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Chapter 1

Theoretical Background

1.0. Introduction

The objective of this study is to shed more light on the study of the Parakimenos, which is the Perfect\(^1\) in Greek. However, the use of the Perfect in Greek seems to overlap very frequently with that of the Aorist, i.e. the Perfective Past in Greek. In an attempt to differentiate Parakimenos from Aorist, I start with an overview of both grammatical categories that are of interest in this study (1.1.). Moving on, I argue that the infrequency of the Perfect in Greek is not only due to its small number of readings and its seeming interchangeability with the Aorist in most of these, but primarily because Parakimenos lacks unique semantic properties that would have a positive effect on its frequency (1.2.). For this reason, in the last section, I suggest that studying the markers that primarily trigger the use of the Greek Perfect would give a better insight on the semantics of the Greek Perfect (1.3.).

1.1. Overview of the Perfect and the Perfective Past in Greek

1.1.1. The Perfect and its readings/use in Greek

From a typological standpoint, the Perfect is found in plenty of languages and is considered to be a universal linguistic category (Dahl, 1985). As in the case of almost every European language, the Perfect is also found in Greek. The Greek Perfect, known as ‘Parakimenos’ in Greek, bears a morphological make-up, which resembles the other versions of the Perfect mostly in European languages (Dahl & Velupillai, 2013). In

---

\(^1\) The notion ‘Perfect’ is used throughout the paper to refer to the grammatical construction that is widely known as the ‘Present Perfect’. The ‘Present Perfect’ is the realization of the more general gram ‘PERFECT’ in the present, which is also realized in the past (‘Past Perfect’) and the future (‘Future Perfect’).
more detail, Parakimenos is a periphrastic tense and consists of a) the auxiliary verb HAVE in the present and b) the past participle of the main verb, as shown in (1):

(1)  Exo  diavasi  ena  vivlio

\(\text{have.1sg. \ read.Pst.Ptcp. \ a \ book}\)

‘I have read a book.’

The use of the Greek Perfect (henceforth ‘Parakimenos’) is still a major question among Greek grammarians, as its functions are not clear-cut. According to Holton et al. (2012: 335), Parakimenos “describes an action that is anterior to the time of utterance but whose consequences are relevant to the present”. This means that Parakimenos is used in order to express eventualities that are temporally located in the past. Its difference with the past tenses is that it has a strong link to the present, as the situation in Parakimenos is marked for relevance at the moment of speech (henceforth ‘MOS’) or ‘current relevance’, as it is widely known (Hedin 1987; Psaltou-Joycey, 1991). Despite the ambiguity of the term ‘current relevance’, it has been claimed to be one of the core functions of the perfect cross-linguistically (Anderson, 1982; Dahl & Hedin, 2000). However, there will be further discussion on this notion in the following subsection, where the uses of Parakimenos will be compared with those of the Aorist.

To begin with, most scholars that have studied the Perfect in Modern Greek (Moser, 2003; Dahl & Velupillai, 2013 among others) support that compared to the Perfect in other languages, Parakimenos is used rather infrequently. It has also been documented that Parakimenos is the least used Perfect among several European languages (Askitidis, 2018). In what follows, I will give a description of the uses of Parakimenos in comparison to the most frequently documented uses of the Perfect cross-linguistically:

a) Resultative/Stative

The resultative/-stative perfect is used in order to show that the result or the consequences of a past eventuality are relevant and hold at the moment of speech (Ritz, 2012). I treat the ‘Perfect’ as a tense throughout the paper, despite its doubtful grammatical status.

Arguing why the ‘Perfect’ is a tense is beyond the scope of this paper.

2 The past participle is a non-finite form that bears a perfective non-past morphological marking. In fact, it is identical with the third person singular of the non-past perfective form in the subjunctive. Unless this form is part of the Perfect, I will refer to it as ‘dependent’, following Holton et al. (2012).
2012). For example, in sentence (2), the resultative perfect emphasizes more the result state of Mary’s being here than the event of her coming.

(2) Mary has arrived (=She is here)

One of the most frequent uses of Parakimenos is that of the resultative perfect, as it can be observed in sentence (3):

(3) O Yanis exi ftasi stin Athina
    The Yanis have.3Sg. arrive.Pst.Ptcp. to.the Athens
    ‘John has arrived in Athens.’ (=He is currently in Athens)

b) Existential/Experiential

The existential/experiential perfect, according to Dahl (1985) is used in order to assert, question or deny that an event has occurred at least once in a time interval that starts somewhere in the past and leads up to the moment of speech.

(4) Mary has been to Australia twice.

The existential/experiential use is also one of the main uses of Parakimenos in Greek, as illustrated in sentence (5):

(5) Exo taksidepsi stis IPA dio fores
    Have.1Sg. travel.Pst.Ptcp. at.the USA two times
    ‘I have traveled/been in the USA twice.’

c) Universal/Continuative

The universal/continuative perfect is used in order to express a state that is persistent throughout an interval that leads up to the present (Ritz, 2012).

(6) Peter has known Mary since his childhood (=and he still knows her).
In Greek, this use of the Perfect cannot be expressed by Parakimenos, due to the fact that the perfect participle bears the perfective aspect. Instead, this function of the Perfect can be denoted by the Imperfective Past or by the Present in Greek. In the following sentences, the first version is the (ungrammatical) universal reading of Parakimenos and the second is the grammatical use of the Imperfective Past or the Present:

(7) a. *O Petros exi gnorisi tin Maria apo pedi

b. O Petros gnorizi tin Maria apo pedi.

(8) a. *O Yanis exi panta thelisi na

b. O Yanis panta ithele na odigisi mia Ferrari

(9) ‘Hot news’/Recent Past
The perfect is also used in order to denote an event that occurred in the recent past, often accompanied by temporal adverbials that indicate the recency of the event, as shown in (9):

(9) The Lakers have just beat the Mavericks.

The recent past use of the Perfect is a marginal use of Parakimenos. Although Parakimenos can be used to denote recent past, this occurs only in narratives where the
‘historical present’⁴ is in use (Tsouloucha, 2017). For instance, in sentence (10), the presence of *xtes* (=yesterday), which pins the temporal location of the eventuality in the past with the use of the ‘historical present’ allows the use of Parakimenos with *molis* (=just):

(10) *(Xtes to proi, sto dromo gia tin dulia)*

*Yesterday the morning, on the way for the work*

*vlepo tin Maria na vgeni apo to spiti tis ke)*

*See.1sg.Pres the Maria to exit from the house her and*

*prospiume pos molis exo vgi apo*

*Pretend.1Sg.Pres. that just have.1Sg. exit.Pst.Ptcp from*

[to grafio tu dikigoru

*the office of the lawyer*

‘(Yesterday morning, on my way to work, I see Maria exiting her house and) I pretend that I have just walked out from the lawyer’s office.’

It is evident that the cross-linguistic uses of the Perfect that are adopted by Parakimenos in Greek are mainly two, namely a) the resultative and b) the existential reading. The recent past use of the Perfect poses a mystery: On the one hand, it could be argued that Parakimenos has a clear-cut recent past use, but on the other hand it could be questioned due to its marginality.

The infrequency of Parakimenos in Greek, however, is not only due to its narrow uses. It has often been argued that Parakimenos is not the only tense that can be used in perfect readings, as it has been found that it can be substituted by the use of the Aorist (Setatos, 1983; Psaltou-Joycey, 1991; Hedin, 1987). It is imperative, thus, to look more extensively at the interchangeability between the two tenses in these contexts.

---

⁴ It is a particular function of the present tense and is used in order to make past events more vivid.
1.1.2. The Perfective Past in Greek

The Greek Aorist is equivalent to a Perfective Past and its function is to describe “an action or state which took place and was completed at a particular point of time in the past” (Holton et al., 2012). The Aorist can be used almost in any case in order to indicate an event that occurred in the past and has no clear-cut uses; after all, the meaning of the word ‘Aorist’ (Aorist means “undefined” in Greek) shows that its use cannot be restricted. In fact, the “indefiniteness” of the Aorist means that it can be used for events that happened prior to the moment of speech, whether this is at a very remote temporal point in the past (11) or a very recent one (12):

(11) O Kostas epestrepse (persi/ prin 10 xronia)  
The Kostas come.back.3sg.aor. (last.year/ before 10 years)

apo tin Ollandia.  
from the Netherlands.
‘Kostas came back (last year/ 10 years ago) from the Netherlands.’

(12) I Maria molis anapse ta fota  
The Maria just switch.on.3sg.aor. the lights
‘Maria has just switched on the lights.’

While (11) is a use of the Aorist that we will not focus on, (12) is, in fact, an example of a ‘hot news’ reading that is associated with the perfect cross-linguistically, yet in Greek it is typically conveyed with the Aorist.5

What is of interest in our case, as mentioned earlier, is that the Aorist can often replace Parakimenos. Holton et al. (2012) note that “the two tenses overlap in meaning to a large extent” and are interchangeable in most cases. The following sentence allows the use of Parakimenos, since it is a resultative reading, but the use of the Aorist is also possible:

---

5 Parakimenos can be used in very specific conditions for this reading, as it was indicated in example (10).
Den mporo na pekso basket giati exo
Not be.able.1sg.Pres. to play basketball because have.1sg

spasi / espasa to heri mu
broken.Pst.Ptcp / break.1sg.aor. the hand mine
‘I can’t play basketball because I have broken/broke my hand.’

Regarding the existential perfect reading, Moser (2003) argues that this use of the Parakimenos is the only one that is not interchangeable by the Aorist, as illustrated in (14):

Exo spasi / #Espasa to heri mu
have.1sg. break.Pst.Ptcp/ break.1sg.aor. the hand mine

tris fores.
three times.
‘I have broken/broke my hand three times.’.

However, this claim has been challenged, as sentences with the use of an Aorist with a negative existential reading have been documented (Askitidis, 2018):

Ego prosopika den vrika pote ton paramikro
I personally not find.aor.1sg never the slightest

logo na min ton leon me to onoma tu,
reason to not him call.1sg.subj with the name his
‘I have never seen any reason to be frightened of saying Voldemort’s name.’

As we can see, (12), (13) and (15) show that among the functions of the Aorist there are some that are often attributed to the Perfect in other languages. Since the Aorist can so easily replace Parakimenos in most of its uses, how can we recognize the conditions in which Parakimenos will be licensed? In order to answer this question, it is essential to examine the semantic properties of Parakimenos that make it unique and differentiate it from the Aorist.
1.2. Semantic properties of the Greek Perfect

It is evident that in Greek the Aorist can be used interchangeably for functions that are originally associated with Parakimenos. In order to find out whether there are conditions, which would favour only the use of Parakimenos, we need to further examine whether Parakimenos has any unique properties that would differentiate it from the Aorist.

1.2.1. Temporal anaphora/deixis

One major aspect that differentiates Parakimenos from the Aorist is that only the latter has been found in a classical narrative discourse context, i.e. a series of events that are linked in a temporal anaphoric order (Askitidis, 2018). To be more specific, answering the question ‘What did Maria do after leaving the office?’ is possible in the Aorist (16a) and is ungrammatical in Parakimenos (16b):

(16)a. I Maria girise spiti ke afu efage
    the Maria go.back.3sg.aor. home and after eat.3sg.aor.

to vradino tis, pig e mia volta
    the dinner hers go.3sg.aor. a walk

‘Maria went back home and after she ate her dinner, she went for a walk.’

b. *I Maria exi girisi spiti ke afu
    the Maria have.3sg go.back.Pst.Ptcp home and after

exi fai to vradino tis, exi
    have.3sg. eat.Pst.Ptcp. the dinner her have.3sg.

pai mia volta
    go.Pst.Ptcp a walk

‘Maria has gone back home and after she has eaten her dinner, she has gone for a walk.’
One could argue that the use of Parakimenos in (16b) is a perfectly acceptable sentence in answering the question ‘What is Maria doing now?’. This indicates that Parakimenos is used only when the perspective of the narration is in the present (historical present). A similar feature that differentiates Parakimenos from the Aorist is that Parakimenos cannot co-exist with temporal adverbials that specify the time of the occurrence of an event in the past:

(17) a. Persi dilosa simetoxi se ena rialiti show
Last.year register.1sg.aor. participation in a reality show
‘Last year I registered to participate in a reality show.’

b. *Persi exo dilosi simetoxi
Last.year have.1sg. register.Pst.Ptcp. participation
se ena rialiti show
in a reality show
‘Last year I have registered to participate in a reality show.’

