

# Some remarks on the rise of declarative Modern Greek complement marker πως

Konstantinos Sampanis & Eleni Karantzola

University of the Aegean

k.sampanis@rhodes.aegean.gr, karantzola@rhodes.aegean.gr

## Περίληψη

Στο άρθρο αυτό εξετάζουμε όψεις της διαχρονικής εξέλιξης του νεοελληνικού δείκτη υπόταξης *πως*. Στη βάση μιας κριτικής ανάγνωσης των θέσεων του Nicholas (1996) και παρουσιάζοντας νέα παραδείγματα, προτείνουμε ένα εναλλακτικό σενάριο για την ανάδυση του *πως* σύμφωνα με το οποίο ο νεοελληνικός δείκτης υπόταξης δεν προέρχεται μόνο από το ερωτηματικό *πώς* της Αρχαίας και Κοινής Ελληνικής, όπως προτείνει ο Nicholas, αλλά και από το αναφορικό *ὅπως*.

Λέξεις - Κλειδιά: Γλωσσική Αλλαγή, Διαχρονική Σύνταξη, Συμπληρωματικές Δομές, Παρεμφατικότητα, Νέα Ελληνικά

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 *The (lack of) research on the diachrony of the Modern Greek Complement Markers*

While in recent decades there has appeared a plethora of excellent studies (especially from the derivational/generative grammar paradigm) dealing with the Standard Modern Greek (MG) complement markers (CM)<sup>1</sup> and the complementation system in general, for the most part these studies and publications chiefly revolve around the analysis of control structures introduced by the subjunctive *na*-clauses and the challenge this constitutes for the mainstream syntactic theoretical model<sup>2</sup>. Due to this theoretical emphasis, the diachronic research on the MG complementation has also been focusing on the development of *na*-finite structures<sup>3</sup>, being somewhat negligent in the overall development of the MG complementation.

An exception to this research trend constitutes Nicholas' two most valuable studies on the diachrony of the CM *πως/pos* and *που/rou* (in 1996 and 1998 respectively). His analysis is based on grammaticalization theoretical models, which may be considered more appropriate in describing the graduality of the syntactic and semantic change of the *pos* and *rou* CMs from their Ancient (and Middle) Greek predecessors *ὅπως-πῶς/hórōs-pōs* and *ὅπου/hórou*. The rise of the *pos* and *rou* CMs occurred not as a parametric change linked with syntactic operations, such as Move, but as a gradual shift (or rather extension) from adverbial and relative to complement hypotactic functions without significant restructuring of the clausal architecture, at

---

<sup>1</sup> We opt for the term “complement marker” to describe both clausal subordinators and preverbal mood markers. The term “complementizer”, in turn, is reserved for its technical interpretation as the head of a Complementiser Phrase (C° of a CP). Cf. also Karantzola and Sampanis 2016.

<sup>2</sup> For a state-of-the-art overview, cf. Anagnostopoulou 2013: 20ff.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Joseph 1983, Markopoulos 2007, Roberts and Roussou 2003, pp. 74 -87.

least at the surface level<sup>4</sup>. Thereby, a functional methodology seems to match better in this case<sup>5</sup>.

In this paper we critically discuss certain points addressed in Nicholas 1996 concerning the diachrony of *pos* and we put forward a slightly alternative scenario to the one he proposes.

## 1.2 A comparative overview of the Ancient (Classical) and Modern Greek Complementation systems.

A striking distinction between the Ancient Greek (AG) and the MG complementation systems is the absence of non-finite predicate complements in the latter. The gradual decline and loss of infinitival structures and the parallel rise of finite constructions has been largely discussed in the literature<sup>6</sup>.

