

Dimitra Ioannou¹
University of Athens, School of English

A CONSTRUCTIONAL APPROACH TO EXO NA ('HAVE TO') CONSTRUCTIONS AND VARIABILITY

This paper investigates the Greek EXO NA constructions in a Construction Grammar approach. While previous analyses have overlooked the role of contextual factors and attributed one meaning to a constant-invariable form, an empirically grounded, corpus-based constructional account reveals important aspects of the pattern(s) at hand and more than one meaning which only emerge in particular morpho-syntactic or/and discourse-pragmatic clusters. The paper aims to explore the low-level constructions that can only be observed in language use and identify the synchronic variability of the constructions using data from the Corpus of Greek Texts.

Keywords: synchronic variation, light verb constructions, construction grammar, *exo*, *na*

1. INTRODUCTION

Previous research (Iatridou 2006, 2014) on the Greek EXO NA² constructions has primarily focused on the “perfective” construction (1), while its “non-perfective” counterpart (2) has been described as “a semi-conventionalized development of ‘generalized auxiliary’ that carries certain modal nuances” (Tsangalidis 1997: 146) and analyzed as part of the Greek auxiliary system (Moser 1993).

¹ dioannos@gmail.com

² Following the CxG notation, small capitals are employed to denote constructions - cognitive objects that are part of our mental representations - and italics are used for the linguistic expressions that instantiate them in discourse.

(1)	<i>exo</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>fao</i>	<i>sokolata</i>	<i>pende</i>	<i>mines</i>	
	have 1SG. PRS	to ²	eat 1SG. PFV	chocolate ACC.SG.F	five	month ACC.PL.M	
	“I haven’t eaten chocolate for five months.”						
(2)	<i>exo</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>pao</i>	<i>sto</i>	<i>maeima</i>	<i>to</i>	<i>apojevma</i>
	have 1SG. PRS	to	go 1SG. PFV	to-DEF.ACC.SG.N	class ACC.SG.N	DEF.ACC. SG.N	noon ACC. SG.N
	“I have to go to class in the afternoon.”						

The current study aims to offer a broader perspective by highlighting the variability of constructions that are formed with EXO and NA, drawing on new evidence from the Corpus of Greek Texts (Goutsos 2010). What previous analyses have underplayed is the importance of the lexical, syntactic, and pragmatic context in which the construction occurs. Adopting a Construction Grammar corpus-based framework the present research shifts the focus to “relatively specific and concrete ‘low-level’ constructions that can be observed in actual language use” (Boogaart 2009: 231).

2. USAGE-BASED CONSTRUCTION GRAMMAR

The theoretical framework adopted for the analysis is that of Construction Grammar (henceforth CxG). The trademark of this model is its *holistic* view of language. In this view, the totality of our linguistic knowledge can be captured in terms of form and meaning pairings i.e., *constructions* (Fillmore 1988: 37). Constructions are defined as “conventionalized clusters of features (syntactic, prosodic, pragmatic, semantic, textual, etc.) that recur as further indivisible associations between form and meaning” (Fried 2015: 974). Whether we are analyzing a single word in terms of its selection preferences or its valence, or the way to create a modification phrase, for example, we are analyzing *patterns* and all these different patterns are seen as constructions of different *levels of schematicity* (Michaelis 2017: 2). Consequently, in this conception of grammar syntactic patterns inherently include semantic and pragmatic features in their representations (Kay & Michaelis 2012: 2272).

Over the last two decades constructional research has been influenced by usage-based approaches (Barlow & Kemmer 2000; Bybee 2010; Glynn & Robinson 2014) that lead to a model of representation that also incorporates aspects of language, such as priming, frequency biases, collocation preferences etc. that

³ There is an extensive discussion in the literature regarding the NA predicates in Modern Greek (*inter alia*, Veloudis 2010; Roussou 2010). It will be glossed as “to” for convenience without taking a stance on its status.

otherwise were overlooked. From a methodological point of view, this led to a shift from introspective data (data that result from a speaker's intuition/ second-level attention) to observational (data mostly from corpora preferably in naturalistic settings) and experimental ones (data derived from speakers in a controlled environment, designed by the researcher) (Gries 2013). Unlike generative approaches that led to a decontextualization of the grammar (Geeraerts 2006: 26), CxG relies on authentic linguistic materials that provide insight into language that goes beyond intuition. Furthermore, in this view the lexical elements that typically occur in a construction's schematic slots are revealing of the meaning of the construction (*inter alia*, Stefanowitsch & Gries 2003). These items are not an unorganized set; instead, they cluster with respect to *similarity* (in form and meaning) and lay the ground for the new extensions of constructions (Bybee 2010).

