Despina Oikonomou[1]
University of Crete

Vasiliki Rizou[2]
Humboldt University of Berlin

Nikolaos Tsokanos[3]
Humboldt University of Berlin

Artemis Alexiadou[4]
Leibniz-Centre General Linguistics (ZAS) &
Humboldt University of Berlin

HOW TO DESCRIBE WHAT DIDN'T HAPPEN:

HERITAGE AND MONOLINGUAL STRATEGIES CONVERGE

In this paper we discuss constructions which convey that an event came close to happen but eventually did not happen, usually referred to as approximative or avertive constructions. We investigate two different strategies, (i) the approximative adverbial constructions (AAs) and (ii) the approximative light verb constructions (ALVs), in monolingual and heritage varieties of Greek. Our findings do not provide evidence for divergence between the heritage and the monolingual groups in either (i) or (ii). No cross-linguistic effects from the majority languages are observed, while extra-linguistic factors such as register and modality variation seem to affect monolingual speakers' productions but not heritage speakers' (HSs) who generalize across the different communication settings.

Keywords: bilingualism, heritage speakers, Greek, approximative constructions

[1] despina.oikonomou@uoc.gr
[2] vasiliki.rizou@hu-berlin.de
[3] tsokanos.nikolas@gmail.com
[4] artemis@leibniz-zas.de

1. INTRODUCTION

The present study investigates the approximative constructions (ACs) expressed with adverbials and light verbs in monolingual and heritage varieties of Greek. Approximative/avertive constructions have been discussed in typological works revealing interesting cross-linguistic patterns (Alexandrova 2016; Kuteva 2000; Kuteva et al. 2019; Caudal 2022). In the domain of acquisition, there is little research, especially on heritage speakers (HSs), which is our focus in this paper. HSs are defined as bi- or multilingual individuals using their heritage language(s), acquired in early childhood in their families alongside the majority language(s) or official language(s) of the hosting community (cf. among many others Benmamoun et al. 2013; Guijarro-Fuentes & Schmitz 2015; Montrul 2015; Polinsky 2015).[1]

The goal of the present study is i) to lay out the basic properties of two types of approximative constructions in Greek, approximative adverbials (AAs) (i.e. *shedon* 'almost' and *paraligo* 'almost') and approximative light verbs (ALVs) (*pao na* 'go to', *kano na* 'do to') and, ii) to gain insights on how different groups of HSs in contact with American English and German as majority languages, perform on ACs. Our study lies in a multifactorial analysis of naturalistic data from monolingual and HSs including register and modality differentiation, addressing the gap in literature.

The study is structured as follows: Section 2 presents the theoretical background for the two types of approximatives, AAs and ALVs. In section 3, we present the research questions and the elicitation task. In section 4, we discuss our findings. Section 5 concludes and presents the open questions.

2. APPROXIMATIVE/AVERTIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

Languages employ a wide range of approximative/avertive constructions such as counterfactual conditionals, modal particles, aspectual particles, partitive particles. Typological studies have proposed a classification of these constructions based on the stage at which the situation is averted (i.e. roughly, before taking place, in the beginning or in the final culmination stage see e.g. Kuteva 2000; 2019; Alexandrova 2016). In this study, we focus, i) on two distinct AAs *paraligo* and *shedon* and, ii) on the ALVs *kano na* and *pao na*. In the following subsections, we refer to these strategies in turn.

---

[1] Heritage speakers are often considered bilinguals with 2L1s belonging to the nativeness continuum. However, the level of proficiency in their languages can vary across the lifespan (Benmamoun et al. 2013; Polinsky 2018). We adopt this view in the present study and do not contrast the heritage data to the monolingual ones as a yardstick for accuracy and view the heritage and monolingual populations as belonging to different language varieties, in line with views such as Rothman et al. (2022) and Wiese et al. (2022).

2.1. Approximative adverbials

In Greek, there are two distinct AAs which express approximation: i) the counterfactual *paraligo* (vernacular: *paratrixa*, dialectal: *apoligo*) as in (1a) and, ii) the scalar *shedon* (1b).

1	a.	Paraligo	na skarfaloso	to Everest.
		by-little	SUBJ. climb.1SG	the Everest
		'I almost climbed Mount Everest.'		
		→ The trip was cancelled, I never got near Mount Everest.		

1	b.	Shedon	skarfalosa	to Everest.
		almost	climb.PST.1SG	the Everest
		'I almost climbed Mount Everest.'		