AG infinitives could be found both in Control and Obviation (cf. “Accusativus cum Infinitivo”) contexts but also, notably, in cases of “insubordination”<sup>7</sup>, i.e. in root (or matrix) infinitives or, more crucially, after *verba dicendi*<sup>8</sup>. Along with the infinitives, AG predicates selected participial and finite complement clauses, mainly introduced by the (assertive) CM *ὅτι/hóti* or *ὡς/hōs*. In broad strokes, the AG (i.e., as already said, the Attic/Classical Greek) complementation followed the following rules<sup>9</sup>:

- i. Verbs of saying and claiming (e.g. λέγειν ‘to say’, ὁμολογεῖν ‘to agree’, ὑπισχεῖσθαι ‘to promise’) + ὅτι or ὡς (rarer: Infinitives, e.g. after φάναι ‘to say, to claim’)
- ii. Verbs of opinion (e.g. νομίζειν ‘to deem’, οἶεσθαι ‘to suppose, to hold (that)’, ἠγγεῖσθαι) + Infinitive
- iii. Verbs of perception (e.g. ὁρᾶν ‘to see’) and knowledge (e.g. εἰδέναι ‘to know’) + ὅτι or ὡς; + Participle
- iv. Verbs meaning ‘to point’ (e.g. δεικνύναι ‘to point, to indicate’) or ‘to announce’ (e.g. ἀγγέλλειν ‘to announce’) + + ὅτι or ὡς; + Participle (rarer: + Inf.).
- v. Verbs of will or wishing (e.g. βούλεσθαι ‘to wish’) + Infinitive.

Contrary to AG, MG does not have non-finite complements at language’s disposal. Yet, (coincidentally) similarly to AG, the complementation of the modern language does not follow a Control versus Obviation pattern<sup>10</sup>. The same grammatical

---

<sup>4</sup> It is reasonable to state that the MG subordinated interrogative marker *πώς* is merged in a SpecCP position while the CM *πώς* is a Complementiser merged in the head of a CP. To examine how this shift occurred is beyond the scope of this paper.

<sup>5</sup> Needless to say, that a derivational model can be more insightful in cases involving radical structural changes. Ideally, a linguist should make the best of both worlds by combining formal and functional approaches as in Fischer 2007. Cf. also the analysis of *na* in Roberts and Roussou 2013: 74ff.

<sup>6</sup> Joseph 1983 for the loss of infinitives within the Balkansprachbund context. Sampanis 2011 and 2013 indicated that the MG *na*-clauses have taken over certain functions of the AG participial complementation as well.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Evans and Watanabe 2016

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Keydana 2017.

<sup>9</sup> Based on Bornemann and Risch <sup>12</sup>2008: 286.

<sup>10</sup> French and German for example after a volitional predicate we find an infinitival complement when matrix and embedded subjects are identical while in obviation contexts French selects a ‘that’+subjunctive clause and German a ‘that’+indicative one: French: a. *je veux lire*, b. *je veux que tu lise*. German: a. *ich will lesen* b. *ich will, dass du liest*.

category, the subjunctive mood as instantiated by a verbal form headed by the CM (or actually the Mood Marker/Particle) *na*<sup>11</sup>, serves for both “Control”<sup>12</sup> and Obviation as in (1):

- (1)  
 θέλω            να            διαβάσω/διαβάσεις  
 want-1SG.    M.PRT.    read-1SG./2SG.SUBJ.(+PERF.)  
 “I want to read/I want you to read”

The *na*-subjunctive complement clauses are selected by predicates with future-oriented, deontic or dynamic and phasal semantics. Predicates entailing a “realis”, assertive meaning such as verbs of saying, thinking, believing select complements introduced by *óti* and *pos*. The MG complementation mosaic is completed by the CM *που/που* selected by the so-called factives, i.e. verbs (expressing emotions, perception or remembrance)<sup>13</sup> that commit “the speaker to the truth of a subordinate proposition” (Matthews <sup>2</sup>2005: 125).

While the distribution of every CM is mostly clearly delineated from each other, there are some cases of overlapping, which however can be easily interpreted if we consider differentiations in the semantic content of the matrix predicate. So, there are some straightforward cases in which a shift in CM leads to change in meaning, for example *xéro* + *óti/pos* means ‘I know that’ whereas *xéro* + *na* is equivalent to English ‘I know to...’ or ‘I know how...’. Yet, there are pairs or even “triplets” of CMs that occur after a single predicate, for example after verbs of perception<sup>14</sup>. In these cases, which we do not examine herein, it is the complement clause, not the matrix predicate, that determines the exact semantics of the overall phrase.