Aligned with the above theoretical and methodological commitments, the present study relies on corpus-attested data, derived from the Corpus of Greek Texts⁴. Although it is the smallest of the available corpora for Modern Greek, with 27.223.775 words compared to HNC's 62.435.379 and GkWaC's 2.342.091.029, it is the most representative in terms of material selection (Goutsos 2010). However, extracting data from the corpus has proven challenging, since the EXO NA construction(s) exhibit great variation, one aspect of which is that the component parts (EXO and NA) are not necessarily sequential. Consider the following examples:

(3)	<i>o</i>	<i>ḡjamandis</i>	<i>eçi</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>pai</i>	<i>kapu</i>
	DEF.NOM.SG.M	Diamadis NOM. SG.M	have 3SG. PRS	to	go 3SG.PFV	somewhere
	"Diamadis has to go somewhere."					
(4)	<i>eçi</i>	<i>akomi</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>ḡosi</i>	<i>pola</i>	
	have 3SG.PRS	still	to	give 3SG.PFV	a lot	
	"He still has a lot to offer."					
(5)	<i>panda</i>	<i>eçi</i>	<i>kati</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>pi</i>	
	always	have 3SG.PRS	something	to	say 3SG.PFV	
	"He always has something to say."					

In these examples, there is no principled way to differentiate (4) and (5) from instances like (3), which intuitively might represent the constructional meaning

⁴ I am grateful to Professor Goutsos for granting me access to the CGT.

we anticipate for the EXO NA construction. Interestingly, in (5) *kati* precedes the NA predicate⁵, and the same word order would be possible for (3) and (4) as well (e.g., *eçi kapu na pai & eçi pola na đosi*). For this reason, all instances, that contain the lemma EXO and the particle NA within a 5-word range, were manually examined and annotated, excluding all instances of irrelevant constructions, such as for example *eçi apofasisi na pai sto ġrafio* “he has decided to go to the office”. The query yielded 26.102 tokens of which 12.417 were excluded as irrelevant, resulting in a total of 13.960 remaining tokens⁶.

3. THE DATA

Analyzing a highly representative corpus in its totality has proven to be enlightening, as it has revealed the existence of more than one construction, that vary in terms of compositionality, schematicity and productivity. More specifically, there are constructions that are relatively fixed in both form and meaning, and there are also constructions that incorporate more abstract constructions. In the latter, we can trace parallels with the stages proposed for the grammaticalization of the English HAVE TO. In other words, we have ground to characterize the data as a case of synchronic variation, in the sense that basic/concrete and most likely historically first senses coexist with more abstract/metaphorical ones. In what follows, I outline the different constructions.

The first construction, exemplified in (6), has low frequency (only 2% of the data), however, it has attracted attention in the literature due to the compositionality issues it poses (Moser 1993; Iatridou 2006, 2014):

(6)	<i>exo</i>	<i>đjo</i>	<i>meres</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>miliso</i>	<i>s-ti</i>	<i>jineka</i>	<i>mu</i>
	have 1SG.PRS	two	day ACC.PL.F	to	speak 1SG.PFV	to-DEF.ACC. SG.F	wife ACC.SG.F	POSS.1SG. GEN
	“I haven’t talked to my wife for two days.”							

The construction roughly translates to a negated perfect despite the absence of any negative element. There is a necessary component of a temporal measure phrase (e.g., *meres* “days”, *xroġa* “years”, etc.) or temporal phrase that specifies a point in the past and establishes a time span from that moment up to the present (e.g., *apo to 1987* “since 1987”/*apo ti mera pu orcistice* “since the day he graduated”, etc.). According to DSMG (Dictionary of Standard Modern Greek) the meaning of the construction is to state that the event described by the

⁵ The constituency of utterances like (5) is not straightforward. We will return to this in Section 4, but for now, it is enough to showcase that there is not a clear-cut boundary between utterances like (3)-(5), thus, all such tokens should be examined and accounted for.

