek, some of the clearest descriptions of Byzantine diglossia use the obscure term 'style' instead of the sociolinguistic terms 'sociolect' or 'diastratic variety' (Hinterberger 2010; Hinterberger 2014; Horrocks 2014a; Toufexis 2008). Previous attempts to characterise this type of variation have proved to be theoretically inconsistent (Schiffer 1992; Schiffer 1999; Zilliacus 1938; Franco 2009). For this reason, a linguistic analysis is still needed to provide a clearer picture of this sociolinguistic polarization. In fact, some researchers have undertaken the task of identifying more specific syntactic (Kälviäinen 2013) and lexical markers (Hinterberger 2021) that distinctly identify them. However, none of them have found SVCs of particular interest, perhaps because of their interface position between lexicon and syntax.

Recently, it has been observed that some SVCs were used by some authors in order to assign their texts to a particular sociolect (Churik 2019). However scarce, there are some clear examples, as has recently been shown by Vives Cuesta and Acero (2022: 320).

(1a) *Vita antiquior Sancti Danielis Stylitae* 5.16 καὶ ἀπολύσας τοὺς γονεῖς αὐτοῦ μετὰ εὐλογιῶν παρήγγειλεν **μὴ πυκνὰ ἔρχεσθαι πρὸς αὐτόν** ‘and, bidding the parents farewell and blessing them, he asked them not to visit him often’

(1b) *Vita sancti Symeonis Stylitae* 5.23 ἐντειλάμενος δὲ τοῖς αὐτοῦ πατράσιν ὁ τῆς μονῆς προεστὼς **μὴ πυκνὰς ποιεῖσθαι πρὸς τὸν παῖδα τὰς προσελεύσεις**, χαίροντας ἐκπέμπει γονεῖς τὸ καινότατον υἱοῦ στερομένους ‘the abbot of the monastery, asking the parents not to make frequent visits to the child, bids the parents, who are happy for their surprising son, farewell’

A very prolific Byzantine author, Symeon Metaphrastes, whose style is usually classified as H, often rewrites earlier texts with more elegant variations. For example, he sometimes opts for H εὐχὴν ποιέομαι instead of L εὐχὴν ποιέω (Vives Cuesta & Acero 2022). These usage trends have been tested in a larger corpus of 20 hagiographic texts collected in the *Menologion* of Symeon (10th century CE). The author rewrites many original Lives of Saints (Βίοι or *Vitae*) and Μαρτύρια from a wider period (4th-9th century AD) using the technique called μετὰφρασις (metaphrasis is understood here as intralingual translation), which account for a total of about half a million words. Data selection has been done by a semi-automatic search of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* database and the data has been tagged manually with the tool *Atlas.ti*.

The main reason for this selection is that it ensures a variety of levels of speech, since many ancient vitae are written in L-Greek, whereas Symeon had a preference for a higher koine (Høgel 2002; Høgel 2021). The contribution draws on the work of the Spanish research teams *Interacción del lexico y la sintaxis en griego antiguo y latino 2: Diccionario de Colocaciones Latinas (DiCoLat)* and *Diccionario de Colocaciones del Griego Antiguo (DiCoGrA)* which have provided a detailed analysis of many types of SVCs in Classical and New Testament Greek (Jiménez López 2016). It analyses the extent to which these SVCs survive in postclassical Greek, how they evolve and how they are replaced in later periods. It concludes that the flexibility of the SVCs may have contributed to the marking of the linguistic change presupposed by the metaphrastic rewriting (μετάφρασις is understood here as intralingual translation), which Symeon applies with only limited systematisation in his *Menologion* (Signes Codoñer 2021; Høgel & Constantinou 2020).

10 WHAT CAN BE USED IN GREEK AND LATIN? A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SUPPORT VERBS XPAOMAI AND UTOR

Lucía Madrigal Acero, lucimadr@ucm.es, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain

Keywords: χράομαι, utor, comparative approach (Latin, Greek), quantitative

Support-verb constructions (SVCs henceforth) in Greek and Latin have been the subject of several papers by the members of the Spanish research project *Interacción del léxico y la sintaxis en griego antiguo y latín 2: Diccionario de Colocaciones Latinas (DiCoLat) y Diccionario de Colocaciones del Griego Antiguo (DiCoGrA)* (PID2021-125076NB-C42) and its previous editions, all funded by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation (José Miguel Baños 2018; Jiménez López 2016; Jiménez López 2021; Jiménez Martínez 2019; Mendózar Cruz 2020; Tur 2020; Baños, Jiménez López, Jiménez Martínez & Tur Altarriba 2022). The comparative approach taken by some of its contributions (Baños & Jiménez López 2018; Baños & Jiménez López 2017; López Martín 2019) has proved productive, since SVCs are frequent in contexts with intense cultural and linguistic exchange and are easily transferred from one language to another (Bowern 2008; Fendel 2021). The different frequencies of SVCs in Greek and Latin texts have often been highlighted, *i. e.*, Greek texts tend to contain more occurrences of simplex verbs than SVCs, whereas Latin texts show a significantly higher proportion of collocations (José Miguel Baños 2018). Nevertheless, the two also share some similarities.

One of these similarities lies in the use that both languages make of χράομαι (1) and utor (2) ‘to use’ as support verbs with a surprisingly wide collocative spectrum. Both are often combined with a range of nouns which is difficult to organize under a few semantic or lexical labels. In fact, previous papers on utor, which overlooked this function of the verb, marvel at the diversity of objects it can take (Alonso Fernández 2010).