The CMS *óti* and *pos* are in free distribution although *pos* is considered more colloquial. The syntactic and semantic interchangeability of the two CMs is illustrated below:

Predicate + CM <i>óti</i> or <i>pos</i>	Attestations
<i>nomízo óti</i> versus <i>nomízo pos</i> ( <i>nomízo</i> = ‘I think’)	210.646x versus 66.064x
<i>xéro óti</i> versus <i>xéro pos</i> ( <i>xéro</i> = ‘I know’)	109.576x versus 45.839x
<i>léi óti</i> versus <i>léi pos</i> ( <i>léi</i> = ‘(s/he) says’)	61.786x versus 17.709x
<i>elpízo óti</i> versus <i>elpízo pos</i> ( <i>elpízo</i> = ‘I hope’)	33.154x versus 8.842x
<i>tharó óti</i> versus <i>tharó pos</i> ( <i>tharó</i> = ‘to believe’, ‘to trow’)	797x versus 3.494x

**Table 1 | Distribution of *óti* and *pos*, Source: Sketch Engine’s Greek Web 2014 (elTenTen14) Corpus**

<sup>11</sup> Cf. e.g. Philippaki-Warbuton 1994, Sampanis 2012.

<sup>12</sup> *Sensu stricto*, in (1) the volitional *thélo* ‘I want’ is not an obligatory control verb (as modal verbs are for example) since it obviously allows for obviation. What we want to point out here is that both in non-obviation and obviation structures there occurs the same grammatical category as a complement. As we saw, this is also the case in English but not in French or German.

<sup>13</sup> For a detailed account cf. Christidis 1982, Roussou 2006, Holton et al. <sup>2</sup>2012: 531ff.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Roussou 2006: 103.

In all cases of semantically distinct predicates both *óti* and *pos* are featured while, as expected, *pos* is less frequent in written attestations. In our samples, the only exception is after the verb *θαρρόω* *tharó* which has a more archaic/poetic vernacular nuance.

## 2 From (both) *ὅπως* and *πῶς* to MG *πως*

Unlike *óti* which stems from an AG subordinator, *pos* rises as a CM in a later period.<sup>15</sup> Etymologically, *pos* is associated with the AG interrogative *πῶς/pōs* ‘how’ and its relative equivalent *ὅπως/hópōs*. Both forms, phonologically evolved as *πώς/pós* (stressed and accentuated in its written form in order to become distinct from CM *πως*) and *όπως* in MG, are still in use in MG and the latter introduces adverbial clauses of manner (‘as’, cf. Holton et al. 2012: 560) or stands as a free relative (meaning ‘no matter how...’). From a typological perspective the grammaticalization path from interrogative/relative of manner to complementizer seems to be rare<sup>16</sup>.

Nicholas (1996) plainly suggests that the AG interrogative *pōs* as the sole predecessor of the modern CM *pos* and, in the light of a number of attestations, he attempts to trace i) possible cases of reanalysis, in which the meaning of *pōs* in Koinē and Early Middle Greek texts swings between the embedded interrogative and the complementation reading, and ii) cases of (analogical) extension in which the CM usage is attested in indisputably complement contexts. Consider the following example (Nicholas 1996: 198):

(2) ἀπήγγειλέ τε ἡμῖν **πῶς** εἶδε τὸν ἄγγελον ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ σταθέντα καὶ εἰπόντα αὐτῷ

“..narravit autem nobis quomodo vidisset angelum in domo sua stantem et dicentem sibi...”

“He told us **how** he had seen the angel standing in his house, and saying to him...”

(New Testament: Acts 11:13)

In (2) both an adverbial and a complement interpretation of the subordinated clause introduced by *pōs* are possible. Given that in older texts we always encounter the grapheme <πῶς> it is uncertain whether this element really bore an accent or not. Therefore, only the context could determine the status of the subordinated clause, although this may not be decisive since *pōs* here may oscillate between an adverbial and a complement interpretation. Yet, both the English and the older Latin translation opted for the interrogative meaning. The following case (Nicholas 1996: 200) is less vague:

(3) Καὶ λέγω ὑμῖν **πῶς** ἡ ψυχὴ, ὡς λέγει ὁ ἅγιος Γρηγόριος, τριμερὴς ἐστὶ. Ἔχει γὰρ τὸ ἐπιθυμητικὸν, καὶ τὸ θυμικὸν, καὶ τὸ λογικόν.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Holton et al. 2019: 1884ff.