⁶ Indeed, in the majority of the tokens (76%) EXO and NA do not appear sequentially.

NA-predicate last happened some time ago. However, when examined in a larger context like (7), special pragmatic effects are revealed.

(7)	<i>opos anaferi stin ekæsi tu anamenonde akanonistes vroxoptosis ksirotera kalocerja ce ipsili riæmi eksatmisioðjapnois cirios stis noties perioçes tis mesojju opu i vroçes æa mioæun tin epomeni fora pu æa <u>anarotiæume</u> jati eçi na vrekxi mines ston topo mas as ferume sto mþalo mas tin petreleociliða tis pilu i opçoðipote apo ta naftika atiçimata pu ðioçetevun tonus petreleojðon stis ealases</i>
	"As he states in his report, "more irregular rainfall, drier summers and high evapotranspiration rates are expected mainly in the southern Mediterranean regions, where rainfall will decrease". The next time we <u>wonder</u> why it hasn't been raining for months in our country, let us think of the Pylos oil spill or any of the maritime accidents that spill tons of oil into the seas."

The utterance in (7) is a nice example of how this construction emphasizes that the event in the NA-predicate is an event which did not occur within the expected time frame and implies that its occurrence was anticipated based on the socio-pragmatic context surrounding the discourse. The use of *anarotiæume* "wonder" further suggests that the event is unexpected and may prompt someone to question why it is happening.

Another construction in the data, one we may think of as an island-construction is the EXO NA KANO ME (7% of the data), that appears to be lexically and morpho-syntactically more fixed.

(8)	<i>epiði</i>	<i>to</i>	<i>zitima</i>	<i>eçi</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>kani</i>
	because	DEF.NOM.SG.N	matter NOM.SG.N	have 3SG.PRS	to	do 3SG.PRS
	me	<i>to</i>	<i>portofoli</i>	<i>mas</i>	<i>ine</i>	<i>fleyon</i>
	with	DEF.ACC.SG.N	wallet ACC.SG.N	POSS.1GEN.PL	be 3SG.PRS	burning
	"This is burning matter because it has to do with our wallets."					

The construction is also noted by the DSMG and Moser (1993) and the attributed meaning is that something is in a relationship with something else. Even in cases like this, where the construction is relatively fixed, corpus data reveal certain idiosyncrasies. First of all, we can identify an even more fixed construction *ðen eçi na kani* – word for word "it doesn't have to do" meaning "it is irrelevant", which is negated and impersonal and its meaning is to characterize as irrelevant the overall topic with regard to some statement (e.g., *esis pandos na pate ðen eçi na kani* "Anyway, you should go, it doesn't matter."). Additionally, this construction in specific environments might have a different meaning:

(9)	<i>ama</i>	<i>citazis</i>	<i>ton</i>	<i>exero</i>	<i>sta</i>	<i>matça</i>	<i>tu</i>
	if	look 2SG.PRS	DEF.ACC.SG.M	enemy ACC.SG.M	to-DEF.ACC. PL.N	eye ACC. PL.N	CL.GEN.SG.M
	<i>đinis</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>katalavi</i>	<i>me</i>	<i>pçon</i>	<i>eçi</i>	<i>na</i>
	give 2SG. PRS	to	understand 3SG.PFV	with	whom	have 3SG. PRS	do 3SG.PRS
	“If you look the enemy in the eyes, you are making him see with whom he is dealing.”						

In examples like (9) the construction does not imply a relationship between the enemy and someone else but rather means “with whom they are up against” or “whom they are facing”. The context (*citazis ton exero sta matça*) provides additional information that the setting is war-like and that the other person is the “enemy”.

Another relatively fixed construction is the pattern DEN EXO (NP) PARA NA, which appears in only 1% of the data. Iatridou and von Fintel (2005) recognize the DEN EXO PARA NA construction as a SUFFICIENCY MODAL CONSTRUCTION, that in Greek has the form MODAL + NEG + EXCEPTIVE PHRASE.

