FOLIA SLAVICA

Volume 7

Number 3

1985

Complementizers, Particles, and Finiteness in Greek and the Balkans[0]

Brian D. Joseph

In several recent works, e.g., Joseph 1981a, 1983a, 1983b, I have discussed the issue of *finiteness* in the languages of the Balkans, especially how this grammatical notion manifests itself in the grammars of the individual languages and how it functions in these languages. In particular, I have argued for the continued importance of a distinction between *finite* and *nonfinite* forms in the verbal systems of at least Modern Greek and Macedonian, the two Balkan languages which have undergone to the greatest extent the loss of the category of *infinitive*, which in a real sense may be considered to be the nonfinite category and form par excellence. The assumption can justifiably be made, moreover, that the other languages, those which have more systematic and viable infinitives than Greek and Macedonian automatically have a finite/nonfinite distinction. Thus, the notion *finiteness* can be seen still to be a significant grammatical feature in Balkan grammar.

The theoretical underpinnings of the arguments I have given regarding finiteness in these languages have largely been structuralist in nature. For example, of paramount importance has been a concern for the oppositions in the verbal system and for the uses to which such oppositions are put in the grammar, for together these give rise to the need for a particular grammatical category in the description of a given language. Similarly, discussion has centered on where the various formal types fit in these requisite categories and what the exponents, i.e., morphological and/or morphosyntactic carriers or indicators, of finiteness are.

In particular, the following criteria, of a morphological, morphosyntactic, and syntactic nature, have emerged for characterizing *finiteness* (and by extension, the converse notion *nonfiniteness*) in Greek (below, (1)), and Macedonian (below, (2)):

1. Criteria for finiteness in Modern Greek
   a. finite forms are marked for person
   b. clitic object pronouns attach to the left of finite forms
   c. the negative particle *δen* occurs only with finite forms
   d. the verbal particle *na* occurs only with finite forms.
2. Criteria for finiteness in Macedonian
   a. clitic object pronouns attach to the left of finite forms
   b. finite forms can stand alone in their clause and participate in multiple agreement patterns with their subject
   c. the verbal particle *da* can occur only with finite forms.

These criteria lead to the classification of the verbal system of each language into the following array of finite and nonfinite forms:

3. Classification of verbal forms in Modern Greek:
   NONFINITE: imperative (positive only) singular and plural, mediopassive participle, active participle[1]
   FINITE: present indicative, past indicative (imperfect and aorist), subjunctive forms,[2] future, perfect system forms[3]
4. Classification of verbal forms in Macedonian
   NONFINITE: imperative, verbal adverb (in *-jḱi*), *-n/-t* participle
   FINITE: present, imperfect, and aorist of the simplex series, the verbal-*l*-forms of both the *sum* series and the *"beše"* series,[4] and the perfect tense forms (i.e., those formed with *ima* 'have').

A discussion of how to justify these criteria and of the forms themselves is given in Joseph (1983a 22-27, 110-117), but some additional comments on the material covered in (1) through (4) are in order. First, there are some details of the criteria in (1) and (2) which may be in need of minor revisions; for example, there are some verbal-*l*-forms in Macedonian, specifically the aorist forms, which cannot cooccur with *da*.[5] This distributional fact may be a matter of the semantics of the aorist forms and of *da*-clauses in general, and if so, it need not be a concern of the syntax of these constructions; moreover, since the verbal-*l*-forms in general, i.e., as a morphologically defined class, do cooccur with *da*, there is a generalization to be made there.

Second, (1) and (2) offer an important point of comparison: one of the common threads in the identification of finiteness is the selection of complementizer-like elements,[6] i.e., *na* in Greek and *da* in Macedonian. This is an important common feature because it is one that occurs as a defining criterion for finiteness in other languages as well, for example, English (see below, (5)):

5. Criteria for finiteness in English
   a. finite forms are marked for tense

b. finite forms show agreement for third person subjects

c. finite forms have the nonobject pronominal forms occur as their subject

d. only finite forms occur with the complementizer *that*.

A connection between finiteness and something like complementizer selection, therefore, may not be just a language-particular or even Balkan-particular phenomenon, and so deserves the careful attention of Balkanists.[7]

A third point is that these criteria and classifications contain an important potential stumbling block. The identification of imperatives as nonfinite in Greek and Macedonian has met with some objections. Some linguists have simply stated, for example, that imperatives must be finite (despite their behavior with regard to (1) and (2)) at least in these two languages and possibly universally so.[8] However, while it is certainly true that there are languages for which a designation of [+finite] for imperatives is justified, for example, Ancient Greek (see Joseph 1983a:13-18) and Albanian (as in Newmark 1957), it is not clear that one can extrapolate successfully from such cases to a universal claim of finiteness for all imperatives. A reasonable position here, it would seem, is that we must be guided by the facts of the languages in question—since imperatives pattern with participles and gerunds in Greek and Macedonian according to the parameters defined in (1) and (2) above, we must conclude that they are all to be classified alike, in this case, as nonfinite.[9]

Similarly, the possible objection that imperatives were finite in Ancient Greek and so should be designated in parallel fashion in Modern Greek rests on the assumption that classification with regard to finiteness must remain stable over time. Since most features in a language are subject to change through time, it again seems aprioristic to assume that such a classification cannot change, and again, I would urge that the patterning of the particular forms in their respective synchronic systems should be the guide as to how to classify them.

A slightly different objection[10] that has been raised is that the negative imperatives, i.e., prohibitions, in Modern Greek, as in (6):

6. mi   to kánis   áli   forá!
   NEG it do/2SG other time
   'Don't do it again!'

clearly involve finite forms. The position of the clitic object

pronoun *to* and the person marking on the verb indicate that the verb is finite. Such an objection, though, presumes that one must treat the functionally similar positive and negative imperatives in parallel manner at least in terms of their classification with regard to finiteness. Since languages can have functionally similar forms that differ in other ways—compare the various ways in which requests for action can be phrased in English—there seems to be no real force to such an objection. Moreover, the two differ syntactically, e.g., with regard to the placement of clitic pronouns, so that clearly there is no compelling reason to treat them alike in all possible ways.