(1) Λυδοὶ δὲ νόμοισι μὲν παραπλησίοισι χρέωνται καὶ Ἕλληνες (Hdt. 1.94.1), ‘the customs of the Lydians are like those of the Greeks’

(2) ergo utar tuo consilio neque me Arpinum hos tempore abdam (Cic. Att. 9.6) ‘accordingly I shall follow your advice and not hide myself away in Arpinum at present’

The objectives of this contribution are the following: (i) to observe the semantic domains in which χράομαι and utor operate; (ii) to analyze the properties and functions of the SVCs with χράομαι and utor, together with their distribution by text type and author; and (iii) to compare and contrast these SVCs in Greek and Latin.

The corpus consists of a selection of classical texts from the *TLG* and the *Latinitas Antiqua (Corpus Corporum)* databases. In order to facilitate and organize data tagging and retrieval, a database has been created in *Atlas.ti* (<https://atlasti.com/>), a program which has often been used for qualitative analysis in Social Sciences and has a similar potential for Corpus Linguistics (Friese 2014).

11 PRESENCE AND ABSENCE OF SUPPORT VERBS FOR GREEK LOAN VERBS IN COPTIC

Matthias Müller, matthias.mueller@unibas.ch, MF Oslo, Norway & University of Basel, Switzerland

Keywords: differential object marking, Coptic, Stern-Jernstedt rule, Greek loan verbs, εἶπε *eire* ‘to do’

Coptic is the final stage of the ancient Egyptian language (Afroasiatic, Egypt). It has two patterns of direct-object marking (Stern 1880: paras. 489–501; Reintges 2004: 217–226; Müller 2021: 431–432):

a) Head marking, in which the verbal form incorporates the direct object resulting in destressed pattern of the whole string (the form the verb appears in is in grammars usually labelled as the construct state), and

b) Dependent marking, in which the direct object is introduced by a case marking prefix while the verbal form appears with the lexical verb in the absolute state.

The distribution of the two patterns is partly driven by syntactic rules. In Present-tense sentences, transitive verbs can only appear in the absolute, never in the construct state, i.e., the direct object must be dependent marked:

<i>ti-kôt</i>	<i>m-p-êi</i>
1S.PRS-build.INF.ABS	OBJ-DEF.M-house
‘I am building the house.’	

Head marking is ungrammatical (i.e., *ti-ket-p-êi* is not possible).

Outside the durative patterns, the speakers/writers can choose between either object-marking pattern, so both construed examples below are grammatical:

<i>a-i-kôt</i>	<i>m-p-êi</i>
1S.PRS-build.INF.ABS	OBJ-DEF.M-house
‘I built the house.’	

vs

<i>ti-ket-p-êi</i>
1S.PRS-build.INF.CONST-DEF.M-house
‘I built the house.’

In honour of the first scholars who described this distribution, it is called the Stern-Jernstedt-rule. There have been various recent attempts to motivate the choice of marking found in specific corpora, but so far with limited success (Engsheden 2008; Engsheden 2018).

There are, however, exceptions to the rule of distribution (see already Depuydt 1993). Nouns without determiners and indefinite pronouns can be attached directly to the verb even in Present-tense sentences. In addition, various varieties of Coptic make use of the light/support verb *ire*, ‘to do’, when using loan verbs from Greek such as *r-pisteuin*, ‘to believe’. Other varieties do not use the light/support

verb but the Greek verb in the form *pisteue* (Hasznos & Müller 2017). Finally, there are lexicalised verbal compounds of a verb plus an incorporated noun such as *ti-sbô*, 'to instruct (lit give-instruction)' or *r-nobe*, 'to sin (lit. do-sin)', which can appear in Present-tense sentences without being subject to a change in object marking.

The contribution focuses on the use of the Greek verbal forms in several diachronic and diatopic varieties of Coptic.

12 ANNOTATION AND AUTOMATIC IDENTIFICATION OF LIGHT-VERB CONSTRUCTIONS IN THE PARSEME FRAMEWORK

Agata Savary, agata.savary@universite-paris-saclay.fr, Université Paris-Saclay, France

Keywords: PARSEME corpora, annotation guidelines, linguistic tests, automatic identification

PARSEME is an international network of researchers dealing with multi-word expressions (MWEs). As a result of a collaborative effort, annotation guidelines for verbal MWEs (VMWEs), including light-verb constructions (LVCs henceforth), were put forward. They are organized as decision trees over linguistic tests, and unified across 26 languages. On the basis of these guidelines, the same community constructs a multilingual corpus annotated for VMWEs, which is continuously enlarged and enhanced. The corpus has been used for linguistic studies and for the organization of evaluation campaigns dedicated to the task of automatic identification of VMWE in text, with 3 editions so far, covering over 20 languages in total. Greek has been on board all these efforts from the very beginning and is one of the best covered languages in the PARSEME resources and tools.

In my talk, I will summarize the PARSEME annotation framework and outcomes, as well as the results of the evaluation campaign, with a special focus on LVCs, notably in Greek. I will also stress the challenges that remain to be addressed for a better account of VMWEs, and LVCs in particular, in language resources and tools.

[VOLUME ONLY] 13 VERB-NOUN COLLOCATIONS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT: A
COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN GREEK AND LATIN

José Miguel Baños, jmbanos@ucm.es, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Madrid, Spain; M. Dolores Jiménez López, mdolores.jimenez@uah.es, Universidad de Alcalá, Alcalá de Henares, Spain

Keywords: New Testament, comparative approach (Latin-Greek), translation, language contact

The aim of this contribution is to give an overview of the use of verb-noun collocations (VNCs henceforth), or support-verb constructions in the broad sense, in the New Testament (NT henceforth), both in the original Greek version and in the Vulgate Latin translation.