(10)	<i>i</i>	<i>voiei</i>	<i>đen</i>	<i>ixan</i>	<i>para</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>simfonisun</i>
	DEF.NOM.PL.M	assistant NOM. PL.M	NEG	have 3PL.PAST	other than	to	agree 3PL. PFV
	“The assistants had no other option but to agree.”						

Interestingly though, in our data we have instances like (11) where there is a pattern DEN EXO NP PARA NA that allows NP to intervene:

(11)	<i>đen</i>	<i>ixan</i>	<i>ali</i>	<i>epiloji</i>	<i>para</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>ipakusun</i>
	NEG	have 3PL.PAST	other	option ACC.SG.F	other than	to	obey 3PL.PFV
	<i>tin</i>	<i>endoli</i>	<i>tu</i>				
	DEF.ACC.SG.F	order ACC.SG.F	POSS.3GEN.SG.M				
	“They had no other choice but to obey his order.”						

The most frequent noun in this position (62% percent of the cases) is *epiloji* “option/choice”. And while formal analyses do not include the pattern, a CxG approach can identify this transient construction as the connecting node to the network of HAVE.

The constructions mentioned above exhibit certain idiosyncrasies, and their meaning is not easily derived compositionally, as acknowledged even outside the CxG framework (Moser 1993; Iatridou & von Fintel 2005; Iatridou 2014; DSMG). The remaining data instantiate more schematic constructions that

are highly productive, as they account for approximately 90% of the tokens. The literature so far has recognized an invariant form EXO NA (e.g., *exo na pao sto maëima to apojevma* "I have to go to class in the afternoon"), characterized as semi-conventionalized, that expresses either an obligation or a future plan (Moser 1993).

Nevertheless, once again the data reveal considerable variation. More specifically, there are patterns that instantiate different stages of a grammaticalization chain, in which we can find many analogies to the stages of grammaticalization proposed for the English HAVE TO construction. Synchronic variation is the inevitable by-product of language change, since, in many cases the original meaning does not disappear when a new one starts emerging, or even when the latter becomes fully conventional. This leads to the formation of "polyfunctional networks of coexisting meanings" (Fried 2013: 428).

Before we proceed, let's take a brief look at the development of English HAVE TO. Although, there are differences among scholars about the timing⁷ and the details of the grammaticalization⁸, the stages originally proposed by van der Gaaf (1931) are generally accepted by most (Visser 1963; Fleischman 1982; Brinton 1991; Heine 1993; Krug 2000). Table 1 exemplifies the most recent adaptation of these stages by Heine:

I	I have a letter	[Possession Schema]
II	I have a letter to mail	[Purpose Schema: Possession Schema + purpose/goal adjunct]
III	I have a letter to write	[the possessive meaning of <i>have</i> has bleached out]
IV	I have to write a letter	[<i>have to</i> now functions as a unit lexeme expressing the modal notion of obligation]
V	I have to write	[the object complement can now be deleted]
Table 1: Stages of the <i>have to</i> grammaticalization (Heine 1993: 42)		

As depicted in Table 1 the pattern HAVE NP TO plays an important role in the evolution of the HAVE TO construction. Specifically, while *to mail* in Stage II functions as purpose adjunct to the possession schema, *to write* is different in

⁷ For an overview, see Brinton (1991) and Fischer (1994) and for a more recent proposal see Krug (2000).

⁸ Fischer (1994) provides a more formal account, arguing that the change of word order in English (SOV > SVO) was the trigger for the grammaticalization.

stage III and IV where the possessive meaning of HAVE has also bleached. We can identify this purpose schema in our data, and in Greek it is more apparent due to the possible alternation of NA and JA NA . In such tokens, EXO preserves its possessive meaning:

(12)	<i>exun</i>	<i>ilika</i>	<i>ce</i>	<i>eryalia</i>	<i>ja</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>xtisun</i>
	have 3PL.PRS	material ACC.PL.N	and	tool ACC.PL.N	for	to	build 3PL.PFV
	<i>omorfa</i>	<i>spitça</i>					
	nice ACC.PL.N	house ACC.PL.N					
	“They have the materials and the tools to build nice houses.”						

