



FACHLITERATUR
EDITION ROMIOSINI
ΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΗ



ICGL12 | 12th INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
ON GREEK LINGUISTICS
16 – 19 SEPTEMBER 2015
FREIE UNIVERSITÄT BERLIN, CEMOG

Proceedings of the ICGL12

vol. 2

The International Conference on Greek Linguistics is a biennial meeting on the study and analysis of Greek (Ancient, Medieval and Modern), placing particular emphasis on the later stages of the language.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE ICGL12
ΠΡΑΚΤΙΚΑ ΤΟΥ ICGL12

**Thanasis Georgakopoulos, Theodossia-Soula Pavlidou, Miltos Pechlivanos,
Artemis Alexiadou, Jannis Androutsopoulos, Alexis Kalokairinos,
Stavros Skopeteas, Katerina Stathi (Eds.)**

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE 12TH INTERNATIONAL
CONFERENCE ON GREEK LINGUISTICS**

**ΠΡΑΚΤΙΚΑ ΤΟΥ 12^{ΟΥ} ΣΥΝΕΔΡΙΟΥ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ
ΓΛΩΣΣΟΛΟΓΙΑΣ**

VOL. 2

© 2017 Edition Romiosini/CeMoG, Freie Universität Berlin. Alle Rechte vorbehalten.
Vertrieb und Gesamtherstellung: Epubli (www.epubli.de)
Satz und Layout: Rea Papamichail / Center für Digitale Systeme, Freie Universität Berlin
Gesetzt aus Minion Pro
Umschlaggestaltung: Thanasis Georgiou, Yorgos Konstantinou
Umschlagillustration: Yorgos Konstantinou

ISBN 978-3-946142-35-5
Printed in Germany

Online-Bibliothek der Edition Romiosini:
www.edition-romiosini.de

ΠΕΡΙΕΧΟΜΕΝΑ

Σημείωμα εκδοτών	7
Περιεχόμενα.....	9
Peter Mackridge:	
<i>Some literary representations of spoken Greek before nationalism(1750-1801)</i>	17
Μαρία Σηφιανού:	
<i>Η έννοια της ευγένειας στα Ελληνικά.....</i>	45
Σπυριδούλα Βαρλοκώστα:	
<i>Syntactic comprehension in aphasia and its relationship to working memory deficits</i>	75
Ευαγγελία Αχλάδη, Αγγελική Δούρη, Ευγενία Μαλικούτη & Χρυσάνθη Παρασχάκη-Μπαράν:	
<i>Γλωσσικά λάθη τουρκόφωνων μαθητών της Ελληνικής ως ξένης/δεύτερης γλώσσας: Ανάλυση και διδακτική αξιοποίηση</i>	109
Κατερίνα Αλεξανδρή:	
<i>Η μορφή και η σημασία της διαβάθμισης στα επίθετα που δηλώνουν χρώμα.....</i>	125
Eva Anastasi, Ageliki Logotheti, Stavri Panayiotou, Marilena Serafim & Charalambos Themistocleous:	
<i>A Study of Standard Modern Greek and Cypriot Greek Stop Consonants: Preliminary Findings</i>	141
Anna Anastassiadis-Symeonidis, Elisavet Kiourti & Maria Mitsiaki:	
<i>Inflectional Morphology at the service of Lexicography: ΚΟΜΟΛεξ, A Cypriot Morphological Dictionary</i>	157

Γεωργία Ανδρέου & Ματίνα Τασιούδη: <i>Η ανάπτυξη του λεξιλογίου σε παιδιά με Σύνδρομο Απνοιών στον Ύπνο.....</i>	175
Ανθούλα- Ελευθερία Ανδρεσάκη: <i>Ιατρικές μεταφορές στον δημοσιογραφικό λόγο της κρίσης: Η οπτική γωνία των Γερμανών</i>	187
Μαρία Ανδριά: <i>Προσεγγίζοντας θέματα Διαγλωσσικής Επίδρασης μέσα από το πλαίσιο της Γνωσιακής Γλωσσολογίας: ένα παράδειγμα από την κατάκτηση της Ελληνικής ως Γ2</i>	199
Spyros Armostis & Kakia Petinou: <i>Mastering word-initial syllable onsets by Cypriot Greek toddlers with and without early language delay.....</i>	215
Julia Bacskai-Atkari: <i>Ambiguity and the Internal Structure of Comparative Complements in Greek.....</i>	231
Costas Canakis: <i>Talking about same-sex parenthood in contemporary Greece: Dynamic categorization and indexicality.....</i>	243
Michael Chiou: <i>The pragmatics of future tense in Greek.....</i>	257
Maria Chondrogianni:. <i>The Pragmatics of the Modern Greek Segmental Markers</i>	269
Katerina Christopoulou, George J. Xydopoulos & Anastasios Tsangalidis: <i>Grammatical gender and offensiveness in Modern Greek slang vocabulary</i>	291
Aggeliki Fotopoulou, Vasiliki Foufi, Tita Kyriacopoulou & Claude Martineau: <i>Extraction of complex text segments in Modern Greek.....</i>	307
Αγγελική Φωτοπούλου & Βούλα Γιούλη: <i>Από την «Έκφραση» στο «Πολύτροπο»: σχεδιασμός και οργάνωση ενός εννοιολογικού λεξικού.....</i>	327
Marianthi Georgalidou, Sofia Lampropoulou, Maria Gasouka, Apostolos Kostas & Xanthippi Foulidi: <i>“Learn grammar”: Sexist language and ideology in a corpus of Greek Public Documents</i>	341
Maria Giagkou, Giorgos Fragkakis, Dimitris Pappas & Harris Papageorgiou: <i>Feature extraction and analysis in Greek L2 texts in view of automatic labeling for proficiency levels</i>	357