As (17b) illustrates, the presence of the temporal marker persi(=last year) renders the sentence ungrammatical. As a matter of fact, the two properties are similar, considering that Parakimenos cannot be used in terms of temporal anaphora or specificity. However, although this is a unique property of Parakimenos, it is not useful for our purposes, as we look for contexts that are favoured by Parakimenos. In the next sections, we look at properties that are favourable to the use of Parakimenos.

1.2.2. Current relevance

The notion of ‘current relevance’ has been noted by several scholars as a characteristic property not only of Parakimenos (Hedin, 1987), but of the perfect cross-linguistically (Anderson, 1982; Dahl & Hedin, 2000 among others). The term refers to the implication that a past situation that is expressed in the perfect keeps being relevant at the moment of speech (henceforth ‘MOS’); in other words, the use of the perfect would always render a past situation ‘currently relevant’.

---

6 It seems that Parakimenos can be favored in any case the focus of the discussion/narrative is the present (‘historical present’), as this has also been documented in sentence (10).

7 Psaltou-Joycey(1991) has argued that it can be grammatical in very specific circumstances.
(18)a. Exo aniksi to parathiro
   Have.1sg. open.Pst.Ptcp the window
   ‘I have opened the window.’

   b. Aniksa to parathiro
   Open.1sg.aor. the window
   ‘I opened the window.’

Although the occurrence of the window opening in (18) is not temporally defined, it is implied that it happened at some point in the past in both situations. The use of the Aorist in (18b) is not informative in any sense, as it could have two possible implications: a) The window is still open at the MOS or b) The window is closed at the MOS. However, the current relevance, which is a property of Parakimenos in (18a) allows only (a) to be implied.

   As Hedin (1987) notes, the current relevance in its strict sense can be only associated with the resultative reading as shown in (19). However, in the wider sense (as a general property of Parakimenos) it is also associated with the experiential reading in (6) repeated here as (19):

(19) Exo taksidepsi stis IPA dio fores
   Have.1Sg. travel.Pst.Ptcp. at.the USA two times
   ‘I have traveled/been in the USA twice.’

The notion of current relevance has been justifiably criticized by many scholars. As Klein (1992) argues, the concept itself is very abstract and cannot be falsified, as there is no clear criterion to determine the ‘relevance’ in the MOS. Following this train of thought, it is evident that a specific event can have the same ‘relevance’ in a discussion regardless of the tense used:

(20) “Giati eisai toso xarumeni?”
   Why be.2sg.pres. so happy
   -‘Why are you so happy?’
“Giati kerdisa /exo kerdisi ena ekatomirio
Because win.1sg.aor. /have.1sg. win.Pst.Ptcp. one million
stin lotaria.”
in.the lottery
-‘Because I won/have won one million in the lottery.’

In (20) it is obvious that the ‘relevance’ in the above discussion is generated by the question of the first person asking about the current state of the second one. However, the verb kerdisa in the Aorist bears as much current relevance as the verb in Parakimenos exo kerdisi.

The notion of ‘current relevance’ seems to be a unique property of Parakimenos, as it was pointed out in (18). However, there are several reasons that make it difficult to count on this concept as a unique property of Parakimenos. In fact, due to its abstractness and seeming unfalsifiability, as well as the fact that it can be generated in a discussion without the use of Parakimenos being necessary, I do not consider ‘current relevance’ as a unique property of Parakimenos.

1.2.3. Anteriority
Moser (2003) argues that all the uses and properties of the PERFECT in Greek originate from the notion of anteriority. Before delving deeper into that, we should mention that these properties are ‘givenness’, ‘completion’ and ‘remoteness’.

1.2.3.1. Givenness
To begin with, Veloudis (2003) was the first to note that the PERFECT is used in order to express that something is “given” in a conversation or a text. Despite the fact that ‘givenness’ might be a property that could explain the use of Parakimenos, due to the fact that it belongs to the sphere of pragmatics and discourse/conversation analysis, it lies beyond the scope of this study.

1.2.3.2. Completion
Completion is thought to be a property not only of Parakimenos, but of the PERFECT in general and it seems to be one of the strongest implicatures of its use (Moser, 2003).
However, since completion is an essential property of the perfective aspect, it entails that all the perfective forms bear this property. After all, the perfect participle in Greek happens to bear the perfective aspect; the implicature of completion comes, therefore, as no surprise. What is more, Moser (2003) herself questions this property, as the Aorist, being the equivalent perfective past, has this implicature as well.

Since completion does not constitute a unique property of the perfect, but a feature that is also shared by the Aorist, it will not be taken into further consideration.

1.2.3.3. Remoteness
The feature that seems to be unique to Parakimenos is the implicature of “greater temporal distance” in the past (Moser, 2003). Example (21), taken by Moser (2003), is a situation where the mother asks her son if he has finished with his homework and there is an additional response by his brother:

(21)
Mama: “Giorgo, ekanes ta mathimata su?”
George, do.2sg.aor. the homework yours
Mum: ‘George, did you do your homework?’

Giorgos: “Ne, ta exo teliosi.”
Yes them have.1sg. finish.Pst.Ptcp
George: ‘Yes mum, I have finished it.’

Yanis: “Psemata, mama, molis tora teliose.”
Lies, mum, just now finish.3sg.aor.
Yanis: ‘He’s lying, mum, he finished it just now.’

Although (21) is a situation that is hard to trace in real life, it is a perfectly acceptable sentence and according to Moser (2003) it shows that the use of Parakimenos is mostly associated with ‘remoteness’, whereas the Aorist is mostly linked to recency in the past\(^8\). Despite the validity of the arguments for this distribution of the temporal

---

\(^8\) It can be argued that the recent past adverbial ‘molis’ (just) could be followed by Parakimenos as well, which would render the argument moot.
functions to hold, it should be noted that it cannot account for the ‘recent past’ use of Parakimenos. As a matter of fact, the concept of ‘temporal remoteness’ in the past seems to be contradictory with the notion of recency in the past within the same tense. Since there is sufficient argumentation for the existence of both contradictory properties (‘recency’ & ‘greater temporal distance’), it is urgent that we take a closer look at real language data in order to understand whether either of the two could be a property unique to Parakimenos.

As it was discussed in this section, the interchangeability between Parakimenos and the Aorist is very difficult to define. Discussing some of the semantic properties that have been attributed to Parakimenos, it has been argued that none of them can be attributed solely to Parakimenos. Apart from the fact that Parakimenos, unlike the Aorist, cannot be found in temporally anaphoric discourse contexts, there is no other semantic property that holds only for Parakimenos and not for the Aorist. Subsequently, we need to turn into other linguistic factors that would render the use of Parakimenos favorable over the use of the Aorist.

In fact, there are some markers in Greek that are found more frequently with Parakimenos than with the Aorist. The study of these markers can arguably offer a valuable insight in the study of Parakimenos in Greek. In the next section, I give an overview of all the markers that could possibly favor the use of Parakimenos over the Aorist.

1.3 Greek perfect markers

As it was discussed in the previous section, there is no function or property that is unique to Parakimenos. In an attempt to delve deeper into the opposition between Parakimenos and the Aorist, I propose that studying certain temporal modifiers that favor the use of Parakimenos over the Aorist will shed some light in the study of Parakimenos in Greek. For instance, already is a temporal marker that is often associated with the use of the Perfect cross-linguistically (Fong, 2005; de Swart, 2013). From now on, markers that tend to favor the Perfect use, such as already, will be referred to as perfect markers.

In Greek, there is a wide variety of adverbials that usually occur with Parakimenos. However, in order to be defined as perfect markers, it is vital that these markers favor the use of Parakimenos over the use of the Aorist. In this chapter, I
present all the adverbials that have been claimed to occur with Parakimenos. In the next chapter, I conduct a corpus research in order to observe their frequency with Parakimenos compared to the frequency with the Aorist, in an attempt to define the Greek perfect markers. As a next step in Chapter 3, I test the results and the conclusions drawn from the corpus analysis regarding the markers by setting up a questionnaire.

According to Psaltou-Joycey (1991), the perfect markers in Greek should provide “a link between a situation and the MOS by specifying either implicitly or explicitly the intervening period of time between the situation and the MOS, thus, implying that the temporal interval is still going on” (ibid: 73-74). Based on this line of thought, a number of adverbials have been selected that are believed to favor the use of Parakimenos in most cases (Hedin, 1987; Psaltou-Joycey, 1991). There were also a few modifiers that were selected based on their co-occurrence with the Perfect in other languages (Howe, 2013).

The overview of the markers will be done based on the perfect reading they are associated with, despite the fact that there will be no further discussion throughout the study about these readings. In more detail, all the markers are purported to trigger the cross-linguistic perfect readings, that are associated with the functions of Parakimenos, namely the resultative (2.1) and the existential (2.2). However, adverbials that trigger the recent past reading were also selected (2.3), in an endeavor to confirm whether this reading is a property of the Aorist or Parakimenos.

1.3.1. Resultative

(1)  *Idi, pleon*

In this subsection, we focus on the adverbials that are associated with the resultative reading of Parakimenos. To begin with, *idi* is the Greek marker which is equivalent to already in English. Following Psaltou-Joycey’s (1991: 126) definition, ‘*idi* (already) emphasizes the anteriority of a situation in the Perfect (Parakimenos) when such an expression is considered important for the sequencing of situations’. While *idi* is mostly found in resultative Parakimenos sentences (22), it can also occur with the experiential reading (Hedin, 1987), as illustrated in (23):

(22)  Exo *idi* vali to fagito sto furno  

*Have.1sg. already put.Pst.Ptcp. the food in.the oven*
‘I have already put the food in the oven.’ (= The food is in the oven)

(23) Aftos o kallitexnis exi idi diafimisi

This the artist have.3sg. already promote.Pst.Ptcp.

to ergo tu se polles ekthesis

the work his in many exhibitions

‘This artist has already promoted his work in many exhibitions’ (=He has done it before)

Pleon, which is roughly translated as ‘already now’, has a similar meaning as idi; yet, its use denotes a stronger relationship of the anterior action with the MOS and it only occurs with the resultative reading, as in (24):

(24) O dromos exi pleon aniksi ke i

The way have.3sg already.now. open.Pst.Ptcp and the

lisı tu provlimatos ine thema xronu

solution of.the problem is matter of.time

‘The way has already opened now and the solution of the problem is a matter of time.’

Contrary to idi, pleon does not convey an existential reading. For instance, if we replace idi with pleon in (23), the implied meaning is shifted from an existential to a resultative one:

(25) Aftos o kallitexnis exi pleon diafimisi

This the artist have.3sg. already.now promote.Pst.Ptcp.

to ergo tu se polles ekthesis

the work his in many exhibitions

‘This artist has already promoted his work in many exhibitions’ (=His work is widely known)
The temporal adverbial *apo* corresponds to English *since*. Both specify the initial point of a temporal interval that leads up to the MOS. Their difference lies in terms of their occurrence with the perfect. In English, *since* refers predominantly to a temporal interval which involves the beginning of a situation that is ongoing at the MOS and is frequently used in the Universal reading of the English Perfect (26a). As it was mentioned earlier, in Greek, Parakimenos does not have a Universal reading, as it was shown in example (7), repeated as (26b).

