THE GREEK FORMS IN –ONTAS:
A STUDY IN 'CONVERBIALITY', TEMPORALITY,
ASPECTUALITY AND FINITENESS*

AMALIA MOSER

This article argues that the forms in –*ontas*, labeled *participles* or *gerunds* in the literature are in reality *verbal adverbs* or *converbs*. This hypothesis is tested on the basis of the cross-linguistic criteria proposed in Haspelmath & König (eds., 1995). Special emphasis is placed on finiteness, which creates problems for these forms if defined in terms of agreement and tense/aspect specification. It is shown that the forms are specified for both aspect and relative tense, but it is argued that this does not prevent them from being non-finite; on a scale of finiteness they would in fact be placed at a rather low point both within Greek and cross-linguistically and this not only allows them to be categorized as converbs, given that they meet all the other criteria, but places them among the prototypical exponents of the category.

1. Introduction

The form in -*ontas* is the only entirely uninflected form in the Modern Greek verbal system; it is formed by the present, i.e. imperfective, stem only of active voice verbs:[1]

τρέχ -*ω* 'run'	>	*τρέχ* -*οντας*
trex -o	>	tréx -ontas
περν -*ώ/-άω* 'pass'	>	*περν* -*ώντας*
pern -o	>	pern -ontas[2]

---

* Warmest thanks are due to my colleagues Dimitra Theophanopoulou-Kontou, Despina Chila-Markopoulou and Pepy Bella for their very helpful comments at various stages of this research.

1. This is a purely morphological restriction; the "diathesis" of the verb, i.e. its semantic nature as active, passive etc. is of no consequence for the existence of the form in question.

2. I will use the transcription -*ontas,* essentially phonemic in character, as the /t/ in the cluster ντ is always voiced, the whole cluster acquiring the pronunciation [nd] or [d].

The fact alone that it is limited to the active voice makes it an anomaly in the Greek system, which otherwise displays a remarkable symmetry of the two voices. The parallel existence of a periphrastic form, consisting of the *-ontas* form of the auxiliary *exo* 'have' and the uninflected form used for the formation of the perfect,[3] complicates the picture, as it is available for both voices:

κουράζω 'tire' >   έχοντας κουράσει   έχοντας κουραστεί
kurazo   exontas kurasi   exontas kurasti

The traditional label for the simple *–ontas* form, preserved in several contemporary works, is *present participle*; there are a number of objections against the use of this term, as there are for the recently introduced term *gerund*. The term *verbal adverb*, proposed in Moser (2001), suggests that the form in *-ontas* belongs to the cross-linguistic category of *"converbs"* as defined by Nedjalkov & Nedjalkov (1987) and Haspelmath (1995).

The aim of the paper is to test this hypothesis, with special emphasis on issues of finiteness; more particularly, after a short discussion of agreement, it will focus on the relationship of the forms in *–ontas* with time, both as tense and aspect, on the role these categories play for the categorization of the forms as converbs and finally on their general significance for finiteness.

2. Why the forms in –ontas are not participles or gerunds

The confusion of converbs on the one hand and participles and gerunds on the other is by no means unique to Greek; not only are converbs often descended from one of the other two categories, but the three share important characteristics: they include features both of the verb and of other grammatical categories, namely adjectives, nouns and adverbs. Haspelmath (1995) defines them as the three derived verb forms which share the common property of being used in non-prototypically verbal syntactic functions; each of these belongs to a different word-class as shown in the table below (ibid., p. 4):

Word class	noun	adjective	adverb
Derived verb-form	masdar	participle	converb
	(=verbal noun)	(=verbal adjective)	(=verbal adverb)
Syntactic function	argument	adnominal modifier	adverbial modifier

This section focuses on the facts that exclude the forms in *–ontas* from member-

---

3. This is a fossilized form of the ancient aorist infinitive, variously known as 'perfect formant' (Mackridge 1985: 118), 'aorist participle' (Hesse 1980: 43) etc.

ship of the two other categories. The most striking of these is the lack of the morphological features that are associated with both nouns and adjectives in Greek, namely case, number and gender. Their meaning and use also places them outside the other categories, since they are exclusively adverbial, expressing several circumstantial relations (manner, time, cause etc.) as shown in examples (1)-(3):

1. Έκανε φοβερό θόρυβο μετακινώντας τα έπιπλα.
   ekane fovero θorivo metakinontas ta epipla.
   (S)he made a terrible noise moving the furniture around.
2. Σιδέρωνε τραγουδώντας.
   siδerone trayuδontas
   (S)he ironed singing.
3. Έχοντας ταχτοποιήσει τις δουλειές του έφυγε για διακοπές.
   exontas taxtopiisi tis δulies tu efige gia δiakopes.
   Having sorted out his business he went on holiday.

The issue is somewhat confused by the fact that nouns and adjectives can be used adverbially and the same is true about their verbal counterparts; the crucial point, however, is that the forms in –*ontas* can only be used adverbially and never as adjectives or nouns, as is shown in the following paragraphs (see also Tzartzanos 1945/1989: 336, Λ210).

2.1. Participiality

The traditional label of *present participle* is still used widely,[4] no doubt due to the fact that the form is descended from the ancient active present participle in -*on*, -*ousa*, -*on*;[5] it is, however, misleading since it can never function as an adjective. This limitation brings it into sharp contrast with the other surviving participle of Greek, the perfect participle in -*menos*, which has predominantly adjectival functions, either predicative (4) or attributive (5):

4. Οι υπάλληλοι ήταν πολύ δυσαρεστημένοι από/*διαφωνώντας με τη διοίκηση.
   i ipalili itan poli δisarestimeni από ti δiikisi
   The employees were very dissatisfied with the management.

---

4. See e.g. Triantaphyllides (1941), Tzartzanos (1946), Bouboulides (1946), Tsopanakis (1994), Joseph & Philippaki-Warburton (1987), where it alternates with *gerund*, Clairis & Babiniotis (2005), Nakas (1985); the latter is the only one who mentions the rival term *gerund*, arguing against it.
5. For a detailed analysis of the history of the forms see Manolessou (2005).

5. Οι δυσαρεστημένοι / *οι διαφωνώντας υπάλληλοι κατέβηκαν σε απεργία.
   i ðisarestimeni ipalili katevikan se aperɣia
   The dissatisfied employees went on strike.

All instances of adverbial uses of the participle in *–menos* are compatible with its adjectival nature: it is either what is sometimes called an 'adverbial predicator' (6), or head of a phrase which functions in a way similar to that of an adverbial clause (indicating cause, manner etc.) without markers or finite verbs (7); both of these uses fall under the label of 'copredicative participle' (cf. Haspelmath 1995: 17-20) and their function can of course be performed equally well by *-ontas*:

6. Οι υπάλληλοι αποχώρησαν δυσαρεστημένοι/διαφωνώντας.
   i ipalili apoxorisan ðisarestimeni/ðiafonontas
   'The employees departed in a dissatisfied mood/disagreeing'.