It is worth noting also with regard to the question of how to classify imperatives with regard to finiteness that in the case of Macedonian, two different researchers, Hendriks 1976 and Groen 1977, working on nearly identical dialects, Radožda-Vevčani and Dihovo, respectively, came up with opposite conclusions about the status of imperatives; Hendriks analyzes them as nonfinite while Groen treats them as finite. Since the dialects in question present verbal systems that are structurally quite similar in most respects, such a conclusion seems surprising, and is more likely to be a reflection of different assumptions and decisions made by the researchers than an indication of a real difference between the dialects.[11]

Imperatives, therefore, seem to form a real crux in the issue of how finiteness manifests itself in the grammar of any language. Moreover, since one of the criteria which interacts with the identification of imperatives as finite or nonfinite is some aspect of complementizer selection, it is appropriate to consider these two interconnected issues together. The situation in English is instructive here, for in English, as evident in (6) above, complementizer selection is one of the classificatory criteria for finiteness and imperatives seem best taken as nonfinite (so Bloomfield 1933, for example). Accordingly, an argument is developed here for the nonfiniteness of imperatives in Greek[12] which depends directly on an aspect of the distribution of complementizer-like elements in the language. Such an argument supports the original conclusion that imperatives really are nonfinite, at least for this language, and moreover it reinforces the importance of the complementizer-selection criterion in Greek and universally.

The argument is framed in the X'-theory of phrase structure

associated with recent versions of the Extended Standard Theory and Government and Binding theory in syntax.[13] The impetus for the argument comes from an analysis of complementizer selection in English given in Freidin 1983.

Freidin starts with the set of phrase structure rules for English given in (7):[14]

7.   S' ---> COMP S
      S ---> NP INFL VP

and expansions of COMP and INFL for English as in (8):

8.   COMP ---> [that, for]
      INFL ---> [TENSE, to]
                [+FIN] [-FIN].

He thus takes TENSE and *to* to be instantiations of the features [+FIN(ITE)] and [-FIN(ITE)] respectively and moreover notes the following distribution of COMP-elements with INFL-elements:

9.   a. that ... TENSE
      b. for ... to
      c. *that ... to
      d. *for ... TENSE.

Assuming that *that* "is specified with the inherent feature [+FINITE] and the complementizer *for* with the inherent feature [-FINITE]" (p. 720), Freidin notes that the facts in (9) amount to an instance of agreement between COMP and INFL, as in (10):[15]

10.   COMP   <--->   INFL
      [αFIN]   [αFIN].

Freidin observes that such an agreement statement is just like what is needed for the distribution of the determiners *this/these*, *that/those* with singular and plural nouns in English, and so does not constitute an ad hoc device in any way.

To turn now to Greek, the following COMP-like and INFL-like elements can be identified:

11.   a. COMP-like: *na, pos, pu, óti*[16]
      b. INFL-like: TENSE, +PERSON.

The inclusion of [PERSON] is based on criterion (1a) above. The COMP-like elements in Greek are not identical in use or meaning, but *pos/pu/óti* are roughly like the neutral English complementizer *that* and *na* imparts some degree of modality to verbs it occurs with.[17] Still, it must be borne in mind that *na* can cooccur with all of the verb forms that *pos/pu/óti* can, except that it is mutually exclusive with the future particle *θa* whereas the others are not; for example, *na* can occur with imperfect, perfect, and

aorist forms, and others as well:

12.   a. kalítera na éfevγa   ekíni ti stiγmí
         better   leave/1SG.IMPF   that-the-moment
         'It would have been better had I left at that moment'
      b. borí   na hórepsa   meθizménos
         can/3SG   dance/1SG.AOR drunk/NOM
         'It may be (the case) that I danced while drunk'
      c. borí   na ton   ého δi   mikrós
         can/3SG   him/ACC have-seen/1SG.PERF small/NOM
         'I might have seen him when (I was) little.'

Thus with *na*, etc., one finds the following array of facts with regard to the realization of INFL:

13.   {na, pos, pu, óti} ...   {TENSE, person}
          "COMP"   "INFL"

Given this, the following configuration of features associated with the elements in (13) can be assumed:

14.   {na, pos, pu, óti} ... [+TENSE, +person]
          [+FINITE]   [+FINITE]

An agreement condition, analogous to that proposed in (10) for English can then be stated, generalizing from the positive feature specifications of (14):

15.   αFIN   <--->   αPerson
      αFIN   <--->   αTENSE

In order to see the realization of the negative specifications, the ones which are actually most relevant here, the obvious and noncontroversial nonfinite forms, the gerund and the mediopassive participle can be examined. Examples of their use are given in (16):

16.   a. episkeptómenos   tin eláδa,   íδa
         visit/MED.PPL.NOM.SG.MASC the-Greece saw/1SG
         ton jáni.
         the-John/ACC
         'When visiting Greece, I saw John'.
      b. γráfondas   to vivlío,   ípia   tris bíres.
         write/ACT.PPL the-book/ACC drank/1SG three beers
         'While writing the book, I drank three beers.'