(13)	<i>an</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>kalitexnis</i>	<i>eçi</i>	<i>arketa</i>	<i>xrimata</i>	<i>na</i>
	if	DEF.NOM. SG.M	artist NOM. SG.M	have 3SG. PRS	enough ACC. PL.N	money ACC.PL.N	to
	<i>sineçisi</i>	<i>ti</i>	<i>đuła</i>	<i>pu</i>	<i>kani</i>	<i>kalos</i>	
	continue 3SG.PFV	DEF.ACC.SG.F	job ACC. SG.F	that	do 3SG.PRS	fine	
	“If this artist has enough money to continue the job that he is doing, fine!”						

The vast majority of the data instantiate a pattern that corresponds to Stage III:

(14)	<i>to</i>	<i>neo</i>	<i>simvulio</i>	<i>eçi</i>	<i>arceta</i>	<i>provlimata</i>
	DEF.NOM. SG.N	new NOM. SG.N	board NOM. SG.N	have 3SG. PRS	enough	problem ACC. PL.N
	na	andimetopisi				
	to	face 3SG.PFV				
	“The new board has a lot of problems to face.”					

According to Heine (1993: 42), the crucial feature of stage III is that HAVE is more bleached and at the same time both HAVE and the verb in the NA predicate share the same object. Many tokens are analogous to this (e.g. (14)), where *provimata* can be analyzed as the object to both *eçi* and *andimetopisi*. It is worth mentioning that a statistical tendency can already be found in this pattern; the words that appear most often in the NP slot are *kati* “something”, *tipote* “nothing”, *ti* “what” and *pola* “many”. Additionally, there are tendencies regarding the verbs that appear in the NA predicate: *leo* “say” and *đino* “give” are by far the most frequent verbs, while many of the rest of the verbs are semantically related to them (e.g., *anafero* “mention”, *đijyume*, “narrate” *parusiazō* “present”, *prosæeto* “add”, *prosfero* “offer”, *sinisfero* “contribute”), e.g. (15), (16):

(15)	otan	afise	tin	patriða	tu	prin	xropa
	when	leave 3SG.PFV. PAST	DEF.ACC. SG.M	homeland ACC.SG.M	POSS.3GEN. SG.M	before	year ACC. PL.N
	itan	enas	ftazmenos	ikonoyrafos	ce	eçi	akomi
	be 3SG. PAST	INDEF.NOM. SG.M	accomplished NOM.SG.M	illustrator NOM. SG.M	and	have 3SG.PRS	still
	pola	na	ðosi				
	a lot	to	give 3SG.PFV				
“When he left his homeland years ago; he was an accomplished illustrator. And he still has a lot to give.”							

(16)	<i>o</i>	<i>toksotis</i>	<i>ine</i>	<i>iðietera</i>	<i>ayapitos</i>	<i>apo</i>	<i>tus</i>
	DEF.NOM. SG.M	Sagittarius NOM. SG.M	be 3SG. PRS	especially	loved NOM. SG.M	by	DEF.ACC. PL.M
	<i>sinŋenis</i>	<i>epiði</i>	<i>eçi</i>	<i>panda</i>	<i>kati</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>pi</i>
	relative ACC. PL.M	because	have 3SG. PRS	always	something	to	say 3SG. PFV
	<i>ja</i>	<i>kapça</i>	<i>peripetja</i>	<i>pu</i>	<i>ezise</i>		
	for	some ACC. SG.F	adventure ACC. SG.F	that	live 3SG.PFV.PAST		

"Sagittarius is especially loved by relatives, because he always has something to say, perhaps about some adventure he lived."

Importantly, despite the similarity in form (HAVE NP NA) we can identify another cluster of constructions similar to (17), which differ in terms of constituency and meaning. In (16) *eçi* and *provlima* form a constituent and NA is the complement of the *eçi provlima*. These types of instances traditionally have been identified in the literature as LIGHT VERB CONSTRUCTIONS (Wierzbicka 1982; Dixon 1991) and they are pervasive throughout the corpus. More specifically, *ðiceoma* "right", *ðinatotita* "ability/capacity", are the most frequent, and along with *efceria* "opportunity/chance", *ipoxreosi* "obligation/responsibility", *loyos* "reason", *skopos* "purpose/aim", *stoxos* "goal/target", *apotelezma* "result", *ikanotita* "ability", *tasi* "tendency", *pieanotita* "chance/probability", *ananyji* "need", *ðjaæesi* "mood/disposition", *timi* "honor", *simasia* "importance", *tiçi* "luck/fortune", *ðinami* "strength/power", *proæesi* "intention" and *provlima* "problem/issue" constitute 59% of the total tokens of nouns that appear in the NP position.