Paraligo is counterfactual, and it can be uttered in a context in which the subject has not started climbing Mount Everest. *Shedon* has a scalar (incomplete, nearly complete) interpretation under which the subject has climbed most but not all of Mount Everest. The two elements differ in their syntax: *paraligo* combines with a *na*-clause with a verb marked for non-past perfective (in certain cases past imperfective as well, see 9a) while *shedon* combines with indicative mood in either perfective or imperfective aspect depending on the interpretation. In Oikonomou et al. (2021) we argue that *paraligo* and *shedon* differ in their interpretation. *Shedon* is analyzed as a scalar VP adverbial which operates on alternatives ranked on a relevant scale (in our case provided by the VP) (Amaral & Del Prete 2010), while *paraligo* is a propositional intensional operator with modal interpretation which states that the prejacent is true in a minimally different world from the evaluation world (Sadock 1981). In English the same lexical item, *almost* can appear in both contexts as suggested by the continuations in (2a, b):

2	I almost climbed Mount Everest.
a.	The trip was cancelled, I never got near Mount Everest.
b.	I was close to its peak when a blizzard started and we had to call for help.

In German the same element, *fast*, can be used in the two different constructions but with different syntax. When it combines with Konjunktiv II as in (3a), a counterfactual interpretation arises, whereas when it combines with Indicative, as in (3b), the scalar interpretation becomes prominent.

3	a.	Fast	wäre	Ich in den Mount Everest	hochgeklettert.
		by-little	SUBJ	I the Mount Everest	climb.1SG
	'I almost climbed Mount Everest.'				
	→ The trip was cancelled, I never got near Mount Everest.				

3	b.	Ich bin in den Mount Everest	fast	hochgeklettert.
		I am in the Everest	almost	climb.PS.1sg
	'I almost climbed Mount Everest.'			
	→ I was close to its peak when a blizzard started and we had to call for help.			

Thus, in Greek there are two different lexical items with distinct meanings and syntax whereas in German there is the same lexical item with different syntax. In English, there is the same lexical item with no apparent difference in their syntax (Amaral & Del Prete 2010).

2.2. Approximative Light Verbs (ALVs)

ALVs as in (4) in Greek, have not received much attention in the literature. According to Stavrakaki (1999) *kano na* expresses "an event initiation with an inference that the event was not realised". [2]

4	Pige	na	Vreksi	ala evgale ilio.
	Go.PFV.PST.3SG	SUBJ	rain.PFV.PST.3SG	but came-out sun
	'It was supposed to rain but the sun came out.'			

We argue that non-realization in the actual world is not just an inference but part of the semantics of ALVs. ALVs syntactically behave like aspectual verbs (e.g. *ksekinao/arhizo* 'start in') exhibiting raising (Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1999)[3]. However, semantically, ALVs differ from aspectual verbs like *ksekinao/ arhizo* 'start'. *Ksekinao/arhizo* encode the initiation of an event but there is no information as to whether the event was completed or not. Thus, the conjunction in (5a) is possible, whereas in (5b) it is not.

[2] The particular verbs *pao/kano* also have a number of different uses as light verbs, which we do not discuss here; see Trigka et al. (2022) for *pao* and Stavrakaki (1999) for *kano*.

[3] Standard tests for control fail in the case of *pao na*, we cannot use *epitides/skopima* modifying the ALV. However, as noted below, there is a difference between pao na and kano na which can be explained if we treat *pao na* as a raising predicate and *kano na* as an obligatory control predicate. Additional evidence comes from the idiom-test, *kano na* cannot have an idiomatic subject, while *pao na* can, e.g. *{Pigan na}/{*Ekanan na} mu bun psili sta aftia* (see Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1999).

5	a.	Arhise	na	vrehi	ke ekane megali kategida.
		start.PVF.PST.3SG SUBJ		rain.IPFV.PRS.3SG and did	big thunder
	'It started to rain and there was a big thunderstorm.'				
	b.	*Pije	na	vreksi	ke ekane megali kategida.
		go.PVF.PST.3SG SUBJ		rain.PFV.PST.3SG and did	big thunder
	'It was going to rain and there was a big thunderstorm.'				

ALVs are also different from a lexical approximative verb like *kontevo* 'came close'. Although their meaning is very similar, there are environments in which *pao* is possible and *kontevo* is not (6) or vice versa (7).