Dionysis Goutsos, Georgia Fragaki, Irene Florou, Vasiliki Kakousi & Paraskevi Savvidou: <i>The Diachronic Corpus of Greek of the 20th century: Design and compilation</i>	369
Kleanthes K. Grohmann & Maria Kambanaros: <i>Bilectalism, Comparative Bilingualism, and the Gradience of Multilingualism: A View from Cyprus</i>	383
Günther S. Henrich: „Γεωγραφία νεωτερική“ στο Λίβιστρος και Ροδάμνη: μετατόπιση ονομάτων βαλτικών χωρών προς την Ανατολή;	397
Noriyo Hoozawa-Arkenau & Christos Karvounis: <i>Vergleichende Diglossie - Aspekte im Japanischen und Neugriechischen: Veriäten - Interferenz</i>	405
Μαρία Ιακώβου, Ηριάννα Βασιλειάδη-Λιναρδάκη, Φλώρα Βλάχου, Όλγα Δήμα, Μαρία Καββαδία, Τατιάνα Κατσίνα, Μαρίνα Κουτσομπού, Σοφία-Νεφέλη Κύτρου, Χριστίνα Κωστάκου, Φρόσω Παππά & Σταυριαλένα Περγέα: <i>ΣΕΠΙAME2: Μια καινούρια πηγή αναφοράς για την Ελληνική ως Γ2</i>	419
Μαρία Ιακώβου & Θωμαΐς Ρουσουλιώτη: <i>Βασικές αρχές σχεδιασμού και ανάπτυξης του νέου μοντέλου αναλυτικών προγραμμάτων για τη διδασκαλία της Ελληνικής ως δεύτερης/ξένης γλώσσας</i>	433
Μαρία Καμηλάκη: «Μαζί μου ασχολείσαι, πόσο μαλάκας είσαι!»: Λέξεις-ταμπού και κοινωνιογλωσσικές ταυτότητες στο σύγχρονο ελληνόφωνο τραγούδι.....	449
Μαρία Καμηλάκη, Γεωργία Κατσούδα & Μαρία Βραχιονίδου: <i>Η εννοιολογική μεταφορά σε λέξεις-ταμπού της NEK και των νεοελληνικών διαλέκτων</i>	465
Eleni Karantzola, Georgios Mikros & Anastassios Papaioannou: <i>Lexico-grammatical variation and stylometric profile of autograph texts in Early Modern Greek</i>	479
Sviatlana Karpava, Maria Kambanaros & Kleanthes K. Grohmann: <i>Narrative Abilities: MAINing Russian–Greek Bilingual Children in Cyprus</i>	493
Χρήστος Καρβούνης: <i>Γλωσσικός εξαρχαϊσμός και «ιδεολογική» νόρμα: Ζητήματα γλωσσικής διαχείρισης στη νέα ελληνική</i>	507

Demetra Katis & Kiki Nikiforidou: <i>Spatial prepositions in early child Greek: Implications for acquisition, polysemy and historical change</i>	525
Γεωργία Κατσούδα: <i>Το επίθημα -ούνα στη ΝΕΚ και στις νεοελληνικές διαλέκτους και ιδιώματα</i>	539
George Kotzoglou: <i>Sub-extraction from subjects in Greek: Its existence, its locus and an open issue</i>	555
Veranna Kyrioti: <i>Narrative, identity and age: the case of the bilingual in Greek and Turkish Muslim community of Rhodes, Greece</i>	571
Χριστίνα Λύκου: <i>Η Ελλάδα στην Ευρώπη της κρίσης: Αναπαραστάσεις στον ελληνικό δημοσιογραφικό λόγο</i>	583
Nikos Liosis: <i>Systems in disruption: Propontis Tsakonian</i>	599
Katerina Magdou, Sam Featherston: <i>Resumptive Pronouns can be more acceptable than gaps: Experimental evidence from Greek</i>	613
Maria Margarita Makri: <i>Opos identity comparatives in Greek: an experimental investigation</i>	629
2ος Τόμος	
Περιεχόμενα.....	651
Vasiliki Makri: <i>Gender assignment to Romance loans in Katoitaliótika: a case study of contact morphology</i>	659
Evgenia Malikouti: <i>Usage Labels of Turkish Loanwords in three Modern Greek Dictionaries</i>	675
Persephone Mamoukari & Penelope Kambakis-Vougiouklis: <i>Frequency and Effectiveness of Strategy Use in SILL questionnaire using an Innovative Electronic Application</i>	693

