Perspective Project Annotation Manual RAG/REPORTS

March 2017

1 The basic annotation scheme REPORTS: an annotation scheme for speech, attitude and perception reports

Entities:

- attitude/speech/perception embedding entity (verb, NP or adjective)

- complement

- complement chunk

- head of complement chunk (finite verb, infinitive or participle)

Events (2-place relations):

- report relation: between embedding entity and complement

- chunk-of relation: between whole complement and complement chunk

- head-of relation: between complement chunk and head of the complement chunk

Consider the following English example:

(1)   *He said that he was ill and couldn't come.*

This would be analysed and annotated as follows:

entities	
1. attitude/speech/perception embedding entity	*said*
2. complement	*that he was ill and could not come*
3. complement chunks	(a) *that he was ill*
	(b) *and could not come*
4. heads of complement chunk	(a) *is*
	(b) *could*
events	
report relation	(1) $\Rightarrow$ (2)
chunk-of relations	(2) $\Leftarrow$ (3a), (2) $\Leftarrow$ (3b)
head-of relations	(3a) $\Leftarrow$ (4a), (3b) $\Leftarrow$ (4b)

Attributes of embedding entities:

		English example verbs
speech	normal	*say, answer, report*
	manner	*scream, cry, whisper*
	manipulative	*convince/order/persuade/beg someone to*
attitude	know	*know/understand that*
	believe	*think/believe/assume that*
	voluntative	*want/intend/hope/prey/fear to*
	other	*be ashamed, be grieved, rejoice*
perception		*see, hear, perceive*

We do not use attributes that do not belong to that specific category.

Attributes of complements:

- direct

- indirect

- mix of direct and indirect (e.g. in case of slipping)

- NP

- preposed NP

Attributes of head of chunk of complement:

No annotation needed, since we aim to have morphological analysis for distinguishing between finite verb, infinitive and participle (including information on tense and mood).

2 Additional choices that we made (default rules)

2.1 Embedding entities

Type of embedding entity

We treat nouns and adjectives expressing speech, attitude or perception as exactly the same as the verbs.

Analytic verb forms

If a verb of speech/belief etc. is an analytic form (e.g. πεπεισμένος εἴην, perfect middle optative of πείθω 'persuade') we annotate both parts together as the embedding entity.

Fixed expressions

In case we have a fixed expression of a noun and a verb, as in γνώμην ἀποφαίνειν ('to express the opinion that'), the embedding entity is not the compound expression, but only the noun expressing speech/perception/attitude (γνώμην in this case).

2.2 Complements

Explicitness

We only make annotations when a complement is explicitly present. In other words, speech or attitude verbs used in an absolute sense (as in *He spoke for a long time*) are left out.

NP complements

NP complements include both objects marked with accusative case and other cases, but not indirect objects.

(2)   a. *He expects a Spartan victory.*

       b. *He told the general to surrender his army.*

In (2a.) a Spartan victory is an NP-complement (direct object). In (2b.) *the general* is an indirect object and is not annotated as an NP-complement. We also include prepositional objects such as in περὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς εἰπεῖν ('to speak about the empire') or ἐς Συρακοσίους δέος ('fear of the Syracusans').

We exclude instances of indefinite and demonstrative pronominal NP-objects – i.e. forms of τις/τι 'someone/-thing' and οὗτος, ὅδε 'this/that' – since these are not interesting for our present research goals due to their lack of meaningful content.

Preposed NP complements

This category is for preposed themes, such as τὰ σφέτερα in the following example:

(3)   [A ship went from Sicily to the Peloponnesus with ambassadors,]

οἵπερ	**τά**	τε	**σφέτερα**	φράσουσιν	ὅτι	ἐν	ἐλπίσιν
who.REL.NOM	the.ACC	PRT	own.affairs.ACC	tell.FUT.3PL	that	in	hopes.DAT

εἰσὶ	καὶ	τὸν	ἐκεῖ	πόλεμον	ἔτι	μᾶλλον	ἐποτρυνοῦσι
be.PRS.3PL	and	the.ACC	there	war.ACC	even	more	incite.PRS.3PL

γίγνεσθαι.
become.INF

'who should tell that their own affairs were hopeful, and should incite [the Peloponnesians] to prosecute the war there even more actively.'   (Thuc. 7.25.1)

Typical of these constructions is that the preposed theme gets its case from the embedding verb, but is also interpreted (but not overtly expressed) in the complement clause. The construction as a whole is annotated as containing two complements (hence two report relations), one preposed NP (τὰ σφέτερα), one indirect (ὅτι ἐν ἐλπίσιν εἰσί). We classify expressions as preposed NP only when reports with a complementizer (e.g. ὡς, ὅτι, εἰ) are concerned. The reason for this choice is that with infinitive or participle complements it is not as clear whether the NP should be seen as preposed or not (as in the second part of example 3, where we do not consider τὸν ἐκεῖ πόλεμον as preposed, though it is separated from the infinitive γίγνεσθαι).