<sup>16</sup> In Heine and Kuteva 2004: passim there is no comparable case. Nicholas (1996: 196) states that: “Greek is not unique in having a manner connective become a complementizer. (Schwyzer [1950] cites Avestan *yā*, cognate to *ho:s*)”. Cf. also West 2011: 80. The Avestan case however seems to have retained its adverbial/manner content while MG *pos* usage expanded over genuine complement functions.

“And I tell you <sup>?</sup>**how/that** the soul, as St Gregory says, is composed of three parts. For it has a desirous part, and a wrathful part, and a reasoning part.”

Whereas “technically” the subordinated clause could be ambiguous, the occurrence of γὰρ in the following sentence and the parenthetical reference to St. Gregory, point to a complement analysis of the embedded clause.

Most of cases gleaned by Nicholas exhibit the same ambivalence so that it is impossible to determine a *terminus post quem*, a date after which the usage of *pos* in complement clauses is established. As he ascertains, in “a period critical to the development of Modern Greek (700–1100)” the vernacular language was poorly documented and, in his view, it is difficult to mine out first-hand information about the evolution of *pōs* at that time. Therefore, his examination turns to Late Middle and dialectal Greek, reaching the conclusion that the *pos* CM “did not take off immediately, but remained in marginal use for some time - thereby failing to secure a foothold in Greek relic dialects”.

Nicholas (1996: 218) examines the logical possibility that MG πώς *pos* stems from AG ὅπως *hōpōs* after the latter underwent the following phonological reduction following an accent shift from penultima to ultima: *hōpōs* > *ōpos* > *opós* > *pos*. This change pattern was applied to other grammaticalized lexemes as well, e.g. *hína* > *ína* > *iná* > *na*; *hōpou* > *ōpou* > *opouí* > *pou* and it even seems to have affected *óti* as the presence of a postverbal enclitic *di/ti* in the Anatolian Greek dialect of Pharsiot suggests<sup>17</sup>. Yet, Nicholas dismisses this scenario mainly on the basis of the following arguments: i) In Standard MG *ōpos* is a Puristic revival, “since it had been displaced in the vernacular by the collocations *kata pos/pou* and *san pos/pou* (‘according to that’ and ‘like that’)”; ii) AG *hōpōs* was an irrealis complementizer usually in a purposive function. Additionally, Hult (1990) demonstrates that *hōpōs* “had already been displaced by *hína* in the vernacular by v AD” (ibid.), iii) dialectal forms such as *após* or *opós* are interpretable = through analogy to *apouí*, a dialectal variant of *(o)pouí*.

Nicholas’ statement against a derivation of MG *pos* from AG *hōpōs* is however too categorical and, in fact, there are two main counterarguments to his approach:

i. In AG, *hōpōs* had indeed a predominantly purposive interpretation, yet it habitually appeared after verbs meaning ‘to strive’ (e.g. σκοπεῖν/σκοπεῖσθαι), ‘to plan’ (e.g. βουλεύεσθαι, φροντίζειν, ὀρᾶν), ‘to care for’ (μέλειν μοι, ἐπιμέλεσθαι), ‘to prepare oneself’ (παρασκευάζεσθαι) as below:

(4) καὶ τὸ μὲν καλῶς ἔχον ὅπως χρονίζον εὖ μενεῖ βουλευτέον  
“We must take counsel **that** what is well shall continue to be well”

(Aeschylus, Agamn. 846-7, apud Goodwin 1889: §339)

While most of these *hōpōs*-clauses are undoubtedly adverbial, they were often selected as belonging to the valency of the afore-mentioned predicates. As the translation of (4) indicates, the embedded clause can be readily interpreted as a complement one. Yet, there are examples more suggestive of the non-purposive interpretation of *hōpōs*:

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Bağrıaçık (2018: 298, fn. 4): “Consider also the fact that *di* in Andriotis (1948) and Anastasiadis (1976) is written with an immediately preceding apostrophe, i.e., ‘*di*’ or ‘*ti*’. These authors adopt this convention because they assume the deletion of the initial [ó] in *óti* in PhG and they mark the deleted constituent with an apostrophe.”