Georgia Maniati, Voula Gotsoulia & Stella Markantonatou: <i>Contrasting the Conceptual Lexicon of ILSP (CL-ILSP) with major lexicographic examples</i>	709
Γεώργιος Μαρκόπουλος & Αθανάσιος Καρασίμος: <i>Πολυεπίπεδη επισημείωση του Ελληνικού Σώματος Κειμένων Αφασικού Λόγου</i>	725
Πωλίνα Μεσηνιώτη, Κατερίνα Πούλιου & Χριστόφορος Σουγανίδης: <i>Μορφοσυντακτικά λάθη μαθητών Τάξεων Υποδοχής που διδάσκονται την Ελληνική ως Γ2</i>	741
Stamatia Michalopoulou: <i>Third Language Acquisition. The Pro-Drop-Parameter in the Interlanguage of Greek students of German</i>	759
Vicky Nanousi & Arhonto Terzi: <i>Non-canonical sentences in agrammatism: the case of Greek passives</i>	773
Καλομοίρα Νικολού, Μαρία Ξεφτέρη & Νίτσα Παραχεράκη: <i>Το φαινόμενο της σύνθεσης λέξεων στην κυκλαδοκρητική διαλεκτική ομάδα</i>	789
Ελένη Παπαδάμου & Δώρας Κ. Κυριαζής: <i>Μορφές διαβαθμιστικής αναδίπλωσης στην ελληνική και στις άλλες βαλκανικές γλώσσες</i>	807
Γεράσιμος Σοφοκλής Παπαδόπουλος: <i>Το δίπολο «Εμείς και οι Άλλοι» σε σχόλια αναγνωστών της Lifo σχετικά με τη Χρυσή Αυγή</i>	823
Ελένη Παπαδοπούλου: <i>Η συνδυαστικότητα υποκοριστικών επιθημάτων με β' συνθετικό το επίθημα -άκι στον διαλεκτικό λόγο</i>	839
Στέλιος Πιπερίδης, Πένυ Λαμπροπούλου & Μαρία Γαβριλίδου: <i>clarin:el. Υποδομή τεκμηρίωσης, διαμοιρασμού και επεξεργασίας γλωσσικών δεδομένων</i>	851
Maria Pontiki: <i>Opinion Mining and Target Extraction in Greek Review Texts</i>	871
Anna Roussou: <i>The duality of mimos</i>	885

Stathis Selimis & Demetra Katis: <i>Reference to static space in Greek: A cross-linguistic and developmental perspective of poster descriptions</i>	897
Evi Sifaki & George Tsoulas: <i>XP-V orders in Greek</i>	911
Konstantinos Sipitanos: <i>On desiderative constructions in Naousa dialect</i>	923
Eleni Staraki: <i>Future in Greek: A Degree Expression</i>	935
Χριστίνα Τακούδα & Ευανθία Παπαευθυμίου: <i>Συγκριτικές διδακτικές πρακτικές στη διδασκαλία της ελληνικής ως Γ2: από την κριτική παρατήρηση στην αναπλαισίωση</i>	945
Alexandros Tantos, Giorgos Chatziioannidis, Katerina Lykou, Meropi Papatheohari, Antonia Samara & Kostas Vlachos: <i>Corpus C58 and the interface between intra- and inter-sentential linguistic information</i>	961
Arhonto Terzi & Vina Tsakali: <i>The contribution of Greek SE in the development of locatives</i>	977
Paraskevi Thomou: <i>Conceptual and lexical aspects influencing metaphor realization in Modern Greek</i>	993
Nina Topintzi & Stuart Davis: <i>Features and Asymmetries of Edge Gemimates</i>	1007
Liana Tronci: <i>At the lexicon-syntax interface Ancient Greek constructions with ἔχειν and psychological nouns</i>	1021
Βίλλυ Τσάκωνα: <i>«Δημοκρατία είναι 4 λύκοι και 1 πρόβατο να ψηφίζουν για φαγητό»:Αναλύοντας τα ανέκδοτα για τους/τις πολιτικούς στην οικονομική κρίση</i>	1035
Ειρήνη Τσαμαδού- Jacobberger & Μαρία Ζέρβα: <i>Εκμάθηση ελληνικών στο Πανεπιστήμιο Στρασβούργου: κίνητρα και αναπαραστάσεις</i> ...	1051
Stavroula Tsiplakou & Spyros Armostis: <i>Do dialect variants (mis)behave? Evidence from the Cypriot Greek koine</i>	1065
Αγγελική Τσόκογλου & Σύλα Κλειδή: <i>Συζητώντας τις δομές σε -οντας</i>	1077