(26)a. Peter has known Mary since childhood.

   b. *O Petros exi gnorisi tin Maria apo pedi

   The Petros have.3Sg. know.Pst.Ptcp. the Maria since child

   ‘Peter has known Mary since childhood.’

On the contrary, *apo* is mainly used together with the resultative reading of Parakimenos. According to Psaltou-Joycey (1991), *apo* requires a situation that was completed before the MOS and denotes a temporal interval, whose starting point is the completion of this situation (the starting point of its resulting state) and its endpoint is the MOS. A comparison of this use of *apo* in Greek (27a) with *since* in English indicates that an equivalent sentence in English is ungrammatical (27b):

(27)a. O Yiannis exi lisi to provlima

   The Yiannis have.3sg. solve.Pst.Ptcp. the problem

   apo xthes.

   *since yesterday.*

   ‘John has solved the problem since yesterday.’

   b. *John has solved the problem since yesterday.* (Psaltou-Joycey, 1991)

*Apo* mostly precedes other definite temporal markers (*yesterday, last year, 3 months, etc*), thus creating a temporal adverbial phrase, such as ‘*apo xthes*’ (= since yesterday) in example (27a), which occurs rather frequently with Parakimenos. However, *apo* can usually follow temporal deictic adverbials, such as ‘*prin*’ (=before, ago) or ‘*meta*’
(=after), as in (28). These cases of apo will not be our focus, as temporal deixis is not a property of Parakimenos (see 1.2.1).

(28) O en logo kathigitis katadikastike prin
The aforementioned professor be.convicted.3sg.aor. ago
apo 2 xronia se filakisi 18 minon
since 2 years to imprisonment of.18 months

‘The aforementioned professor was convicted a long time ago into an 18-month imprisonment.’

Furthermore, in cases where it is unknown when the referred situation is completed and the speaker wants to emphasize the temporal remoteness of its completion, the speaker would use the indefinite apo kero, whose corresponding translation would be since long.

(29) O Yiannis exi lisi to provlima
The Yiannis have.3sg. solve.Pst.Ptcp. the problem
apo kero. (*Vasika to elise xtes)
since long. (actually it solve.3sg.Aor. yesterday)

‘Yiannis has solved the problem since long. (*Actually, he solved it yesterday.)

Edo ke is the Greek correspondent for the English temporal adverbial for. What has been discussed about the case of apo can also be said for edo ke, as they both have the same function. In fact, they can both refer to the same temporal point and they only differ in terms of viewpoint regarding the completed situation:

(30) Exo teliosi tis spudes mu edo ke
Have.1sg finish.Pst.Ptcp. the studies mine for
ena xrono/ apo persi
a year/ since last.year

‘I have finished my studies for a year/since last year.’
1.3.2. Existential

(1)  *Pote* (ever/never), *den*..*akomi*

One of the key properties of the perfect markers that occur mostly with the existential reading of Parakimenos is to denote ‘frequency’ (Psaltou-Joycey, 1991; Hedin, 1987). *Pote* is a negative polarity item and is the equivalent of *ever* or *never*, depending on the context that it is found.

(31) “*Exeis paei pote stin Australia?*”

*Have.2sg. go.Pst.Ptcp. ever to.the. Australia?*

“*Oxi, den exo pai pote mu*”

*No, not have.1sg. been never of.mine*

*Akomi den* is the equivalent of *not yet* and can only be found in negated contexts, as the negative particle *den* indicates. In fact, the focus is only in *akomi*, but it can behave as a perfect marker only in non-affirmative contexts. Therefore, the presence of the negative particle is deemed necessary to co-occur in the same sentence in order to function as a perfect marker:

(32) Giorgo, *den exis teliosi ta mathimata*

*Giorgo, not have.2sg. finish.Pst.Ptcp. the homework*

su *akomi?*

*yours yet*

(2)  *Fores, sto parelthon, epanilimena, ksana-*

*Fores* can be translated as the English *times* and our main focus is on the phrases that contain *fores*. The phrases that contain *fores* denote definite frequency of occurrence with the presence of a number, as shown in (19), repeated here as (33). They can also denote indefinite frequency when they are found with quantified adjectives, such as *many* and *few* (34).
(33) Exo taksidepsi stis IPA dio fores

Have.1Sg. travel.Pst.Ptcp. at.the USA two times

‘I have traveled/been in the USA twice.’

(34) Oli exume skefti kapies fores ta

Everyone have.1pl. think.Pst.Ptcp some times the

xirotéra gia tus allus

worst for the others

‘Everyone has had sometimes the worst thoughts about others.’

Sto parelthon (= in the past) can be used as a perfect marker to express indefinite frequency of occurrence of a situation (35). The same applies to the marker ksana- (equivalent to the temporal use of before)\(^9\), which is found most frequently as a prefix to a verb (36). Epanilimena(=repeatedly), though, indicates a higher amount of indefinite frequency compared to the previous two markers. (37)

(35) O katigorumenos exi katigorithi sto

The defendant have.3sg. be.accused.Pst.Ptcp. in.the

parelthon gia simmetoxi se enopli listia

past for participation in armed robbery

‘The defendant has been accused of participating in an armed robbery in the past.’

(36) Den exo ksanafai toso nostimi pizza

Not have.1sg. again.eat.Pst.Ptcp. so delicious pizza

‘I have not eaten such a delicious pizza before.’

---

\(^9\) Ksana originally is translated as again, however when it co-occurs with Parakimenos, before is a more appropriate translation.
‘We have repeatedly asked for an increase of the security measures.’

Apart from the perfect markers that express frequency of occurrence of an event, Hedin (1987) found that the most frequent marker occurring with the existential reading of Parakimenos is *mexri tora(=till/up to now)*. This phrase implies the presence of a temporal interval until the MOS, but it only specifies its temporal interval, which coincides with the MOS. For experimental reasons, we will also look at similar phrases like *mexri simera(= until/up to today)* and *mexri stigmis(=until/up to this moment)*, which can be used interchangeably.

‘Until this moment/Until today/Until now, the government has fulfilled all the goals that it had set in the beginning of its stint.’

**1.3.3. Recency**

*Molis, prosfata*

As mentioned throughout this section, the recent past reading of Parakimenos has been a controversial issue among Greek scholars. Although it is not one of the main functions of Parakimenos, it is vital that the adverbials that are associated with the recent past reading are tested. Adverbs such as *molis(=just)* and *prosfata(=recently)* trigger the recent past reading and it will be important to observe with which grammatical form
they co-occur. It is clear that the recent past use is shared by both tenses, as illustrated in the two example below:

(39) I Maria molis anapse ta fota

The Maria just switch.on.3sg.aor. the lights

‘Maria has just switched on the lights.’

(40) Exun teliosi prosfata polla erga

have.3sg. finish.Pst.Ptcp. recently many constructions

stin poli mas

in.the town ours

‘Many constructions have been finished recently in our town.’

The recent past is conveyed by the use of Aorist in (12) repeated as (39), while the same purpose serves the use of Parakimenos in (40). It is vital to study whether this variation might originate by the markers that induce the recent past reading.

1.3.4. Phrases including this

Fetos, afti tin evdomada, simera proi

Last but not least, adverbials which consist of proximal deictic pronouns- i.e. this, have been found to be closely related with the use of the perfect in other languages, such as Spanish (Howe, 2013). Therefore, I also selected the markers that are the equivalent Greek translations of this year, this week and this morning, i.e. fetos, afti tin evdomada, simera to proi respectively. One can observe that they behave similarly together with Parakimenos, having an existential reading, as in (41) and (42).

(41) Fetos o Olympiakos exi kani

This.year the Olympiakos have.3sg. do.Pst.Ptcp.

polles metagrafes

many transfers

‘This year, Olympiakos has made many transfers.’
This week many fascinating things have occurred.'

However, the classical narrative context licenses the use of the Aorist, as in (43):

'This morning I went to the bakery and I bought bread.'

Overall, I have introduced and presented in detail all the markers that have been noted to occur with Parakimenos. Even though all of them are potentially Greek perfect markers, we need to confirm this in the corpus research, which will be the focal point of the next chapter.

1.4. Conclusion

In this chapter, I provided an overview of the grammatical categories that are of interest in this study: Parakimenos and Aorist. In more detail, I argued that Parakimenos is hard to differentiate from the Aorist, as Parakimenos seems to not bear any unique linguistic properties that would increase its overall use in Greek. For this reason, in the last section, I suggest that studying the markers that favor the use of the Perfect in Greek would offer a better insight on the semantics of the Greek Perfect.

However, in order to find out which markers co-occur most frequently with Parakimenos, it is necessary to take a look at real language data. In the next chapter, I give an overview of the corpus research that was carried out for this purpose.
Chapter 2

Corpus Research

2.0. Introduction

In the first chapter, I argued that in order to understand better the semantics of Parakimenos in Greek, it is vital to find out the contexts that would favor its use over the use of the Aorist. Such contexts can be found in sentences that include perfect markers.

At the end of the first chapter, I introduced some adverbials that are considered to occur frequently with Parakimenos. However, in order to identify which of these adverbials could favor the use of Parakimenos, we need to test their frequency with Parakimenos in real language data. For this reason, a corpus research that included these markers was carried out. Table 1 consists of the 22 Greek markers that were investigated in the corpus research (with their English translation in parenthesis). The aim of the corpus research is to formulate a preliminary hypothesis regarding the relationship between the use of Parakimenos and the presence of markers, which is expressed in the following way: The higher the frequency of Parakimenos together with a marker, the more likely Parakimenos is favored by this marker. This hypothesis will be tested in the next chapter in the form of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Markers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.mexri stigmis (up to this moment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.pleon (already now, no longer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.prosfata (recently)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.mexri simera (until today)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.fetos (this year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.edo ke (for)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.mia fora (once, one time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.idi (already)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.ksana- (before)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.sto parelthon (in the past)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.afti ti vdomada (this week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.apo [+date] (since)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.pote (ever [+comparative])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.simera proi (this morning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.mexri tora (up to now)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.molis (just)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.epanilimena (repeatedly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.[num] fores (times)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.apo kero (since long)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.den..akomi (yet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.poles fores (many times)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: The list of markers investigated in the corpus research
questionnaire and the corpus research will assist in finding good test items (markers).

This chapter is an overview of the corpus research that was conducted and all the examples are corpus data. In what follows, I present the methodological details of the corpus research (2.1). Moreover, I discuss the data that was not included in the presentation of the results (2.2) and I proceed to show the final results as a continuum that shows the distribution of markers with Parakimenos (2.3). Finally, there is some discussion on the results (2.4), as well as the conclusion of this chapter (2.5).

2.1. Methodology

To begin with, the corpus that was used for this corpus research is called “Corpus of Modern Greek”. The size of the corpus is approximately 36 million tokens and most texts come from contemporary Greek newspapers, although there are other kinds of written texts as well (fiction, poetry, religion etc) that are original or translated. Nevertheless, among the sentences there were some bits of formal spoken language, in the forms of interviews or formal speeches.

As it has been already mentioned, the focus on this corpus research is to find markers that would favor the use of Parakimenos over the Aorist, which could be used interchangeably. Thus, I collected the first 100 sentences that contained each marker (Step 2).

Regarding Step 4, apart from the two options in our interest (Aorist and Parakimenos), there were several cases, where the markers did not have a temporal function (assigned as ‘not relevant’) or there was use of a finite verb form that was neither in Parakimenos nor in the Aorist (assigned as ‘Other’). The cases that were not included in the final results are discussed in more detail in the next section.