7. Δυσαρεστημένοι από / διαφωνώντας με τη διοίκηση, οι υπάλληλοι κατέβηκαν σε απεργία.
   ðisarestimeni apo / ðiafonontas me ti ðiikisi, i ipalili katevikan se aperɣia
   'Dissatisfied/disagreeing with the management, the employees went on strike'.

The marginally preserved medio-passive present participle in *–ómenos –i –o*, used mainly in more or less formal or learned contexts and predominantly with deponent verbs, has mostly adverbial functions (8), but it does not exclude adjectival ones, always attributive and never predicative (9):

8. Φοβούμενος/προβλέποντας ότι θα έπιανε βροχή βιάστηκε να γυρίσει στο σπίτι.
   fovumenos/provlepontas oti θa epiane vroxi viastike na ɣirisi sto spiti
   'Fearing/foreseeing that it would start raining, he hastened home'.

9. Το διαμαρτυρόμενο/*το αντιδρώντας πλήθος γινόταν όλο και πιο απειλητικό.
   to ðiamartiromeno / to antiðrontas pliθos ɣinotan olo ke pio apilitiko
   'The protesting / reacting crowd was getting more and more threatening'.

In addition to this, both the *–menos* and the *–omenos* participle can be nominalized (οι πεφωτισμένοι-i pefotismenoi-Illuminati – οι Διαμαρτυρόμενοι-I ðiamartiromeni-Protestants), an option not available to the *–ontas* forms.

2.2. Gerundivity

The term *gerund* has been used extensively in the recent bibliography, in re-

sponse, no doubt, to the need to distinguish the forms in *–ontas* from the other descendants of participles.[6] It is, however, even less appropriate than *participle*, given that it has none of the features associated with nouns; as pointed out by Tsimpli (2000: 134), it is disallowed in argument positions, a fact shown by the ungrammaticality of (10)-(12):

10. **(Το) ψηφίζοντας μικρά κόμματα βοηθάει τη δημοκρατία.*
    (to) psifizontas mikra komata voiθai ti δimokratia
    'Voting for small parties helps democracy'.
11. **Αντιπαθώ (το) πηγαίνοντας για ψώνια.*
    antipaθo (to) piγenontas γia psonia
    'I hate going shopping'.
12. **Θυμάμαι το Γιάννη οδηγώντας.*[7]
    θimame to γiani oδiγontas
    'I remember Yannis driving'.

"Nounhood" is an essential feature of gerunds, often described as "verbal nouns", starting with Latin (cf. e.g. Buck 1933: 310, Sihler 1995: 626) and reaching down to the modern languages. It was no doubt the fact that certain uses of the Greek form correspond to certain uses of the *-ing* form in English and the so-called gerunds of the Romance Languages, exemplified in (13) that led to the adoption of the term for Greek:

13. *Παρακολουθώντας τον μεγαλύτερο αδερφό μου έμαθα να κολυμπάω.*
    parakoluθontas ton meγalitero aδerfo mu emaθa na kolimbao.
    Mirando a mi hermano, aprendi a nadar.
    Watching my older brother, I learned to swim.

The English *-ing* form does possess gerundial features, since it has uses corresponding to those of an adjective and others corresponding to those of a noun; even in the case of English, however, a clear distinction is often drawn between the two types of uses, both in traditional and more modern analyses, the term *gerund* in these cases being reserved for the form when used as a noun.[8] Even the Romance forms, though by no means verbal nouns, retain some traces of their erstwhile nominal nature in forming periphrases such as the Spanish *estar cantan-*

---

6. See e.g. Tsoulas (1996), Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-Warburton (1997), Tsimpli (2000), Sitaridou & Haidou (2002), Manolessou (2005).
7. Where *oδiγontas* is coreferential with *Yannis*. Bouboulides (1946) is the only scholar who admits such uses, while Nakas (1985: 138 ff.) rightly points out that they are exclusive to literature, and a very small number of authors at that.
8. Cf. e.g. Trask (1993), Matthews (1981), Richards, Platt & Platt (1992), Miller (2002).

do,[9] and the use of the term is sanctioned anyway by their descent from the Latin gerund, in the same way that the term 'participle' derives some validity through the history of the *–ontas* forms. Greek has no such claims on the term: historically it never possessed a gerund and the similarity of its use to that of the Romance forms is no adequate reason for the adoption of an essentially misleading term.

3. The forms as "converbs"

The data presented so far shows that the Greek *-ontas* form has exclusively adverbial functions; it remains to be seen whether it can indeed be categorized as a *verbal adverb* or *converb*.

Haspelmath (1995: 1) defines a converb (ibid., p. 3) as "*a non-finite verb form whose main function is to mark adverbial subordination*. Another way of putting it is that converbs are verbal adverbs". Interestingly, although the *–ontas* forms have never been systematically studied in this light, they appear as his first example of typical converbs.

The *–ontas* forms satisfy most of the requirements set by this definition: they are derived from all verbs with active morphology, they have exclusively adverbial functions and they cannot appear in independent clauses, hence they clearly mark subordination; in any case they meet all the specific criteria for subordination posited by Haspelmath (ibid., 12-16):

a) clause-internal word order (the subordinate clause can be embedded in a way that makes the superordinate clause discontinuous)

14a. *Ο Νίκος (λέγοντας ανέκδοτα) διασκέδασε (λέγοντας ανέκδοτα) τους φίλους μας.*
 o nikos *(leγontas anekδota)* δiaskeδase *(leγontas anekδota)* tus filus mas
 'Nikos entertained our friends telling jokes'.

b) variable position in respect to the superordinate verb

14b. *(λέγοντας ανέκδοτα) ο Νίκος διασκέδασε τους φίλους μας (λέγοντας ανέκδοτα).*
 (leγontas anekδota) o nikos δiaskeδase tus filus mas *(leγontas anekδota)*
 'Nikos entertained our friends telling jokes'.

---

9. Interestingly, while a similar periphrasis emerged and came to be used extensively in the Hellenistic era, when the ancestor of the *–ontas* forms was still a fully inflected participle, it disappeared completely later on.

c) backwards pronominal anaphora

14c. *λέγοντάς τους; ανέκδοτα ο Νίκος διασκέδασε [τους φίλους μας];*
       leγontas tus; anekδota o nikos δiaskeδase tus filus mas
       'Telling them; jokes, Nikos entertained our friends;'.

d) restrictiveness and focusability

14d. *λέγοντας ανέκδοτα θα καταφέρει ο Νίκος να διασκεδάσει τους φίλους μας;*
       leγontas anekδota θa kataferei o nikos na δiaskeδasi tus filus mas?
       'Telling jokes, will Nikos manage to entertain our friends?'

e) possibility of extraction

14e. *ποιους διασκέδασε ο Νίκος λέγοντας ανέκδοτα;*
       pius δiaskeδase o nikos leγontas anekδota?
       'whom did Nikos entertain telling jokes?'