Αλεξιάννα Τσότσου:	
<i>Η μεθοδολογική προσέγγιση της εικόνας της Γερμανίας στις ελληνικές εφημερίδες</i>	1095
Anastasia Tzilinis:	
<i>Begründendes Handeln im neugriechischen Wissenschaftlichen Artikel: Die Situierung des eigenen Beitrags im Forschungszusammenhang.....</i>	1109
Κυριακούλα Τζωρτζάτου, Αργύρης Αρχάκης, Άννα Ιορδανίδου & Γιώργος Ι. Ευδόπουλος:	
<i>Στάσεις απέναντι στην ορθογραφία της Κοινής Νέας Ελληνικής: Ζητήματα ερευνητικού σχεδιασμού</i>	1123
Nicole Vassalou, Dimitris Papazachariou & Mark Janse:	
<i>The Vowel System of Mišótika Cappadocian</i>	1139
Marina Vassiliou, Angelos Georganas, Prokopis Prokopidis & Haris Papageorgiou:	
<i>Co-referring or not co-referring? Answer the question!.....</i>	1155
Jeroen Vis:	
<i>The acquisition of Ancient Greek vocabulary.....</i>	1171
Christos Vlachos:	
<i>Mod(aliti)es of lifting wh-questions.....</i>	1187
Ευαγγελία Βλάχου & Κατερίνα Φραντζή:	
<i>Μελέτη της χρήσης των ποσοδεικτών λίγο-λιγάκι σε κείμενα πολιτικού λόγου</i>	1201
Madeleine Voga:	
<i>Τι μας διδάσκουν τα ρήματα της ΝΕ σχετικά με την επεξεργασία της μορφολογίας.....</i>	1213
Werner Voigt:	
<i>«Σεληνάκι μου λαμπρό, φέγγε μου να περπατώ ...» oder: warum es in dem bekannten Lied nicht so, sondern eben φεγγαράκι heißt und ngr. φεγγάρι</i>	1227
Μαρία Βραχιονίδου:	
<i>Υποκοριστικά επιρρήματα σε νεοελληνικές διαλέκτους και ιδιώματα</i>	1241
Jeroen van de Weijer & Marina Tzakosta:	
<i>The Status of *Complex in Greek.....</i>	1259
Theodoros Xioufis:	
<i>The pattern of the metaphor within metonymy in the figurative language of romantic love in modern Greek.....</i>	1275

THE DUALITY OF *MIPOS*

Anna Roussou
University of Patras
aroussou@upatras.gr

Περίληψη

Στόχος της παρούσας εργασίας είναι να εξετάσει τα χαρακτηριστικά του «μήπως» ως Συμπληρωματικού Δείκτη (ΣΔ) στις συμπληρωματικές προτάσεις και ως τροπικού δείκτη, με επιρρηματική κατανομή, στις κύριες ερωτήσεις. Υποστηρίζεται ότι και στις δύο περιπτώσεις αναλύεται ως ένα ονοματικό στοιχείο, το οποίο απαιτεί την παρουσία ενός προτασιακού τελεστή (Ερωτηματικού-τύπου), όπως συμβαίνει και με τους δείκτες πολικότητας. Τα ονοματικά του χαρακτηριστικά του προσδίδουν ιδιότητες αόριστης αντωνυμίας, υποκείμενης σε απαιτήσεις νομιμοποίησης. Πρόκειται για το ίδιο στοιχείο του οποίου η λειτουργία ως ΣΔ ή επιρρήματος εξαρτάται από το συντακτικό περιβάλλον στο οποίο εμφανίζεται (συμπληρωματικές έναντι κύριων προτάσεων αντίστοιχα).

Keywords: adverb, complementizer, indefinite, modality, nominal, question

1. Introduction

The element *mipos* in Greek seems to have a dual function: on the one hand, it introduces complement clauses selected by certain predicates, such as verbs of fearing, as in (1a), and on the other hand, it occurs as a modal marker in matrix questions, as in (1b) (MP = middle-passive morphology):

(1a) Φοβάμαι μήπως φύγει
fear.MP-1s prt leave-3s
'I fear that he may leave'

(1b) Μήπως είδες τη Μαρία;
prt saw-2s the Mary
'Have you seen Mary? I wonder'
'Could it be that you've seen Mary?'

In the above examples, I gloss *mipos* as particle 'prt' for two reasons: first, because in this way we can express its common nature in the two structures (as will be argued), and second, because there seems to be no obvious equivalent in the English examples. At this point, 'prt' is simply a neutral mnemonic, without reflecting anything about its categorial status. As we can see in the English translations, as a complementizer in (1a) it translates as *that*, but crucially a modal (*may*) is required in the embedded clause. As a modal marker in (1b), it can take two possible translations: either through an expression that shows the speaker's attitude (wonder) towards the utterance, or with some modal expression. A closer look at the data shows that in any case, in (1b) we have a modal epistemic reading, which is also present in (1a).

The second point we observe about *mipos* is that quite often it can be substituted by *mi*, as in (2) (for purposes of consistency, I also gloss *mi* as 'prt'):

(2a) Φοβάμαι μη φύγει.
fear.MP-1s prt leave-3s
'I fear that he may leave'

(2b) Μην είδες τη Μαρία;
prt saw-2s the Mary
'Have you seen Mary? I wonder'
'Could it be that you've seen Mary?'