These forms are untensed and show no marking for person. Furthermore, there are several reasons for assuming the existence of a COMP node with these forms. First, "WH"-Movement can occur within the syntactic unit defined by the active and the mediopassive participles:[18]

17. a. ti léγondas psevδomartírise o jánis.
       what saying/ACT.PPL perjured/3SG the-John/NOM
       'By saying what did John perjure himself?'
    b. ti léγondas hamojélase o jánis.
       what saying/ACT.PPL smiled/3SG the-John/NOM
       'When saying what did John smile?'
    c. pjón episkeptómenos, apoláfstike
       whom/ACC visiting/MP.PPL enjoyed/3SG.MP
       o jánis.
       the-John/NOM
       'When visiting whom did John enjoy himself?'

so that positing a COMP node gives a structural place for the
preposed question word (*ti* and *pjón* in (17)) to "reside." Second,
they parallel other adverbial adjuncts with an overt "subordinating
conjunction" such as *ótan* 'when' as in *ótan episkeftómuna* 'when I
was visiting' or *enó* as in *enó éγrafa* 'while I was writing'; positing
a COMP node for the nonparticipial adjuncts gives a structural
place for forms like *ótan* and *enó* and extending that to the
participial adjuncts captures the parallelism between the two types.
Moreover, the active participle, in at least one, somewhat formal,
style of Greek,[19] can occur with an independent nominative subject,
as in the proverbial statement found in (18a) or the sentence in
(18b):

18. a. rotóndas kanís, pijéni ke s tin póli.
       ask/ACT.PPL one/NOM go/3SG even to Istanbul/ACC
       'By (one's) asking, one can go even to Istanbul.'
    b. vjénondas o flios, ksekinísame ja
       go-out/ACT.PPL the-sun/NOM set-out/1PL for
       to horáfi.
       the-field
       'As the sun was coming out, we set out for the field.'

In principle, then, the participle can define a sentence, at least a
subordinate one, and can occur with a specified subject; as such, it
would be expected to have a COMP node associated with it.[20]
Although the mediopassive participle does not present such a
pattern as (18), one can again appeal to the parallelism between it
and the active participle to justify the COMP node with that
form.[21] It is clear, though, that this COMP node is empty for the
participles, so that the realization of the agreement rule (15) for
participles would be as in (19):

19. Ø <—-> [-person, -TENSE]
    [-FIN]

thereby giving an indication of how the negative specifications are
instantiated.[22]
    At this point, now, the question of where the imperatives fit
in can be asked. Since imperatives define a sentence, and a
main-clause sentence at that, and can occur with a specified
subject, as in (19):

20. esí . γráfe!
    you/NOM.SG write/IMPV.SG
    'You (SG) write!'

the assumption of a COMP node with them is relatively
noncontroversial. Moreover, there is evidence for a COMP node
with main clauses in Greek, since Greek has "WH"-Movement in
main clauses:

21. pjó vivlío δa páris Ø mazí su.
    which-book/ACC FUT take/2SG with you/GEN
    'Which book will you take with you?'

and is a language which has (some) sentence-initial question
particles, such as *mípos* as in:

22. mípos éhete tsiγáro?
    QN have/2PL cigarette
    'Perhaps you have a cigarette?'

A COMP node, then, is needed to give a structural place not only
to the preposed question element but also to the question
particle.[23] Given this, then, it should be clear that the COMP
node with imperatives has a zero-realization (see (20), for
example), and accordingly they would pattern with the participles
with regard to (19). Thus, they too would be nonfinite.
    Thus these facts provide a formal argument in favor of
treating the active and mediopassive participles and the imperatives
in Modern Greek all alike with respect to complementizer-selection
and accordingly with respect to finiteness as well.
    Despite the apparent forcefulness of this argument in
providing yet another way in which imperatives and the (active
and mediopassive) participles pattern alike with regard to a
feature—zero-realization for the COMP-position—that sets them
apart from the clearly finite forms, there are a few potential
problems with the analysis presented here that need to be
addressed. It turns out that these can be dealt with, and actually
prove to have some interesting consequences for the analysis of

Greek syntax in particular and for syntactic theory in general.

First, upon initial examination, the prohibitives in Greek discussed briefly earlier (see (6), above), appear to have a zero in COMP-position, inasmuch as *mi* seems to be identifiable as the negative element (and is so glossed in (6)). If it has a zero as COMP, then one would expect it to be a nonfinite type, according to the line of argumentation followed here. But in that case, prohibitives would run counter to the criteria for finiteness referred to in (1), since by those criteria, the verb in prohibitives is clearly finite (e.g., it is marked for person and has clitics attached to its left).

A solution to this problem that is in keeping with the zero-COMP argument for nonfiniteness is simply to say that *mi* itself fills the COMP-position, so that it should be added to the list of COMP-like elements given in (11a).[24] It turns out that this is not just an ad hoc move designed to save the analysis, for *mi* is found as an apparent complementizer (or complementizer-like element) with a few verbs, e.g., *fováme* 'fear' and *prosého* 'watch out, take care', as in:

23. fováme   mi   hásis   ta leftá   su.
    fear/1SG COMP lose/2SG the-money your
    'I fear that you might lose your money.'

It is worth noting, as Warburton (1970:98–100) points out, that sentences such as (24):

24. fováme   mi   ðen vris   ta leftá   su.
    fear/1SG COMP not find/2SG the-money your
    'I fear that you might not find your money.'

with a negative complement clause where the negation is expressed overtly with the particle *ðen* 'not' show that the *mi* really cannot be identified with the true negative *mi* found in sentences such as:

25. ϑélo   na   mi   to kánis   áli forá.
    want/1SG PRT NEG   it do/2SG   other-time
    'I want you not to do it again.'

Thus the *mi* of (23) and (24) which occurs with *fováme*, etc., is free to be classified as a complementizer and so provides some support for the complementizer-analysis of the *mi* of prohibitives.[25]

Also relevant here is the observation noted above regarding (22) that Greek has *mípos*, which is a variant of *mi* in sentences such as (23) and (24) (see note 25), occurring as a question particle, and thus presumably in COMP. Moreover, the "abbreviated" form *mi* also occurs as a sentence-initial

(nonnegative) question particle (again, presumably in COMP), as in:[26]

26. min íðes   to peðí?
    QN saw/2SG   the-child
    'Did you perhaps see the child?'

again supporting the analysis of at least some occurrences of *mi* as a complementizer-like particle.[27]