Differences between corpora

In Thucydides, reports with NP complements (including preposed NPs) are all annotated (except when the NP is an indefinite or demonstrative pronoun, see above). In Herodotus, however, these are not annotated, which means that in Herodotus only propositional complements are annotated.

Two complements with one verb

We only annotate a construction as having two complements if one of them is an NP complement and the other is not. For example:

(4)   *He said the following: "..."*

Here we have two complements, with different attributes: an NP (*the following*) and a direct complement (the quotation). Other cases concern the conjunction of an NP-complement with an indirect one, as in:

(5)   Most ancient of all those who are reported to have settled in any part of the island were the Cyclopes and Laestrygonians,

ὧν	ἐγὼ	οὔτε	γένος	ἔχω	εἰπεῖν	οὔτε	ὁπόθεν
whose.REL.GEN	I.NOM	nor	stock.ACC	be.able.PRS.1SG	tell.INF	nor	whence

ἐσῆλθον	ἢ	ὅποι	ἀπεχώρησαν
come.to.PST.3PL	or	whither	go.away.PST.3PL

'whose stock I am not able to tell, nor whence they came or whither they went.'
                                                                        (Thuc. 6.2.1)

Here we have an NP complement (ὧν ... γένος) and an indirect one (ὁπόθεν ἐσῆλθον ἢ ὅποι ἀπεχώρησαν) that are dependent on the same embedding verb (εἰπεῖν) and are conjoined by οὔτε ... οὔτε.

Note that in Herodotus we annotate only propositional complements as a rule (see above), which means that this rule is only relevant for Thucydides (as far as the NPs involved are not indefinites or demonstratives).

Two embedding verbs with one complement

In some cases we find a complement that belongs to two verbs, a main verb and a modifying participle. For instance:

(6) ἣ   δὲ   ὑπολαβοῦσα   ἔφη
     she.NOM   PTC   reply.PST.PTCP.NOM   say.PST.3PL
     'And she said replying: "..."'   (Hdt. 1.11.5)

(7) Δελφῶν   οἶδα   ἐγὼ   οὕτω   ἀκούσας
     Delphians.GEN know.PRS.1SG   I.NOM   in.this.way   hear.PST.PTCP.NOM
     γενέσθαι.
     happen.PST.INF
     'After I have heard from the Delphians I know that this is how it happened.'
                                                                 (Hdt. 1.20.1)

In these cases the complement is annotated as being the object of both verbs separately (two report relations). Thus in (7) the complement οὕτω γενέσθαι is related both to οἶδα and to ἀκούσας. Should we know that one of the verbs never occurs with this specific type of complement on its own (without the other verb), we annotate it as belonging to this other verb only.

Complement or cause?

In some cases, especially with verbs expressing emotions (in our attitude 'other' category) that take a participle, it is not always clear whether the participle is syntactically dependent on the verb in an AcP or NcP construction (cf. translation 8a.) or rather is a modifying participle, determining the cause of the emotional state (cf. translation 8b.).

(8) εἴ τέ τις   ἄρχειν   ἄσμενος   αἱρεθεὶς
     if PTC someone.NOM command.INF   enjoy.NOM   choose.PST.PTCP.PASS.NOM
     παραινεῖ   ὑμῖν   ἐκπλεῖν...
     exhorts.PRS.3SG you.DAT sail.INF
     a. 'And if anyone here, who enjoys having been chosen to command, exhorts you to sail...'
     b. 'And if anyone here, happy because he has been chosen to command, exhorts you to sail ...'   (Thuc. 6.12.2)

Whenever it can naturally be taken as a complement (as in (8)), we do that.

NP-complement + participle or AcP-construction?

If a combination of an NP and a participle can both be interpreted as such, i.e. as an NP-complement + additional participle (*he saw him, while he was running*), or as an AcP-construction (*he saw him running*), we choose the latter by default (reason: otherwise we would miss them in Herodotus). If it's an AcP, the head is the participle. If it is an NP + participle, the head would be the noun, but we don't annotate heads with NP complements (see 2.3 below).