The only point about which there is any doubt is non-finiteness, which is the most problematic part of the definition given above: on the one hand there is no agreement on the nature of the concept and on the other hand, according to some analyses (e.g. Nedjalkov 1995), it is not a necessary condition for converbiality. Given that the essentially prototypical approach adopted by Haspelmath does not demand the satisfaction of all criteria, its presence or absence is not critical for the categorization of the forms as converbs; nevertheless, the issue of finiteness is interesting in itself, and the remainder of this paper will explore it in some detail.

4. *–ontas* and finiteness

The most widely acceptable view of finiteness is that it is a property of verb forms which require person and number agreement and which are specified for at least tense (and possibly aspect and mood); it is alternatively defined as the property of verb forms which can be used in independent sentences and it is sometimes seen as a continuum or a *scale of desententialization* (Lehmann 1988: 2000).

There is no doubt that the *–ontas* forms cannot be used in independent sentences, but it is questionable whether they fulfil the more specific criterion of agreement and possibly that of tense/ aspect/ mood specification; these issues will be explored more fully below.

4.1   -*ontas* and agreement

The non-finiteness of the –*ontas* forms seems *prima facie* unchallengeable, given that they are the only verb forms in Greek not only without either person and number or gender, case and number agreement, but also without inflection. It appears, however, that for a number of speakers certain agreement requirements do exist; these speakers demand coreferentiality of the covert subject with the subject of the matrix verb and, for them, sentences of the type in (15) are unacceptable:

15. ?*Βγαίνοντας ο Νίκος από το μαγαζί άρχισε να χιονίζει.*
    vɣenontas o nikos apo to maɣazi arxise na xionizi
    'As Nikos came out of the shop, it started snowing'.

The acceptable way of expressing the meaning implicit in (15) would be something in the lines of (16) i.e. sentences with an adverbial in the form of a dependent temporal clause:

16. *Μόλις/με το που/όταν βγήκε ο Νίκος από το μαγαζί άρχισε να χιονίζει.*
    molis/me to pu/otan vɣike o nikos apo to maɣazi arxise na xionizi
    'As soon as Nikos came out of the shop, it started snowing'.

It should be noted, however, that there is another group of speakers for whom sentences like the one in (15) are perfectly acceptable. The absence of statistical data means that the extent of acceptability is at the moment indeterminate. Interestingly, a comparison between contemporary and older grammatical descriptions suggests that non-coreferential uses were more acceptable in the past. Tzartzanos, for instance (1946/1989: 333-336), gives the absolute use of -*ontas* as an alternative, quoting several examples, though at the same time noting not only that it is more frequent with impersonal verbs such as *ksimeroni* 'the day breaks' or *nixtoni* 'the night falls', but also that, with the exception of the aforementioned verbs, it is unusual outside poetry. The examples he quotes (e.g. 17) sound rather odd to the present-day speaker:

17. *Ανοίγοντας η πόρτα χρυσάφι χύθηκε στο σανιδένιο πάτωμα ο ήλιος.*
    aniɣontas i porta xrisafi xiθike sto saniδenio patoma o ilios
    'As the door opened, the sun poured in like gold onto the plank floor'.
    <div align="right">Drosinis, *"Ersi"*, 1929</div>

If there was indeed a more pronounced tendency towards stronger adverbialization at the time, it would seem that it has become less acceptable in the intervening years (see also Nakas 1985: 139), its use probably curbed by both normative language teaching and the wish of native speakers -particularly pronounced

in the Greek linguistic community- to speak 'correctly'. The continued instances of uses of the *-ontas* form with a subject other than that of the main verb indicate that the tendency still exists; Tsimpli (2000: 148-160), for instance, quotes several examples, which she has checked with a small sample of speakers. The fact that such uses exist at all, regardless of the extent of their acceptability, argues strongly for the non-finiteness of the forms and hence for its analysis as a converb.

4.2 *-ontas* and time

The strict view of non-finiteness demands the lack of specification at least of tense and usually of aspect. Tsimpli (2000) is the only contemporary analyst who seems to adopt such a view of the forms in question, since she sees them as capable of expressing both simultaneity and anteriority, as well as perfectivity and imperfectivity. While this is theoretically the most satisfactory solution, both the morphology of the forms (present stem, i.e. imperfective) and their meaning (they always denote an event in some temporal relationship with that of the matrix clause) pose serious doubts. Most of the other analyses accept that the simple form denotes simultaneity and the periphrastic one anteriority, but there are a few that explain this opposition in terms of aspectuality.

4.2.1 *-ontas* and tense

The last decade or so has seen a number of specific analyses concerned with this issue in a generative framework, and therefore centering around the question of the existence of a Tense Phrase projection, which most of them deny.[10] The remaining approaches, most of them short analyses within grammars,[11] show a tendency to attribute a temporal interpretation to the *-ontas* form; this is no doubt due to the fact that the suggestion of simultaneity is particularly strong in the most frequent uses of the form, as adjunct of manner and related circumstantial relations, and it is certainly reinforced by the fact that, at least when it functions as a time adjunct, it is possible for it to be replaced by a temporal clause, which by definition expresses a temporal relation - simultaneity, anteriority or posteriority. It is in fact this relative time dimension rather than absolute tense that is at issue in respect to the *-ontas* form; even though it is often referred to as the

---

10. Those who do not, such as Sitaridou & Haidou (2002), make a distinction between the coreferential and the non-coreferential (nominative subject) type, the latter being difficult to explain without the postulation of a TP projection. Manolessou (2005) discusses the possibility of the loss of such a projection as explanation for the loss of perfective (aoristic) medieval forms like γράψοντας.

11. Joseph & Philippaki-Warburton (1987), Holton et al. (1997: 234-235), Clairis & Babiniotis (2005: 70).

"present participle", there can be no claim that *-ontas* has a closer connection with the present than any other non-indicative form of the verb based on the present stem, i.e. any other imperfective form. This is easily proved by the fact that it can co-occur with verbs in all tenses:

18. *περπατάει/ περπατούσε/ θα περπατάει τραγουδώντας.*
    perpatai perpatuse θa perpatai traγuδontas
    '(s)he walks / walked / will walk singing'.

It is equally indisputable that the periphrastic form can only express anteriority:

19. *Έχοντας κάνει το μπάνιο του, ξάπλωσε και άρχισε να διαβάζει ένα μυθιστόρημα.*
    exontas kani to banio tu ksaplose ke arxise na δiavazi ena miθistorima
    'Having had his bath, he lay down and started reading a novel.