2.2. What is not included?

In the following subsections, I present an overview of the data that were filtered out and not taken into account for the results that are presented in the continuum (which

| 1. Type the marker in question (one of the 22 markers in Table 1) |
| 2. Collect the first 100 sentences that were presented in the corpus |
| 3. Read each sentence individually |
| 4. Assign the sentence as one of the following options:(Parakimenos, Aorist, Other or not relevant) |

Table 2: Methodological steps of corpus research
appears in section 2.3). During the classification of the data, I decided to make three distinct categories. The first one includes all the finite verb forms, namely tenses other than the Aorist and Parakimenos (henceforth named as *Other*). The second category, named as not relevant (henceforth *n/r*), includes sentences that either involved ellipsis of the main verb or the use of the markers was other than their temporal one. Lastly, there was a third category (*extraordinary cases*) that involved scope ambiguity of the markers in question and were also not included in the results.

### 2.2.1. Other

First of all, as mentioned earlier, the main focus of this corpus research was to draw some observations regarding the competition between the use of Parakimenos and the Aorist. As a result, all the other verb forms were classified as *other* and were excluded. Although this classification involved a great amount of finite (all tenses) and non-finite verb forms (gerunds and participles), the majority of the cases involved the use of the present (example 43), the imperfective past (example 44) and the past perfect tense (example 45).

(43) **Idi** perimene me arketo kero na

---

lithi to provlima

*be.solved.3sg.dep*¹⁰ the *problem*

‘We are already waiting a long time for the problem to be solved.’

(44) **Sintoma** mu epiveveose afor pu idi

---

fantazomun

*imagine.1sg.impf.pst*

---

¹⁰ Since Greek does not have infinitive forms, I will adopt the terminology used in Holton et al. (2014), namely dependent is the perfective non-past verb form that cannot be used independently of a particle or a conjunction (see also footnote 3).
‘Soon, he/she confirmed to me what I was already considering.’

(45)  O Williamson ixe idi grapsi dio

the Williamson had.3sg. already write.Pst.Ptcp.two

prosedia 5 selidon
drafts of.5 pages

‘Williamson had already written two 5-page drafts.’

2.2.2. Not relevant

There was also a considerable amount of examples, that were not at all relevant to our discussion, and this is due to many reasons. First of all, one significant reason is the multifunctionality of some markers. For instance, the adverbial molis can be used in main clauses to denote the recency of an eventuality, as its English counterpart just (example 46).

(46)  «Molis ematha oti ali 10.000 profiges

“Just learn.1sg.aor that another 10.000 refugees

anamenun sta sinora»

await.3pl.pres at.the borders.”

‘I just learned that another 10.000 refugees are waiting at the borders.’

However, another rather frequent use is to introduce a subordinate temporal clause, which is followed by the main clause (example 47). The sentences with the use of molis in (46) was included in the analysis, while its use in (47) was excluded.

(47)  Molis anikse to limani, i 1.600 tu Zenith

as soon as open.3sg.aor. the harbor, the 1.600 of Zenith

29
leave.3pl.aor. directly to the airport

‘As soon as the harbor opened, the 1.600 people of Zenith headed directly to the airport.’

In (48) and (49), the use of pente fores (=five times) and edo ke (=since) is also not that of a temporal marker, therefore it is not relevant for our purposes. In particular, the use of pente fores in (48) functions as a quantifier.

(48) Diladi o kumparas tis giagias mu
Namely the money.box of.the grandmother mine

exi sxedon pente fores parapano omologa apo
have.3sg.pres. almost five times more bonds than

ton vasiko xrimatodoti tu Hitler.
the basic sponsor of.the Hitler

‘Namely my grandmother’s money box has five times more bonds than Hitler’s sponsor owns.’

The marker edo ke is a compound marker and it consists of edo (=here) and ke (=and). Although they can be used as a single marker temporarily (meaning equivalent to the temporal for), its use in (49) is the meaning of the two words, when used separately.

(49) Ine doro pu mporun na erxonte edo ke
be.3sg.pres. gift that can.3pl.pres. to come.3pl.pres. here and

Elines pektes
Greek players.

‘It is a gift that Greek players can also come and play here.’
A large amount of not relevant cases was found for the adverbial *apo kero*. One reason is that it occurred with elided verb forms (50):

(50) *Ke i danistes mas, san etimi apo kero,*

*And the lenders ours, as if ready since long,*

*arxisan tis omovronties kata ton Elinon proletarion*

*start.3pl.aor the fusillades against the Greek proletarians*

‘And our lenders, as if (they were) ready since long, started the fusillades against the Greek proletarians.’

Another reason is that the preposition *apo* was preceded by temporal adverbs such as *prin* (=ago, before) or *meta/istera* (=after). These adverbs are temporally deictic and would therefore favor the use of the Aorist over Parakimenos, as temporal deixis is not a property of Parakimenos (see 1.2.1. & 1.3.1). Due to this priming, sentences like (51) and (52) were classified as not relevant.

(51) *Iipothesi Papakonstantinou apotelese mia niki*

*the case of Papakonstantinou constitute.3sg.aor. a win*

*istera apo kero gia tin kivernisi*

*after since long for the government*

‘The case of Mr. Papakonstantinou constituted a win for the government after a long time.’

(52) *Oen logo kathigits katadikastike prin*

*The aforementioned professor be.convicted.3sg.aor. ago*

*apo kero se filakisi 18 minon*

*since long to imprisonment of 18 months*
'The aforementioned professor was convicted a long time ago into an 18-month imprisonment.'

The marker *sto parelthon* is a prepositional phrase, which had also many cases of not relevant sentences. Several times the verb, to which the marker was attributed, was elided, as illustrated in (53):

(53)  

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Sti diarkia tu trexontos etus exun} \\
\text{In the duration of the current year have.3pl.} \\
\text{prosfigi se megalitero vathmo ap'oti sto} \\
\text{resort.Pst.Ptcp to larger extent than.that in.the} \\
\text{parelthon sti sinapsi atomikon simvaseon ergasias} \\
\text{past to.the conclusion of.individual contracts of.labor} \\
\end{align*}\]

‘During the current year, they have resorted to the conclusion of individual labor contracts to a larger extent than in the past.’

The verb form in Parakimenos occurs due to the temporal marker *trexontos etus* and *sto parelthon*, is a temporal marker of the clause introduced by *ap'oti*. However, the verb form of this clause is elided.

Sentences, like (54), used the prepositional phrase as a complement to the verb, leaving aside its temporal function.

(54)  

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Dietreksan tin pediki ilikia tus, taksidepsan sto parelthon} \\
\text{run.3pl.aor. the childhood theirs, travel.3pl.aor. to.the past} \\
\text{tus, periegrapsan ton tropo me ton opio megalosan} \\
\text{theirs, describe.3pl.aor. the way with the which grow.3pl.aor.} \\
\end{align*}\]

‘They ran back to their childhood, they traveled back to their past, they described the way they grew older.’
2.2.3. Extraordinary cases

The category of not relevant cases included the pairing of temporal adverbials, such as *mexri tora* (=so far, until now) with nouns instead of verb forms, like in (55):

(55) I nea igitis tu kivernontos komatos Kadima ke
      the new leader of.the governing party Kadima and
      mexri tora ipurgos eksoterikon Tsipi Livni elave
      until now minister foreign.affairs Tsipi Livni receive.3sg.aor
      xthes entoli na sximatisi kivernisi
      yesterday mandate to form.3sg.dep. government

‘The new leader of the governing party Kadima and the minister of foreign affairs so far, received yesterday a mandate to form a government.’

The marker has only a narrow scope interpretation, which is restricted to the noun phrase in (55). The existence of the temporal adverbial *xthes* denotes that there can be no wide scope interpretation to the verb phrase.

However, the existence of *mexri tora* in (56), despite being syntactically a part of the prepositional phrase, is relevant for the verb tense of the main clause. In fact, if the marker was placed between the verb and the prepositional phrase, it would have the same temporal interpretation:

(56) Ke ti apokomisate apo ti mexri tora sinanastrofi
      and what gain.2pl.aor. from the until now engagement
      sas me ta pedia kata ti diarkia ton
      yours with the children in the duration of the
dokimastikon?
      trials?
‘And what did you gain from your engagement so far with the children during the trials?’

There were several sentences similar to (56) and usually had to do with nouns that involved duration, such as ‘progress’ and ‘experience’. Since in sentences like (55), the markers were not involved in the tense selection, they were excluded from the results. On the contrary, sentences similar to (56) were deemed relevant and were included in the final results.

One significant problem for associating the marker with the tense of the verbal phrase it attaches to is the scope ambiguity regarding the marker. For instance, in (57) the marker afti tin evdomada can be syntactically a complement of the noun ipoxreosis and would have the (a) reading. It could also function as an adjunct and would therefore have the (b) reading:

(57) Oles i episimes ipoxreosis tis afti tin
    all the official duties her this the
    evdomada exun metatethi I akirothi
    week have.3pl. be.moved.Pst.Ptcp or be.canceled.Pst.Ptcp

a) ‘All her (the queen’s) official duties for this week have been moved or cancelled.’

b) All her (the queen’s) official duties have been moved or cancelled this week.’

A different version of scope ambiguity is illustrated in (58), where the marker mexri stigmis can refer to either the preceding verb eginan or the following prokalesan. The absence of comma, in this case allows the interpretation of two possible readings.

(58) Den to exume antimetopisi, i sismi pu
    Not it have.1pl. face.Pst.Ptcp., the earthquakes that
    eginan mexri stigmis den prokalesan provlima
    occur.3pl.aor. until moment not cause.3pl.aor. problem
sta idia ta nosokomia.

at.the same the hospitals.

a) ‘We have not dealt with it, the earthquakes that occurred so far, did not cause any problem for the hospitals.’

b) ‘We have not dealt with it, the earthquakes that occurred, did not cause any problem for the hospitals so far.’

However, (58) did not pose a problem for the annotation since both verbs were in the Aorist. On the contrary, the scope ambiguity of the adverbial mexri tora in (59) is more significant, since petixe is in the Aorist and exi petixi is in Parakimenos:

(59) Me tis gnosis, tis empiries ke tis gnorimies

with the knowledge, the experiences and the connections

tu petixe osa exi petixi mexri tora

of.his achieve.3sg.aor. what has achieve.Pst.Ptcp. until now

‘With his knowledge, his experiences and his connections,

(a) he achieved all that he has achieved so far.

(b) he achieved so far what he has achieved.’

Osa functions as a quantifier that introduces a relative clause and the verb of this clause is the one in Parakimenos. Since quantifier scope is clause-bound (May, 1977) then the (a) reading is the most probable and the marker is paired with the Parakimenos verb form. Regardless, in some marginal cases, the (b) reading could also be possible.

Having discussed all the cases that were not included in the analysis, we can now proceed to the next section, which presents the results of the corpus research.
2.3. Results

The results of the corpus research involve the 22 markers that were depicted in Table 1 earlier. I will refer to the Table 3 below as the continuum of markers, because as I further argue, it depicts a gradual transition regarding the frequency of occurrence with Parakimenos.

What does this continuum include? As earlier mentioned, the corpus research involved the 22 markers that were presented in the beginning of this chapter. The first column (Marker) includes the markers in Greek and their equivalent translation in parentheses, while the second one (Total) includes the total corpus occurrences, which except for two markers (ksana- & pote{+ comparative}) were 100. The next three columns show the distribution of the total occurrence, Perfect for Parakimenos, Aorist and N/A for the cases that were not included.

Finally, the last column (%Perfect) shows the relative frequency of Parakimenos compared to the Aorist and is therefore, the most significant category for our purposes. It is calculated as the result of the Parakimenos occurrences (3rd column) divided by the sum of the Aorist and Parakimenos occurrences (3rd+4th column). In essence, this is a way to observe how frequent the use of Parakimenos is in comparison to that of the Aorist within the sentences containing one marker.