(17)	<i>o</i>	<i>sinxronos</i>	<i>emboros</i>	<i>bori</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>eçi</i>
	DEF.NOM.SG.M	modern NOM. SG.M	merchant NOM. SG.M	may 3SG. PRS	to	have 3SG.PRS
	<i>provlima</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>promieefei</i>	<i>tin</i>	<i>pramatça</i>	<i>tu</i>
	problem ACC.SG.N	to	get 3SG.PFV	DEF.ACC. SG.F	merchandise ACC.SG.F	POSS.3GEN. SG.M
	“The modern merchant might face difficulties in order to get his merchandise.”					

Finally, there are examples that can be considered analogous to Stage IV or even V, in terms of their form, since the verbs are intransitive or the object complements can be omitted. However, examples like (18) and (19) express a different type of obligation from their English counterpart, since the Greek construction conveys a sense of *self-imposed* obligation.

(18)	<i>i</i>	<i>servia</i>	<i>eçi</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>andapekselei</i>	<i>stis</i>
	DEF.NOM.SG.F	Servia NOM.SG.F	have 3SG.PRS	to	cope with 3SG. PFV	to-DEF.ACC. PL.F
	<i>ananjes</i>	<i>tulaçiston</i>	<i>triakosion çiliaðon</i>		<i>kosovaron</i>	<i>servon</i>
	need ACC.PL.F	at least	350,000 GEN.PL.M		Kosovar GEN. PL.M	Serb GEN. PL.M
	“Serbia has to cope with the needs of at least 350,000 Kosovar Serbs.”					

(19)	<i>o</i>	<i>ðjamandis</i>	<i>eçi</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>pai</i>	<i>kapu</i>	<i>ce</i>
	DEF.NOM. SG.M	Diamantis NOM. SG.M	have 3SG. PRS	to	go 3SG.PFV	somewhere	and
	<i>zita</i>	<i>apo ton</i>	<i>kleopa</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>citazi</i>	<i>to</i>	<i>periptero</i>
	ask 3SG. PRS	by	DEF.ACC. SG.M	Cleopas ACC. SG.M	to	look 3SG.PFV	DEF.ACC. SG.N
							pavilion ACC.SG.N
	“Diamantis has to go somewhere and asks Cleopas to look after the pavilion.”						

However, the omission of the object complement might also give rise to a different meaning. In (20) and (21), for example, the object complement is omitted but easily retrievable in context since it coincides with what would be prototypically expected.

(20)	<i>afti</i>	<i>me</i>	<i>ipostiriksən</i>	<i>otan</i>	<i>ðen</i>	<i>ixa</i>
	DEM.NOM.PL.M	CL.1SG.ACC.	support 3PL.PAST.PFV	when	NEG	have 1SG.PAST
	<i>mia</i>	<i>ðen</i>	<i>ixa</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>fao</i>	
	INDEF.ACC.SG.F	NEG	have 1SG. PAST	to	eat 1SG.PFV	
	“They supported me when I didn’t have any money, when I didn’t have anything to eat.”					

(21)	<i>o</i>	<i>eryatis</i>	<i>tremi</i>	<i>min</i>	<i>arostisi</i>	<i>jati</i>	<i>kseri</i>	
	DEF.NOM. SG.M	worker NOM. SG.M	tremble 3SG.PRS	NEG	get sick 3SG. PFV	because	know 3SG. PRS	
	<i>pos</i>	<i>pço</i>	<i>poles</i>	<i>piëanotites</i>	<i>eçi</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>vji</i>	<i>me</i>
	that	more	a lot	chance ACC. PL.F	have 3SG. PRS	to	exit 3SG.PFV	with
	<i>feretro</i>	<i>para</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>jini</i>	<i>kala</i>	<i>afu</i>	<i>ðen</i>	
	coffin ACC.SG.N	rather than	to	get 3SG. PFV	well	since	NEG	
	<i>exi</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>plirosi</i>					
	have 3SG.PRS	to	pay 3SG.PFV					
“The worker is afraid of getting sick, because he knows that there are more chances of him going out in a coffin than of getting well, since he has nothing to pay.”								