In the case of the Greek text, we analyse the most frequently used VNCs in the NT, distinguishing between two main types:

(i) those which are a survival of classical Greek (πορείαν ποιῶμαι 'to go, to walk', δεήσεις ποιῶμαι 'to pray, to make a prayer', φόρον δίδωμι 'to tax, to pay tax');

(ii) those which represent an innovation from a diachronic point of view.

In this case, it is appropriate to distinguish collocations that illustrate the process of renewal that these complex predicates have undergone in Koine Greek (e.g. the use of the support verb ποιέω in the active voice instead of the middle: φόνον ποέω 'to murder, to commit murder', κρίσιν ποιέω 'to judge, to make a judgement'), from those others which are foreign to the Greek language and are, in fact, the fruit of linguistic interference with the other languages of their context (Marucci 1993; Adams 2003; Rochette 2010; Jiménez López 2017; Jiménez López 2018; Jiménez López & Baños 2022): Hebrew (τὴν ἀνομίαν ἐργάζομαι 'to commit iniquity, to act lawlessly', καρπὸν ποιέω 'to bear fruit') and/or Latin (συμβούλιον δίδωμι, συμβούλιον λαμβάνω 'to form a plan', κῆνσον δίδωμι 'to tax, to pay tax'). From this perspective, we show some important differences between the four evangelists in the use of VNCs.

For the Vulgate, we offer a typology of the Latin collocations of the NT according to their greater or lesser fidelity to the original Greek text (Baños 2015). We distinguish between two types of examples:

(i) the Greek text employs a VNC which is translated in the Vulgate in the regular way by a parallel collocation, but with two distinct possibilities: (a) the same support verb as in Greek (ἀπόκρισις δίδωμι = *responsum do* 'to give an answer, to respond', λόγον ποιέω = *sermonem facio* 'to speak'); (b) a different support verb, but one that is more natural in classical or late Latin (ἐνέδραν ποιέω = *insidias tendo* 'to lay an ambush', λόγον συναιρέω = *rationem pono* 'to settle accounts'). This regularity presents some significant exceptions: on the one hand, a VNC like χρείαν ἔχω ('to need, to have need') is translated by different collocations (*opus est, necesse habeo, necessitatem habeo*), but also by a parallel verb (*egeo, indigeo, desidero, debeo*). On the other hand, exceptionally, a Greek VNC is translated by a simplex verb in Latin (ὁδὸν ποιέω = *praegredior* 'to make their way, to walk');

(ii) Latin often uses a VNC where the Greek text has a simplex verb. In such cases, there are also two possibilities: (a) a Greek simplex verb is systematically translated by one or more Latin collocations (εὐχαριστέω = *gratias ago* 'to be thankful', ἐπιμελέομαι = *curam ago/habeo* 'to take care of'); (b) a Greek simplex verb is translated either by a collocation or by a parallel verb in Latin (Baños & Jiménez López 2017a; Baños & Jiménez López 2017b): μαρτυρέω 'to give evidence, to bear witness' = *testor* or *testimonium habeo/perhibeo/reddo/do*; μισέω 'to hate' = *odi* or *odio habeo/sum*).

The study of VNCs in the New Testament, a crucial corpus in the history of the Greek language, offers valuable information for comparison with other stages or corpora of the Greek language (Janse 2002; Janse 2007; Horrocks 2014b; Joosten 2013; Porter 2014). Furthermore, the comparative analysis of the Greek text with the Latin translation of the Vulgate (Burton 2013; Houghton 2016), besides showing the linguistic interferences in the use of these idiosyncratic constructions, reveals the different use and functionality of VNCs in the two classical languages (Hoffmann 2014; Jiménez López 2016; Baños 2023).

[VOLUME ONLY] 14 PROTO-INDO-EUROPEAN LIGHT VERBS AND LIGHT VERB CONSTRUCTIONS

Máté Ittész, ittzes.mate@btk.elte.hu, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary

Keywords: Proto-Indo-European, comparative method, **d^heh₁* ‘to put’, **deh₃* ‘to give’, univerbation

In the last decades, there has been a growing interest in the reconstruction of light-verb constructions (a.k.a. support-verb constructions or Funktionsverbgefüge) for Proto-Indo-European (PIE henceforth) (see, most importantly, the comprehensive monograph of Schutzeichel (2014) and many other individual papers and articles). However, there are several practical, theoretical and methodological problems with this nowadays apparently very popular approach.

First of all, these reconstructions are, with few exceptions, not based on cognate syntagms of different Indo-European daughter languages, but merely on data taken from a single language, which means that they are transpositions (Transponats) whose PIE status is entirely uncertain rather than reconstructions in the methodologically true sense of the word.

Secondly, although the phenomenon of lexical substitution is in fact a diachronic reality, which can be observed even in the case of historically attested light-verb constructions (cf., e.g., Old High German *wara tuon* vs. Middle High German *wara niman* treated by Hackstein (2012)), its application in reconstruction runs counter to theoretical and methodological principles of comparative historical linguistics and should therefore be avoided. The same is true for the rather vague notion of so-called “open-slot constructions”, which is applied to the problem of light-verb constructions by Hackstein in his above-mentioned article.

Furthermore, at least since the often-quoted paper by Hackstein (2002), it has been routinely assumed that the PIE root extension **-d^h-* is the univerbated form of the root **d^heh₁*, which points to an earlier existence of a PIE or Pre-PIE type of light-verb construction consisting of the light verb **d^heh₁* and a nominal host. In the individual cases, however, the exact morphological make-up of the nominal host remains generally unspecified and reference is made, either explicitly or implicitly, to irregular phonological processes (such as “attrition”), which often accompany grammaticalization and which would prevent us from detecting the exact phonological and, consequently, morphological shape of the noun. Moreover, the apparently singular instance of a multi-word construction with **d^heh₁* which demonstrably undergoes univerbation in the Indo-European daughter languages (i.e. PIE **k^hred(s) d^heh₁* > Lat. *credo* vs. OIA *śrād dhā*) and which, therefore, plays a prominent role in the argumentation of the adherents of this approach, is in my view no (semi-compositional) light-verb construction at all but rather a (fully non-compositional) phraseological unit.