6	a.	Piga	na	se voithiso	ke ta ekana hirotera.
		go.PFV.PST.1SG SUBJ		you help.PFV.PST.1SG	and them did worse
	b.	*Kontepsa	na	se voithiso	ke ta ekana hirotera.
		Come_close.PFV.PST.1SG SUBJ you help.PVF.PST.1SG			and them did worse
	Intended Interpretation: 'I tried to help you and I messed everything up.'				

7	a.	Kontepsa	na	olokliroso	to vapsimo ala kurastika.
		Come-close.PFV.PST.1SG SUBJ finish.PFV.PST.1SG the painting but got_tired.			
	b.	?Piga	na	olokliroso	to vapsimo ala kurastika.
		go.PFV.PST.1SG SUBJ finish.PFV.PST.1SG the painting but got_tired.			
	Intended Interpretation: 'I was close enough to finish painting but I got tired.'				

In terms of the counterfactual vs. scalar distinction that we followed for AAs, *kontevo* is more scalar, whereas *pao na* (and *kano na*) is counterfactual. However, while *paraligo* can be entirely counterfactual in the sense of the (non)-actualization of an event in a possible world, as illustrated by the example in (1a), this is not the case with *pao na,* which is not felicitous in environments in which there is no initiation of the event. The sentence in (8) is infelicitous under the approximative interpretation of *pao na*. It can only be interpreted with the primary meaning of *pao* 'go' which is not counterfactual.

8	#Pija	na	skarfaloso	to Everest.
	go.PFV.PST.1SG	SUBJ. climb.1SG		the Everest
	'I almost climbed Mount Everest.'			
	Intended: The trip was cancelled, I never got near Mount Everest.			

Some initiating eventuality is assumed when *pao na* is used, which is not necessary with *paraligo*. This becomes apparent when *paraligo* combines with a

proposition expressing a state, something which is not possible with *pao na,* as illustrated by the contrast between (9a) and (9b).[4]

9	a.	Paraligo	na	ksaplona	se mia paralia tora
		almost	SUBJ. lie.IMPF.PST.1SG		in a beach now
	'I could be lying in a beach right now.'				

9	b.	*Piga	na	ksaplona	se mia paralia tora
		go.PFV.PST.1SG	SUBJ. lie.IMPF.PST.1SG		in a beach now
	'I could be lying in a beach right now.'				

Thus, the meaning of *pao na* must express both the existence of an initiating eventuality which can lead to the actualization of the prejacent and the non-actualization of the prejacent in the actual world, capturing the differences with the counterfactual approximative *paraligo* and the differences with the aspectual predicates *arhizo/keskino* 'start/begin'. *Pao na*, which is obligatorily in past tense,[5] expresses past circumstantial possibility and non-actuality in the actual world. Under the meaning in (10), *pao na* expresses that there is an eventuality *e* in the actual world, such that in a world w' minimally different from the actual world w, *e* can lead to the actualization of the prejacent proposition, but the prejacent proposition is false in the actual world.[6]

10	$[[pao\ na]]^w = \lambda f<\varepsilon,st>.\ \lambda e.\ \exists w'.\ \exists e'.$ w' is consistent with the circumstances in w & w' is minimally different from w & e leads to e' in w' & f(e',w') =1 & f(e'w) = 0

Under the meaning in (10), we can capture the interpretation of sentences like (4) and (6) suggesting that there was an eventuality (which involves an event or a state) which in a minimally different world than the actual world could lead to the actualization of the prejacent but this didn't happen. Notice that it is still

---

[4] The compatibility of *pao na* with achievements is not so clear. For example, it sounds strange to say *To treno **pige na ftasi** stin ora tu*. 'The train went to arrive on time.' but it is not entirely odd to say *Piga na haso to leoforio* 'I went to miss the bus.'

[5] It can appear in present, but only with a historical present interpretation or describing hypothetical scenarios (e.g. *Fantasu eki pu pao na tin vgalo fotografia, na girisi ke na me kitaksi* 'Imagine the moment I try (ALV) to take a picture of her, she turns and looks at me').