Constructions like 'consider X as Y'

In constructions such as 'consider X as Y' (for instance with ἡγέομαι in Greek) we treat X + Y as indirect complement, assuming that a form of *to be* is left out (e.g. the infinitive εἶναι or a participle form like ὄντα in Greek). The consequence is that there is no head.

Free relative clauses

In complement constructions with free relative clauses, such as *tell me what they did*, we treat the free relative clause (what they did) as an NP complement.

Personal passive report constructions

Subjects of passive report (say, belief etc.) constructions (e.g. *the Persians are said to. . .*) are not annotated as being part of the complement, although semantically they are. (Reason: otherwise, for consistency we would need to do that for all cases of subject coreference, including cases like *I want to. . .*). The same applies to constructions with verbs meaning 'to seem' such as with φαίνομαι 'to appear' and δόκει μοι 'X seems to me' (see 2.5 below).

2.3 Chunks

Complement types and chunks

Chunks are all of the individual complement clauses that are *syntactically dependent* upon one and the same embedding entity. So, if and only if we have more than one clause depending on the embedding entity, we have more than one chunk. This implies that with direct complements and NP complements (including the preposed ones) we do not annotate chunks, nor heads (since a head is always head of a chunk).

Complementizers

Complementizers (e.g. ὅτι/ὡς 'that', εἰ 'if/whether', μή 'lest') are part of the complement and of the first chunk of the complement (see the example in section 1).

Conjunctions/disjunctions

If chunks are connected by a conjunction or disjunction, that word belongs to the second chunk (see the example in section 1).

Predicative participle phrases within complements

Predicative participle phrases are not annotated as separate chunks, but as part of the chunk they belong to. For example:

(9) [Indirect speech: Paris carried off Helen.]

τοῖσι	Ἕλλησι	δόξαι	πρῶτὸν	πέμψαντας
the.DAT	Greeks.DAT	decide.PST.INF	first	send.PST.PTCP.ACC

ἀγγέλους	ἀπαιτέειν	τε	Ἑλένην	καὶ	δίκας
messengers.ACC	demand.back.PRS.INF	PTC	Helen.ACC	and	atonement.ACC

τῆς	ἁρπαγῆς	αἰτέειν.
the.GEN	rape.GEN	demand.PRS.INF

''[They say that] the Greeks first decided to send messengers to demand Helen back and demand atonement for the rape.'   (Hdt. 1.3.2)

Although the participle-phrase πέμψαντας ἀγγέλλους modifies both of the embedded clauses, we annotate it as part of the first chunk only. Thus, we have two chunks here: (i) πέμψαντας ἀγγέλλους ἀπαιτέειν τε Ἑλένην and (ii) καὶ δίκας τῆς ἁρπαγῆς αἰτέειν.

2.4 Heads

The head of a chunk is always only a single verb (negation, predicative adjective etc. are not part of the head). When the head of a chunk is an analytical form, we only annotate the part that directly depends on the embedding entity, e.g. only εἴην when we have πεπεισμένος εἴην. (Reason: we are interested in the heads mainly for syntactical reasons.)

2.5 Report verb classification

Check the document *List of relevant embedding entities with regard to perspective shifts* for the default classification of a verb. Some default rules that underlie the classification:

- some verbs occur in more than one category and in some of these cases the categorization depends on the complement construction used. For instance, εἴπον with a bare infinitive means 'tell someone to' and is classified as a manipulative speech verb, whereas εἴπον with a subordinated ὅτι-clause means 'say that' and belongs to the category of normal speech.

- the class of manner speech verbs is restricted to verbs referring to the physical properties (loudness etc.)

- the class of manipulative speech verbs is reserved for speech that is meant to lead to future actions, e.g. *convince/order someone to do* X (NB: *not convince that...*).

- verbs of direct perception are annotated as such by default, i.e. if this is a possible interpretation in the context. Only if this is not possible (e.g. the complement denotes something that you cannot physically see) are they annotated as attitude verbs.

Particular verbs

- ἐλπίζω: We only annotate as 'belief' (*to expect*), if it cannot be 'voluntative'.

- πυνθάνομαι: We only annotate as 'belief' if it cannot be 'knowledge'.

- We annotate all instances of δοκέω ('I think'), but instances of δῆλον ἐστι ('it is clear') and φαίνομαι ('to appear') only when a specific experiencer is explicitly expressed (in the dative) or highly accessible from the immediately preceding discourse.