In my contribution, I argue that, while typological considerations make it very likely that the category of N+V light-verb constructions as a type did in fact exist in PIE and the light-verb use of roots such as, for instance, **d^heh₁* ‘to put’ or **deh₃* ‘to give’ may be reconstructed for the parent language with a sufficient degree of certainty, the reconstruction of specific constructions can probably never be successful, since apart from the lack, or at least extreme rarity, of exact correspondences between light verb constructions of the individual Indo-European languages, it also runs counter to various theoretical and methodological principles of comparative historical linguistics.

REFERENCES

- Adams, James. 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Alonso Fernández, Zoa. 2010. Estructuras de complementación de “utor” en latín arcaico y clásico. In M^a Angeles Almela Lumbreras, José Francisco González Castro, J. Siles Ruiz, Jesús de la Villa, Gregorio Hinojo Andrés & Patricia Cañizares Ferriz (eds.), *Perfiles de Grecia y Roma: actas del XII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos, Valencia, 22 al 26 de octubre de 2007. Vol. II*, 231–239. Madrid: Sociedad Española de Estudios Clásicos.
- Altshuler, Daniel & Robert Truswell. 2022. *Coordination and the syntax-discourse interface* (Oxford Surveys in Syntax and Morphology 12). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baldwin, Timothy & Su Kim. 2010. Multiword expressions. In Nitin Indurkha & Fred Damerau (eds.), *Handbook of Natural Language Processing*, 267–292. Boca Raton, FL ; London: CRC press.
- Baños, José Miguel. 2015. Colocaciones verbo-nominales y traducción del griego al latín: el Evangelio de San Mateo. In Jesús Ángel Espinós, José Floristán Imízcoz, Fernando García Romero, Mercedes López Salvá & Ignacio Rodríguez Alfageme (eds.), *Υγίεια και γέλως : homenaje a Ignacio Rodríguez Alfageme*, 61–72. Zaragoza: Libros Pórtico.
- Baños, José Miguel. 2018. Las construcciones con verbo soporte en latín: una perspectiva diacronica. In Olga Spevak & Colette Bodelot (eds.), *Les constructions à verbe support en latin* (Cahier Du Laboratoire de Recherche Sur La Langage), vol. 7, 21–52. Clermont-Ferrand: Presses Universitaires Blaise Pascal.
- Baños, José Miguel. 2018. Las construcciones con verbo soporte en latín: una perspectiva diacrónica. *Cahiers du Laboratoire de Recherche sur le Langage* 7. 21–51.
- Baños, José Miguel. 2023. Support verbs constructions in Plautus and Terence. In James Adams, Anna Chahoud & Giuseppe Pezzini (eds.), *Early Latin: Constructs, Diversity, Reception*, 118–137. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baños, José Miguel & María Dolores Jiménez López. 2017a. ‘Arrepentirse’ en el Nuevo Testamento en griego y en latín: el empleo de las construcciones con verbo soporte en la Vulgata. *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica. Estudios Latinos* 37(1). 11–32.
- Baños, José Miguel & María Dolores Jiménez López. 2017b. “Odiar” en el “Nuevo Testamento” (“odi”, “odio sum”, “odio habeo”): traducción y construcciones con verbo soporte en la “Vulgata.” *Euphrosyne : revista de Filología Clásica* 45. 59–78.
- Baños, José Miguel & María Dolores Jiménez López. 2018. Vota nuncupare = εὐχὰς ποιεῖσθαι: sobre la traducción griega de las Res Gestae de Augusto. In Alberto Bernabé, Luis Calero, Sonia Blanco & Javier del Hoyo (eds.), *Phílos hetaíros: homenaje al profesor Luis M. Macía*, 189–208. Madrid: UAM Ediciones.
- Baños, José Miguel, María Dolores Jiménez López, María Jiménez Martínez & Cristina Tur Altarriba. 2022. *Collocations in theoretical and applied linguistics: from classical languages to Romance languages*. Madrid: SEEC.
- 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.
- Bel, Nuria, Maria Coll & Gabriela Resnik. 2010. Automatic Detection of Non-deverbal Event Nouns for Quick Lexicon Production. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Computational Linguistics (Coling 2010)*, 46–52. Beijing, China: Coling 2010 Organizing Committee. <https://aclanthology.org/C10-1006>.
- Bentein, Klaas. 2016. *Verbal periphrasis in ancient Greek: have- and be- constructions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bentein, Klaas & Mark Janse (eds.). 2020. *Varieties of Post-classical and Byzantine Greek. Varieties of Post-classical and Byzantine Greek*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Bentein, Klaas, Mark Janse & Jorie Soltic (eds.). 2017. *Variation and Change in Ancient Greek Tense, Aspect and Modality*. Leiden ; Boston: Brill.