[6] Under this interpretation, we can understand why ALVs resist negation in contrast to aspectual verbs like *arhizo/ksekino* 'begin'. An utterance like '*Telika den pije na vreksi. Ihe enan lambero ilio oli mera'* (Finally it didn't ALV rain. It was sunny all day) is odd compared to the one with *arhizo* 'start' '*Telika den arxhise na vrehi. Ihe enan lambero ilio.*' (Finally, it didn't start raining. It was sunny all day). Negation can be interpreted as metalinguistic in examples with *pao/kano na*. For the example '*Den pige na vreksi. Evrekse*' is fine under a metalinguistic interpretation of the negation.

possible, depending on the aspectual properties of the embedded predicate and the context, to understand an entirely counterfactual interpretation, that the event never took place or a scalar one that it started and stopped at an earlier or later stage. What is negated, is in any case, the actualization of the entire completed event and this is also the case for *paraligo* (see Oikonomou et al. 2022). This similarity between *paraligo* and *pao na* is, on the one hand, welcome, since in many environments the two are interchangeable without a meaning difference. On the other hand, there are many cases in which *pao* creates an inference of intention by the subject, which is absent from *paraligo*. In the following example, both sentences are licit, but *pao* in (11) creates the inference that the subject had a clear intention. However, we think that this interference is not an integral part of the meaning of *pao na* since it can combine with weather verbs (e.g. 4) or unaccusatives (e.g. 12c)

11	{Pije na}/#{paraligo} mu tin pi ala to metaniose.
	'He was about to backtalk to me but he regretted it.'

Thus, we consider intentionality an inference created in the presence of a volitional agent. In relation to intentionality, *kano na*, seems to have a greater degree of intention. While the two ALVs are interchangeable when there is a volitional agent as in (12a), *kano na*, unlike *pao na*, is not so felicitous with non-agentive (12b) or unaccusative verbs (12c).

12	a. Pija /Ekana na	fonakso, ala to metaniosa.
	Go.PST.1SG/ Do.PST.1SG SUBJ	shout.1SG, but it regretted.1SG
	'I would almost shout but I regretted it.'	
	b. Pija /#Ekana na	trakaro, ala teleftea stigmi frenara.
	Go.PST.1SG/ Do.PST.1SG SUBJ	crash.1sg but last moment brake.PST.1sg
	'I would almost crash but at the last moment I braked.'	
	c. Pije /#Ekane na	kai olo to dasos.
	go.PS.3SG / do.PS.3SG SUBJ	burn.3SG all the forest
	'It looked like it would rain, but it didn't rain.'	

One possibility is that intentionality is part of the meaning of *kano na*. We can capture this difference by proposing an enriched meaning compared to the interpretation of *pao na* in (10), under which there is an agent involved in *kano na*. Thus, we assume that *kano* is agentive, i.e. takes an external argument controlling the embedded subject (obligatory control). In this way, we could explain why (12b, c) is not felicitous with *kano na*.[7]

---

[7] Notice that '*ekane na vreksi'(it ALV to rain)* is not so bad. However, it is also possible to say

Comparing *paraligo* with *pao* and *pao* with *kano*, we observe different grades of intentionality. It is possible that intentionality is associated with the original interpretation of *pao* as a motion verb and *kano* as an activity verb.

Unlike AAs, *pao na/kano na* do not have an equivalent with a light verb in German or English. Notice that in some of the contexts it is possible to translate *pao na* with 'went to' but not with an approximative meaning. Instead, other constructions like 'be about to/going to/try/dabei sein zu' can be used.

3. APPROXIMATIVES IN HERITAGE AND MONOLINGUAL VARIETIES OF GREEK

Based on the theoretical discussion, a variety of questions emerges regarding the grammar of the heritage and monolingual speakers in the domain of ACs. Our study is based on an elicitation task which did not target specifically ACs and thus, our research focuses on whether the instances of AAs and ALVs and their distribution are analogous for the different populations and across the different modalities.

3.1. Research questions and hypotheses

First, we investigate whether there is a divergence between the grammar of the two heritage groups and the grammar of monolingual controls in the domain of ACs. According to the Interface Hypothesis (Tsimpli & Sorace 2006; Sorace 2011, a.o.) properties at the interface between grammar and external domains are likely to be more vulnerable. ACs lie in the interface of syntax, semantics and pragmatics, in the sense that the counterfactuality and scalar interpretation interacts with their morphosyntax (subjunctive/indicative) and the lexical aspect of the predicate, as noted in Section 2. Thus, we expect that the distinction between the interpretations of ACs and the mapping of syntax-semantics might be vulnerable in heritage grammars.