What is more, the markers depicted in Table 3 are ascendingly sorted by the relative frequency of Parakimenos. For example, the first marker afti ti vdomada occurred least frequently with Parakimenos (in 2,5% of the data and respectively 97,5% with the Aorist.) On the contrary, the last marker pleon was found most frequently with Parakimenos (in approximately 89% of the data, while the rest 11% occurred with the Aorist.)
The results of the continuum show that there is considerable variation among the markers regarding the frequency of occurrence with Parakimenos, which comes into four different stages. To begin with, (1-8) is the first set of markers, which favor the use of the Aorist over Parakimenos. I will refer to this set as ‘non-perfect markers’. The second set of markers (9-12) can be classified as a different category, as there is a balance regarding their occurrence with the two tenses. Even though the last two groups of markers both tend to occur frequently with Parakimenos, the markers in red (18-22)
have a relative frequency of Parakimenos higher than 80%. I will therefore refer to this group as ‘perfect markers’.

2.4 Discussion

In what follows, I discuss in more depth the results of the corpus research. To be more specific, I present some examples of the categories that stand out, (the blue and the red color group) and I compare the results from markers with functional similarity, similar to the structure of the discussion followed in 1.3 (apo/ apo kero, pleon, idi). However, at the end of the section, I introduce the markers that will be used as test items in the questionnaire that is carried out in the next chapter.

2.4.1. Non-perfect markers (blue group)

Starting from the blue group, it seems that Parakimenos is not used frequently to convey eventualities in the recent past, as the temporal markers molis (just) and prosfata (recently) that are associated with the recency in the past are used much more frequently with the Aorist. This seems to support the marginality of the use of Parakimenos to express eventualities in the recent past. One interesting observation of the corpus, though, is the fact that it is not ungrammatical for these markers to co-occur with Parakimenos. For instance, molis co-occurs with Parakimenos to express an event in the recent past in example (60).

(60) Molis exo perasi ta sinora tis xoras ke vriskomai
Just have.1sg cross.pst.pfv. the borders of.the country and be.1sg.prs se mia xora tis Afrikis
in a country of.the Africa

‘I have just crossed the orders of the country and I am in an African country’.

What is more, markers which are translated in English with the addition of the proximal demonstrative pronoun this, (i.e. afti ti vdomada, fetos, simera to proi) are also rarely used with Parakimenos.
It is noteworthy that even the presence of temporal markers with a higher relative frequency of Parakimenos did not influence the emergence of Parakimenos. For example, in sentence (61) the addition of apo could possibly favor the use of Parakimenos, but it did not.

(61) I earini isimeria sto vorio imisferio, mas
the spring equinox at the north hemisphere us
efere episima tin aniki apo simera to proi
bring 3sg aor officially the spring since today the morning

‘The vernal equinox in the north hemisphere brought us officially the spring this morning.’

2.4.2. Apo/apo kero (Since/ Since long)
First of all, it is noteworthy that apo kero is among the markers that favors Parakimenos the most. Regarding the distinction between apo and apo kero, it should be pointed out that the latter mainly denotes an eventuality in the remote past, while the former is more malleable in terms of temporal location of the eventuality. Namely, apo followed by a date, introduces an interval and the date serves as the left boundary of this interval. The right boundary of this interval is given in (62) and only the Aorist could be grammatical:

(62) O Ilhan Koman genithike to 1921 stin
The Ilhan Koman be born 3sg aor the 1921 in the
Andrianupoli tis Turkias ke apo to 1959
Edirne of the Turkey and since the 1959
metakomise sti Stokkolmi, opu ezise mexri to
move 3sg aor to the Stockholm where live 3sg aor until the
thanato tu to 1986
death his the 1986
‘Ilhan Koman was born in 1921 in Edirne at Turkey and since 1959 he moved to Stockholm, where he lived until his death in 1986.’

In case the right boundary of the interval is not explicitly stated, it is normally determined contextually and most frequently is the time of speech. In sentence (63), however, the use of the Aorist is justified, since the event that is introduced in the first clause is cancelled out by the second one. In fact, the use of Parakimenos would be ungrammatical.

(63) Apo to 1950 ksekinise i diadikasia gia tin
Since the 1950 start.3sg.aor. the process for the
anegersi tu, alla mateothike oristika meta tin
erection of.it, but be.canceled.3sg.aor. permanently after the
apokalipsi arxeon evrimaton
disclosure of.ancient findings

‘Since 1950, the process for its erection started, but was canceled permanently after disclosure of ancient findings.’

On the contrary, there were no cases where the use of Parakimenos were considered as ungrammatical or infelicitous. For instance, the use of the Aorist with apo kero can be interchangeable with Parakimenos, as sentence (64) illustrates:

(64) O thimos ton politon ine megalos, alla apo
the anger of.the citizens is big, but since
kero i elit katorthosan na ton elegxun
long the elite manage.3pl.aor. to him control.3pl.prs

‘The anger of the civilians is big, but since long the elite managed to control it.’
Still, this example was one of the few exceptions where the Aorist was used instead of Parakimeninos.

2.4.3. Perfect markers (red group)

Last but not least, pleon, idi, mexri stigmis and akomi (den) are among the markers that favor the use of Parakimeninos the most. While in English, as well as in other languages, the use and meaning of ‘already’ is conveyed by one marker, Greek adopts quite a few, two of which are idi and pleon. Their frequent occurrence with Parakimeninos shows that similarity and the sentences with the use of the Aorist depict much interest. For instance, in one of the two sentences of pleon with an Aorist verb form, it is evident that there is a Parakimeninos verb form in the coordinate clause following the clause with pleon:

(65) O Hitler ipe oti ola pleon
the Hitler say.3sg.aor. that everything already.now

xathikan ke oli ton exun prodosi
be.lost.3pl.aor. and everyone him have.3pl. betray.Pst.Ptcp

‘Hitler said that everything was (already) now lost and everybody has betrayed him.’

Regarding the marker idi, the few sentences with an Aorist verb form show an interesting pattern. Four of those sentences contain the verb ‘begin/start’ in the Aorist, as depicted in (66):

(66) Se oti afora to zitima tis doreas
To what concern.3sg.prs. the issue of the donation
organon somatos, o dimos Sikeon
of.organs of.body, the municipality of Sikies

ksekinise idi enimerotiki ekstratia
start.3sg.aor. already informative campaign
‘As far as the issue of organ donation is concerned, the municipality of Sikies already started an information campaign.’

What is more, _idi_ occurred several times as a secondary marker in sentences of the other tested markers. For example, in sentence (67), the addition of _idi_ triggered the use of _Parakimenos_. Although this was an instance of the marker _mia fora_.

(67) To Monaxo exi _idi_ filoksenisi _mia fora_  
    the Munich _has already_ host._Pst.Ptcp_ one _time_  

    tus Olimpiakus Agones, tus therinus to 1972  
    the Olympic Games, the summer _in.the_ 1972  

‘Munich has already hosted the Olympic Games once, the Summer ones in 1972.’

(68), on the contrary, is one of the two examples with the use of the Aorist. The focus on episodicity of a past eventuality, as well as the fact that the eventuality refers to a dead person, would render the use of _Parakimenos_ strange, if not ungrammatical. As a result, the use of the Aorist comes as no surprise:

(68) _I am sorry, but I cannot accept this version, since, I can remember my deceased student and friend Makis F..._

    ...otan, _idi_ apo to 1983, siniditipiise tin pikri  
    ..._when_ already _since the_ 1983, _realise.3sg.aor._ the _bitter_  

    pragmatikotita tis propagandas, egkatelipse tin Athina  
    _reality_ of.the propaganda, _quit.3sg.aor._ the _Athens_  

    ke epestrepse sto nisi tu.  
    _and return.3sg.aor._ to.the _island his._
‘…when, already since 1983, he realized the bitter reality of the propaganda, he left Athens and he went back to his island.’

_Mexri stigmis_ seems to favor the use of Parakimenos much more than its counterparts (_mexri tora/_ _mexri simera_), which were found in the yellow group. For instance, we can observe the interexchangeability of the Aorist and Parakimenos in similar contexts, as sentences (69) and (70) illustrate:

(69) _Mexri stigmis_ den _exi_ kerdisi kamia (maxi)  

*Until moment not have.3sg. win.Pst.Ptcp. no (battle)*

‘Until this moment, (s)he has won no battle.’

(70) _Mexri stigmis_ den _ipirkse_ xrimatodotisi epixiriseon _ke_  

*Until moment not exist.3sg.aor. funding of.businesses and*

i _kivernisi_ Epixiri _ti_ lipsi metron  

_the government attempt.3sg.prs. the taking of.measures*

_gia_ _tin_ energopiisi _tu_ tamiou epixirimatikotitas  

*for the activation of.the treasury of.entrepreneurship*

‘Until this moment, there was no funding of business and the government attempts to take measures for the activation of the treasury of entrepreneurship.’

In any case, Parakimenos was found to be the main grammatical category to co-occur in the contexts with this marker.

Last but not least, due to its multifunctionality, the marker _akomi_ was treated in a special way in the corpus research. Since it is a negative polarity item, there was a restriction in the corpus research, namely to co-occur with the negative marker den(=not). Tense interchangeability was possible for both cases, as in example (71) and (72).
(71) To ipurgio den exi apantisi akomi
the ministry not have.3sg. answer.Pst.Ptcp. yet.
‘The ministry/department has not answered yet.’

(72) I pagkosmia ikonomia ke i simantikoteri
the global economy and the most.important
pektes diethnos, opos i IPA ke i Iaponia
players globally, like the USA and the Japan
den kataferan akomi na antidrasun thetika
not manage.3pl.aor. yet to react.3pl.dep. positively
sta metra pu exun lifthi
to.the measures that have.3pl. be.taken.Pst.Ptcp.

‘The global economy and the most important players globally, such as the USA and the Japan, did not manage yet to the measures that have been taken.’

2.4.4. Items for questionnaire
The purpose of the corpus research was to formulate a hypothesis regarding the relationship between the use of Parakimenos and the presence of markers. Consequently, the markers were distinguished between two categories: the markers that presumably favor the use of Parakimenos (perfect markers) and the markers that presumably disfavor the use of Parakimenos (non-perfect markers). In order to test this hypothesis, I will set up a questionnaire, using some perfect markers and some non-perfect markers.

By looking at the table 3, I will pick 6 markers in total, namely the 3 markers with the highest Perfect% (pleon, mexri stigmis, den..akomi) and the 3 markers with the lowest Perfect% (afti ti vdomada, pote, prosfata).

With this distinction in mind, we can proceed onto the next chapter, where I will test the validity of this hypothesis, by showing the results of the questionnaire.
2.5. Limitations

The corpus research that is presented in this chapter was conducted as a tool for exploring the relationship between the markers that are purportedly occurring with Parakimenos and their frequency with it. However, there are some limitations.

First and foremost, the corpus analysis is was conducted on a small-scale and based on only one corpus. Since the sources of the corpus are mostly newspapers and books, its scope is limited to the written form (except for some interviews) and the formal register of the Greek language (e.g. politics, news, etc.). As a result, the observed variation and grouping of the markers might differ in case of addition of parts taken by a daily conversation in the colloquial language.

2.6. Conclusion

In this chapter, I conducted a corpus research in order to check the frequency of Parakimenos with 22 markers in real language data. As a result, we ended up with a group of markers that occur rarely (non-perfect markers) and another group that occur very frequently with Parakimenos (perfect markers). In order to test the hypothesis that the frequency with Parakimenos results to favor of its use in general, we need to test this in the form of a questionnaire.

The corpus research provided us with the two different groups, of which 3 items were picked as test items for the questionnaire. In the next chapter, I discuss the questionnaire that was set up and present the results.
Chapter 3

Questionnaire

3.0. Introduction

In this chapter, I present the questionnaire that was set up for a more in-depth analysis of the markers related to Parakimenos. In particular, the purpose of this survey is to test the results and verify the conclusions that were drawn from the corpus research in Chapter 2.