A slightly more serious problem is that this analysis necessarily places *na* in the COMP-position. As such, the obvious guess as to what *na* is categorically is that it is a complementizer. Calling *na* a complementizer, though, is at odds with the claim, stated first in Philippaki-Warburton & Christides 1980 and reiterated in Philippaki-Warburton 1985, that clauses with *na* in Modern Greek are to be analyzed as having a zero complementizer. Moreover, *na* does not behave like a complementizer in the sense of being a delimitor of sentence boundaries for embedded clauses, for lower clause noun phrases can freely "escape" to the left of *na*, as in (27b), but clearly do not become part of the higher clause; in particular, they cannot trigger the (clause-bounded) clitic doubling coindexing process, as in (27c):

27. a. ϑélo   na   episkeftó ton andóni.
       want/1SG   PRT   visit/1SG the-Anthony/ACC
       'I want to visit Anthony.'
    b. ϑélo ton andóni na episkeftó.
    c. *ton   ϑélo ton andóni na episkeftó.
       him/ACC

The solution to this problem, short of reevaluating the categorization of all of the complementizer-like particles in Greek[28] or giving up the idea that complementizers in Greek are delimitors of sentence boundaries,[29] may lie simply in the realization that elements other than complementizers can occur in COMP (e.g., topicalized or questioned noun phrases, in most accounts of NP movement). That is to say, *na* could be analyzed as being in COMP-position without entailing that it be classified as a complementizer; a classification as "verbal particle" would be consistent with the present analysis.[30] At the very least, though, the analysis presented here concerning *na* requires that certain aspects of the syntax of complement clauses in Greek be reexamined.

Yet another problem is that under certain circumstances, imperatives in Greek can be preceded by a "particle," to use what

at present is meant to be an entirely neutral term. The relevant
form is *já*, in utterances such as:

28. a. já stásu!
         stop/IMPV.SG
         '(Hey), stop!'
     b. já kitákste   ekíno ton ánⴰropo!
         look/IMPV.PL   that-the-man/ACC
         '(Hey), look at that man!'.

The presence of *já* is optional, in the sense that both (28a) and
(28b) are perfectly well-formed without it, though these imperatival
sentences are somewhat more emphatic with *já* than without it.[31]
The possibility of having a preceding *já* with imperatives presents a
problem for the analysis given here because it appears that
imperatives occur with a "complementizer-like" element before
them and therefore that the COMP-position does not have a
zero-realization; if that were the proper analysis, then, in that
regard, they would seem to pattern with the clearly finite forms
and run counter to the patterns found with the clearly nonfinite,
participial, forms. Alternatively, if the claim that imperatives are
nonfinite is to be maintained, then the common thread with
participles—a zero realization for the COMP-position—that formed
the basis for the argument given above disappears.

    This is a problem, though, that can be countered, so that the
present analysis can be maintained intact. One can simply claim
that *já* in such utterances is an independent word, perhaps an
exclamation somewhat parallel to *hey* in English (cf. *Hey! Stop
that!*) or even an adverbial.[32] A better hypothesis, though, as to
what *já* as an independent word might be is the claim that it is
an imperative itself. For one thing, *já* does independently take
noun phrase arguments, as in:

29. já mja stiɣmí!
         one-moment/ACC
     'Wait a minute!'

and can introduce verbal complements with *na*, as in:[33]

30. já na δúme.
         see/1PL
     'Let's see.'

so that it is verb-like in certain respects. The analysis of *já* as a
verb, specifically an imperatival form, would account for those
properties.

    Under this interpretation, then, a sequence as in (28) above

would have the same analysis as the concatenated imperatives in
(31):

31. éla   fére   mu   to kapélo!
     come/IMPV.SG bring/IMPV.SG to-me   the-hat/ACC
     'Come (and) bring me the hat!'

This "serial verb"-like construction is quite restricted in Greek, and
seems to be found mainly with *éla*, the imperative of 'come,'[34] but
serial-verb constructions in other languages tend to be highly
restricted as well. For example, in English one finds it only with
go, come, and for some speakers, *run* as well, as in:

32. a. Go bring me a cookie!
     b. Come put your shoes on right away!
     c. Run get some beer!

and only for certain forms/categories with those verbs:

33. a. *John is going get/getting some cookies.
     b. *Bill goes get/gets some beer for all of us now.
     c. *Stan went get/got the car.
     d. Now we go get the records and the party can start.
     e. I plan to go find a place to sit before the others come.

Thus the restricted nature of this construction in Greek is perhaps
not surprising.

    It may be, though, that there is a slightly wider range of
serial verb constructions in Greek than previously indicated.
Besides the patterns with *éla* noted in (31) and the possibility of
analyzing the *já* + *Imperative* pattern in a similar way, sequences
of deictic *ná* 'here (is)!'[35] with a following imperative, as in:

34. ná   par   to!
     DEICTIC.PRT   take/IMPV.SG   it/ACC
     'Here, take it!'

may well involve concatenated imperatives as well. Under the
analysis of deictic *ná* given in Joseph (1981b), this particle is to be
treated as an imperative; among other things, this analysis accounts
for the dialectal variant *náte*, in which the imperative plural ending
-te has been added to *ná*. This would provide a further parallel
(in addition to those noted in note 34) for the analysis of *já* +
Imperative as a sequence of imperatives. While it must be
admitted that this aspect of the analysis of *já* is a bit
speculative,[36] it does seem clear that there are non-ad hoc ways of
analyzing *já* which allow one to treat it as something other than a
complementizer(-like particle), so that the existence of such a
pattern in the language does not vitiate the line of argumentation

developed here for the nonfiniteness of imperatives in Greek.[87]

The final problem to be addressed is perhaps the most serious one. A "zero-element" figures prominently in the analysis presented here, in particular in the guise of a "zero-realization" for the COMP-position for nonfinite clauses. In fact, though, all the [+finite] COMP-elements can have a zero-realization, in the sense that they can be absent on the surface. For example, *na* is optional in combination with *prin* 'before', as in (35a), and *óti* (as well as its equivalent, *pos*) is optional with a verb such as *pistévo* 'believe,' as in (35b):

35. a. prin   (na) fíγo,   ϑa su   milíso.
       before PRT leave/1SG FUT you/GEN speak/1SG
       'Before I leave, I will speak to you.'

    b. pistévo   (óti) o jánis   íne   eδó
       believe/1SG that John/NOM is/3SG here
       'I believe (that) John is here.'