A second question is whether cross-linguistic differences play a role in the acquisition of ACs (Language Transfer Hypothesis). In German, similar to Greek AAs, the approximative *fast* has different syntax depending on the interpretation, while in English, the adverbial *almost* can get different interpretations albeit the same surface syntax. ALVs are not available in either of the two dominant languages.

Finally, our study also explores the role of register and mode variation in the choice of ACs in monolingual and/or heritage groups (Wiese 2020). Given that light verbs are generally preferred in informal settings (Alexiadou & Rizou 2023), we expect the ALVs to be more common in informal/spoken varieties.

'ekane na vreksi ala to metaniose'(it ALV to rain, but he regretted) , suggesting that in this case an agentive interpretation is at stake, in which the agent is perhaps the nature.

3.2. Task and participants

Our methodology involves elicitation based on a short video (00:42 minutes) of a fictional event which was shown to every participant. A non-severe car accident occurred in a parking lot, and the task was to retell what happened to different people imagining that they witnessed the incident. They had to produce both an oral and a written narration in two levels of formality in distinct communication settings (Wiese 2020). HSs narrated the event in both their heritage and their majority language in two different elicitation sessions, while monolingual participants took part only once. Different elicitation combinations were created to avoid bias our participants; see elicitation orders in Oikonomou et al. (2021).

The data come from an elicitation study of HSs of Greek in the US (HSs-US) and in Germany (HSs-DE) in comparison to monolingual controls (GR Monolinguals). Table 1 shows their metalinguistic data.

	GR Monolinguals		HSs-DE		HSs-US	
Age Group	Adults	Adolescents	Adults	Adolescents	Adults	Adolescents
N	32 (16F)	32 (16F)	27 (17F)	21 (7F)	31 (18F)	32 (16F)
Mean Age	27;6 (24-35) SD 3.003	15;3 (13-18) SD 1.755	28;5 (21-36) SD 4.108	16;3 (14-19) SD 3.224	29;9 (24-35) SD 3.224	16;2 (14-18) SD 1.408
Mean Onset Age	-	-	2;3 (0-8) SD 2.4.03	1;3 (0-4) SD 0.865	1;7 (0-6) SD 2.175	1;0 (0-5) SD 1.692
Self-ratings in GR	4.8 (3.25-5) SD 0.353	4.8 (3.75-5) SD 0.269	3.9 (2.5-5) SD 0.853	4.2 (2.25-5) SD 0.865	3.8 (1.75-5) SD 0.973	3.3 (2-5) SD 0.844
Self-ratings in ML	-	-	4.9 (4-5) SD .218	4.6 (.491) SD .419	4.9 (4.7-5) SD .045	4.8 (4-5) SD .282
Years of education in Greek	-	-	6 (0-12) SD 4.350	8;5 (3-12) SD 2.673	7;7 (0-12) SD 4.266	10;4 (8-12) SD 1.319
Hours of education in Greek	-	-	5078 (0-12480) SD 4865.710	6884 (312-12480) SD 4262.286	1616 (0-3120) SD 981.326	2671 (0-3120) SD 355.319

Table 1. Participants

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section the results of the two approximative strategies are presented in turn.

4.1. Approximative adverbials

As shown in Table 2, the countrerfactual adverbial *paraligo* is produced more often in the narrations across groups, compared to the scalar adverbial *shedon* which is produced by 2 monolingual speakers.

Within the US-HSs group, we notice that *paraligo* constructions are quantitatively more than *paraligo* productions in monolinguals' narrations. In HSs-DE we found only one instance.

	GR Monolinguals		HSs-DE		HSs-US	
Age group	Adults	Adolescents	Adults	Adolescents	Adults	Adolescents
Paraligo	8 (6)	2 (1)	0	1 (1)	17 (7)	6 (2)
Shedon	0	0	0	1 (1)	0	0
Shedon + QP/ AdvP	3 (2)	0	0	1 (1)	0	0

Table 2. Distribution of *paraligo* and *shedon* constructions across groups and age groups

In general, HSs correctly use *paraligo* in counterfactual environments with subjunctive mood. *Shedon* is absent due to the lack of scalar environments. Participants' production favored *paraligo* constructions, as the events presented in the video did not indicate any scalability. *Paraligo* was combined with telic events and mainly with the verb class of achievements as in (13).