4. DISCUSSION

As obvious from the data presented in the previous Section, this study is the first step for the analysis of very diverse material. A comprehensive CxG treatment of all the aforementioned constructions is called for, in order to capture not only the properties of each construction but also the network that would represent the interconnections among them. In this first approach, I tried to show the importance of focusing on actual data attested in modern corpora. While analyzing the complete set of tokens is time consuming, it reveals that various constructional meanings emerge in specific contexts (i.e. particular morpho-syntactic, lexico-semantic, and/or discourse-pragmatic clusters), and how even seemingly fixed constructions may exhibit low-level variability.

References

- Barlow & Kemmer 2000: M. Barlow, S. Kemmer (eds.), *Usage Based Models of Language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Boogaart 2009: R. Boogaart, Semantics and Pragmatics in Construction Grammar: The Case of Modal Verbs. In A. Bergs & G. Diewald (eds.), *Contexts and Constructions*, (pp. 213–41). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Brinton 1991: L. Brinton, The Origin and the Development of Quasi Modal HAVE TO in English. *The Origin and Development of Verbal Periphrases Workshop in 10th International Conference on Historical Linguistics*, 10, 1–31.
- Bybee 2010: J. Bybee, *Language, Usage and Cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Croft 2001: W. Croft, *Radical Construction Grammar - Syntactic Theory in Typological Perspective*. Oxford NY: Oxford University Press.
- Dictionary of Standard Modern Greek (DSMG) [Λεξικό της Κοινής Νεοελληνικής]. Manolis Triandafildis Foundation, *Institute of Modern Greek Studies*. Thessaloniki: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.
- Dixon 1991: R. Dixon, *A New Approach to English Grammar, on Semantic Principles*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fillmore 1988: C. Fillmore, The Mechanisms of “Construction Grammar.” *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 12, 35–55.
- Fischer 1994: O. Fischer, The Development of Quasi-Auxiliaries in English and Changes in Word Order. *Neophilologus*, 78, 137–164.
- Fleischman 1982: S. Fleischman, *The Future in Thought and Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fried 2013: M. Fried, Principles of Constructional Change. In T. Hoffmann & G. Trousdale (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar* (pp. 420–434). Oxford NY: Oxford University Press.
- Fried 2015: M. Fried, Construction Grammar. In T. Kiss & A. Alexiadou (eds.), *Syntax – Theory and Analysis. An International Handbook* (pp. 974–1003). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gaaf 1931: W. Gaaf, Beon and Habban Connected with an Inflected Infinitive. *English Studies*, 13, 176–188.
- Geeraerts 2006: D. Geeraerts, *Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Readings*. Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Glynn & Robinson 2014: D. Glynn, J. Robinson, *Corpus Methods for Semantics Quantitative Studies in Polysemy and Synonymy*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Goutsos 2010: D. Goutsos, The Corpus of Greek Texts: A Reference Corpus for Modern Greek. *Corpora*, 5(1), 29–44.
- Gries 2013: S. Gries, Data in Construction Grammar. In T. Hoffmann & G. Trousdale (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar*, (pp. 93–108). Oxford NY: Oxford University Press.
- Heine 1993: B. Heine, *Auxiliaries. Cognitive Forces and Grammaticalization*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Iatridou 2006: S. Iatridou, A Free-Choice Item Hidden in Verbal Morphology. *Glossologia*, 17, 11–41.
- Iatridou 2014: S. Iatridou, About Determiners on Event Descriptions, about Time being like Space (when we talk), and about one Particularly Strange Construction. *Natural Language Semantics*, 22(3), 219–263.
- Iatridou & von Stechow 2005: S. Iatridou, K. von Stechow, Anatomy of a Modal. In J. Gajewski, V. Hacquard, B. Nickel & S. Yalcin (eds.), *New Work on Modality* (pp. 1–57). Cambridge Massachusetts: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics #52.
- Kay & Michaelis 2012: P. Kay, L. Michaelis, Constructional Meaning and Compositionality. In C. Maienborn, K. Von Stechow & P. Portner (eds.), *Semantics: An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning* (pp. 2271–2296). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Krug 2000: M. Krug, *Emerging English Modals - A Corpus-Based Study of Grammaticalization*. Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Michaelis 2017: L. Michaelis, Meanings of Constructions. In M. Aronoff (ed.), *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics* (pp. 1–23). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moser 1993: A. Moser, Γραμματικοποίηση και Βοηθητικά Ρήματα [Grammaticalization and Auxiliaries]. *Μελέτες για την Ελληνική Γλώσσα*, 14, 161–175.
- Roussou 2010: A. Roussou, Selecting complementizers. *Lingua*, 120, 582–603.
- Stefanowitsch & Gries 2003: A. Stefanowitsch, S. Gries, Collocations: Investigating the Interaction between Words and Constructions. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 8(2), 209–43.
- Tsangelidis 1997: A. Tsangelidis, *Will and Tha: A Comparative Study of the Category of Future*. Aristotle University of Thessaloniki: Doctoral Dissertation.
- Veloudis 2010: I. Veloudis, Από τη Σημασιολογία της Ελληνικής Γλώσσας - Όψεις της "Επιστημικής" Τροπικότητας [Greek Semantics - Aspects of "Epistemic" Modality]. Θεσσαλονίκη: Ινστιτούτο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών.
- Visser 1963: F. Visser, *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*. Leiden: Brill.
- Wierzbicka 1982: A. Wierzbicka, Why Can You Have a Drink When You Can't *Have an Eat? *Language*, 58(4), 753–799.