The problem, therefore, centres around the simple *-ontas* form and the question of whether it is limited to expressing simultaneity. Most analyses explicitly or implicitly take this view, with the exception of Tzartzanos (1946/1989: 338-339) and Tsimpli (2000: 134, 138-139), both of whom claim that the simple *–ontas* form can have a reading of anteriority. Tzartzanos in fact disclaims the periphrastic form entirely, insisting, in an uncharacteristically prescriptive mood, that "this participle is an entirely new concoction, *foreign to genuine Demotic, which, even in the case of anteriority [...] uses the present participle in* -ontas. It is better to use a temporal clause introduced by *ama, afu, san* etc." His examples are particularly interesting: in several of them, all corpus based, anteriority is indisputable, although sometimes they seem rather awkward to the present-day speaker; (20) is a case in point:

20. *Τελειώνοντας τα όσα είπαμε για το θερμοηλεκτρισμό, ας πούμε και για ένα άλλο φαινόμενο (=αφού τελειώσαμε).*
    telionontas ta osa ipame γia to θermoilektrismo, as pume ke γia ena alo fenomeno (= afu teliosame)
    'Concluding what we have said about thermoelectricity, let us talk about another phenomenon' (= after having concluded).

The contemporary hearer would expect to listen to something about yet another phenomenon related to the subject of thermoelectricity, rather than a new topic. Several of his examples, however, such as (20) and (21) can only be interpreted as anterior even by present-day speakers:

21. *Αφήνοντας τον κουβά με το νερό, προχώρησε σε μια πορτούλα*

afinontas ton kuva me to nero, proxorise se mia portula
Leaving the bucket of water, he walked towards a little gate.

22. *Στα 1818 γυρνώντας στην πατρίδα του, ρίχτηκε αμέσως στην εθνική δράση (= αφού γύρισε)*
    sta 1818 γirnontas stin patriδa tu, rixtike amesos stin eθniki δrasi (= afu γirise)
    'In 1818, returning to his country, he threw himself into patriotic (lit. "national") action' (= after he returned)

Tsimpli is also right in claiming anteriority for some of her examples, presented here as (23) and (24):

23. *Τελειώνοντας το βιβλίο το έστειλε για δημοσίευση.*
    telionontas to vivlio to estile γia δimosiefsi
    '(Upon) finishing the book, (s)he sent it to the publisher'.

24 *Διαβάζοντας τα δημοσιογραφικά σχόλια ο υπουργός θύμωσε.*
    δiavazontas ta δimosioγrafika sxolia o ipurγos θimose
    ''Reading the comments in the press the minister got angry'.

More uses of this sort are easy to find:

25. *Μη θέλοντας να τον συναντήσει πήγε από άλλο δρόμο.*
    mi θelontas na ton sinandisi piγe apo alo δromo
    'Not wishing to meet him, (s)he went another way'.

26. *Τρώγοντας συνέχεια μακαρονάδες θα παχύνεις.*
    troγontas sinexia makaronaδes tha paxinis
    'Eating pasta all the time you will put on weight'.

The anteriority in examples (24)-(26), however, is not unrelated to the fact that the events denoted by the two clauses are connected by either a causal or a conditional relationship; logically, both causes and conditions are of necessity anterior to their result; examples such as these, therefore, do not seriously challenge the claim that the forms denote contemporaneity.

The obvious counterargument is that the unchallengeable contemporaneity of –*ontas* as an adjunct of manner is equally a result of logical necessity and therefore the only thing proved by all the above is that the form itself is indeed neutral as to relative tense, which is specified by the logical relationship of the clauses.

A closer look, however, reveals that even in these cases the extent to which the -*ontas* form can express anteriority is limited. In all of them the events denoted by the -*ontas* form have their origin undoubtedly in the time prior to that of the event denoted by the matrix verb, but they coincide for part of its duration, or at least they are contingent. Very often the second event is a process, or the result of

a process, which developed in parallel with the initial event: the minister (24) clearly got angry gradually as he was reading the comments, the speaker's reluctance to meet someone (25) continued after (s)he changed direction, obesity (26) is certainly not achieved instantaneously. Even this limitation, however, could be attributed to the causality or conditionality of the relationship between the two events.

The definitive answer lies in the temporal uses of the *–ontas* form, such as the one in Tsimpli's example quoted as (23) above, which are not subject to such logical limitations. From their analysis it transpires that this partial temporal overlap is not a minor detail, but a necessary condition for the appearance of the *-ontas* form, as becomes obvious in the relevant context:

23a. *?? Τελειώνοντας το βιβλίο το 1980 το έστειλε για δημοσίευση το 2000.*
        telionontas to vivlio to 1980 to estile για δimosiefsi to 2000
        ''Finishing the book in 1980, (s)he sent it to the publisher in 2000'.

The unacceptability of (23a) lies in the definition for the first event of a time clearly separated from the time of the subsequent event. The same sentence would be equally unacceptable with an adverbial indicating a time breach, such as *arγotera* 'later':

23b. *?? Τελειώνοντας το βιβλίο το 1980 αργότερα το έστειλε για δημοσίευση.*
        telionontas to vivlio to 1980 arγotera to estile για δimosiefsi
        'Finishing the book in 1980, (s)he later sent it to the publisher'.

but perfectly acceptable with an adverbial indicating immediate succession:

23c. *Τελειώνοντας το βιβλίο το 1980 το έστειλε αμέσως για δημοσίευση.*
        telionontas to vivlio to 1980 to estile amesos για δimosiefsi
        'Having finished (lit.: finishing) the book in 1980, (s)he sent it to the publisher at once'.

The importance of temporal affinity is indicated by the fact that when a temporal clause is substituted for the forms in cases where anteriority is expressed, the conjunction preferred is generally one that shows immediate succession (the neutral in this respect *otan* is also an option):

23d. *Μόλις/με το που τελείωσε το βιβλίο το έστειλε για δημοσίευση.*
        molis / me to pu teliose to vivlio to 1980 to estile για δimosiefsi to 2000
        'Upon finishing the book in 1980, (s)he sent it to the publisher in 2000'.

These tests yield the same results when applied to any temporal use of the *–on-*

tas form, such as the ones in Tzartzanos' examples quoted as (21) and (22) above; this suggests strongly that a shared temporal interval is essential for its use. Even so, the relative temporal freedom that the form enjoys is enough to raise doubts as to whether contemporaneity can be considered as its basic meaning, or at least an integral part thereof. The next section will investigate whether this role can be played more successfully by its aspectual properties.

4.2.2 *-ontas* and aspect

Strangely, given the importance of the category of aspect for the Greek verbal system, there is little mention of it in connection with the *-ontas* form, until Tsimpli (2000), who, as mentioned already, takes the view that it is neutral as to both tense and aspect. Manolessou (2005) sees it as self-evident that an aspectual projection exists, the simple form being imperfective and the periphrastic one perfective.[12] The starting point for the discussion that follows will be Tsimpli's (2000: 137) insightful observation that "the simultaneity or the temporally prior nature of the event in the gerund clauses can depend on the situation type of the gerund [...] and on the aspectual properties of the main verb", but the analysis proposed here differs in several points in respect to the role of both (grammatical) aspect and Aktionsart (the term used henceforth for 'situation type' or 'lexical aspect').[13]

4.2.2.1 *-ontas* and (grammatical) aspect

The main stumbling block for the claims that the form in *-ontas* is aspectually neutral is that it is clearly marked morphologically for imperfectivity; similar claims are often made about the morphologically imperfective Present, but, while it can be argued that in the latter case aspectual overtones can be explained as implicatures of the basic temporal meaning, it is difficult to see how such overtones can be explained for a form neutral as to at least absolute tense.