Despite the similarities in their distribution, there are some basic differences. In particular, in matrix clauses, *mi* has a fixed position, clause-initially, while *mipos* can appear in different positions within the sentence, as the contrast between (3a) and (3b) shows (based on the examples (1b) and (2b) respectively):

(3a) *Μήπως* είδες (*μήπως*) τη Μαρία (*μήπως*);

(3b) *Μην* είδες (**μη*) τη Μαρία (**μη*);

In embedded clauses, the position of either *mipos* or *mi* is fixed clause-initially, as is the case with all subordinators.

A second difference between the two elements has to do with the fact that while *mipos* may co-occur with the modal particles *na* or *tha*, this is excluded for *mi*:

(4a) *μήπως*/**μη* να φύγω;
prt prt leave-1s
'Should I leave perhaps?'

(4b) *μήπως*/**μη* θα φύγεις;
prt prt leave-2s
'Will you be leaving perhaps?'

As we can see in the above examples, *mi* has both a fixed position and selectional requirements as well. On the other hand, *mipos* has a more liberal distribution and no selectional requirements of this sort. In this respect, *mipos* distributes like an adverb.

A third difference concerns the fact that *mi* is also a negative marker, a reading which is blocked for *mipos*:

(5a) *Μη*/**μήπως* φύγεις!
prt leave-2s
'Don't leave'

(5b) *Μη*/**μήπως*!
prt
'Don't!'

As a negator, *mi* may accompany a verb or stand as an utterance on its own (expressing prohibition; see Veloudis 1982). Note that as a negative marker, *mi* may combine with *na* (or *as*, the hortative particle) but in a fixed order: *na/as-mi+verb* (e.g., *na mi fjjis/as mi fjjis*). A similar pattern is attested in Albanian with respect to the element *mos*, which corresponds to *mi*, as argued by Joseph (2002).

Whether or not negator *mi*, complementizer *mi* and modal (interrogative) particle *mi* are one and the same element is an open question. In the present paper, I will assume, as in Roussou (2015), that *mi* as a negative and as an interrogative/complementizer marker is one and the same element. It is worth mentioning though, since this is relevant to the discussion of *mipos* as well, that according to Janda & Joseph (1999) the element *mi* forms a morphological constellation: various elements with distinct forms and functions (e.g. *mi* and *mipos*), which share a common property. In their view, the underlying property is that of negation. Still, under this perspective, the absence of a negative reading in the other functions has to be accounted for.

In the present paper I argue, focusing on *mipos*, that the underlying property is that of an indefinite element, that is an element of a nominal (N) category. The fact that *mipos* cannot occur in matrix declaratives shows that it is subject to some licensing conditions. More precisely, it requires the presence of a designated (Q-type) operator. This is the property that determines its distribution in embedded clauses as well, and for this reason it can only be selected by predicates with the relevant lexical semantics, as we will see below. *Mi* slightly differs, since it can carry a negative reading as well, attributed to focus (see Roussou 2015). I will only refer to *mi* where it is relevant, but I will do not discuss its idiosyncratic properties with respect to negation. The following sections discuss the selection of *mipos* in complement clauses (section 2) and the extensions of the current proposal for *mipos* in matrix clauses (section 3). It is argued that *mipos* is a nominal (indefinite) that acquires its interpretation contextually, thus allowing for the unification of the two different readings. The final section 4 concludes the discussion.

2. *Mipos* in complement clauses

According to Holton, Mackridge, and Philippaki-Warburton (1997: 452), the elements *mi* or *mipos* can be selected by verbs expressing fear, such as *fovame* ('I fear'), *anisixo* ('I worry'), or *aghonio* ('I am anxious'). As they put it:

“The particle $\mu\eta$, which introduces these complement clauses, is not a negative marker as such, since the clause it introduces has its own negative. $M\eta$ in this context combines the meaning of the complementizer $\acute{o}\tau\iota$ with a wish that what the clause conveys will be averted and that it will not happen.”

The above description is consistent with the data in (1a) and (2a). Furthermore, the negator used when *mi* or *mipos* is selected is *dhen*, as in the following examples:

(6a) Φοβάμαι μήπως δεν έρθει.
 fear.MP-1s prt not come-3s
 ‘I fear that he may not come.’

(6b) Φοβάμαι μήπως *(δεν) έρθει ΚΑΝΕΝΑΣ.
 fear.MP-1s prt not come-3s no one
 ‘I fear that no one may come.’

Substituting *mi* for *mipos* in (6a) and (6b) has the same effect. That *mipos* (or *mi*) carries no negative reading is also supported by the fact that the polarity item *ΚΑΝΕΝΑΣ* (focused), with a negative reading (‘no one’) cannot be licensed if negator *dhen* is absent in (6b). This fact supports the absence of a negative reading on *mipos*.

Although *mipos* is selected by verbs of fearing, that is predicates that express some sort of a negative emotion, it is not restricted to them. As Makri (2013) shows, *mi* and *mipos* can be also selected by other predicates, as in the following examples:

(7a) Σκέφτομαι / αναρωτιέμαι μήπως φύγουμε.
 think.MP-1s / wonder.MP-1s prt leave-1p
 ‘I’m thinking that we may leave’
 ‘I’m wondering whether we may leave.’