(5) οὐ μὲν οὐδὲ φήσω ὄκως Αἰγύπτιοι παρ' Ἑλλήνων ἔλαβον ἢ τοῦτο ἢ ἄλλο κού τι νόμαιοι  
“Nor again will I say **that** the Egyptians took either this or any other custom from the Greeks.”

(Herodotus, 2.49)<sup>18</sup>

The dialectal form ὄκως/*hókōs*, a “cognate” to *hópōs*, is often found in Ionic Greek as introducing a complement clause (and it would be an interesting working hypothesis to contemplate to what extent Ionic syntax contributed to the formation of Koinē later). Likewise, in late Classical Greek (CG) we also find similar complementation patterns, especially after negative matrix verbs:

(6) ἀλλ' ὄπως μὲν, ἐγὼ ἄχθομαι ὑμᾶς τρέφων μηδ' ὑπονοεῖτε  
“Do not let yourselves imagine, Cyrus and the rest of you Persians, **that** I am embarrassed at having to support you.”

(Xen. Cyrop. 3.3.20)

In early Koinē, Horrocks (<sup>2</sup>2010: 90–94) observes the first signs of recession of the infinitival complementation. In the example below (ex. (7), *ibid.*: 90), it is an *hópōs*-clause that is selected by a matrix verb which in CG would have an infinitive as its complement:

(7) ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος κρίνω ψηφίσασθαι ὑμᾶς ὄπως τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν παρ' ὑμῖν Θεσσαλῶν...δοθῆι πολιτεία  
“...for the present I decree that we vote **that** citizenship be granted to those of the Thessalians living among you” (219 BC)

In papyri texts both *hópōs* and *pōs* are attested. Although an earlier attestation, *hópōs*-clause in (8) is better construed as a complement of a verb of knowledge. The *pōs*-clause after a similar verb here is ambiguous but more meticulous research in papyri corpora would probably yield less vague examples. What is important here is to mention how both forms are used as complements of semantically comparable verbs.

(8) Εἶ γνωῖναι ὄπως ἀνθρώπῳ [ἔ]τ[ι] ὀφείλω ὀβολόν.  
“to know **that** I still owe money to this man” (2<sup>nd</sup> c. AC)

(9) οἶδας γὰρ πῶς αὐτοῦ ἐκάστης ὥρας χρήζωι  
“for you know **how/ that** I need him all the time” (1<sup>st</sup> c. AC)

Thus, we see that *hópōs* was not restricted in purposive meanings. On the contrary, its function as a CM is easy to trace up to Koinē.

ii. Nicholas' second argument about the decline of *hópōs* in favour of *hína* similarly does not seem to hold, as in the case below:

---

<sup>18</sup> Retrieved from:

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Hdt.%202.49&lang=original> (09.05.2020).

(10) Ἔλθωμεν οὖν εἰς ταπείνωσιν καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἀποκαλύπτει ἡμῖν τὰ μυστήρια αὐτοῦ, ἵνα ὅπου δεῖ ἀεὶ λαλῶμεν, καὶ ὅπου οὐ δεῖ, ἀεὶ σιωπῶμεν, ὅπως γίνονται τὰ ἀμφοτέρωθεν εἰς ὠφέλειαν ἡμῶν τε καὶ τῶν ἀκουόντων

“Let us then come to humiliation and God reveals us his mysteries, in order that we always speak, when (<where) we should, and we always be silent, when we shouldn’t (talk), **so that** both happen to our and listeners’ benefit.”

(Barsanuphius et Joannes, 644.47, 6<sup>th</sup> c.)