- Bentein, Klaas & Emmanuel Roumanis. 2024. The Power of Judgement: A Comparison of Evaluative Stance in the Atticist Lexica of Phrynichus and Moeris. *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 102.
- Blass, Friedrich & Albert Debrunner. 1961. *A Greek grammar of the New Testament and other early Christian literature*. Chicago ; London: University of Chicago Press.
- Bowern, Claire. 2008. The diachrony of complex predicates. *Diachronica* 25(2). 161–185.
- Burton, Philip. 2013. The Latin Version of the New Testament. In Bart Ehrman & Michael Holmes (eds.), *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. (New Testament Tools, Studies and Documents), vol. 42, 167–200. Leiden ; Boston: Brill.
- 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.
- Churik, Nikolas. 2019. Greek Explicating Greek: A Study of Metaphrase Language and Style. In Alex MacFarlane & Matthew Kinloch (eds.), *Trends and Turning Points: Constructing the Late Antique and Byzantine World* (The Medieval Mediterranean), vol. 117, 66–82. Leiden ; Boston: Brill.
- Cock, A. 1981. ΠΟΙΕΙΣΘΑΙ: Ποιειν. Sur les critères déterminant le choix entre l'actif Ποιειν et le moyen ΠΟΙΕΙΣΘΑΙ. *Mnemosyne* 34(1/2). 1–62.
- Constant, Mathieu, Gülşen Eryiğit, Johanna Monti, Lonneke van der Plas, Carlos Ramisch, Michael Rosner & Amalia Todirascu. 2017. Multiword expression processing: A survey. *Computational Linguistics* 43(4). 837–892. https://doi.org/10.1162/COLI_a_00302.
- Cowie, A. P. (Tony). 2001. Speech formulae in English: problems of analysis and dictionary treatment. In Geart van der Meer & Alice ter Meulen (eds.), *Making Senses: From Lexeme to Discourse. In Honor of Werner Abraham*, 1–12. Groningen: Center for Language and Cognition.
- Croft, William & D. Alan Cruse. 2004. *Cognitive Linguistics* (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511803864>.
- Depuydt, Leo. 1993. For the sake of οὔωυ, 'love': an exception to the Stern-Jernstedt Rule and its history. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 79. 282–289.
- Engsheden, Åke. 2008. Differential object marking in Sahidic Coptic. In Folke Jesophson & Ingmar Söhrman (eds.), *Interdependence of diachronic and synchronic analyses*, 324–344. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Engsheden, Åke. 2018. Verbal semantics and differential object marking in Lycopolitan Coptic. In Alena Witzlack-Makarevich & Ilja Serzant (eds.), *Diachrony of differential argument marking*, 153–182. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Fendel, Victoria. 2021. Greek in Egypt or Egyptian Greek? Syntactic regionalisms (IV CE). In Klaas Bentein & Mark Janse (eds.), *Varieties of Post-classical and Byzantine Greek* (Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs), vol. 331, 115–140. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Fendel, Victoria. 2022. *Coptic interference in the syntax of Greek letters from Egypt*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fendel, Victoria. 2023. 'I haven't got a clue!': assessing negation in classical Greek Support-Verb Constructions. *Journal of Greek Linguistics*.
- Fendel, Victoria. 2024. Support-verb constructions with objects: Greek-Coptic interference in the documentary papyri? In Robin Meyer & Michele Bianchoni (eds.), *Proceedings of the ICHL workshop "Typology, Language Contact, and Corpus Languages: a Unifying Approach"*, Oxford, August 2022 (Transactions of the Philological Society. Special Edition.). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Fendel, Victoria & Matthew Ireland. 2023. Discourse cohesion in Xenophon's On Horsemanship through Sketch Engine. *Digital Humanities Quarterly*.
- Fotopoulou, Angeliki & Voula Giouli. 2016. MWEs: Support/light Verb Constructions vs Fixed Expressions in Modern Greek and French. In Gloria Corpas Pastor, Johanna Monti, Violeta Seretan & Ruslan Mitkov (eds.), 68–73. Malaga: Tradulex.

- Franco, Laura. 2009. *A Study of the Metaphrastic Process: the case of the unpublished Passio of St James the Persian (BHG 773), Passio of Plato (BHG 1551-1552), and Vita of St Hilarion (BHG 755) by Symeon Metaphrastes*. University of London, Royal Holloway PhD thesis.
- Friese, Susanne. 2014. *Qualitative Data Analysis with ATLAS.ti*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Givón, Talmy. 1978. Definiteness and referentiality. In Joseph Greenberg (ed.), *Universals of Human Language*, 293–330. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Grimshaw, Jane. 1990. *Argument structure* (Linguistic Inquiry Monographs). Vol. 18. Cambridge, Mass ; London: MIT Press.
- Gross, Gaston. 2005. Pour un Bescherelle des prédicats nominaux: *Lingvisticæ Investigationes* 27(2). 343–358. <https://doi.org/10.1075/li.27.2.14gro>.
- Gross, Gaston. 2017. Petit historique de la notion de verbes supports. *Cahiers de lexicologie* 111(2). 121–144. <https://doi.org/10.15122/isbn.978-2-406-07412-0.p.0121>.
- Gross, Maurice. 1982. Une classification des phrases « figées » du français. *Revue québécoise de linguistique* 11(2). 151–185.
- Gross, Maurice. 1998. La fonction sémantique des verbes supports. *Travaux de Linguistique : Revue Internationale de Linguistique Française* 37(1). 25–46.
- Hackstein, Olav. 2002. Uridg. *CH.CC > *C.CC. *Historische Sprachforschung* 115. 1–22.
- Hackstein, Olav. 2012. When words coalesce: chunking and morphophonemic extension. In Craig Melchert (ed.), *The Indo-European Verb. Proceedings of the Conference of the Society for Indo-European Studies, Los Angeles 13–15 September 2010*, 87–104. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Halliday, Michael & Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English* (English Language Series). Vol. 9. London: Longman.
- Hasznos, Andrea & Matthias Müller. 2017. Coptic. In George Kanarakis (ed.), *The Legacy of the Greek Language*, 545–573. Boston; New York: Peridot International Publications.
- Heusinger, Klaus von. 2002. Specificity and Definiteness in Sentence and Discourse Structure. *Journal of Semantics* 19. 245–274.
- Heusinger, Klaus von & Petra Schumacher. 2019. Discourse prominence: Definition and application. *Journal of Pragmatics* 154. 117–127.
- Hewitt, Joseph. 1927. The Terminology of “Gratitude” in Greek. *Classical Philology*. University of Chicago Press 22(2). 142–161.
- Hinterberger, Martin. 2010. Hagiographische Metaphrasen. Ein Möglicher Weg der Annäherung an die Literarästhetik Der Frühen Palaiologenzeit. In Andreas Rhoby & Elisabeth Schiffer (eds.), *Imitatio – Aemulatio - Variatio. Akten des Internationalen Wissenschaftlichen Symposions zur Byzantinischen Sprache und Literatur (Wien 22.-25. Oktober 2008)*, 137–151. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Hinterberger, Martin. 2014. Byzantine Hagiography and Its Literary Genres. Some Critical Observations. In Stephanos Efthymiadis (ed.), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography*, 25–60. London: Routledge.
- Hinterberger, Martin. 2021. Metaphraseis as a Key for the Understanding of Different Levels in Byzantine Vocabulary. In Elisabeth Schiffer, Martin Hinterberger & Anne Alwis (eds.), *Metaphrasis in Byzantine Literature*, 109–126. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Hoffmann, Roland. 2014. Les constructions causatives dans les traductions latines des textes hébreux et grecs: le cas de la Vulgate de Jérôme. In Bernard Bortolussi & Peggy Lecaude (eds.), *La causativité en latin*, 143–174. Paris: Editions L’Harmattan.
- Høgel, Christian. 2002. *Symeon Metaphrastes. Rewriting and canonization*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press.
- Høgel, Christian. 2021. Rewriting in Byzantium: Standardization and Metaphrasis. In Anne Alwis, Martin Hinterberger & Elisabeth Schiffer (eds.), *Metaphrasis in Byzantine Literature*, 29–41. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Høgel, Christian & Stavroula Constantinou (eds.). 2020. *Metaphrasis. A Byzantine Concept of Rewriting and Its Hagiographical Products* (The Medieval Mediterranean). Vol. 125. Leiden ; Boston: Brill.