13	Paraligo na skodapso.
	'I was about to stumble.'

Regarding the extra-linguistic factor of register variation, we observe that monolinguals use *paraligo* primarily in the informal setting, as shown in Table 3. US-HSs do not differentiate their narrations depending on the setting (see also Alexiadou & Rizou 2023).

Age group	GR Monolinguals		HSs-DE		HSs-US	
	Adults	Adolescents	Adults	Adolescents	Adults	Adolescents
Formal spoken	0	1	0	0	3	1
Formal written	0	0	0	1	4	1
Informal spoken	3	1	0	0	7	2
Informal written	5	0	0	0	3	2

Table 3. Distribution of *paraligo* per settings and modalities across language and age groups

We also looked at the HSs' narration in English and German. We found 26 instances of *almost* and 8 instances of *fast* in speakers' narration in their dominant languages. In many cases, the instances of *almost* are directly mapped to the instances of *paraligo,* as shown in example (14) below.

14	a.	This lady's dog almost got run over.
	b.	Paraligo na skotosun ena skilaki ston dromo.
		By-little SUBJ kill.3PL a dog in the street.
		'They almost killed a dog in the street.'

Given the few, but grammatical instances of *paraligo* and *shedon*, we cannot make any strong claims regarding the acquisition of AAs from the narration tasks (Polinsky 2018). In order to further investigate the acquisition of these constructions, Oikonomou et al. (2022) conducted a targeted evaluation task of AAs in the three groups. They provide evidence that, indeed, HSs-US and HSs-DE have acquired the differences between the two AAs, namely both the interpretation and the structure with the expected mood. Taken together, the data of both studies converge on the hypothesis that the two groups have acquired the semantic and the syntactic distinction between the two AAs, thus not confirming the IH.

4.2. Approximative light verbs

Pao na is widely used by both monolinguals and HSs (Table 4). For *kano na* we found one instance in mononlinguals and two instances in HSs-US. We see a clear effect of modality/register for monolinguals but not for HSs patterning with the observation in Alexiadou and Rizou (2023) for LVCs.

Pao na	Monolinguals	HSs-DE	HSs-US
Formal spoken	19	15	16
Formal written	8	8	10
Informal spoken	23	15	21
Informal written	23	11	10
Total instances	73	49	57

Table 4. Distribution of *pao na* per settings and modalities across language and age groups

While some environments are ambiguous between a motion and an approximative interpretation (i.e. *pije na voithisi me ta psonia* 'He went to help with the shopping bags'), there are clear instances in which *pao na* is used by HSs as approximative as in (15-16), suggesting that HSs have acquired this special interpretation (notice their corresponding narrations in the translations).

15	HS-US informal spoken
	a. Ke pige na ormisi to skili na piasi ti bala
	'and the dog was about to rush and catch the ball'
	b. mia alli ikogenia pige na pidiksi mesa sto dromo
	'another family was about to jump on the street'

16	HS-DE formal spoken
	a. Ke o skilos pige na figi pros t aftokinita
	'and the dog almost left towards the cars'
	b. Blepontas afto pai na ormiksi gabgisontas
	'seeing this he was ready to rush barking'

Given the limitation of the data, we cannot investigate whether heritage and monolingual groups behave differently in terms of subtler differences between the ALVs and AAs presented in Section 2.

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS AND OPEN QUESTIONS

The goal of the paper was, on the one hand, to provide a first description and analysis of AAs and ALVs in Greek and, on the other hand, based on the data from the elicitation task, to investigate whether there are performance differences between the three target groups (monolinguals, HSs-US and HSs-DE). For AAs, a targeted experimental study by Oikonomou et al. (2022) is in line with our findings that HSs semantically and syntactically distinguish the two adverbials. An additional possibility, not investigated, is *paraligo* combining with the particle *tha* 'would' (e.g. *paraligo tha epefta* 'I would almost fall.'). We did not find instances

in our data, and thus, it remains an open question whether HSs have acquired this construction.

For ALVs, *pao na* and *kano na*, we only have evidence for *pao na*, which is attested in both heritage groups, with an approximative interpretation. Further questions emerge from our theoretical analysis which require targeted investigation. It remains an open question whether HSs have an approximative interpretation of *kano na*, and if so, whether they find a difference with *pao na* in terms of intentionality. Furthermore, it would be interesting to test interpretation differences between ALVs, AAs and aspectual verbs like *arhizo*, *kontevo* in different language varieties and modalities.