On the contrary, if imperfectivity is taken as the basic time-related meaning, there is no difficulty in explaining the simultaneity found in most of its uses. This is one of the most common results of imperfectivity when two verb forms co-occur - compare the uses of the Imperfective Future and the Imperfect in such contexts:

---

12. She believes that historically the aspectual opposition was lost along with that of tense, but was reestablished in the 20th century with the emergence of the periphrastic form.
13. The view adopted here is that Aktionsart and aspect are clearly distinguishable categories, the former referring to the objective temporal constituency of the event and the latter to the point of view adopted by the speaker (see Moser 1994, 2005).

27. *Θα διαβάζει όσο εγώ θα πλένω τα πιάτα.*
    θa δiavazi oso eγo tha pleno ta piata
    '(S)he will read / will be reading while I am doing the dishes'.
28. *Όταν έφτασε βρισκόμουν σε σύσκεψη.*
    otan eftase vriskomun se siskepsi
    'When (s)he arrived, I was at a meeting'.

It should be noted that the imperfective forms indicate simultaneity in combination with both imperfective and perfective forms (cf. (27) and (28) respectively); the only difference is that in the former case there is a suggestion of a parallel development of the two events, while in the latter the event denoted by a perfective form is seen as covering only a limited time span or even a time point within the event denoted by the imperfective.

This leaves the anterior readings to be accounted for. One interesting fact is that these are only possible when the matrix verb is perfective (Tsimpli 2000: 137):

29a. *Διαβάζοντας τα δημοσιογραφικά σχόλια ο υπουργός ανησυχούσε.*
     δiavazontas ta δimosioγrafika sxolia o ipurγos anisixuse$_{IMPERFECTIVE}$
     'Reading the press comments the minister worried/was getting worried'.
29b. *Διαβάζοντας τα δημοσιογραφικά σχόλια ο υπουργός ανησύχησε.*
     δiavazontas ta δimosioγrafika sxolia o ipurγos anisixise$_{PERFECTIVE}$
     'Reading the press comments the minister got worried'.

This restriction indicates that the inference of simultaneity is not as strong in the case of -*ontas* as in that of the indicative, though it can only be cancelled when -*ontas* co-occurs with a perfective; thus, it turns out that the aspect of the matrix verb is a crucial factor for the final meaning of the sentence.

Keeping in mind that anterior readings are furthermore limited to a time-span which overlaps or at least immediately precedes the time of the second event (see 4.2.1 above), we should investigate whether, as suggested by this, -*ontas* always refers to an event with some duration and whether the anterior reading is triggered entirely by the causal or conditional meaning of the clause or by the Aktionsart of the verb as well.

4.2.2.2 -*ontas* and Aktionsart

Tsimpli's point about the role of the "situation type of the gerund" in the anterior reading is illustrated by the following examples (Tsimpli 2000: 137):

30. *Τελειώνοντας το βιβλίο το έστειλε για δημοσίευση.*
     telionontas to vivlio to estile για δimosiefsi
     'Having finished the book (s)he sent it to the publisher'.

31. **Γράφοντας το βιβλίο το έστειλε για δημοσίευση.*
     γrafontas to vivlio to estile για δimosiefsi
     'Writing the book (s)he sent it to the publisher'.

32. *Τελειώνοντας το βιβλίο πρόσθεσε ένα κεφάλαιο ακόμη.*
     telionontas to vivlio prosθese ena kefaleo akomi
     'Finishing the book (s)he added an extra chapter'.

Tsimpli attributes the unacceptability of (31) to the absence of (lexical) perfectivity (henceforth: *telicity*; the term *perfectivity* will be reserved for distinctions of grammatical aspect). The difference between the verbs 'write' and 'finish', however, is one not only of telicity but also of duration: 'finish' is, in Vendler's (1957/1967) terms, an *achievement*, in the sense that it is not only lexically telic, but instantaneous. 'Write' on its own is an *activity*, i.e. non-telic (unbounded) and non-instantaneous, but with a definite noun phrase as an object it becomes an *accomplishment*, i.e. telic and non-instantaneous.[14] Even so, what really differentiates (30) and (31) is neither telicity nor duration but simple pragmatic reasons: it is not possible to send a book for publication unless it is finished. Equally, it is for pragmatic reasons that (32) is interpretable as either simultaneous or anterior; the combination with the imperfective allows for a durative interpretation of an instantaneous achievement verb like 'finish' (Moser 1994: 87-89).

The following paragraphs present a systematic examination of the four types of Aktionsart, which reveals that their behaviour as 'verbal adverbs' directly reflects their behaviour in interaction with imperfectivity as described in Moser (1994:72-98).

Accomplishments

Accomplishments are complex events, with duration and an end point, i.e. non-instantaneous and telic; the perfective stresses the end point, the imperfective the duration, thus allowing non-telic interpretations:

33a. *Όσο εμείς χαζεύαμε*$_{IMPERF.}$*, αυτός έγραφε*$_{IMPERF.}$ *τη διατριβή του, την οποία όμως δεν τελείωσε ποτέ.*
      oso emis xazevame$_{IMPERF.}$ aftos eγrafe$_{IMPERF.}$ ti δiatrivi tu tin opia omos

---

14. Moser (1994: 84), Chila-Markopoulou & Moser (2001).

δen teliose pote

'While we were wasting our time, he was writing his thesis, which, however, he never finished'.

33b. *Όσο εμείς χαζεύαμε*IMPERF.*, αυτός έγραψε*PERF. *τη διατριβή του, *την οποία όμως δεν τελείωσε ποτέ.*

oso emis xazevame_{IMPERF.} aftos eγrapse_{PERF.} ti δiatrivi tu *tin opia omos δen teliose pote

'While we were wasting our time, he wrote his thesis, *which, however, he never finished'.

The use of the *-ontas* form of accomplishment verbs forces a reading of simultaneity:

34. *Χτίζοντας το σπίτι της ανακάλυψε μία σαρκοφάγο.*
    xtizontas to spiti tis anakalipse mia sarkofaγo
    'While building her house she discovered a sarcophagus'.

35. *Επιδιορθώνοντας την κεραία έπεσε από την ταράτσα.*
    epiδiorθonontas tin kerea epese apo tin taratsa.
    'While repairing the antenna, (s)he fell off the roof'.

The only case in which this reading can be cancelled is when there is a clear conditional or causal meaning:

34a. *Χτίζοντας το δικό της σπίτι θα καταφέρει επιτέλους να ανεξαρτητο-ποιηθεί.*
     xtizontas to δiko tis spiti tha kataferi epitelus na aneksartitopiiθi
     'By building her own house she'll manage at last to become independent'.