(7b) *(Δεν) υπολόγισα μήπως φύγουμε νωρίτερα.
 not calculated-1s prt leave-1p earlier
 ‘I didn’t calculate that we may leave earlier’

Note that negation is obligatory in (7b). The same effect holds if instead of negation there is matrix question or the verb is in the imperative, thus expressing a modal reading. According to Makri (2013) there are three classes of verbs that may select for a *mipos*-complement: i) emotive doxastics (verbs of fearing), ii) doubtatives (*doubt*, *suspect*), and iii) interrogatives. Following Lahiri’s (2002: 287) typology, Makri also takes interrogative predicates to fall into two relevant subclasses: a) rogatives (*wonder*, *ask*) (Karttunen’s (1977) ‘inquisitive’ verbs), and b) negated (veridical) responsive

predicates (*know*, *remember*). In the above examples then, we have instances of the selection by a rogative predicate (*anarotjeme*) or a rogative-like predicate (*skeftome*), and a responsive (*ipolojisa*); the latter requires negation. The characteristic property of questions is that they denote a set of alternatives. In (7b), this is achieved by the presence of negation (or question) in the matrix clause, since this verb may also give rise to a factive interpretation (a fixed truth value for the embedded proposition, and therefore no sets of alternatives).

Makri (2013, 2015) calls *mi/mipos* an instance of ‘expletive negation’, since in these uses it has no negative reading (so the underlying assumption being that it is somehow inherently negative). She further argues that it is an epistemic modality marker which is compatible with a set of alternative propositions. The import of *mi/mipos* is that all possibilities (alternatives) carried by the embedded proposition are interpreted (by implication) as equal. The best way to illustrate this is with the following dialogue (Makri 2015):

(8a) A: Έρχεται ο Νίκος; (Is Nikos coming?)

(8b) B: Φοβάμαι ότι/μηπως έρχεται. (I’m afraid he’s coming).

Selection of *mipos* in (8b), as part of B’s answer is infelicitous. The question of A in (8a) requires an answer, that is a choice between one of the two possible alternatives. This is felicitous with *oti*, but infelicitous with *mipos*. Finally, that it carries epistemic modality has been obvious in the English translations of the Greek examples so far. So for present purposes, I follow Makri (2013, 2015) in attributing a modal reading to *mipos*.

Going back to the examples in (6) and (7), what we observe is that *mipos* (and *mi*) must be licensed in a context where there is a propositional operator (question, negation, modal) either incorporated in the lexical semantics of the selecting predicate or expressed individually (as in (7b)). Note that these are precisely the contexts where polarity items are licensed (on Greek, see Tsimpli & Roussou (1996), Giannakidou (1998)). On the basis of this distribution, the claim put forward is that *mipos* is akin to an indefinite pronoun; in essence, a nominal element, subject to selectional (licensing) requirements (for a diachronic analysis of *mi* as a polarity item see Chatzopoulou (2012)).

But how is the nominal character of *mipos* compatible with its status as a complementizer? To put it differently, what is the exact category *mipos* belongs to? Is it a nominal or a complementizer? The answer to this question actually implies an

answer to the question ‘what is a complementizer?’. In traditional grammatical descriptions, subordinate clauses fall into two types: nominal and adverbial. Nominal (complement) clauses distribute like NPs, and can function as subjects or objects. Kayne (1982) argues that the role of the complementizer is to turn the clause into an argument. If that is the case, then the property of being nominal must stem from the complementizer. In recent approaches, complementizers of the sort found in Indo-European languages have indeed been analyzed as nominals, based on the fact that they all derive from the (pro)nominal system (Manzini 2010, Roussou 2010, Franco 2012, among others). This is indeed the case of Italian *che* (complementizer, interrogative, relativizer), Greek *pu* (complementizer, interrogative, relativizer), English *that* (complementizer, demonstrative, relativizer), and so on. The implication of this approach is that the term ‘complementizer’ is used to describe the ‘function’ of an element that belongs to a major lexical category, namely that of nominals (and accordingly in some languages they may derive from verbs, the other major lexical category).

Having outlined the background assumptions, let us consider *mipos* a bit more carefully. First, it is morphologically complex, consisting of the morphemes *mi* and *pos*. The morpheme *pos* in (Modern) Greek is an interrogative pronoun in its stressed form, but also a complementizer, in free distribution with *oti*, in its unstressed form. Second, *mipos* cannot just be treated as an augmented form of *mi*, since despite similarities, they exhibit differences both in their distribution and function (i.e., *mi* has a fixed position and can also carry a negative reading). However, the requirement for licensing probably has to be attributed to the *mi* morpheme, since in that respect both *mi* and *mipos* behave alike. We can then formulate the following statement:

- (9) *Mipos* is a nominal (indefinite) element which requires the presence of a Q-type operator.

The reason why we refer to a Q-type operator is precisely because some of the predicates that select *mipos* may not have a question operator incorporated in their lexical meaning. Along with the presence of a designated propositional operator (question, negation) in the matrix clause, they end-up sharing with the other predicates the property that their complement introduces a set of alternative propositions, exactly as is the case with questions. The additional contribution of *mipos* is that these alternatives are presented, by implication, as equally possible.