In the previous chapter, I discussed about the corpus analysis that served two purposes regarding the survey that is discussed in this chapter: i) it provided good test items for the survey and ii) it provided the tendencies of the markers that will be tested in the survey regarding their co-occurrence with Parakimenos.

The results of the corpus research have offered great insight, as there seems to be some kind of grouping in regards to the co-occurrence of the markers with Parakimenos. In more detail, while most markers do not seem to favor or disfavor the use of Parakimenos, some markers tend to stand out in a certain direction: either they are very rarely found with Parakimenos (non-perfect markers) or they tend to favor its use (perfect markers). Since this is a conclusion that is drawn from an exploration with a small dataset, it is tentative and needs a sounder methodological verification.

This chapter offers an overview of the questionnaire study that was carried out, namely its methodological set-up (3.1), the results that came up (3.2), as well as the discussion following the results (3.3).

3.1. Methodology

3.1.1. Materials

Throughout this chapter, I treat the conclusion from the corpus analysis as a hypothesis that needs verification. Subsequently, the perfect markers and the non-perfect markers are two distinct conditions that need to be tested in an experimental design, such as a questionnaire. With this in mind, I opted for the 3 markers that stood out the most in each category, i.e. *afti tin evdomada* (this week), *prosfata* (recently) and *pote* (never) are the markers that disfavor the use of Parakimenos the most, whereas *den..akomi*
(not... yet), pleon (already now) and mexri stigmis (until this moment) are the markers that occur with Parakimenos most frequently.

The test items that were included in the questionnaire are all drawn from the corpus. The questionnaire was a forced choice task with only two options and the participants had to select between the conjugated form of the verb in Parakimenos or in the Aorist. For example, sentence (73) is a test item containing a non-perfect marker (prosfata) and was originally found with the Aorist, while sentence (74) contains a perfect marker (pleon) and was found in the corpus with Parakimenos.

**Aorist condition (Non-perfect marker)**

(73) I Huffington Post prosfata (pragmatopiise/ exi pragmatopiisi)  
*The Huffington Post recently* carry.out.3sg.aor *has* carry.out.pst.ptcp

mia antistixi erevna katagrafontas tus protus 100 thanatus  
a similar study reporting the first 100 deaths

apo pirovolismo meta to makelio sto Sandy Hook.  
*from gunfire after the massacre at the Sandy Hook.*

‘Huffington Post recently (carried out / has carried out) a similar study reporting the first 100 deaths by gunfire after the massacre at Sandy Hook.’

**Parakimenos condition (Perfect marker)**

(74) Prin apo 20 xronia kanena pedi den ixe  
*Before of 20 years no child not had.3sg.*

diaviti tipu 2, alla afto pleon (allakse / diabetes type 2, but this already.now (change.3sg.aor./

exi allaksi)  
*has change. pst.ptcp*)

---

11 The two available options in the test items will be presented in bold letters throughout the chapter.
‘20 years ago no child had Type 2 Diabetes, but this now (changed / has changed).’

The set-up of the survey was the following: 24 test items & 24 fillers (see Appendix): 24 test items were included in total: i) 12 Parakimenos items (like example 74) and ii) 12 Aorist items (like example 73). As mentioned earlier, I tested 3 markers for every condition and I used 4 test items for each of these markers in order to have a total of 12 test items per condition.

The 24 fillers involved the distinction between the present and the past, which could be identified by the surrounding context that was usually augmented with the addition of temporal markers. For instance, the temporal adverb *xtes* (=yesterday) locates the time of the eventuality at the past in (75), while the adverb *simera* (=today, nowadays) in (76) locates it at the present:

**Present (Filler 1)**

(75) *Xtes* to vradi, i aderfi mu *(perimene/ perimeni)*

*Yesterday the evening, the sister mine* *(wait.3sg.pst/ wait.3sg.prs)*

stis stasi to astiko gia mia ora

at.the bus.stop the city.bus for one hour

‘Yesterday evening, my sister (was/is) waiting the city bus at the bus stop for an hour.’

**Past (Filler 2)**

(76) Mu fenete adianoito pos iparxun anthropi pu

*to.me seems unthinkable that exist.3pl.prs. people that*

*(pistevan/ pistevun) akomi ke simera oti i gi*

*(believe.3pl.pst/ believe.3pl.prs) even and today that the earth*

*ine epipedi.

*is flat.*

‘It seems unthinkable to me that there are people who even nowadays (believe/believed) that the earth is flat.’
3.1.2. Procedure

The questionnaire was made available through the platform of Limesurvey 2.5 and the participants were recruited in social media, such as Facebook. The order of the test items was random for each participant. The participants were asked to fill in the survey with what they deemed was the option that matched the most. They were advised to read carefully before answering, but also not overthink their selection.

Before the realization of this survey, a pilot study was carried out with 6 people. Through the feedback from the pilot, the survey was improved by i) clarifying the initial instructions to the participants and ii) adding more context to the test items.

3.1.3. Participants

80 native Greek speakers participated in this survey in total, 43 women and 37 men. The participants were all adults between the ages of 19 and 73 years old (mean = 30.7, SD = 12.6).

3.1.4. Analysis

In order to further investigate these results, I analyzed the data using logistic mixed effects regression modelling in SPSS. The logistic mixed-effects model is a type of general linear model that is used for a binomially distributed dependent variable, which accounts for random effects, such as differences between participants, differences between test items, but it can also deal with missing data (Eddington, 2016).

3.2. Results

There was a total of 80 trials of the survey. 19 of the trials were incomplete, while in 15 of those 80 there were mistakes in the fillers. Given that there is an implementation of an analysis that can deal with missing data, I include the 19 incomplete cases in the analysis. On the contrary, the 15 cases with mistakes in the fillers are excluded from the analysis, as it is implied that the participant did not pay much attention while filling in the questionnaire. The results that follow are based on 65 valid complete and incomplete responses of the questionnaire.
To begin with, the results seem to be clear when it comes to the use of Parakimenos and there seems to be some kind of connection with the marker that is used. *Figure 1* shows that the use of the Aorist was the dominant choice in test items with the markers that belong in the *non-perfect markers* group.

![Non-perfect markers](image)

*Figure 1: Tense occurrences (Non-perfect markers)*

On the contrary, Parakimenos was overwhelmingly used in sentences where one of the *perfect markers* was present, as illustrated in *Figure 2*.

![Perfect markers](image)

*Figure 2: Tense occurrences (Perfect markers)*

Table 1 below depicts the distribution of responses for each marker. It is noteworthy that the individual differences between the percentages among the markers in the same group are small (none bigger than 4%).
Moving on to inferential statistics, I ran three separate models: one with the responses of non-perfect markers, one with the responses of perfect markers and a last one that includes all the responses. The model that included only the responses with the non-perfect markers show that no significant difference was detected between the markers. Test item and participant were included as random effects, but turned out to not be significant either.

### Table 1: Tense occurrences (per marker)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Markers</th>
<th>Parakiméno</th>
<th>Aorist</th>
<th>Incomplete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-perfect</td>
<td>Prosfata (recently)</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>markers</td>
<td>Afí tin evdomáda (this week)</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pote (never)</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>Mexrí stigmís (until this moment)</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>markers</td>
<td>Pleon (already now)</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Den. akomi (yet)</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The model term statistics are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model term</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Exp (Coefficient)</th>
<th>Lower 95% Conf Interval</th>
<th>Upper 95% Conf Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.097</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>22.123</td>
<td>6.171</td>
<td>79.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pote</td>
<td>-0.457</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>3.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosfata</td>
<td>-0.082</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>5.387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rdm Effect (Participants)</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Lower 95% Conf Interval</th>
<th>Upper 95% Conf Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Var(Intercept)</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>2.056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rdm Effect (Items)</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Lower 95% Conf Interval</th>
<th>Upper 95% Conf Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Var(Intercept)</td>
<td>1.095</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>4.123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the second model, that included the responses with the perfect markers there was also no significant difference between the markers. Test item and participant were included as random effects. Unlike test item, participant turned out to be significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model term</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Exp (Coefficient)</th>
<th>Lower 95% Conf Interval</th>
<th>Upper 95% Conf Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-2.110</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleon</td>
<td>-0.124</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>2.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexristigmis</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.413</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>1.314</td>
<td>0.584</td>
<td>2.956</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rdm Effect (Participants)</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Lower 95% Conf Interval</th>
<th>Upper 95% Conf Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Var(Intercept)</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>1.820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rdm Effect (Items)</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Lower 95% Conf Interval</th>
<th>Upper 95% Conf Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Var(Intercept)</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>1.354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since no significant difference was detected between the markers, I grouped them into two separate conditions (perfect & non-perfect) and ran the third model with all the data, including the random effect of participants. The difference between the two groups of markers came out as significant, while the difference between the participants was not significant.
### 3.3. Discussion

#### 3.3.1. Main goal

The main goal of this questionnaire was to test the insights that were drawn from the corpus research in Chapter 2. In particular, the results of the corpus analysis suggested that there was considerable variation amongst the markers regarding their frequency with Parakimenos, with 2 extreme groups standing out: i) a group of markers that occurred rarely with Parakimenos (non-perfect markers) and ii) a group of markers that occurred very frequently with Parakimenos (perfect markers). I proceeded on taking these insights as a hypothesis in this chapter in order to test it in a form of survey amongst Greek native speakers and verify or reject it.

The results of the questionnaire confirm the tendency that was reported after the corpus research: The markers that are purported to be found with Parakimenos do not behave in the same way. In fact, we can claim that there are some markers that favor the use of Parakimenos (perfect markers) and there are some other markers that disfavor its use (non-perfect markers) and substitute it with the Aorist.
3.3.2. Further observations

Apart from the main goal of the questionnaire, we can use it as a source where we can look at interesting observations. For example, it should be mentioned that the option of Aorist was always selected, while this was not the case with Parakimenos. In particular, in (79) the option of Parakimenos was never selected:

(79) O ipurgos ikonomikon George Osborn anakinose/ exi
The minister of finances George Osborn announce.3sg.aor/ has

anakinosi afti tin evdomada tis anatheorimenes
announce.pst.ptcp. this the week the revised

provlepsis tis Kivernisis gia tin ikonomiki anaptiksi:
predictions of.the government for the financial development

ine ipodiplasiasmenes.
be.3pl.prs half.reduced

‘The minister of finances George Osborn announced/has announced this week the revised predictions of the government for the financial development: they are reduced in half.’

Despite the fact that there is a present resultative state following the main sentence (ine), it does not influence the reading of the sentence. The presence of afti tin evdomada makes the reading of recency more imminent than that of the resultative state that follows after the main sentence.

Another interesting observation is the variation of selection within markers. For instance, despite the small variation in responses within the same group of markers, the marker afti tin evdomada had the biggest difference. While (79) above had 0 responses of Parakimenos, in sentence (80) it was selected 10 times.

(80) Sto plesio astinomikon epixiriseon pu eginan se
in.the context of.police operations that occurred.3pl in
peripu 1110 atoma prosixthisan / exun prosaxthi
approximately 1110 people be.brought.3pl.aor./ have be.brought.pst.ptc
afti tin evdomada stin asfalia Thessalonikis.
this the week to the police.headquarters of Thessaloniki
‘As part of police operations that were carried out in shops, houses, cars, squares and parks, approximately 1110 people were/ have been brought this week at the police headquarters of Thessaloniki.’

Contrary to (79), (80) has an existential reading, as the temporal location of the eventuality is located in a time interval until the MOS. In fact, this can be confirmed by the fact that afti tin evdomada could be replaced by the existential marker mexri stigmis. This explains the variation of the responses of Parakimenos between the two test items, but also seems to enhance the argument of this study: Since the functions of Parakimenos can also be conveyed by the Aorist, it is the presence of the markers that would influence the selection of the former or the latter grammatical construction.