35a. *Επιδιορθώνοντας την κεραία μπόρεσε να συνδεθεί με το νέο κανάλι.*
     epiδiorθonontas tin kerea borese na sinδeθi me to neo kanali
     'By repairing the antenna (s)he was able to connect to the new channel'.

Achievements

Achievements are both telic and instantaneous; as a result, they cannot normally have a durational meaning, which disallows their combination with the imperfective, except in a habitual meaning:

36a. Ἔβρισκα πάντα τα κλειδιά μου, όταν τα ἔχανα.
    evriska panta ta kliδia mu otan ta exana
    'I always found my keys when I lost them'.
36b. *Ἔβρισκα τα κλειδιά μου επί μισή ώρα.
    evriska ta kliδia mu epi misi ora.
    'I found my keys for half an hour'.

The only case in which the imperfective of an achievement can be durative is when the event is used as a background for another event - in which case naturally it also expresses simultaneity:

37. Την ώρα που άναβα το φως, χτύπησε το κουδούνι.
    tin ora pu anava to fos xtipise to kuδuni
    'Just as I was switching on the light, the bell rang'.

Neither the telicity nor the instantaneity of the event are cancelled in this use; the imperfective simply chooses to treat the event as if it had some duration, i.e. as if it were an accomplishment, thereby indicating the simultaneity of the two events, suggesting (when the other verb is in a perfective form) a slight precedence of the action denoted by the dependent clause. The function of the *-ontas* form seems to be identical: *telionontas* in (30) above shows near-simultaneity: it follows pragmatically that finishing the book has precedence over sending it to the publisher, as it follows that adding a chapter precedes finishing the book (32); the same holds for (38):

38. Ξυπνώντας το πρωί άκουσε το καναρίνι να κελαϊδάει.
    ksipnontas to proi akuse to kanarini na kelaiδai
    'Waking up in the morning (s)he heard the canary sing'.

Again, the anterior interpretation is reinforced by a causal or conditional meaning:

39. Βρίσκοντας το ρολόι που είχε χάσει αναστέναξε με ανακούφιση.
    vriskontas to δaxtiliδi pu ixe xasi anastenakse me anakufisi
    'Finding the ring (s)he had lost, (s)he heaved a sigh of relief'.

The *-ontas* form, therefore, once again proves to be an instance of normal imperfectivity.

Activities

Activities are inherently atelic and durative. The imperfective naturally does

nothing to change this inherent meaning, while the perfective introduces telicity, suggesting as it does an end point. At the same time, in conjunction with temporal clauses the imperfective expresses simultaneity, while the perfective precludes it:

40. *Όταν τον είδα έτρεχε/έτρεξε.*
    otan ton iδa etrexe
    'When I saw him, he was running / he ran (= started running)'.

Again, -*ontas* behaves like any other imperfective form. It always has a non-telic and simultaneous meaning:

41. *Τραγουδούσε/τραγούδησε μια άρια οδηγώντας στην εξοχή.*
    traγuδuse$_{IMPERF}$/traγuδise$_{PERF}$ mia aria oδiγontas stin eksoxi
    '(S)he sang an aria (while) driving around in the country'.
42. *Περπατώντας στον κήπο βρήκε το ρολόι που είχε χάσει.*
    perpatontas ston kipo vrike to roloi pu ixe xasi
    '(While) walking in the garden he found the watch he had lost'.

The only occasion on which an anterior reading is possible is a causal or conditional environment:

43. *Τρέχοντας έφτασε πιο γρήγορα.*
    trexontas eftase pio γriγora
    '(By) running (s)he arrived more quickly'.

States

Finally, states, also inherently atelic and durative, cannot lose these two characteristics, except in combination with the perfective aspect, whose most usual effect is to turn the verbs into inchoatives (i.e. accomplishments or achievements).

44. *Όταν φτάσαμε, κοιμόταν.*
    otan ftasame, kimotan
    'When we arrived, (s)he was asleep'.
45. *Κοιμήθηκε τρεις ώρες / κοιμήθηκε στις τρεις.*
    kimiθike tris ores / kimiθike stis tris
    '(S)he slept for three hours' / '(S)he slept (=fell asleep) at three'.

It is interesting that in the case of states the -*ontas* form always expresses not only atelicness, but also simultaneity, even in causal environments, for which, significantly, -*ontas* does not seem to be particularly felicitous except in the negative:

46. *Αναπολώντας τα περασμένα άνοιξε ένα παλιό άλμπουμ.*
    anapolontas ta perasmena anikse ena palio album
    'Thinking about the past, (s)he opened an old photagraph album'.
47. *Διψώντας πολύ ήπια βυσσινάδα που τη σιχαίνομαι.*
    δipsontas poli ipia visinaδa pu ti sixenome
    'Being very thirsty, I drank cherry juice, which I hate'.
48. *Μην έχοντας νερό, ήπια βυσσινάδα που τη σιχαίνομαι.*
    min exontas nero ipia visinaδa pu ti sixenome
    'Having no water, I drank cherry juice, which I hate'.

All the above leads to the conclusion that the form in -ontas is anything but neutral aspectually, displaying as it does not only the morphological, but also the semantic characteristics of imperfectivity. It was shown, moreover, that its imperfectivity, contrary to simultaneity, remains virtually unaffected by the context. This suggests that, if a basic time-related meaning is to be sought for the form, this will have to be imperfectivity.

6. The periphrastic form

If the simple –ontas form has a basic meaning of imperfectivity, it is logical to assume that the basic meaning of its periphrastic counterpart is one of perfectivity. The problem is that the form in question always marks anteriority; this is not inconsistent with perfectivity, but it can hardly be seen as more than a possible implicature, whereas in this case it seems to be uncancellable, and therefore an integral part of the meaning. It could be argued that this is a case of grammaticalization of an implicature; in my view, however, a more plausible explanation for the meaning of anteriority is to be found in the time of its creation, taking into consideration the wider picture of the verbal system as a whole and of its historical development. Although little is known about the exact time of its appearance, it is certain that it is much later than that of the simple form, and it is likely that it was not fully established until the second half of the 20th century.[15] Manolessou (2005) suggests that its appearance marks the rise of an aspectual opposition within the realm of the active participle/gerund, which was missing before; however, it seems strange that a language which draws so heavily on the opposition of the present and the aorist stem should not opt for the latter as the source for the perfective counterpart of–ontas, especially in view of the fact that such forms existed briefly in the medieval period. On the other hand, there is no doubt that, by the time it appeared, the system of the

15. Although there is no specific study, the comments by mid-twentieth century grammarians such as Tzatzanos above withness to the fact; see also Manolessou 2005.

modern Perfect was complete. While it is true that the Modern Greek Perfect is much more convincingly analysed as perfective rather than as a third aspect, on the basis both of its semantics and its morphology, there is some doubt on whether perfectivity is its basic meaning. It has been argued before (Moser 2003, 2005, Moser & Bella 2003) that the basic meaning of the Perfect Indicative (Past, Present and Future) is anteriority in the respective time spheres; the anteriority of the periphrastic –ontas form fits perfectly into this pattern. Anteriority and perfectivity are, of course, perfectly compatible; indeed, the anterior event is of necessity viewed as finished, and therefore as a whole, i.e. perfectively.