Thus in this analysis, it is essential to distinguish between obligatory zero-realizations in COMP-position (as with the nonfinite forms) and COMP-elements that are deletable (e.g., *na* and *óti/pos*, under appropriate conditions). Such a move is necessary for English too, of course, since *that* is not obligatory with most subordinate clauses:

36. I believe (that) the earth is flat.

There is a difference, however, between the situation with English and that with Greek here: nothing in the analysis of the English complementizer system depends on a zero-realization in COMP-position whereas, under the analysis presented here, a zero-realization is significant in Greek for signalling the nonfiniteness of certain clause types. Still, the proliferation of phonologically null elements is somewhat problematic in that it represents an undesirable embarrassment of riches for the theory.

However, the problem may not be too severe and the situation in Greek may provide an insight into the ways in which languages can differ from one another with regard to their complementizer systems. Even English has to reckon with an obligatory zero-realization in COMP-position, as Greek has to, except that for English this obligatory "zero-element" occurs in main clauses only.[38] That is, while evidence from WH-Movement and Topicalization suggests that there is a COMP node in main clauses in English that is filled by various leftward movements of constituents, there is never an overt element, such as the question

particles *mípos* and *mi(n)* found in Greek (see (22) and (26) above), that would independently point to such a main clause complementizer "slot". Thus, it may in fact be necessary to make a distinction between obligatory zero-realization elements in COMP and those that only optionally have such a realization, and moreover to recognize that languages may differ as to how these elements are distributed in main clause as opposed to subordinate clause COMP-positions.

In closing, it is worth pointing out that the foregoing discussion shows the interrelatedness of questions of Greek syntax, Balkan grammar, and Universal Grammar. The analysis of what at first appears to be a minor aspect of the syntax of one construction in Greek, i.e., the question of the finiteness of imperatives in Greek, can be seen to have implications for the analysis of other constructions of Greek (e.g., the "serial verb" construction), for the analysis of complementizers in English and by extension Universal Grammar, and finally, though they were not specifically focussed on here, for the interpretation of the status of imperatives, finiteness, and the complementizer-like particles, throughout the Balkan languages.

Ohio State University

Notes

[1] This is the verbal form in -*ondas*, e.g. γráfondas '(while) writing,' which has also been referred to in the literature as an adverbial participle (e.g. in Babiniotis & Kontos (1967:218)), occasionally as a gerund, and so on. The designation "active participle" is found in a number of standard descriptions of Greek, e.g., Thumb 1964, and Mirambel 1959, and so is

adopted here.

[2] There is, to be sure, some controversy as to whether Modern Greek actually has a category of *subjunctive*. I adopt here the traditional view that such a category does exist in the language; see also Veloudis & Philippaki–Warburton 1984 for some further discussion and elaboration of the argumentation supporting this traditional view.

[3] Excluding, of course, the (rare) imperative of the perfect and the active participle of the perfect, since these are nonfinite forms.

[4] See Friedman 1977, especially pp. 13–15, for this terminology for the various forms of the Macedonian verb.

[5] My thanks to Victor Friedman of the University of North Carolina for this information.

[6] My use of the term "complementizer–like particle" is so as to be neutral on the question of what to call these elements at the moment. The other common thread in (1) and (2), namely clitic placement, may just be restricted to Greek and Macedonian, since a different pattern for clitic placement is to be found in Bulgarian; consequently, it is of less interest from the pan–Balkan perspective.

[7] I say this under the assumption that Balkanists must be concerned with aspects of Universal Grammar in order to be able to separate out the common features among the Balkan languages which are due to language universals from those which are due to some aspect of the common development—whether genetic or contact–induced—of the languages in question. See Joseph (1983a:240, 308) for some discussion.

[8] Although such objections, to my knowledge, have not (yet) appeared in print, they have been raised by Marios Fourakis (personal communication, and in an unpublished review of Joseph 1978), for one.

[9] It is clear that some cross–linguistic guide is necessary for correct labelling of the forms; in Joseph (1983a:Chap. 2), the absence of some type of morphological marking was taken to be the relevant criterion for labelling one of two opposing classes of forms as nonfinite.

[10] Again, by Marios Fourakis (personal communication).

[11] See Joseph (1983a:110ff.) for some discussion of their analyses and of the question of finiteness in Macedonian in general.

[12] In giving this argument based for Greek, I am sticking to the Balkan language I know best; I suspect, though, that the argument does not lose in the translation into Macedonian, but I leave that for others to determine for certain.

[13] My adoption of certain aspects of this theoretical framework should not be taken to indicate a wholesale endorsement of this particular line of inquiry into syntactic phenomena; rather, theories such as Extended Standard Theory or Government and Binding theory, together with the theory of phrase structure they generally assume, have shown a concern for details of syntactic structure such as complementizers, and so have something to offer the analysis of Modern Greek syntax with regard to the question of complementizers and finiteness in Greek.

[14] I am using the ' notation for what has been called "bar," so that S' is to be read "S–bar"; COMP is the label for the complementizer node, and INFL stands for the node which gives the syntactic indication of inflection.

[15] Other work in the Government and Binding framework has used the idea of agreement between a complementizer element and another element in the sentence. For example, Stowell (1982:563), in discussing the tense of infinitival complements and gerunds, considers an analysis in which "the tense operator must appear in COMP at D–structure ... [allowing] us to capture the matching between complementizer and the tense operator type." Although he ultimately rejects this analysis in favor of one in which gerunds have no COMP position at all (see notes 18 and 21 below), his rejection is not based on any inherent deficiencies or problems with the "matching" (= agreement) analysis, but instead on the extendability of the other analysis to additional infinitival complement structures.