- Horrocks, Geoffrey. 2014a. High-Register Medieval Greek. In Caterina Carpinato & Olga Tribulato (eds.), *Storia e storie della lingua greca*, 49–72. Venice: Edizioni Ca' Foscari.
- Horrocks, Geoffrey. 2014b. *Greek: a history of the language and its speakers*. Second edition. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell.
- Houghton, Hugh. 2016. *The Latin New Testament: a guide to its early history, texts, and manuscripts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 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. 2007. Remarks on the Periphrastic Constructions with the Verb 'to make, to do' in Sanskrit, Greek and Latin. In Dezső Csaba (ed.), *Indian Languages and Texts Through the Ages. Essays of Hungarian Indologists in Honour of Prof. Csaba Tóttösy*, 1–40. New Delhi: Manohar.
- Ittzés, Máté. 2013. Light Verb Constructions vs. Simple Verbs in Vedic: vimócanam kṛute (RV 3,30,12d). In Anna Trynkowska & Danuta Stasik (eds.), *CEENIS Current Research Series*, vol. 1, 107–123. Warsaw: Dom Wydawniczy Elipsa.
- Ittzés, Máté. 2016. *Funkcióigés szerkezetek a védikus óind nyelvben [Function Verb Constructions in Vedic Old Indo-Aryan]*. Budapest: Eötvös Loránd University Habilitation.
- Ittzés, Máté. 2022. Light Verb, Auxiliary, Grammaticalization: The Case of the Vedic Periphrastic Perfect. *Die Sprache* 54. 95–129.
- Janse, Mark. 2002. Aspects of Bilingualism in the History of the Greek Language. In James Adams, Mark Janse & Simon Swain (eds.), *Bilingualism in ancient society: language contact and the written text*, 332–390. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Janse, Mark. 2007. The Greek of the New Testament. In Anastasios Christidis (ed.), *A history of ancient Greek : from the beginnings to late antiquity*, 646–653. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ježec, Elisabetta. 2016. *The Lexicon. An Introduction* (Oxford Textbooks in Linguistics). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jiménez López, María Dolores. 2011. El uso de ποιεῖσθαι en Lisias: construcciones con verbo soporte. *Lingüística en la Red* 9. 1–20.
- Jiménez López, María Dolores. 2012. Construcciones con verbo soporte, verbo simple y nombre predicativo: un ejemplo en griego antiguo / Support Verb Constructions, Simple Verb and Predicative Noun: An Example in Ancient Greek. *Minerva* 25. 83–105.
- Jiménez López, María Dolores. 2016. On Support Verb Constructions in Ancient Greek. *Archivio glottologico italiano* 51(2). 180–204.
- Jiménez López, María Dolores. 2017. Las colocaciones verbo-nominales con συμβούλιον en el nuevo testamento: un ejemplo de calco e interferencia lingüística. *Habis* 48. 219–239.
- Jiménez López, María Dolores. 2018. Colocaciones verbo-nominales en el Nuevo Testamento: aproximación a una tipología de errores. In Olga Spevak & Colette Bodelot (eds.), *Les constructions à verbe support en latin* (Cahier Du Laboratoire de Recherche Sur La Langage), vol. 7, 95–116. Clermont-Ferrand: Presses Universitaires Blaise Pascal.
- 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 ; Boston: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Jiménez López, María Dolores & José Miguel Baños. 2022. Translation as a mechanism for the creation of collocations (II): the alternation operor/facio in the Bible. In María Dolores Jiménez López, María Jiménez Martínez, Cristina Tur Altarriba & José Miguel Baños (eds.), *Collocations in theoretical and applied linguistics: from classical languages to Romance languages*, 189–234. Madrid: SEEC.
- Jiménez Martínez, María. 2019. Colocaciones verbo-nominales en diacronía: del latín a las lenguas romances. *Sorda & Sonora* 2. 21–36.