This analysis makes more sense if the forms are examined within a wider context, namely the changes in the entire verbal system. According to the analysis in Moser (2005) the language moved from a system based on Aktionsart distinctions to one organized around the binary aspectual opposition and at the same time, though more slowly, incorporating the expression of tense, first as a binary (past – non-past) and later as a tripartite (past – present – future) opposition. The creation of the modern Perfect system is but one symptom of this general move. In this context the question of the logical priority of perfectivity or anteriority becomes immaterial, except in a historical perspective; the system permits, indeed invites, the simultaneous existence of oppositions of aspect and tense. Seen in this light, the relationship of the two categories in the simple forms in –ontas becomes easier to understand: the morphology of the forms exemplifies the historical (and possibly logical) precedence of imperfectivity; contemporaneity must have gained ground as tense acquired a stronger position in the system. The significance of Tzartzanos' remarks and in particular examples like the one quoted as (20) above becomes obvious: the simple form seems to have been until fairly recently genuinely neutral as to relative tense, whereas nowadays it can only have a quasi-anterior meaning when used causally or conditionally, or if it denotes an event temporally contingent with that denoted by the matrix verb. It was the creation of the periphrastic form, with the combination, since it was part of the Perfect system, of anteriority and perfectivity, which permitted the establishment of an opposition, with the simple form retaining its imperfectivity and limiting itself to contemporaneity.

7. Tense, aspect and non-finiteness

Having attributed both aspectual and temporal features to the forms under investigation, we need to discuss whether these affect their alleged non-finiteness. The issue is too complex to deal with here definitively; nevertheless, some points emerge quite clearly:

Firstly, in a language that relies so heavily on inflection and overt case marking, the fact that one single form in the entire verbal system is uninflected must

carry special weight; this feature becomes even more striking when one takes into consideration that it lost its inflection at a time when practically every other non-finite and certainly every uninflected form of the verb, namely all infinitives, disappeared in favour of finite structures.

Secondly, in a language where all other verbal forms throughout its history, including all non-finite ones, have always been marked at least for aspect and usually for relative tense, it is difficult to posit lack of time-related features as a condition for non-finiteness.

Thirdly, this is made much more difficult in view of the fact that morphologically the forms are unequivocally marked for aspect and, in the case of the periphrastic ones, for relative tense.

This leaves us with two alternatives: either non-finiteness does not exist in the Greek verbal system or finiteness should be defined independently of the expression of time. This is consistent with some analyses (e.g. Nedjalkov & Nedjalkov 1987 and Miller 2002, esp. pp. 34-48). Perhaps the solution that best mirrors the real situation is to accept the existence of a continuum along the lines of Lehmann's (1988) proposal for a desententialization scale, on which forms can be placed according to the number of criteria they satisfy. The scope of Lehmann's study is much wider, concerning the typology of clause linkage, but finiteness plays a major role. Space limitations do not allow for a detailed analysis here, but it should be pointed out that one argument in favour of this solution is that there exist cross-linguistically a number of forms which resist strict categorization. Within Greek there has been a long debate about the finiteness of the subjunctive, which displays not only aspect and agreement, but perhaps even tense (see Moser, forthcoming); it is clear from the data presented here that the –ontas form has a much stronger claim on non-finiteness.

A discussion of finiteness should also take into account the adverbial nature of the forms: adverbials are closely associated with time, since all the relations that they express are either directly or indirectly temporally connected with the event denoted by the verb.

An idea found more or less explicitly in various works, including Lehmann (1988), and developed in several recent analyses (e.g. Alexiadou 1997) sees adverbs and adjectives as a single category, which takes one form or the other according to whether it specifies a verb or a noun phrase. Manolessou (2005) uses this idea to convincingly explain the different development of the two surviving participles (–ontas and –menos) into a verbal and a nominal category respectively. This line of argument could be used to lend some support to the claim that the forms under investigation express aspect and relative tense: these temporal characteristics are inevitable not only because of the verbal derivation of the forms, but also because of their syntactic association with the verb.

8. Conclusions

The aim of this article was to test the proposed analysis of the Greek verb forms in –ontas as verbal adverbs or converbs; they have been shown to satisfy all the relevant criteria, with some doubts about its non-finiteness in its narrower definition as the lack not only of agreement but also tense and aspect features.

The analysis led to the conclusion that the -ontas form does have time-related characteristics: the simple form is unequivocally imperfective, while relative tense is determined by the nature of the circumstantial relation, with the limitation that any anterior time span has to overlap with that of the matrix event; the periphrastic form seems to accord equivalent status to perfectivity and anteriority, since they are both obligatory. This asymmetry, atypical for the Greek verbal system, was explained through the recent creation of the periphrastic form, within the system of the Perfect, seen here as perfective (rather than a third aspect) and distinguished from other perfective forms by anteriority. The tendency towards the limitation of the simple form to contemporaneity was seen as a result of this recent development and as a step towards symmetry.

The final question concerned the implications of the existence of these temporal features for the non-finiteness of the forms. While most contemporary approaches attribute equal importance to the two criteria of agreement and temporality, it was claimed here that for highly inflected languages the former has to take precedence; some additional support was found in recent analyses which see adjectives and adverbs as exponents of the same category, distinguished only by their position in the noun and verb phrase respectively, and thus associated with the features typical of each. The view adopted here is that finiteness is best seen as a continuum, on which the –ontas form would occupy a position close enough to the non-finiteness end to make it a prototypical member of the cross-linguistic category of converbs.

Amalia Moser
University of Athens
e-mail: amozer@cc.uoa.gr

REFERENCES

Alexiadou, A. 1997: *Adverb Placement: A Case Study in Antisymmetric Syntax.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Bella/Μπέλλα, Σ. forthcoming: Ο Ενεστώτας και η αντίληψη του παρόντος [Present tense and the perception of the present].
Bouboulides/Μπουμπουλίδης, Π. 1946: *Η Μετοχή στα Νεοελληνικά.* Αθήναι.

Buck, C.D. 1933: *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Chila-Markopoulou / Χειλά-Μαρκοπούλου, Δ. 2003: "Προτασιακότητα και μετοχικές δομές στην Αλεξανδρινή και Μεσαιωνική Ελληνική [Sententiality and participial structures in Hellenistic and Medieval Greek]". In Θεοφανοπούλου-Κοντού κ.ά. (εκδ.), *Σύγχρονες Τάσεις στην ελληνική Γλωσσολογία: Μελέτες αφιερωμένες στην Ειρήνη Φιλιππάκη-Warburton*. Αθήνα: Πατάκης, 128-143.