In this excerpt, the register of which is obviously non-learned or even vernacular, both *hína* and *hórōs* appear in closely related but distinct semantic functions, the former as a final and the latter as a purposive subordinator. That *hórōs* was still in regular use as shown in the example below gleaned from the same text:

(11) Οὕτω λαμψάτω τὸ φῶς ὑμῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὅπως ἴδωσι τὰ καλὰ ὑμῶν ἔργα

“Let the light so shine in front of the people, **so that** they see our good deeds”

(Barsanuphius et Joannes, 834.16)

Thus, *hórōs* seems to have still been in use in the spoken language without having been replaced by *hína* as suggested. Moreover, again in texts without blatant archaisms, *hórōs* is attested as a CM, introducing a complement in a context where CG would select *hóti* or *hōs*:

(12) γινώσκων δὲ καὶ τοὺς αὐτοῦ γονεῖς, καὶ ἐπιστάμενος ὅπως ἦσαν ἐν πλούτῳ, ἠθέλησεν ἐλεῆσαι αὐτὸν

“Since he knew his parents and was aware of the fact that they are wealthy, he wanted to assist him.”

(Moschus, Pratum Spirituale: 193)

Interestingly, even authors diligently imitating classical patterns, may use *hórōs*-clauses as complements in the same context, as Anna Komnene does in the 12<sup>th</sup> c.

(13) ὁ βασιλεὺς...μεμαθηκῶς ὅπως ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον χρόνον καὶ τοσοῦτων κύκλων περιόδου ἔμφρουροι ὄντες οὐδὲ ἅπαξ ἥλιον ἐθεάσαντο οὐδὲ τῶν δεσμῶν ἐλύθησαν...

“The king...having learnt that, while being kept in prison for a very long time and many months, neither did they see the sun once nor were they freed of their chains, ...”

The matrix verbal form selecting *hórōs* (actually pronounced *ópos* in the 12<sup>th</sup> c.)<sup>19</sup> is here a verb of knowledge as in the previous example. So, we observe that the syntax deviates from CG although the author’s style went “by the book”. It could be proposed that *hórōs* is an embedded interrogative, and this is the reading preferred by some translators, such as Dawes (2000) who translates “[he] learned how they had been kept in prison”. Yet, syntactically this is not possible: *hórōs* introduces a finite clause, so it is constructed with the phrase οὐδὲ ἅπαξ ἥλιον ἐθεάσαντο (“they did not see the sun once”). Dawes’ translation in turn attaches *hórōs* to the participle ὄντες ‘being’ presupposing a rather awkward construction. Therefore, it is reasonable to

<sup>19</sup> The pronunciation in the 12<sup>th</sup> c. was certainly closer to Modern Greek, hence *ópos* is a more appropriate transliteration here. The AG transliteration is kept due to the archaic register of the text.

surmise that Komnene's deviation from the classical grammatical rules reflects syntactic practices of the spoken language of her time.

Based on our argumentation above we postulate that *hópōs/ópos* was still in use in the spoken language after the 5<sup>th</sup> c. steadily developing to a CM along with its counterpart *pōs*. In turn, Middle Greek *ópos* underwent regular accent shift to ultima, giving rise to the modern genuine CM *pos*.

### 3 Concluding remarks

Our succinct study demonstrated that even issues seemingly uncomplicated get thorny once we dig deeper into the corpora. Variation, analogical influences, stylistics, diglossia and numerous other phenomena are all factors in play that yield a clear-cut interpretation of language change a challenging enterprise. As Nicholas (1996: 220) stated, the historical linguist needs “to take a broader view of what constitutes diachronic evidence than merely the textual attestation of one prestige dialect of a given language.” On these grounds, it is evident that what is needed is i) a more “philological” work on Middle and Early Modern Greek Greek and dialectal corpora and ii) a comprehensive treatise of the history of Greek complementation. Besides, as Nicholas (*ibid.*: 197) remarks, a revision of Jannaris' (1987) emblematic, yet linguistically outdated, work “is long overdue”.