[16] This list may not be exhaustive—see below for more discussion and some possible additions.

[17] For some discussion of the distribution of the complementizers óti, pos, and pu, see Christides 1982; for discussion of the use of na, see Hesse 1980.

[18] Thus, the Greek present participles are unlike English gerunds, which permit no WH–Movement (cf. *What by saying ø did John perjure himself?, with movement of the WH–word, vs. the acceptable By saying what ..., with no such movement; see also Stowell 1982). It is important to note that the fronting of the "WH"–element in the Greek sentences in (17) is not obligatory, so that ti can occur after the participle as well; this, however, is a structural position (postverbal) which is possible for noun phrases in general and thus does not require the assumption of any special extra nodes.

[19] This pattern is admittedly marginal in Greek, but seems to represent a possible sentence type. The sentences in (18), for instance, are taken from a relatively recent high–school grammar book, D. Monójios et al. (1976:125). The observation of Thumb (1964:169) is also relevant: "a nominative absolute construction [with the active participle] is rare," for it too indicates that this construction, while marginal, is nonetheless a possibility; Thumb moreover gives what may be cited as a further example, from the *Istoría tis Romiosínis* of Eftaliotis (1901):

i. jínete   meɣálo sinéório   sto paláti
   happens/3SG   great–assembly/NOM   in–the–palace
   párondas   ki   o patriárhis
   be–present/ACT.PPL   and   the–patriarch/NOM
   ki óli i prúhondes
   and all–the–dignataries/NOM
   'A great assembly is held in the palace, at which the patriarch and all the dignitaries were present.'

[20] In some versions of the X'–theory associated with the Government and Binding framework, there can be clauses with no COMP–node; under such an assumption, the argument given here would not be valid. However, the facts of (17) by themselves indicate the existence of a COMP–node with the participles, so that this argument can be seen as supportive of that conclusion. See also note 22.

[21] It may be also that evidence for a COMP node with the mediopassive participles can be motivated by the apparent variant perfect system forms of

the type *ého haméno* 'I have lost' and *íme haménos* 'I have been lost.' These forms are cited in most standard handbooks and descriptions of Modern Greek alongside the periphrastic perfects formed with the Modern Greek continuation of the infinitive of previous stages of the language, i.e., the type of *ého hási* 'I have lost' and *ého havθí* 'I have been lost,' although it may be that the active at least is not a perfect per se but instead is *ého* + *[NP + modifier]*. The modifier, in −*meno*−, is akin to the mediopassive participle, though not formally identical with it; the two share the formative −*meno*−, but it is added to two different stems of the verb altogether (i.e., *hanó-menos* 'being lost/MED/PASS.PPL' vs. *ha-ménos* in the periphrastic perfect cited above). If the two are considered, however, to be exponents of the same category of mediopassive participle, marked, say, by −*meno*−, then the syntagms with these forms could give evidence for a COMP node with the mediopassive participles, since the "participle" here is a complement of a verb, namely *ého/íme*. This argument would only show, of course, that mediopassive participles are capable of having a COMP node occurring with them, not that every instance of such a participle necessarily has a COMP node; still, taken together with the other evidence (i.e., the parallelism with the active participles), it is suggestive of the conclusion that the mediopassive participles do have a COMP node that is accordingly obligatorily realized as zero.

[22] These facts, then, and the analysis offered here of them, indicate that Greek needs what Kayne 1981 has referred to as a "null–complementizer," i.e. a COMP node which is unfilled, distinct from the complete absence of a complementizer node (something Stowell 1982 has argued for for infinitival complements, contrary to Kayne's analysis). See also the discussion at the end of this paper about zero–elements.

[23] See Radford (1983:171–173) on the evidentiary value of such question particles for indicating the existence of COMP nodes.

[24] One might think that prohibitions such as *mi γrápsis* 'Don't write!' could be derived directly from the subjunctive form *na mi γrápsis*, which provides a politer prohibition (i.e. '(Please) don't write'), via whatever elision process allows the absence of *na* after *prin* 'before,' for example (see (35), below). However, the absence of *na* in prohibitions and its absence with *prin* are not really parallel in that in the latter case the suppression of *na* has no discernible effect on the meaning at all, while in the prohibitions the suppression of *na* would have significant semantic/pragmatic effects. Thus it seems best to separate the two forms of the prohibition syntactically, inasmuch as they are separated semantically/pragmatically.

[25] It is of course true that the *mi* with verbs such as *fováme* 'fear' can be replaced by *mípos* 'that, lest' and in that regard differs from the *mi* in prohibitives. I have no explanation for this but do point out that *mípos* may contain the true complementizer *pos*, as well as the complementizer–like element *mi*, while the prohibitive, not being embedded under any (overt) verb has only the complementizer–like element. As noted below, the occurrence of an element in the COMP–node does not necessarily mean that it has to be identified as a complementizer proper, and for the argument presented here, all that is necessary is for the COMP–node to be filled by some element. From a Balkan perspective, it is interesting to note that something akin to *mípos* occurs in Albanian after the noun *frikë* 'fright, fear,' namely *se mos*, as in:

i. ... pa   patur frikë se   mos sekretari i shtetit Dalles
       without having fear   that not secretary-of-state Dulles
       do   të   na burgosë
       FUT PRT us imprison/3SG
    '... without having the fear that Secretary of State Dulles will
       imprison us'

(This example is taken from the anonymous *Albanian Reader* prepared by the U.S. Department of State in the 1950s, from selection IV, lines 20–21.) *Se mos* literally is "that not," with the Albanian unmarked complementizer *se* (cf. Greek *pos*) and what appears at first to be the modal negation particle, despite the absence of a negative meaning in the sentence (cf. Greek *mi(n)*).

[26] The final *n* in this occurrence of *mi* is a combinatory variant found before following words that begin with a vowel or a stop; properly speaking, then, the citation form of *mi* should be *mi(n)*. I am indebted to Kostas Kazazis of the University of Chicago for bringing sentences such as (26) to my attention.