2.6   Other issues

Negation

Negation that goes with the speech/attitude/perception embedding entity is not part of the embedding entity. The same holds for negation that goes with the head (see 2.4 above). In some cases it is unclear whether the negation belongs to the verb or to the complement (as in *He didn't think that she was ill* vs. *He thought that she was not ill*). A Greek example:

(10) [The general charge which they brought against them was that they had made this revolt in spite of the fact that they were not held in subjection like the other allies; and what contributed not least to their fury was that the Peloponnesian fleet had dared to venture over to Ionia to their support;]

οὐ   γὰρ   ἀπὸ   βραχείας   διανοίας   ἐδόκουν   τὴν   ἀπόστασιν
not   for   after   short.GEN   deliberation.GEN   think.PST.3PL   the.ACC   revolt.ACC
ποιήσασθαι
make.PST.PASS.INF
a. 'for they didn't think the revolt had been made after short deliberation.'
b. 'for they thought the revolt had not been made after short
deliberation.'   (Thuc. 3.36.3)

Here we follow word order by default and treat preposed negation only as belonging to the complement when it does not make sense otherwise. In (10) then, we treat οὐ as modifying the main verb ἐδόκουν (cf. translation 10a.) and therefore exclude it from the span of annotation.

Unembedded indirect discourse (UID)

UID has a form that is usually associated with a dependent construction (infinitive or oblique/reportative optative mood), but without there being an embedding verb it is syntactically dependent on. For instance:

(11) [A general sends messengers to his allies,]

ὅπως   μὴ   διαφρήσωσι   τοὺς   πολεμίους   ἀλλὰ
in.order.that   not   let.through.SBJV.3PL   the.ACC   enemies.ACC   but
ξυστραφέντες   κωλύσωσι   διελθεῖν· ἄλλη   γὰρ   αὐτοὺς
combine.PST.PTCP.PASS   prevent.SBJV.3PL   pass.INF   elsewhere   for   them.ACC

οὐδὲ   πειράσειν.
not.even try.FUT.INF

'in order that they would not let the enemies through, but would combine
themselves and prevent them from passing; for [he said] elsewhere they would not
even attempt it.'   (Thuc. 7.32.1)

Since the clause with the infinitive or optative (ἄλλη γὰρ αὐτοὺς οὐδὲ περιάσειν in this
case) expresses the content of the report, we do annotate it as a complement (although the
term complement may be misleading in this case). As a consequence, there is no report
relation here (cf. (12) below).

(12) This, say the Persians (but not the Greeks), was how Io came to Egypt, and this,
      according to them, was the first wrong that was done.

      μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα Ἑλλήνων τινάς (οὐ γὰρ ἔχουσι τοὔνομα ἀπηγήσασθαι) **φασὶ** τῆς
      Φοινίκης ἐς Τύρον προσσχόντας ἁρπάσαι τοῦ βασιλέος τὴν θυγατέρα Εὐρώπην. εἴησαν
      δ᾽ ἂν οὗτοι Κρῆτες. ταῦτα μὲν δὴ ἴσα πρὸς ἴσα σφι γενέσθαι, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα Ἕλληνας
      αἰτίους τῆς δευτέρης ἀδικίης γενέσθαι·

      'After that, they say (φασί) that certain Greeks – for they cannot tell their name –
      landed at Tyre in Phoenice and carried off the king's daughter Europe. These
      Greeks must, I suppose, have been Cretans. So far, then, [they say] the account
      between them stood balanced, but after this it was the Greeks who were guilty of
      the second wrong.'   (Hdt. 1.2.1)

Here, the sentence εἴησαν δ᾽ ἂν οὗτοι Κρῆτες clearly is a comment of the narrator
and is not part of the complement (there is no embedded infinitive here). Neither is the
parenthetical γάρ-clause. By contrast, a non-final relative clause is always part of the
complement. Sentence-final relative clauses are often comments of the narrator. We
decide how to annotate individual cases based on the content of the clauses.

A related issue is whether after an interjection (that is not part of the complement)
a new report starts. If the interjection interrupts a clause (that is, what is before and
after the interjection are not full clauses in themselves) no new report starts. If what is
before and after the interjection are full clauses it is annotated as a new report, unless the
second one starts with a conjunct (in that case it is annotated as a continuation of the
same report). Thus in example (12), a new report starts after εἴησαν δ᾽ ἂν οὗτοι Κρῆτες,
but not after the parenthetical γάρ-clause.

Parenthetical verbs

We do annotate parenthetically used verbs of saying/belief (e.g. ὡς λέγεται), even though/if
they don't have complements. The content of the report (which is in such cases not a
syntactical complement of the verb) is not annotated as a complement, nor is it linked to
the verb of saying in any way.