In the following section, I turn to the properties of *mipos* in matrix questions, arguing that its nominal nature allows it to distribute like an adverbial element.

3. *Mipos* in matrix questions

As we saw in section 1, the distribution of *mipos* in matrix clauses has the following two basic characteristics: it requires a Question operator (excluded in declaratives and imperatives), and can occur in different positions in the clause structure.

Another property of *mipos* is that it is restricted to yes/no-questions; thus it is incompatible with *wh*-questions:

- (10) #*Mήπως* ποιος την= ρώτησε;
 prt who her asked-3s
 ‘Who would ask her? (No one)’

Note that the only possible interpretation assigned to the sentence in (10) is that of a rhetorical question, hence the ‘#’ notation. On the other hand, substituting *mipos* for *mi* gives rise to an ungrammatical output. More precisely, *mi* excludes the rhetorical question reading as well.

On the basis of the data we have seen so far, we observe that *mipos* expresses the speaker’s attitude (doubt, concern, etc.) towards the speech event. It is licensed by the Q-operator (supplied at LF) and contributes an epistemic modal reading (along the lines of Makri 2013). The combination of these two properties gives rise to the particular reading that *mipos* contributes to the clause. We could further assume, along with Haegeman & Hill (2013) that the left periphery of the clause is expanded upwards and contains a Speech Act shell. While the vP-shell in the lower right periphery of the clause provides the arguments that qualify as the event coordinates, the speech act layer provides the discourse coordinates. These coordinates are restricted to the Speaker and the Hearer. The relevant configuration is as below:

- (11) [_{SAP1} Role-speaker [_{SA1} part] [_{SAP2} Role-hearer [_{SA2} part] [Utterance]]]

According to the structure in (11), there are two Speech Act (SA) heads: the higher (SA1), akin to light *v*, hosts the information about the Speaker, while the lower (SA2),

akin to V, hosts the information about the Hearer. Although we do not have to follow this type of articulated structure, it is interesting to see that elements with typical discourse properties are given a syntactic expression. For our purposes, it suffices to assume a higher SA head that hosts the information about speaker-oriented elements (particles or adverbs), that is situated above the projections that relate to the utterance.

Going back to *mipos*, the other main property we observe is that it distributes like an adverbial. So far we have assigned it to the syntactic category of a nominal (N-type). So a similar question as the one raised for *mipos* as a complementizer arises in this case as well. Recall that in terms of the present analysis, ‘complementizer’ is a function. Similarly, the term ‘adverb’ describes a function that a given element has in relation to the predicate, or the proposition, or the utterance. So calling *mipos* an adverb is a descriptive tool that captures its distribution in matrix questions. Its morphological make up though, points towards a nominal in terms of a syntactic category, exactly as in the case of ‘complementizer’ *mipos*. It is worth mentioning at this point, that Manzini & Savoia (2002) in their discussion of so-called ‘negative adverbs’, like *mia*, *briza* (‘crumb’), or *buka* (‘piece’) in Italian dialects, argue that these are simply nominal elements (as suggested by their original lexical meanings as well), which participate in the modification of the event or of the event participants (as is the case with partitive arguments for example). They acquire a negative reading by being associated with a negative operator (on the grammaticalization of these type of elements, see Roberts & Roussou (2003)).

Bearing the above remarks in mind, we are now in a position to support the current claim, namely that *mipos* belongs to the syntactic category of a nominal element. In the absence of selection, as with the complementizer function, the Q operator is imported at LF (as is typical of questions in general). Being a nominal that functions as an adverb allows it to distribute rather freely in the clause structure, a property which is independently available in Greek, for arguments and adverbs alike (word order variation). The postulation of a high SA projection is meant to capture the wide scope it has over the utterance, which necessarily links it to one of the two discourse-participants; the relevant participant in the case of *mipos* is the Speaker.

(12) [SA $mipos_x$ [Utterance (x)]]

According to the configuration in (12) *mipos*, as in indefinite introduces a variable x . The SA projection corresponds to its scope position. If, however, *mipos* appears in

another position in the clause structure, then it still forms an Agree relation with the SA head, since this is the projection that determines its wide scope (and its speaker-oriented character). Note that the SA projection is relevant in matrix clauses only. So as a complementizer, *mipos* directly merges with the selecting predicate and embeds the sentence as its complement. This is evident also from the fact, that *mipos* in complement clauses is not subject-oriented.

At this point, it is natural to ask how the ‘complementizer’ and the ‘adverbial’ functions are compatible in phrase-structure terms. More precisely, as a complementizer, *mipos* corresponds to a head, while as an adverb, it should correspond to a phrase. Note that this may be a question relevant to an X^2 -theoretic phrase structure system, but is irrelevant in the light of Bare Phrase Structure (Chomsky 1995), where the distinction between heads and phrases is only relative. So a potential problem is actually resolved, since it does not arise in the first place.