[27] It is worth pointing out that this result may not accord with all native speakers' intuitions concerning the status of *mi*. I suspect that native speakers' intuitions on the identification of morphemes are often shaped by similarities of form, and so in that sense are not always reliable, however interesting and revealing they may be in their own right. One might compare, for example, how an English speaker might attempt to make a synchronic connection between the preposition *to (I gave it TO him)* and the complementizer *to (I want TO go)* or even, on a lexical plane, between *arm* 'body part' and *arm* 'weapon' (despite the fact that the etymological connection between the two is actually quite distant, the one being a native Germanic formation and the other a back-formation via a borrowing from Latin, though both are from the same Proto–Indo–European root).

[28] This is an area which certainly requires further study. For one thing, *na* has been given a variety of labels in the literature, including "main specifier of V[erb ... i.e.] an element of AUX (using this as a cover term for the verbal specifier system" (Ingria 1981:143ff.); modal particle and subordinating conjunction (Householder, Kazazis, and Koutsoudas 1964:166); and others. Also, there are interesting distributional facts about the Greek "verbal particles" which are still in need of a full accounting; for instance, *θa* and *na* do not cooccur (except for the rare dialectal combination *θa na*) and so are conceivably to be assigned to the same preverbal "slot," but *óti/pos* can only precede *θa* and not *na*.

[29] It is true, though, that even the noncontroversial complementizers, such as *óti* or *pos*, are not strong delimitors of sentence boundaries, since some speakers find a sentence such as:
    i. pistévo   ton andóni   óti   andipaθís.
        believe/1SG Anthony/ACC   COMP   dislike/2SG
        'I believe that you dislike Anthony.'
to be an acceptable variant of:
    ii. pistévo óti andipaθís ton andóni.
        'I believe that you dislike Anthony.'

[30] This of course begs the not–insignificant question of what the status of "verbal particle" is. It is important to point out that the claim that *na* is a "subjunctive marker," as in Veloudis and Philippaki–Warburton 1984, usually interpreted to mean that subjunctive clauses consequently have a zero

complementizer, need not be interpreted in that way. The element *na* need not be taken to be an affix, and if an independent word underlyingly, it could certainly be in the COMP node, as is the case with the question particles discussed above. Moreover, there is no need to put *na* in the INFL node, for it has no effect on verb inflection—the forms that occur with *na* are morphologically identical with indicative forms. Thus the analysis whereby *na* is a subjunctive marker is not inconsistent with the analysis presented here in which *na* is in the COMP node, even though not a complementizer proper.

[31] An alternative view, which does not affect the claims made here, is that the more emphatic nature of such imperatives is what conditions the occurrence of *já*; under such an account, the presence of *já* would be, strictly speaking, obligatory, under particular, and as yet ill-defined, conditions of emphasis.

[32] It is worth noting that a sequence of adverbials at the beginning of an imperative seems to have the same effect in terms of grammaticality as a sequence of adverbial plus *já*:

   i.   s ta alíϑia káne   mja prospáϑja!
       in the-truth make/IMPV.SG a-try/ACC
       'Make a try in earnest!'
   ii. ??s ta alíϑia γríγora káne mja prospáϑja!
                    quickly
       'Quickly, make a try in earnest!'
   iii. ??s ta alíϑia já káne mja prospáϑja.

Sentences (ii) and (iii) can, of course, be improved by adding pauses between the adverbial elements at the beginning of the sentence, but these facts do attest to a parallel behavior between *já* and true adverbials with imperatives.

[33] The sequence *já na* in utterances such as this must be kept distinct from the homophonous sequence *ja ná* meaning 'in order that,' which seems best taken to contain a different *ja*, most probably the independent preposition *ja* 'for, about.'

[34] There is another expression in Greek which appears to contain two concatenated imperatives; this is the expression given in (i) below:

   i.   káne   (ke líγo)   kráti!
      make/IMPV.SG and a-little hold/IMPV.SG
      'Have (a little) restraint!'

It is unlikely that this expression is synchronically analyzable in the same way as the "serial verb" construction discussed above, for the second verb form, *kráti*, is not the synchronically regular imperative singular form for the verb *krató* 'I hold' (*kráta* is the expected form); thus, it appears that *káne kráti* is a lexicalized, frozen, expression that happens to contain what historically was a sequence of imperatives. Indeed, one informant consulted on this, despite being well educated and a trained linguist, was completely unaware of the fact that this phrase contained an imperative at all, suggesting that it really is learned as a lexical unit. Still, the existence of such a phrase could well indicate a period of greater productivity for this pattern at one, perhaps relatively recent, period of the language. Another possible serial verb construction in Greek is deictic *ná* discussed below, and it may well be that some expressions with the "interjection" *ánde* 'come! come on!,' such as:

   i.   ánde fíγe!
        leave/IMPV.SG
      'Go on, get out of here!'

are to be analyzed in a similar fashion.

[35] This is not to be confused with the verbal particle *na* under discussion throughout the paper so far. See Joseph 1981b for some discussion of the differences, synchronic and diachronic, between these two forms, with an elaboration as well of the analysis of deictic *ná* as a verb (an analysis hinted at also in Householder, Kazazis, & Koutsoudas (1964:153) and countered in Christidis 1985).

[36] It is worth pointing out that the standard etymology of "imperatival" *já*, e.g., that of Andriotis (1983:sév.) derives it from the Ancient Greek *eia*, an exclamation used in exhortations and often followed by an imperative; although there are some phonological details that would need to be worked out and none of the standard etymological dictionaries of Ancient Greek give such a connection, it may very well be the case that *eia* is, from a diachronic standpoint, derived from an imperative of the verb *eáo*: 'allow, permit.'