3.4. Limitations

The survey that was set up in this chapter was carried out in order to test the findings of the corpus research in the previous chapters. However, it presents some limitations that need to be communicated.

First and foremost, the selection of the test items was limited to the dataset that was obtained from the corpus. As mentioned in the previous chapter, since the sources of the corpus are mostly newspapers and books, the scope of its dataset is limited to the written form (except for some interviews) and the formal register of the Greek language (e.g. politics, news, etc.).

What is more, the selection of the test items was a bit problematic due to the small size of the corpus dataset: Ideally, the test items in the survey that included non-perfect markers should originally be found with Parakimenos and vice versa the perfect markers should be found with the Aorist. However, this was not possible, as the number
of these sentences were very few and their surrounding context was missing; therefore they would not make good test items.

Last but not least, the variation among participants was treated as a random effect and not utilized into much detail.

3.5. Conclusion

In this chapter, I presented the set-up, as well as the results of the survey that was carried out in order to confirm the findings of the corpus research. In more detail, even though I ignored the grouping of markers into perfect and non-perfect for the sake of inferential statistics, the difference between the two separate groups came as significant. As a result, we can postulate that a marker can favor or disfavor to a specific extent the use of Parakimenos. What is more, I noticed and discussed some interesting observations that came out from the questionnaire that can offer another insight in the relationship between the markers and their frequency with Parakimenos.
4.0. Introduction

This chapter serves as the overview of the results that were obtained in the corpus research and the questionnaire and their connection with the main objective of the thesis. In more detail, I discuss the most important takeaways regarding the semantics of Parakimenos (4.1), as well as possible topics for further research that could describe more about the semantics of Parakimenos and the Perfect in general (4.2). Finally, I provide a conclusion of the study (4.3).

4.1. Discussion

As it was mentioned in the beginning of this study, the main objective of this endeavor is to search for desiderata regarding the semantics of Parakimenos. Since there is no semantic property that was unique to Parakimenos, I decided to look at the markers that allegedly co-occur with Parakimenos and explore their frequency with Parakimenos in a corpus research (Chapter 2), and then verifying the tendencies through a questionnaire with native speakers (Chapter 3). The key conclusions that can be drawn from the previous chapters can be expressed in the following four sentences:

1. *Markers that are purported to co-occur with Parakimenos show a big variation regarding their frequency with it*

2. *Markers that are associated with recency seem to disfavor the use of Parakimenos*

3. *No context is unique to Parakimenos amongst speakers*
1. *Markers that are purported to co-occur with Parakimenos show a big variation regarding their frequency with it*

First of all, the corpus analysis in Chapter 2 served as an exploratory methodological tool in order to find out more about the frequency of Parakimenos with 22 markers that allegedly are used with the perfect not only in Greek, but also cross-linguistically. The main finding of the corpus analysis was the fact that there is considerable variation among the markers regarding their co-occurrence with Parakimenos. In particular, this variation is rather gradual, which allows their distribution into four separate groups; the first one includes the markers that are used least frequently with Parakimenos and the last one consists of the markers that co-occur with Parakimenos the most.

2. *Markers that are associated with recency seem to disfavor the use of Parakimenos*

In Chapter 1, there was a discussion on the contradiction between two simultaneous properties of Parakimenos: the first being its marginal recent past use (Tsouloucha, 2017) and the second its alleged implicature of ‘temporal remoteness’ (Moser, 2003). The reason why the markers that are associated with the recent past use of Parakimenos draw special attention in this study is the resolution of this contradiction, so that we could comprehend better the semantics of Parakimenos.

Based on the results of the corpus analysis, the markers that are associated with the recent past use (molis, prosfata) seem to be used rather infrequently with Parakimenos. As a matter of fact, both markers belonged to the *non-perfect marker* group (Chapter 2), which was found to be significantly different from the *perfect marker* group (Chapter 3), which consisted of markers that occurred very frequently with Parakimenos.

This observation seems to support the opinion that the concept of ‘temporal remoteness’ is closer to the semantics of Parakimenos than the temporal recency. Yet, the question that remains to be answered is: “Why is Parakimenos used in order to express eventualities in the non-remote past?”.

The answer to the question does not lie in the semantic but rather in the discourse functions of Parakimenos. In fact, Psaltou-Joycey (1991) claims that, in cases where certain linguistic conditions are met, the use of Parakimenos is intended by the speaker in order to perform a specific communicative function. For instance, in sentence (10), repeated here as (81), the communicative function of Parakimenos is
similar to the one of the historical Present: to add vividness in the narration of a past eventuality.

(81)   Prospiume  pos  molis  exo  vgi  apo  
   Pretend.1Sg.Pres.  that  just  have.1Sg.  exit.Pst.Ptcp  from  
   to  grafio  tu  dikigoru  
   the  office  of.the  lawyer  

‘I pretend that I have just walked out from the lawyer’s office.’

As a matter of fact, the use of the Aorist instead of Parakimenos would make perfect sense. Yet, since the speaker decides to put more emphasis on the communicative function of vividness instead of the recency of the eventuality, the use of Parakimenos is more appropriate.

Subsequently, the results of this thesis suggest that the semantics of Parakimenos is closer to the concept of temporal remoteness. On the contrary, the use of Parakimenos in order to denote recency in the past is marginal, as it serves more as a communicative function rather than a feature of the semantic definition of Parakimenos.

3. No context is unique to Parakimenos amongst speakers
Last but not least, there was no test item in the questionnaire that drew solely responses of Parakimenos. What this means is that it was not possible to find a context that is associated with only Parakimenos, i.e. comprise its core semantic meaning. One major reason why this might have occurred is the evident interchangeability between Parakimenos and the Aorist, that was mentioned in Chapter 1. This, however, is a significant reason why it is so difficult to define clear-cut desiderata for the semantics of Parakimenos in general.
4.2. Further research

Since the study of markers with the purpose of finding desiderata for the semantics of Parakimenos is a novel perspective in the study of Perfect, there are numerous further research questions that need to be answered.

First of all, the findings and the conclusions of this thesis need to be further evaluated and verified. For example, a corpus analysis of a bigger scale would extend the list of markers that favor and disfavor the use of Parakimenos and possibly draw the line between the two groups.

Additionally, a more refined replication of the questionnaire that is described in Chapter 3 would yield interesting results. For instance, a set-up of a questionnaire with inclusion of a bigger variety of contexts- that were not accounted by the corpus dataset-, e.g. bits of informal spoken language (everyday conversation) could bring out contexts that would demonstrate a clear inclination to the use of Parakimenos. A survey with a sociolinguistic focus could account for differences within the participants, such as age, place of origin, sex etc., could offer an insight regarding the use of Parakimenos by various groups of people and the current status of the competition between Parakimenos and the Aorist, that is obvious cross-linguistically.

On a more general note, this approach that aims to find desiderata for the semantics of Parakimenos-through the lens of the markers that it co-occurs with- could be applied to the study of Perfect cross-linguistically. Since there have been attempts to link the semantics of the English Perfect with the semantics of temporal markers, e.g. already (Fong 2005), a study that could attempt to look at the markers that are accompanied with the Perfect cross-linguistically could offer a great insight in the study of Perfect.

For all these reasons, the conclusions that are drawn in the present thesis should provide an opportunity for a more extensive study of the Perfect in relation to the markers it co-occurs with.

4.3. Conclusion

The semantics of the Perfect has been a topic that has been studied extensively. This thesis is an attempt to provide an unconventional way of studying Parakimenos, the Greek Perfect. In particular, this study is an endeavor to explore the desiderata for the
semantics of Parakimenos by studying the markers that are most frequently used together with it.

Since the existing literature does not put emphasis on the study of markers, it was necessary to gather the markers that are purported to co-occur with the Perfect cross-linguistically, as well as Parakimenos and explore their frequency with Parakimenos. As a result, we ended up with a continuum of the markers (Chapter 2) that would distinguish between several groups, with their extremes being two groups: i) the perfect markers i.e. the markers that occurred most frequently with Parakimenos & ii) the non-perfect markers i.e. the markers that occurred least frequently with Parakimenos.

As a next step, we tested and confirmed the validity of these findings in the form of a questionnaire to native speakers (Chapter 3). The results of the questionnaire indicate that there is a significant difference between the two groups and that the use of Parakimenos might be favored or disfavored depending on the presence of some marker. A more extensive study of these markers will bring a deeper insight in the study of the semantics of Parakimenos.
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Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question order</th>
<th>Question code</th>
<th>Questionnaire items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Φύλο (Gender)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Ηλικία (Age)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3              | T01          | Και σαν να μην έφθαναν όλα αυτά, αυτή την εβδομάδα έχουμε μάθει / μάθαμε ότι ένας θανατηφόρος ίδιος που ανήκει στην οικογένεια ενός παλιού μας γνώρισμου, του SARS, που σκότωσε περί τα 800 άτομα παγκοσμίως πριν από μία δεκαετία, δείχνει τα... δόντια του στη Μέση Ανατολή απειλώντας ίσως να «δαγκώσει » ολόκληρο τον πλανήτη. 
Like all this was not enough, this week we have learned / learned that a deadly virus which belongs to the family of an already known one - SARS- that killed approximately 800 people all over the world a decade ago, is showing its... teeth in Middle East threatening to "bite" the whole planet. |
| 4              | T02          | Στο πλαίσιο αστυνομικών επιχειρήσεων που έγιναν σε καταστήματα, σπίτια, αυτοκίνητα, πλατείες και αλσύλλα, περίπου 1.110 άτομα έχουν προσαχθεί / προσήχθησαν αυτή την εβδομάδα στην Ασφάλεια Θεσσαλονίκης. 
As part of police operations that were carried out in shops, houses, cars, squares and parks, approximately 1110 people have been brought / were brought this week at the police headquarters of Thessaloniki.’ |
| 5              | T03          | Ο υπουργός Οικονομικών Τζορτζ Όζμπορν έχει ανακοινώσει / ανακοίνωσε αυτή την εβδομάδα τις αναθεωρημένες προβλέψεις της κυβέρνησης για την οικονομική ανάπτυξη: είναι υποδιπλασιασμένες, σε μόλις 0,6%, για το τρέχον έτος. 
‘The minister of finances George Osborn has announced / announced this week the revised predictions of the government for the financial development: they are reduced in half.’ |
| 6              | T04          | Στο πλαίσιο της διεξαγωγής του 15ου Περιφερειακού Συνεδρίου για την Παραγωγική Ανασυγκρότηση, έχει συναντηθεί / συναντήθηκε αυτή την εβδομάδα ο Υφυπουργός Ναυτιλίας με εκπροσώπους της ΤΑ και στελέχη του ΛΣ-ΕΛΑΚΤ. 
As part of the 15th Regional Conference on Productive Reconstruction, the Secretary of Shipping has met / met this week with representatives of the TA and members of the OSCE-ELAK |
| 7              | T05          | Η «Huffington Post » πρόσφατα έχει πραγματοποιήσει / πραγματοποίησε μια αντίστοιχη έρευνα καταγράφοντας τους πρώτους 100 θανάτους από πυροβολισμό μετά το μακελειό στο Σάντι Χουκ. 
Huffington Post recently has carried out / carried out a similar study reporting the first 100 deaths by gunfire after the massacre at Sandy Hook. |
| 8              | T06          | Στη φετινή εκδήλωση συμμετείχαν όμως και αρκετοί άνεργοι που πρόσφατα έχουν χάσει / έχασαν τη δουλειά τους, από επιχειρήσεις που διέκοψαν τη λειτουργία τους μέσα στο 2008 ή προχώρησαν σε μεγάλες μειώσεις του προσωπικού τους. |
This year’s event also involved several unemployed people who recently have lost / lost their jobs, from businesses that ceased operating in 2008, or proceeded to major staff cuts.