Before leaving this section, it is worth mentioning some empirical evidence from English. According to van Gelderen (2015), in some English varieties, *how* occurs as an interrogative marker in matrix questions, as in the following examples (her (23), (26), and (9) examples respectively):

(13a) **How** would you like to go to the park?

(13b) Paul said: “Starting would be a good thing to do. **How** would you like to begin?” I said “Well, Paul, I’m new at this sort of thing. **How** would you like to begin?” [COCA 2010 Finction].

(13c) Your Dad once said **how** I had legs like Betty Grable. [BNC AC5 2999]

As van Gelderen argues, *how* in (13a) and (13b) does not carry a manner reading, in the sense that it does not modify the event denoted by the predicate. Instead it contributes to “the mood of the sentence, in this case the interrogative mood” (p. 172). If this is correct, then *how* in these cases has wide scope, and resembles, in terms of interpretation, *mipos* in the Greek examples. The example in (13c) manifests yet another function of *how* as a declarative complementizer, alternating with *that* (also Legate 2010). Note that complementizer *how* gives rise to a factive interpretation, and differs from the distribution of complementizer *mipos*. In any case, the empirical evidence from English (change in progress) is supporting the analysis provided in the present paper with respect to *mipos*.

4. Conclusions

The present paper considered the two main functions of *mipos*, as a complementizer and as an adverb in matrix interrogatives. It was argued that there is a single *mipos* which belongs to the syntactic category of a nominal. In its complementizer function, it is selected by a predicate and introduces a complement clause. In this case, it has an argumental role (the predicate's argument). In its adverbial function, it modifies the utterance. In an abstract level, it modifies a discourse argument, related to the Speaker, projecting in a Speech-Act position above the utterance. The implications of this approach is that homophony is eliminated from the lexicon, while the primitive properties of lexical items are manipulated by (morpho-)syntax.

References

- Chatzopoulou, Katerina. 2012. *Negation and Non-veridicality in the History of Greek*. PhD dissertation, University of Chicago.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. "Bare Phrase Structure". In *Government and Binding Theory and the Minimalist Program*, edited by Gert Webelhuth, 383–439. Oxford: Blackwell's.
- Franco, Ludovico. 2012. "Against the Identity of Complementizers and (Demonstrative) Pronouns". *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics* 48:565–596.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 1998. *Polarity Sensitivity as (Non)veridical Dependency*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Haegeman, Liliane, and Virginia Hill. 2013. "The Syntacticization of Discourse". In *Syntax and its Limits*, edited by Rafaella Folli, Christina Sevdali, and Roberts Truswell, 370–390. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Holton, David, Peter Mackridge, and Irene Philippaki-Warbuton. 1997. *Greek. A Comprehensive Grammar of the Modern Language*. London: Routledge.
- Janda, Richard, and Brian Joseph. 1999. "The Modern Greek *mi(n)* as a Morphological Constellation". *Greek Linguistics 97 (Proceedings of ICG13)*, 341–351. Athens.

- Joseph, Brian. 2002. "Balkan Insights into the Syntax of **mē* in Indo-European". In *Indo-European Perspectives*, edited by Mark Southern, 103–120. Washington DC: Institute for the Study of Man.
- Karttunen, Lauri. 1977. "Syntax and Semantics of Questions". *Linguistics and Philosophy* 1:3–44.
- Kayne, Richard. 1982. "Predicates and Arguments, Verbs and Nouns". *GLOW Newsletter* 8.
- Lahiri, Utpal. 2002. *Questions and Answers in Embedded Contexts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Legate, Julie Anne. 2010. "On how *how* is used instead of *that*". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 28:121–134.
- Makri, Maria Margarita. 2013. *Expletive Negation beyond Romance. Clausal Complementation and Epistemic Modality*. MA dissertation, University of York.
- Makri, Maria Margarita. 2015. "What 'not' might Mean. Expletive Negation in Attitude Contexts". Paper presented at the Incontro di Grammatica Generativa 41, Perugia, February 26–28.
- Manzini, M. Rita. 2010. "The Structure and Interpretation of (Romance) Complementizers". In *The Complementizer Phase*, edited by Phoebos Panagiotidis, 167–199. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Manzini, M. Rita, and Leonardo M. Savoia. 2002. "Negative Adverbs are neither Adv nor Neg". *Proceedings of NELS* 32:327–346.
- Roberts, Ian, and Anna Roussou. 2003. *Syntactic Change. A Minimalist Approach to Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roussou, Anna. 2010. "Selecting complementizers". *Lingua* 120:582–603.
- Roussou, Anna. 2015. "Is particle *a* (unified) category?". In *Discourse-oriented Syntax*, edited by Josef Bayer, Roland Hinterhölzl, and Andreas Trotzke, 121–158. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Tsimpli, Ianthi M., and Anna Roussou. 1996. "Negation and polarity items in Modern Greek". *The Linguistic Review* 13:49–81.
- van Gelderen, Elly. 2015. "The particle *how*". In *Discourse-oriented Syntax*, edited by Josef Bayer, Roland Hinterhölzl, and Andreas Trotzke, 159–174. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Veloudis, Ioannis. 1982. *Negation in Modern Greek*. PhD dissertation, University of Reading.