[37] Irene Philippaki–Warburton (personal communication) has pointed out that under one interpretation of these facts, the serial verb construction could be taken to show that imperatives are in fact marked for person, contrary to criterion (1a) noted at the outset as relevant for defining finiteness in Greek. She has drawn my attention to the fact that parallel to the *éla fére* concatenated imperative of (29), one also finds imperatives concatenated with prohibitives, as in:

   i.   éla   min   kles!
      come/IMPV.SG COMP cry/2SG
      'Come, don't cry!'

Since the verb *kles* is overtly marked as second person (and is in fact finite by the tests in (1) as pointed out in the discussion of prohibitives), one might argue that the concatenated verb construction requires agreement between the two verbs and reach the conclusion that imperatives are in fact marked as second person just like *kles* is. However, it seems that the crucial step in the argument, namely the assumption that the concatenated verb construction requires syntactic agreement in person between verbs, cannot be supported. In particular, there are instances of *éla* with a first person plural verb, e.g.:

   ii. éla   páme   mazí.
      come/IMPV.SG go/1PL together
      'Come, let's go together.'

Thus there is no requirement of agreement in person between the verbs in this construction. Imperatives are, of course, regularly associated with second person interpretations but that can be taken to be a pragmatic fact (as noted in Joseph (1983a:14)); moreover, the first person form as in (ii) pragmatically also entails a second person referent, so that at most, one could say that there is pragmatically controlled—but not syntactically controlled—agreement in this construction.

[38] Under Stowell's 1982 analysis (see also notes 15, 20, and 22), complement gerunds and infinitives have no COMP node at all, and so have no such node that can go unfilled.

References

Andriótis, N.   1983. *Etimilojikó Lexikó tis Kinís Neoelinikís.*   Thessaloniki: Aristotélio Panepistímio Θesaloníkis, Instituto Neoelinikón Spuδón   (Third Edition).

Babiniótis, G. and P. Kontós.   1967.   *Sinhronikí Γramatikí tis Kinís Néas Elinikís.*   Athens.

Bloomfield, L.   1933.   *Language.*   New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Christídes, A.-Ph.   1982.   "*óti/pos – pu*: epilojí δiktón simbliromáton sta néa eliniká," in *Melétes ja tin Elinikí Γlósa / Studies in Greek Linguistics. Proceedings of the 2nd Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Philosophy, Aristotelian University of Thessaloniki,* pp. 113–177.

Christídes, A.-Ph.   1985.   "To δiktikó na."   To appear in *Praktiká tis 6is Etísias Sinándisis tu Toméa Γlosolojías, Filosofikís Sholís, Aristotélio Panepistímio Θesaloníkis.*

Freidin, R.   1983.   "X–Bar Theory and the Analysis of English Infinitivals," *Linguistic Inquiry* 14:713–722.

Groen, B. M.   1977.   *A Structural Description of the Macedonian Dialect of Dihovo. Phonology, Morphology, Texts, Lexicon.*   Lisse: The Peter de Ridder Press.

Hendriks, P.   1976.   *The Radožda–Vevčani Dialect of Macedonian. Structure, Texts, Lexicon.*   Lisse: The Peter de Ridder Press.

Hesse, R.   1980.   *Syntax of the Modern Greek Verbal System.   The Use of Forms, Particularly in Combination with* ϑa *and* na.   Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press (Opuscula Byzantina et Neograeca, Vol. 2).

Householder, F., K. Kazazis, and A. Koutsoudas.   1964.   *A Reference Grammar of Literary Dhimotiki.*   Bloomington: Indiana University / The Hague: Mouton (Publication #31 of Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics.   Also Part II of *International Journal of American Linguistics* Vol. 30).

Ingria, R.   1981.   Sentential Complementation in Modern Greek.   Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation.   Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Joseph, B.   1978.   *Morphology and Universals in Syntactic Change: Evidence from Medieval and Modern Greek.*   Ph. D. Dissertation, Harvard University (Printed and distributed by Indiana University Linguistics Club, Bloomington, Indiana).

_____.   1981a.   "The Balkan Infinitive Loss—Some Methodological Problems," *Folia Slavica,* 4:300–308.

_____.   1981b.   "On the Synchrony and Diachrony of Modern Greek NA," *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 7:139–154.

_____.   1983a.   *The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive.   A Study in Areal, General, and Historical Linguistics.*   Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____.   1983b.   "Nonfiniteness," paper presented at panel on Grammatical Categories of the Balkan Languages, at Annual Meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies (AAASS), Kansas City.

Kayne, R.   1981.   "On Certain Differences between French and English,"

Linguistic Inquiry 12:349–371.

Monójios, D., B. Moskóvis, E. Prevalákis, & G. Filaktópulos.   1976. *Syntaktikó tis δimotikís.*   Athens: Athens College.

Newmark, L.   1957.   *A Structural Grammar of Albanian.*   Bloomington: Indiana University Press (Indiana University Publications, Slavic and East European, Number 8).

Philippaki–Warburton, I. and A.-Ph. Christides.   1980.   "The Syntax and Semantics of Modern Greek Complementizers," paper presented at First Annual Meeting of Modern Greek Linguistics, University of Thessaloniki.

Philippaki–Warburton, I.   1985.   "Word Order in Modern Greek," *Transactions of the Philological Society,* pp. 113–143.

Radford, A.   1983.   *Transformational Syntax.   A Student's Guide to Chomsky's Extended Standard Theory.*   Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stowell, T.   1982.   "The Tense of Infinitives," *Linguistic Inquiry* 13:561–570.

Thumb, A.   1964.   *A Handbook of the Modern Greek Language.   Grammar, Texts, Glossary.*   Chicago: Argonaut.

Veloudis, I. & I. Philippaki–Warburton.   1984.   "I ipotaktikí sta N. Eliniká," in *Melétes ja tin Elinikí Γlósa / Studies in Greek Linguistics.   Proceedings of the 4th Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Philosophy, Aristotelian University of Thessaloniki,* pp. 151–168.

Warburton, I.   1970.   *On the Verb in Modern Greek.*   Bloomington: IndianaUniversity / The Hague: Mouton. (Language Science Monographs, Volume 4).