Δήμητρα Ιωάννου
Πανεπιστήμιο Αθηνών, Τμήμα Αγγλικής Γλώσσας και Φιλολογίας

**ΜΙΑ ΠΡΩΤΗ ΠΡΟΣΕΓΓΙΣΗ ΤΩΝ ΕΧΩ ΝΑ ΔΟΜΩΝ ΤΗΣ ΝΕΑΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ
ΓΛΩΣΣΙΚΕΣ ΔΟΜΕΣ ΚΑΙ ΣΥΓΧΡΟΝΙΚΗ ΠΟΙΚΙΛΙΟΤΗΤΑ**

Περίληψη

Η παρούσα εργασία εξετάζει τις δομές ΕΧΩ ΝΑ της Νέας Ελληνικής υπό το πρίσμα της Γραμματικής Συμβολικών Δομών (Construction Grammar). Στόχος του άρθρου είναι να γίνει μια πρώτη αναγνώριση της συγχρονικής ποικιλότητας των διαφορετικών δομών που έχουν ως βασικά συστατικά το ελαφρύ ρήμα ΕΧΩ και το μόριο ΝΑ. Σε αντίθεση με προηγούμενες αναλύσεις που κατά κανόνα αποδίδουν μία γενική σημασία σε μια αφηρημένη και αποπλαισιωμένη δομή, η παρούσα οπτική αντλεί δεδομένα από το Σώμα Ελληνικών Κειμένων (ΣΕΚ) και αποσκοπεί στην αποτύπωση της ποικιλότητας, τόσο σε επίπεδο μορφής όσο και σε επίπεδο σημασίας που μπορεί να γίνει ορατή σε συγκεκριμένα συντακτικά ή/και συμφραστικά περιβάλλοντα. Το θεωρητικό πλαίσιο της Γραμματικής Συμβολικών Δομών επιτρέπει τη διάκριση γλωσσικών δομών που διαφοροποιούνται τόσο σε επίπεδο συνθετικότητας (compositionality) όσο και σε επίπεδο παραγωγικότητας (productivity) και σχηματικότητας (schematicity). Πιο συγκεκριμένα, εντοπίζονται τόσο δομές που έχουν πιο αυστηρά καθορισμένη μορφή και των οποίων η σημασία δεν προκύπτει συνθετικά, όσο και δομές που πραγματώνουν περισσότερο αφηρημένα σχήματα.

Λέξεις-κλειδιά: ελαφριά ρήματα, συγχρονική ποικιλία, γραμματική συμβολικών δομών, έχω, να