Finally, a cross-linguistic semantic comparison of approximative constructions used in similar contexts (e.g. *going to/ dabei sein*) might be revealing regarding general properties of approximation in natural language. Overall, the domain of approximation offers itself for testing the interface of syntax, semantics, and pragmatics comparing different constructions with similar functions across different language varieties.

REFERENCES

Alexandrova 2016: A. Alexandrova, *Avertive constructions in Europe and North Asia: An areal typology*. In *Chronos 12 - 12th International Conference on Actionality, Tense, Aspect, Modality/Evidentiality.* Université Caen-Normandie.

Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1999: A. Alexiadou, E. Anagnostopoulou, Raising without infinitives and the nature of agreement. In S. Bird, A. Carnie, J. D. Haugen & Peter Norquest (eds.), *Proceedings of Proceedings of the 18th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics (WCCFL 18).* University of Arizona.

Alexiadou & Rizou 2023: A. Alexiadou & V. Rizou. The use of periphrasis for the expression of aspect by Greek heritage speakers. A case study of register variation narrowing. *Register Studies, 5*(1), 81-109.

Amaral & Del Prete 2010: P. Amaral, F. Del Prete, Approximating the limit: the interaction between quasi 'almost' and some temporal connectives in italian. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, *33*, 51–115.

Benmamoun, Montrul & Polinsky 2013: E. Benmamoun, S. Montrul, M. Polinsky, Heritage languages and their speakers: Opportunities andschallenges for linguistics. *Theoretical linguistics*, *39*(3 – 4), 129–181.

Caudal 2022: P. Caudal, Avertive/ frustrative markers in Australian languages: blurring the boundaries between aspectuo-temporal and modal meanings. In K. M. Jaszczolt (ed.) *Understanding Human Time*. *Oxford Studies of Time in Language and Thought* (pp. 107 – 174). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Guijarro-Fuentes & Schmitz 2015: P. Guijarro-Fuentes, K. Schmitz, The nature and nurture of heritage language acquisition. *Lingua*, *164*, 239–250.

Kuteva 2000: T. Kuteva, TAM-auxilation, and the avertive category in Northeast Europe. In J. Fernandez - Vest (ed.), *Areal grammaticalization* (178 – 191). Louvain-Paris: Peeters.

Kuteva, Aarts, Popova & Abbi 2019: T. Kuteva, B. Aarts, G. Popova, A. Abbi, The grammar of 'non- realization'. *Studies in Language*, *43*(4), 850 – 895.

Montrul 2015: S. Montrul, *The acquisition of heritage languages*. Cambridge University Press.

Oikonomou, Rizou, Bondarenko, Özsoy & Alexiadou 2022: D. Oikonomou, V. Rizou, D. Bondarenko, O. Özsoy, A. Alexiadou, Scalar and Counterfactual Approximatives: Investigating Heritage Greek in the USA and Germany. *Languages*, *7*(1), 11.

Polinsky 2018: M. Polinsky, *Heritage Languages and Their Speakers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rothman, Bayram, DeLuca, Di Pisa, Dunabeita, Gharibi, Hao, Kolb, Kubota, Kupisch et al. 2022: J. Rothman, F. Bayram, V. DeLuca, G. Di Pisa, J. A. Dunabeita, K. Gharibi, J. Hao, N. Kolb, M. Kubota, T. Kupisch et al., Monolingual comparative normativity in bilingualism research is out of "control": Arguments and alternatives. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, *44*(3), 316–329.

Sadock 1981: J. Sadock, Almost. *Radical pragmatics*, 257–71.

Sorace 2011: A. Sorace, Pinning down the concept of "interface" in bilingualism. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism*, *1*, 1–33.

Stavrakaki 1999: S. Stavrakaki, KANO: The case of a light berb in Modern Greek. In S. Lambropoulou, *Proceedings of the 12th International Symposium of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics* (pp. 171 – 185). Thessaloniki: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.

Trigka, Vardakis & Markopoulos 2022: A. Trigka, G. Vardakis, T. Markopoulos, *Morphological specialization in the verbal domain as a result of grammaticalization in Modern Greek and Romance: the case of πηγαίνω/ πάω*. In ICGL15. Belgrade.

Tsimpli & Sorace 2006: I. M. Tsimpli, A. Sorace, Differentiating interfaces: L2 performance in syntax-semantics and syntax-discourse phenomena. In D. Bamman, T. Magnitskaia & C. Zaller (eds.), *Proceedings of the 30th Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development* (pp. 653 – 664). Boston: Cascadilla Press.