- Joosten, Jan. 2013. Varieties of Greek in the Septuagint and the New Testament. In James Paget & Joachim Schaper (eds.), *The New Cambridge History of the Bible. Vol. 1. From the Beginnings to 600*, 22–45. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kälviäinen, Nikolaos. 2013. Levels of Style in Byzantine Greek and the Role of Syntactic Complexity: A Quantitative Analysis of the Sentence Structure of Three Early Byzantine Hagiographic Texts. *Arctos – Acta Philologica Fennica* 47. 173–198.
- Kamber, Alain. 2008. *Funktionsverbgefüge-- empirisch: eine korpusbasierte Untersuchung zu den nominalen Prädikaten des Deutschen* (Reihe Germanistische Linguistik). Vol. 281. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Keenan, Edward & Matthew Dryer. 2007. Passive in the world's languages. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description: Volume 1: Clause Structure*, vol. 1, 325–361. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511619427.006>.
- Kovalevskaitė, Jolanta, Erika Rimkutė & Laura Vilkaitė-Lozdienė. 2020. Light Verb Constructions in Lithuanian: Identification and Classification. *Studies about Languages* 36. 5–16. <https://doi.org/10.5755/j01.sal.0.36.22846>.
- Kühner, Raphael & Bernhard Gerth. 1894. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache 2: Satzlehre*. 3rd edn. Hannover ; Leipzig: Hahnsche Buchhandlung.
- Langer, Stefan. 2004. A linguistic test battery for support verb constructions. *Linguisticæ Investigationes* 27(2). 171–184. <https://doi.org/10.1075/li.27.2.03lan>.
- López Martín, Iván. 2019. Las colocaciones verbo-nominales en griego y en latín: una comparación entre César y Jenofonte. *Cuadernos de filología clásica: Estudios latinos*. Servicio de Publicaciones 39(2). 209–225.
- Löw, Otto. 1908. *Χάρις*. Marburg: Philipps University of Marburg PhD thesis.
- Luraghi, Silvia. 2003. Definite referential null objects in Ancient Greek. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 108. 167–194. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110243482.167>.
- Luraghi, Silvia. 2010. The extension of the transitive construction in Ancient Greek. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 42(1). 60–74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03740463.2010.486919>.
- Lyons, John. 1977. *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marini, Emanuela. 2010. L'antipassivo in greco antico: ποιείσθαι come verbo supporto in Aristotele. *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 11(1). 147–180. <https://doi.org/10.1515/joll.2010.11.1.147>.
- Marucci, Corrado. 1993. Influssi latini sul greco del Nuovo Testamento. *Filologia neotestamentaria* 6. 3–30.
- Meinschaefter, Judith. 2016. Nominalizations. In Susann Fischer & Christoph Gabriel (eds.), *Manual of Grammatical Interfaces in Romance*, 391–418. Berlin ; Boston: Mouton De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110311860-016>.
- Mel'čuk, Igor. 1998. Collocations and Lexical Functions. In A. P. (Tony) Cowie (ed.), *Phraseology. Theory, Analysis, and Applications*, 23–53. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Mendózar Cruz, Juan. 2020. Las construcciones con verbo soporte en latín. Estado de la cuestión. *Tempus: Revista de Actualización Científica sobre el Mundo Clásico en España*. Ediciones Clásicas (47). 7–48.
- Müller, Matthias. 2021. *Grammatik des Bohairischen* (Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica). Vol. 24. Hamburg: Widmaier Verlag. <https://doi.org/10.37011/studmon.24>.
- Pompei, Anna. 2006. Tracce di incorporazione in greco antico. In Pierluigi Cuzzolin & Maria Napoli (eds.), *Fonologia e tipologia lessicale nella storia della lingua greca. Atti del Incontro Internazionale di Linguistica Greca, Bergamo, 15–17 September 2005*, 216–237. Milan: FrancoAngeli.
- Pompei, Anna & Nicola Grandi. 2012. Complex -éo verbs in Ancient Greek: A case study on the interface between derivation, compounding and inflection. *Morphology* 22. 399–416.
- Pompei, Anna & Lunella Mereu. 2019. *Verbi supporto: fenomeni e teorie*. Munich: LINCOM.
- Porter, Stanley. 2014. New Testament. (Ed.) Georgios Giannakis. *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics, Vol. II*. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