From the environment of Kapsis it was rumored yesterday that PAOK is the team he likes, but firstly he has not been contacted so far and secondly this could not be done because he just recently has renewed / renewed his contract with the Cypriot team.

The press publishes daily information that would allow the ambassador to understand the Egyptians’ doubts about the benefits of privatization. For example, Justice recently has canceled / canceled the privatization of Omar Efendi’s chain of stores.

As noted, the country’s fiscal situation worsened because the deficit control measures adopted in 2009 have never been completed / were never completed.

"We have repeatedly submitted a request to the Ministry for the Environment, Physical Planning and Public Works but unfortunately they have never answered / never answered to us."

With AEK doubling its championships in 1939-40, Olympiacos was limited to the Piraeus Championship, while the 1940-41 Championship has never been completed / was never completed.

Shock has been drawn by the case of Mike Johnson, who has been in prison for 17 years, sentenced to life imprisonment for a crime that as proven, he has never committed / never committed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Document Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 15 P01 | Χιλιάδες άτομα που συμμετείχαν στην απογραφή της περασμένης άνοιξης δεν έχουν πληρωθεί / πληρώθηκαν ακόμη για τη δουλειά τους, πληροφορείται η στήλη. 
Thousands of people who participated in the census of last spring have not been paid / were not paid yet for their work, the column is informed. |
| 16 P02 | Τα κόμματα της Αριστεράς, παρότι δεν φέρουν ευθύνες άσκησης και διαχείρισης, δεν έχουν καταθέσει / κατάθεσαν ακόμη να πείσουν ότι δεν αποτελούν μέρος της πολιτικής κρίσης του συστήματος αλλά ενδεχόμενη εναλλακτική επιλογή, που θα μπορούσε να καταθέσει ρεαλιστικές και εφαρμόσιμες λύσεις. 
The left-wing parties, although not in charge of exercising power and management, have not succeeded/ did not succeed yet in convincing themselves that they are not part of the political crisis of the system but a possible alternative that could provide realistic and workable solutions. |
| 17 P03 | Η συζήτηση για το θέμα αυτό έχει ξεκινήσει από τις 7 Ιουλίου και ακόμη δεν υπήρξε συμφωνία, καθώς, σύμφωνα με τη διοίκηση του ΟΤΕ οι συνδικαλιστές της ΟΜΕ-ΟΤΕ δεν έχουν καταθέσει / κατέθεσαν ακόμη τις δικές τους προτάσεις, παρά το γεγονός ότι έχουν ενημερωθεί πλήρως για όλες τις λεπτομέρειες που αφορούν την τύχη των συγκεκριμένων υπαλλήλων. 
The debate on this issue has begun since July 7, and there has been no agreement, as according to OTE's management OME-OTE syndicates have not submitted / did not submit yet their own proposals despite having been fully informed for all the details regarding the fate of these employees. |
| 18 P04 | Ωστόσο δεν έχει επιτευχθεί / επιτεύχθηκε ακόμη η μακροπρόθεσμη πρόγνωση του καιρού, δηλαδή η πρόβλεψη για μεγάλα διαστήματα, π.χ. μηνών, εποχών ή ετών. 
However, the long-term weather forecast has not been achieved / was not achieved yet, ie the forecast for long intervals, eg months, seasons or years |
| 19 P05 | Δεκατέσσερις εταιρείες έχουν εκδηλώσει / εκδήλωσαν μέχρι στιγμής ενδιαφέρον για την εγκατάστασή τους στο Βιομηχανικό Πάρκο Θεσσαλονίκης (VIPATHE), επένδυσης 32 εκατ. ευρώ του ομίλου ΓΕΚ ΤΕΡΝΑ, που εγκαινιάσθηκε το Σάββατο στο δήμο Αγίου Αθανασίου. 
Fourteen companies have expressed / expressed so far interest in their establishment in the Industrial Park of Thessaloniki (VIPATHE), an investment of 32m euros in the GEK TERNA group, which was inaugurated on Saturday in the municipality of Agios Athanasios |
| 20 P06 | Οι παίκτες δεν συμμετείχαν στην απογραφή προπόνηση, διότι δεν έχουν εισπράξει / εισέπραξαν μέχρι στιγμής όλα τα χρήματα που τους οφείλει η ΠΑΕ. 
The players did not participate in the afternoon training because they have not received / received so far all the money owed to them by the Club. |
| 21 P07 | Τα τέσσερα εκατομμύρια προσεγγίζουν οι φορολογικές δηλώσεις που έχουν υποβληθεί / υποβλήθηκαν μέχρι στιγμής από τους φορολογούμενους μέσω |
Four million is approached by the tax returns that have been submitted / were submitted so far by taxpayers via TAXISnet, according to data released by the Treasury.

So far, no accident related to this issue has been reported / was reported.

As for the eight injured police officers, they have already received / received discharge notes from the hospital.

20 years ago no child had Type 2 Diabetes, but this has now changed / changed now.

Last September, NASA's NEO program, which warns of dangerous asteroids and comets, announced that it has now recognized / now recognized 90% of asteroids with a diameter of more than one kilometer and are within 200 million kilometers of orbit of the Earth.

The country has been experiencing economic growth since 1995 and inflation has now fallen / now fell to negligible levels.

In the past, the two major parties, such as PASOK and ND, mostly appointed / their own people in key positions in the public sector.

50 years ago, women do not enjoy / did not enjoy the same rights as men.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Greek Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Μου φαίνεται αδιανόητο πως υπάρχουν άνθρωποι που πιστεύουν / πίστευαν ακόμη και σήμερα ότι η γη είναι επίπεδη.</td>
<td>It seems unthinkable to me that there are people who even nowadays believe / believed that the earth is flat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Το ζήτημα που συνεχίζει / συνέχιζε να απασχολεί ακόμα και σήμερα το πανελλήνιο είναι η ονοματοδοσία του όρου Μακεδονίας στο κράτος των Σκοπίων.</td>
<td>The issue that continues / continued to concern the Greek people even today is the naming of the term Macedonia in the state of Skopje.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Οι πολίτες αντιδρούν στα νέα οικονομικά μέτρα, αφού καθημερινά βιώνουν / βίωναν τις επιπτώσεις της οικονομικής κρίσης, που ξεκίνησε πριν από πολύ καμρό.</td>
<td>Citizens react to the new economic measures, since they experience / experienced on a daily basis the effects of the economic crisis that began long ago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Πλέον τα παιδιά χειρίζονται / χειρίζονταν με μεγαλύτερη άνεση τους Η/Υ απ’ότι οι ενήλικες.</td>
<td>Nowadays, children handle / handled computers more easily than adults.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Θυμάμαι πως στην περίοδο της παιδικής μου ηλικίας, παίζω / έπαιζα καθημερινά ποδόσφαιρο με τα παιδιά της γειτονιάς.</td>
<td>I remember that during my childhood I am playing / was playing football daily with the children of the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Χτες το βράδυ, η αδερφή μου περιμένει / περίμενε στη στάση το αστικό για μια ώρα.</td>
<td>‘Yesterday evening, my sister is waiting / was waiting the city bus at the bus stop for an hour.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Όταν ήμουν μικρό παιδί, σκέφτομαι / σκεφτόμουν πως η δουλειά του αστροναυτή ήταν η πιο συναρπαστική.</td>
<td>When I was a young child, I think / thought that the work of the astronaut was the most exciting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Σοκ προκαλεί η υπόθεση της Μαρίας Παπαδοπούλου, η οποία έπιασε “στα πράσα” τον σύζυγο της, την ώρα που βρίσκεται / βρισκόταν στο κρεβάτι με την καλύτερη της φίλη.</td>
<td>There is shock around the case of Maria Papadopoulou, who caught her husband red-handed while he is / was in bed with her best friend.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the policies that are being implemented are catastrophic, I think / I thought the country’s economy will recover in the next decade.

The solution to the country’s fiscal problem could have been given since 2003 if the opinion of the scientists was used and the siting was not based only on the parameter of political costs and benefits. Even today, however, there is / there was time for a change of cruise.

ERT executives, who overwhelmingly said yes to the continuation of the familiar program, talk about a substantial reduction in the cost of the broadcast, which reaches 30%. Let’s recall here that ERT top executives are talking / were talking about 50% clipping a while ago.

For a long time the projection of the super productions has begun and now those are presented / were presented in the so-called summer box office are present / presented, potentially coming to the next Oscars.
Meanwhile, two new road works were delivered yesterday, that were of major importance to the residents of the region: The new bridge of Analipsi on the provincial road of Lagada - Rentina and the Polydendriou street - Pente Vrys in the municipality of Vertiskos. These areas were cut-off for decades and today they are linked / were linked with a modern road of European standards.

Measurements made for the first time in Thessaloniki are going to record the amount of carcinogen pollutants inhaled by a cyclist, pedestrian or car driver as he drives / drove to the city center.

The 34-year-old Jordan, who has been in psychiatric treatment for at least seven months in prison in Korydallos where he is detained, said the period before the assault is not feeling / was not feeling well, but it was not clear what he meant.

A traffic accident with a 24-year-old victim occurred on Sunday morning in the land area of the port of Rethymno and specifically on Eleftherios Venizelos Street. According to information from the Maritime Administration, the 24-year-old lost control of the motorcycle he is riding / was riding and initially collided with a concrete reflector and then a parked vehicle, resulting in his fall on the road and his injury.

As of today, on May 16, 1990, Jim Henson, marionettes, cartoonist, screenwriter, actor, director and creator of the Muppet Show, passed away. Jim and his companions not only bring / brought life in some dozens of adorable characters, but they had discovered the golden intersection between family spectacle and an authentic anarchist mood, reviving the forgotten graces of the vondville and combining all sorts of figures from the operetta as acrobats, through surreal styles.
| 48 | F23 | Ένας από τους βασικούς λόγους που συνετέλεσε στη γρήγορη εξάπλωση της φονικής πυρκαγιάς στην Αττική ήταν ότι η περιοχή είναι κατάφυτη από χαλέπιο πεύκη, το πιο ρητινοπαραγωγικό δέντρο στον κόσμο. Η ρητίνη συνέβαλε στην γρηγορότερη εξάπλωση της φωτιάς, σε βαθμό που κάποιοι καίγονται / καίγονταν ακόμη και μέσα στη θάλασσα.

One of the main reasons for the rapid spread of the deadly fire in Attica was that the area was overgrown with arid pine, the most resinous tree in the world. The resin contributed to the fastest spread of fire, to the extent that some people are burning / were burning even in the sea.

| 49 | F24 | Μετά το 1939 και το ξέσπασμα του πολέμου, τα στρατόπεδα συγκέντρωσης μετατράπηκαν σε μέρη όπου τα θύματα των Ναζί, μεταξύ άλλων Εβραίοι και αιχμάλωτοι πολέμου, είτε δολοφονούνταν είτε αναγκάζονταν να εργαστούν σαν σκλάβοι, και βρίσκονται / βρίσκονταν σε καθεστώς υποσιτισμού και βασανισμών.

After 1939 and the outbreak of war, concentration camps were transformed into places where Nazi victims, among other Jews and prisoners of war, were either murdered or forced to work as slaves and are / were in a state of malnutrition and torture.

| 50 | F22 | "Αισθάνομαι ευλογημένη που είμαι ζωντανή, καθώς μετά από τόση πάλη με τον καρκίνο κατάφερα να τον κερδίσω", δήλωσε η γυναίκα που πάσχει / έπασχε από καρκίνο του μαστού για 5 χρόνια.

"I feel blessed to be alive because after so much struggle with cancer I managed to win it," said the woman who is suffering / was suffering from breast cancer for 5 years.