Chila-Markopoulou & Moser / Χειλά-Μαρκοπούλου, Δ. & Μόζερ, Α. 2001: "Τελικότητα και αναφορικότητα στη ρηματική φράση της Νέας Ελληνικής: ποιόν ενεργείας και άρθρο [Telicity and referentiality in the Modern Greek verb phrase: aspect and the article]". In G. Aggouraki et al. (eds.), *Greek Linguistics '99: Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Greek Linguistics, Nicosia 15-18 September 1999*. Thessaloniki: University Studio Press, 138-145.

Clairis & Babiniotis / Κλαίρης, Χ. & Μπαμπινιώτης, Γ. (σε συνεργασία με τους Αμαλία Μόζερ, Αικατερίνη Μπακάκου-Ορφανού και Σταύρο Σκοπετέα) 2005: *Γραμματική της Ελληνικής (Δομολειτουργική-Επικοινωνιακή) [Greek Grammar (Structural-Functional-Communicative)]*. Αθήνα: Ελληνικά Γράμματα.

Comrie, B. 1985: *Tense*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haspelmath, M. 1995. "The converb as a cross-linguistically valid category". In M. Haspelmath, & E. König (eds.), 1-55.

Haspelmath, M. & König, E. (eds.) 1995: *Converbs in Cross-Linguistic Perspective: Structure and Meaning of Adverbial Verb Forms –Adverbial Participles, Gerunds–*. Berlin/ New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hesse, R. 1980: *Syntax of the Modern Greek Verbal System: The Use of the Forms, Particularly in Combination with θα and να*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.

Holton, D., Mackridge, P. & Philippaki-Warburton, I. 1997: *Greek: A Comprehensive Grammar of the Modern Language*. London / New York: Routledge.

Joseph, B. & Philippaki-Warburton, I. 1987: *Greek*. London: Croom Helm.

König, E. 1995: "The meaning of converb constructions". In M. Haspelmath & E. König (eds.), 57-95.

Lehmann, C. 1988: "Towards a typology of clause linkage". In J. Haiman & S.A. Thompson (eds.), *Clause combining in Grammar and Discourse*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 181-225.

Mackridge, P. 1985: *The Modern Greek Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Manolessou, I. 2005: "From participles to gerunds". In M. Sifaki & A. Terzi (eds.), *Advances in Greek Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 241-283.

Matthews, P. 1997: *Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Miller, D.G. 2002: *Nonfinite Structures in Theory and Change.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Moser/Μόζερ, A. 1994: *Ποιόν και Απόψεις του Ρήματος [Aktionsart and Aspects of the Verb].* Αθήνα: Παρουσία.

Moser/Μόζερ, A. 2002: "Μετοχές, γερούνδια, -οντας: Χρόνος και άποψη [Participles, gerunds, tense and aspect]". In Ch. Clairis (ed.), *Recherches en linguistique grecque/ Γλωσσολογικές έρευνες για την Ελληνική.* Paris: L'Harmattan, tome II, 111-114.

Moser/Μόζερ, A. 2003: "Tense, Aspect and the Greek Perfect". In A. Alexiadou, M. Rathert & A. von Stechow (eds.), *Perfect Explorations.* Berlin: De Gruyter, 235-252.

Moser/Μόζερ, A. 2005: *Άποψη και χρόνος στην ιστορία της Ελληνικής [Aspect and Tense in the History of Greek].* Αθήνα: Παρουσία.

Moser/Μόζερ, A. forthcoming: Υποτακτική, χρόνος και παρεμφατικότητα [Subjunctive, tense and finiteness].

Moser & Bella / Μοζερ, A. & Μπέλλα, Σ. (2003) "Παρελθόν, παρόν, οριστικότητα και Παρακείμενος [Past, present, definiteness and the Perfect]". In Γ. Κατσιμαλή κ.ά., *6ο Διεθνές Συνέδριο Ελληνικής Γλωσσολογίας, 18-21 Σεπτεμβρίου 2003.* Ρέθυμνο: Πανεπιστήμιο Κρήτης, Εργαστήριο Γλωσσολογίας (cd-rom).

Nakas/Νάκας, Θ. 1985: "Μετοχικά [On participles]". In Θ. Νάκας, *Γλωσσοφιλολογικά: Μελετήματα για τη Λογοτεχνία και τη Γλώσσα.* Αθήνα: Κάλβος, 136-174.

Nakas/Νάκας, Θ 1988: "Για τη μετοχή και το ρηματικό επίθετο σε –τος (όπως εμφανίζονται στην Κοινή Νέα Ελληνική και στις διαλέκτους) [On participles and verbal adjectives in –τος (as used in Modern Greek and its dialects]". In Θ. Νάκας, *Γλωσσοφιλολογικά, Β': Μελετήματα για τη Γλώσσα και τη Λογοτεχνία.* Αθήνα: Εκπαιδευτήρια Δούκα, 177-204.

Nedjalkov, V.P. 1995: "Some typological parameters of converbs". In M. Haspelmath & E. König (eds.), 97-136.

Nedjalkov, V.P. & Nedjalkov, I.V. 1987: "On the typological characteristics of converbs". In T. Help (ed.), *Symposium on Language Universals.* Tallinn, 75-79.

Richards, J.C., Platt, J. & Platt, H. 1992[2]: *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics.* London: Longman.

Sihler, A.L. 1995: *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sitaridou & Haidou /Σιταρίδου, I. & Χάιδου, K. 2002: "Η αρχή της νομιμοποίησης των υποκειμένων στα ελληνικά γερούνδια [The principle of subject licensing in Greek gerunds]". *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 20: 499-510.

Trask. R.L. 1993: *A Dictionary of Grammatical Terms in Linguistics.* London: Routledge.

Triantaphyllides/Τριανταφυλλίδης, Μ 1941: *Νεοελληνική Γραμματική (της Δημοτικής) [Modern Greek Grammar (Demotic]*. Εν Αθήναις: Οργανισμός Εκδόσεως Σχολικών Βιβλίων.

Tsimpli, I.-M. 2000: "Gerunds in Greek". *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 1, 133-169.

Tsopanakis/Τσοπανάκης, Α. 1994: *Νεοελληνική Γραμματική [Modern Greek Grammar]*. Αθήνα: Εστία

Tsoulas, G. 1996: "Notes on temporal interpretation and control in Modern Greek gerunds". *York Papers in Linguistics* 17: 441-470.

Tzartzanos/Τζάρτζανος, Α. 1946: *Νεοελληνική Σύνταξις (της κοινής Δημοτικής) [Modern Greek Syntax (Common Demotic)]*. Αθήναι: Οργανισμός Εκδόσεως Σχολικών Βιβλίων. Ανατύπωση 1989: Θεσσαλονίκη: Κυριακίδης.

Vendler, Z. 1957/1967: "Verbs and times". *The Philosophical Review* LXVI (1957), 143-160. Reprinted in: Z. Vendler 1967: *Linguistics in Philosophy*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 97-121.