### References

- Anastasiadis, V.K. 1976. *Η σύνταξη στο Φαρασιώτικο Ιδίωμα της Καππαδοκίας* (Syntax in the Pharasa idiom of Cappadocia). Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Ioannina.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2013. “Greek Syntax 2012: State-of-the Art and Perspectives”. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 33 (Proceedings of the 33rd Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, April 26-27, 2012). pp. 11-57.
- Andriotis, N.P. 1948. *To Glossikó Idioma ton Faráson (The Idiom of Pharasa)*. (Collection De L'Institut Français D'Athènes 8). Athens: Ikaros.
- Bağrıaçık, Metin (2018): *Pharasiot Greek Word order and clause structure*. Unp. Diss. Universiteit Gent.
- Bornemann, Eduard and Ernst Risch. <sup>12</sup>2008 (=1978). *Griechische Grammatik*. Diesterweg.
- Christidis, Anastassios.Fivos. 1982. “óti/pos – pou. Selection of Complementizers in Modern Greek”. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 2: 113 -177. (In Greek).
- Dawes, Elizabeth A. S. 2000. *Anna Comnena. The Alexiad*. Cambridge, Ontario: Byzantine Series.
- Evans, Nicholas and Honoré Watanabe. 2016. *Insubordination*. Typological Studies in Language, 115. John Benjamins.
- Fischer, Olga. 2007. *Morphosyntactic Change. Fuctional and Formal Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goodwin William. Watson. 1889. *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*. Ginn and Company.



- Heine, Bernd and Tania Kuteva. 2004. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jannaris, Antonius Nicholas. 1897. *An Historical Greek Grammar*. London: Macmillan.
- Joseph, Brian D. 1983. *The synchrony and diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive, a study in areal, general, and historical linguistics*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Holton, David, Peter Mackridge and Irene Philippaki-Warbuton. 2012. *Greek, a comprehensive Grammar*. Second edition revised by V. Spyropoulos. London and New York: Routledge.
- Holton, David; Geoffrey Horrocks; Marjolijne Janssen; Tina Lendari; Io Manolessou; Notis Toufexis. 2019. *The Cambridge Grammar of Medieval and Early Modern Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horrocks, Geoffrey. 2010. *Greek, A History of the Language and its Speakers*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hult, K. 1990. "Syntactic Variation in Greek of the 5th Century AD". *Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia LII*. Gothenburg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
- Karantzola, Eleni and Konstantinos Sampanis. 2016. "On the "pleonastic" usage of complement markers in Early Modern Greek". *Journal of Greek Linguistics*, Vol. 16, Issue 2, pp. 202 – 231.
- Keydana, Götz. 2017. 'Finite' infinitives in Ancient Greek. *Indo-European Linguistics* 5, pp. 49 -76.
- Mandilaras, G. Basil. 1973. *The Verb in the Greek non-literary Papyri*. Athens: Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sciences.
- Markopoulos, Theodore. 2007. "Categorial features and grammaticalization: the case of Medieval Greek 'na'". Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Greek Linguistics.
- Matthews, Peter H. 2005. *The concise Oxford dictionary of Linguistics* Oxford: University Press.
- Nicholas, Nick. 1996. "The Diachrony of Modern Greek Complementiser pos: A Non-Monotonic Language Change". University of Melbourne Working Papers 16, p. 95–222
- Nicholas, Nick. 1998. *The story of pu. The grammaticalisation in space and time of a Modern Greek complementiser*. Unpubl. Diss. University of Melbourne.
- Philippaki-Warbuton, Irene. 1994. "The subjunctive mood and the syntactic status of the particle na in Modern Greek." *Folia Linguistica* 28: 297-328.
- Roussou, Anna. 2006. *Συμπληρωματικοί δείκτες (Simbliomatiki dhiktes: Complementisers)*. Athens: Patakis. (In Greek)
- Roberts, Ian and Anna Roussou. 2003. *Syntactic Change: A Minimalist Approach to Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sampanis, Konstantinos. 2011. *A Diachronic and Typological Approach to the Modern Greek Subjunctive Complementation*. Unpubl. Doctoral Thesis. University of Salzburg.
- Sampanis, Konstantinos. 2012. "The Modern Greek Subjunctive Mood and its Semantic Features". In Current Trends in Greek Linguistics. Fragaki G., Georgakopoulos Th. and Ch. Themistocleous (eds). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 66-91.
- Sampanis, Konstantinos. 2013. "Dissertation Review". *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 13, pp. 165-169.
- Schwyzler, E. 1950. *Griechische Grammatik (Greek Grammar)*. Munich: Beck.

West, Martin L. 2011. *Old Avestan Syntax and Stylistics. With an edition of the texts.*  
Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.