- Radimský, Jan. 2011. Noms prédicatifs, noms de résultat et noms concrets dans les constructions à verbe support. *Linguisticæ Investigationes* 34(2). 204–227. <https://doi.org/10.1075/li.34.2.02rad>.
- Rafiyenko, Dariya & Ilja A. Seržant (eds.). 2020. *Postclassical Greek: Contemporary Approaches to Philology and Linguistics* (Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs [TiLSM]). Vol. 335. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110677522>.
- Ramisch, Carlos, Silvio Ricardo Cordeiro, Agata Savary, Veronika Vincze, Verginica Barbu Mititelu, Archana Bhatia, Maja Buljan, et al. 2018. Edition 1.1 of the PARSEME Shared Task on Automatic Identification of Verbal Multiword Expressions. In *Proceedings of the Joint Workshop on Linguistic Annotation, Multiword Expressions and Constructions (LAW-MWE-CxG-2018)*, 222–240. Santa Fe, New Mexico, USA: Association for Computational Linguistics. <https://aclanthology.org/W18-4925>. (22 March, 2023).
- Ramisch, Carlos, Agata Savary, Bruno Guillaume, Jakub Waszczuk, Marie Candito, Ashwini Vaidya, Verginica Barbu Mititelu, et al. 2020. Edition 1.2 of the PARSEME Shared Task on Semi-supervised Identification of Verbal Multiword Expressions. In *Proceedings of the Joint Workshop on Multiword Expressions and Electronic Lexicons*, 107–118. online: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Reintges, Christoph. 2004. *Coptic Egyptian (Sahidic dialect): a learner's grammar* (Afrikawissenschaftliche Lehrbücher). Vol. 15. Köln: Köppe.
- Ricci, Eleonora. 2016. *Referenzialità, verbi supporto e incorporazione: uno studio di caso in greco antico*. Rome: Università di Roma Tre MA thesis.
- Rijksbaron, Albert. 1984. *The syntax and semantics of the verb in classical Greek: an introduction*. Amsterdam: Gieben.
- Rochette, Bruno. 2010. Greek and Latin bilingualism. In Egbert Bakker (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, 281–293. Chichester; Malden: John Wiley & Sons.
- Sag, Ivan, Timothy Baldwin, Francis Bond & Ann Copestake. 2002. Multiword expressions: A pain in the neck for NLP. In Alexander Gelbukh (ed.), *Proceedings of the 3rd International conference on Computational Linguistics and Intelligent Text Processing*, 1–15. Berlin; Heidelberg: Springer.
- Sánchez López, Elena. 2020. On the importance of a diachronic approach to phraseology. In Jorge Fernández Jaén & Herminia Provencio Garrigós (eds.), *Changes in Meaning and Function: Studies in Historical Linguistics with a Focus on Spanish* (IVITRA Research in Linguistics and Literature), vol. 25, 299–330. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ivitra.25.12san>.
- 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, Carlos Ramisch, Silvio Cordeiro, Federico Sangati, Veronika Vincze, Behrang QasemiZadeh, Marie Candito, et al. 2017. The PARSEME Shared Task on Automatic Identification of Verbal Multiword Expressions. In *Proceedings of the 13th Workshop on Multiword Expressions (MWE 2017)*, 31–47. Valencia, Spain: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Schiffer, Elisabeth. 1992. Metaphrastic Lives and Earlier Metaphraseis of Saints' Lives. In Christian Høgel (ed.), *Redactions and Audiences in Middle Byzantine Hagiography*, 22–41. Oslo: The Research Council of Norway.
- Schiffer, Elisabeth. 1999. *Untersuchungen zum Sprachniveau metaphrastischer Texte und ihrer Vorlagen*. Vienna: University of Vienna PhD thesis.
- Schutzzeichel, Marc. 2014. *Indogermanische Funktionsverbgefüge* (Wissenschaftliche Schriften der WWU Münster 12). Vol. 13. Münster: Monsenstein und Vannerdat OHG.

- Schwyzler, Eduard. 1950. *Griechische Grammatik. II. Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik. Vervollständigt und hrsg. von A. Debrunner*. Munich: Beck.
- Ševčenko, Ihor. 1982. Levels of Style in Byzantine Prose. *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 31(1). 189–312.
- Sheinfux, 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* (Phraseology and Multiword Expressions), vol. 3, 35–68. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Signes Codoñer, Juan. 2021. Metáfrasis en Bizancio: aproximaciones al concepto en dos publicaciones recientes. *Medioevo Greco: Rivista di storia e filologia bizantina* 21. 511–528.
- Stahl, Johann Matthias. 1907. *Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums der klassischen Zeit*. (Indogerman. Bibl. 1.1). Vol. 4. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Stern, Ludwig Christian. 1880. *Koptische Grammatik*. Leipzig: Weigel.
- Storrer, Angelika. 2009. Corpus based investigations on German support verb constructions. In Christiane Fellbaum (ed.), *Idioms and collocations: Corpus-based linguistic and lexicographic studies* (Research in Corpus and Discourse), 164–187. London: Continuum.
- Tan, Yee Fan, Min-Yen Kan & Hang Cui. 2006. Extending corpus-based identification of light verb constructions using a supervised learning framework. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Multiword-expressions in a multilingual context*, 49–56.
- Thumb, Albert. 1905. *Handbuch des Sanskrit, mit Texten und Glossar: eine Einführung in das sprachwissenschaftliche Studium des Altindischen* (Indogermanische Bibliothek. Erste Reihe, Lehr- und Handbücher). Heidelberg: C. Winter.
- Toufexis, Notis. 2008. Diglossia and register variation in Medieval Greek*. *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*. Cambridge University Press 32(2). 203–217. <https://doi.org/10.1179/174962508X322687>.
- 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.
- Tur, Cristina. 2020. Una aproximación a la enseñanza de las colocaciones latinas a través de metáforas cognitivas. *Estudios clásicos*. Sociedad Española de Estudios Clásicos (158). 123–140.
- Van Camp, Bruno. 2005. À propos de λόγον διδόναι, formule-clé de la dialectique platonicienne. *Revue belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 83(1). 55–62. <https://doi.org/10.3406/rbph.2005.4909>.
- Vanséveren, Sylvie. 1995. "ἔχω, verbe à sens neutre (dans l'épopée homérique). *L'Antiquité Classique*. *L'Antiquité Classique* 64. 199–203.
- Vives Cuesta, Alfonso & Lucía Madrigal Acero. 2022. Support-verb constructions in Postclassical Greek and sociolinguistics: a diachronic study of εὐχῆν ποιέω as a level-of-speech marker. In María Dolores Jiménez López, María Jiménez Martínez, Cristina Tur Altarriba & José Miguel Baños (eds.), *Collocations in theoretical and applied linguistics: from classical languages to Romance languages*. Madrid: SEEC.
- Zilliacus, Henrik. 1938. Zur stilistischen Umarbeitungstechnik des Symeon Metaphrastes. *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 38. 333–350.