Wiese 2020: H. Wiese, Language situations: A method for capturing variation within speakers' repertoires. *Methods in dialectology* XVI, *59*, 105–117.

Wiese, Alexiadou, Allen, Bunk, Gagarina, Iefremenko, Martynova, Pashkova, Rizou, Schröder et al. 2022: H. Wiese, A. Alexiadou, S. Allen, O. Bunk, N. Gagarina, K. Iefremenko, M. Martynova, T. Pashkova, V. Rizou, C. Schröder

et al., Heritage speakers as part of the native language continuum. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5982.

Δέσποινα Οικονόμου
Πανεπιστήμιο Κρήτης, Τμήμα Φιλολογίας

Βασιλική Ρίζου
Πανεπιστήμιο Βερολίνου Humboldt, Τμήμα Γερμανικών Σπουδών και Γλωσσολογίας

Νικόλαος Τσόκανος
Πανεπιστήμιο Βερολίνου Humboldt, Τμήμα Αγγλικών και Αμερικανικών Σπουδών

Άρτεμις Αλεξιάδου
Κέντρο Γενικής Γλωσσολογίας Leibniz & Πανεπιστήμιο Βερολίνου Humboldt, Τμήμα Γερμανικών Σπουδών και Γλωσσολογίας

ΠΩΣ ΕΚΦΡΑΖΟΥΜΕ ΤΙ ΔΕΝ ΣΥΝΕΒΗ ΤΕΛΙΚΑ: ΣΥΓΚΛΙΣΗ ΑΝΑΜΕΣΑ ΣΕ ΟΜΙΛΗΤΕΣ ΤΗΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ ΩΣ ΓΛΩΣΣΑ ΠΟΛΙΤΙΣΜΙΚΗΣ ΚΛΗΡΟΝΟΜΙΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΣΕ ΜΟΝΟΓΛΩΣΣΟΥΣ ΟΜΙΛΗΤΕΣ ΤΗΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ

Περίληψη

Η έρευνα αυτή μελετά δομές που εκφράζουν ότι ένα γεγονός δεν έλαβε χώρα ή δεν ολοκληρώθηκε. Συγκεκριμένα εστιάζουμε σε δύο δομές: α) προσεγγιστικά επιρρήματα (σχεδόν, παραλίγο) και β) περιφραστικές δομές με τα ελαφριά ρήματα (light verbs) *πάω να* και *κάνω να*. Ο σκοπός της μελέτης είναι διττός. Πρώτα παρουσιάζουμε τις συντακτικές και σημασιολογικές ιδιότητες αυτών των δομών και στη συνέχεια παρουσιάζουμε τα σχετικά δεδομένα από μία μελέτη τόσο σε μονόγλωσσους ομιλητές της ελληνικής όσο και σε ομιλητές της ελληνικής ως γλώσσα πολιτισμικής κληρονομιάς που μένουν στη Γερμανία και στις ΗΠΑ. Οι ομάδες ομιλητών της ελληνικής είτε ως πρώτη γλώσσα είτε ως γλώσσα πολιτισμικής κληρονομιάς έλαβαν μέρος σε μια έρευνα παραγωγής λόγου και δεν βρήκαμε ενδείξεις ότι διαφέρουν μεταξύ τους ως προς τη χρήση των παραπάνω δομών συντακτικά ή σημασιοσολογικά παρά μόνο αποκλίνουν ως προς το εύρος της παραγωγής των δομών αυτών και την περίσταση επικοινωνίας (γραπτός/ προφορικός λόγος, επίσημο/ ανεπίσημο ύφος). Με βάση τα δεδομένα μας φαίνεται πώς υπάρχει μία τάση οι ομιλητές της ελληνικής ως γλώσσα πολιτισμικής κληρονομιάς να γενικεύουν τη χρήση των δομών με ελαφριά ρήματα στις διάφορες περιστάσεις επικοινωνίας ενώ οι μονόγλωσσοι ομιλητές προτιμούν τη χρήση τους σε ανεπίσημες και προφορικές περιστάσεις επικοινωνίας.

Λέξεις-κλειδιά: διγλωσσία, γλώσσα πολιτιστικής κληρονομιάς, Ελληνικά, προσεγγιστικά ρήματα και επιρρήματα